**Minutes for the 140th Meeting of the Faculty Senate for Thursday, February 20th in 1P-119 from 3:30 to 4:30 pm**

Attendance: Appendix A

1. Approval of the proposed agenda. *Moved, seconded, seconded and passed unanimously.*
2. Approval of the minutes of the meeting of the Faculty Senate on December 19, 2019. *Moved, seconded, and passed unanimously.*
3. Executive Committee Report: Appendix B
4. Provost’s Report : Appendix C

**Question**: Do the moneys you are talking about come from the overhead funds? Can you discuss the distribution to the Departments, because as you recall the distribution to the Departments was reduced by 25% and then by 10%, so in a sense the money that is coming is coming from money that was already taken away from the Departments not fork the College budget, so isn’t this like taking with one hand and giving back with the other?

**Answe**r: Yes, you could look at it that way, I suppose, but ultimately we are trying to encourage people to do their scholarship and by transferring it back to the colleges, schools, and divisions it allows them to decide how best to spend them.

**Question**: The Research Committee has two questions: First: How much? Is it true last year Departments got $0? What does it look like for this year for Departments getting some portion of overhead for faculty? Second: What should Departments Expect?

**Answer**: Last year, Departments got 10% and Deans got 10% of what was generated from Departments within their School or Division. So in total 20% went out from what came in. We really haven’t discussed what Departments should expect. There was one year when there was no distribution to Departments in response to the budget. In the past there have been a very different type of distribution of indirect costs based on the amount that had been charged to the grounds. And it was significantly higher. The 10% that was distributed last year is highly in line with other CUNY colleges. There are other ways that the Departments use those funds and, we use those indirect funds to support research. I will work with the President and the Provost to summarize the ways in which they are used but there are many, many expenses covered in the college by these indirect costs. And out of other budgets. It’s a very significant amount. Certainly all of our research costs are not covered. I am happy to put together a document that will outlines the categories and amount for you because we do have a very good picture.

**Question**: So are you implying that the amount of money currently spent is an increase because there are additional funds available or is it just that the money is just being pushed around differently?

**Answer**: No, there are additional monies. $20,000 that was not allocated for travel is now allocated for travel.

**Question**: And the amount for Research? Is that flat or is that being increased, decreased??

**Answer**: We have a very good picture of the 2018-2019. We’re not able to track it, so I can’t give you the full picture for 2019-2020. Of course a lot of costs go up with the new contract, and while a good thing, it does increase the cost related to personnel. We are also looking closely at the research support coming from tax levy and the amount of direct costs that are put in support of research that people are putting into their research grants. The ultimate goal is to coax people to put more direct costs into their grants because we just can’t continue the level of research support from tax levy that we’ve had in the past.

Recommendation form the Chair: for the research committee to meet with Dr. Pipe and the Provost to follow up to get the reports and numbers straight and report back in March to get clarity on the issue.

1. Reports of the Committees of the Faculty Senate
	1. Admissions Committee – Appendix D

 **Question**: The review, who will be doing that and what will be the impact on their workload?

 **Answer**: Admissions office will be doing that under Emanuel Esperance. They have agreed to take that on because they feel it is an important and powerful way to improve recruitment. They’ve actually already started reviewing.

* 1. Curricular Committees –
		1. General Education Committee – none.
		2. Graduate Studies Committee – Appendix E

**Question**: While the Program coordinators may know each student in their program who earned an F, what is the means of communication with the registrar, since that office ultimately records and calculates the GPAs?

**Answer**: When there is academic dishonesty, it should be communicated to the Dean of Students’ office, which contacts the Registrar’s office, and the Registrar then puts a PEN grade on the student’s record so the student can’t drop the course or withdraw. The PEN grade goes on the record and the case is closed. Also there is an audit trail, because students cannot just take a course twice. They need permission form the coordinator, who has to send a letter to the Registrar. They can’t just sign up by themselves.

**Question**: Is the term program adviser clear enough? Wouldn’t program coordinator be clearer?

**Answer**: That’s a good point. That should be changed.

* + 1. Undergraduate Curriculum Committee –

**FACULTY SENATE**

**FEBRUARY 20, 2020**

**AII. GENERAL DEGREE REQUIREMENTS**

AII.I GRADUATE STUDIES: F GRADE REPLACEMENT POLICY

*Motion moved, seconded, and passed unanimously*

**AIV. NEW COURSES**

AIV.1 DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH: ENG 112 PUBLIC SPEAKING

*Motion moved, seconded, and passed unanimously*

**AV. CHANGE IN EXISTING COURSES:**

AV.1 DEPARTMENT OF PERFORMING AND CREATIVE ARTS: ART 120 INTRODUCTORY DRAWING

*Motion moved, seconded, and passed unanimously*

AV.2 DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS: MTH 113 PROBABILITY & STATISTICS

*Motion moved, seconded, and passed unanimously*

1. Course and Standing – none
2. Library Committee– none
3. Research Committee– none
4. Academic Facilities Committee– none
5. Academic Freedom Committee– none
6. Academic Technology committee– none
7. Faculty Personnel Policy Committee– call to look at the Faculty Joint Appointment proposal

 VI. University Faculty Senate Report – none

1. Old Business

 Proposed Guidelines for Faculty Joint Appointments Between Two Departments

 *Motion to table, seconded, did not pass. No action taken due to time.*

VIII. New Business

 IX. Adjournment. *Motion made, seconded, and passed at 4:24*

Appendix A:

Attendance of the FS meeting on February 20, 2020
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Appendix B:

Faculty Senate Executive Committee Report

I am pleased to submit this report on behalf of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. We have several items to present to the Senate, as well as a brief report of our monthly meeting with the Provost and Deans. The topics on which we focused this month included the following:

Communication issues on campus, including faculty governance leaders’ ability to send email messages directly to faculty and staff;

* COACHE survey results;
* CSI’s on-going budget crisis and its ramifications for faculty;
* The President’s upcoming evaluation by CUNY;
* The Re-imagining General Education committee;
* The Credit-Hour committee discussion.

In this report, I will briefly touch upon each of these topics. The first two areas were discussed at the Executive Committee’s meeting with Provost Parrish. The Provost distributed a timeline of the COACHE committee’s process in assessing and disseminating information about the survey. The Executive Committee noted that there was no process in place for consultation with or distribution to the faculty, but instead there would be a report given directly to the administration. We also noted with some consternation that the report is scheduled to be delivered in May, when most faculty leave campus. This may somewhat limit the campus community’s opportunities to discuss the survey results. The Executive Committee urged the Provost to work with the committee to revise the timeline and to make discussion of the survey more inclusive.

Regarding the on-going budget crisis, the Executive Committee is deeply concerned about the impact of CSI’s financial shortfalls on the College’s academic life. There have been significant cuts to the number of fulltime faculty members. Some departments have been adversely affected by the hiring freeze, which precludes academic units from hiring lecturers and other instructional staff needed to maintain programs. Academic growth is – with a few exceptions – at a standstill. Departments are unable to provide co-curricular programming or other opportunities to students. Faculty members’ research agendas, especially junior faculty members’, have been badly compromised by the lack of travel funds and cuts to library resources, especially scholarly databases. Not having basic supplies such as paper and toner have affected instructional quality and, perhaps more egregious, faculty and staff morale. Campus conditions, ranging from building cleanliness to neglected maintenance repairs, reflect badly on the College and have a negative impact on the overall quality of life at CSI. The Executive Committee has expressed to the Administration that a comprehensive vision of financial and quality of academic life issues must be conveyed to the community as soon as possible.

 The Executive Committee will meet with a CUNY representative on Monday to provide input into its evaluation process of President Fritz. We raised an issue with the Provost regarding CSI’s policy of not allowing faculty governance leaders to send email messages directly to faculty and staff. At present, all such messages must be submitted to the Office of Academic Affairs and transmitted with the Provost’s approval. This issue arose during the period when CUNY was soliciting input from faculty regarding the President’s evaluation. The Faculty Senate and College Council Executive Committees submitted an email message for distribution to the faculty to inform the community about the survey and to encourage its members to participate. The Provost’s office refused to send out the email message, and informed us that they needed to consult with CUNY before doing so. During our meeting, the Provost expressed his support for the Executive Committee to be allowed to send email messages directly to faculty and staff. This restriction has yet to be changed, however, and the Executive Committee is conferring with the University Faculty Senate as to how to proceed. We refer Senate members to important publications by the AAUP regarding Academic Freedom and Electronic Communications that stress the critical role of shared governance in determining policies on the dissemination of information to the campus community. Restricting elected faculty leaders’ ability to communicate with faculty is a violation of academic freedom and an unnecessary form of censorship. We encourage the College and CUNY to revise this policy immediately.

The Executive Committee has been actively participating in discussions on Re-Imagining General Education and on the “Credit-Hour” committee. Regarding the former, the Faculty Senate understands that the group has been meeting and will be presenting a preliminary report within the next few weeks. The ad hoc “credit-hour” committee also met and had a fruitful conversation about whether, how, and if some of CSI’s courses should be shifted from four to three hours. The committee further addressed the issue of very large majors, and discussed the question of how to balance general education, electives, and majors in a diverse and varied liberal arts institution. The Senate is encouraged to provide input into the work of these committees.

Finally, there are several openings on Faculty Senate committees that need volunteers. Please let us know if you or someone in your department is willing to serve on one of them. In addition, we will be conducting an election for representatives to the University Faculty Senate, and a nomination process will be announced soon.

In conclusion, I would like to recognize the outstanding work that is taking place at the College and all of the tireless efforts of our faculty and staff. There are many exceptional accomplishments at all levels here on campus, and I would like to invite the community to make us all aware of them by communicating with the elected leadership of the Faculty Senate. We may be without paper, chalk, or travel money, but we continue to provide our students with our time and resourcefulness, our intellectual energy and curiosity, and our creativity. As always, it is a privilege for me to be part of this community.

Respectfully submitted,

Jane Marcus-Delgado

Appendix C

Provost Report

Good Afternoon, and welcome to the first Senate Meeting of 2020. I would like to lead off with some good news. AS the President mentioned, CSI is doing very well in national rankings and enrollment, collections, and scheduling have all had positive effects on our budget situation.

Next week, we will be releasing another $20K in travel funds from RF monies, to be transferred to the Deans’ offices on a full-time faculty FTE basis. Each school and division will develop their own strategy for distribution of these funds.

As announced in previous meetings, we are beginning the search for a new Dean of the School of Education this semester. Once the search committee is finalized with input I just got from the College Council Exec, the committee will begin reviewing applications and we will anticipate bringing candidates to campus around mid-semester.

The COACHE Survey task force is continuing their work to analyze the data from last year’s survey. They will be scheduling meetings with stakeholders during the month of March, and anticipate finalizing their report by the end of the semester.

As we move towards the next Middle States Accreditation Cycle, Associate Provost Mel Pipe and Professor Chris Miller have agreed to co-chair the steering committee, and are currently working on staffing both the steering committee and the working groups for each standard. We have requested input for team membership from IPC and the Executive Committees of the Council and Senate, and a call to faculty and staff went out yesterday.

We are continuing early discussions on the possibility of developing a P-Tech school in conjunction with Port Richmond High School. The next step will be to bring a group of CSI faculty to meet with the leadership at Port Richmond. We are trying to finalize a date in the next few weeks. If anyone wants to participate, please let me know.

In 2016, a plan was developed and approved by the campus for a space move that involved ASAP moving to 2A into the space currently occupied by Social Work. The Social Work program was slated to move into the ground floor of 2N, displacing space currently occupied by two classrooms, a computer lab, and a faculty office. It became apparent during the winter break that no one currently in 2N or in the HSS Dean’s Office knew of this plan, construction of which was set to begin this semester. Because of this, and because of the concern about taking three teaching spaces offline, we have put a pause on this project, and Interim VP for Facilities Hope Berte and I will be assembling an ad-hoc committee to develop a set of alternative solutions for this moves and select one that best fits the college’s overall needs.

As you know, we are currently in a hiring freeze, with any requests for new hires this year requiring CUNY approval. I am currently working with several Deans on developing need statements for specific hires in high-need areas experiencing high and increasing enrollment demand. There is no way we will be able to address all staffing needs in our current budgetary climate.

This semester Professor Nan Sussman has begun Trevia leave, so we want to acknowledge her many contributions to CSI and to the world. Nan is unable to attend today, so we will postpone this recognition until the March meeting when she can be in attendance.

Appendix D

Admissions Committee Report

Report for the Faculty Senate from the Chair of the Admissions Committee, 2/14/2020

The committee wishes to inform the Senate of its discussions regarding baccalaureate admission standards and their effect on enrollment, as was requested by the Senate Executive. After discussion, the Office of Recruitment and Admissions has decided to expand their individual review of applications. There is no change in policy; only in practice, however the Admissions Committee unanimously voted in support of the plan. In short, the Office of Admissions will begin to proactively review borderline baccalaureate candidates for eligibility, rather than simply admit them on the associate track. Currently, the Office carries out this type of manual review only if students appeal their placement, a practice that places CSI at a disadvantage when competing with the senior colleges that initiate their own reviews of applications. Changes in the CUNY application systems are now allowing CSI Admissions to see much of the additional documentation they would have requested in the appeals process, which makes this modified practice possible. Ultimately this will result in some students receiving baccalaureate admissions offers when in the past they would have received associate admissions offers. The Admission’s Committee believes that in a higher education market that is growing more competitive, CSI must appeal to students who are likely to prefer a baccalaureate acceptance to an associate’s acceptance. It will make CSI more competitive with other 4 year schools and may provide an incentive for students to choose CSI over the community colleges. The details and justification for this change are described below, but the faculty and professional members of the committee agree that this plan may not only increase enrollment, but also will result in a very strong freshman admissions profile.

Currently, most first-time freshman students are admitted to the CSI baccalaureate program on automatic criteria (based largely on GPA, SAT scores, and proficiency). All the senior colleges at CUNY receive the applications of students who fall below the automatic admissions criteria for review. Currently, at CSI these “review” applicants are usually admitted as associate students. However manual review based on a larger set of criteria is implemented if a student appeals, and a number of these students are admitted as Baccalaureate students each year. These decisions are made based on examination of improvement trends in transcripts, levels of completion in core subjects, and additional documentation such as essays, recommendations, and resumes. For example, often a student who does poorly in their freshman year of HS may have a low overall GPA, but success later, in Junior and Senior year, is often a better indicator of success in College than the total GPA. HS GPA is often a better indicator of college success for some students than SATs and students who have higher levels of completion in English and Math may be better prepared for College. Essays and other supporting documents also can be valuable in identifying students who are focused on their college education.

Since proficient students take the same classes in their first year regardless of track, there should be no negative effect on course success. Advisement is similar for all students; they are encouraged to consider an associate’s degree en-route to the baccalaureate degree, regardless of the track on which they enter. Current expectations are that these students will not significantly affect baccalaureate completion rates, but they will be tracked and data from the cohort of students allowed in on review will be evaluated as it becomes available.

Enrollment is a significant concern for the Admissions Committee members, and the school’s budget. The Office of Admissions estimates that, had they proactively reviewed applications last year, of the 950 applications received from students who were proficient in English and Math but who had non-qualifying SAT and GAPs, as many as 285-332 could have been accepted into baccalaureate programs. Instead almost all of them received associate’s admissions; if a baccalaureate offer had been made, these students would have had an added incentive to choose CSI. CSI does provide a real advantage over other schools offering associate’s programs: the students can complete their 4-year degree right here with a smooth transition. Baccalaureate acceptance helps students see that.

The Committee has also discussed recruitment efforts that are vital to enrollment. The Office of Admissions continues to work to improve faculty engagement with recruitment, through attendance at events for admitted students, presentations at admitted student events and at local high schools. Phone calls from faculty to the most qualified students can have a high impact on how many students accept our offer of admission. Currently, many transfer students are discouraged from attendance due to delays in evaluation of transfer credit over the summer, which will require faculty engagement to improve. Spring is the primary “Yield” season when students are choosing schools, so the Admissions Committee encourages all faculty to participate however they can to recruit the types of students they wish to see in their programs in the coming years.

The Proposal:

November 18, 2019

The Admissions Committee of the Faculty Senate recommends to the Faculty Senate executive committee that it votes to implement a temporary change to admissions policies to the associate degrees for students entering the colleges in spring and fall 2020.

* Whereas CUNY University policy has changed how students are identified in need of remediation, the Math and English departments have worked with the Program for Student Success to consider how best to meet the needs of students deemed to require remediation by CUNY.
* Whereas the new CUNY policy, which combines reading and writing proficiency into one measure, is not properly reflected in current CSI remediation and admissions policy language, new language has been proposed to remove reference to evaluative measures no longer used.
* Whereas the committee recognizes that its purview is admissions, the proposed guidelines do not adjust the placement decisions of any department into their own remedial courses. The proposal fundamentally deals with the question of which students must take CUNY Start and which will instead be admitted but with particular intervention requirements (remediation, immersion, co-remedial classes, Math Start with other coursework).
* As discussion of remediation and outcomes is ongoing, the change is recommended for two semesters only, so that outcomes can continue to be evaluated.
* **The new recommended polices allow some students deemed in need of remediation in two subjects to begin appropriate general classwork, as long as they do not have “deep developmental” needs in both subjects. Students with deep developmental needs in both subjects will be required to take full-time CUNY Start. This policy represents an attempt to continue the spirit of current admissions guidelines, in light of new CUNY policies.**

The Admissions Committee asks that the Senate Executive committee directly approve the below suggested proposal as a temporary measure or, if necessary, allow the matter to come up to an expedited vote of the body, as student advisement and registration must begin immediately for the spring.

--respectfully submitted by Christine McEvilly, Chair, Admissions Committee

Appendix E

Graduate Studies Committee Report

At the GSC meeting on 10 February 2020 we discussed and voted on three major ongoing initiatives.

 1. Graduate Studies Committee Appeals Process.

We completed our review and clarification of our appeals process. The new forms and process will soon be posted on the CSI Website. This review has vastly improved the process, which has long needed attention, since there has been much confusion over the years between GSC Appeals, which hears appeals for graduate students and those of the Course and Standing Committee, which is responsible for appeals made by undergraduates.

2. F-Grade Replacement Policy

I brought back to the GSC the concern raised at the Faculty Senate meeting in December 2019 regarding the question as to how we would know that an F Grade that a graduated student earned in a course is not the result of Academic Dishonesty. This concern arose from the restrictions stated in the policy:

F-Grade Replacement is limited to a maximum of one (1) course during the student’s enrollment (matriculation) in graduate programs at the College of Staten Island

F-Grade Replacement may not be used to replace an F grade resulting from a violation of CUNY’s policy on Academic Integrity.

I explained to the members of the GSC committee that there was concern at Faculty Senate that it would be difficult to know whether or not a student’s F was the result of Academic Dishonesty. The members of the committee feel strongly that this is not an issue in our graduate programs. It may be an issue elsewhere in the college, but all the members of the GSC insisted that it is simple enough to know whether or not a student’s F grade is the result of Academic Dishonesty because of the requirement to report all such incidents. We reviewed the CUNY Policy on Academic Dishonesty, which requires mandatory reporting of all incidents. Further the policy states that a student who is twice reported for acts of Academic Dishonesty will be dismissed from the college. The members of the committee know the policy and adhere to it, and explained that the reports are filed with the Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs, so that if there is a question regarding a student’s F grade, the coordinator and the appeals committee can check with that office. Further, the program coordinators and directors also keep copies of the report. The committee feels strongly the F-Grade Replacement policy is sound and will be benefit to our students and our programs by aligning us with the other graduate schools across the CUNY system.

3. Assessment: Dr. Pipe, Michael Anderson and I updated the committee on the status of the assessment reporting across all of our graduate programs and set the goal that all would be updated by the next meeting on 10 March. Once all the files are current, we will form a committee that will review the reports and make recommendations for clarification and improvement of the reports and plans.

February 2020 Report of the Graduate Studies Committee prepared by Kate Goodland