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Chapter 4: Faculty, Administration and Governance

Standards 10, 5 and 4

Standard 10: Faculty

“The institution’s instructional, research, and service programs are devised, developed, monitored, and supported by qualified professionals.”

Overview of Standard 10

The Introduction (pp. x – xi) speaks of the growth of the faculty from the College’s early planning phase in 2010 when seven lines were filled to the current fiscal year with 49 full-time faculty. While this growth put significant human resource demands on faculty and staff, it has yielded a truly excellent faculty, productive in scholarship and passionate about the career and teaching opportunities at Guttman. With extensive feedback from both the working group and the faculty at large, this chapter reports on the challenges that accompanied that exceptional growth. These include development and implementation of effective onboarding, sustained professional development, and Guttman’s efforts to balance the triad of faculty teaching, service and scholarship with both its commitment to a new educational model and its place within a traditional university and its labor contracts. The latter was focused on the Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure guidelines which were of considerable ongoing concern by faculty and the Office of Academic Affairs, and which now are in the process of negotiation. Without academic departments Guttman has no department chairpersons nor comparable departmental structures. Nonetheless, responsibility for the curriculum remains within the faculty domain and is overseen by a series of Guttman administrative positions (Program Coordinators, Area Coordinators, and First Year Experience Course Coordinators) for which faculty receive reassigned time. Given the first-year core curriculum, a non-traditional organization of responsibilities, and the tenure-track status of most of the faculty, it is not surprising that there are robust discussions of potential faculty research and the meaning of academic freedom within a highly collaborative environment.

Findings for Standard 10

Growing the Faculty

The faculty of Guttman Community College has grown at a rapid pace since August 2012. Guttman began with seven full-time faculty in September 2010 and by September 2016 had grown to include 49 full-time (including 2 librarians) and 26 adjunct faculty (20.5 FTE). Currently about one-third of the faculty are adjunct and during fall 2016 41% of the classes were taught by adjunct faculty. The growth of the faculty is shown in the graph below. (See Document Set 10-b for a complete list of faculty and their credentials.)
Guttman has recruited and appointed a qualified faculty. All full-time faculty at the assistant professor-level and above hold doctoral degrees and are active in their scholarly fields. Those in lecturer or instructor lines have lower research expectations but still hold Master’s level degrees in their fields. Part-time faculty typically hold Master’s level qualifications as well, and a number of them are engaged in doctoral study.

In close collaboration between OAA and the Office of Human Resources, faculty job descriptions are written and posted in diverse venues (see Document Set 10). Our hiring practices reflect the college’s stated commitment to diversity (see above Standard 6, pp. 12-14). In 2015, 55.9% of Guttman’s full-time instructional staff were identified by the University as members of federally protected groups (CUNY Workforce Demographics) and 48% of Guttman’s 2016 full-time faculty identified as minorities. Faculty search committees are composed of both faculty and staff from multiple disciplines and are charged by the Provost and the Diversity Officer.

Onboarding, Mentoring, and Professional Development

Once appointed, faculty are onboarded in a number of ways. Full-time faculty participate in a multiday seminar (see AY17 New Faculty Orientation Agenda- Document Set 10), in which they are introduced to the unique features of the Guttman academic model including instructional principals, learning outcomes, preferred pedagogies, academic technologies, and student support structure. Part-time faculty are invited to two-hour sessions in which they, too, are introduced to the unique features of the Guttman academic model as well as campus-specific information and logistics (see New Hire Onboarding PPT). These programs have grown with the College, in response to faculty needs that were expressed informally to OAA and HR personnel.

Beginning in spring 2016, Guttman initiated a new mentoring initiative, the First Year Sponsor program. This embraces an approach to faculty success which is rooted in building a long-term, broad, and flexible support network of people, practices, and institutional supports. No one person or element of the network is expected to fulfill all of the faculty member’s needs; rather, the strength of the networked approach is that a diversity of skills, resources, and perspectives are assembled. The individual faculty member is an active agent at the center of the network, not at the receiving end, and is thereby positioned in an ownership role vis-à-vis her or his professional success.

All new faculty hired during spring 2016, including substitute full-time faculty, were assigned “sponsors” from among the existing full-time faculty. The only requirement for the first-year sponsor is having been at Guttman for more than one year and a desire to serve in this role. The sponsor is meant to encourage,
collaborate, and assist in the process of intentionally identifying areas of need to be addressed which are
intended to include teaching; service; scholarship in the discipline(s); scholarship of teaching and
learning; reappointment, promotion, and tenure; professional development; the Guttman model; transition
support for faculty new to Guttman; work-life balance; support for faculty members from traditionally
underrepresented groups; and other areas of support as identified by the faculty member. The First-Year
Sponsor relationship can either be dissolved after the first year, the faculty can elect to identify a different
mutually-agreeable continuing sponsor, or she can continue to engage with her First-Year Sponsor (who
will then become her continuing sponsor).

Professional development for faculty has always been available at Guttman. However, in the spring 2015
Faculty Staff Survey only 50% of faculty agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, “Guttman’s
professional development opportunities have substantially enriched my knowledge/skills. This indicates
that faculty may need more and more meaningful professional development, which the College continues
to work towards providing. Small self-generated faculty groups have sprung up on campus to address
some of the shortfall in mentoring that junior faculty face. One instance of this is the English Faculty
Reading Group, which has chosen a common read and will convene several times over the semester to
tackle issues of teaching and scholarship within the discipline.

The Assessment and Professional Development Committee (A&PD) also addresses some of these needs.
Assessment Days (10 per academic year) are a cornerstone of the Guttman Model. On these days the
A&PD Committee holds workshops to reinforce the Guttman Learning Outcomes (GLOs), models best
practices on the use of ePortfolios for assessment, and allots time for the ongoing Periodic Program
Review process. There is a focus on curriculum mapping and assignment design (inquiry), assessment of
student work (reflection), and support of curricular improvement (integration). The Committee takes
active steps to make enhancements through analysis of faculty attendance and feedback after individual
workshops. This has led to various opportunities for faculty to share their practices and to a recent
conversation on equity. The conversation on equity led to a college-wide discussion and initiative on
inclusion and equity that occurred at the All-College Meeting on January 10, 2017.

Seminars and workshops are also offered at other times during the year. For instance, faculty lead face-to-
face workshops on ePortfolio practice and produce video series (“Technology Teatime” on YouTube) to
enhance ePortfolio pedagogy. There are hybrid course development workshops for faculty interested in
developing such courses, and the College held a Signature Work Institute in summer 2016 to support
faculty developing assignments unique to their courses. For the last two years the College has offered a
semester-long writing seminar led by a tenured faculty member on the scholarship of teaching and
learning that has resulted in several peer-reviewed publications by junior faculty. Likewise, another
seminar led by faculty, “The Space for Scholarship,” assists with making time for research and writing.
To further support the writing of research grant applications, the College held an information session in
fall 2016 with the Director of the University Research Foundation.

All part-time faculty are invited to full-time professional development opportunities, although the
College’s inability to compensate for all attendance limits part-time participation. When funding is
available Guttman offers compensated professional development opportunities that might draw greater
part-time attendance, such as the Signature Work Institute, and the Guttman Seminar, which is offered to
part-time faculty with support from CUNY Coordinated Undergraduate Education (CUE) program. This
faculty-led series of five in-person workshops is offered annually to current part-time faculty to facilitate
the sharing of model teaching strategies and the introduction of research-based approaches. Post-seminar
surveys suggest the Seminar has been successful in creating sustained conversations about student
learning among part-time faculty.
The Office of Student Engagement provides professional development for faculty as well. The Office of Student Conduct and Community Standards offers an annual workshop on classroom management issues. Likewise, the College supports faculty who work with students with disabilities, in conjunction with the Office of AccessABILITY and the University’s Central Office of Student Affairs. Ongoing professional development is also offered on the incorporation of Starfish by Hobsons into faculty practice at least once per semester.

The College and the University fund professional development and conference or research travel and expenditures. The average reimbursement for a faculty member’s annual travel was $1380 in 2015 and $1460 in 2016. The Provost’s Office has also earmarked funds to support faculty travel to present a paper or for professional development opportunities in support of institutional goals, including sending Guttman delegations to venues such as the Atlantic Center for Learning Communities and the National Summer Institute on Learning Communities run by the Washington Center for Excellence in Undergraduate Education at the Evergreen State College.

One challenge that the College will face as it grows is responding to a wide variety of the needs for faculty professional development. Newly hired faculty and faculty who have been at Guttman for several years are likely to have differing needs in terms of professional development. To meet these varied needs it will be important for the college to provide differentiated layers of professional development to meet the needs of both new and experienced faculty (both full time and adjunct).

Balancing Teaching, Service, Scholarship
Balancing the competing demands of teaching, service, and scholarship is a challenge for any faculty member. At Guttman, the correct balance between these, for both the faculty and the institution, has been continually evolving. When building a new teaching centered college, there is a great amount of service to be done, and faculty must do that work while maintaining the primacy of their teaching roles and must also make sure that they have adequate time to engage in their scholarly work. Identifying and implementing the correct balance among teaching, service, and scholarly work has been especially challenging in the context of a new college with a majority of the faculty are untenured assistant professors.

Teaching
An effort is made to achieve the right balance of part-time and full-time teaching, especially in the First-Year Experience courses, with a strong preference for as much full-time teaching as practical, given contractual requirements and the many critical tasks the faculty perform outside the classroom. The commitment to full-time experienced faculty teaching students in the first-year has been a seminal insight since the Concept Paper. Though always a challenge in practice, and especially so for a small college with limited personnel to cover both general education and courses in the programs of study, Guttman has nevertheless strive to find that balance. The table below shows the percentage and number of classes in the FYE that have been taught by full time and adjunct faculty over the last two semesters. (For data broken out by course, see the Analysis of FYE Staffing in Document Set 10.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Full Time Faculty</th>
<th>Adjunct Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
<td>64.1% (59)</td>
<td>35.9% (33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2016</td>
<td>76.5% (88)</td>
<td>23.5% (27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2017</td>
<td>67.4% (62)</td>
<td>32.6% (30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>70% (209)</td>
<td>30% (90)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There has always been a heightened focus on teaching at Guttman. The Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure document outlines a set of teaching principles that are essential to the instructional methodology basic to the college’s mission. Such principles include:

1. employing a range of learning techniques beyond lecture including group work, student presentations and research, active discussions, and problem solving;
2. conveying information and leading discussions in an interactive, participatory environment; and
3. effectively linking course content to real world applications.

While these are a small sample of the college’s teaching principles, they demonstrate a focus on interactivity and problem-based learning. Faculty at Guttman take their teaching responsibilities quite seriously and, on the sixth floor where workstations are located, they can often be heard discussing both the successes and challenges related to their teaching. Walking the halls of the fourth and fifth floors while classes are in session will reveal the investment that faculty have in the teaching principles referenced above. The table below contains results of a Faculty Survey conducted in spring 2016, when the faculty were asked to rate the importance of each role for a teacher/scholar.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How important is it that teacher/scholars:</th>
<th>Important or Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Be responsive to student feedback on assignments and topics covered</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make periodic changes to the syllabus to update course content</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty commitment to teaching is also reflected in the Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction survey from spring 2015. On a scale of 1 (lowest) to 7 (highest), student responses from Guttman and National Community Colleges showed Guttman with a statistically significant difference for several faculty related items.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Guttman Average</th>
<th>National CC Average</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37. Faculty take into consideration student differences as they teach a course.</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Faculty provide timely feedback about student progress in a course.</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Faculty are interested in my academic problems.</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the annual reappointment, promotion, and tenure process, faculty have the opportunity to explicitly narrate how Guttman teaching ideals are reflected in their practice. In conjunction with this narrative, faculty are evaluated in the RPT peer-review process on evidence that they are incorporating these principles into their teaching. All indications are that that faculty are excellent teachers who respond to the needs of their students in innovative and creative ways.

Service

In addition to teaching, faculty are active in their service to the College and/or University. Given the relatively small size of the Guttman faculty, service opportunities are broadly available to faculty at all stages and levels of their career. Without academic departments Guttman has no department chairpersons nor comparable departmental structures. Nonetheless, responsibility for the curriculum remains within the
faculty domain and is overseen by a series of administrative positions through which the faculty serve the institution and for which they receive reassigned time. These include Program Coordinator for each major (PC), Area Coordinator for Academic Technology, Global Guttman, Bridge, Experiential Learning, Math, Reading and Writing, and ESL (AC), and FYE Course Coordinators for City Seminar, Ethnographies of Work, and The Arts in New York City (CC) (see Coordinator Position Descriptions in Document Set 10). All Coordinators receive reassigned time for the work they do related to these appointments. Course Coordinators are the newest component of the faculty arm of academic leadership growing out of a desire to maintain the integrity of the FYE and the imperative, surfaced at numerous Assessment Days and the January 2016 All-College Meeting, that we protect and foster the Guttman model. These foundational Guttman courses are taken by every Guttman student beginning in the first semester. They are each complex, with integrated components, field work or site visits, and non-traditional curricula and pedagogies. The CC works with the instructors of all sections of their course, working to maintain course integrity across the houses, cohorts, and sections, and assessing and strengthening the curricula.

Other service and leadership opportunities arise throughout the year, including local and university-level committee membership, graduate fellow coordination (Guttman hosts both Quantitative Reasoning and Writing Fellows from the Graduate Center of CUNY), instructional team leadership positions, participation in recruitment and admissions events, and serving as faculty advisors to student activities, initiatives, research, and travel.

The work of the Council Curriculum Committee is a major focal point for faculty development and redevelopment of courses, graduation and program requirements, and academic policies and procedures such as those related to academic standing. It is through the work of the Curriculum Committee that faculty formally update the curriculum and courses that are offered at the college. As discussed below under Standard 4: Leadership and Governance (p. 83), the majority of Council resolutions have been introduced by the Curriculum Committee, approved by the Council, and ultimately the Board of Trustees.

Scholarship

Faculty scholarship is supported through typical CUNY mechanisms of contractual junior faculty research reassigned time (24 hours to be used in the first five years of a tenure-track faculty appointment) and institutional support for faculty travel to professional conferences. Guttman also recognizes the high impact practice of engaging students in research. Faculty in the fields of chemistry, anthropology, sociology, economics and biology have all provided students with exceptional opportunities to better understand the practice of scholarly research.

Faculty are also active in their respective fields of scholarship and in the scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL). During 2015, faculty produced and disseminated 101 pieces of scholarly work (including books or book chapters, peer reviewed articles, conference proceedings, presentations at professional conferences, invited lectures, and other [see Document Set 10 for details of this scholarly work.]) The Office of Academic Affairs supports, publicizes and disseminates faculty work at yearly events on campus. For example, six faculty were featured at a June 7, 2016 Annual Faculty Scholarship Showcase (program attached) in “ignite presentations.” The President, Provost and Dean of Academic Affairs all attended and spoke at this event. With recent guidance, faculty have been encouraged to pursue grants and publications on the inter-university and national scale. This has resulted in faculty at the College obtaining external to Guttman and external to the university money to support their scholarly work.

The Office of Academic Affairs in collaboration with the Office of the President has also initiated a series of awards and fellowships this year. Awards 1-4 were awarded for the first time in December 2016. The Guttman Innovation Fellowships is yet to be awarded for the first time.
1. The Paul Naish Award for Excellence in Teaching
2. Award for Excellence in Part-Time Teaching
3. Provost’s Award for Outstanding Scholarship
4. President’s Award for Community Engagement
5. Guttman Innovation Fellowships (see Document Set 10 for RFP).

Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Guidelines
At its January 23, 2013 meeting, the Council unanimously resolved to approve Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Guidelines dated January 14, 2013 and thus established Guttman protocols in this area. Key to recruiting and sustaining an excellent faculty is the effort to advance the educational vision of the college. Developing, adopting, implementing and in the future revisiting faculty Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure (RPT) guidelines has been a significant challenge for the institution. Guttman’s Interim Governance Plan and the RPT guidelines it adopted attempted to map Guttman’s approach to the CUNY Bylaws and the PSC-CUNY contract, particularly with respect to faculty responsibilities in key areas as they relate to a new vision and educational model. Aspects of the RPT guidelines that on other CUNY campuses were in the domains of departments and department chairs were subsequently challenged in a formal grievance and are currently in negotiation with the Professional Staff Congress. It is anticipated that the new governance plan that is being developed will address the concerns that are a part of the grievance.

Guttman Community College is committed to the core tenets of the larger academic community but has organized the areas of teaching, service, and scholarship in a unique manner relative to faculty time and evaluation. The preliminary procedures regarding reappointment, promotion, and tenure acknowledge that the “foundation of faculty excellence is rooted in teaching and service” (p. 3) so as to provide a rich and academically rigorous curriculum that is grounded in and measured by student success. Since the vision of the college is to remove the barriers that traditionally inhibit students from achieving their anticipated outcomes and eventual graduation, one significant change to organization of the faculty includes a unitary rather than departmental structure that traditionally separates disciplines and sometimes faculty from one another. A substantive challenge during the growth phase of the institution has been effectively communicating how the role of the teacher/scholar is evaluated in the annual reappointment, promotion, and tenure process. Fifty-four percent of faculty state that, at present, most communication regarding the RPT standards is through verbal exchanges between colleagues rather than formally conveyed written or spoken instructions from the chief academic officer. This is symptomatic of the varied leadership of the Office of Academic Affairs since Guttman’s opening. In five years, Guttman has conducted two national searches and appointed two Provosts, both of whom have moved on. A third national search is almost completed with finalists visiting campus in early February. The Interim Provost has agreed to be serve until the end of February and to be available for consultation until the new Provost is able to begin.

As the College’s faculty grows, more stable mechanisms for communicating responsibilities and expectations will be needed to support a thriving intellectual culture. To that end, in spring 2016 the Interim Provost held a forum for all faculty to discuss and clarify Guttman’s Reappointment, Promotion, Tenure guidelines and in fall 2016 invited representatives of the College Personnel Committee to a meeting with new faculty to discuss the RPT guidelines. Distributed at both of those meetings was a best practices document written by members of the College Personnel Committee with specific suggestions about what to include and not include in a reappointment packet. Through these meetings and his other work, the Interim Provost also made improvements to support the faculty, so that submissions are more closely aligned with contractual expectations. Files are being re-organized to be strictly compliant with University requirements and faculty are receiving guidance in what to submit and when and how to make submissions. The protocol and form used in peer observations of teaching were reviewed this past summer by a committee of faculty and administrators and a new observation form was being piloted in
The pilot use of that form will be evaluated during spring 2017. With these initiatives underway, we will continue to explore ways to support faculty as they move from assistant to associate professor as well as from associate to full professor.

**Collaboration and Academic Freedom**

Collaboration is at the heart of Guttman’s design and at times this had led to tension and a lack of clarity about roles. The Curriculum Committee of the College Council is composed of an interdisciplinary team of faculty and staff, chaired by a faculty member, under the guidance of the Provost. Faculty hold all leadership roles in the Programs of Study, discipline areas, and other curricular area such as the FYE and Bridge program. At the same time, tension remains between the role of OAA administration and the role of faculty in scheduling and staffing (as described below) and in designating leaders. Under the current governance plan there are no elected faculty leaders. Rather all of the faculty leadership positions have been created and filled by Provost appointments. Some Faculty have indicated dissatisfaction with what has been viewed as a lack of transparency in the identification and filling of these roles. More opportunities for collaboration, faculty input, and information sharing could help alleviate this tension.

The college has never had a dedicated course scheduling office or officer. Through the end of the 2014-2015 academic year the course schedule and staffing assignments was handled by faculty members working with the Office of Academic Affairs. The arrival of new OAA administrators in late August, 2015, was meant to relieve the faculty of this pressure but the transition has not been a smooth one. While preferred practice would be for schedules to be drafted one year in advance and full-time faculty teaching assignments drafted at least one semester in advance, current practice is that schedules and teaching assignments are often in draft form until approximately one month before the start of the next semester. In addition to the overall lack of staff capacity and expertise, multiple factors contribute to the challenges of both scheduling and staffing. The scheduling of classes has not been systematically reviewed and expanded in response to growth in the number of students and the increased space constraints. The staffing of classes has been hindered by an inadequate system for tracking faculty workload and lack of clarity about whose responsibility it is. Both have been impacted by overall lack of staff capacity and expertise.

Current plans to address these serious issues include the convening of collaborative scheduling meetings, beginning in February 2017, a clarification of the roles of both faculty Coordinators and OAA staff regarding scheduling and staffing, beginning in the Spring semester, 2017, and the hiring of a dedicated faculty workload and scheduling Assistant in OAA. The job description for this Assistant is in development and the hiring is expected to be completed by the end of the spring semester, 2017.

As a young, predominantly junior, faculty at a new college, Guttman faculty have engaged in rigorous informal discussions about the interpretations of policies regarding academic freedom. In these conversations, faculty express feeling the freedom to develop courses, but question how to maintain a level of rigor while having that freedom. With that said, there are sufficient resources at GCC and throughout CUNY that reference and affirm Academic Freedom policies: CUNY Board of Trustee’s *Manual of General Policy* 1.02; Chancellor’s Statement on Academic Freedom (2005) former CUNY General Counsel Frederick P. Schaffer’s *A Guide to Academic Freedom; Guttman Faculty Handbook 2015-2016*.

The Working Group for Standard 10, in exploring the understanding of academic freedom among Guttman faculty, collected survey responses from 35 Guttman faculty/staff respondents in total (25 full-time; 5 part-time; 4 academic advisors; 1 graduate coordinator). Affirming the notion that resources are available at Guttman regarding policies on Academic Freedom, 34 out of 35 answered a question about
where in their work at Guttman they encounter the policy on academic freedom. Underscoring the need for further professional development and mentorship, half indicated that they were not clear about the policy. In response to a follow-up question exploring the usefulness of readily available Guttman resources in creating a balance of academic freedom with cross-curricular consistency and standardization, respondents indicated that instructional teams were “very useful”, more than any other option given, for this purpose. This highlights the perceived value of Guttman’s collaborative model and, again, the prime role of informal channels of communication amongst faculty.

In summary, the faculty do have sufficient access to resources related to academic freedom policies and have been informally discussing academic freedom-related issues. Nonetheless, as we grow, there is an opportunity to more intentionally direct people to the resources (e.g. faculty onboarding) and to also have more formal discussions about academic freedom, standards and rigor in a more formal setting. With increased access to academic freedom-related resources and more formal discussions, student academic success will be positively impacted.

Summary of Findings for Standard 10: Faculty
1. Guttman has consistently recruited an excellent faculty in all the necessary disciplinary areas with effective pedagogical skills to support student learning and success in both its first-year core curriculum and its programs of study.
2. Guttman faculty have demonstrated a consistent record of scholarly work.
3. Guttman strives to balance the triad of faculty teaching, service and scholarship with both its commitment to a new educational model and existing within a traditional university and labor contracts.
4. Guttman is developing ongoing mentoring and ongoing professional development opportunities for all faculty.
5. Faculty Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure (RPT) guidelines have been problematic and a point of significant concern for faculty and OAA. The College is in negotiation with the Professional Staff Congress regarding needed revisions to the RPT and has already taken steps to better articulate expectations regarding reappointment, promotion, and tenure.
6. Creating a working schedule and assigning faculty teaching loads for each semester needs to be better structured so that both are available in a timely manner.
7. Guttman is committed to academic freedom at both the local and University levels.

Suggestions for Improvement and Recommendations for Standard 10
Suggestions
- Onboarding of all faculty and ongoing professional development should remain an institutional priority, and even more resources should be invested in the onboarding of part-time faculty.
- Monitor the differing professional development needs of all the faculty and make sure to offer programs that will serve those needs.
- Guttman should maintain a healthy ratio of full-time to part-time faculty, especially in the first-year experience courses.
- Continue work on clarifying the expectations for reappointment, tenure, and promotion in regards to teaching, service, and scholarship.
Recommendations

- Guttman should conclude negotiations with the Professional Staff Congress concerning elements of the Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure guidelines, consistent with the new governance plan.
- Guttman should establish and commit to an annual time line for the review of the schedule of classes, the assignment of instructors to their classes, and the notification of faculty of their teaching assignments.
Standard 5 – Administration

“The institution’s administrative structure and services facilitate learning and research/scholarship, foster quality improvement and support the institution’s organization and governance.”

Overview of Standard 5

Scott E. Evenbeck, was appointed the Founding President of The City University of New York’s New Community College by the Board of Trustees on July 22, 2010, upon the Chancellor’s recommendation. Dr. Evenbeck, previously a professor of psychology and dean of University College at Indiana University-Purdue University at Indianapolis, is a prominent expert on education assessment and higher education initiatives to boost student success. His selection followed a national search for an innovative educator. Presidents at the City University of New York serve at the pleasure of the Board of Trustees for an indefinite period (see below Standard 4). They lead their respective colleges as executive agents of the Board and have wide discretionary powers. In the event of a President’s death, the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost at Guttman would assume the CEO’s responsibility until the Board appointed an acting President and undertook a full search for a permanent President.

The President’s Senior Staff is comprised of highly qualified individuals, as follows: the President’s Chief of Staff, the Interim Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, the Interim Vice President for Finance and Administration, the Dean of Strategic Planning and Accreditation, and Legal Counsel. Over approximately the past two years, GCC has recruited a middle layer of administrative staff, most notably in the Office of Academic Affairs with the addition of a Dean of Student Engagement, Dean and Associate Dean of Academic Affairs, and Associate Dean for Assessment and Technology. The Interim Vice President for Finance and Administration oversaw the hiring of an Assistant Vice President for Financial and Business Services, and a Finance Budget Director to lead the Business and Finance Office. Guttman has professional staff adequate to its size and structure and appropriate to its unique mission, and it has developed and made public organizational charts for all areas of the college.

The position of Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost has recently undergone a transition, with former Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost Joan Lucariello resigning in April, 2016 after 26 months of service in that role. Dr. Stuart Suss, formerly Provost (2004 – 2013 and 2014 - 2015) and Interim President (2013-2014) of Kingsborough Community College, was appointed Interim Dean of Academic Affairs and Provost at Guttman Community College in May of 2016, and Interim Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost in June of 2016. As of spring 2016, President Evenbeck had charged a committee to launch the search and screen process for a permanent Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, targeting a late 2016 / early 2017 hire date.

Findings for Standard 5: Administration

Moving From Start-Up to Scale-Up

Guttman’s original administrative structure was remarkably flat, designed intentionally “to mitigate the common experience of college as a jigsaw puzzle of discrete courses, services and administrative obligations” (Concept Paper Executive Summary, 2008, p. 2). Individuals in leadership positions maintained broad portfolios, and lines of direct report tended to converge on a small number of individuals, leading to a centralized administrative structure. As originally conceived and subsequently implemented, there are no academic departments and therefore no department chairs at Guttman. Student affairs, which in a traditional higher educational administrative configuration is headed by a Vice President that reports to the President, was instead at Guttman headed initially by an Assistant Dean for Student Engagement reporting to the Provost, thereby folding the Office of Student Engagement (OSE)
under the Office of Academic Affairs (OAA). The rationale for this initial architecture was fourfold: it stemmed from the reality that Guttman was starting from a base of zero administrative personnel as recently as 2010; it embodied a start-up mentality wherein a small number of individuals span a wide latitude of functions in a flexible environment; it structured substantive collaboration among student and faculty affairs; and it responded to a desire to direct the resources of the College toward student success rather than administrative overhead and salaries.

Adding Administrative Middle Layers (see Organization Charts in Document Set 5)

GCC’s organization was created to maintain optimal focus on decisions that would enhance student success and to avoid more traditional separation of academic and student support services. There is an ongoing and intentional effort at Guttman to avoid construction of the administrative silos that typically hinder collaboration and nimbleness at traditional institutions of higher education. A Guttman, there is an unusually high level of respectful and productive cooperation between Academic Affairs, and Finance and Administration, and Strategic Planning, and Human Resources, and Informational Technology.

The recently-appointed layer of administrative personnel provides the breadth and expertise necessary to manage the College at this moment in its evolution, as well as a welcome buffer between the faculty and staff on the one hand, and the senior administrative team on the other. In addition, they work laterally and collaboratively with one another toward the shared goal of student success. For instance, the newly-hired Finance Budget Director worked closely with the Chief Librarian, Dean of Student Engagement, Dean of Academic Affairs, and Director of the Office of Partnerships and Community Engagement to develop initial decentralized FY17 budgets for each of these areas.

The addition of this administrative layer in OAA has allowed the College to focus specifically on increasing faculty scholarship and research productivity. Over the course of Academic Year 2015 (AY15) and again (scheduled) for AY16, a faculty member hired in AY16 (with expertise in the area from a former institution) has led a series of intensive writing workshops for faculty colleagues, focusing on preparing both disciplinary and teaching and learning scholarship (SoTL) for publication. The Dean of Academic Affairs has, since AY15, worked with faculty to encourage the pursuit of external funding for research. In AY15, five Guttman faculty applied for, and were awarded, PSC-CUNY funding for their research. In AY16, Guttman had its first call for proposals for NEH Summer Stipends and a brown bag professional development session is scheduled to discuss the elements of successful grant proposals.

The appointment of the Dean of Student Engagement and the reorganization of that area is another example of growing necessary administrative infrastructure to more effectively manage the responsibilities in this area and provide support for student success. On the administrative side, the Interim Vice President for Finance & Administration has clarified responsibilities, supplemented units with new hires, improved work flow business processes, and added a layer of middle management in the form of an Assistant Vice President for Financial Business Services and a Finance Budget Director in the Business Office.

Reconfiguring the Cabinet

In response to community recommendations from the January 6 All-College Meeting, the Chief of Staff worked with the President to reorganize Cabinet into an Administrative Cabinet and a separate Leadership Council. The Administrative Cabinet includes the senior staff, area leaders above the director level including AVP, Deans, CIO, Chief Librarian, and directors of HR, Registrar, and Public Safety. The Administrative Cabinet, which meets monthly, is a forum to delve into significant issues in depth and to provide leadership for high level college and University matters. The Leadership Council includes the Administrative Cabinet plus unit leaders at the director level. This advisory group, which meets twice
each semester, shares key information that may inform decision-making and helps define Guttman priorities for further consideration by the Administrative Cabinet, senior staff, or the President. (See p. 89 below for an organization chart of leadership and governance.)

The College Foundation

Founded in 2015, the Stella and Charles Guttman Community College Foundation is a not-for-profit 501 (c) 3 (the IRS determination letter is dated February 2015) educational foundation dedicated to finding friends and supporters for the College. The seven member Foundation board is chaired by Dr. Lisette Nieves, an experienced social entrepreneur and public sector leader who is currently a Founding Partner at Lingo Ventures, where she provides consulting services to the nonprofit and public sector on growth, talent recruitment/retention, and change management. This independent group of trustees have a wide range of expertise and interests, as well as shared passion for public higher education and Guttman’s innovative model. The foundation board met for the first time in May 2015, and four more times during the last academic year. All gifts to the foundation are used to support the College’s mission and are deductible to the full extent allowed by law.

Challenges and Opportunities as We Scale Up

Since its early formative years, the College has both evolved and learned. Specifically, we find ourselves as an institution at a point of inflection, where the mentality and practice of a start-up must give way to the mentality and practice of a scale-up. We have experienced some growing pains, which is to be expected in an environment of rapid change and development. In U.S. higher education, there are few (if any) models for us to follow as we navigate this process. On balance, however, we endeavor to identify and strengthen those aspects of Guttman’s original model that have proven to be integral to our mission of collaboration in support of student success. These discrete aspects can together be understood as coalescing around a productive tension. On the one hand, administrative verticalization is necessary to effectively conduct our business and maintain compliance and alignment with CUNY and the other layers of the higher education environment within which Guttman nests; on the other hand, we strive to retain the fluidity, intimacy, and collaboration that allow us to operate in a highly responsive manner.

In the category of ‘growing pains’ are a handful of challenges that have arisen as the College deepens and broadens its administrative structure.

Improving Communication

In surveys, communication emerged as a prominent theme in need of improvement. For instance, on the Noel-Levitz Employee Survey (see Document Set 1), “there are effective lines of communication between departments” emerged as the lowest-rated item related to campus culture and policies. Developing and maintaining regular, effective, and respectful channels of communication has been a major focus of the College leadership, on the heels of feedback provided via the Noel Levitz and Guttman Employee Surveys, conducted in spring 2015, and the January 2016 All-College meeting to follow up on the results of the surveys. One example of this is the periodic publication of a new newsletter—the Guttman Gazette—produced in the office of the Chief of Staff that focuses in-depth on different areas of the College to communicate information about the people in those units, their mission, and upcoming events. Another example is a faculty forum held by the Provost in May 2016 to discuss the Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion guidelines. That forum will become an annual RPT panel going forward.

Decreasing Bottlenecks

The throughput of the administrative workload is occasionally not as timely as we would like it to be. The flatness of the reporting and supervisory structures has resulted in a large amount of workflow funneling
to one or a few individuals. This is particularly the case for the Office of the Provost, the Business and Finance Office, and Human Resources. Administrators and staff expressed concern over long work hours, unclear boundaries between work and personal life, and burnout in their survey comments.

Hiring a middle administrative layer in OAA and Business and Finance, and a staff layer in HR, has redistributed and thereby alleviated the sheer workload in these areas. However, one of the unique features of Guttman’s academic organizational structure – the lack of traditional academic departments – carries with it the lack of departmental chairs, who at CUNY (as with other institutions of higher education) perform important evaluation and supervisory functions. In Guttman, these functions line directly to the Provost. As our full-time permanent faculty grows to fifty four in AY18, the workload of evaluating these faculty annually will become difficult to manage by the Provost, who should ideally be primarily concerned with higher-level strategic issues in OAA.

Managing Friction

As new administrative positions are filled, the formerly very broad portfolios of the original administrators and staff have begun to focus-in on core aspects of their respective positions. Several job descriptions and reporting lines have been revised. This process has led to a certain amount of friction in the short term, giving way to what are ultimately productive discussions about job descriptions, appropriate areas of responsibility, and ways that communication and collaboration across positions and offices can be facilitated.

Guttman Community College has hired so-called “hybrid faculty,” who were appointed as instructors, lecturers, and tenure-track assistant professors, and for whom a significant portion of faculty workload was reassigned to collaborative work with faculty and some administration of areas such as global learning, academic technology, experiential learning, and tutoring. How the administrative component of their work will be evaluated is unclear. OAA is currently working with the four faculty in this category, to put in writing annual goals, strategies, and assessment for the hybrid reassigned workload. A formal written evaluation of this component of their work will form part of the respective faculty member’s annual evaluation.

The following specific elements of Guttman’s administrative structures and services conducive to student success should be preserved as the college scales.

Intimacy

Guttman has the “high touch” environment so many institutions aspire to. A notable proportion of Guttman’s administrative business is conducted face-to-face, both in scheduled meetings and through impromptu encounters. President Evenbeck routinely walks each floor of the College’s building, on a daily basis, to engage with faculty, staff, and students. He schedules breakfasts and lunches with faculty, staff, and students. He also personally interviews the finalists for positions at the Director-level and above.

Hiring to Mission

One of the recommendations that emerged from the January 6, 2016 All-College Faculty-Staff Meeting was “continue to hire faculty/staff committed to mission/focus on student success.” The above-mentioned Presidential interviews with finalists is an important component of this objective. For the AY17 faculty hires (n=9), interviews and teaching demonstrations focused on familiarity with the Guttman model. For the AY18 round of hiring, HR and OAA collaborated closely to develop a faculty job advertisement template, in order to concisely and consistently portray the essentials of the Guttman model uniformly
across all of our job ads. Just as for faculty hires, administrative hires at Guttman are also screened for commitment to innovation, team playing, and doing things differently with the goal of enhanced student success as foregrounded in the College’s mission.

Creative Use of Limited Space

The co-location of administration and faculty, and of clustered faculty workspaces around interdisciplinary lines, is not purely an artifact of Guttman’s limited space. It is also intentionally structured to foster interdisciplinary collaboration, coordination among faculty and administration, and to encourage the intimate environment mentioned previously. The impetus dates to the NCC Concept Paper (2008: 57) and remains true today: “Office space in the new building will be clustered to foster interdisciplinary collaborations among the academic areas. Additionally, academic and administrative offices will be positioned to integrate faculty and administrative colleagues in the close partnerships the new community college means to foster.”

Assessment

The annual PMP report to the Chancellery including the President’s letter, and its target metrics is one template for assessing administrative structures. Guttman SAGE Plan (Systematic Assessment of Guttman Effectiveness—see Standard 7) by individual units, including the Offices of the President, Academic Affairs, Finance and Administration, and Strategic Planning along with the President’s ECP annual performance reviews provide a second means for assessment of this work. The Board of Trustees fulfills one of its most important responsibilities in appointing CUNY Presidents and reviewing and assessing their performance in office. Finally, the Noel-Levitz and Guttman Employee surveys furnish direct and indirect feedback on the effectiveness of the College’s administration and the means to its continuous improvement. Ongoing formative assessment has already led to two rounds of redefining business workflow processes, leading to more efficient operations.

Summary of Findings for Standard 5

1. Guttman’s CEO and senior staff are capable and are effectively leading the College as it grows. A national search is underway to appoint a new Vice President of Academic Affairs and Provost.
2. Guttman has professional staff adequate to the size and structure of the College’s administration, which is still evolving and reconfiguring in its structure and leadership roles.
3. The College Foundation was formed and convened at four meetings in the 2015 - 2016 academic year.
4. The College has redefined job descriptions/responsibilities and made key mid-level administrative appointments in both the Office of Academic Affairs and Finance and Administration.
5. Guttman has developed and made public organizational charts for all areas of the college.
6. There is a robust College-wide conversation about sustaining the integrity of Guttman’s model and the focus on Guttman’s mission while scaling-up operations.

Suggestions for Improvement and Recommendations for Standard 5

Suggestions

- Continue to monitor and improve the alignment of Guttman administrative leadership and its profile as a Hispanic Serving Institution.
- Determine which of Guttman’s unique features can and should be preserved (or adapted) as the College grows in size and re-locates to new facilities.
- Pay attention to both the cultural and logistical dimensions involved in the scale-up process.
• Continue to craft an alternative structure to traditional academic departments and chairs—one that is compliant with the University bylaws, agreed to by PSC-CUNY, and is in accord with the College’s evolving governance structure.

• Continue to assess the effectiveness of administrative structures and the campus climate.

• Sustain communications to avoid the construction of administrative silos, enhance transparency, and facilitate the collaborative ethos of the model in support of student success.

• Area unit leaders should encourage the systematic and cascading process of planning, involving the collaborative and data-driven development of a formal strategic plan that articulates a mission, vision, and goals that are nested within the College’s strategic plan. Within these frameworks, individual administrator goal-setting and evaluations can be regularized and aligned.

Recommendations
None
Standard 4 – Leadership and Governance

“The institution’s system of governance clearly defines the roles of institutional constituencies in policy development and decision making. The governance structure includes an active governing body with sufficient autonomy to ensure institutional integrity and to fulfill its responsibilities of policy and resource development, consistent with the mission of the institution.”

Overview of Standard 4

The City University of New York (CUNY) has twenty four colleges and schools and one Board of Trustees (Board). The Board Bylaws at Article II, sections 2.1 through 2.6, describe the duties of its members and delegate to each campus the responsibility for developing a governance plan, subject to Board approval. Plenary authority is delegated to the CUNY Chancellor, who in turn delegates authority to the college Presidents to act as the Chief Executive Officers of their respective colleges.

The New Community College (now Stella and Charles Guttman Community College) Interim Governance Plan was approved by the CUNY Board at its meeting of June 25, 2012. As noted in the Board Minutes, the proposed governance plan was informed by faculty, staff and administrators from across CUNY’s multiple campuses and “broad discussion within the College community.” The Interim Plan “incorporates a simplified structure appropriate to a small start-up institution with an interdisciplinary core curriculum and a limited number of majors.”

Critically, the Board Minutes acknowledge: “Over time, there may be a need to include provisions for the election of faculty representatives to the College Council (rather than having all faculty serve), the election of adjunct faculty to the College Council, the establishment of programs and program officers, and other provisions appropriate to a large, highly structured institution.” Minutes of Proceedings, p. 94.

The College Council first met in fall 2012 and in its twenty-five meetings overall in five years has effectively conducted the College’s business, approving policies, programs, courses and committees. In February 2015 the Council approved the organization of an Ad Hoc Exploratory Committee on Governance to jumpstart the consideration of a new governance plan. That Committee reported out in November 2015, and at its March 31, 2016 meeting the Council approved formation of a Governance Task Force with this charge:

In furtherance of the Guttman mission, the Governance Task Force shall consider the Ad Hoc Exploratory Governance Committee Report recommendations dated November 15, 2015, with a view to proposing revisions to the existing Guttman Governance Plan (the New Community College Interim Governance Plan of 2010). The Task Force may convene advisory sub-committees and Consult with Guttman and non-Guttman experts and staff for research or advice, including but not limited to other CUNY campuses, consultants and the CUNY Office of General Counsel. The Task Force is urged to consult widely throughout the drafting process in both formal and informal venues with various Guttman constituencies. Any proposed revisions shall be referred to the Council for consideration, discussion and approval.

The faculty chair of the Governance Task Force gave an update at the January 11, 2017 All-College Faculty-Staff meeting. It is expected that a further update or proposed governance plan will be taken up at a Council meeting in March or May of 2017.
Findings for Standard 4: Leadership and Governance

CUNY Governance
The City University of New York is an integrated federation of twenty-four colleges and schools, including seven community colleges governed by a 17 member Board of Trustees representative of the five boroughs of New York City, whose duties and responsibilities are established by Article 125 § 6206 of New York State’s Education Law. Operating in accordance with its Bylaws and responsive to the New York State Board of Regents, the CUNY Board of Trustees approves all recommendations for staff appointment, promotion and tenure; oversees the university’s operating and capital budgets; reviews facility construction and rental plans; evaluates curricular and program proposals, and monitors non-academic matters relating to students, such as enrollment, tuition, disciplinary appeals, financial aid policies and educational support initiatives (Trustee Orientation Handbook).

The Chancellor is the CUNY Board of Trustees’ chief executive, educational and administrative officer. With advice from the Council of Presidents, the Chancellor is responsible for developing institutional strategy, formulating a unified academic plan for the university and setting financial goals and academic performance standards for each campus. Also appointed by the Board, campus presidents’ primary responsibility (Manual of General Policy 3.1: President) is conserving and enhancing their college’s educational programs, with particular emphasis on improving faculty quality, implementing Board initiatives and general administration of the college so as to meet the needs of the students, staff and faculty.

In carrying out their duties as public employees, faculty, staff and administrators at every CUNY campus institution are bound by the conflict of interest policies and ethical standards applicable to all New York State civil servants set forth in Public Officers Law Article §§ 73 and 74. These laws govern the business and professional activities of all state employees. Additionally, the Board of Trustees must adhere to specified CUNY standards of conduct (Policy Article II.2.05.2) as must all members of the University community.

Guttman Governance and the College Council
In 2011, as one aspect of CUNY’s institutional approach to education and after three years of research and support from University and community leaders, the CUNY Board of Trustees approved the creation of a New Community College specifically dedicated to increasing student learning, retention and graduation rates of New York City students. The mission was ambitious: achieve a three year graduation rate of 35%; increase degree attainment among those least likely to persist in higher education (particularly those from low-income, first generation groups who are under-prepared for college-level work); enable graduates to go on to earn baccalaureate degrees or actively participate in NYC’s workforce, and serve as a laboratory for research-based innovation in community college education. (See Case Study: Rethinking Community College for the 21st Century.) These ambitions were underwritten in 2013 by a generous gift from the Stella & Charles Guttman Foundation dedicated to enhancing the success of academically qualified, low-income CUNY community college students who hope to continue their education at CUNY senior colleges.

The Interim Governance Plan established a College Council composed of the President, Provost, three appointments from among the professional and administrative staff, all full-time and consortial faculty, and four members of the full-time non-teaching staff. Election of a Secretary occurred at its first meeting in fall 2012, followed by election of members to the Standing Committees (Agenda, Curriculum, Assessment and Professional Development, College Personnel) at subsequent meetings. With the launch of the Student Government Association (SGA) in fall 2012 and election of student senators, the SGA
President and Vice President also became members of the College Council. By fall 2016, the College Council had a total of 54 members, of whom 44 were full-time faculty.

Table 20:
Stella and Charles Guttman Community College Council
2012 - 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Number of Council Meetings</th>
<th>Meetings Devoted to Elections</th>
<th>Average # of Members Attending Per Meeting</th>
<th>Average # of Guests Attending Per Meeting</th>
<th>Total # of Resolutions Passed for the Academic Year</th>
<th>Average # of Resolutions Passed Per Meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-2015</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2**</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Plus 2 partial meetings for elections
** Plus 1 partial meeting for elections
A significant amount of the Council’s business is introduced by the Curriculum Committee. *Typical actions* include recommended changes in graduation requirements, new course proposals, changes to existing courses, program requirements or pre-/co-requisites, amendments to a variety of academic policies, third party articulation agreements and so forth. Other matters brought to the Council for consideration by a Standing Committee or individual Council member have included the Strategic Plan for 2014 – 2017, the Institutional Assessment Plan (May 2016), the Ad Hoc Exploratory Governance Committee Report (November 2015) and annual reports of the Council Standing Committees.

**Toward a New Governance Plan**

Since opening in August 2012, Guttman has undergone exceptional growth (see pp. xi and 72) in faculty, staff and students. Given this growth, certain college constituents are only remotely aware of the nature and workings of the Council (see below p. 92) and increasingly its limit as a representative body is seen as a matter of concern.

Since the Middle States Accreditation Readiness Team visit in September 2014, Guttman has formally acknowledged the need to move to a more representative form of governance with a balance of faculty, staff and administrative participation. As noted above, the Interim Plan was designed to be a simplified structure to help the College operate in its early years. Since then, the faculty’s commitment to the scholarship of teaching and learning has grown and now calls for a governance framework that supports an academic body that will take responsibility for formulating policies on academic matters, as required by Article VIII Section 8.5 of the CUNY Bylaws.

At the same time, the College has become a more complex and structured institution with an academic mission based on a unique blend of pedagogy, student support services and holistic advising. Based on the feedback of current faculty and staff, it is now necessary to formulate a governance body more representative of the faculty and staff population. Accordingly, in February 2015, the GCC Council approved the election of an Ad Hoc Exploratory Committee on Governance to jump start the revision process. The Committee was charged with researching the rationale, benefits and challenges of the existing governance structure, and with identifying the issues, reasons and ramifications of changing it.

In November 2015, the Ad Hoc Committee published a report based on its findings, intended for use as a primary resource in the development of a new governance structure at Guttman. Inclusiveness, transparency and GCC’s collaborative model were identified as essential characteristics of and guiding principles for developing a new plan. The report suggested points of further inquiry in ten discrete areas, including the number and balance of governance chambers, Council composition, elections, officers, standing committees, speaking at Council, checks and balances, and the College Personnel Committee. One such point of inquiry echoed an issue raised during an earlier union challenge to Guttman’s reappointment, promotion and tenure guidelines: the absence of mandatory peer review during the tenure evaluation process.

The Ad Hoc Committee’s report was adopted by the GCC Council one month later, with prospective membership on the Governance Task Force to consist of 11 voting and two ex-officio members representing the Office of Academic Affairs (OAA), the Office of Student Engagement (OSE), administration, faculty, students, the President and legal counsel. By Council resolution, this group was charged with considering the November 2015 report en route to proposing revisions to the existing governance plan. The formation of advisory subcommittees and consultation with internal and external resources was suggested and periodic progress reports required, with the goal of producing a formal recommendation or a request for an extension for Council consideration no later than April 15, 2017.
The revised governance plan is expected to address concerns about transparency, efficiency, student participation and the strategic, systematic flow of information. Any new governance structure would need to be innovative in nature, addressing the unique value of faculty to the institution, the integration of the OSE into OAA, and the contributions and commitment to the mission of professional staff and administration.

Faculty, under CUNY Bylaws and higher education practice in general, are responsible for academic curriculum, admission standards, validity of college credits and scholarship standards. CUNY Bylaws 8.6: Faculty/Academic Councils anticipates the creation of a faculty or academic council to serve as the primary body responsible for formulating policy on academic matters. At present, that role is played by the College Council’s Curriculum Committee, with faculty concerns being voiced during separate meetings called by the Provost or during ad hoc meetings of faculty colleagues. Ideally, an amended governance structure would allow faculty voices to be expressed and channeled in more effective ways, with the Council then serving as a representative College-wide decision-making body. It will be an essential responsibility of the Governance Task Force to recommend whether a newly created academic senate would assume equal status with the College Council, providing recommendations directly to the President for review and transmittal to the CUNY Board of Trustees, or provide recommendations on all matters academic for subsequent College Council ratification, review by the President and referral to the Board for adoption.

By creating an independent forum for faculty to come together to express ideas and formulate academic recommendations, the College Council will become an increasingly important space for collaboration among different units of the college. This collaboration is essential to Guttman’s mission of serving students holistically, and fundamental to the transparency, communication, trust and efficiency that Guttman’s decision-making body should embody.

In addition, the unique integration of members of Student Engagement and Student Affairs at Guttman with faculty from the Office of Academic Affairs has benefitted the institution immensely by valuing the differences in lenses utilized by each group as they work toward the common goal of student success. There seems to be a strong consensus among administration, faculty and staff that bringing together the perspectives from all three teams to make decisions and policies aligns most closely with Guttman’s institutional mission and should be highlighted in the new governance structure, both in Council and in whatever form an academic senate might take. To sustain Guttman’s collaborative model, consideration should be given to including members of OSE in the new structure of the faculty governing body.

Assessment
Since September 2013, the College Council has required Standing Committee chairs to submit a written report at the first meeting of the new academic year on the last year’s committee work. Although these reports afforded the Council an opportunity to reflect on and assess the work of its Committees, there has rarely if ever been a substantive discussion along these lines. The 2014 Middle States report noted the need for a periodic assessment of the Council itself, something a new governance plan might address explicitly in its provisions. The SAGE template (see Chapter 6, Standard 7) also can readily be adapted for Council self-assessment purposes.

For example, in 2016, two questions on two different surveys about the work of the Council were directed to Council members themselves and to the college community at-large by the Center for College Effectiveness. Sixteen of 44 Council members completed the first survey. Of those 16 respondents, 31% agreed or strongly agreed with the statement “Guttman College Council meetings are productive,” while 44% somewhat agreed/somewhat disagreed that statement. 69% of the responding Council members
agreed or strongly agreed that “Guttman College Council's standing committees effectively support the work of the Council,” while 25% somewhat agreed/somewhat disagreed.

The survey of the Guttman community at-large posed two questions about the Council:

- I understand the role of Guttman's College Council's members.
- I am aware of the type of decisions that Guttman's College Council makes.

![Fig. 14: I understand the role of Guttman College Council members](image1)

![Fig. 15: I am aware of the type of decisions that Guttman College Council makes](image2)

Not surprisingly, part-time employees (n = 18) agreed or strongly agreed the least (17%) compared to full-time employees (n = 89, 42%, 43% respectively) in terms of their understanding the role of the Council members or awareness of the type of decisions that Council makes. All-faculty (n = 28) responded most affirmatively (54%) to these questions, perhaps reflecting their greater representation on the Council and investment in its work, compared to all-staff (n = 78, 32%, 33% respectively) who have little or no representation on the existing Council.

The responses to both of these questions point out the need for the work of the College Council to be better communicated with the entire college community in addition to the need to improve Council representation, as discussed above. Communication improvement could occur through existing channels such as the Guttman Gazette, by including a summary of the actions taken by the Council in
the Guttman Gazette following each Council meeting, or by posting Council minutes online in more readily accessible locations.

**Summary of Findings for Standard 4**

1. The College is in compliance with MSCHE standards with respect to the CUNY governing board, Guttman’s Interim Governance Plan and the College Council.
2. The College Council has met regularly since the 2012 – 2013 academic year to conduct the College’s business according to the protocols of the Interim Governance Plan and the work of the Standing Committees.
3. Through consensus, the College is moving to revise its governance plan to include both a faculty-centric body responsible for academic matters and one that represents the institution’s various constituents and stakeholders at large.
4. In the process of moving toward a new governance plan, the College has developed preliminary findings from survey responses of both Council members and the community-at-large.

**Suggestions for Improvements and Recommendations for Standard 4**

**Suggestions**

- A consistent means for communicating the work of the College Council to the larger Guttman community should be developed.
- Guttman should conclude negotiations with the Professional Staff Congress concerning elements of the Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure guidelines, consistent with the new governance plan.

**Recommendations**

- After consultation with all involved constituents, and approval by the College Council, Guttman should propose to the CUNY Board of Trustees a successor governance plan to the 2012 Interim Governance Plan now in effect, including explicit provision for the periodic assessment of the Guttman Council.
Chapter 5: Planning and Resource Management  
Standards 2, 3

Standard 2: Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal

"An institution conducts ongoing planning and resource allocation based on its mission and goals, develops objectives to achieve them, and utilizes the results of its assessment activities for institutional renewal. Implementation and subsequent evaluation of the success of the strategic plan and resource allocation support the development and change necessary to improve and to maintain institutional quality."

Overview of Standard 2

The documentation required for the CUNY Board of Trustees and New York State Education Department (NYSED) in January 2011, which consisted of the “Application for Opening a New College” and “Proposal to Establish Initial Programs of Study” was extensive (767 pages) and in effect constituted the initial Guttman Community College five year strategic plan. GCC established its Institutional Goals in 2011, and in June 2012—the summer it welcomed its first students—it submitted its first Performance Management Process (PMP) targets that aligned its goals with the University’s major goals. It also submitted its first accreditation self-study to the New York State Education Department (NYSED) that summer and hosted an accreditation site visit in August.

In the summer it opened, Guttman agreed to participate with a CUNY consortium in a John N. Gardner Institute for Excellence in Undergraduate Education year-long self-study on first-year student experience called the Foundations of Excellence (FoE). The FoE self-study dimensions and recommendations were aligned with Guttman’s Institutional Goals, MSCHE Standards, NYSED Standards, and PMP goals/targets. The Strategic Planning Task Force, chaired by the Dean of Strategic Planning with members from the College’s various stakeholders, was informed by the College’s founding documents, the NYSED self-study and the Foundations of Excellence self-study. It worked through the 2013 – 2014 academic year to produce Stella and Charles Guttman Community College’s Strategic Plan 2014 – 2017 dated May 6, 2014. The Plan was endorsed by acclamation at a meeting of the College Council on May 13, 2014. The Strategic Plan reconfigures the college’s initial institutional goals around four major goals and 30 objectives, and Appendix IX of the Plan includes a table of initiatives related to the achievement of those 30 objectives. The Plan also addresses the key issues of increasing enrollment, faculty and staff growth, space requirements, programming and program roll-out, resources, improvement and our emerging GCC culture. Throughout FY 2015 and FY 2016, the Strategic Planning Committee has grown in membership and continued to meet periodically, review data and discuss its institutional PMP goals and targets. In FY 2017 the Committee is meeting to develop the College’s next strategic plan encompassing the period 2018 – 2022. Guttman currently occupies a rental space pending relocation to a permanent campus allowing for enrollment growth. With a clear destination in view, it will develop discrete plans for facilities and academic programming. In the meantime, it continues to strive to even more tightly align budget planning and analysis with strategic planning.


During fall 2015, Working Group 2 members investigated the following questions: How has the planning process evolved since Guttman CC opened its door to students in August 2012, and what were the reasons

17 CUNY’s major PMP goals: 1) Raise Academic Quality; 2) Improve Student Success; 3) Enhance Financial and Management Effectiveness.
for the evolution? How well aligned are the College’s goals and objectives and the planning and resource allocation processes, both at the unit and institutional levels? How effectively does the College use assessment data to improve and refine the planning and resources allocation processes, demonstrating a commitment to institutional growth? How effectively does the College seek broad participation and input from faculty, staff, and administration in the planning and resource allocation processes and their assessment? How does the College keep track of institutional and unit improvement efforts and their results? Why is there a low score on the 2015 Noel-Levitz College Employee Satisfaction Survey concerning awareness of the strategic planning process?18

**Foundational Planning & Initial Accreditation**

The research shows that planning at GCC has evolved over time and to understand the reasons underlying the evolution, it is necessary to distinguish between two time periods. First, from spring 2008 to summer 2012, before GCC enrolled its first cohort of students, the main role of planning was to inform the design of an innovative educational model as well as an administrative structure that together would best support the College’s mission and values. Two planning documents stand out during the design phase of the College and served to inform the application to the New York State Board of Regents for the establishment of a new CUNY community college. The [Concept Paper](#) (2008) provided a set of key ideas and practices that the Planning Team deemed essential for developing a new community college model. The Concept Paper, however, was never meant to offer detailed instructions for the implementation of a new community college. As a result, in 2009 and 2010, more than 100 faculty and staff across the University worked in groups to develop ideas put forward in the Concept Paper and made recommendations for an administrative and educational structure aligned with the new College’s mission. Their work culminated in the publication of the [First Round Working Group Committee Reports](#) (March 2010) and the [Second Round Working Group Committee Reports](#) (September 2010) that informed the application to the New York State Board of Regents for the establishment of a new CUNY community college. After the College opened its door to students in August 2012, it started to collect data to assess whether the new educational model was working and progress was being made toward realizing the aspirations of the Concept Paper. Between August 2012 and now, the College completed three important phases of self-study and planning, which highlight the critical role of self-study, assessment, and planning that College has continuously engaged in to guide and inform GCC’s decisions and resource uses.

**Foundations of Excellence**

With Title IV funds depending on Guttman’s accreditation, the College prepared and submitted a self-study (1) to the New York State Education Department in the summer of 2012 and hosted a site visit. With the Central Office, College of Staten Island, York College, and LaGuardia Community College, Guttman took part in a CUNY Foundations of Excellence consortium for a self-study (2) focused on the first-year student experience. That year-long effort, which involved the entire college community, identified three areas (student experience, sustainable practice, and communications) with recommendations for improving each. In addition, the Foundations of Excellence self-study informed the College Strategic Plan which the College Council approved in May 2014.

**Strategic Plan 2014 - 2017**

The [Strategic Plan](#) (3) strengthens and reconfigures GCC’s original goals into four main areas (Refine a New Educational Model, Focus on Student Experience, Create Sustainable Practice, and Improve Communications) and provides specific objectives for each area, 30 in all. Importantly, Appendix VII shows that the goals and objectives of the Strategic Plan are aligned with both Middle States standards and the University’s Performance Management Process. Finally, Appendix IX provides details of the

---

18 2.79 (on a scale of 1 -5 disagree / agree) in response to: This institution plans carefully.
initiatives for each objective as well as benchmarks to measure success with goal achievement on a short-term (Interim measure of success) due FY 2015 and long-term measure of success due FY2017. As reported to the Strategic Planning Committee on September 9, 2016, 83% (25 out of 30) of the objectives were complete or in progress toward completion; and 17% (5/30) were partially complete or in progress.

GCC developed a facilities plan—New Community College Planning Committee Recommendations Report, July 2011—even before it was established officially as a new college. The Facilities Director working with the VP for Finance and Administration, the Administrative Executive Associate and Central Office continue to monitor and address facilities management and space requirements. With college leadership the Vice President works closely with the University’s Vice Chancellor for Facilities Planning, Construction, and Management and her experts on staff to plan GCC’s long-term permanent home.

Guttman’s CIO is developing a technology acquisition/replacement plan based on industry standards subject to budget considerations. To accommodate our 2013 entering class, Guttman upgraded its infrastructure with the expansion of the server clusters in the data center. For classroom technology, Guttman looks for recommendations from faculty and administrators and works with a Curriculum Subcommittee on Academic Technology. Administrative systems are handled much in the same way, but with the input from administrative staffing, as well as consultation from CIS and with consideration of CUNY-wide initiatives. The Supplement to the Strategic Plan 2016 – 2017 (Document Set 2) addresses four discrete areas: Managing Enrollment Growth; Academic Programming; Facilities Management; and Information Technology Management. Given that we are approaching the end of the Strategic Plan’s four-year period in 2017, the Supplement should be considered as foreshadowing the issues and challenges to be taken up in our next strategic plan (2018 – 2023), especially in regard to scalability.

As a new institution, GCC is developing its risk management and internal control plans, in consultation with the University Internal Audit and Management Services. This spring it completed an FY2013 Risk Assessment to assist Internal Control Managers administering the annual Directive #1 Internal Control Self-Assessment review that is required by the University and by the City of New York.

The Performance Management Process or PMP is the foundation for GCC assessment of its institutional effectiveness. Each June, the college reports on the year just ending and establishes its targets for the following year aligned with CUNY’s major goals and the College’s institutional goals, which are themselves aligned with the Middle States Standards. College performance is evaluated by the Chancellery and the college president meets with the Chancellor to discuss the performance in the year just ended and in the early fall the College through the Strategic Planning Committee sets its goals and targets for the year just beginning. Document Set 2 contains the President’s letter dated June 23, 2016 to the Chancellor and the close of academic year 2015 – 2016 report.

In response to recommendations made by Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE) accreditation team led by Dr. Karen Stout, the College took a number of important steps to strengthen the planning process. First, it researched the development of additional plans for enrollment management, academic programming, facilities and technology, tied to the goals and objectives of the Strategic Plan (see Supplement to the Strategic Plan 2016 – 2017). Most notably, the academic and technology draft plans frame the issue of how these areas might grow with an increase in enrollments as the College moves toward its eventual long term permanent campus and its goal of serving 5,000 students at full capacity. The facilities plan addresses the knowns and
unknowns concerning the occupancy of the current rental property. Given feedback from the January 2016 All-College Faculty-Staff meeting, the VP for Finance and Administration has already taken steps to reconsider how best to utilize current space as efficiently as possible, with current constraints until the college relocates to a permanent campus near John Jay. The projections and considerations in the Supplement are necessarily tentative and provisional pending more conclusive information and a timeline on a move to the permanent campus. With the FY 2017 year of strategic planning just beginning, the reports will inform the development of the College’s next strategic plan 2018 - 2023.

The College launched the Systematic Approach for Guttman Effectiveness (SAGE) Plan at its January 7, 2015 All-College Meeting. As described in detail below in Chapter 6, Standard 7, the SAGE Plan is a framework for continuous improvement that facilitates participating units across the college in identifying each unit’s purposes and practices, highlighting accomplishments, and determining ways to improve. One important goal for launching the SAGE Plan was to streamline data collection initiatives throughout the College and to link plans at the unit levels to goals and standards by Guttman, CUNY, and accreditation organizations. As a result, the SAGE Plans provide an effective mechanism to keep track of unit improvement efforts and results.

Guttman is committed in its planning practices to collect data from a wide range of constituencies and to analyze and use these data to continually refine the planning process. The SAGE Plan, while an integral component of the planning process, is not the only channel through which GCC collects and assesses data. In May 2015, Guttman employees participated in the Noel-Levitz College Employee Satisfaction Survey (CESS), a nationally administered instrument that focuses on faculty, staff, and administrators’ perceptions of working at their college. To standard Noel-Levitz questions the CCE added custom questions for Guttman, and a full analysis of the survey findings was presented at the All-College Retreat on January 6, 2016. Faculty and staff met in subject area work groups in the morning to review survey findings and make recommendations for improvements, and those morning recommendations were reviewed and prioritized in the afternoon by groups of administrators, faculty and staff. Many of those recommendations were implemented over the course of the spring 2016 semester (see Document Set 2 for details of the recommendations, priorities, and implementation in response to the employee survey. One notable improvement that involved additional resource allocation was the construction of three private meeting spaces (on the fifth and 6th floors) for faculty and advisors to use when meeting with students. Another is the inauguration of the Guttman newsletter, the Guttman Gazette, to improve internal communication.

The All-College retreat is one example of a multiple step process that is institutionalized in Guttman’s planning cycle, including:

- Data collection from faculty, staff, and administration about employee satisfaction;
- Formulation of recommendations from faculty, staff, and administration during an All-College Retreat;
- Strategic Planning Committee review, and its decision that operational units are in best position to review and respond to all-college recommendations;
- Operational units’ recommendations for actions are presented to Cabinet for review and discussion;
- And finally information is disseminated to the larger community.

Another example is the work of the Strategic Planning Committee on the budget and the alignment of the Budget Call and Strategic Planning Calendar (see below, p. 103).
Assessment results for student learning are used for planning purposes and institutional renewal. Faculty and staff participate in Assessment Days (see pp. 62-63), during which they assess student work, review assessment data previously collected, and plan to incorporate what they learn from these data into lessons or professional development around lessons. This assessment work is guided by both the Associate Dean for Assessment and Technology and the Assessment and Professional Development committee, which also plays an important role in making the link to college planning by reporting on this work to the College Council. Reports are made and the Council reviews and discusses them, making recommendations to the administrators sitting on the Council who, in turn, can implement planning changes. The unique role of Assessment Days coupled with the Assessment and PD Committee creates a clear link to institutional planning in terms of human resources (in the form of new hires, professional development, etc.) and, therefore, student achievement and overall satisfaction.

Guttman Learning Outcomes (GLO) and Periodic Program Review teams carry out detailed assessment work over 2-3 year cycles, focusing on one of the five GLO as well as the program of study being assessed. Reports prepared by these teams include recommendations for changes to existing resource planning related to student learning, including human resource allocation.

Finally, Guttman has since 2008 periodically convened (annually since the college opened in 2012) an Advisory and Research Council comprised of nationally recognized experts on community college and higher education both within CUNY and beyond. At the Advisory Council in December, 2015, Council members provided valuable advice and feedback on scalability challenges that the College faces at it continues to grow, including how to scale up academic support units, continue to develop experiential learning, and introduce new program of studies.

The above practices taken altogether demonstrate that the College seeks broad participation from faculty, staff, and administration in the planning process and its assessment and that results of assessment activities inform institutional renewal.

### Summary of Findings for Standard 2

1. GCC has developed sound planning practices and policies that align well with the institution mission and goals and that allow for meaningful participation of faculty, staff, and administration;
2. GCC uses results of assessment activities for institutional renewal, including refining the College educational model and its administrative structure, thereby improving institutional quality;
3. The chain-of-command for the planning process and assignment of accountability are well-defined and GCC has developed sound practices to keep track of institutional and unit improvement efforts and their results;

### Suggestions for Improvement and Recommendations for Standard 2

#### Suggestions
- Continue to enhance the mechanisms and means to communicate planning efforts and results to the wider community.
- Given the pending revisions to the Interim Governance Plan and the goal to be more inclusive, consider making the Strategic Planning Committee a standing committee of the College Council in the future, thereby increasing visibility, transparency, and communication.

#### Recommendations
None.
Standard 3: Institutional Resources

“The human, financial, technical, facilities, and other resources necessary to achieve an institution’s mission and goals are available and accessible. In the context of the institution’s mission, the effective and efficient uses of the institution’s resources are analyzed as part of ongoing outcomes assessment.”

Overview of Standard 3

Just as CUNY has one Board of Trustees, it has one overall operating and capital budget under the control of the University, with funds channeled from the City and State of New York. As part of CUNY, GCC is fully integrated into the administrative and budget structures of the University and relies on those structures for support and execution. GCC’s Vice President for Finance and Administration develops the GCC annual budget with college leadership, the University Executive Budget Director, and the CUNY Vice Chancellor for Budget and Finance. From a very centralized budget process in the early years, Guttman has made progress in developing a more transparent budget process that engages the major operating areas, connects resource allocation to institutional goals and is aligned with strategic planning.

When it comes to the budget, the senior and community colleges are considered separate entities. For the senior colleges, the State establishes the total annual operating budget. Funding is primarily from the State and tuition revenues, with modest revenue offset from the City of New York. For the community colleges, the City establishes the total annual operating budget. Funding is from the State, City, and tuition revenues. The City and State funding is appropriated directly to the University, as opposed to the individual colleges. The University Budget Office then allocates the overall budget among the campuses (albeit sometimes according to certain formulae set by the City or State). Guttman Community College follows the bylaws of the Board of Trustees and the Manual of General Policy. Even so the College was created to implement and refine a new educational model, as detailed in Chapter 1, Standard 1, and the University has been unstinting in its support for the project. When James Milliken became Chancellor in 2015, he expressed his ongoing commitment to seeing the College grow on its permanent Manhattan campus to 5,000 students.

Human Resources carefully monitors and justifies the growth of faculty and staff based on student FTE enrollments, and technology management is adequate to the mission. Guttman currently occupies a rental space at 50 West 40th Street that constrains and challenges the community. The College relies on classroom availability at additional locations for its continuing students on W31 Street (CUNY School of Professional Studies) and The Murphy Institute (W43 St). With a clearer destination for relocation to a permanent campus that will allow for enrollment growth, the College will develop discrete plans for facilities and academic programming.

Findings for Standard 3: Institutional Resources

During fall 2015, Working Group 2 members investigated the following questions about Standard 3: How well does Guttman assure that it has enough resources to fulfill the College’s mission, goals and objectives and that these resources are available and accessible? How effectively does the budgeting process connect resource allocation to the planning process? How effectively does Guttman manage the logistics and academic constraints at the current facility? Are its plans, moving forward, regarding the facilities to accommodate a growing population of students, staff, and faculty adequate for the college to continue to fulfill its mission? How effectively does Guttman manage its technology and learning resources to achieve Guttman’s learning outcomes? As the college grows and matures, how will it assure that its allocation approach will result in adequate faculty, staff, and administration to
support the institutions mission and outcomes expectations? How effective are Guttman’s strategies to assess periodically the level and utilization of institutional resources?

**Financial Plan Process**
The College financial plan is developed from an internal and external components process. These processes occur separately and independently but eventually the components logically come together to produce a coordinated and effective optimal budget.

**Internal Component**
The College begins the financial plan process during the month of March of the prior fiscal year by issuing a budget call letter to all vice presidents and unit coordinators. The budget call letter, accompanied by a budget request template, asks all unit coordinators to prepare and submit their budget needs to their respective VP for the upcoming year. Unit coordinators are required to prepare their budget requests factoring the established strategic goals for the units. These units’ requests are then vetted and negotiated with the VPs. The VPs review and ensure requests consistency with the strategic objectives of the division. After negotiating and approving the budget requests, they are submitted to Administration and Finance in May for compilation and submission to the President’s senior staff cabinet and other appropriate governing bodies. During the month of June, senior staff and other governing bodies do their due diligence to ensure that the overall draft budget is consistent with the College’s strategic goals and objectives. Before implementation, the College has to make sure that the funding received from the University is sufficient to cover the overall draft college budget.

**External Component**
The City University of New York provides initial funding to Guttman at the same time it issues the Budget Model for all community Colleges. The University typically prepares and distributes this Model by early July of each fiscal year. When the initial funding is received, Administration and Finance compares the funding to the overall draft college budget and submits the finding to the cabinet. The cabinet then decides whether to increase, decrease or maintain budget as in the draft and approve a final budget. If the budget is deemed inadequate to support the College’s programs, Administration and Finance is responsible to enter negotiations with the University Budget Office to secure adequate funding. Once negotiations are completed, the final overall budget is then approved by senior staff and returned to the Administration and Finance for implementation and monitoring. All expenditures against the budget are carefully monitored during the fiscal year to ensure that overspending does not occur.

**Financial Statement Structures, Funding**
Stella and Charles Guttman Community College’s internal operating budget differs from the overall available funding, reflected in the IPEDS report, as the internal operating budget excludes University withheld funds for items such as fringe benefits and energy. The centrally held funds, representing about 40% of the funding, are used by the University to pay expenses for the College. In Fiscal Year 2016, from overall revenues and expenses of approximately $28M, the College’s controllable budget allocation approximated $21M.

The primary sources from which College receives its funding are New York State, The City of New York and tuition and fees. New York State funds the University for community colleges on an annual full-time equivalent (FTE) student basis. For FY 2017, State funding per FTE is $2,697. The City of New York funds the community colleges on a Maintenance of Effort (MOE) basis. This MOE, by State Law, obligates the City of New York to maintain its funding at a level no less than the prior year. Currently, each student pays tuition of $2,400 per semester.
All funds are centrally received by the University and are normally distributed to the community colleges using the Community College Allocation Model. This Model has five segments, providing funding to all community colleges: (1) on an equal base level; (2) per student FTE; (3) based on Instructional and Departmental Research (I&DR) using student FTEs per discipline; (4) maintenance and operations (M&O), based on the size and configuration of physical plant; and (5) security (Public Safety) based on size and configuration of physical plant. Because Guttman Community College is a recent startup, with a relatively small student population and an experimental, non-traditional instructional model, it has been allowed to operate outside the Budget Funding Model. Funding is currently being provided based on historical and negotiated needs. It’s anticipated that the current funding basis will continue until the college has scaled up and/or achieved optimal facilities and enrollment.

Fig. 16: Guttman Operating Budget FY2013 – FY2016

After the startup year FY 2013, State contribution to overall funding remained essentially flat, hovering between 10% and 13% in the Fiscal Years 2014 through 2016. With a relatively small staff during FY 2013 startup, the operating budget, excluding $15M in endowment funds, was significantly less than subsequent years. The College had a full-time staff of 51 during Fiscal 2013. This increased to 91 during the following year.

Controllable/Operating Budget
Funds from the operating budget are spent directly by the College and represent approximately 77% of the overall amount reported in the IPEDS report, including rent which is approximately 20% of overall funding. (As previously stated, CUNY centrally retains approximately 40% of the overall IPEDS reported funds excluding rent to pay expenses for the College). Below is a graph showing the College’s internal operating budget for Fiscal Years 2013 through 2017

The current fiscal year has seen a leveling off of enrollment, and there is an expectation that little, if any, growth will be experienced through Fiscal Year 2020. However, no decrease in enrollment is anticipated. In spite of the flat or marginal growth expectation in enrollment, tuition revenue is expected to yield a greater contribution to overall revenue. State appropriations are expected to remain flat or increase slightly as there is an expectation that as the economy improves, the legislature is unlikely to support tuition increases and is more likely to increase State allocation through FTE support. City appropriations are expected to remain consistent largely because of the MOE obligations. The College is continuing its effort to generate more revenue through grant activities, fundraising and auxiliary services.
Expenditures

Approximately 61% of the College’s operating budget, which is similar to the revenue budget in amount, is expended on personnel services. Roughly 37% of the overall budget is absorbed by instructional support services, student support services and library and organized activities. As the College gradually increases the full-time faculty, an increased percentage of the budget will be devoted to instruction. As seen below, rental of our current facility absorbs roughly 30% of the budget. Net of rent, the percentage of the budget dedicated to the categories listed above rises to 52%.

Fig. 18
The Evolution of the Budget Process at Guttman

Prior to FY 2016, the budget process was centralized in the Office of the VP for Finance and Administration and resources were allocated based on projected growth and need. Without baseline expenditure data, this tight control followed the projections, modified as they became actual, from the original plan approved by the Board of Trustees renewed by the senior staff each year. Through the organizational planned structure and careful faculty and staff hiring, the budget from the start was aligned with and able to successfully implement and support Guttman’s unique education model. The entrepreneurial budget approach, with solid support and guidance from the Central Office, made sense and was a practical way of managing the proportionally explosive growth that comes with a start-up. Faculty hiring was projected based on the standard budgeting practices at CUNY, and so was a well-planned and executed mechanism for ensuring the most critical of all positions were funded and budgeted adequately from the beginning. While the budget process has been centralized since inception, area budgets were phased in beginning spring 2016. The allocation of resources—specifically in regards to human capital, financial, technical, and facilities infrastructure—has always been well grounded, and solidly based on our key mission of student achievement. Thus fiscal years 2016 and 2017 have been exploratory in establishing and reviewing the implementation of the baseline budget, following the timeline in Table 21 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Budget Call Activity</th>
<th>Strategic Planning Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 2016</td>
<td>Mid-Year Financial Plan Review and Update</td>
<td>Strategic Planning Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>E-Procurement/CUNYFirst shutdown for Requisitions</td>
<td>Recap closing FY performance at SPC in anticipation of April budget call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average Salary Report FY2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>Divisional Budget Call Letter</td>
<td>Budget call letter will remind VPs to consider costs of proposed College Focus Area goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vacancy List Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Third Quarter Financial Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>Annual Division Report Submission &amp; Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VP’s Review of Annual Budget Submission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>Draft Start-Up Budget FY2017</td>
<td>Budget update at SPC meeting documents resource allocation to institutional goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July – August</td>
<td>Draft Ending Budget Condition FY 2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Initial Budget Allocation from CUNY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reconcile Draft Budget Condition with CUNY Allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finalize Budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>Implement Start-Up Budget</td>
<td>Finalize PMP targets with SPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Financial Plan Submission to CUNY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>First Quarter Financial Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The implementation of this timeline represents real progress in developing a budget that clearly connects and documents resource allocation to the advancement of institutional goals. We are moving from a highly centralized process with minimal engagement of the college community in the budget development, allocation, and monitoring processes, to one that is more transparent and collaborative. With the College entering its fifth year, its budgeting processes are maturing to ensure that resource allocation decisions are shared and supported and meet the college’s operational and strategic goals. To that end, the college has embarked on implementing a distributed budgeting process designed to increase transparency and more fully involve the College community during budget development. The
College has made substantial progress over the past year in building a culture of analytically and evidence driven decision-making, and it continues to coordinate strategic and operational planning with budgeting and assessment efforts. The self-study review process has been a very useful and strengthening activity for the College.

Institutional Grants
Since shortly after the Concept Paper was issued in 2008, the then New Community College was the beneficiary of substantial foundation support, most notably the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, which in March 2009 provided an early planning grant of $560,258. In 2010, B&MG Foundation supplemented their original amount to bring its total support to $1,120,515 for planning and implementation. Carnegie Corporation of New York and the Lumina Foundation were also early supporters, and the Robin Hood Foundation has provided persistent support for the College’s summer bridge program for five years totaling $1,816,000. For fiscal year 2016, Guttman’s institutional grants managed through the Research Foundation amounted to $620,630, and the Guttman Foundation administered another $316,834. For fiscal year 2017, those figures amount to $889,870 and $80,547 respectively. These monies are in addition to the generous support of the Guttman Foundation naming grant of $15 million in 2013.

In addition to peer mentoring, summer bridge program, and student incentive stipends, grant funds have been used to support the work of the planning committees and documentarians. Last fiscal year Guttman was awarded a three year Educause iPass grant that is supporting the roll out of Starfish by Hobsons and enabling the improvement of the student engagement model. In 2016 Guttman was formerly recognized as a Hispanic Serving Institution and in fiscal 2017, the College was awarded a Title V five year grant totaling $1,882,590. These and other institutional grants comprise significant resources for the College and wherewithal to continue to address Guttman’s first major strategic goal to “improve student learning, retention and graduation rates by implementing a new educational model to serve our students.”

Human Resources
As noted throughout this self-study, Guttman has a student cohort model of a specific configuration: three cohorts of approximately 25 (occasionally ranging from 18 - 30) comprise one “House,” which is staffed by one academic advisor, who at Guttman is designated a “Student Success Advocate.” This creates a highly modular and predictable cost directly associated to FTE.

Faculty hiring is based on a series of projections and analysis in the Offices of Strategic Planning and Academic Affairs, in consultation with the central CUNY office. From a macro perspective, these projections take into consideration projected enrollment and disciplinary averages for student to faculty ratio. The Provost’s office analyzes the proportion of full-time to part-time faculty teaching loads, to determine the programs of study and courses that are most effectively taught by adjuncts.

Staff hiring has been based on two priorities. First and foremost has been the required staffing to meet legal and administrative needs. This baseline set of people is required to ensure adequate controls are in place and that the College meets the administrative needs of not only an institution of higher education but of CUNY as well. Secondary to this are the needs of individual units. The Office of Human Resources meets with the unit heads to discuss and assess the unit structure, current composition of staff, and to identify needs and possible redistributions of work. Once positions are identified, units request approval from their respective Vice President’s office. Full-time positions in the HEO and Classified titles ($60k+), are recommended to the HEO Screening Committee for discussion and vote prior to being recommended to the President’s office for approval. This has allowed for a systematic way to identify and justify need and recruitment across the college (see above p. 11). Vacant positions and recruitment activities are all carefully monitored and tracked by the Human Resources Office. This activity is reviewed by HR and the budget office to help drive decisions on new hires and to ensure the College recruits the best candidate for
the position. As outlined above in Table 9, the College’s internal budget calendar allows ample time for analysis and review for the upcoming fiscal year. Plans are vetted by senior leadership and the Budget and Finance Committee to ensure consistency with the College’s operational and strategic plans. A draft budget is then implemented to allow for the continued operations at the start of the next fiscal year.

Technology
There are three funding sources for technology at GCC that ensure a stable and sustainable environment for the College, which has proven to be an effective way of ensuring that necessary resources are in place to meet mission needs (see Supplement to the Strategic Plan, 2016-2017 for Technology in Document Set 2).

Infrastructure costs are primarily covered by GCC’s operational budget allocated from tax levy funds. This ensures a continued level of service required to run the college’s computer systems. GCC’s mission is centered on student achievement, and accordingly, the College makes a large investment in technology that is in use directly by students in the academic space. Student-centered technology is funded primarily from the Student Technology Fee (see current proposal in Document Set 3). This fee is paid by the students, and is governed by the CUNY Board of Trustees, to directly benefit the students. The GCC technology replacement policy affords for the sustainable allocation of current-level resources in the classroom and for the students, due to the fact that this fee is enrollment based. This ensures the continued allocation of the current level of technology as GCC grows. Furthermore, GCC has submitted a number of successful and innovative grant proposals, which the Office of Information Services reviews for operational impact to project costs going forward and provides technical staffing to ensure the needs are met for any specialized situation.

Facilities
GCC is currently located in a rental property at 50 West 40th Street, with a ten year lease and a net assignable square footage of 42,375. While the College quickly outgrew its capacity at this location, it has assured the most efficient uses of its space to maximize the effectiveness of this limited resource. The College will continue to assure that it is able to fully complete its mission and serve every student it enrolls at Guttman. Over the past few years, Guttman has been very creative in using its building, and has met its student needs by securing supplemental space nearby. Great care is taken in scheduling classes to assure that limited space is best used to serve our students. All first-year classes are housed within the primary building that provides space for all faculty and advisors. The College has effectively used an additional location at the CUNY School of Professional Studies (31st Street and Avenue of the Americas) for most courses in the programs of study. The College has made efforts recently to schedule first year students in either morning, afternoon or early evening blocks, but the preponderance of our young students who are recent high school graduates make evening schedules more of a challenge than for community colleges with more traditional (older) students.

One primary point of concern has been the need for private space for discussion with students, and based on feedback received at the January 6, 2016 All-College Faculty-Staff meeting, three additional private meeting spaces were created on the 5th and 6th floors in spring 2016. Use of these spaces is overseen by the Dean of Academic Affairs. (See Document Set 2 in the Supplement to the Strategic Plan 2016 – 2017.) We have also introduced technology systems to provide alternative mechanisms for student-to-advisor communication (Starfish Early Alert, and Starfish Connect), and have recently completed a renovation of the lower-level and Information Commons to allow for student recreation space and an eating area for students. This reconfiguration also included moving the Peer Mentors to the south (39th Street) side of the Information Commons, where they are more visible and can more easily engage with the students directly (see pp. 49-50 for more on the Information Commons space).
While these short term measures have been effective, the only long term solution is the additional space of a permanent campus that will allow the College to grow to its target of serving 5,000 students. In the meantime, we have leveled our incoming first-time freshman enrollments to 450 each fall, which will result in approximately 1,000 FTE new and continuing students served at West 40th Street and in loaned classrooms from the School of Professional Studies on West 31st Street. Guttman has been assured of significant funds from the Mayor’s budget to conduct a conditions assessment of North Hall at Amsterdam Avenue and 59th Street. That assessment is expected to be completed by the end of the current fiscal year. The Vice President for Finance and Administration worked with the Central Office in presenting a request in the CUNY Five-Year Capital Plan for the projected cost of GCC’s permanent home. Pending City and State legislative approval, this will secure a 300,000 square foot facility, located at 59th Street and 10th Avenue, and allow for the continued and expected growth of Guttman Community College, projections for which are contained in the Document Set 2 Supplement to the Strategic Plan 2016 - 2017.

Summary of Findings for Standard 3
The research findings from Working Group 2 support the conclusion that GCC is in compliance with Standard 3.

1. Guttman Community College is part of the larger CUNY budgeting process that channels funds from both New York State and New York City in accordance with established protocols.
2. Though in its early years there was a centralized budget process at the College, Guttman has made progress toward developing a budget process that is more transparent, engages the major operating areas, and clearly connects and documents resource allocation to the advancement of institutional goals and strategic planning.
3. The Budget and Finance Committee has been charged and is expected to meet during the current fiscal year.
4. Guttman has attracted significant foundation support for the planning, implementation, and improvement of its educational model.
5. Through careful human resource management, the growth of both faculty and staff has been carefully monitored and justified based on student FTE growth and effective administration.
6. The procurement, distribution, maintenance, and replacement of technology has been carefully managed and is adequate to support the mission of the college.
7. Space constraints at 50 West 40th Street continue to challenge the college community, and Guttman relies on classroom availability at an additional location in the CUNY School of Professional Studies.

Suggestions for Improvement and Recommendations for Standard 3

Suggestions
- Place a high priority on assuring that faculty, staff, and administrators have input on the budget.
- Continue to explore how to creatively use the space available to the College and consider even marginal improvements, when feasible.

Recommendations
- Guttman should continue to connect budgeting and planning cycles for greater transparency on the reallocation of resources.
- With a clearer destination for relocation to a permanent campus that will allow for enrollment growth, the College should develop discrete plans for facilities and academic programming.
Chapter 6: Institutional Effectiveness

Standard 7: Institutional Assessment

“The institution has developed and implemented an assessment process that evaluates its overall effectiveness in achieving its mission and goals and its compliance with accreditation standards.”

Overview of Standard 7

Guttman’s foundational thinking committed the College to continuous improvement through sustained and systematic assessment, and its current strategic plan (2014-2017) has two objectives that emphasize useful, planned, organized and sustained assessment:

1.9 Use ongoing assessment to inform decisions about student learning and professional development and to improve institutional practice; and

3.8 Create phased-in implementation and assessment plans across operating units to facilitate a proactive culture.

Guttman has persevered in creating a culture of institutional assessment that reviews the college’s overall effectiveness in accurate, useful, and cost-effective ways. Its assessment processes adhere to fundamental elements defined by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education. In terms of achieving the high expectations set by the College’s founding documents, there have been successes and challenges with respect to:

- Use of assessment findings to make decisions and improvements in relation to Guttman’s mission and strategic goals;
- Faculty, staff, administrator, and student involvement in assessment activities; and
- Sustainable and scalable practices as the college grows and evolves.

Findings for Standard 7: Institutional Assessment

Center for College Effectiveness and the Institutional Assessment Framework

The Center for College Effectiveness (CCE) is the office at Guttman Community College through which institutional effectiveness assessment work is focused and coordinated. Conceived before the College opened as a hybrid of traditional institutional research, assessment and professional development (see Document Set 7 The Evolving Culture of Assessment at Guttman CC: An Organizational History), the CCE is now responsible for generating and validating data for internal and external audiences and driving institutional assessment through the SAGE (Systematic Approach for Guttman Effectiveness) planning processes. It conducts periodic Noel-Levitz and CCSSE surveys, publishes those findings and leads campus conversations about those data. It also evaluates grant activity; prepares various quantitative and qualitative studies; helps create data dashboards; engages with the college community by distributing its “What’s the BIG IDEA?” newsletter; presents during Assessment Days and All-College Meetings; and hosts hands-on, tech-tips workshops known as GUST of Knowledge (for Guttman Users Sharing Tips aka GUST).

To understand Guttman’s assessment processes, it is useful to focus on two main areas—its institutional assessment framework and its assessment culture. Guttman’s institutional assessment framework is known as SAGE, the Systematic Approach for Guttman Effectiveness. SAGE provides structure for
institutional assessment efforts primarily conducted at the college unit-level. Assessment efforts related to student learning are addressed in detail in Chapter 3, Standard 14 (pp. 60 - 70). SAGE “is a framework for continuous improvement” that “engages college areas in a commonly agreed upon user-friendly process that focuses on reflection (by looking back at our practices and accomplishments) and direction (by looking ahead at enhancing our practices).” The SAGE Overview notes that the College benefits by:

- Providing an easy-to-follow template for mapping plans, practices, and performance;
- Linking area plans to goals and standards by Guttman, CUNY, and accreditation organizations;
- Documenting activities and achievements on an ongoing basis;
- Promoting evidence-based reflection, decisions, and problem-solving;
- Creating a SAGE community of practice across college areas.

The development of an institutional assessment framework was one area for which the pre-college planning reports did not provide much guidance. Subsequently, in July 2013, the Center for College Effectiveness (CCE), which serves as Guttman’s institutional research and assessment office, began work on SAGE. To collect feedback about the plan and ensure its usefulness, senior staff reviewed a draft of the plan in November 2013. A pilot ran with several units from January to July 2014. In September 2014, the Middle States ARR team reviewed SAGE and suggested revising it from a three-year cycle to a one-year cycle and recommended that the college proceed with full implementation of SAGE. The ARR team’s suggestion was adopted, and SAGE was officially launched at an All-College Meeting in January 2015.

In coordination with the Offices of the President, the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, the Vice President for Finance and Administration, and the Dean for Strategic Planning and Accreditation, SAGE (see Document Set 7 for SAGE template) is facilitated by the Center for College Effectiveness (CCE). It operates on an annual cycle and has three stages with additional feedback checkpoints. Figure 3 below illustrates the continuous cycle of the SAGE process:

1. Identify Goals and Practices: Units describe what they plan to accomplish and how those plans align with the college’s strategic goals, CUNY goals, and/or Middle States standards.
2. Support with Evidence: Units describe the information they collect, which serves as evidence of performance toward goals.
3. Reflect and Improve: Units use the collected evidence to describe accomplishments, challenges, and ideas for improvements. Including needed resources.

SAGE has been successful at providing a simple, supportive and collaborative structure for organizing multiple sources of evidence and reviewing progress towards unit and institutional goals. For the 2014-2015 SAGE cycle, 23 units were identified to participate in SAGE. Sixteen units, which were staffed at the time, completed the first SAGE cycle in 2014-2015. For the 2015-2016 SAGE cycle, as new units were staffed, they too adopted SAGE plans (see Document Set 7 for SAGE plans). One of the new plans for the 2015-2016 SAGE cycle was created by the Associate Dean for Assessment and Technology, who is responsible for guiding faculty work related to assessment for student learning. The Associate Dean’s SAGE plan featured a goal to “implement and refine Guttman Learning Outcomes (GLO), Periodic Program Review (PPR) processes, [and] development of] faculty-owned, sustainable assessment practices,” which was a constructive step toward expanding the scope of SAGE to represent efforts related to student learning assessment. SAGE has also encountered challenges. For example, its implementation has not been uniform across all units at the college. As survey results from the 2015 Guttman Faculty and Staff Survey indicate, staff are more familiar with SAGE than faculty: 57% of all respondents (71% of staff respondents and 24% of
faculty respondents) agreed or strongly agreed with the statement “I understand the purpose of SAGE (Systematic Approach for Guttman Effectiveness) plans.”

To support the SAGE work, the college dedicates time and staff resources. Since SAGE was launched in January 2015, two Assessment Day-sessions per academic year have been reserved to focus on this work. The 2014-2015 SAGE cycle, which operated on an abridged timeline, had sessions in the February and June Assessment Days. The 2015-2016 SAGE cycle, which established a full academic year timeline, had sessions scheduled in the October and June Assessment Days. Data compiled about SAGE workshops during Assessment Days showed favorable results. Across four workshops facilitated by CCE staff, 99% of the ratings (67 of the 68 “instant input” response forms) were positive or very positive.

**Figure 19: SAGE Process**

Participants’ comments highlighted the following positive aspects:

- “It dawned on me how purposeful it feels to do assessment/planning with colleagues led by peers.”
• “The session showed us how to make sense of the data by reflecting on it.”
• “The survey data was super helpful.”
• “I liked many things about the SAGE training. One thing in particular is the opportunity to resolve changes during data-ing [one of the session activities].”

Participants also offered suggestions for improvement:
• “More time for speed data-ing [one of the session activities] to interact with more departments.”
• “Less time, more frequent meetings.”
• “Additional sessions to share concerns and resolutions.”
• “Share more examples of how units have made strategic changes in response to the previous SAGE cycle.”

For the 2014-2015 SAGE cycle, CCE staff members prepared packets with existing data from multiple sources for each participating unit. The packets consisted of survey results from:

• Guttman Faculty and Staff Survey (2015)
• Guttman Student Survey (2014, 2015)
• CUNY Student Experience Survey (2014)
• Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory (2015)

This information supplemented the units’ own records. It was reviewed in relation to unit and strategic plan goals and used to identify unit strengths, challenges, and suggested improvements.

Use of SAGE Assessment Data

The alignment of SAGE plans to the College’s Strategic Plan allowed the Dean of Strategic Planning to review progress on strategic action plans. At the September 2015 Strategic Planning Committee meeting, the Dean reported that interim measures for the 31 strategic plan objectives were successfully met in 24 instances and partially met in six instances; one objective was deemed no longer feasible. Document Set 7 illustrates four examples from the 2015-2016 SAGE Highlights that show how data were used to assess progress toward goals.

For strategic objective 1.9 (Use ongoing assessment to inform decisions about student learning and professional development and to improve institutional practice), the Strategic Plan Update for 2014-2015 reported that the CCE achieved this objective by:

• Overseeing the SAGE plan
• Assessing student satisfaction by obtaining feedback through surveys and focus groups
• Providing support (as requested) for analysis of student learning outcomes data
• Partnering with the Student Government Association (SGA) to promote student surveys
• Disseminating information to Guttman community via reports, presentations, and CCE ePortfolio
• Analyzing and preparing information about student grades, grade point averages, credits attempted, credits earned, proficiency status, retention, and graduation rates

For strategic objective 3.8 (Create phased-in implementation and assessment plans across operating units to facilitate a proactive culture), the Strategic Plan Update for 2014-2015 reported that the CCE achieved this objective by setting a timeline for SAGE, hosting SAGE sessions in Assessment Days, and coordinating units’ development of SAGE plans.
Scalability and Sustainability

As a relatively new college and one founded on the evidence of research and best practices, Guttman is in a unique position to build and foster a strong foundation for assessment—for both institutional effectiveness and student learning. With the rewards and demands of on-boarding new employees, developing new initiatives, and strengthening the structure of existing practices, a systematic and inclusive approach to assessment helps provide needed focus. This relates to two purposes of SAGE, which are aimed at clear and efficient practices: 1) Provide an easy-to-follow template for mapping plans, practices, and performance; and 2) Link area plans to goals and standards by Guttman, CUNY, and accreditation organizations. With the college turning its attention to the development of a new strategic plan, effective in 2018, SAGE is an existing framework that can be relied upon to collect evidence about current and future goals.

As the college grows, it will be increasingly important to use a framework to document the connection between plans, evidence, and decision-making. It is a positive step forward for an institution to use feedback to make decisions and improvements. It is even more effective to document the evidence and rationale used to make institutional decisions and improvements, in a format that can be accessed college-wide. In addition to the two SAGE purposes noted above, two others are: 1) provide and document activities and achievements on an ongoing basis; and 2) promote evidence-based reflection, decisions, and problem-solving. In the January 2016 self-study interviews with senior staff members, it was clear that they had examples for which they thoughtfully considered multiple points of view in making decisions in support of institutional improvements. For example, they described assessment-based changes that were made in the Information Commons and in student support staffing. It was not clear how the evidence was documented and if existing resources, such as survey data about the Information Commons, were used. In its 2014-2015 SAGE plan, the CCE stated, “It would be ideal to have more information about how results are being used for improvements and decisions.” The SAGE template offers a simple way to document this information, which strengthens shared institutional knowledge and minimizes misdirected or duplicated efforts that arise when documentation is not available.

To reinforce the usefulness of SAGE plans as the college grows, it is vital that this assessment work is integrated at the unit level and that senior staff recognize its value. The CCE indicated in its 2014-2015 SAGE plan that “it is key to have senior staff support of SAGE for it to succeed as a college framework that facilitates assessment across all units--focusing on continuous improvement and complying with accreditation requirements” and that “documents practices and evidence in relation to senior staff members’ unit goals.” Signs of senior staff support were evident in January 2016 interviews. The Interim Vice President for Finance and Administration showed her support for building structure for SAGE plans by indicating an intent to include an annual evaluation goal related to completion of SAGE for her direct reports. The then Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost indicated that she intended to expand the use of SAGE plans in her unit by involving faculty program coordinators.

Community Participation and Feedback
The CCE manages the college’s extensive survey schedule, which provides opportunities for all members of the Guttman community to share feedback about their experiences at the College. Student surveys have included nationally-designed instruments (SENSE, Survey of Entering Student Engagement; CCSSE, Community College Survey of Student Engagement; Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory) and CUNY and Guttman-designed instruments (CUNY Student Experience Survey, The Guttman Student Survey, Gutman Community Days survey, Gutman stipend survey, Guttman alumni survey). Many of these findings are posted publically on the CCE’s website and are often featured in all-college meetings at which data is often shared and discussed. A recent example of this is a benchmark chart from the spring 2016 CCSSE survey which was included in the President’s remarks at the January 11, 2017 All-College Meeting.
Faculty and staff surveys have included the Noel-Levitz College Employee Satisfaction Survey, The Guttman Faculty and Staff Survey, Guttman Assessment Days surveys, and Guttman Starfish Early Alert survey.

A special Guttman survey is Flash Feedback. Flash Feedback creates opportunities not only to provide feedback, but to participate in the design of survey questions. Flash Feedback is a series of short survey questions intended to provide faculty, staff, and students with timely student input. The purpose is to increase opportunities for student feedback, while, at the same time, to reduce the number of different requests and emails asking for student input. The CCE serves as a coordinator that compiles questions from different college units, administers surveys for units, and shares results to inform decisions and improvements. In addition to the faculty and staff who have partnered with the CCE for Flash Feedback, the Student Government Association (SGA) has also been a partner. The SGA sponsors the survey incentive prizes and serves as an advisory group to generate ideas about increasing response rates.

Responses from the 2015 Guttman Faculty and Staff Survey indicated that 73% of all respondents (including 83% of staff respondents and 64% of faculty respondents) agreed or strongly agreed, “The Center for College Effectiveness (CCE) provides relevant data” (pp. 17-19). The ratings reflect current college practices, which afford the CCE more opportunities to work with staff than faculty, even though the original intent was for the CCE to serve the entire college community.

All-College Meetings
Guttman typically convenes four All-College Meetings during the academic year in September, January, February and May, and many of these meetings have been dedicated in whole or part to disseminating and discussing institutional assessment data. The All-College Meetings dedicate time for President Evenbeck to give a State of the College talk and for faculty and staff to give feedback on timely topics. During each of President Evenbeck’s presentations, he updates the community on enrollment growth, student demographics, retention and graduation rates, and survey results. These community-gathering events provide a chance for both faculty, staff, and peer mentors to build a culture of collaboration and assessment, as important issues are surfaced, discussed, and move forward. One prominent meeting that has been cited a few times in this self-study concerns the all-day discussion of findings in a May 2015 Noel-Levitz Faculty-Staff Satisfaction Survey in January 2016. Strengths and challenges identified in the N-L and Guttman Faculty and Staff Surveys were presented by the CCE Director and Associate Director, and afterward, breakout groups reviewed the data related to six themes: Colleagues, Community and Work Atmosphere; Communication; The Guttman Model; Leadership, Planning, and Organization; Space and Resources; Staffing, Workload, and Collaboration. Priorities were set by role groups in the afternoon (faculty, staff, administrators), plans were acted on and reported out in June to the community-at-large.
An alumni panel about how graduates were adapting to their senior colleges facilitated by the Director of Mentoring & Student Success (January 2015); 
Real-time feedback about working at Guttman, commitment to the college mission, and priorities for the future facilitated by the Director of the Center for College Effectiveness (January 2015); 
Introduction of the college-wide launch of the SAGE plan presented by the Director of the Center for College Effectiveness (January 2015); 
A discussion about Guttman’s governance plan facilitated by the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs and Legal Counsel (January 2015); 
Overviews of and Q&As about the Middle States process, timeline, and working groups presented by Dean for Strategic Planning and Institutional Effectiveness with his steering committee co-chair and working group chairs (January 2015, May 2015); 
A discussion about student culture featuring the Provost, Dean for Student Engagement, the Chief Librarian, the Associate Director for Leadership and Success, a faculty member, the student government president, and a student (May 2015); 
“Tell a Story” activity in which attendees told a brief story about work that exemplified a successful aspect of the Guttman model and documented the evidence in a template aligned with Middle States standards (September 2015); 
A discussion on Guttman innovation and institutional memory featuring faculty and student engagement staff reflecting on: What in our model is critical to our mission and why? What are our strengths? What can be improved and how? What are our challenges as we grow? (September 2015); 

Supporting the Culture of Institutional Assessment 
The assessment frameworks described above and in Chapter 3, Standard 14 (pp. 60 - 70) have evolved in significant ways since the college’s inception, as Guttman changed organizationally in terms of senior leadership and evolved in the implementation of its aspirations to establish a college-wide culture of assessment. It began to build a culture of assessment long before the college opened in 2012. While the 2014-2017 Strategic Plan set goals for the College, the NCC Concept Paper (2008) and working group committee reports (March & September 2010) described how the college would endeavor to achieve these goals. The Second Round Working Committee Report (2010) stressed that “the culture of assessment and continual self-improvement suggested in the Concept Paper and elaborated in the first set of working committee reports is the main strength of the NCC [Guttman] model” (p. 23). The Strategic Plan 2014-2017 also stressed “create[ing] phased-in implementation and assessment plans across operating units to facilitate a proactive culture” (p. 8). 

The five elements that best represent the college’s culture of assessment are 1) Guttman Learning Outcomes and the assessment for student learning (above pp. 64 – 70); 2) The Center for College Effectiveness; 3) the Assessment and Professional Development (A&PD) Committee, a Standing Committee of the College Council (p. 62); 4) Assessment Days (pp. 62 - 63); and 5) All-College Meetings. Each of these components strives to attain the College’s high expectations for assessment. The high expectations drive a multitude of assessment initiatives, which adhere to the Middle States’ Characteristics of Excellence fundamental elements as well as ongoing reflections about the extent to which Guttman is living up to its own aspirations. Indeed, in a January 2016 interview with President Evenbeck, he acknowledged that “the Concept Paper saw the CCE as melding together IR [institutional research] with assessment and professional development with the very high aspiration that professional development would be driven by what we found with assessment and IR results. I think that is still an aspiration.”
As the College’s organization continues to evolve to find ways of fulfilling its ambitious agenda, it is determined to stay true to its mission. In October 2016 the President decided to bring the Center for
College Effectiveness under the Chief Information Officer in order to manage the many demands and requests for data as effectively as possible. This shift is also informed by a recent white paper, “A New Vision for Institutional Research” by Randy L. Swing and Leah Ewing Ross, that proposes a matrix network model” that “broadly engage[s] all stakeholders in data-informed decisions (tactical, operational, and strategic). . . This hybrid model positions students, faculty, staff and other decision-makers as key consumers and clients of institutional research, and is foundational to a change agency vision of institutional research as a driver of institutional improvement” (p. 11). In so many ways, SAGE is already working at the unit-level to set goals, identify relevant data, and reflect on outcomes with an eye to improvement. Operationalizing unit-level decision making seems like a natural expansion of this foundational work. Functions related to data collection and use, reporting, and assessment are spread across multiple units at Guttman, and in some cases, individuals or units have overlapping responsibilities or unclearly defined roles. As the college has transitioned from concept to implementation, the assessment infrastructure has evolved in complex ways. As it continues to evolve, it is important that roles and responsibilities be well-defined and the effects of changes on the overall culture be considered.

Summary of Findings for Standard 7
1. The Center for College Effectiveness is a focal point for institutional effectiveness assessment at Guttman CC. The CCE’s primary tool for unit-level planning and assessment is SAGE (Systematic Approach for Guttman Effectiveness).
2. Guttman’s framework for institutional assessment is well-articulated, and evidence shows it has persistent, systematic assessment processes that are aligned with unit goals, the College’s institutional strategic goals, CUNY goals, and Middle States standards.
3. Guttman’s institutional assessment activities routinely involve faculty, staff, and administrators, and occasionally students.
4. Assessment results are regularly shared and discussed with appropriate constituents, including the publication of survey findings, quantitative and qualitative studies, and discussions at assessment days and all-college faculty-staff meetings.
5. As the college has grown and evolved, it has adapted its assessment processes to organizational changes.

Suggestions for Improvement and Recommendations for Standard 7

Suggestions
- To reinforce the usefulness of SAGE plans as the college grows, it is vital that this assessment work is integrated at the unit level and that senior staff recognize its value.
- Involve faculty more directly in SAGE processes related to the Office of Academic Affairs.
- Regularly involve staff in active SAGE assessment work during Assessment Days.
- To enhance assessment processes and overall institutional effectiveness, continue to clarify the roles and responsibilities of individuals and units to ensure coordination of efforts and eliminate overlapping responsibilities.
- Establish use of an institutional effectiveness and student learning outcomes assessment rubric to self-appraise Guttman’s assessment procedures as a whole. Using such a rubric would help ensure that subsequent changes to the assessment infrastructure are made in a transparent, holistic manner.

Recommendations
None
Conclusion

Guttman Community College has fully engaged in the self-study process and the production of this document. After careful and rigorous investigation, we can say with confidence that based on the evidence cited in the self-study, included in the Documentation Roadmap, and in the Verification of Compliance with Accreditation-Relevant Federal Regulations (dated December 1, 2016), the College meets all fourteen Middle States Characteristics of Excellence. The two-year process of inquiry has helped the community articulate further the areas we need to improve as a College already seriously engaged in continuous improvement. We are committed to acting on the self-study recommendations and to further consider the many suggestions that emerged from the study. As we approach our next five-year strategic plan FY 2018 – 2022, the College is well-positioned to implement through strategic initiatives the ideas generated by the self-study.

In its Self-Study Design document dated May 20, 2015 (see Document Set 2), Guttman articulated two overarching questions and nine outcomes for the self-study process itself. The first question pertained to the effectiveness of Guttman’s unique educational model “in allowing all students to successfully persist and complete their degree.” Guttman’s documented outcomes data for persistence and graduation along with the self-study analysis allow us to say conclusively that the model does work. Nevertheless, we remain committed in our first major Strategic Plan goal to continuing to “implement . . . and refin[e] a new educational model to serve our students.” The second overarching question concerned how we “maintain the integrity of Guttman’s educational model as we scale.” Woven throughout the findings are references to scaling, scalability, and sustainability. These references most often entail an acknowledgement of the challenges and the need to commit ourselves to the mission and to the model as we grow from just under 1,000 to 3,000 – 5,000 student FTEs. While we remain at 50 W 40th Street with our entering first-time freshman enrollment capped at about 450 new students a year, we have the opportunity to continue to refine our model and prepare for major growth down the line when we relocate to a permanent campus, probably in 2022 or 2023.

As a prominent case study in education reform, Guttman Community College is on a national stage and hosts a steady stream of visitors interested in our work. In 2015, seven colleges sent delegations, and in November of that year Lumina-sponsored an all-day Strategy Labs visit in which state policy administrators and faculty met with us. President Evenbeck, who is himself very active nationally at conferences, sets the example for us all of collegial generosity, and the visits we host most often include meetings with Guttman senior administrators, faculty and staff, peer mentors and students. Though Guttman never claimed to be a universal model that would supplant the way comprehensive community colleges serve multiple missions, we believe for our students—mostly recent high school graduates—the guided pathways approach is the most effective in engaging them to learn, stay on track, graduate with a degree and go on to baccalaureate studies or enter the workforce. From the start Guttman was conceived with intentionality, informed by research and best practices, and determined to find more effective ways to work with our underserved urban students. We will continue to share our theory and practice with educators committed to a social justice mission.

The Middle States team visit in March 2017 will come just before Guttman marks the milestone of its fifth year anniversary—an auspicious moment for the College. The multiyear self-study process has engaged the community in analysis, reflection, and assessment. This report goes a long way to telling the story of this unique institution and its approach to postsecondary associate degree education. We hope it also conveys some of the passion and creative drive of the exceptional faculty, staff, administrators, and leaders who have joined in the vision to “support student achievement in a dynamic, inclusive and intellectually engaging environment.”
Glossary

MSCHE Self-Study Glossary

12/6 – Shorthand for the distinctive calendar of Guttman, Kingsborough, and LaGuardia Community Colleges.

AccessABILITY – Guttman’s office serving students with special needs.

Assessment Days – Days reserved for faculty and student engagement staff to assess student attainment of the GLOs and each POS’s learning outcomes.

ATB – Ability to Benefit Test to satisfied the TAP Award for students with foreign diplomas.

Bridge – Shorthand for Winter and Summer Bridge.

BUSI – Business, a POS.

Career Strategist – Guides students as they progress toward completing their degree and transitioning into a baccalaureate program and/or career.

CAT-R, CAT-W – CUNY Assessment Test in Reading/Writing.

CCE – Center for College Effectiveness.

CEAFE – CUNY Elementary Algebra Final Exam.

CI – The Critical Issue component of CS.

Cohort – A group of 25 students; three cohorts make a House.

Community Days – Days reserved for students to engage in community-based service, campus-based and community workshops, and other activities designed by students, faculty and staff and related to course objectives and GLOs.

CPC – College Personnel Committee.

CS, City Sem – City Seminar, a signature course of the FYE.

CUE – Coordinated Undergraduate Education, a CUNY funding initiative.

CUNYfirst – An integrated suite of software that runs all computer systems overseeing student administration, finance, and human resources. An Oracle/PeopleSoft product.

CUNY START – A full-time college transition program that is designed to prepare students who have been admitted to Guttman but whose CUNY Assessment Test results indicate they need to further develop their reading, writing, and math skills.

The Depot – An internal, online, survey tool.

EMPL ID number – An 8-digit code that is used by the CUNY system for identification purposes.

EoW – Ethnographies of Work, a signature course of the FYE.

ePortfolio, ePort – An essential component of Guttman pedagogy, and the primary digital medium used in Guttman instruction. A Digication product.

eTerns – Student workers who provide ePortfolio support for students and faculty.

FYE – First Year Experience.

GEMS – Guttman Events Management System, an online calendar.

GIS – Admissions Group Information Session.

Global Guttman – is a program for students to travel and engage in innovative ways with populations and institutions and expand their visions of themselves and the world.

GLOs – Guttman Learning Outcomes.

Graduate Coordinators – are doctoral candidates who help students with statistics, reading, writing, and the
development of critical thinking through group and individual tutoring. They also work closely with ASPMs to facilitate Studio.

**Guttman Gazette** – is a bi-weekly online employee newsletter that offers a summary of campus activities and events, highlights staff from different department, their roles, and related information.

**HEO Series** – CUNY staff and administrator job titles with a ranking system comparable to faculty ranks, represented by the PSC-CUNY.

- **aHEO** – Assistant to a HEO
- **HEa** – Higher Education Assistant, “Assistant Director”
- **HEA** – Higher Education Associate, “Associate Director”
- **HEO** – Higher Education Officer, “Director”

**HIP** – High Impact Practice.

**House** – A cluster of three cohorts. Houses 1 through 6 begin in the fall semester and House 7 begins in the spring semester, e.g., H1C1: House 1, Cohort 1.

**HSVC** – Human Services, a POS.

**The Hub** – The Student Services Center on the 3rd floor.

**IC** – Information Commons, Guttman’s Library.

**IIS** – Admissions Individual Information Session.

**INFT** – Information Technology, a POS.

**iPASS** – Integrated Planning and Advising for Student Success.

**IT** – Instructional Team, a collaborative team of faculty and staff, an essential component of the FYE.

**LaBSS** – Learning about Being a Successful Student, a signature piece of the FYE, a component of EoW.

**LASC** – Liberal Arts and Sciences, a POS.

**LASC 100/101** – City Seminar I/II.

**Lecture** – The Critical Issue component of CS.

**Message** – The Studio component of CS.

**Practicum** – The Quantitative Reasoning component of CS.

**Recitation** – The Reading and Writing component of CS.

**Learning Community** – sets of linked course sections that are smaller in size and supported by instructional teams comprised of faculty, SSAs, Peer Mentors, Graduate Coordinator, and library staff.

**The Learning Lab** – A student learning and tutorial space, located within the IC.

**Math Start** – An intensive 8-week program for incoming students who need to increase their math proficiency before starting credit math courses.

**Meet-Up** – weekly group study session for a particular class or subject area.

**MSCHE, Middle States** – Middle States Commission on Higher Education, our accrediting body.

**NCC** – New Community College. Before the generosity of the Stella and Charles Guttman Foundation we were the NCC.

**OAA** – Office of Academic Affairs. Falls under the Provost.

**OPCE** – Office of Partnerships and Community Engagement. Falls under OAA.

**OSE** – Office of Student Engagement. Falls under the Provost.

**Pathways** – A new system of general education requirements and new transfer guidelines across CUNY.

**PC** – Program Coordinator.

**Peer Mentoring Program** – an integral component of the academic and co-curricular student experience. Three different types of Peer Mentors help ease the transition from high school to college, and coach students through their continued educational career while at Guttman..

- **ASPM** – Academic Success Peer Mentor (Studio and Meet-up)
AAPM – Admission & Access Peer Mentor
LSPM – Leadership & Service Peer Mentor

POS – Program of Study.
PPR – Periodic Program Review.

PSC-CUNY – Professional Staff Congress/CUNY, the Faculty and HEO Series collective bargaining unit.

QR – The Quantitative Reasoning component of CS.

Retake – A section of an FYE course taken by students who were previously unsuccessful in that course.

RF – Research Foundation/CUNY. Affiliated with CUNY, this organization is responsible for administering all grant-funded projects across the university.

RPT – Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure guidelines for Guttman faculty.

RW – The Reading and Writing component of CS.

SAGE – Systematic Approach for Guttman Effectiveness, a self-assessment framework for units.

SGA – Student Government Association.

Single Stop – Connects students to helpful resources (food stamps, government benefits, housing/shelter).

SPS – CUNY School for Professional Studies, where many Guttman classes meet.

SSA – Student Success Advocate who helps students with a smooth transition to college life.

Starfish by Hobsons (Connect, Early Alert) – an integrated planning and advisement system that is an essential component of the model for Guttman student success.

Stella the Guttman Grizzly – The college mascot.

Studio – A reflective and integrative workspace, a signature piece of the FYE, a component of CS.

TAP – New York State Tuition Assistance Program.

Touch Points – individual student meetings with the academic advisor (either Student Success Advocate or Career Strategist).

UBST – Urban Studies, a POS.