

Faculty Senate Minutes #375

September 7, 2011

1:40 PM

Room 630 T

Present (45): Michael Alperstein, Jana Arsovska, Andrea Balis, Erica Burleigh, Demi Cheng, Kathleen Collins, Lyell Davies, Virginia Diaz-Mendoza, James DiGiovanna, Mathieu Dufour, Janice Dunham, Jennifer Dysart, DeeDee Falkenbach, Beverly Frazier, Terry Furst, Jay Gates, Lior Gideon, Demis Glasford, Laura Greenberg, Norman Groner, Maki Haberfeld, Devin Harner, Veronica Hendrick, Tim Horohoe, Shaobai Kan, Karen Kaplowitz, Kwando Kinshasa, Anru Lee, Richard Li, Yue Ma, Vincent Maiorino, Evan Mandery, Roger McDonald, Sara Mcdougall, Mickey Melendez, Brian Montes, Catherine Mulder, David Munns, Richard Ocejo, Rick Richardson, Raul Rubio, Francis Sheehan, Staci Strobl, Denise Thompson, Patricia Tovar

Absent (5): Elton Beckett, James Cauthen, Richard Haw, Nicholas Petraco, Manouska Saint-Gilles

Agenda

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. Announcements & Reports
3. Approval of Minutes #374 of the May 25, 2011, meeting
4. Ratification of election slates: College, University and Faculty Senate Committees
5. CUNY Academic Integrity Policy revised by the CUNY BoT June 2011
6. Follow-up regarding the new Honors Program
7. Follow-up regarding proposal policy regarding final course grades

1. Adoption of the agenda Approved.

2. Announcements & Reports [Attachment A]

A Senator expressed concern about the anonymous evaluation distributed at the conclusion of the Faculty Development Day at the end of August; the concern expressed was that the demographic questions were of descriptive information that could easily identify faculty

members. President Kaplowitz agreed that such demographic information should not have been asked and said she would request that such information not be asked in the future.

3. **Approval of Minutes #374 of the May 25, 2011, meeting.** Approved: 43-0-2

4. **Ratification of Election Slates for positions on College, University, and Faculty Senate Committees** [Attachment B]

Faculty election slates to College, University, and Faculty Senate Committees [Attachment B] were approved by the Senate by unanimous vote.

5. **Revised CUNY Academic Integrity Policy: Implementation Decisions: Executive Committee** [Attachment C, D]

The CUNY Board of Trustees revised the CUNY Academic Integrity Policy [Attachment C] in June 2011, effective July 1, 2011. As a result, John Jay's Faculty Senate must make recommendations about two issues:

(1) should the Academic Integrity Officer at John Jay continue to be a staff member located in the Office of the Vice President for Student Development, or henceforth be a staff member located in the Office of the Provost, or henceforth be a tenured member of the faculty?

(2) should charges of cheating and plagiarism and other breaches of academic integrity, as defined in the CUNY policy [Attachment C], continue to be referred to and adjudicated by the Student/Faculty Disciplinary Committee or rather by a newly created Committee on Academic Integrity and, if the latter, who should be the members of the Committee and how should it operate?

The Senate may also wish to identify problems and propose ways to improve the academic integrity culture and processes of the College.

President Kaplowitz gave a brief historical context of the process and the revision of the policy. Next a brief anonymous survey was distributed to the Senators; the responses will facilitate a discussion about academic integrity issues at subsequent Senate meetings.

The Senate reviewed a document [Attachment D] provided by the current Academic Integrity Officer, Dana Trimboli, as to the number of complaints of academic dishonesty annually since 1994 and the number of cases that were referred by the Dean of Students to the

Student/Faculty Judicial Committee. During these 7 years, 346 complaints were lodged and only 11 hearings were held. A Senator asked at what course level (100 level - 400 level, undergraduate or graduate) were the incidents most prevalent. Also requested was information as to whether the students were found guilty or not guilty and what penalties were given. Also asked was what happened to the hundreds of complaints that were not referred to the Disciplinary Committee by the Dean of Students, Wayne Edwards. President Kaplowitz said she would ask for this information.

President Kaplowitz praised the current Academic Integrity Officer, Dana Trimboli, who reports to Vice President for Student Development Berenecea Johnson Eanes, saying she has been doing an excellent job but positing that the Office of Student Development, by definition, has a student advocacy orientation and role, which she called an inappropriate one for this work. President Kaplowitz reported that she had participated in a meeting the previous week called by Provost Bowers about the revised academic integrity policy. At the meeting were Provost Bowers, Dean Lopes, VP Eanes, Counsel Maldonado, and Academic Integrity Officer Dana Trimboli. Although the Senate's position is ultimately the key one, she said she thinks it relevant that everyone at that meeting agreed that the AI Officer should henceforth be in Academic Affairs, reporting directly to the Provost.

A Senator expressed concern about whether there is a clear definition of what plagiarism is that has been agreed on at the College and whether students aware of it. President Kaplowitz referred the Senate to the description of academic dishonesty that is included in the CUNY Policy on Academic Integrity [Attachment C]. She said one of the responsibilities of the IA Officer is to educate the faculty and the students about AI and the processes for reporting it and what happens after it has been reported.

A Senator spoke about being uncomfortable reporting incidents of academic dishonesty because she is untenured. Others agreed. President Kaplowitz commented that administrators seemingly do not understand why being untenured is an issue for faculty members who are confronted by student academic dishonesty and why that fact tends to result in few faculty members not reporting incidents to the AI Officer. On the other hand, she said she believes that the fact that few of the incidents that are reported are ever referred by the Dean of Students to the Student/Faculty Disciplinary Committee also has an inhibitory result.

Senators discussed the attitude of the administration about academic integrity and how it influences the image of the institution, particularly with its move toward higher academic standards. A Senator suggested that not having an academic integrity committee in place is a problem. A Senator argued that a streamlined, user friendly, effective method of reporting is needed.

The Senate affirmed by a vote of 45-0-0 that the College should create an Academic Integrity Committee, comprised only of faculty members, and that the Committee should be charged with immediately creating a system whereby faculty members can report instances of academic dishonesty by using an online system that is easy and fast to use.

The Senate then affirmed by a vote of 44-0-0 that the Academic Integrity Officer should henceforth be located in the Office of Academic Affairs (OAA) because this is an academic matter and having the AI Officer in OAA, reporting directly to the Provost, will send an important message to the faculty about the importance and seriousness with which the Provost and academic deans view instances of student academic dishonesty and how they will treat such cases. No one voted to continue having the Academic Integrity Officer continue to report to the Office of Student Development (which s/he has been doing since the University's first creation of an Academic Integrity Policy in 1993) and one Senator voted in favor of having the Academic Integrity Officer be a tenured member of the faculty.

The Senate recommended that a formal proposal for the establishment and membership of an Academic Integrity Committee be developed by the Academic Standards Subcommittee of UCASC and then jointly by UCASC and the Graduate Studies Committee and then be transmitted to the College Council for its action. This was supported by unanimous vote.

6. Decisions about the Honors Program [Attachment E]

President Kaplowitz reported that she had just informed Dean of Undergraduate Studies Anne Lopes and Honors Program Director John Matteson that before they assumed their current positions (indeed, three months before Dean Lopes joined John Jay), the College Council in May 2009 had unanimously approved three amendments [Attachment E] proposed by Karen Kaplowitz, in response to the concerns of faculty members about the Honors Program proposal which was then on the agenda of the College Council for approval. Without those amendments, she and the Senate recalled, the Honors Program proposal would not have been approved by the faculty.

Unfortunately, it turns out no one informed Dean Lopes nor Professor Matteson when he became the director of the Honors Program about these amendments. The Senate, by unanimous vote, decided to therefore extend the deadlines of the three amendments, calling for them to take place in December 2011 since the October 2009 deadline had been missed. The Senate agreed with President Kaplowitz's suggestion that she convey the Senate's position, in writing, directly to President Travis rather than submit them to the College Council for the Council's action.

Senators expressed their dismay that their diligence in attending College Council meetings – and because the proposed Honors Program was initially defeated at the first College Council meeting in May had to attend a second College Council meeting in May 2009 – and in studying and analyzing proposals, such as that of the Honors Program, about which the Senate devoted part of five meetings during the 2008-9 year, was not matched by the most minimal requirement, that of the implementation of the College Council's decisions. It is a serious problem when decisions are formally adopted and are then not implemented. A Senator stated that policy votes are not suggestions and these amendments must be implemented.

The Senate's unanimously held position is that even though the deadlines for two of the amendments were missed two years ago, the decisions of the College Council are binding and must still be honored. The Senate, therefore, voted to recommend that the deadline established in Resolution #2 and Resolution #3 [Attachment E] be extended from October 2009 to December 2011. The vote of the Senate was unanimous: 45-0-0. In other words, the Senate recommended that a proposal on admissions standards, as required by Resolution #2, be brought to the College Council at its December 2011 meeting. The Senate also recommended that the surveys and focus groups of students and also of faculty members who participated in the previous honors program (several of whom are members of the Faculty Senate) that were to have taken place in 2009-10, as required by Resolution #3, be conducted between now and December 2011.

7. Follow-up on proposed policy regarding changing the final course grade after grades have been submitted to the Registrar [Attachment F]

President Kaplowitz reviewed the fact that during the spring 2011 semester, a proposed policy from the Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee (UCASC) to the College Council, if approved, would have permitted a faculty member to change final grades after they are submitted to the Registrar only if the faculty member had made an error in computation or transmission; furthermore, the proposed policy would prohibit a faculty member from permitting a student to do extra work after the grades are submitted in an attempt to receive a higher grade [Attachment F]. Because of questions about the proposed policy by some members of the Senate, the item had been withdrawn from the College Council agenda at the request of the Senate. The withdrawal was agreed to by President Travis, the Chair of the College Council, conditional on the item being resubmitted to the College Council in the beginning of the fall 2011 semester.

Associate Provost James Llana, who is the administrator heading our Middle States self-study of our Middle States 10-year reaccreditation process, has expressed dismay at the failure of John Jay to approve this policy, which deals with an issue of institutional integrity, which is something that Middle States pays particular attention to; indeed, institutional integrity is one of the 14 Middle States standards that the College must pass. Final course grades are not supposed to be subject to negotiation.

President Kaplowitz asked Senators to think about this proposed policy which will be on the next Senate meeting agenda for discussion.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:30 PM.

Submitted by Virginia Diaz
Recording Secretary

ATTACHMENT A

Announcements

129 faculty members attend Faculty Development Day on August 25

Faculty Development Day, on August 25, was co-sponsored by the Faculty Senate and by the Office of the Provost. 129 faculty members attended and participated in 11 workshops presented by 14 faculty members (one of whom is an academic administrator):

SESSION I: 10:30-12 NOON:

1. Undergraduates as Scholars: Developing Faculty-Student Research/Creative Projects
Angela Crossman & Nathan Lents
2. Multi-Media Authoring in the Classroom: Student Blogging and Video Making
Lyell Davies, Jessica Cantiello & Kate Szur
3. Basic Backwards Techniques
Andrea Balis
4. Promoting Student Participation In Large Classes
Jill Grose-Fifer
5. How to Provide a Classroom Environment Conducive to Learning
Karen Kaplowitz & Elton Beckett
6. Small Group Work In Class
Matthew Perry

SESSION II: 1 PM- 2:30 PM

7. Simulation, Games and Play
Meghan Duffy & Isabel Martinez
8. The Importance of Student Motivation
Jill Grose-Fifer & Raul Rubio
9. How to Encourage and Motivate Students to Participate In Class Discussion
Karen Kaplowitz & Matthew Perry
10. Developing Assignments
Andrea Balis

11. Peer Learning

Anne Lopes

The Faculty Development Day Planning Committee members are: Andrea Balis, Elton Beckett, Lyell Davies, Meghan Duffy, Jill Grose-Fifer, Amy Green, Karen Kaplowitz, Jim Llana, Anne Lopes, Nathan Lents, Matthew Perry, Raul Rubio. Inez Brown was staff to the Planning Committee.

Board of Trustees approves John Jay Charter Amendment:

In June, the CUNY Board of Trustees approved John Jay's Charter Amendment initiated by the Faculty Senate. This amendment permits the College to return to its 40-year method of considering candidates for promotion to full-professor by having the process begin with a consideration and vote by the candidate's Department Personnel & Budget Committee. Without this Charter amendment, consideration of candidates for full professor had to bypass the departmental committee and begin at the College-wide personnel committee level.

Town Hall meetings for students, faculty, and administrators are announced:

Thursday, September 15 at 1:40 pm

Tuesday, February 14 at 1:40 pm

Thursday, November 3 at 4:15 pm

Wednesday, April 18 at 4:30 pm

New Chairs:

The following new Chairs were elected in May : Jay Hamilton – Economics; Jonathan Jacobs – Philosophy; Allison Pease,-- English; Robert Till, Interim Chair, Protection Management

Meeting with Chancellor Matthew Goldstein:

CUNY Chancellor Matthew Goldstein will meet with the faculty of John Jay on Wednesday, November 30, from 10-11:30 am. The Chancellor is meeting with the faculties of all the CUNY colleges. Chancellor Goldstein will speak and then there will be a Q&A.

New Building Ribbon Cutting Ceremony:

The ribbon cutting ceremony is scheduled for Wednesday November 2 at 11 am (subject to change).

IRB Changes at CUNY to be Discussed at a CUNY-wide Town Meeting on Friday, September 9:

This event, hosted by CUNY Vice Chancellor for Research Gillian Small, will be from 3-5 pm at Hunter College's Faculty Dining Room on the 8th floor of its West Building at 68th Street and Lexington Avenue. To RSVP email Luz.Jimenez@mail.cuny.edor or call her at 212-794-5649.

Update on CUNY's Pathways Resolution on General Education:

The CUNY Board of Trustees approved the Pathways Resolution on General Education at its June meeting. As a result, the CUNY community colleges will have a 30-credit general education curriculum which all the senior colleges must accept and each senior college must then add 12 additional general education credits. The Pathways Steering Committee's report is due for transmission to the Chancellor by December 1. The Chair of the Steering Committee, Dean of the Law School Michelle Anderson, has announced that a draft report will be issued on November 1 with two weeks for each college to develop a single campus response. The Steering Committee comprises 11 faculty, 2 students, and 2 campus administrators, one of whom is John Jay's Dean Anne Lopes. The Pathways Working Committee, which has two to three faculty members from each campus, includes John Jay's Professor Maki Haberfeld (Law, PS, CJA) and Professor Lisandro Perez (Latin American and Latino/a Studies). The website is at The following links: <http://www.cuny.edu/pathways>.

<http://www.cuny.edu/academics/initiatives/degreepathways/planning-process.html>

<http://www.cuny.edu/academics/initiatives/degreepathways/about/working-committee.html>.

--Retreat agenda

http://www.cuny.edu/academics/initiatives/degreepathways/planning-process/RetreatAgenda_08_26_11_final.pdf

--Retreat summary:

http://www.cuny.edu/academics/initiatives/degreepathways/planning-process/Pathways_Retreat_Summaries_08_26_11.pdf

--Retreat PowerPoint: <http://www.cuny.edu/academics/initiatives/degreepathways/planning-process/PathwaysRetreatPPT826.pdf>

ATTACHMENT B

Agenda Item #4 : Slates of faculty candidates for ratification by the Faculty Senate as nominees for College Council committees, other College committees, and for Faculty Senate and University Faculty Senate committees

College Committees:

1. College Council Executive Committee. *Needed: 7 faculty members who are members of the College Council*

Karen Kaplowitz: President, Faculty Senate (statutory) – English

Francis Sheehan: Vice President, Faculty Senate (statutory) – Science

Andrea Balis – History/ISP

Elton Beckett – Communication & Theater Arts

Janice Dunham – Library

Jennifer Dysart – Psychology

Staci Strobl – Law, Police Science, CJA

2. College Budget & Strategic Planning (BSP) Committee: *Needed 4 Faculty Senate members*

Karen Kaplowitz: President, Faculty Senate (statutory) – English

Francis Sheehan: Vice President, Faculty Senate (statutory) – Science

Staci Strobl: member, Strategic Planning Subcommittee – Law, Police Science, CJA

Jennifer Dysart: member, Senate Executive Committee – Psychology

3. College Fiscal Planning Subcommittee of the BSP Committee

Karen Kaplowitz: President, Faculty Senate (statutory)

Francis Sheehan: Chair, Senate Fiscal Advisory Committee

Maki Haberfeld: Vice Chair, Senate Fiscal Advisory Committee

4. College Strategic Planning Subcommittee of BSP Committee

Karen Kaplowitz: President, Faculty Senate (statutory)

Francis Sheehan: Vice President, Faculty Senate

Staci Strobl: Member, College BSP Committee

5. Appeals Panel for the College Student Complaint Against Faculty policy

Under a CUNY policy, students may bring formal complaints against faculty in the classroom and other academic settings. If the faculty member or the student complainant disagrees with the finding of the person who investigates the complaint, that person may appeal to an Appeals Panel comprising the Provost, the VP for Student Development, one student chosen by student government and two faculty members chosen by the Faculty Senate. **Needed: 2 full-time tenured faculty members**

Angela Crossman – Psychology

Daniel Pinello – Political Science

6. Committee on Faculty Elections

This Committee is responsible for counting ballots in college-wide faculty elections, such as for the at-large members of the College Faculty Personnel Committee, and for adjudicating any challenges to the results of an election. **Needed: 5 full-time faculty members**

Kashka Celinska – LPS

Kathleen Collins – Library

Olivera Jokic – English

Ekaterina Korobkova – Science

Samantha Majic – Political Science

7. Committee on the Student Evaluation of the Faculty

This Committee is responsible for a continuous review of the procedures of the student evaluation of the faculty; of the design of the survey instrument; of the terms under which the instrument is to be used; and of the development of guidelines. A current College project is the development of a survey of students taking online courses. Another project is the development of a new survey instrument. The Provost is required to provide staff for the Committee. The Committee comprises 4 full-time faculty and 2 students; the chair is elected by the committee members from among the faculty members. **Needed: 4 full-time faculty members**

Joshua Clegg – Psychology

Alexander Long – English

Yi Lu – Public Management

Keith Markus – Psychology

8. Student/Faculty Judicial Committee

This Committee is responsible for adjudicating disciplinary charges brought against students and has a range of penalties it can impose if it finds a student guilty of the charges, from a letter of censure to suspension or expulsion from the College. The Committee is constructed of three panels from which to draw participants for each hearing: a panel of 6 faculty members, a panel of 6 students, and a panel of 3 faculty members who serve as chairs. For each hearing three faculty and two students are selected for each hearing. A majority vote is needed for every decision by the panel. ***Needed: 9 full-time tenured faculty members***

3-member Rotating Chairs Panel:

Gail Garfield – Sociology

Stanley Ingber – Criminal Justice

Robert McCrie – Protection Management

6-member Faculty Panel:

Effie Cochran – English

Richard Culp – Public Management

Barbara Josiah – History

Ali Kocak – Science

Lori Sykes Martin – Africana Studies

Liliana Soto-Fernandez – Foreign Languages & Literature

9. Committee on Scholarships

This Committee allocates several hundreds of thousands of dollars in scholarships to incoming and current students. The membership is 8 faculty members and 6 administrators, including VP Saulnier who chairs the committee. *Continuing faculty members: Jennifer Dysart (Psychology), Olivera Jokic (English), Catherine Mulder (Economics), Deryn Strange (Psychology), Denise Thompson (Public Management).* ***Needed: 3 full-time faculty members***

Mangai Natarajan – Criminal Justice

Edward Paulino – History

Susan Will – Sociology

10. Committee on Student Interests

This Committee is concerned with matters of student life including but not limited to student organizations, student housing, extracurricular activities, and student concerns at the College. The Committee on Student Interests is chaired by the Dean of Students and comprises 10 additional members: the director of student activities, the director of athletics, 2 full-time faculty members, and 6 students. ***Needed: 2 full-time faculty members***

Lorraine Moller – Communication & Theater Arts

Rick Richardson – Sociology

11. Committee on Assessment

This is a new committee, created by the College Council in May, which has been created to coordinate assessment efforts for both student learning and institutional effectiveness, broadly understood. The committee is to engage in such activities as receive assessment plans from academic departments and other departments and units of the college in order to make recommendations about them and to identify best practices for the college; make proposals to the Strategic Planning Subcommittee; and promote assessment activities and disseminate information and best practices. The Committee comprises seven faculty members and three HEOS. The Director of Assessment is an ex officio member without vote. The Associate Provost for Institutional Effectiveness is the committee chair. ***Needed: 7 full-time faculty members***

Carla Barrett – Sociology

Lisa Farrington – Art & Music

Elizabeth Jeglic – Psychology

Mark McBeth – English

Marilyn Rubin – Public Management

Jennifer Rutledge – Political Science

Andrew Sidman – Political Science

12. Committee on General Education

This is a new Committee, actually a subcommittee, of the Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee (UCASC). It was created by the College Council in May and replaced the Gen Ed Steering Committee/Task Force which fulfilled its charge and has ceased to exist. The (Sub)Committee on General Education will develop a proposal for revising the 47-credit Gen Ed curriculum approved by our College Council in May so that John Jay can be in compliance with the 42-credit Gen Ed curriculum approved by the CUNY Board of Trustees a month later in June. The (Sub)Committee will also consider courses submitted by the academic departments for inclusion in our new Gen Ed curriculum and decide whether to recommend to UCASC that each course should be included or not and will also recommend the learning

outcomes for each course it does recommend. The (Sub)Committee comprises a chair, chosen by the Dean of Undergraduate Studies (who is chair of UCASC) in consultation with the President of the Faculty Senate, from among the faculty members of UCASC; five faculty members chosen from UCASC; and five faculty members chosen by the Faculty Senate. This call for self/nominations is for the five faculty members chosen by the Faculty Senate. **Needed: 5 full-time members of the faculty**

Elton Beckett – Communication & Theater Arts

Susan Kang – Political Science

Jessica Gordon Nembhard – Africana Studies

Matthew Perry – History

Alexander Schlutz – English

13. Committee on Honors, Prizes, and Awards

This Committee recommends to the College Council undergraduate students whom it deems deserving of various Commencement awards, prizes, and other honors. Members are the VP for Student Development (chair); Dean of Students; Director of Student Activities; 3 students who are not seniors who have a minimum 3.0 GPA; and 3 faculty members. **Needed: 3 full-time faculty members**

Marta Bladek – Library

Effie Cochran – English

Shuki Cohen – Psychology

14. Committee on Student Admissions and Recruitment

This Committee considers written requests for admission students from students who did not meet the criteria for admission and who request a waiver; the Committee is also charged with advising the VP on Enrollment Management on recruitments of students to the College.

Needed: 5 full-time members of the faculty

Preeti Chauhan – Psychology

Peggy Escher – English

Maria Kiriakova – Library

Ekaterina Korobkova – Science

Keith Thomas – Mathematics

Other:

15. Committee on Ceremonial Occasions

This College committee makes decisions about the various facets of the Commencement ceremony, so that this academic event can be as meaningful and as joyous as possible for our graduates and for our faculty.

Needed: at least 3 full-time members of the faculty

Alexa Capeloto – English

Janice Dunham – Library

Cary Sanchez -- Counseling

Karen Kaplowitz – English (alternate)

16. Student Activities College Association Board of Directors

This is the entity that is responsible for deciding how the approximately \$1.5 million in annual revenues generated by the mandatory Student Activities Fee – required of all full-time and part-time, undergraduate and graduate students – are spent. The Board comprises 3 faculty, 3 administrators, and 5 students. This Board is mandated by the CUNY Board of Trustees.

Needed: 3 full-time faculty members

Ann-Marie Col – Public Management

Tanya Rodriguez – Philosophy

Toy-Fung Tung – English

17. Auxiliary Corporation Board

This is the entity responsible for deciding how the approximately \$2.1 million in annual revenues generated by the college's B&N Bookstore, the faculty/staff dining room, the student cafeteria, and any other such auxiliary enterprises shall be spent. It is also responsible for decisions about awarding and renewing the contracts and the provisions of those contracts of such auxiliary enterprises. This Board is mandated by the CUNY Board of Trustees. ***Needed: 3 tenured full-time members of the faculty.***

Carmen Solis – SEEK

Susan Will -- Sociology

Liza Yukins – English

18. University Faculty Senate

This organization represents the entire faculty of CUNY. There is now a vacant seat for one adjunct faculty member to serve as the *alternate* adjunct delegate. Meetings are at 6:30 pm once a month on Tuesday evenings at the Graduate Center. **Needed: 1 adjunct faculty member**

Richard Kempter – Psychology

Faculty Senate Committees: This requires Senate approval only:

A. Committee on Honorary Degrees

This committee of the Faculty Senate comprises 7 faculty members, all of whom must be tenured. The Committee on Honorary Degrees solicits nominations for candidates for an honorary degree from the College community and considers -- without knowing the identity of the nominators -- which candidates to recommend to the Faculty Senate. The members of the Committee on Honorary Degrees attend a dinner for the honorary degree candidates, hosted by the College president, the evening before the commencement ceremonies. *Continuing members serving their 3-year terms: Valerie Allen (English), Katie Gentile (Counseling), Amy Green (Communications & Theater Arts/ISP), Janice Bockmeyer (Political Science).* **Needed: 2 tenured members of the faculty**

Enrique Chavez-Arviso – Philosophy

Nathan Lents – Science

Gerald Markowitz – History

B. Faculty Senate Fiscal Advisory Committee

The committee meets with college budget officials for briefings and consultations and advises the Faculty Senate on college budget issues. **Needed: faculty knowledgeable and/or interested in learning about fiscal matters**

Maki Haberfeld

Karen Kaplowitz

Francis Sheehan

C. Faculty Senate Technology Committee

The committee represents faculty concerns and experience in meetings and communications

with college administrators responsible for computing and information technology. Advises the administrators and advises the Faculty Senate. ***Needed: faculty interested and/or knowledgeable about informational technology and computing***

Anthony Carpi

Joshua Clegg

Norman Groner

Lou Guinta – Co-Chair

Karen Kaplowitz (ex officio)

Bilal Khan

Richard Lovely

Peter Mameli

Peter Moskos

Bonnie Nelson – Co-Chair

Pat O'Hara

Jason Rauceo

Alexander Schlutz

Ellen Sexton

Peter Shenkin

Maggie Smith

Liliana Soto-Fernandez

Robert Till

Adam Wandt

Valerie West

Alan Winson

D. Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Student Faculty Sexual Relationships

Staci Strobl – Chair

Karen Kaplowitz

David Munns

Francis Sheehan

Denise Thompson

E. Senate Ad Hoc Committee on CUNY Trustees Selection Process

Veronica Hendrick

Karen Kaplowitz

Sara McDougall

Staci Strobl

ATTACHMENT C

Agenda item #5: CUNY Academic Integrity Policy revised by the CUNY BoT June 2011

CUNY POLICY ON ACADEMIC INTEGRITY: REVISED EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2011

Policy 1.3 Academic Integrity

Academic dishonesty is prohibited in The City University of New York. Penalties for academic dishonesty include academic sanctions, such as failing or otherwise reduced grades, and/or disciplinary sanctions, including suspension or expulsion.

1 Definitions and Examples of Academic Dishonesty

1.1 Cheating

Cheating is the unauthorized use or attempted use of material, information, notes, study aids, devices or communication during an academic exercise.

Examples of cheating include:

- a) Copying from another student during an examination or allowing another to copy your work.
- b) Unauthorized collaboration on a take home assignment or examination.
- c) Using notes during a closed book examination.
- d) Taking an examination for another student, or asking or allowing another student to take an examination for you.
- e) Changing a graded exam and returning it for more credit.
- f) Submitting substantial portions of the same paper to more than one course without consulting with each instructor.
- g) Preparing answers or writing notes in a blue book (exam booklet) before an examination.
- h) Allowing others to research and write assigned papers or do assigned projects, including using commercial term paper services.
- i) Giving assistance to acts of academic misconduct/ dishonesty.
- j) Fabricating data (in whole or in part).

k) Falsifying data (in whole or in part).

l) Submitting someone else's work as your own.

m) Unauthorized use during an examination of any electronic devices such as cell phones, computers or other technologies to retrieve or send information.

1.2 Plagiarism

Plagiarism is the act of presenting another person's ideas, research or writings as your own. Examples of plagiarism include:

a) Copying another person's actual words or images without the use of quotation marks and footnotes attributing the words to their source.

b) Presenting another person's ideas or theories in your own words without acknowledging the source.

c) Failing to acknowledge collaborators on homework and laboratory assignments.

d) Internet plagiarism, including submitting downloaded term papers or parts of term papers, paraphrasing or copying information from the internet without citing the source, or "cutting & pasting" from various sources without proper attribution.

1.3 Obtaining Unfair Advantage

Obtaining unfair advantage is any action taken by a student that gives that student an unfair advantage in his/her academic work over another student, or an action taken by a student through which a student attempts to gain an unfair advantage in his or her academic work over another student.

Examples of obtaining unfair advantage include:

a) Stealing, reproducing, circulating or otherwise gaining advance access to examination materials.

b) Depriving other students of access to library materials by stealing, destroying, defacing, or concealing them.

c) Retaining, using or circulating examination materials which clearly indicate that they should be returned at the end of the exam.

d) Intentionally obstructing or interfering with another student's work.

1.4 Falsification of Records and Official Documents

Examples of falsification include:

a) Forging signatures of authorization.

b) Falsifying information on an official academic record.

c) Falsifying information on an official document such as a grade report, letter of permission, drop/add form, ID card or other college document.

2 Methods for Promoting Academic Integrity

2.1 Packets containing a copy of the CUNY Policy on Academic Integrity and, if applicable, the college's procedures implementing the Policy, and information explaining the Policy and procedures shall be distributed to all current faculty and, on an annual basis to all new faculty (full and part-time) These packets also shall be posted on each college's website. Orientation sessions for all new faculty (full and part-time) and students shall incorporate a discussion of academic integrity.

2.2 All college catalogs, student handbooks, faculty handbooks, and college websites shall include the CUNY Policy on Academic Integrity and, if applicable, college procedures implementing the policy and the consequences of not adhering to the Policy.

2.3 Each college shall subscribe to an electronic plagiarism detection service and shall notify students of the fact that such a service is available for use by the faculty. Colleges shall encourage faculty members to use such services and to inform students of their use of such services.

3 Reporting

3.1. Each college's president shall appoint an Academic Integrity Officer in consultation with the elected faculty governance leader. The Academic Integrity Officer shall serve as the initial contact person with faculty members when they report incidents of suspected academic dishonesty. The Academic Integrity Officer may be the college's Student Conduct Officer, another student affairs official, an academic affairs official, or a tenured faculty member.

Additional duties of the Academic Integrity Officer are described in Sections 4.1, 4.2.1, 4.2.2, 4.3 and 4.4.

3.2. A faculty member who suspects that a student has committed a violation of the CUNY Academic Integrity Policy shall review with the student the facts and circumstances of the suspected violation whenever feasible. Thereafter, a faculty member who concludes that there has been an incident of academic dishonesty sufficient to affect the student's final course grade shall report such incident on a Faculty Report Form in substantially the same format as the sample annexed to this Policy and shall submit the Form to the college's Academic Integrity Officer. Each college shall use a uniform form throughout the college, which shall contain, at a minimum, the name of the instructor, the name of the student, the course name and number and section number, the date of the incident, a description of the incident and the instructor's contact information.

3.3 The Academic Integrity Officer shall update the Faculty Report Form after a suspected incident has been resolved to reflect that resolution. Unless the resolution exonerates the student, as described in Section 4.4, the Academic Integrity Officer of each college shall place the Form in a confidential academic Integrity file created for each student alleged to have violated the Academic Integrity Policy and shall retain each Form for the purposes of identifying repeat offenders, gathering data, and assessing and reviewing policies. Unless the student is exonerated, written decisions on academic Integrity matters after adjudication also shall be placed in the student's academic integrity file. The Academic Integrity Officer shall be responsible for maintaining students' academic integrity files.

4 Procedures for Imposition of Sanctions

4.1 Determination on academic vs. disciplinary sanction

The Academic Integrity Officer shall determine whether to seek a disciplinary sanction in addition to an academic sanction. In making this determination, the Academic Integrity Officer shall consult with the faculty member who initiated the case and may consult with student affairs and/or academic affairs administrators as needed. Before determining which sanction(s) to seek, the Academic Integrity Officer also shall consult the student's confidential academic integrity file, if any, to determine whether the student has been found to have previously committed a violation of the Academic Integrity Policy, the nature of the infraction, and the sanction imposed or action taken. Prior violations include both violations at the student's current college and violations that occurred at any other CUNY college. In making the determination on prior violations, the Academic Integrity Officer shall determine whether the student previously attended any other CUNY colleges and, if so, shall request and be given access to the academic integrity files, if any, at such other CUNY colleges.

The Academic Integrity Officer should seek disciplinary sanctions only if (i) there is a substantial violation; or (ii) the student has previously violated the Policy; or (iii) academic sanctions are

unable to be imposed because the student has timely withdrawn from the applicable course. Examples of substantial violations include but are not limited to forging a grade form or a transcript; stealing an examination from a professor or a university office; having a substitute take an examination or taking an examination for someone else; having someone else write a paper for the student or writing a paper for another student; sabotaging another student's work through actions that prevent or impede the other student from successfully completing an assignment; and violations committed by a graduate or professional student or a student who will seek professional licensure. The college also should consider any mitigating circumstances in making this determination.

4.2 Procedures in Cases Involving Only Academic Sanctions

4.2.1 Student Admits to the Academic Dishonesty and Does Not Contest the Academic Sanction

If a faculty member wishes to seek only an academic sanction (i.e., a reduced grade) and the student does not contest either his/her guilt or the particular reduced grade the faculty member has chosen, then the student shall be given the reduced grade, unless the Academic Integrity Officer decides to seek a disciplinary sanction. The reduced grade may apply to the particular assignment as to which the violation occurred or to the course grade, at the faculty member's discretion. A reduced grade may be an "F" or another grade that is lower than the grade that the student would have earned but for the violation. The faculty member shall inform the Academic Integrity Officer of the resolution via email and the Officer shall update the applicable Faculty Report Form to reflect that resolution.

4.2.2 Student Admits to the Academic Dishonesty but Contests the Academic Sanction

In a case where a student admits to the alleged academic dishonesty but contests the particular academic sanction imposed, the student may appeal the academic sanction through the college's grade appeal process. The student shall be allowed, at a minimum, an opportunity to present a written position with supporting evidence. The committee reviewing the appeal shall issue a written decision explaining the justification for the academic sanction imposed.

4.2.3 Student Denies the Academic Dishonesty

In a case where a student denies the academic dishonesty, a fact-finding determination shall be made, at each college's option, by an Academic Integrity Committee established by the college's governance body or by the Student-Faculty Disciplinary Committee established under Article XV of the CUNY Bylaws. Each college's Academic Integrity Committee shall adopt procedures for hearing cases. (If a college opts to use its Student-Faculty Disciplinary Committee for this purpose, that Committee shall use Article XV procedures.) Those procedures, at a minimum, shall provide a student with (i) written notice of the charges against him or her; (ii) the right to appear before the Committee; and (iii) the right to present witness statements and/or to call witnesses. Those procedures also shall provide the faculty member

with the right to make an appearance before the Committee. The Committee may request the testimony of any witness and may permit any such witness to be questioned by the student and by the administrator presenting the case. Academic Integrity Committees and Student-Faculty Disciplinary Committees, as applicable, shall issue written decisions and send copies of their decisions to the college's Academic Integrity Officer. The Academic Integrity Officer may not serve on a college's Academic Integrity Committee.

4.3 Procedures in Cases Involving Disciplinary Sanctions

If the college decides to seek a disciplinary sanction, the case shall be processed under Article XV of the CUNY Bylaws. If the case is not resolved through mediation under Article XV, it shall be heard by the college's Faculty-Student Disciplinary Committee.

If the college seeks to have both a disciplinary and an academic sanction imposed, the college shall proceed first with the disciplinary proceeding and await its outcome before addressing the academic sanction. The student's grade shall be held in abeyance by using the PEN grade established for this purpose, pending the Committee's action. If the Faculty-Student Disciplinary Committee finds that the alleged violation occurred, then the faculty member may reflect that finding in the student's grade. The student may appeal the finding in accordance with Article XV procedures and/or may appeal the grade imposed by the faculty member in accordance with section 4.2.2. If the Faculty-Student Disciplinary Committee finds that the alleged violation did not occur, then no sanction of any kind may be imposed.

Where a matter proceeds to the Faculty-Student Disciplinary Committee, the Academic Integrity Officer shall promptly report its resolution to the faculty member and file a record of the resolution in the student's confidential academic integrity file, unless, as explained below, the suspected violation was held to be unfounded.

4.4 Required Action in Cases of No Violation

If either the Academic Integrity Committee or the Faculty-Student Disciplinary Committee finds that no violation occurred, the Academic Integrity Officer shall remove all material relating to that incident from the student's confidential academic integrity file and destroy the material.)

4.5 Implementation

Each college, in accordance with its governance plan, shall implement this Policy and may adopt its own more specific procedures to implement the Policy. Colleges' procedures must be consistent with the policy and procedures described in the Policy.

Academic Integrity Data Fall 2004- Present			
Semester	# of Cases Reported	Hearing	Notes
Fall '04	26		Declan Walsh, Academic Integrity Officer
Sp '05	31		
Su '05	1		
Fall '05	17	1	
Sp '06	30		
Su'06	2		
Fall '06	18	1	
Sp '07	21		
Su '07	2		
Fall '07	8		
Sp '08	27	2	
Su '08	3	3	
Fall '08	21		
Sp '09	36	4	2 students left John Jay without hearing. C-Stops placed, 2 took place
Fall '09	10	1	
Sp '10	19	1	
Su '10	3		
Fall '10	30		Paul Wyatt, Academic Integrity Officer
Sp '11	11		
Totals	316	13	

ATTACHMENT D

ATTACHMENT E

Agenda Item #6: Decisions about the Honors Program

3 Resolutions to amend the proposal for a new Honors Program

That had been submitted to the College Council by Professor Karen Kaplowitz

Each of these Resolutions was approved by unanimous vote of the College Council on May 11, 2009 following which the proposal for the Honors Program, as amended, was approved on May 16, 2009

RESOLUTION #1

Resolution Regarding Assessment of the Honors Program

RESOLVED

That there shall be an annual evaluation of the proposed new Honors Program that is on the agenda of the College Council's May 11, 2009, meeting;

That this evaluation shall consist of annual reports that shall include but not be limited to the following: admissions standards, enrollment, retention, progress toward degree, graduation rates, curriculum, student satisfaction, faculty satisfaction, and cost to the college; and

That the reporting and assessment methodologies and instruments shall be developed during the 2009-10 academic year by the Honors Program Task Force in consultation with the Director of Assessment and the Director of the Office of Institutional Research and shall be approved by the Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee and by the College Council; and

That beginning in Fall 2011 and annually thereafter, for the subsequent four years, an assessment report shall be submitted by the Honors Program Governance Committee to the Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee and to the College Council.

RATIONALE

The College has an interest in carefully monitoring the effectiveness of the proposed Honors Program at John Jay. Since this is a College-wide interest, it is appropriate that the assessment and evaluation of such initiatives have the attention of College governance committees.

RESOLUTION #2
Resolution Regarding Admission to the Honors Program

RESOLVED

That the Honors Program shall be amended to provide for the admission of students who are in the top ranks of each major; and

That the Honors Program Task Force and the Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee shall study such admittance to the Honors Program and shall present a proposal for action by the College Council at its October 2009 meeting, at the latest.

RATIONALE

Certain majors are extremely challenging and might unfairly exclude students from possible admission in the Honors Program. This provision would provide a method for including them and thus further ensure diversity of the students in the program by providing for diversity of academic majors. The proposal is provide for the invitation of students in each major who are in the top 5% or 10%, to be determined by the relevant governance bodies, of all students in each major to apply for admission.

RESOLUTION #3
**Resolution Regarding an Assessment of Former and Current
Honors Program Students and Faculty Members**

RESOLVED

That the Office of Assessment and the Director of Institutional Research, in consultation with the Honors Program Task Force, shall develop an assessment instrument and methodology, including focus groups, that measure the satisfaction and experience of those students currently and previously enrolled in the current Honors Program and of those students enrolled in the existing Program during the 2009-10 Academic Year as well as those faculty members who currently and previously taught in the Program as well as those teaching in the program during 2009-10. The survey instrument and focus groups shall include questions for ascertaining the opinions of these students and of these faculty members about the proposed new Honors Program.

RATIONALE

The experience and opinions of students and faculty in the current Honors Program – which has existed for 7 years – are important to know and to analyze in developing and implementing the best possible Honors Program at John Jay.

ATTACHMENT F

Agenda Item #7: This item had been withdrawn from the March 2011 agenda of the College Council because of questions that had been raised by members of the Faculty Senate. The Senate agreed to revisit this proposed policy at the beginning of the Fall 2011 Semester.



JOHN JAY COLLEGE
THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK
OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE

To: Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee

From: The Academic Standards Subcommittee

Date: February 17, 2011

Re: Proposal Regarding Change of Grade After Final Grades are Filed

N.B. This item was approved by UCASC in the of Spring 2010 and was referred back to Committee by the College Council during the Fall 2010 semester for clarification. It was subsequently revised by the Academic Standards Committee.

Current Policy:

After final grades for a course have been submitted to the Registrar, a faculty member who decides to change a grade completes a Change of Grade form and submits it to her/his department chair who emails the request to the Registrar.

Proposed Policy:

Grades, once submitted to the Registrar, shall not be changed unless there has been a computational error resulting in an incorrect grade having been submitted. Faculty requests for a change in a final grade shall be submitted to the department chair and, if approved, submitted by the chair to the Dean of Undergraduate Studies. If the Dean of Undergraduate Studies approves the grade change request because a computational error was made, the Dean shall forward the change of grade request to the Registrar.

Given this policy, faculty shall not permit students to submit supplemental/extra-credit work in an attempt to try to improve their final course grade after grades have been submitted to the Registrar. (Implementation date: Fall 2011)

Rationale:

Grades are universally recognized as a means of showing student achievement within a particular course. Grades are not a negotiation. Rather, they are based on the same work required of all students within the course of the semester. This is sound fairness policy. It is also institutional integrity policy. The acceptance by faculty of additional student work after the final grade is recorded is not fair to those students who have completed the course and have been given a course grade without the opportunity to do extra work and without the extra time to do such extra work. Appeals of grades and grade changes should not be influenced by extra work that other students are not afforded the opportunity to do. This policy also ensures integrity of the grading system which is essential for the reputation of the College, which is essential for our students and our graduates. Furthermore, the Incomplete Grade exists for those students unable to complete their work during the course of the semester. Similarly, an Administrative Withdrawal from a course is possible, with documentation, after the course withdrawal date and a Retroactive Withdrawal is available, with documentation, even after the completion of a course and the submission of the final grade.