



Borough of Manhattan Community College
The City University of New York
Executive Committee of the Academic Senate

Agenda
November 13th, 2019
Room N499H

- I. CALL TO ORDER: 4:03pm
- II. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES: Minutes from last minutes unanimously approved.
- III. STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS FROM REPRESENTATIVES:
 - a. CURRICULUM COMMITTEE:
 - i. **Course SLO Revisions for Academic Literacy and Linguistics: Description:**
The SLOs for the following courses have been revised to reflect the Department and University move away from stand-alone courses to co-requisite courses. Some courses also have additional changes as noted below.
 - a. ACR 95 Academic and Critical Reading II
Vote: Motion to approve the course revision passed 14-0-0.
 - b. CRT 100.5 Critical Thinking Corequisite for Reading Proficiency
This also includes: change of title, change of basic skills requirements and change of course description.
Vote: Motion to approve the course revision passed 14-0-0 pending required revisions.
Required Revisions: Change basic skills requirements so that instead of “Index Score of 55 or above” it lists the range of scores. Remove reference to ACR 95 in SLOs and other areas of the syllabus.
 - c. ESL 49 English as a Second Language
This also included change of course description.
Vote: Motion to approve the course revision passed 14-0-0.
 - d. ESL 54 English as a Second Language
This also included a change of course description.
Vote: Motion to approve the course revision passed 14-0-0.
 - e. ESL 96 Intensive Reading and Writing

Vote: Motion to approve the course revision passed 14-0-0 pending required revisions.

Required Revisions: Remove reference to ACR 95 in SLOs and other areas of the syllabus.

- f. **LIN 150.5 Language, Race, and Ethnicity in the US and its Territories Corequisite for Reading Proficiency**
This also includes: change of title, change of basic skills requirements and change of course description.

Vote: Motion to approve the course revision passed 14-0-0 pending required revisions.

Required Revisions: Change basic skills requirements so that instead of “Index Score of 55 or above” it lists the range of scores. Remove reference to ACR 95 in SLOs and other areas of the syllabus including reference to taking ACR 95 separately.

- ii. **New Course:** LIN 101.6 Introduction to Linguistics for ESL 95

Description: This new course combines two existing courses: LIN 101 and ESL 95.

Vote: Motion to approve the new course passed 14-0-0.

- iii. **New Course:** LIN 140.4 World/Global Englishes Reading Corequisite

Description: This new course combines two existing courses: LIN 140 and ACR 94.

Vote: Motion to approve the new course passed 14-0-0.

- iv. **New Course:** LIN 100.6 Language and Culture for ESL 95

Description: This new course combines two existing courses: LIN 100 and ESL 95.

Vote: Motion to approve the new course passed 14-0-0

- v. **New Course:** ACR 150.5 Literacy in American Society: Contexts & Practices Corequisite for Reading Proficiency

Description: This new course combines two existing courses: ACR 150 and ACR 95.

Vote: Motion to approve the new course passed 14-0-0

- vi. **New Curriculum:** Public & Nonprofit Administration

Description: Business Department proposal for a new Associate in Science degree in Public and Nonprofit Administration.

Vote: Motion to approve the new curriculum passed 14-0-0 pending required revisions.

Required Revisions: In the PAN 240 Syllabus change “Prerequisites/Co-Requisites” to “Prerequisites” so it is clear than PAN 100 is a prerequisite.

- vii. **Curriculum Revision:** Sociology

Description: This proposal changes the elective requirements to require students to take more Sociology courses to give them a stronger background in sociological theory and methods.

Vote: Motion to approve the curriculum revision passed 14-0-0 pending required revisions.

b. FACULTY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE: D. Gambs

- i. Faculty Development Day - Wednesday, December 4, 10am-2pm at Fiterman Hall. At the time of the meeting there were 14 submissions and two panels already formed.
 1. The Faculty Development Day subcommittee will review the different proposals in the coming days and group them in panels. A program is expected to be ready no later than Wednesday, November 13.
 2. Save the dates and RSVPs will be sent out as soon as possible. The website will be updated soon. Information will be included in the next CETLS newsletter and Dean Berg's office will also send out an email advertising the event.
- ii. Eight possible candidate speakers for the Professor Joe Doctor Colloquium. After a voting process, the committee recommended the following names (ranked by priority) for the shortlist:
 - 1) Christopher Emdin
 - 2) Gloria Ladson-Billings
 - 3) Django Paris
 - 4) Elizabeth Stordeur Pryor

c. INSTRUCTION COMMITTEE. A. Colapinto

- i. Continue working on Student evaluations. Nothing to share yet.
- ii. Proposal (below). Will review and bring this to the body in the January 29th 2020 meeting.
- iii. Instruction committee should have a liaison to Academic assessment committee; liaison should belong to the committee they represent and also AS.

d. ACADEMIC STANDING COMMITTEE. G. Miller

- i. No items for the agenda.
- ii. Chair reported on two meetings that he had:
 1. Met new Financial Aid Director regarding appeals process.
 2. Met with Registrar's office and IT regarding getting appeal process online.

e. COMMITTEE ON STUDENT AFFAIRS: B. Haas

- i. Islamophobia event very successful.
- ii. Muslim students raised several issues, including reflection space – there is a hold up on that because several groups are also requesting space. Looking to improve communication with Muslim students about these issues.
- iii. Disciplinary approaches – language etc on appeal forms. Talked about ways to think about interventions before appeals are needed e.g through cohort programs
- iv. Connect2Success conversation – template looser now, so better. However, concern about student surveillance and also another layer of complexity for students. Working with Janice.
- v. Counseling services online possibility – hotline style.
- vi. Talked about 15 to finish: how is data used etc. Have questions for Dean Schultz, who is coming to the next meeting.

- vii. Working on developing new lines of communication with students.... digital and face-to-face.
- f. ADMISSIONS COMMITTEE: R. Smart
 - i. Remediation discussion:
 - 1. Admissions committee should be involved in the process of remediation– discussing how that could happen.
 - 2. Ben Powell will meet with Olivia Harris in the Admission Office.
- g. ACADEMIC FREEDOM COMMITTEE: G. Clock
 - i. The matter concerning the request for information (Agenda) about a meeting prior to being granted a room has been closed to the satisfaction of all parties.
 - ii. The question about the perceived change in online course shell has been dropped. Committee will ask for information about what a “standard” course shell includes.
 - iii. Student Recording of Class Sessions. Committee will seek information about guidelines from other sources (examples: What does the AAUP say? What are federal guidelines? Are there academic articles on this topic?)

IV. CHAIR’S REPORT

- a. Planned topics:
 - i. Liaisons
 - ii. Budget transparency problems
 - iii. Meeting with Faculty Governance Leaders (FGLs)

V. NEW BUSINESS

- a. Follow up on motion about representative on cabinet.

VI. OLD BUSINESS

VII. ADJOURNMENT: 5:33pm

Proposed BMCC E-Learning Observation Guidelines

The traditional BMCC summary form¹ used for in-class peer observations should also be used for online class evaluations. When used for online class evaluations, this form should indicate the method of evaluation (see guideline 2, below). Both the Observer and Observee should be aware of the following guidelines.

Guidelines for Online Observation:

1. Online course observations should be as close as possible in structure to in-class observations.
2. In order to mirror the time frame of face-to-face course observations, the observation should be of a past class period’s content, as defined by the Observee, and decided upon in advance. This could mean that (i) the Observer and Observee sit down to look at the lesson together for a maximum of a two-hour time period, or (ii) the Observer will be allocated a 48-hour (maximum) window of time to observe the lesson.

3. Absent specific instructions from a chairperson or deputy chairperson, the Observer and the Observee should mutually agree on (i) which type of class should be observed, traditional face-to-face course OR online course, and (ii) should agree on the time and method of observation. If the observation is of an online class, the Observer must be trained in online teaching.
4. The Observer's primary responsibility is to provide feedback regarding teaching and learning, rather than course design.
5. If the observation takes place online, without the Observer and Observee meeting together (method (ii) in Guideline 2), then the observer must be enrolled in student/guest access. The Observer's access to the class will be closed (unenrolled) by the Observee after the mutually decided upon 48-hour (maximum) window.
6. The observee should inform the students enrolled in the online class of the observer's presence in the class prior to the observation.

1 No single "form" is used for peer observations across departments at BMCC. Despite this, we refer to the common set of standards and PSC guidelines regarding peer observations (imbued in the variety of forms) as the "traditional BMCC