

BROOKLYN COLLEGE
OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

FACULTY COUNCIL

March 12, 2013

- (5965) Call to order The fifth meeting of Faculty Council for the 2012-2013 academic year was called to order at 3:30 pm in the Woody Tanger Auditorium by the chair, Professor Langsam (CIS).
- (5966) Roll call The roll call was taken at the door. Department Chairs and Representatives: Latortue (Africana Stu.), Bankoff & Sharman (Anthro & Archeao), Ciszowska (Chemistry), Kellogg (Classics), Cheng (E&ES), Rawson (History), Childers (Modern Lang.), Zeng (Physical Ed), Miyano (Physics); School Delegates: Menser (Humanities & Social Sci.), Grubbs (Visual, Media & Performing Arts) were absent (-12); Johnson (Physical Ed.), Easley (Theater). Lenzer (Children & Youth Stud.), Taylor (Visual Media & Performing Arts) were excused (-4); Administrators: Faria, Green, Hewitt were also absent and excused. All other members were present.
- (5967) Minutes of February 19, 2013 Professor Langsam presented the minutes of February 19, 2012. The minutes were approved.
- (5968) Steering Committee Professor Langsam announced the election for Brooklyn College representatives to the University Faculty Senate, which will be held on line from March 19 through March 22, 2013. He also announced faculty nominations for the board of the Brooklyn College Association, which will take place at the April 2013 meeting of Faculty Council. A special election for a member of the Committee on Committees took place. Professors Grasso (Psychology) and Birnbaum (FBM) were nominated and received 48 and 31 votes, respectively. Professor Grasso was elected.
- The Special Resolution on Faculty Governance, sponsored by the Committees on Core Curriculum, Course & Standing, Undergraduate Curriculum & Degree Requirements, Graduate Admissions & Standards, Graduate Curriculum, Master Planning, Education Policy & Budget, and Steering, was presented. Professor Shortell (Sociology) opened with a discussion of the resolution. He stated that although the President and Provost did not create Pathways and are in a difficult position, the resolution makes clear that what the administration has done so far is, in fact, in violation of the Brooklyn College governance plan. He stated that we have to make a public, strong statement or risk sending the signal to the Brooklyn College administration and to CUNY Central that shared governance can be set aside whenever convenient. Regardless of the specifics of Pathways as a curriculum, it is clear, as far as governance is concerned, that what has happened so far is a violation of the Brooklyn College governance plan and that Faculty Council should respond to that. Pathways is the first step of a broader process of centralizing the curriculum; it is important that we resist this publically. Faculty members are in charge of curriculum, because they are experts and are in the classrooms. Professor Shortell asserted that this is about the best interests of students and that faculty members have to be the defenders of true liberal arts education. Professor Soare (SEEK) stated that the Provost and President are in a difficult situation and that they are caught in the middle "between a rock and a hard place." He declared that they are doing the best that they can, given that they are being forced by the Chancellery. Professor Yarrow (Classics) asked for clarification of the phrase "much behind the scenes work." Professor Shortell referred her to the minutes of February, 2013 meeting of Faculty Council, which referred to the remarks of the Provost. Professor Langsam reminded Faculty Council that he asked the Provost whether he would change the front matter of the Brooklyn College *Undergraduate Bulletin* as well as submit classes not approved by Faculty Council. The Provost confirmed that would be the case, and Professor Langsam stated that those actions would be in violation of Brooklyn College governance. Professor Ball (Art)

recognized that the Provost and the President are doing their jobs and that there were concerns about the resolution being too mean spirited, but the fact remains that administration did something that violated faculty governance. It was the job of the faculty to maintain that governance, she stated. Professor Powell (EEEC) stated that courses were submitted by departments. Professor Shortell stated that current Faculty Council policy is that Brooklyn College will not participate in Pathways as it is currently configured. Faculty Council could choose to change that policy, but that should involve direct faculty discussions about curriculum. In the absence of that change, current Faculty Council policy stands. That is, he stated, the governance issue. Professor Okome (Political Science) declared that this was about process and that the administration had subverted process and shared governance. The point of the resolution is that Faculty Council is opposed to this subversion rather than a personal attack. Professor Sower (Classics) asked if this resolution would change or augment the stance that Faculty Council took in April and May. Professor Shortell responded that if Faculty Council did not respond publically, a strong message would be sent to the Chancellor that faculty governance could be discarded when convenient. He stated that the resolution may be largely symbolic, but is part of a campaign that may lead to other things, including a resolution at the Stated Meeting of the Faculty or actions at other campuses or at the University Faculty Senate. Professor Hughes (Theater) said that Faculty Council is going on record about responding to the administration's actions since last spring. Professor Langsam said that the resolution was crafted in a very careful manner so as not to imply a loss of confidence. It is the action of violating governance -- until such time that governance is changed -- that the resolution addresses. The resolution passed with a vote of 70 yeas, 12 nays, and 7 abstentions.

(5969)
Communications
from the
Administration

President Gould opened by stating, "The message has been delivered; we understand it." She declared that she is pleased to note that some understand the situation for the administration, which is committed to doing the best it can under the circumstances, which are not ideal.

President Gould then moved to a discussion of the budget. She stated things are unusual this year, as New York State Governor Cuomo may bring the budget to the state by March 18, which is early because of Easter and Passover. This is a good thing, in terms of knowing what the budget will be. Unfortunately, it is not yet clear if there will be any capital funds for CUNY or SUNY. However, there have been rumors and rumblings from some elected officials about the possibility of capital funds. She said that New York State Senator Golden is slightly optimistic that there could be the possibility of capital, which could stimulate the economy by creating jobs. However, most East Coast governors are contending with the implications of Hurricane Sandy and with sequestration. If there is an opportunity for capital at CUNY, Brooklyn College is well positioned with the Roosevelt Teaching Commons. Elected officials are eager to help Brooklyn College. The reception for Brooklyn College's request is positive.

President Gould called attention to the steps located on the side of Ingersoll, which are almost available. Once the steps are open and clear, the entry will be a very pleasant student seating area. The Tow Performing Arts Center is on schedule for a Fall 2014 opening. There is tremendously encouraging news about Steiner Studios: the Brooklyn Borough President will add to Brooklyn College's donations.

President Gould stated that, although she missed the last meeting, she did want to report that the office of General Counsel and Senior Vice Chancellor for Legal Affairs Schaeffer and an additional lawyer have been working on and virtually completed their interviews about the events of February 7, 2013, in particular about the four students who were asked to leave the room. She hoped that a report and review from them would be available by the end of the month. The President reiterated her stance on the importance of academic freedom. If it is determined through this review that the students should not have been asked to leave,

President Gould will be the first to apologize privately and in public. She has refrained from doing so, as she has been told that it is not appropriate for her to do so until the investigation has concluded. It behooves us all to remember all of the ways that respecting academic freedom can be both large and small, she asserted. If, in this particular case, academic freedom was not respected, it is not good for Brooklyn College and its students. Steps are being taken to make sure that this does not happen again. There has been a Policy External Relations Subcommittee meeting, and a Policy Council meeting will take place in the following week. There is agreement that this is an important conversation to have and that there are more specific guidelines in place for student clubs when they have events open to the public. In that way, the responsibility for conduct will be clear, so students and faculty marshals will not be asked to make difficult calls.

(5970) Committee on Committees Professor Shortell reminded Faculty Council that the form requesting committee assignments would be sent to Brooklyn College faculty soon

(5971) Liaison with the Faculty Senate

Professor Fox read the following:

Notes on the March 5, 2013 Meeting of the CUNY University Faculty Senate

Guest Speaker: Chancellor Matthew Goldstein

Before the meeting, UFS members were asked to read a talk given by the Chancellor on Jan. 29 on "The Future of Higher Education":

<http://www1.cuny.edu/mu/chancellor/2013/01/29/remarks-at-cuny-financial-management-conference-the-future-of-higher-education/>. In the talk, the Chancellor spoke about what he considers to be "a few key areas that are critical to the future of CUNY and to higher education in general." He said "We must embrace change," and "we're in a race ... between the power of new ideas to lower costs and boost quality and the power of entrenched interests to protect their habits." Some specific issues that he mentioned are the following:

- 1) "the rate of tuition increases is unsustainable"
- 2) the MOOC model (massive open online courses) may become widely adopted
- 3) lack of student readiness and student skills is a serious problem
- 4) half of college faculty are part-time but "the quality assurance measures that are in place for full-time faculty are not as robust for part-timers"
- 5) many students transfer to different colleges during the course of their higher education, and more students are part-time and/or adults
- 6) Shared governance is an issue: "Administrators may feel justifiably compelled to generate a framework for new innovations – whether a gen ed/transfer system, or alternative course models – in order to improve the educational experience and progress of students"
- 7) We need "data-driven assessment and outcomes to evaluate existing programs and justify new advances"
- 8) "Universities need to seek advice and direction from companies whose employment needs can shape the direction of curricular innovation"

In his talk at the meeting, the Chancellor also said that CUNY would like faculty to develop new Master's programs in areas where job opportunities exist, especially related to applied math, science, and technology. He also said that remedial programs do not seem to be very successful and need to be reformed, adding that he considers this "a moral problem" if we are not effectively preparing students for college studies. He said that this has been a difficult year but he wants to find commonality with the faculty union and with governance leaders so that we can deal together, like a family, with threatening external forces, like reduced government support for higher education.

In the following question and answer period, one faculty member said that Pathways has not been a good example of the Chancellor trying to work cooperatively with faculty governance bodies and leaders. Another faculty member said that CUNY was once considered a national leader and innovator in the area of remedial education, but she was concerned about CUNY's current commitment to this sort of education.

Other business

After the Chancellor left, some other issues were briefly discussed. Concern was expressed that more faculty teaching at the Grad Center are on "Central lines" and less is of faculty from the colleges. Concern was expressed that the introduction of CUNYFirst and Pathways requirements next Fall will create massive confusion and demoralization among CUNY students and faculty. It was reported about the two anti-Pathways lawsuits that one is fully briefed and the other will be fully briefed very soon. The CUNY administration has requested that the lawsuits be dismissed, and we are waiting for the judicial decision on this matter. Professor Okome of Brooklyn College, who has been elected to be a member of the UFS Executive Committee, reported about the Brooklyn College BDS event, that it was held, that the BC Committee on College Integrity praised President Karen Gould for her statements about the event, that the College will hold another event presenting the other side of the issue, and that there was concern about the fact that some students were removed from the event for allegedly creating a disturbance. Concern was also expressed that at some colleges, including Brooklyn, all faculty and students were apparently enrolled in an inyourclass.com software pilot program without properly asking for faculty and student consent to participate in this program.

- (5972) Degree Lists Degree Lists 2013/23 & 24 were presented by Professor Langsam and were approved with a vote of 79 yeas, 1 nay, and 1 abstention.
- (5973) Report of Standing Committees Committee on Undergraduate Curriculum & Degree Requirements: Professor Tenenbaum (CIS) presented Curriculum Document 361, with Page 6 removed. Provost Tramontano spoke about the shift from 3 credits to 4 credits courses in the proposed changes in English Department degree requirements and courses. He stated that he had several concerns about the three hours of classroom time and the addition of a conference hour. These concerns include the lack of financial analysis about what the changes would cost Brooklyn College, the consequences for staffing issues, and the effect on accreditation by Middle States, which has recently released a new document, entitled "The Verification of Compliance with Accreditation Relevant Federal Regulations." The document addresses consistent credit hour policies at member institutions. The Provost read the following: "The Department of Education establishes the credit hour as the basis for measuring an institution's ability for federal funding." The Provost stated that this was student's ability to receive federal funding. He said that institutions must provide the following information to the Middle States evaluators and in the PRR letter: written policies to assign credit hours, evidence and analysis that demonstrates that policies and procedures are consistently applied to all programs and courses regardless of the delivery mode or the teaching and learning format, an explanation of how institution assigns credit hours and how this conforms to commonly accepted standards. The commission must take appropriate action if evaluators find deficiencies as part of its review process. If Middle States concludes that there is evidence of non-compliance with the credit hour policy, it is obligated to notify the US Department of Education. The Provost stated that what the curriculum document presents is part of something that needs far broader and much more extensive discussion about what this would mean to the students' financial aid ability and how it would be received by Middle States. At the program level, Brooklyn College is not yet in a position to discuss this. Professor Yarrow asked the Provost to continue reading from the document about internships. Assistant Provost for Planning and Special Projects Wagner read about the option for students to do an equivalent amount of work as required in Paragraph One, which contains a description of the Carnegie Credit for other academic activities as established by the institution, including laboratory works, internships, practica, studio work, and other academic work leading to the award of credit hours. AP Wagner stated that at the Middle States conference, Brooklyn College was told that the evidence required to submit in compliance with this regulation is auditable, so Brooklyn College would have to submit an official college policy that covers all instructional offering as well as audits to ensure that it is enforcing this policy. Professor Yarrow asked if there were a Faculty Council committee that could develop such a policy. Professor Langsam stated that it could be the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee or Master Planning,

Education Policy, & Budget and that Steering would have to discuss this. Professor Yarrow stated that she was not clear if Brooklyn College should hold up the implementation of curriculum while waiting for the development of such a policy. She pointed out that the Classics Department moved some classes to three credits and some, including its 4000 level courses, to four credits. These courses include research methodologies; Classics has a specific formula for how conferences are set up and what independent research looks like. Even though the English Department changes would be much more widespread and affect more students, the Classics Department should be part of the conversation about credit hour policies. Professor Tennenbaum stated that the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee reviewed the academic integrity of the courses. In each case, there were arguments that students would learn in greater depth and would absorb the material in much more significant ways if this were done. He stated that, presumably, there is an audit of faculty hours. There is a responsibility of individual faculty members, departments, and the administration to ensure that conference and special outside work is on the up-and-up. He reminded Faculty Council that there was an ad hoc committee appointed by Faculty Council to look into workload balance. The committee asked the departments about 4 credits/4 hours courses for 3 credits/3 hours courses. Roughly half of the departments were interested in this shift, and half were not. The general conclusion was that those departments that could academically justify the shift could make it. The time for discussions of the validity of this shift should have come with that committee's report. Professor Tennenbaum questioned the financial implications, as students will pay for four credits and faculty members will do four credits of work per course. The total number of credits would remain the same; therefore student input would remain the same and the faculty workload would remain the same. There should not be any obvious financial implications. Brooklyn College has many courses that use this style of teaching. In terms of the decision made at Faculty Council on that day, English has to make a case that the changes are academically justified. If that case is made, Faculty Council can safely go ahead. Professor Tremper (English) said that she made the case to the English Department that the writing requirement was serious and would be auditable. Given the poor state of student writing, the changes would help students improve their work. Dean Phillips (HSS) commended the thoughtfulness of the document but stated that she shared, with the Provost, concerns about the financial implications within English and across the school. She stated that, as a Dean, she was concerned about the differences in document, as there are some classes that will extend contact time between faculty and students; others will ask students to do more work outside of classroom. She raised broader questions about the process of making the leap from 3 to 4 credits. She stated that she would like to see a syllabus to see how this is done. She declared that this led to another issue, about "faculty governance right now, which is shared," she stated. The Dean's office should be brought into the conversation. She referred to her experience as a dean at another institution, where she worked with the majority of departments to shift from 3 to 4 credit hours per course. She stated that before the changes came before the curriculum committee at that institution, they went through her office so she was could do her job. She noted that many of the departments involved in the proposed change from 3 to 4 credits courses were housed her school and state that she was not allowed to do her job for faculty and for students. She stated that Faculty Council should consider the reverberations of the shift across the college. The President reiterated what Dean Phillips stated. She said that in "shared governance," dialogue and conversation are emphasized. That was woefully lacking as the Dean, Provost, and President did not know about the changes. While she did not disagree with the intentions of the shift, she did refer to the implications of such a major shift. She stated that more discussion and analysis were warranted. She questioned the usage of "independent study" in a regular class and stated that this was redefining the meaning of the term. She declared that it was inappropriate for there to be differences in meaning of the term across departments and that the courses would be out of sync with national norms and that Middle States would focus on this. Professor Yarrow stated that the courses in Classics tested the waters and may have "slipped through." She asked if it were

appropriate to make a motion to ask Steering and the administration to review the language used in the Brooklyn College *Undergraduate Bulletin* to describe conference, independent work, and other terms. Professor Langsam responded that was appropriate under New Business. It was noted that the Economics had a proposal in the curriculum document and asked about separating the document. Professor Wasser (TV & R) reiterated this concern. Professor Shortell stated that the colleagues in English are experts in how to teach English and that any problems could be addressed in the future, as documents can be changed. He stated that Faculty Council should let the English Department tell members why this is in the best interest of students. Professor Hainline (Psychology) stated while she was sure that the department had best intentions for students, she had concerns about the conference hour and was worried that it would not occur. She asked about ensuring that it did occur, as, in her experience, some courses included conferences that never met. Professor Yarrow stated that this could indeed be done and described her method. Professor Tremper stated that across Brooklyn College's curriculum, there were many definitions of credit hours, including independent study and research with a variety of meeting times and ways in the ways in which credit was assigned. Professor Sower stated as a member of a department in which a credit hour was given for independent work, that, it was possible to do so and that he was confident that such efforts would meet all assessment criteria. He then made a motion to divide the document. The motion passed with a vote of 62 yeas, 17 nays, and 0 abstentions. The following pages were separated: 11-26, 37-43, 48-55, 65-177, 181-183. The remainder of Curriculum Document 361 passed with a vote of 76 yeas, 2 nays, and 2 abstentions. Professor Sower moved to change the agenda to consider Graduate Curriculum Document 213 in advance of the remainder of Curriculum Document 361. The motion passed with a vote of 59 yeas, 22 nays, and 1 abstention.

Committee on Graduate Curriculum & Degree Requirements: Professor Ball (Art) presented Curriculum Document 213 with changes. It passed with a vote of 76 yeas, 0 nays, and 1 abstention. In addition, Professor Ball presented errata from Curriculum Document 212, which passed with a vote of 77 yeas, 0 nays, and 0 abstentions.

Committee on Undergraduate Curriculum & Degree Requirements: A motion to send the remaining curriculum document back to the department was made. The motion failed with a vote of 13 yeas, 61 nays, and 3 abstentions (Note: due to a software error, this was reported as 13 yeas, 62 nays, and 3 abstentions during the meeting). Professor Nadell (English) stated that the faculty members of the English Department are committed to the department's status as a writing intensive department and have considered these questions very carefully. Given the difficulty of fulfilling the double charge of teaching content – the range of English, American and other literatures -- and writing, the English Department faculty members are committed to the conference hour. She stated that she felt that if an audit were to take place, it would be successful. Professor Pérez y González (PRLS) stated that there are New York State regulations about the Carnegie credit hour, independent study, and other terms. She asked if the Undergraduate Curriculum committee looked at these regulations and if the English Department materials were in compliance. Professor Tennenbaum stated that the committee did not look at New York State or Middle States regulations but did look at past practice at Brooklyn College. Professor Hadler (Art) asked why the English Department changed to 4 credits/4 hours, as opposed to 4 credits/3 hours. Professor Tremper stated some courses would meet for four hours (writing courses and Linguistics courses). Other courses would be better served with more time on writing and reading. She pointed out that the current number of courses in the English major is 13. The revised major would add 5 hours but reduce the number of courses to 11. Professor Hughes asked if it were Faculty Council's responsibility to endorse or otherwise respond to curricular changes brought by departments and the Undergraduate Curriculum committee based on students and learning outcomes or on financing, Middle States accreditation and those sorts of matters. Professor MacIntyre stated that he hoped

that Steering would recommend a discussion between deans and representatives from Faculty Council committees about policies. He stated that we should respect the best practices for discipline, as put forth by the national disciplinary associations and can assume that English Department colleagues are following common, acceptable, and successful practices. Dean Shanley (Education) raised the issue of accreditation. Professor Tremper pointed out that many colleges offer 4 credit classes. Professor Pérez y González stated that we should vote and that if this was approved by us, it would then have to go to the Board of Trustees for their final approval. Professor Moore (Philosophy) called the question, which was withdrawn. Pages 11-26, 37-43, 48-55, 65-177, 181-183 of Curriculum Document 361 failed with a vote of 53 yeas, 21 nays, and 4 abstentions (Note: due to a software error, this was reported as 54 yeas, 22 nays, and 5 abstentions during the meeting.

(5974)Old Business There was no old business.

(5975)New Business Professor Yarrow moved to assign to the Master Planning, Educational Policy & Budget and Undergraduate Curriculum Committees the task of examining “these issues,” relating to credit hour policy. The motion passed with a vote of 63 yeas, 10 nays, and 0 abstentions. Professor Langsam, on behalf of Steering, directed Master Planning, Education Policy & Budget, the Undergraduate Curriculum, and the Graduate Curriculum Committees to do so in all due haste.

(5976) Adjournment There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:03 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Yedidyah Langsam,
Chair

Martha Nadell,
Secretary