

Bronx Community College
of the City University of New York

College Senate

Minutes of the Meeting of February 19, 1981

4 P. M.

Tech Two - Room 228

Present: Faculty: Jan Asch, Ruth Bass, Irwin Berger, Kathleen Berger, Dolores Bullard, Donald Cancienne, Francis Costello, Marsha Cummins, Frank Donnangelo, Walter Duncan, Blanche Ettinger, Thomas Finnegan, Kenneth Fogarty, Howard Fuld, John Furst, Ralph Gorman, Anne Gotta, Lillian Gottesman, Neil Grill, Arthur Hirshfield, Carlos Infante, Erwin Just, William Kleiber, Jean Kolliner, Richard Kor, Arlene Levey, Gerald Lieblich, Donald McCulloch, Stephen O'Neill, Maureen O'Riordan, Joyce Patterson, Alvin Paullay, Carl Polowczyk, Jack Prince, Rosemary Quinn, Joseph Riley, Morton Rosenstock, David Sacher, Harriet Shenkman, Wallace Sokolsky, Michele Stern, Michael Steuerman, Manuel Stillerman, Jacqueline Stuchin, Herb Tyson, Bernard Witlieb.

Students: Jerry Hall, Joseph R. Tabacco

Excused: Cortland Auser, Roscoe C. Brown, Richard Donovan, Victor Garcia, Jacqueline Gardinier, Gabriel Motola, Martin Pulver, Seymour Reisin.

Guests: C. Harris, L. Handy, A. Rodgers, J. Ryan, A. Wolk.

1. Report from Senate Committees

a. Curriculum Committee - Dr. J. Ryan.

A report in writing was submitted. [See attached.] Dr. Ryan noted that Item B of the report contains items to be acted on at the next meeting of the Senate.

b. Committee on Academic Standing.

The current concern is that faculty be reminded of the Dean's memo on debarment of non-attending students.

c. Student Activities - Dean M. Steuerman.

No quorum was reached at any of the Student Activities meetings. The deadline for filing nominations of students to committees is February 20. Thus far, six nominations have been received, and

BRONX COMMUNITY COLLEGE
OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

A g e n d a

COLLEGE SENATE

(Special Meeting)

Thursday, March ¹⁹12, 1981

4:00 - 6:00 p.m.

TECH TWO 228

1. Committee on Governance - Report
2. Action Items:
 - a. Approval of Minutes - 2/19/81
3. ADJOURNMENT

Next College Senate Meeting

Thursday, March 26, 1981

4:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.

there are 19 vacancies.

d. CUNY Senate - Prof. Gil Riley.

There has been discussion of a number of items, but no significant actions have been taken, during the past two meetings.

e. Governance Committee Status Report - Prof. H. Tyson.

The Committee expects to complete its governance plan by next week.

Dean Polowczyk distributed a memo to the Committee on Governance from President Brown, offering a proposed revision of the governance plan. [See attached.] Dean Polowczyk reminded the Senate that the Middle States Association will be expecting a report from the College by April 15. [See attached letter from Dr. Howard Simmons.]

It was decided that an additional meeting of the Senate will be held on March 5, solely for the purpose of discussing the Governance Plan.

2. Action Items

a. Minutes of the meeting of December 18, 1980 were approved as submitted.

b. Curriculum Committee.

On attached Curriculum Committee report, the following actions were taken:

Item 1. Carried. Viva voce.

Item 2. Motion to postpone action. Carried viva voce.

Item 3. Motion that decision be postponed, pending submission to the Office of Academic Affairs, an experimental design and a specifically selected textbook. Motion

voted: Yes 24 No 17 Abstentions 2
Motion carried.

- Item 4. Carried viva voce.
- Item 5. Carried viva voce.
- Item 6. Carried viva voce.

c. Goals and Objectives.

It was moved and seconded that Goal 4 be changed to read:

"To contribute to students' ethical, personal
and interpersonal development."

Motion voted: Yes 32 No 3 Abstentions 1.
Motion carried.

Meeting adjourned at 5:35 P. M.

Respectfully submitted,
Jacqueline B. Stuchin,
Secretary

/ao

BRONX COMMUNITY COLLEGE
of the City University of New York

February 18, 1981

TO: Members of the Bronx Community College Senate

FROM: J. D. Ryan, Chairman, Curriculum Committee

SUBJECT: Report of Curriculum Committee Actions, 10/14/80 through 1/6/81

A. The following items were reported to the Senate at its meeting of 12/18/80, and are action items for the February meeting:

- 1) Course title change. Sociology 33, formerly called "The Family" to be retitled Marriage and the Family, cf. Minutes of 10/28/80.
- 2) Motion concerning RR flags and registration procedures (see below), cf. Minutes of 11/18/80.
- 3) Change in prerequisite for GEO 10, now to be listed as having a minimum corequisite of ENG 01 or RDL 01 (12-4-2), cf. Minutes of 11/25/80.
- 4) Change in curriculum for Paralegal Studies AAS program.
 - a. Inclusion of LAW 99 (Legal Research and Writing), to take the place of POL 61 in the curriculum.
 - b. Additional choice of a science course. CHM 10 to be added to the list of possible science courses to satisfy the science requirement.
 - c. Additional footnote advising transferring students concerning recommended science, Mathematics and music and art courses (7-1-1). cf. Minutes of 12/9/80.
- 5) Change in prerequisite for Data sequence: MATH 05 to be listed as a corequisite (rather than a prerequisite) for DATA 30. MATH 05 to become a prerequisite for all other DATA courses (i.e. DATA 31, 40 and 41) (16-2-0). cf. Minutes of 12/16/80.
- 6) Approval of the Experimental Automotive Certificate program as a regular program of the college (15-2-1). cf. Minutes of 12/16/80.

Concerning item #2 - the RR flags and registration procedures: On 11/18/80, Dean Polowczyk requested that the Curriculum Committee approve for the spring registration the continued use of the list of remediation required (RR) flags employed in the final stages of last fall's registration. The Dean's letter is printed in Curriculum Committee minutes, pp 20-22.

The committee carefully considered the Dean's request but did not endorse the reimposition of the RR flags. There were several compelling arguments for the rejection of the Dean's suggestion. Important among those was the fact that the RR flags were to be put into place only after the early registration process was complete, thus threatening to severely disrupt the college by "undoing" great numbers of the early registrations. Even more important was the fact that the RR flags suggested did not correspond to the remedial requirement set down by the Curriculum Committee and approved in the Senate last year.

For these reasons, the committee adopted three resolutions on 11/18/80, which were communicated to the Dean of Academic Affairs in a letter of 11/20/80 (cf. Curriculum Committee minutes, page 25). In brief, these motions reaffirmed the RR flag procedures passed by the Senate in 1979, requested that the Dean's remedial flag list be used only for incoming freshmen in the spring 1981 registration, and urged that faculty advisers be informed of the correct remedial requirements so that students would be properly advised without the imposition of an incorrect list of RR flags. The Dean, in a letter of 12/10/80, informed the committee that he could not accept our position. It is my understanding that the list of RR flags which the committee rejected was used in the spring registration.

Because of the complex nature of the problem and since this matter will surely arise again, the chairman of the Curriculum Committee was asked to set down, in his report to the Senate, the basic background material necessary to evaluate this semester's (and future) actions with regard to the RR flags.

The RR flag procedure has arisen as a result of the recommendations of the Curriculum Committee Subcommittee on Academic Standards, which was set up at the request of then President James Colston in 1975 and chaired by Professor Jean Kolliner. The task of the subcommittee was to examine the academic program at the college and to recommend ways by which academic standards could best be maintained. There was a preceived problem because many academically under-prepared students were finding their way into the mainstream of the college without any exposure to the remediation courses which had been established. Although some of these students coped well, many did not develop basic skills and fell by the wayside. The committee deliberated and gathered evidence over a two-year period. It was not possible to simply require that all remedial courses needed be taken "up front," for this would make many students ineligible for TAP assistance. In addition, considerable evidence exists which suggests that remediation linked to content courses is more effective than remedial courses taken in a vacuum. The committee presented a series of sweeping recommendations in 1978. Among these were the recommendations that English remediation be started as early as possible where a writing deficiency was diagnosed and that, as a practical compromise, either RDL 02 or ENG 02 be a minimum corequisite for all college credit courses. By means of these two separate steps, students would be forced to enter the remedial track and to acquire basic writing skills early on.

The Senate rejected the resolution calling for an RDL 02 or ENG 02 co-requisite because of a change in TAP regulations which was promulgated between the framing of the recommendation and its consideration by the Senate. The new (now current) TAP regulation called for each TAP recipient to take at least 3 credits of college work in the first semester and 6 or more in each subsequent semester. After further deliberation, the subcommittee recommended, and the Senate approved, an altered measure by which:

- a) RDL 02 or ENG 02 would be the basic corequisite for most college-level courses.
- b) An interim list of courses appropriate for the 01-level student was identified.
- c) As an interim measure, 01-level students who could not progress to RDL 02 or ENG 02 by the end of their first semester would be allowed to register in courses with an 02 minimum corequisite.
- d) The entire prerequisite, corequisite structure vis-a-vis remedial and entry-level courses would be examined by the Curriculum Committee.

These procedures are now operating and the examination/discussion of remedial prerequisites and corequisites is now in process. Some additional courses have been recommended as appropriate for 01-level students and added to the list mentioned in (b) above.

However, the basic recommendation that ENG 02 or RDL 02 be the basic co-requisite for most college-level courses has not been implemented in the registration procedure. This is because the computer program used in registration is not sufficiently sophisticated to allow the machine to distinguish between two possible corequisite courses as the remedial requirement. As a result, the college resorted, in the fall 1980 registration, to a procedure by which 01-level students would be flagged and prohibited from registering for college-level courses with an 02 corequisite. Even in this case, however, the level of sophistication of the computer program did not allow the machine to screen for 01 in RDL or ENG - and as a result, the Office of Academic Affairs stipulated that an ENG 01 requirement would be an RR flag in some subjects, and RDL 01 in others. A MATH 05 requirement also operated as an RR flag when various departments requested this.

The Curriculum Committee has rejected this procedure as inadequate in the face of the Senate action of 1979 and has repeatedly urged that the computer program for registration be upgraded as rapidly as possible to allow for the imposition of RR flags based on the minimum corequisite structure which was approved by the Senate and which is stated in the college catalogue.

B. At the meeting of 1/6/81, the following two actions were taken:

- 1) Approval of a new course to be offered by the Department of Special Educational Services - "Methods and Materials for Teaching Language Arts in a Bilingual Program" (14-2-0).
- 2) Minor change in the Electrical Technology Curriculum, enumerating the departments in which the restricted "Humanities" elective could be taken (16-1-0).

Since these latter motions are being reported to the Senate for the first time at the February meeting, they are not action items

bo

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

MEMORANDUM

February 16, 1981

To: Committee on Governance
From: President Roscoe C. Brown, Jr. *RCB*
Subject: REVISION OF THE GOVERNANCE PLAN

I recently met with your Committee Chairman, Prof. Herbert Tyson, to communicate the importance of having a revised governance plan approved by the Senate by April 1st, so that the College can meet the deadline set by the Middle States Association for submission of a revised governance plan as required in their accreditation letter. (See attached letter.)

I have received the minutes of the Committee's January 16, 1981 meeting and note that the Committee is proposing ten committees. The number of committees as now proposed by the Committee is too many and tends to continue a structure that is too cumbersome. The Middle States visitor clearly expressed this concern in his visit over a year ago. Accordingly, I am making the following recommendation for a streamlined governance structure which I hope the Committee will use as a basis for its recommendation to the Senate.

The proposal is as follows:

1 Limit the number of senators to no more than 54. A suggested distribution is listed below:

- 30 - Faculty (18 elected by the departments and 12 at-large)
- 16 - Students (12 day, 4 evening elected by the student body)
- 1 - HEO (elected)
- 1 - Secretary (elected)
- 1 - CLT (elected)
- 1 - Buildings and Grounds (elected)
- 1 - Adjunct Faculty
- 2 - Deans (elected by the Deans)
- 1 - President
- 54 - TOTAL

bronx community college of the city university of new york
university avenue and west 181 street, bronx, new york 10453 • (212) 367-7300

II Limit the number of Standing Committees to six (6) as follows, with an:

1. Executive Committee (which would also serve as a budget review committee) - Twelve (12) members---Chairperson and Vice Chairperson of the Senate, 3 Division Coordinators, 4 faculty senators, 2 student senators, 1 dean, plus President or designee (ex-officio).

The Executive Committee would prepare the agenda for Senate meetings and act for the Senate when it is not possible to convene the Senate.

2. Committee on Committees - An elected committee of ten (10) members elected by the total Senate---5 faculty, 3 students, 2 administrators, and the President (non-voting, ex-officio).

The Committee on Committees would be responsible for appointing the members of the Committees with at least two students on each committee. Administrative officers or deans would be ex-officio members of the committees in their areas of responsibility.

Other ad hoc committees can be appointed by the Executive Committee as needed. In addition, Administrative Advisory committees, which include faculty, will be convened when necessary.

3. Governance Structure and Functions (also to serve as an elections committee). Eight (8) members.
4. Curriculum Committee - Twenty-four (24) members---3 Division Coordinators, 5 faculty representatives from each division---and six (6) students.
5. Academic Standing Committee - Twenty-two (22) members---1 from each department and 4 students.
6. Student Activities Committee - Eight (8) members.

III All other committees would be ad hoc committees created by the Executive Committee, with members to be appointed by the Committee on Committees.

This structure would be similar to the committee structure found in most colleges, allowing for the major legislative functions of the Senate to be handled by 3 standing committees (Curriculum, Academic Standing, and Student Activities) and the administrative aspects of the Senate by the other 3 committees (Executive, Committee on Committees, and Governance). Ad hoc committees could be created on a yearly basis to perform some of the functions now proposed for other standing committees.

My administrative staff and I will be glad to work with the Committee to help work out the details, so that a plan can be reported to the Senate in early March.

I wish to reiterate the urgency of completing this final step that is necessary for the College to have its accreditation fully endorsed. As you know, as President of the College it is my responsibility to provide leadership to see that this is accomplished. I look forward to the Committee's completing its work swiftly. Again, I want to thank the Committee for its diligent efforts in helping the college community to focus on an improved governance structure.

RCB/egh
Attachment

che commission on higher education

3624 Market Street
Philadelphia PA 19104

msa middle states association of colleges and schools

215-662-5600

June 27, 1980

Dr. Monroe C. Brown
Office of the President
CUNY Bronx Community College
University Avenue and West 181 Street
Bronx, New York 10457

Dear Dr. Brown:

At its meeting on June 18-20, 1980 the Commission on Higher Education voted to accept the report from CUNY Bronx Community College and to thank the College for receiving the Commission's visitor. Further, the Commission requests a further report by April 1, 1981 on the governance structure and functioning; the submission of this report will be followed by a staff visit. The Commission also wishes to note that the Periodic Review Report is due April 15, 1983.

While there was no specific mention made of an approved statement of mission and goals, the Commission still expects the College to make progress in this area. This statement, which should serve as the basis for institutional planning, will be expected to get adequate attention in the Periodic Review Report.

Please be advised that the Commission stands ready to assist the College in whatever way seems appropriate. Best regards.

Sincerely,



Howard L. Simmons, Ph.D.
Associate Director

vle

cc: Chancellor Robert J. Kibbee
The City University of New York