



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

Agenda
March 27th, 2019
Room N451

- I. CALL TO ORDER
- II. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES
- III. STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS FROM REPRESENTATIVES
 - a. CURRICULUM COMMITTEE:
 - i. **Course Revision:** BTE 201 Introduction to Biotechnology
Description: This revision changes the pre-requisites from CHE 202 to CHE 201.
Vote: Motion to approve the course revision passed 13-0-0 pending required revisions.
 - ii. **Curriculum Revision:** Modern Languages – French
Description: This revision adds additional Program Electives to the major and modifies the French Language requirements.
Vote: Motion to approve the curriculum revision passed 13-0-0.
 - iii. **Curriculum Revision:** Modern Languages – Italian
Description: This revision adds additional Program Electives to the major and modifies the Italian Language requirements.
Vote: Motion to approve the curriculum revision passed 13-0-0.
 - iv. **Curriculum Revision:** Modern Languages – Spanish
Description: This revision adds additional Program Electives to the major, modifies the Spanish Language requirements to account for pre-requisite changes in SPN courses.
Vote: Motion to approve the course revision passed 13-0-0.
 - v. **Curriculum Revision:** Office Automation Program
Description: This revision deregisters the major.
Vote: Motion to approve the curriculum revision passed 13-0-0.
 - vi. **Curriculum Revision:** Office Operation Program
Description: This revision deregisters the major.
Vote: Motion to approve the curriculum revision passed 13-0-0.

- vii. **Certificate Revision:** Office Automation Certificate
Description: This revision deregisters the certificate.
Vote: Motion to approve the curriculum revision passed 13-0-0.
- viii. **New Course:** SOC 220 Art, Culture & Society
Description: In this course students will examine the role of arts and culture in society with an emphasis on social meaning, interpretation and impact.
Vote: Motion to approve the course revision passed 13-0-0 pending required revisions.
- ix. **Curriculum Revision:** Gender & Women’s Studies
Description: This revision adds CRT 196 Critical Thinking: Inquiry though Queer Theories, as an elective option.
Vote: Motion to approve the curriculum revision passed 13-0-0 pending required revisions.
- x. **New Course:** LAT 140 Introduction to Mexican-American Studies
Description: In this course students will study the varied experiences of Mexicans in the United States from an interdisciplinary perspective.
Vote: Motion to approve the new course passed 13-0-0 pending required revisions.
- xi. **Pathways Course:** LAT 140 Introduction to Mexican-American Studies
Description: Inclusion of the course in the US Experience in its Diversity Pathways bucket.
Vote: Motion to approve the Pathways course passed 13-0-0 pending required revisions.

- b. COMMITTEE ON STUDENT AFFAIRS
- c. FACULTY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
- d. INSTRUCTION COMMITTEE
- e. ACADEMIC STANDING COMMITTEE
- f. ADMISSIONS COMMITTEE
- g. ACADEMIC FREEDOM COMMITTEE
 - i. See below

IV. CHAIR’S REPORT

V. NEW BUSINESS

- a. Study Abroad ad hoc committee

VI. OLD BUSINESS

VII. ADJOURNMENT

Academic Freedom Committee Report on Designing for Success Initiative

I. In the fall of 2018 the Academic Freedom Committee decided to look into the process of the development and implementation of Designing for Success (DfS). The Academic Freedom Committee decided to look into the DfS initiative when it became clear in the October Academic Senate (AS) meeting that the initiative was well under way, with five large committees being populated, including several whose work impact pedagogy and learning. It is our charge to ensure that there is shared governance and that faculty are the primary decision-makers regarding curriculum and teaching. This investigation is not looking at the content of the DfS initiative directly and we recognize that many people are working hard and coming up with good ideas.

II. Findings:

1. The minutes from the Executive Committee (EC) and the AS indicate that Interim President Wilks talked to those bodies about Guided Pathways. The Interim President has hosted two forums on DfS and is visiting departments to speak about the initiative. There was a brief report from the AS chair in the October 2018 meeting, but there is no record of what was communicated specifically about the initiative, and there remains confusion regarding the relationship between DfS and Guided Pathways. According to the BMCC Website, Guided Pathways was Phase I of DfS.
2. Faculty not directly involved with DfS in its early stages did not recognize the magnitude of the initiative and did not follow through with queries.
3. Conceptualization of DfS involved a relatively small number of the faculty, mostly department chairs.
4. There are still many faculty members who are completely unaware of DfS. In addition to this confusion, there are some strong critiques of DfS, partially based on lack of information, but also based on a larger critique of the spread of Neo-liberalism into higher education, of which DfS is perceived to be a part.

III. In the spirit of preserving shared governance and creating better collaboration among faculty and administration, the AF Committee respectfully offers the following recommendations.

1. The chairs committee should elect a chair of the committee who sits on AS EC and reports about committee activity that month. We can vote to do this immediately and instantiate the practice when we re-write the governance plan.

Rationale: Much of the conceptual and early administrative work of DfS was done with the department chairs and not more widely shared. Faculty need to know what the chairs are discussing as it is almost always about pedagogy and curriculum.

2. The faculty chair of the DfS committees related to pedagogy should directly report to the AS.

Rationale: Faculty should hear from faculty about pedagogical and curricular issues, not just from the administration. Those closest to the decisions and deliberations (in other

words, those sitting on the committees) should be speaking directly to the Academic Senate.

3. The college needs to engage in a discussion that questions the fundamental assumptions of DfS.
Rationale: There is a robust critique of the Designing for Success movement as well as other pedagogical and economic practices within higher education. It does not appear that the administration is aware of these critiques. If the conceptualization of DfS had included those perspectives, we would have seen a number of benefits. First, more people would have known about it. Second, there would have been a richer discussion and opportunities for questions and alternative proposals that may have strengthened or broadened the initiative. Third, there would have been less suspicion about the initiative. As is, the suspicion and critiques of DfS are relegated to the sidelines, when many of the assumptions and structures of the initiative are already in place. We hope that this discussion will take place so that the DfS initiative may still benefit from alternative perspectives and a more holistic approach.

4. Faculty in departments directly affected by pedagogical changes because of DfS should be actively discussing and deciding on how to teach their effected courses.

- A. Faculty on the DfS Committees should be reporting back to their departments regarding the initiative and anything that might affect the departments. Those same faculty should also relate their departments' concerns back to the DfS committees.

Rationale: This will help ensure full communication with the faculty. Furthermore, the DfS committees are very large and necessarily hold meetings that not all of its members can get to. Having another communication process in place will increase the chances that diverse voices are heard.

- B. Faculty in departments where there is significant differences in opinion regarding the implications of DfS, specifically as it influences the developmental skills courses and co-curricular courses, should be having rigorous discussions with the intention of coming to consensus.

Rationale: The Interim President says she is committed to making sure the faculty control the courses and pedagogy of this college. The faculty and chairs of those affected departments should ensure that they are exercising their responsibility to control how they teach our students. The co-curricular courses are central to the DfS initiative. It is optimal that the faculty come to agreement about how to best serve our students in the developmental courses.

These recommendations are offered for consideration and discussion by the full Academic Senate.