June 12, 2012

Alexandra Logue
Executive Vice Chancellor and University Provost
535 E. 80th St., Room 702
New York, NY 10075

Dear EVC Logue:

In accordance with CUNY requirements for the Pathways project, I hereby submit the College of Staten Island Pathways Framework for the Common Core and the College Option. As I know you are aware, I am deeply committed to the principles of shared governance as expressed in the College of Staten Island governance plan, but at this time no clear consensus on a Pathways model for CSI emerged from the General Education Committee and from the Faculty Senate. This leaves me no choice but to submit the material in compliance with Board Policy, though it has not yet been approved through our governance channels. I want to state that the CSI faculty has worked very hard to develop a model that would comply with the Pathways guidelines. They have done this despite the fact that many of the faculty have serious reservations concerning the process of the development of the Pathways. Nevertheless, I am confident that the campus will develop courses and ultimately come together and put forth a consensus model that will be in all ways consistent with Pathways. Personally, I have had a continuous association with this project since its inception and remain fully committed to Pathways.

While I deeply regret that our governance bodies did not bring the matter to a vote, the material submitted represents my view of the current status of various positions articulated and discussed over the course of the last year.

Consultation Efforts

I want to assure you that CSI followed due process and that I made every effort to seek extensive consultations with the faculty through the General Education Committee, a committee in our governance plan; the Faculty Senate, also included in our governance plan; Town Hall meetings with faculty, staff, and students; General Chairs’ meetings; Divisional Chairs’ meetings; the Student Government, and other venues. The General Education Committee met weekly since February and the Faculty Senate held an extra meeting at the end of the year. Nevertheless, no consensus was reached and the proposal that I submit here has not been approved by either the General Education Committee or
the Faculty Senate. Given this situation, an explanation of the origin of the proposal I submit here on behalf of CSI is appropriate.

CSI Debates

Various models for Pathways frameworks have been vetted in the General Education Committee and through committee members in the academic departments. These models include a proposal brought forth by an advisory committee appointed by the Faculty Senate to the General Education Committee, the self-named “Lemonade Committee,” and several models proposed by members of the General Education Committee. All of these proposals have been publicly posted since early Spring on a CSI Pathways Website, which can be viewed at:

http://www.csi.cuny.edu/pathways/index.html

Comments were invited through CSI’s online discussion board as well as through an email invitation that was sent to the campus community.

As the campus struggled to reach a compromise, modifications to various models were made as a result of input and feedback from the General Education Committee members and various other constituencies. These were also posted on the public website and shared with the faculty and broader CSI community.

During the course of the debate, the committee did reach consensus on a few items. These included support for the:

- Requirement of two science labs in the College Option;
- Requirement of an additional writing module to supplement the ENG 111 and 151 sequence in the College Option;
- Inclusion of performing and applied arts courses in the College Option;
- Preservation of a Pluralism and Diversity Overlay and, to a lesser extent, a Contemporary World requirement through exposures in the Common Core and the College Option.
- Maintaining the current Foreign Language requirement for BA and BS students currently required to take a language.
- Not adding a new Foreign Language requirement for BS students in the STEM disciplines.

All of these conclusions were in the spirit of and guided by CSI’s current General Education requirements.

Although there was a campus appreciation of the importance of the Foreign Languages, and several proposals were advanced to include the Languages in the Flexible Core and/or College Option, no consensus was reached as to how best to ensure that BA and BS students are required to take a Language at the third level of proficiency in the Common Core and/or College Option.
Moreover, there was no consensus as to whether we should retain our current CORE 100 requirement, given the possible impact on other disciplines that might be included in the U.S. Experience in Its Diversity bucket.

Following the last General Education Committee meeting, the “Lemonade Committee” and several departments presented to me additional positions, which I have attempted to capture in the model I submit here. I have also met with many other faculty members individually in the last two weeks, and have attempted to address areas of concern related to the proposal.

The CSI Pathways Framework: The Current (6_12_2012) CSI Pathways Model

The proposal that I submit here represents my best attempt to represent the current position of the CSI faculty. It includes elements of several competing models and I believe that it is a strong model that preserves many of our current General Education requirements. In fact, exposure to the Arts and Social Sciences may be enhanced for BS students in STEM areas. Exposure to 200 level courses will be ensured for both BA and BS students in this model by requiring a minimum of 6 credits of 200 level courses with at least one 200 level course taken in the College Option.

Please note that we have added overlay requirements to the Common Core and College Option. These preserve our current Pluralism and Diversity and Contemporary World requirements. We will also continue to require all students to take two science courses with labs; the labs will be part of our College Option. Although the model submitted preserves foreign language requirements only to the second level of proficiency, we may encourage the inclusion of a requirement for the third level of proficiency in selected majors.

We hope that CUNY finds our model acceptable. We believe it is an exemplary way to adapt CSI’s current General Education requirements to Pathways while striving to make improvements where possible.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

William J. Fritz
Provost & Sr. Vice President for Academic Affairs
Interim President Effective 8/15/2012

Cc:
Tomás D. Morales, President
CSI Faculty Senate
CSI Faculty
Provost’s Council