

**BROOKLYN COLLEGE
OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK**

FACULTY COUNCIL

April 3, 2012

- (5890) Call to order The seventh meeting of Faculty Council for the 2011-2012 academic year was called to order at 3:30 pm in the Woody Tanger Auditorium by the chair, Prof. Pérez y González (PRLS).
- (5891) Roll call The roll call was taken at the door. Department Chairs and Representatives: Boyer (Anthro & Archae), Ciszowska (Chemistry), Schnabolk (CIS), Cheng & Powell (EES), Sardy (Economics), Gurskis (Film), Miyano (Physics), Jayaraman (Political Sci.), Epstein (Speech); Divisional Delegates: Taylor (Arts), Perdikaris (Social Sci.) were absent (-12); Richardson (Arts) & Grommet (HNS) were excused (-2); Administrators: Hewitt, Joyner, Rodriguez & Schechter were also absent and excused. All other members were present.
- (5892) Minutes of March 13, 2012 The Chair announced that the minutes of the March 13 meeting were not yet ready. They will be presented at the May meeting. Prof. Nadell (English), the Faculty Council secretary, has given birth to a lovely baby girl, Georgina Rose. Prof. Bill Gargan (Library) is serving as acting secretary in her place.
- (5893) Steering Committee Prof. Pérez y González announced time limits on discussion and debate: those presenting a motion are to be limited to 5 minutes, while participants in discussion are asked to keep their comments to 2 minutes. She then called for a moment of silence in honor of Prof. Jonathan Adler (Philosophy), who recently passed away, before reading a tribute in his memory from the Philosophy department:
- "The Brooklyn College Philosophy Department mourns the passing, on Monday, March 26, of our dear friend and colleague Jonathan Adler. In over three decades Jonathan established an international reputation as a leading epistemologist, whose contributions ranged over a wide range of philosophical specializations. As a citizen of Brooklyn College he will be remembered for his contributions to the Core: for his leading role in mounting the old Core 5, and in the creation of one of the most popular courses in the current upper tier, "Paradoxes and the Limits of Knowledge." We honor, and will sorely miss, Jonathan's generosity, his kindness and his unquenchable passion for philosophy."
- Online nominations and election of Faculty Council at large delegates will be held in May. Nominations will be held between May 14th and 16th. Elections will be held roughly between May 21st and 23rd. The at large delegates who are elected will serve for three years. There will also be nominations for BCA (Brooklyn College Association). Three to six nominees are needed. Please volunteer. The President will choose three of those nominated to serve.
- (5894) Communications from the Administration Given Council's full agenda for the afternoon, President Gould noted that she would speak on three points and keep her comments brief. She began by saying that she knows, respects, and understands that the Pathways initiative and its formulation process has been challenging. However, the Board of Trustees has said it will go forward and she believes, despite the PSC's challenge, that it will be implemented. She asked the Body to keep in mind as deliberations go forward – that two thirds of the new undergraduates this year are transfer students. Students want to know how and if their transfer credits are going to be applied. There is a real transfer problem at CUNY and at a number of institutions around the country. Many state legislatures have directed their colleges to address transfer credit issues. The President asked

Faculty Council to think seriously about ways to remain in the Pathways conversation and ensure that our Core Curriculum is included in this planning. She applauded Brooklyn College's core curriculum, noting that she celebrates it everywhere she goes, particularly with our alumni. She said that she knows there will be modifications that may be unwelcome and that she understands these concerns. She stated that she and the Provost have committed to paying the fourth hour of English and that they are prepared to finance a fourth hour of science, whether it's required or not, so that those fourth hours of science, which allow for two lab hours, can continue to be offered. The President went on to say that she and the Provost are doing everything they can financially to support our core. We will continue to do so whether they add the credit count or not. We hope to make progress on these issues over time. However, she encouraged discussions of the models presented today because, like it or not, we are going to have to implement Pathways and she would like to see the faculty rather than herself and the Provost doing it. She noted that she respects all the dialog and the differences in views – and there are many – and that's what a college or university is supposed to be about -- spaces of intellectual debate.

Moving on to her second point, the President said that she wanted to clarify for the record information reported in an article in the NY Post and other media today. "I want to give you the facts," said President Gould: "Natalie Mason-Kinsey, the college's AA\EEO (Affirmative Action\Equal Employment Opportunity) Officer determined that the search process, in which Dov Fisher was a candidate, did not follow the University's policies and, therefore, was flawed. She determined that this past semester. For this reason alone the search was not completed and no one was hired. This had nothing to do with the Provost. Neither did it have anything to do with myself. Furthermore, there have been ongoing concerns for some time about irregularities in faculty search processes in the departments within the School of Business. Dean Hopkins, our new Dean of Business, and Ms. Mason-Kinsey have been working together to resolve these issues. They will continue to work on these issues. A committee comprised of all academic chairs at Brooklyn College, which you know to be P&B, reviews all applications for tenure and promotion and makes a recommendation to me, the President. In the case of a senior faculty member, who has been named in the press, -- therefore, I will name her-- Prof. Kass Schreibman, the vote was divided. As President, I determined that the Prof. under review had not yet fulfilled the scholarly and teaching requirements for promotion to full Prof.. This was my call, not the Provost's, whom the articles are taking to task for being anti-Semitic. Prof. Kass-Schreibman filed a complaint with the University, which was thoroughly investigated and determined to be entirely without merit last fall. Nava Silton, who was also named in the complaint, has not made any complaint to Brooklyn College or the University. In this instance, it was determined that her credentials, while impressive, were not applicable to the position for which she had applied. She has since been hired by Marymount Manhattan as an assistant Prof. of psychology. What is this all about? This is about a series of decisions in locations on our campus that were negative in nature, or searches were closed, or promotions were denied and some faculty members were upset. I understand when difficult decisions are made and faculty members are upset and they don't like these decisions, but it has nothing to do with prejudice. It has to do with the evaluation of the criteria and the merits of the case. I stand behind the Provost on these matters. I will continue to stand behind him. I stand behind all chairs who have to make tough decisions and sometimes have to say no, and I will continue to say no when I need to on difficult decisions just as you have to do when you are determining the evaluation of students and their progress. These are not easy decisions, but from time to time they must unfortunately be made, and the major response should not be to go seek out a lawyer or try to find a way to embarrass or in other ways denounce an individual for prejudice. This is just not good for Brooklyn College, and I am really appalled that this community would find itself having to deal with the brunt of these kinds of allegations which are so sad."

President Gould apologized for speaking for so long before moving on to address her third and final point -- student requests for funding. She announced that she would

have a very positive report for the May meeting on fundraising efforts that have taken place over the past 18 months.

The Chair asked if there were any questions for the President. None were forthcoming. She then called on Provost Tramontano, who announced the appointment of Sharona Levy, chair of the SEEK department, to the position of Interim Associate Provost for Academic Programs for the current academic year to replace Donna Wilson, who is leaving Brooklyn to accept a position as Provost and Senior Vice President at Lock Haven University. A full search for the position of Associate Provost for Academic Programs will begin in the fall. The announcement was met with a round of applause.

(5895) Liaison with University Faculty Senate

Prof. Namulundah Florence (Secondary Education) reported on the University Faculty Senate meeting of March 20th. The Pathways controversy is causing divisions among all CUNY institutions, as well as departments and faculty. More information, including resolutions, letters, and statements on general education, articulation, and the CUNY Pathways process can be accessed at <http://www.cunyufs.org/A/>. In support of Pathways right now are: Borough of Manhattan Science department, Queens, and Hunter. Some support Pathways with reservations or rather suggestions. These include, among others, City, College of Staten Island, and La Guardia Community. A majority of CUNY colleges oppose Pathways and have passed resolutions to that effect, including Baruch, the Borough of Manhattan Academic Senate, John Jay's History department, Lehman, Medgar Evers, and Queensborough faculty. Meanwhile, resignations are coming in from Pathways' curriculum committee representatives including: Joel Brind (Baruch College) George D. Sussman (La Guardia Community), and Paisley Currah (Brooklyn College). As for other business mentioned, the Chancellor announced a new sexual harassment policy, which will prohibit relations between students and faculty. A new diversity policy will be implemented shortly. The PSC has filed a lawsuit against Pathways.

(5896) Committee on No report Committees

(5897) Degree Lists Degree lists 2012 25 and 26 were presented by Prof. Thurm (CIS) and were approved with a vote of 69 yes, 1 no, 4 abstentions. Ballot 2

(5898) Report of Standing Committees

Committee on Undergraduate Curriculum & Degree Requirements: Prof. Tenenbaum (CIS) presented Curriculum Documents 353 and 354, including a music erratum, with corrections, of which there were many. Considering 353 first, he noted a major change -- that almost all of the material for the department of Health & Nutrition Sciences is being removed from the document at the request of the department: In A3, pages 85-90 and in A4, pages 156-157; page 155 remains but all the new nutrition courses have been pulled back for additional consideration by the department in the future. Prof. Tenenbaum reminded department chairs that the School of Education no longer used the "EDUC" code and the number to describe its courses. Each department within the school now has its own rubric. Any departments that reference an "EDUC" rubric in their degree requirements or prerequisites need to submit changes in order to change those "EDUC"s to the appropriate department rubric.

Prof. Timothy Gura (Speech) asked the Chair if it wouldn't be possible regarding curriculum documents 353 and 354 to extend special latitude to the committee in making any and all editorial changes that it sees fit. Without any objections from the Body, the Chair accepted Prof. Gura's suggestion.

Curriculum Document 353 with erratum was approved with a vote of 77 yes, 1 no, 3 abstentions. Ballot 3

After reading a list of corrections, Prof. Tenenbaum presented Curriculum Document 354, which involved extensive changes to the Department of Physical Education and Exercise Science's curriculum. Prof. Leslie Jacobson (Health & Nutrition Science) raised a question about the need for clearance for a new course, PEES 2500 Personal Health and Wellness, which she noted is the same as a course currently being offered in her department. Prof. Johnson (PEES) noted that this course is a reworking of a current course PEES 3004, Fundamentals of Physical Conditioning. After some discussion back and forth, Prof. Langsam (CIS) moved to pull the course from Document 354. The motion was seconded and proceeded to a vote, resulting in 45 yes votes, 6 no votes, and 26 abstentions. The motion failed. Ballot 4

Prof. Jacobson said that she would like it on the record that this course did not have clearance from her department. Prof. Forest (Biology) moved that the original name and description of the course be re-instated in the document. Prof. Jacobson seconded the motion. A motion was made to amend the motion but it was not seconded. The motion passed with a vote of 55 yes, 21 no, 2 abstentions. Ballot 5

Curriculum Document 354 as amended was approved with a vote of 72 yes, 6, no. Ballot 6

Prof. Tenenbaum and the members of the CUCDR received a round of applause for all of their hard work.

Committee on Graduate Curriculum & Degree Requirements: Prof. Jennifer Ball (Art) presented Curriculum Document 207, with changes and corrections. Prof. Gura suggested that the same authority be extended to this committee as well in making any and all necessary editorial changes. Hearing no objections from the floor, the Chair concurred. The document was approved with changes and corrections with a vote 71 yes, 2 no, and 1 abstention. Ballot 7. Prof. Ball and the members of the GCDR also received a round of applause for their hard work.

Vice President Joyner noted that the curriculum changes just voted on involved an enormous amount of work for his unit. He announced that the fall schedule will be live without some of the curriculum changes just passed because new students need to begin registering on April 15th. Changes should appear in the online schedule by May 1st.

There was a question about who departments should contact when something on the department home page concerning scheduling -- or things like that -- rolls over from the central database and is incorrect or needs to be changed. Vice President Joyner answered that the person in charge of scheduling is Risa Rosenberg but that he can also be copied as well.

Committee on Master Planning, Education Policy & Budget: Prof. Bruce MacIntyre (Music) introduced a resolution brought forth by the Committee to change the name of the School of Education's Department of Childhood and Special Education to the Department of Childhood, Bilingual, and Special Education. The measure passed with a vote of 72 yes, 2 no, and 1 abstention. Ballot 8

After being recognized by the Chair, Prof. Tremper (English) made a motion to move the agenda to consider a resolution on Pathways that was emailed as well as distributed at the door. The motion was seconded. Prof. Langsam, the Parliamentarian, reminded the Body that a 2/3 vote of those present was required on this motion. The Chair called for an attendance check to ascertain the number of members present and the number of votes needed to pass the motion. Based on the attendance (76 members), it was determined that 51 votes would be needed to pass the motion to move the agenda. Ballot 9

The motion to move the agenda passed by a vote of 60 yes to 16 no. Ballot 10.

The Parliamentarian noted that discussion on the resolution was to be limited to 2 minutes per person until everyone had spoken. He informed Council that the Chair would keep a list of those wishing to speak and reminded everyone to address their remarks to the Chair. The resolution, sponsored by Prof.s Tremper (English), Lipke (Biology), Ball (Art), Bell (Finance & Business) and Winslow (Secondary Education), was brought up on the screen:

**BROOKLYN COLLEGE
OF THE
CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK
Faculty Council
April 3, 2012**

A Resolution on Pathways

Whereas, Pathways fails to uphold academic integrity as defined by the faculty; fails to achieve the goal of creating seamless transfer within CUNY as it negates existing articulation agreements; and penalizes CUNY students by making transfer of credits outside of the CUNY system impossible in certain subject areas; and

Whereas at the March Faculty Council meeting Provost Tramontano made clear that much of the actual motivation for Pathways is to improve six-year graduation rates at CUNY in keeping with national efforts to use numerical metrics to evaluate educational effectiveness in higher and primary education (although these metrics have little to do with the actual quality of the education received); and

Whereas recent studies indicate that the burdens of employment, which are exacerbated by regular tuition increases, are, in fact, the major cause of the increase in drop-out rates; and **Whereas** the intellectual unsoundness of Pathways is a direct result of the manner in which it has been imposed; and

Whereas the Pathways resolution was passed by the Board of Trustees in violation of its own Bylaws and has been implemented through a process that undermines both shared governance and academic freedom, bedrock principles of a university; and

Whereas the CUNY central administration has refused to repeal Pathways despite an outpouring of opposition from elected faculty bodies such as the University Faculty Senate, college senates, academic discipline councils, academic departments and learned societies, as well as over 3,000 individual faculty who signed the PSC petition opposing Pathways;

Therefore **Be it resolved** that the Brooklyn College Faculty Council call on the Board of Trustees to repeal the "Pathways" resolution ("Creating an Efficient Transfer System") at its next meeting – on April 30, 2012; and

Be it further resolved that we call on the Board of Trustees and its representatives to initiate a new planning and implementation process to address the issue of student transfer in conformation with the University Bylaws and upholding the principles and practices of shared governance and academic freedom in order to create a curriculum worthy of CUNY's mission; and

Be it further resolved that the Faculty Council of Brooklyn College affirm that it will not implement a Pathways curriculum under the current guidelines.

The Chair recognized Prof. Tremper. Speaking for herself, Prof. Tremper said that she believed that if one voted for this resolution, it did not preclude voting for one of several resolutions scheduled to come up later on the agenda, namely the resolutions being proposed by Prof.s Tenenbaum (CIS), Brooks (English), and Moore (Philosophy). She asked that the Body consider the resolution, not because one thinks that by passing it, one can stop Pathways from going forward -- the PSC's legal action, she added, had a better chance of doing that -- but because it violates faculty governance, which is being thrown under the bus by the way in which this proposal by the Chancellery has been presented to us and we have been asked to work within its confines. Rather than our ability to implement Pathways around the core curriculum, it's really about faculty governance, which has been obliterated. She went on to say that faculty governance is important for our students, whose educational benefits are tied to the faculty's control of curricula. The Chair called next on Prof. Lipke, who said that he too signed on to the resolution because of faculty governance issues. He noted that the guidelines of the sciences run counter to learning outcomes for science students and that he believed the Chancellery had no interest in changing them in a way that would allow us to meet those learning objectives. Prof. Wills (History) spoke next, saying that she agreed with Prof. Tremper that it was not just about faculty governance but that we needed to protect the interests of students. They are the ones who have not been brought into the Pathways conversation and they are the ones most affected by it. She brought Council's attention to the Brooklyn College Student Union's letter to President Gould, copies of which were distributed to Council members as they entered the Woody Tanger Auditorium. She encouraged Council members to read the letter and to begin a discussion about the financial hardships our students face and to look to find ways to relieve them. Students are not having so much of a problem with the curriculum designed by the faculty as they are with no longer being able to afford to go to school here. Next, Prof. Len Fox (English) expressed his support for the resolution, noting that, according to Prof. Florence's earlier report, 6 campuses had voted against Pathways. He read a resolution passed by the general faculty of Baruch College into the record:

Resolved: The General Faculty therefore recommends that Baruch College discontinue the process of revising the College's general education curriculum until a University-wide summit meeting of campus faculty, students, and administrators along with leaders from CUNY's central office has convened and reached agreement on a solution to the ostensible transfer problems that does not entail a major dilution of the university's general education programs.

He noted that the Baruch College General Faculty further resolved that "the General Faculty rejects the current Pathways curriculum proposals that the relevant Baruch College committees and schools have developed" and also that "The General Faculty strongly recommends that the faculty at all of Baruch's schools vote to reject the current Pathways curriculum proposals that are coming before them."

The Chair asked Prof. Fox how he felt about the motion in question. He replied that he supported it.

Prof. Williams (Classics) then asked what would happen if Faculty Council refused to move forward.

The Chair replied that we couldn't answer that right now, that it was food for thought for all of us.

Prof. Langsam noted that he read the resolution as saying that we would not implement a Pathways curriculum under the current guidelines. He did not read it as saying we were prohibiting other committees of faculty council to continue to work on that curriculum.

The Chair replied that his reading was correct.

The Chair then called on Prof.s Tremper or Lipke to respond to Prof. Williams' prior question.

Prof. Tremper believed that Prof. Langsam had just answered the question in the way that she would have. By voting for this resolution, she said, one is sending a message to the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees that we reject the high-handedness of telling us how to implement a program that will affect students CUNY-wide. If Pathways goes through, as President Gould thinks it will, something may have to be done. That being the case, she said that she is not asking Faculty Council to vote against any of the resolutions that are being put forward by any of the other committees. Prof. Lipke added that he wholeheartedly agreed that transferability is necessary and is the key to the success of the University and that changes in curricula would be necessary to achieve that but we don't have to change curriculum according to the mandates of one Executive Vice Chancellor who, to his mind, found the loopholes in the suggestions from the working committees.

The Chair called for a ballot. The resolution passed with a vote of 65 yes, 8 no, 3 abstentions. Ballot 11

The Chair called on Prof.s Moore, Brooks, and Tenenbaum to present the resolutions sponsored by Core, Academic Foundations & CUCDR. She reminded Council that the 2 minute limit on discussion was still in effect.

Prof. Moore noted that there were three resolutions to be considered. He summarized the resolutions that were included in each Council members packet.

Prof. Tenenbaum rose to urge Council to vote for all 3 resolutions. Prof. Fox was opposed. He said that, while he respected the tremendous work done by these committees, he thought voting for them sent a mixed message, if on the one hand we have voted to repeal it and, on the other hand, we are prepared to go along with it. Prof. Williams disagreed with Prof. Fox, noting that such a vote might be considered a double strategy rather than a mixed message. Prof. Cunningham (Africana Studies) rose to support all three resolutions. Like Prof.s Tremper and Williams, he said he was in favor of doing both things at once.

In response to the Chair's call for further comments, Prof. Lipke offered an amendment: "Be it resolved that if Pathways is implemented under guidelines consistent with faculty governance, Brooklyn College will, provided that Faculty Council votes to do so, modify the current Core Curriculum by fall 2013 to meet the requirements of Pathways, with the modification to include as much of the current Core framework as possible..."

Mica Tomkiewicz (Physics) seconded the amendment and Prof. Gura called the question. The vote to call the question passed by a vote of 60 yes, 8 no. Ballot 12.

The vote on the amendment proceeded. The amendment failed by a vote of 52 yea, 12 nay, 5 abstentions. Ballot 13

The Chair announced that the original resolution was before the Body once again. She recognized Prof. MacIntyre (Music) who spoke in support of the resolution. Prof. Tenenbaum wanted to respond to Prof. Fox's earlier point that we should not vote for a plan to implement Pathways at this point. Right now, we're only saying that if Pathways does come into being, we want it to include as much of the core as possible – that is what we are voting on. Prof. Fox's point might apply to the two following resolutions but it does not apply to the one before us presently. The Chair called for a ballot. The resolution fell short of passing with a vote of 49 yes, 19 no, and 1 abstention. Ballot 14.

Prof. Moore presented the resolution on Model 1. Council is not being asked to adopt this model, only to tell the curriculum committees that work should continue on this model -- that this is a general direction we should continue to pursue. Prof. Tenenbaum spoke in favor of both models. He urged everyone who favored moving the process forward to vote for both. Prof. Cunningham expressed some support for model 1, but spoke more favorably for model 1.1, an alternative, proposed by a group of faculty concerned with promoting diversity, which was distributed at the door. Prof. Mica Tomkiewicz noted that if we were just voting to let the committees continue to chat that was one thing but if we were being asked to direct the committees to chat in a specific direction then that was a different issue. The Chair indicated that it was the later that was being proposed. She then called on Prof. Williams who noted that his department, Classics, favored Model 1 over Model A. He said that he wanted the discussion to go forward. He asked, however, what would happen if both models fail to win 55 votes and if the union's suit is unsuccessful? If both models fail to receive 55 votes, the Provost and the President will be compelled to propose curriculum for the college. Prof. Jones (CIS) urged a vote for the resolutions. Prof. Bell called the question.

The vote to call the question passed with 52 yeas. Ballot 15.

The vote proceeded on Model 1: The result was 46 yes, 17 no, 2 abstentions. The resolution failed. Ballot 16

Model A was considered next. Prof. Moore noted that Model A more closely resembles the present core. He urged Council not to underestimate the amount of time and effort that went into formulating these models. These resolutions were put forward because the sponsoring committees are creatures of Faculty Council. The committees do what Faculty Council tells them to do. The committees need to know whether or not they should continue to work along these lines. Many other models were considered, but these two were the ones, in the end, that the committees felt they could propose in good conscience as possibilities. If both of these models are voted down, he doesn't know what we'll do. Prof. Tenenbaum said that Model A has the most flexibility in allowing the committees to look at different alternatives. He noted that the arguments of the diversity groups were very powerful and should be taken into consideration. After saying that he probably shouldn't say this, he went on to say that if you vote against Model A, it's tantamount to telling President Gould and Provost Tramontano to make up a general education course. The rejection sentiment is very understandable and entirely justified but we're in a really tough situation and this is our last chance. Prof. Troyansky (History) talked about Model 1.1 and he suggested that we be given an opportunity to discuss this model, which he believed had a greater opportunity of passing. Prof. Cunningham agreed, noting that this model provided greater flexibility both in terms of the subject matter and in the number of departments participating. Prof. Williams moved to reconsider Model 1 or to direct committees to consider another model like 1.1. Prof. Langsam, the Parliamentarian, ruled that the only choice right now was to vote on model A or someone has to make a motion to substitute. Prof. Lipke called for a quorum.

A quorum was 55 people: 59 members were present. Ballot 17

Prof. Macintyre spoke in support of model A. Prof. Martinez (PRLS), noting that she represented a small diversity based department, expressed support for model 1.1. Prof. Tenenbaum said that he was unsure as to whether he should call the question or introduce a substitute motion. Parliamentarian Langsam noted that there were only 57 members present and reminded the Body that all but two members were needed to vote in the affirmative for any action to pass. Prof. Ball spoke in support of Model A. Prof. Cunningham began to speak about what model 1.1 should be but he was ruled out of order by the Parliamentarian. Prof. Cunningham then called the

question.

The vote to call the question passed with 60 members present: 52 yes, 8 no. Ballot 18

The resolution on Model A failed with a vote of 38 yes, 21 no, 2 abstentions. Ballot 19 new ballot 1).

(5899) Old Business There was no old business.

(5900) New Business Prof. Cunningham introduced a new resolution, Model 1.1. There was a call for a quorum as a group of people left the meeting. The Chair directed a vote be taken. A quorum was absent.

(5901) Adjournment There being no further business, the Chair declared the meeting adjourned at 5:18pm.

Respectfully submitted,

María Pérez y González,
William Gargan,

Chair
Acting Secretary