



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

Minutes
February 28th, 2018
Room N451

- I. CALL TO ORDER: 2:57 pm
- II. ATTENDANCE: A quorum was achieved. The following senators were absent: Aleksandra Artyfikiewicz, Melanie Aucelio, Khadeja Baldeh, Joel Barker, Sharon Brickman, Horace Brockington, Robin Brown, Loreisy Bueno, Arthur Cain, Kay Conway, Veronica De La Cruz, Marcelle Edinboro, Juan Garcia, Joel Hernandez, Samvel Jesmaridian, Dana Johnson, Orlando Justo, Cara Kronen, Marci Littlefield, Lucille Menzies, Rime Nakhlawi, Malika Sabirova, Brett Simms, Andre Simon, Rebecca Smart, Ali Syed, Hao Tang, Cynthia Wiseman.
- III. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES: Minutes from 11.29.2017 unanimously approved.
- IV. MOTION: Prof. Blake made a motion to include addressing Islamophobia on the agenda. Motion unanimously approved.
- V. STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS FROM REPRESENTATIVES:
 - a. CURRICULUM COMMITTEE: The following items were unanimously approved by the Academic Senate:
 - i. Course Revision: **MAT 206 Pre-Calculus**
 - ii. Course Revision: **MAT 209 Statistics**
 - iii. Curriculum Revision: **Music (Music Studies Specialization)**
 - iv. Course Revision: **SOC 350 Sociology Capstone**
 - v. New Course: **GIS 101 Digital Earth**
 - vi. Pathways Course: **GIS 101 Digital Earth**
 - vii. New Course: **CIS 165 Introduction to Computer Operating Systems**
 - viii. Course Revision: **CIS 255 Computer Software**
 - ix. Curriculum Revision: **Computer Network Technology**
 - x. Curriculum Revision: **Computer Information Systems**
 - b. FACULTY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
 - i. Faculty Development Grants: committee is currently identifying reviewers.
 - ii. Joe Doctor Colloquium to be held on April 18th, 2018, from 11am – 2pm. Topic to be determined.

- c. INSTRUCTION COMMITTEE
 - i. Working on revising hybrid and online course student evaluations.
- d. ACADEMIC STANDING COMMITTEE
 - i. Read and acted on appeals.
 - ii. Committee read and acted on 1093 appeals over January, granting approximately 83% of appeals.
- e. COMMITTEE ON STUDENT AFFAIRS
 - i. Panther Partners first-generation student mentoring program: 12 faculty, 21 staff and 87 students are participating this semester.
 - ii. Starfish: mostly positive feedback received from those involved in the pilot program of last semester. Dean Zummo:
 - 1. Biggest issue is that faculty cannot create templates. There are four templates, prewritten by a committee of faculty and administrators, and these cannot be changed. However, faculty will have the opportunity to view and make changes to what they write.
 - 2. Also of some concern is that the faculty person's signature is on the message that the student receives.
 - 3. A new survey will be sent out at midterm.
 - 4. A forum for additional feedback will be held. An invitation will be sent out with details.
- f. ADMISSIONS COMMITTEE
 - i. Reached out to low-enrollment programs and have identified volunteers from four of them to make 2 minute videos with M. Romero.
- g. ACADEMIC FREEDOM COMMITTEE
 - i. Reported that the AAUP states that "collegiality" is an improper criterion for evaluation of faculty regarding reappointment, promotion and tenure. The committee has heard reports that chairs and administrators continue to evaluate faculty on "collegiality" and so the college should be aware of AAUP's statement. The full statement is included below (committee emphases in italics).
 - ii. Prof. Bishop: Collegiality is not evaluated by college-wide P&B.

VI. CHAIR'S REPORT

- a. SVP Wilks: Guided Pathways 2.0
 - i. AACC oversees this endeavor. It is based on research around the importance of giving student specific maps to follow to graduation. It is an integrated framework from bringing together many student success initiatives.
 - ii. BMCC has a Guided Pathways coach who will give a presentation at College Council in March.
- b. New CUNY Board of Trustees directive: need to accept AP credits with a score of 3.
 - i. Need to determine how this will be done and how senior colleges are dealing with the issue.
 - ii. SVP Wilks: this is a policy matter so what BMCC decides should be accepted

- by senior colleges. Needs to be in place by Fall 2018. Will share clarifying information with departmental chairs
- iii. G. Miller: accepting these credits will create an advising issue, because students will not necessarily be prepared for the next level of a class.
 - iv. M. Alam: If an AP credit is accepted, students cannot take the course over. So far only 4 students have applied for this.
- c. Assessment committee: the committee is to be led to two faculty co-chairs rather than a faculty member and an administrator.
 - d. Middle States: Prof. Bishop - It is unfortunate that the faculty co-chair of the Middle States Steering Committee has not been given the recognition she deserves for all her hard work, and also unfortunate that faculty and the administration should see themselves as on opposite sides of the table when we are all working for the same thing – student success. Nonetheless, the Academic Senate, and its leadership, is 100% behind the administration when it comes to the Middle States visit. It is in the best interest of the entire college to present a unified front, and we are fully committed to doing so.

VII. NEW BUSINESS

- a. Pathways Committees
 - i. Nominees for committee I: G. McNamara (HED), C. Noimann (ENG), E. Henao (MLD), C. Macciavello (MUS). McNamara (42 votes), Noimann (35 votes) and Henao (49 votes) to be submitted to CUNY central as candidates.
 - ii. Nominees for committee II: D. B. McKernan (SCI), A. Colapinto (SOC), B. Kelley (ALL). McKernan, Colapinto and Kelley to be submitted as candidates.
- b. UFS: Prof. Conway unable to attend AS. Handouts were distributed.
- c. Prof. Blake: Discussed Islamophobia on campus and directed the body to a blog by the American Council of Education ([blog](#)) and a paper: Mrayan, SA and Saleh, AI. 2016. Not Without Their Hijab: Being a Muslim Female Student at A Mid-Southern University. RISE – International Journal of Sociology of Education, vol. 5, no. 3, pp 244-267 ([paper](#)). Prof. Blake noted that the senate body has the opportunity to bring about a better opportunity for Muslim students. A motion was made to charge the Student Affairs Committee with this – the motion was unanimously approved.
- d. J. Walters: the Distinguished Teaching Award deadline extended to 12pm, March 12th 2018.
- e. R. Smart: proposed the creation of an ad hoc committee to extend the adjunct handbook. Will speak with Dean Berg on how to proceed. Also noted that an emergency fund for adjuncts should be considered.

VIII. OLD BUSINESS

IX. ADJOURNMENT: 3.59pm.

The statement that follows was approved by the Association's Committee A on Academic Freedom and Tenure and adopted by the Association's Council in November 1999. Committee A revised the statement in 2016.

In evaluating faculty members for promotion, renewal, tenure, and other purposes, American colleges and universities have customarily examined faculty performance in the three areas of teaching, scholarship, and service, with service sometimes divided further into public service and service to the college or university. While the weight given to each of these three areas varies according to the mission and evolution of the institution, the terms are themselves generally understood to describe the key functions performed by faculty members.

In recent years, Committee A has become aware of an increasing tendency on the part not only of administrations and governing boards but also of faculty members serving in such roles as department chairs or as members of promotion and tenure committees to add a fourth criterion in faculty evaluation: "collegiality." For the reasons set forth in this statement, we view this development as highly unfortunate, and we believe that it should be discouraged.

Few, if any, responsible faculty members would deny that collegiality, in the sense of collaboration and constructive cooperation, identifies important aspects of a faculty member's overall performance. A faculty member may legitimately be called upon to participate in the development of curricula and standards for the evaluation of teaching, as well as in peer review of the teaching of colleagues. Much research, depending on the nature of the particular discipline, is by its nature collaborative and requires teamwork as well as the ability to engage in independent investigation. And committee service of a more general description, relating to the life of the institution as a whole, is a logical outgrowth of the Association's view that a faculty member is an "officer" of the college or university in which he or she fulfills professional duties.¹

Understood in this way, collegiality is not a distinct capacity to be assessed independently of the traditional triumvirate of teaching, scholarship, and service. Evaluation in these three areas will encompass the contributions that the virtue of collegiality may pertinently add to a faculty member's career. The current tendency to isolate collegiality as a distinct dimension of evaluation, however, poses several dangers. Historically, "collegiality" has not infrequently been associated with ensuring homogeneity and hence with practices that exclude persons on the basis of their difference from a perceived norm. The invocation of "collegiality" may also threaten academic freedom. In the heat of important decisions regarding promotion or tenure, as well as other matters involving such traditional areas of faculty responsibility as curriculum or academic hiring, collegiality may be confused with the expectation that a faculty member display "enthusiasm" or "dedication," evince "a constructive attitude" that will "foster harmony," or display an excessive deference to administrative or faculty decisions where these may require reasoned discussion. Such expectations are flatly contrary to elementary principles of academic freedom, which protect a faculty member's right to dissent from the judgments of colleagues and administrators.

A distinct criterion of collegiality also holds the potential of chilling faculty debate and discussion. Criticism and opposition do not necessarily conflict with collegiality. Gadflies,

critics of institutional practices or collegial norms, even the occasional malcontent, have all been known to play an invaluable and constructive role in the life of academic departments and institutions. They have sometimes proved collegial in the deepest and truest sense. Certainly a college or university replete with genial Babbitts is not the place to which society is likely to look for leadership. It is sometimes exceedingly difficult to distinguish the constructive engagement that characterizes true collegiality from an obstructiveness or truculence that inhibits collegiality. Yet the failure to do so may invite the suppression of dissent. The very real potential for a distinct criterion of “collegiality” to cast a pall of stale uniformity places it in direct tension with the value of faculty diversity in all its contemporary manifestations.

Nothing is to be gained by establishing collegiality as a separate criterion of assessment. A fundamental absence of collegiality will no doubt manifest itself in the dimensions of teaching, scholarship, or, most probably, service, though here we would add that we all know colleagues whose distinctive contribution to their institution or their profession may not lie so much in service as in teaching and research. Professional misconduct or malfeasance should constitute an independently relevant matter for faculty evaluation. So, too, should efforts to obstruct the ability of colleagues to carry out their normal functions, to engage in personal attacks, or to violate ethical standards. The elevation of collegiality into a separate and discrete standard is not only inconsistent with the long-term vigor and health of academic institutions and dangerous to academic freedom; it is unnecessary.

Committee A accordingly believes that the separate category of “collegiality” should not be added to the traditional three areas of faculty performance. Institutions of higher education should instead focus on developing clear definitions of teaching, scholarship, and service, in which the virtues of collegiality are reflected.² Certainly an absence of collegiality ought never, by itself, to constitute a basis for nonreappointment, denial of tenure, or dismissal

Notes

1. The locus classicus for this term is the 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure: “College and university teachers are citizens, members of a learned profession, and officers of an educational institution.”
2. Even when collegiality is not employed as a separate criterion in conducting faculty evaluations, if the term is improperly used to denote civility or congeniality, it should play no role in evaluating a faculty member’s performance.