

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES #130

John Jay College of Criminal Justice

November 9, 1995

3:15 PM

Room 630 T

Present (28): Yahya Affinnih, Arvind Agarwal, Luis Barrios, Michael Blitz, Peter DeForest, Janice Dunham, Arlene Geiger, P. J. Gibson, Elisabeth Gitter, Lou Guinta, Elizabeth Hegeman, Zelma Henriques, Karen Kaplowitz, Andrew Karmen, Sandra Lanzone, Tom Litwack, James Malone, Mary Ann McClure, Robert McCrie, Ruth O'Brien, Daniel Pinello, Chris Rashbaum, Marilyn Rubin, Frederik Rusch, Carmen Solis, Davidson Umeh, Agnes Wieschenberg, Daniel Yalisove

Absent (10): Edward Davenport, Jane Davenport, Robert DeLucia, Amy Green, Lee Jenkins, Kwando Kinshasa, Gavin Lewis, Henry Morse, Dagoberto Orrantia, Maurice Vodounon

Guest: Sandy Berger (Chair, Science Department)

Agenda

1. Announcements from the chair
2. Election of faculty to the College's Judicial Committee
3. Proposed Resolution: That the Senate co-sponsor the second academic freshman orientation scheduled for January 18
4. In Memoriam Wall
5. Report on the November 8 meeting with Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Richard Freeland and University Dean for Academic Program Planning Ann Martin
6. Invited Guest: Provost Basil Wilson

1. Announcements from the chair

Senator Kwando Kinshasa is recovering from surgery: he is home from the hospital and will have a complete recovery but he will not be able to return to the College until later in the semester or next semester.

Chancellor Reynolds has just announced that Governor Pataki has made a \$17.8 million mid-year cut to CUNY. The Chancellor reported that the Governor had wanted to institute a \$30 million mid-year cut to CUNY but that she had been able to have the cut reduced to \$17.8 million. In June, Vice Chancellor for Budget

Richard Rothbard, in anticipation of a possible mid-year cut, had sequestered \$15 million (3%) of each senior college's budget when he made the budget allocation to each college. This mid-year cut means that at John Jay, \$750,000 (John Jay's 3% sequestered dollars) is cut from our budget for the 1995-96 academic year. The additional \$2.8 million (the difference between the \$17.8 million mid-year cut and the \$15 million which was sequestered) will either be taken from the senior colleges or absorbed by the CUNY Central Administration.

The CUNY Board of Trustees' Long Range Planning Committee is meeting on Monday, November 13, at 4:30 PM at 80th Street. The Long Range Planning Committee, which rarely meets, last met in June to approve the 37 policy resolutions and President Kaplowitz said that she wants to observe this meeting so that she can report from a John Jay perspective and so will make her regular report to the College Council at 3:30 PM and then will leave the Council meeting to attend the meeting at 80th Street. She said that the Board's Long Range Planning Committee meeting is especially important in light of the long range plans announced by the SUNY Board of Trustees.

Mayor Giuliani has nominated a fourth person for the CUNY Board of Trustees: Satish K. Babbar. The nomination must go to the NYS Senate for confirmation. Mayor Giuliani's other three nominations have not yet been acted on by the State Senate but may be at a special session of the Senate scheduled for December: John Marino, George Rios, and Richard Stone. His first nominee, Jerome Berg, was confirmed and he has been serving on the Board since last year. Mr. Babbar, who would replace Thomas Tam, whose term has expired, lives in Douglaston and would represent the borough of Queens. A graduate of the School of Planning and Architecture in New Delhi, India, with a master's in architecture from Pratt Institute, Mr. Babbar is Assistant Commissioner for Technical Affairs in the NYC Department of Buildings: as such he provides technical oversight and counsel on regulations and modifications of building laws, codes, and procedures. Previously Mr. Babbar was Borough Commissioner and Deputy Borough Superintendent for the Department of Buildings and was Project Architect for the Department of Social Services' Facilities Management Unit. He has taught at the New York Institute of Technology and has worked for architectural and engineering firms in the private sector.

Senator Amy Green (Speech & Theater) is rehearsing John Jay students in the play De Donde, which is about Mexican immigrants and the law enforcement agents they interact with. The play will be performed in our Theater at 7:30 PM on November 15 and 16 and at 5:30 PM on November 20 and 21. A symposium at 3:15 on November 20 about the play and its theme will feature the playwright, Mary Gallagher, and immigration experts. The symposium is entitled: "De Donde, A Donde: Illegal Immigrants, Immigration Law, and the Immigration & Naturalization Service."

The November 30 Better Teaching Seminar will be on "Race in America: Faculty Perspectives and Reports from the John Jay Classroom." Senator James Malone explained that the academy should be discussing the issue of race in America. He noted that the nation is discussing race, especially in light of the Million Man March and the O.J. Simpson trial, both of which have raised the issue of race in American society, and that we should also be discussing it at John Jay. The panelists include Professors Migdalia DeJesus-Torres, Jannette Domingo, Karen Kaplowitz, Barry Latzer, Jerry Markowitz, Harold Sullivan, and Basil Wilson.

Professor James Malone will be the moderator. The names of other panelists will be announced shortly. (The Better Teaching Seminar topic originally scheduled for November 30, the Americans with Disability Act, is being rescheduled for the spring, with the cooperation of the co-sponsor, Farris Forsythe.)

President Kaplowitz reported having received a lovely letter from Professor Frank Cullen, the plenary keynote speaker at the October 20 Conference on criminal Justice Education: the letter was sent to her because the Senate had proposed and co-sponsored the conference: "Dear Professor Kaplowitz, Just a brief note to thank you and the faculty of John Jay College for allowing me to participate in a wonderful conference on criminal justice education. I must confess that I was honored and heartened by your kind comments regarding my being the selection committee's first choice to speak at the conference. Hopefully my address played a small role in getting the conference off to a good start. I wished I had more of an opportunity to talk with you. I was struck by the uniqueness of your academic position and would have enjoyed hearing more about your experience at John Jay. I have taken the liberty of enclosing a copy of my address which I transformed from detailed notes into essay form. Given your general interest in criminal justice, I have also enclosed an essay that I thought you might enjoy. Again, I appreciate your support for the conference and for my visiting John Jay."

Professor Cullen has also sent a wonderful letter to President Lynch saying, in part, that "There is a pressing need, perhaps even a thirst, among criminal justice educators to share knowledge about teaching" and praising the President and the College for holding this conference so that educators can have a forum for such an activity. Dr. Cullen also wrote a very complimentary -- and entirely deserved, as we all know -- letter to Professor Eli Silverman, the conference coordinator.

Also, she reported that she received a very complimentary letter from Dean Frank McHugh, writing from the branch campus in Gurabo, Puerto Rico, praising the conference which he and 13 colleagues from Gurabo attended and which he said they all enjoyed and benefitted from.

Professor Silverman has also received a number of very positive letters: one letter is from a professor of criminal justice in the Mid-West who wrote that as a result of the Conference he intends to henceforth urge all his students to do their graduate work at John Jay.

Having invited Assemblyman Scott Stringer, who represents the district John Jay is located in, to the Senate last May, as well as Assemblyman Larry Seabrook last month, the Senate's executive committee plans to invite the other Assemblymembers and Senators and the City Council member who represent the district John Jay is located in. North Hall and T Building are in different districts and so in addition to Assemblyman Stringer, we are represented by Assemblyman Richard Gottfried, Senator Franz Leichter, and Senator Catherine Abate. Our City Council member is Ronnie Eldridge.

President Kaplowitz reported that the November 2 reception honoring Assembly Speaker Shelly Silver sponsored by the Black and Puerto Rican Legislative Caucus and by President Lynch was very successful as was the November 6 reception for Paul Shechtman, the New York State Director of Criminal Justice and Commissioner of the NYS Division of Criminal Justice Services, who was a plenary

speaker at our October 20 Criminal Justice Education Conference: at the reception, Mr. Shechtman praised the conference and asked to be signed up for next year's conference on October 3-5, 1996.

President Lynch is hosting a reception on November 13 in the gymnasium for the law enforcement personnel who protected the dignitaries who attended the 50th anniversary celebration of the United Nations as well as those who protected the Pope. All faculty are invited. Many of the 2500 law enforcement people who have been invited are John Jay alumni and alumnae and others are potential John Jay students.

Those who wish to testify at the NYS Black and Puerto Rican Legislative Caucus' all-day budget hearing at John Jay, in Room 1311 North, on November 14 must call the Caucus' Albany office to sign up to speak. President Kaplowitz is scheduled to testify at 10:30 AM and can provide information about who to call to be placed on the list of speakers.

2. Election of faculty to the College's Judicial Committee

The Judicial Committee is a committee of the College Council which adjudicates disciplinary charges brought against students by students, faculty, or administrators. By mandate of the CUNY Board of Trustees, each case is heard by a 5-member committee of faculty and students and for each hearing, names are chosen by lot from a panel of six faculty elected by the Faculty Senate, from a panel of six students elected by the students, and from a panel of three faculty chairs, appointed by the President of the College. Last month the Faculty Senate reelected three members of last year's faculty panel: Elizabeth Hegeman (Anthropology), Richard Koehler (Law, Police Science), and Barry Latzer (Government). The Senate has three more slots to fill. On behalf of the Executive Committee, she nominated Professors Elizabeth Crespo (Puerto Rican Studies), Delores Jones (Law, Police Science), and Isidore Silver (History), and she also nominated Professor Roy Lotz (Sociology) as an alternate panel member in case one member goes on leave in the spring (as expected) or if a member cannot serve.

Senator James Malone, who is one of the three faculty chairs along with Professors Jane Bowers and Dagoberto Orrantia, who are appointed by the College's President, said that this is a very important committee where justice is served at the College and this committee is the source of the message to all students that justice will be served.

Senator Lou Guinta seconded the nominations. The nominees were elected by unanimous vote.

3. Proposed Resolution: Resolved, That the Senate co-sponsor the second academic freshman orientation on January 18

The first Academic Freshman Orientation on August 28 was very successful and so the Senate's executive committee and Dr. Pat Sinatra, director of Freshman Programs, propose holding a second academic orientation for those freshmen who are entering this Spring. This orientation, which would again include sessions with the faculty coordinators of all the majors, would take place on January 18. The Senate voted to co-sponsor the conference: the

vote was unanimous.

4. In Memoriam Wall

A number of years ago three faculty members and one staff member came to the Senate with a proposal to have an In Memoriam plaque on a wall in the atrium lobby of T Building. The proposal that 15 years' service would be the criterion if a faculty or staff person died while employed by the college or after retiring was amended by the Senate to include the provision that exceptions would be made by the In Memoriam Committee on a case-by-case basis for those who had been employed fewer than 15 years. Indeed, the first president of John Jay would not otherwise be included on the plaque because Leonard Reisman died after being president only three years. In the interim one of the members of the In Memoriam Committee has died and another has retired and a third is an emeritus faculty member and so only one of the two committee members is presently employed as a member of the faculty or staff.

The Library faculty has been informed by the In Memoriam Committee that Professor Robert Grappone's name will not be included on the In Memoriam plaque because he was on the faculty for 12 years and, therefore, was not eligible because he did not meet the 15-year requirement. People who loved and respected Professor Grappone and who worked with him are very upset by this decision and the Senate's Executive Committee would like the Senate to recommend that Professor Grappone's name be included and that the membership of the In Memoriam Committee be expanded. Senator Dunham said that Bob Grappone had, in fact, been rejected by the Committee but that it is her understanding that the Committee is now reconsidering its decision and may change its position.

It was recalled that the In Memoriam Committee ruled that Professor Olga Scarpetta (Sociology), who died a few years ago, was ineligible to be memorialized on the plaque because although she had been an adjunct for 10 years and a member of the full-time faculty for 3 years and a major force in the College's dispute resolution program and on the Faculty Senate (and was a member of the Senate's executive committee at the time of her death) she had not been a full-time employee for 15 years.

Senator Tom Litwack said that since the wall is owned by John Jay College, the In Memoriam Committee members should not be self-selected but, rather, should be selected by the Faculty Senate and the College administration. He said that no matter how much work people put into this project at one time, they do not own the wall and do not own the criteria. He said that the Committee should consist of members of the faculty and administration and some of the members, at least, should be selected by the Faculty Senate. There could be a representative of the emeritus and emerita faculty but it cannot be a self-selected, self-perpetuating committee. Senator James Malone agreed that the College should take ownership. Senator Dunham said that in the meantime she would like the Senate to take the position that Robert Grappone's name should be included on the memorial wall.

Senator Litwack moved that it is the strong sense of the Faculty Senate that the name of Professor Robert Grappone be included on the memorial wall and that the Senate's position be

forwarded to the current Committee. Senator Malone seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous vote. Senator Chris Rashbaum suggested that the Senate president appoint a Senator to consult with the In Memoriam Committee and develop a proposal for the Senate about the Committee's membership. Senator Janice Dunham was asked to represent the Senate on this matter and she agreed to do so and Senator Betsy Gitter offered to join her on this.

5. Discussion of the November 8 meeting with Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Richard Freeland and University Dean for Academic Program Planning Ann Martin

[The Provost arrived. The report about the November 8 meeting is part of the following discussion with Provost Wilson.]

6. Invited Guest: Provost Basil Wilson

President Kaplowitz welcomed the Provost, noting that he has been in an especially wonderful mood of late and that when she asked why he explained that it is because he is back in the classroom (teaching one of Senator Kwando Kinshasa's courses until he returns from medical leave) and she welcomed him in his many capacities.

Provost Basil Wilson: I want to thank the members of the Academic Program Planning Committee and the several other faculty who attended yesterday's meeting with Vice Chancellor Richard Freeland and University Dean Ann Martin about academic program planning. I heard it was an excellent meeting. The members of the College administration had quite a stirring meeting with Vice Chancellor Freeland and Dean Martin from 2:30 until 4:00, before his meeting with the faculty.

President Karen Kaplowitz: I am hoping that you will report on the meeting that the College administrators had with Vice Chancellor Freeland and Dean Martin. Those of us who attended the subsequent meeting from 4:00 until 6:00 have not had a chance to report and we could all do so now and also share information with each other.

Provost Wilson: The major concern of the John Jay administration was why John Jay had been allocated only \$71,000 for academic program planning for the 1995-96 academic year.

Senator Tom Litwack: That was the very first question we asked Vice Chancellor Freeland.

President Kaplowitz: Yes, our question was why John Jay received only \$71,000 out of the \$3 million that was allocated to the senior colleges for academic program planning.

Provost Wilson: I don't think we received an appropriate answer: they kept saying that it was because we did not retrench and that we had not set priorities. But we had, in fact, a visiting distinguished professor for 1995-96, we did fill an additional six faculty lines, although they are mostly substitute lines. I think it was really punishment for not having retrenched and I think the formula they used for dispensing academic program planning dollars is just another attempt to underfund John Jay College. The other

thing I found quite striking is that it is terribly difficult for a vice chancellor for academic affairs to cope with 18 distinct colleges and it was clear from the discussion that Vice Chancellor Freeland is just beginning to understand the interdisciplinary nature of our programs and how sharply focused we are as an institution. I mentioned to him that York College has fewer students than we have and yet York College offers 40 majors. We have over 10,000 students and we have only 17 majors and 5 master's programs and one doctoral program. And so I think he is feeling his way, hopefully getting a much better understanding of who we are and what we are about. There is the presumption that because you prioritize it becomes a panacea. An undergraduate curriculum is not just about majors: there are 60 credits that are taken in general requirements. Are we to take the position that we will never give full-time lines to Mathematics, to English, or to the other support departments? And, in fact, Robert Sermier, who was at the meeting, also conveyed quite forcefully to the Vice Chancellor that we are the most efficient college in the City University and the most underfunded and, therefore, to use academic program planning as a means of further underfunding us is just another great disservice. I think it really is punishment because we did not retrench anybody. I think it was a good meeting, they did hear us, and they are now pushing the multi-year planning, a much more comprehensive planning, which we will proceed to do. I heard that your meeting was also quite helpful.

President Kaplowitz: It turned out that there was a scheduling mixup and Vice Chancellor Freeland was supposed to meet with us at 4:30 and it turned out he had to leave the College at 4:30. And so the meeting began shortly after 4:00 and he was very apologetic about having to leave after only 30 minutes and asked if he could come back. And then he said that since he is already scheduled to come to the Faculty Senate on December 8, he promised to spend at least 2 hours with the Senate and asked if he could revisit the issue of academic program planning with us. And it was, of course, for the purpose of discussing academic program planning that we had invited him to the Senate meeting (before yesterday's meeting had been set up). And so we have time to consider what was discussed yesterday and better prepare for the December 8 meeting. After Vice Chancellor Freeland left, Dean Ann Martin stayed for another hour and a half and at the end of the meeting we asked if she had questions of us and she said she has so many questions that her main question is whether we would invite her back to continue the discussion and, of course, we said yes.

Professor Sandy Berser: One of the most mystifying things about all this was that I had thought that their concept of academic program planning was one category and that retrenchment was another category but that is not what they mean. They were using academic program planning as a means of trying to retrench. And at yesterday's meeting they made it quite clear that because we did not retrench we were, therefore, not doing academic program planning and for that reason the funds were withheld from John Jay. What the faculty pointed out at yesterday's meeting was that we already did academic program planning in 1976 when the College was transformed from a full-service liberal arts school to one that was exclusively criminal justice.

Provost Wilson: The other contradiction is that the University is saying that John Jay is underfunded and 80th Street has introduced Base Level Equity and John Jay has received the largest Base Level Equity allocation. When the President and I went to the meeting at 80th Street in the spring of 1995, the case we made was that we

are so lean and so efficient that we could not retrench anyone. And we persuaded them. They were convinced that we had already developed a mission unlike some of the other colleges. Yet we were punished in terms of the appropriation of academic program planning dollars.

Professor Bercherer: It might not have been the issue of retrenchment. Vice Chancellor Freeland and Dean Martin repeated that they wanted us as a College to take a long, hard look at the programs we offer and to eliminate programs that are not well subscribed.

Provost Wilson: But we have only 17 majors.

Professor Bercherer: But that is what they want.

Senator Marilyn Rubin: I made the point yesterday, at the meeting, about their wrapping together academic program planning and retrenchment. I had the feeling, too, that a lot of what they are looking for is words, that there has been a lot of reaction from other schools, as many of us have heard from our colleagues at the other CUNY colleges, all of which retrenched while we did not. I think that perhaps this year when our report is written we have to be very clear about the words that we use because Vice Chancellor Freeland and Dean Martin kept saying they are looking for priorities and it seemed to me that a lot of what matters is how we say what we are doing, not that they were necessarily looking for us to do things differently.

Senator Litwack: Ours was a long meeting: it went on for over two hours and a lot of us took a lot of notes. And I had the same perception, Basil, as you did from your meeting. Unfortunately, at your meeting you weren't able to change their mind because they said the same thing to us. But what I heard, ultimately, was the following message: there are going to be continuing cuts to the City University and John Jay is going to take its share of those cuts. Of course we were arguing that John Jay should not take any cuts because we're so underfunded. Anyway: what I heard Vice Chancellor Freeland and Dean Martin say is the following: John Jay is going to take its share of the cuts; in light of the upcoming cuts, how are John Jay going to maintain first-class programs? It is as if the message was: we would rather John Jay have five excellent programs than 17 mediocre programs and how is John Jay going to do that in light of the cuts that are coming? And I think that is the issue, more than any other, that we have to address, apart from the issue of how unfair it is to begin with.

Provost Wilson: That was not the issue in 1995. That is a new issue. Because when the documents went to 80th Street regarding retrenchment, it was stated clearly that retrenchment would be the prerogative of the College President. What I find distasteful is that there is a pretence that the discussion is democratic and it is not. That is what I really find distasteful.

Senator Litwack: You are absolutely correct.

Provost Wilson: To me it is better to tell me up front what we must do. Instead, we are told that retrenchment is the prerogative of the College and of the President and then they spin around and tell us that because we did not retrench we have to be punished.

Senator Litwack: They are saying, in a way, that it is **the** College's prerogative but not if the College wants academic program planning dollars.

Provost Wilson: And what are academic program planning Uollars? They take the dollars off the top and then give the money back to the college.

President Kaplowitz: I think we must make our case over and over and we must document our case over and over. At yesterday's meeting, the faculty articulated John Jay's situation very eloquently and every faculty member said the same thing. The tone was excellent: we were all saying the same thing, with variations. It was clear that we are a very cohesive and a very informed faculty. And at one point, Dean Ann Martin said we made our case in our documents to 80th Street about Base Level Equity and that those documents were compelling and that we proved our case in those documents. Then she said that we need to do the same thing in terms of academic program planning.

Senator Rubin: Yes, that is what Dean Martin said and that is what I was referring to a few minutes ago when I spoke about the importance of the paper, of the words, that we send to 80th Street.

Provost Wilson: But the only difference is the **Base** Level Equity comes through the Office of Vice Chancellor [for Budget] Rothbard and I don't think the Office of Academic Affairs was very receptive to Base Level Equity.

President Kaplowitz: Since the Senate sponsors the Better Teaching Seminars, and the Provost supports this activity, I want to mention another statement Dean Martin made: she said that John Jay is in the lead among the CUNY colleges in recognizing that faculty development is an integral part of academic program planning and she noted that John Jay has been providing faculty development for a long time through the Senate's Better Teaching Seminars and she praised the program.

Provost Wilson: In some respects we have to redefine academic program planning. They have a narrow economic definition of academic program planning but I think academic program planning has to take into consideration that this is a community. Look at what happened at York College on Monday, look at what has been happening at City College. All of these things have ramifications in terms of whether this is going to be a community or not. I don't think you can just proceed with academic program planning oblivious as to what impact it has on the larger community. The other thing I find striking about it is absent in academic program planning: a college is defined by what goes on in the classroom, by the teaching and the learning process, and scholarship, and yet there is very little discussion regarding teaching, scholarship, conferences, and so forth. And what happens with this kind of economic preoccupation is that all of those central things get lost in the shuffle.

President Kaplowitz: Sandy Berger made the case about community and about the trauma we suffered in 1976 and that we learned from that and have committed ourselves to not traumatizing our community and that we have succeeded in not retrenching and that perhaps our model is the one to be followed. And Tom Litwack made the point that the other colleges did not retrench out of necessity but rather they chose to retrench: those colleges had

funded vacant lines that they could have given up but instead they chose to give up people, to retrench people. The fact is that most college faculties do not know any of this even though John Jay's faculty has been raising the issue with 80th Street which faculty from other colleges do know we have been doing. And so when Tom raised this fact yesterday, there was no reply because there is no possible answer because they know that is true.

Senator Litwack: Unfortunately, Vice Chancellor Freeland was not at the meeting at that point.

President Kaplowitz: But he will be back on December 8.

Provost Wilson: I have said to Vice Chancellor Freeland in the Academic Council that my position is that not one faculty member in CUNY should be fired until everybody is teaching his or her full teaching load.

President Kaplowitz: Yesterday, Dean Martin said that at the other colleges faculty now teach the full contractual load and we explained that that is not altogether true. Faculty at the other colleges say they have a 21-hour teaching load but then explain that they get three credits for student advisement, three credits for research, etc. At some colleges, English 101, for example, is 5 credits and so the number of courses that someone needs to teach to have a 9-credit or 12-credit load is fewer than when such a course is 3 credits, as is the case at John Jay.

Senator Litwack: I just want to point out to you, Basil, and to everyone else here -- Karen knows about this -- last year I wrote a letter to our union representative asking him what is the position of the union as to the question of whether faculty should be fired as long as there were vacant funded lines in the University. To this day I have not received a response. The faculty here should know that our own union has been unwilling to take the position that no one should be fired as long as there are funded vacant lines that are being used to give people released time. Our own union representative, who I wrote the letter to, has not responded.

President Kaplowitz: Tom cc'd me and so I received a copy of his letter.

Senator Guinta: One of the comments made at the end of yesterday's meeting was when Dean Martin kept talking about long range rational planning. The point that was brought forward was how can we have long range rational planning in an irrational environment? Specifically, if we at John Jay are receiving \$4500 per student and some other colleges are receiving \$8000 per student, that fact is driving planning. We said that if we are given a building that cannot accommodate our students, that inhibits our ability to do long range rational planning. We made the point that we are in an irrational situation but what it comes down to is what you, Basil, said in your initial remarks: we were punished. It came down to the fact that the Chancellor had made certain suppositions that would be followed through by the presidents and it was not followed at this college and we were punished. At the end, I asked Dean Martin about this and she did not know what to say except that this is the way it is. Therefore, I agree with what Marilyn Rubin said before about paper: if what we put down on paper looks good, 80th Street will be happy because they do not seem to check whether things are being followed through.

Provost Wilson: They check meticulously. But we have to remember that although we did not retrench, we lost 16 lines because of early retirements, resignations, and P&B non-reappointments. On the other hand, we cannot say we retrenched when we did not. There are things, however, that we could have done and I imagine we will do those things this year: I'm referring to what one could call re-engineering, consolidating, making savings. We sent up a report on faculty productivity which included information about marginal increases in some of the remedial courses, reducing reassigned time, and so forth: that report went up October 20.

President Kaplowitz: As you know, there is a meeting of the Long Range Planning Committee of the Board of Trustees on Monday, which I will be attending. Many of us are especially concerned in light of the actions of the SUNY Board of Trustees and in light of the likelihood that there will be new members on CUNY's Board nominated by Mayor Giuliani and Governor Pataki. There is also a desire by some of the CUNY Trustees to have the Legislature increase the size of the Board which would mean that there would be even more members appointed by the current Mayor and Governor.

Provost Wilson: We should, indeed, note the impact that the new SUNY Board has had on that institution. The one heartening thing, and certainly heartening for us, is that SUNY is moving in a decentralized direction. CUNY is moving in the opposite direction and is attempting to centralize everything. I think what CUNY should have done is to have placed emphasis on decentralizing the University. I think you can centralize a university without undue centralization.

President Kaplowitz: In June, the Long Range Planning Committee approved the reduction of credits needed for a degree to 120 and 60 and the Board approved this on June 26. This, of course, has been very much an issue for us at John Jay and it is coming up before the Curriculum Committee on November 17. Would you like to discuss this issue with us, Basil?

Provost Wilson: Certainly. There was emerging something of a consensus, which is the way we like to do things at John Jay. There is some erosion now of that consensus. The Psychology Department and the Economics component of the Public Management Department are concerned that the proposed reduction of social science core requirements from 9 credits to 6 credits could be damaging to their interests. I really don't anticipate such a result. What I do think I have to do is to give the Psychology Department and that component of the Public Management Department an assurance that we would monitor the situation quite carefully and ensure that there would be no detrimental result to the interests of that department or component. I think we have failed at John Jay to integrate economics into the panoply of criminal justice programs and I think we need to take another look at that, we need to explore, perhaps, the possibility of having an economics/criminal justice major or some economic tracks within the majors that exist. We have, in fact, reduced the Economic sections recently but at the same time they have gotten a new faculty member and they are hoping to become much more integrated into the College. I think there is a future for Economics at the College and I want to assure them that that is the case. In terms of Psychology, I think the fear that exists is that many students who come to the College become intrigued by Psychology not during that first year but later on. And if they are not exposed to Introduction to Psychology then that fascination may not come into

being. We do engage in block registration for all incoming freshmen and we do the same thing for **second-semester** freshmen. Through block registration, we could ensure that there is equity and that it is not just one or two departments that are getting the lion share of the students. Our critical problems at this time is that we have more students than we have sections. We have done much better recently in making sure that there are available sections especially in Mathematics, English, and some of **the** other basic courses but I don't think the proposed change would be detrimental to either the department or to the Economics component. I will work on this right until the Curriculum Committee meets. We all know that the agreed upon deduction is that the 8 credits for the two courses in the sciences would become 6 credits but the number of hours for the lectures, the recitation, and the labs would remain the **same**. That is a reduction of 2 credits. The social science requirement of nine credits would be reduced to 6. And then three credits would be taken from **the** electives. There was a recommendation, but this is a long-term approach, of trying to reduce the number of credits required for all the majors to 36 (with the exception of the Computer Information Systems and Forensic Science majors): we will have to ask for a variance or waiver for the Forensic Science major because the major is 62 credits and the core is 60 credits and there is no way the students can complete a degree in 120 credits. The deadline to request a waiver is February, but I think we should do it as soon as possible.

President Kaplowitz: At our last Senate meeting, when we discussed this proposal, which had been developed by the students, we agreed to check some of the issues that had come up during the discussion. I checked some of the issues that Arvind Agarwal raised. Dean Don Gray told me that if this proposal goes through, he would have the students' transcripts explicitly state "Laboratory course" next to Natural Science 107 and 108 and he proposed that the name of the courses be changed to "Natural Science with Laboratory" and that the course descriptions be amplified to more fully describe the laboratory component. He said that college catalogs always have to be checked in making credit and other evaluations because credit variations might reflect tri-semester calendars, with shorter semesters, or other such situations.

Senator Rubin: Although I was supposed to review the students' survey on this topic, I haven't to date received a reply from the Student Council President to my phonemail messages.

Professor Berger: I cannot say at this point that I am completely overjoyed at the idea of a reduction in the number of credits for the science courses. This could create difficulties for our students who want to transfer to John Jay who may have 3-credit science courses without a laboratory and could create difficulties for John Jay students who wish to transfer to other schools. Historically, this institution offered some courses in the humanities areas for two credits which was later changed to three credits. I think if one goes back to those early catalogs this was the case. I had a meeting with the Science Department yesterday, with the Department's curriculum committee, and I have to say that we discussed this proposal in great depth and my department members are not overjoyed at a reduction in the number of credits even though the number of contact hours would be the same. We did some research and found that courses in some of the other departments had been two credits at one time so it is conceivable that some reversions could take place without harming

those other courses.

Senator Arvind Acrarwal: As Sandy mentioned, most of the research that we did in terms of the credits that are associated with science courses and the hours that go with them reveal that a three-hour lecture and laboratory course is a four-credit course. Here we are taking courses where students have three-hour lectures and laboratories and we would reduce the number of credits. Nowhere in the country are there courses like that. There are science courses with laboratory that are three credits but those are courses in which during the lecture there is a demonstration by the professor. But that is not a science course with laboratory. To make this change there would be tremendous harm to the students.

President Kaplowitz: In what way would there be harm done to the students?

Senator Asarwal: The students would be doing work worth four credits but they would receive only three credits. If there is no relationship between the amount of work and the number of credits, then credits would have no meaning and we could just as well reduce the credits from 4 to 2. And so I agree with Professor Berger that we should look at other courses, humanities courses, that could be reduced from 3 to 2 credits.

Vice President Michael Blitz: I want to point out the fallacy of the assertion that the number of credits relate directly to the number of hours put into a course. I teach English and Thematic Studies courses and if we should mete things out to the number of hours spent my courses should be 6 credits or 5 credits. It is true that traditionally science courses with labs have been 4-credit courses. I would not, however, want us to get hung up on the idea that there is some intrinsic connection between credit hours awarded and hours spent or that somehow students will do less work for fewer credits. It is quite conceivable that many of the courses at John Jay that offer three credits are awarding too few credits and so it is a difficult situation. There is nothing "4-creditish" about a science course that is not "4-creditish" about other courses.

Senator Acrarwal: I agree. There is no relation between hours and credits. But when a lab is associated with a course, the course carries four credits.

President Kaplowitz: I taught a journalism workshop course at John Jay for many years: the students learned journalism by publishing a newspaper, "The John Jay Journalist," that only they could write for. The course was 3 credits, 6 hours. The students not only wrote the stories, they worked on headlines, they did the proofreading, and indeed it was a 6-hour course because the lab component -- the lab was the newsroom -- was a required and integral part of the course in addition to the regular classroom component. But the course carried only 3 credits. And the fact was that the students worked much more than 6 hours a week, but it was still a 3-credit course because that is what the College decided it should be. The course could have just as easily been many more credits given the amount of work and the demanding nature of the work that the students did. They put out a newspaper that won national awards year after year.

Senator Acrarwal: Karen, you are right. We have forensic science courses that consist of 3 hours of lecture and 8 hours of

lab and those courses are 3 credits.

Provost Wilson: But isn't that a negation of your position?

Senator Acrarwal: Those courses are only for graduate students. The undergraduate students receive 4 credits for those same courses.

Senator Mary Ann McClure: I would be suspicious of the move to change three credit courses to 2 credits for the very same reasons concerning students who transfer in and those who transfer out.

Senator Karmen: The Provost mentioned that the Psychology Department and the Economics component of the Public Management Department have expressed concern about the proposal. The Sociology Department met last week and we are also concerned about the social science reduction. If we are reassured that the flow of students to us will be about the same, at best what we are doing is creating a hidden prerequisite because if students do not take Sociology 101 as part of the core they will have to take it before they take any elective and we have electives in many of the majors. And so we are creating a hidden prerequisite and are not really saving any credits. Then there is another concern: most of the students are freshmen and sophomores and so any kind of tampering with the core will have a great impact on the flow of students to courses. But if the requirements for the majors are changed and even if the number of free electives were cut, unappealing as that might be, the impact would be much less because there are so many fewer juniors and seniors who survive to that level. In conjunction with our earlier discussion about how we present our programs, would it not be better to make the changes in the majors, which are really paper changes and don't affect most of our students who unfortunately don't go on to be juniors and seniors, rather than make a drastic change in the core which very much influences the flow of students? Also, are we now to have the impression that the students' proposal is also the administration's proposal?

Provost Wilson: My position in all of this is to try to be a conciliator, to try to forge a consensus. I do not think there is a separate administrative position. I am trying to work with the Faculty Senate and with the Council of Chairs to see if we can come up with an agreeable kind of way of dealing with this. Let me respond to some of the points you addressed. One of the serious problems at the College that we keep making reference to is the proliferation of adjuncts. We argue that we have too many adjunct faculty. I don't know if this is going to make that much of a difference, in a significantly meaningful way, but a lot of the introductory courses that you mention are, in fact, taught by adjunct faculty and, indeed, 50 percent of all our course sections are taught by adjunct faculty. And so these proposed changes do not constitute a threat to any full-time faculty member and very little of a threat to any adjunct faculty member. I think many of the majors already have hidden prerequisites: one reason that Government and Sociology would not be harmed is that many of the huge majors such as Legal Studies and Criminal Justice do have Government or Sociology as prerequisites. Presently, a student must take three social science courses from five departments. If you look at our tally sheets, most of our basic courses are jam-packed. Psychology, Anthropology, Sociology, Government will not see that much of a difference. We have recently been reducing the number of sections of Economics 101 because of the low enrollments but I do not think that the change from three to two

required courses will have a negative impact on Economics. But one has to watch and monitor the situation. We have the largest core requirement of any of the CUNY colleges and this proposal would reduce the size of our core somewhat. To reduce the size of the majors is a very time consuming task and there's no way that we could do that, I think, by September. We agreed to reduce the size of the majors that are in excess of 36 credits but that has to be a careful and deliberate task.

Senator Janice Dunham: When I was in college, the prospect of a science course with a lab struck pure terror into the hearts of all of us because this was a course that was both difficult and time consuming. I think Arvind is persuasive that a transcript stating that a course is a lab course could be mistaken for the kind of lab course where the lab component is a lab demonstration by the teacher. This would devalue our degree because we would be giving fewer credits for a course that is traditionally 4 credits.

Provost Wilson: I don't see how that devalues our degree. The vast number of students at John Jay who take the science courses do so because the courses are part of the core requirements and that makes no difference. Nor would this have an impact on those students who are majoring in forensic science, because they would receive 8 credits for the two courses.

Senator Guinta: I think your point is well taken about the size of our core. We do, indeed, have the largest core in the University. We have, perhaps, one of the largest cores in the country. This has been a very stimulating discussion. There is a very good book that I recommend: it was written in the 1930s by Pettiwell and it is entitled, "The Saber Toothed Curriculum." This discussion dictates that some of us should read this book.

President Kaplowitz: In determining the size of our core in comparison to other colleges we really have to look at what the other colleges require but do not list as part of the core. Professor Robert Crozier has been looking into this and he has found, for example, that some of the CUNY colleges do not list the required composition courses as part of their core (as we do) although those colleges require composition courses. Some colleges distinguish between required skills courses and core courses and as a result those colleges seem to have a smaller core. We, of course, could do the same thing: if we listed English 101, English 102, Mathematics 108, and Speech 113 as required skills courses and did not list them in the core we would automatically lessen our core by 12 credits. It's very tricky: this is similar to the way statistics can be read in various ways: so too can degree credits.

Senator Guinta: I've looked at the core of Harvard, the core of colleges in New Jersey, and our core is dramatically larger than most which are usually in the 40s. We should begin by considering how to reduce our core.

Provost Wilson: The proposal we are discussing calls for reducing 5 credits from the core and so that is in keeping with your position.

Senator Litwack: Do we know what is done at the other CUNY colleges in terms of the number of required science courses?

Senator Acrarwal: Several years ago when we were changing our core at John Jay, I looked at the science requirements at CUNY colleges

and all the science courses were 4 credits and all the colleges required 2 courses, a year of science. There was also a discussion at that time about reducing the number of science requirements here and we had a heated discussion. And with today's developing technology, how can we expect students getting a four-year degree not to have a year of science?

Provost Wilson: But what we are suggesting is that we continue to require a year of science.

Senator Acrarwal: But now we would be telling the students to do three hours of lecture and an hour of lab for fewer credits.

Provost Wilson: But it is the students who suggested who this change. The point that you should focus on is why would such a change in the number of credits from 8 to 6 be detrimental to students. I think that is the critical issue.

Senator Acrarwal: It would be tremendously detrimental.

Provost Wilson: Why?

Senator Acrarwal: Because of the transfer of students. When students transfer here with three credits of science we do not recognize that.

Senator Litwack: I still have not heard the answer to my question: if students took two of these 3-credit science courses and they wanted to then go to Hunter, to Lehman, how would it affect them? Frankly, it seems to me that we should know the answer to the question. If I were on the Curriculum Committee, the first thing I would want to know is how a two-semester, 6 credit required science sequence that includes laboratory work would be treated by Hunter or Lehman, should our students transfer.

Provost Wilson: We have looked. Brooklyn College requires 8 credits but they require 4 courses of 2 credits each.

Professor Bercher: Brooklyn does this by having an 8-week geology course, then an 8-week chemistry course, then an 8-week biology course, and finally an 8-week physics course.

Provost Wilson: Tom's question is an important question.

President Kaplowitz: We have to adjourn because an open house for graduate students is scheduled for 5:30 tonight in this room and the B&G staff need to set up the room now and so we have to adjourn. Basil, thank you for coming to today's meeting. I know we will be discussing this issue further.

Provost Wilson: Let's find ways to continue this discussion.

By a motion duly made and seconded, the meeting was adjourned at 5:15 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Edward Davenport
Daniel Pinello

Co-Recording Secretaries