

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES #134

John Jay College of Criminal Justice

February 21, 1996

3:15 PM

Room 630 T

Present (30): Yahya Affinnih, Arvind Agarwal, Luis Barrios, Michael Blitz, Edward Davenport, Jane Davenport, Robert DeLucia, Janice Dunham, Arlene Geiger, P. J. Gibson, Elisabeth Gitter, Amy Green, Lou Guinta, Elizabeth Hegeman, Zelma Henriques, Karen Kaplowitz, Andrew Karmen, Kwando Kinshasa, Sandra Lanzone, Tom Litwack, Mary Ann McClure, Ruth O'Brien, Dagoberto Orrantia, Daniel Pinello, Chris Rashbaum, Marilyn Rubin, Davidson Umeh, Maurice Vodounon, Agnes Wieschenberg, Daniel Yalisove

Absent (8): Peter DeForest, Lee Jenkins, Gavin Lewis, James Malone, Robert McCrie, Henry Morse, Frederik Rusch, Carmen Solis

Invited Guest: Executive Director of Computer Information Services  
Peter Barnett

Agenda

1. Announcements from the chair
2. Approval of Minutes #133 of the February 8 meeting
3. Proposed Resolution on meetings with the President of the College
4. Proposed Resolution on developing and implementing a program that will effectively recruit and retain in-service and other public service students
5. Proposed Resolution on the awarding of the associate degree
6. Proposed Resolution on a generic associate degree
7. Proposed Resolution on membership of search committees
8. Proposed Resolution on establishing a Senate Legislative Action Committee
9. Proposed Resolution endorsing a bill co-sponsored by Senator Franz S. Leichter and Assemblymember Scott Stringer
10. Invited Guest: Dr. Peter Barnett, Executive Director of Computer Information Services

1. Announcements from the chair

President Kaplowitz reported that the CUNY Central Administration has informed our College administration that further lobbying efforts for funding for John Jay's Phase II are to be conducted by John Jay. And so we must develop a strategy of our own for lobbying Albany for the \$20 million for the design of Phase 11. The Chancellor's asking budget for CUNY included the \$20 million design request, but Governor Pataki's Executive Budget

issued on December 15 did not provide any funding for the design of Phase 11. Last year the Chancellor requested \$10 million for the purchase of the land contiguous to T Building for Phase II but the Governor not only did not fund that request, he removed the appropriation which had been made in the past. As a result of lobbying efforts, the Legislature last year restored funds to purchase the land. Now John Jay must develop a strategy for lobbying for the \$20 million requested by CUNY for the next stage, which is the design stage.

John Jay's enrollment increased over Spring 1995 by 5.4%. Only NYC Technical College also had an increase, a small one, (after a previous decrease in its enrollment). The other colleges experienced sizable decreases this Spring compared to the previous Spring semester (enrollment comparisons are always Fall to Fall and Spring to Spring): several colleges lost between 1,000 and 2,000. This is preliminary data provided by faculty at a meeting of the Council of CUNY Faculty Governance Leaders on February 9.

John Jay's preliminary headcount is:

	<u>Spring 1996</u>	<u>Spring 1995</u>	<u>% change**</u>
New Freshmen	590	509	+ 15.0%
New Transfers	644	634	+ 1.5%
New Graduate Students	194	137	+ 41.0%
Undergraduate Students	9467	9004	+ 5.1%
Graduate Students	820	750	+ 9.0%
Total Students	10,287	9,754	+ 5.4%

\*\* There is time still remaining in the drop period, so these are preliminary numbers and there will, therefore, probably be approximately 100 fewer students by the fourth week of classes. Also, John Jay has a very large graduating class this month: 350 students graduate in February 1996, which will further decrease our enrollment.

On February 14, by a vote of 24 to 9, the College Council approved a Curriculum Committee proposal that the Board of Trustees' mandated credit reduction from 128 to 120 credits take place in the following way: 3 credits are to be reduced from the Social Science core requirement (students will have to take 2 Social Science courses rather than 3 from the 5 options of introductory Psychology, Sociology, Anthropology, Economics, and Sociology); 3 credits are to be deleted from all majors that comprise more than 33 credits; and 2 credits are to be reduced from elective credits. The Curriculum Committee will now consider proposals as to how each major (that is in excess of 33 credits) will reduce the major by 3 credits and the recommendations forwarded by the Curriculum Committee about how these credit reductions are to be made will be voted on by the College Council at its March meeting.

Also at the February 14 College Council meeting, a proposal from

the Undergraduate Standards Committee to raise the criteria for the Dean's List was approved. Professor James Malone was the driving force behind this and Vice President Witherspoon spoke in support as did several faculty. We currently have 1000 students on our Dean's List and the concern was that John Jay has been giving the wrong message to both our students and to those outside the College about students' academic accomplishments. Until now, the criteria for Dean's List was a 3.2 GPA during the past academic year (summer, fall, and spring) as long as 18 credits had been taken during that time in other than remedial or developmental or pass/fail courses. This meant that a student could be on the Dean's List despite a cumulative GPA of, for example, 2.0, and without having passed the reading, writing, or mathematics proficiency tests so long as she or he had a 3.2 GPA during the past academic year.

By vote of the College Council, the new Dean's List criteria are: a 3.35 cumulative GPA and a 3.5 GPA over the past academic year in at least 18 credits in other than remedial, developmental, and pass/fail courses and with no grade of "WU" or "Incomplete" received in any course during the past academic year. Also, the student must have completed at least 24 credits at John Jay and have passed all three proficiency tests: reading, writing, and mathematics.

President Kaplowitz reported that she attended the Student Council breakfast for legislators on February 15 and described it as a wonderful event and praised the students for organizing it, most notably Sophomore Representative Terrence DeGrenier, Sophomore Representative Milagros Vicente, and Student Council Vice President Marlene Aponte. Four legislators attended: Assemblymembers Deborah Glick and Ed Sullivan and State Senators Catherine Abate and Franz Leichter as well as a member of Assemblymember Scott Stringer's staff. The comments and questions of the students were tremendously moving.

John Jay was honored by the New York State Black and Puerto Rican Legislative Caucus at its annual convention in Albany on February 17. John Jay was the only institution to be so honored. Provost Wilson and Vice President Witherspoon gave speeches that were very well received.

The theatrical event of Women's History Month is a play, "Cage," co-written by Professor Michael Blitz (English/TSP) and P.J. Gibson (English). "Cage" was commissioned by the Women's Studies Committee. Professor Blitz is directing the cast of John Jay students. The performances are March 25 at 3:30 PM and March 26 at 3:30 and 7:30 PM. Admission is free.

President Kaplowitz also reported that CUNY is already planning to pilot test a "rising junior" exam that it has just developed. The term "rising junior exam" is a colloquial reference to the ACE -- Academic Certification Exam -- because this Certification Exam is a benchmark that students will have to pass in order to move from sophomore to junior status. This is the test that was the subject of the faculty forum at John Jay on December 13 which Vice Chancellor Richard Freeland, Vice Chancellor Elsa Nunez, CUNY Testing Director Eduardo Cascallar, and Professor George Otte (Baruch), chair of the ACE Taskforce, participated in and which was co-hosted by the Office of the Provost and the Faculty Senate.

A letter is being sent from 80th street to students who have accumulated between 40 and 80 credits asking them to volunteer to take the pilot rising junior test in March. Various incentives are

being considered so that students will not only agree to take the pilot ACE exam but will do their utmost to do well so that the exam can be accurately evaluated. The ACE exam is a 3-hour series of written essays, long and short, based on texts (a book chapter and other materials) which will be distributed to the students a week prior to the test and on which the written exam will focus. The ACE will test students' ability at critical thinking, developing arguments from a text, commenting analytically about others' ideas, writing, and other college-level skills. A 40 minute ETS [Educational Testing Service] test will also be administered as a control to the ACE.

The tests are to be graded at a central location by faculty from all disciplines from the various campuses, none of whom will know the name or college of the students whose tests they are grading. The faculty will be paid for both the training and grading sessions.

Senator Umeh asked what the impetus for the ACE exam is. President Kaplowitz said that it was reported to her that Vice Chancellor Freeland and Vice Chancellor Nunez have said that too many people in the professional and business communities complain to them and to others in CUNY, including to Trustees, that some CUNY graduates they interview for jobs are deficient in reading, writing, and critical thinking skills. Furthermore the Vice Chancellors assert that although faculty are supposed to certify students every time we give a passing grade in a course, since a passing grade is supposed to mean that the student can at least read and write and analyze at the college level -- and can do those things well if they receive A's, B's, and C's, that we, as faculty are not, in fact, accurately certifying our students and that the only way to certify whether students really have achieved what a diploma means that a student has achieved is by having a test which certifies the students. She said that this was not said at the John Jay forum but at other forums and meetings and seems to be a major concern of 80th Street.

Senator Umeh asked what the downside to this test is for us. President Kaplowitz said that since John Jay is so underfunded we are at a disadvantage in terms of providing the support services our students need and yet John Jay will be judged according to our students' pass rates and, undoubtedly, in comparison to the pass rates of other colleges. If budget decisions are based not on funding needs but rather on a college's rate of success in terms of bringing students to the certification level, then there could be serious consequences for us. She said that one course of action which she thinks the College should engage is a serious recruitment effort with the goal of recruiting academically better prepared students while at the same time maintaining our commitment to access.

Senator Affinnih asked why this test is being proposed now and whether this is a sudden decision. President Kaplowitz said that Vice Chancellor Nunez spoke about plans for a rising junior test when she met with our Faculty Senate in December 1994.

## 2. Approval of Minutes #133 of the February 8 meeting

Minutes #134 of the meeting of February 8, 1996, were approved by a motion duly made and carried.

3. Proposed Resolution: Resolved, That the Faculty Senate requests that the President of the College meet with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee for the express purpose of developing a method for holding regular meetings with the faculty leadership of the College for the purpose of sharing information and communicating issues and concerns

President Kaplowitz explained that there is no mechanism in place for discussing issues such as the rising junior test or recruitment of students or lobbying strategies for Phase II with the President of the College. In the past the faculty leadership met with the President regularly and the faculty leadership (the President of the Faculty Senate, the Chair of the Council of Chairs, and the Chair of the Budget Planning Committee) had been invited to the President's weekly cabinet meetings but neither forum for sharing information has taken place in the past two years.

Senator Guinta said that the Middle States final report indicated that one of the weaknesses of the College was the lack of communication. He said that, furthermore, we are not meeting the mandate prescribed by Middle States, which was to develop and implement more creative communication mechanisms.

The motion was moved, seconded, and approved by unanimous vote.

4. Proposed Resolution: Resolved, That the Faculty Senate supports and endorses the position that John Jay College must, without delay, develop, and implement a program that will effectively recruit and retain In-Service and other Public Service students and that the specifics of such a program be submitted to the Faculty Senate for discussion and comment by the Faculty Senate before the program is implemented: Senators Kaplowitz and Litwack

President Kaplowitz recalled that on December 8th, the Faculty Senate discussed the education of in-service students in response to an announcement that had just been released about credit-bearing courses being offered by a newly created consortium of three colleges -- Mercy College, Manhattanville College, and Fordham University's Graduate School of Education -- through live teleconferencing by a company called EdTel. The Senate was given copies of a letter co-signed by NYPD Commissioner William Bratton and the head of EdTel, which was distributed to all 38,000 members of the NYPD with their paychecks [Minutes #132: Part I: Attachment E]. The EdTel program is designed to recruit 800 police officers the first semester and involves sites for police officers to watch live teleconferenced courses at police station houses throughout the City as well as at One Police Plaza and at the Police Academy. What was troubling to the Senate, President Kaplowitz recalled, was not only that John Jay has had a decreasing in-service student population but that NYPD Commissioner Bratton's signature on the letter gives the EdTel program an imprimatur by the NYPD.

She said that many at the College consider the EdTel initiative to be John Jay's Sputnik -- that is, our call to action.

At John Jay our in-service student population has been declining since the late 1980's. We now have only 1300 in-service students among our 10,000 students: that is, we enroll only 1300 police officers, correction officers, fire fighters, and court officers. Of those 1300, only 650 are members of the NYPD although there are now 38,000 NYPD police officers. Furthermore,

police officers now need 60 credits before they can even take the test for sergeant and they need 90 credits to take the test for lieutenant. Furthermore, anyone who is currently a sergeant who has not earned 60 college credits will be removed from the rank of sergeant and will lose the extra annual salary that goes with the rank. And in order to join the NYPD, applicants now must have at least 60 college credits and so there is a large incentive for police officers and aspiring police officers to attend college and we need to let them know that we want them to be our students. She said that some are anticipating that the New York Fire Department will announce similar college requirements.

The Faculty Senate has long asserted that a top priority of the College must be the recruitment and retention of in-service students. The Senate's position has been that John Jay should make education available to the people who serve the City and who put their lives on the line every day for every one of us. The College was originally, in fact, established to educate police officers and other law enforcement and public service personnel and our day/night schedule was designed to serve them.

President Kaplowitz noted that President Lynch himself called EdTel our Sputnik at the February 14 College Council meeting. During January, President Lynch appointed Mr. George Cockburn, our director of community relations, to develop a program for in-service students and President Lynch appointed a steering committee, on which she and Senator Tom Litwack are the two faculty members, and which Mr. Cockburn chairs. The steering committee has met throughout intersession and continues to work and will be proposing a program for in-service students.

The steering committee has been holding focus group sessions during the past three weeks with police officers who are at John Jay for training sessions conducted by NYPD trainers. A different group of officers is here for training every day and the officers are randomly chosen, except that they all are stationed in Manhattan. The purpose of the focus group discussions is to learn what the police officers' educational interests and needs are: to learn whether they are attending college and, if so, why not at John Jay or if at John Jay how they assess their experience, and if they are not going to college what kind of program would meet their needs, both their educational and their schedule needs.

Senator Kinshasa asked which colleges police officers attend if they are not attending John Jay. Senator Litwack responded that the focus groups are not truly representative samples because they comprise police officers who are all stationed in Manhattan and they are self-selected in terms of their participation in the focus groups. Each day 30 or 40 officers are invited to meet with several John Jay faculty and staff: they are told by Mr. Cockburn that we are interested in developing a program designed to accommodate police officers' schedules, etc., and that lunch will be provided to those who speak with us and that their comments will be off the record. Approximately a third of each group comes to talk with us each day and so, conceivably, some of the people who do not come are attending college somewhere else and are satisfied or already have college degrees or have no interest in attending college: we have no way of knowing that, he explained. Thus, we do not have information about how many police officers are going to college some place else.

President Kaplowitz said the reason she and Senator Litwack asked the Senate executive committee to place this resolution on

the agenda is that assertions have been made at various strategy meetings from various members of the College that faculty do not support the idea of teaching in-service students, that the faculty do not see this as a central and essential part of the mission of the College. She said she has asserted that the opposite is true. And, indeed, the Faculty Senate has taken the position that the education of in-service students is a central and essential part of the College's mission on March 13, 1992 [Minutes #72]; October 27, 1992 [Minutes #81]; November 11, 1992 [Minutes #82]; and January 4, 1993 [Minutes #85].

But that was several years ago. Now the EdTel situation has brought those on board who had not seen this as a top priority of the College but, ironically, the faculty's commitment to this aspect of our College's mission is being questioned by some. President Kaplowitz said that perhaps those who are making this assertion about the faculty are correct and, if so, we should know this. But if they are incorrect, that should also be known also.

Senator Kinshasa said he would be interested in learning whether police officers feel that John Jay is conducive to their educational development. President Kaplowitz said that most of the officers who have participated in the focus group discussions are not attending college at all and few have ever attended college. But in each focus group there is at least one officer who either now attends John Jay or who previously attended John Jay and in every case those officers speak about the lack of day/night course sections as the most negative aspect of their experience at John Jay: all NYPD officers who are stationed in Manhattan work rotating shifts. (The NYPD officers stationed in the other boroughs do not.) They also speak about the difficulty of attending John Jay because of the lack of parking and they criticize what they characterize as the less serious students who attend our day classes as compared to those who attend our night classes. But the most important issue is the lack of day/night courses and our geographic location.

All the officers say they would like courses that meet once a week for a double period and all the officers, including those who have never attended John Jay, speak very positively about the reputation of the College. They all say that they would prefer courses taught by a John Jay professor in a classroom to any courses that they would have to watch on a television monitor taught by an instructor located elsewhere who is teaching via teleconferencing, which is what the EdTel program will provide.

Senator Litwack said part of the problem is not John Jay as an institution but John Jay's location. He said that over and over again he and the others conducting the focus groups hear officers say that it is too difficult for them to come to this campus: they need to take courses either closer to their precincts or closer to their homes. He said the focus group leaders hear that very, very consistently and very, very strongly. Also, the police officers say they need one-day a week classes which need to be given on a different day/night schedule than we currently give our day/night courses. He said he does not think a detailed presentation about these matters is germane at this point, adding that these matters are very complicated. He said that the focus group leaders have not heard a single person say that he or she does not want to be associated with John Jay. In fact, he added, all the officers he has met with have been very receptive and very interested: it is clear, he said, that if we offer courses that meet their interest and their needs they will register for courses

enthusiastically. President Kaplowitz added that the officers all ask when our program will start and how they will learn about it and, in fact, have suggested ways of getting the word out to police officers.

Senator DeLucia said that he talks to a great many police officers who are considering John Jay and that they tell him how really upset they are that they can't come here and this is despite the fact that they are often offered better deals by other colleges, such as Empire College/SUNY, which offers credits for service and for life experience and which requires their presence only once a week. He said that the officers make the decision that they want those 60 credits and although they would rather attend John Jay, Empire College is more convenient. He said they want to attend John Jay but the deal is so good elsewhere that that determines their decision.

Senator DeLucia said that our schedule of classes does not work as well for them and that, furthermore, they do not receive priority at registration and so they can't get the courses they need in order to fit their work schedule. And so, he said, we do lose a great many police officers but it is not because they don't want to come to John Jay. He suggested that one thing we should definitely do is set up a better registration schedule and system for in-service students. President Kaplowitz agreed. She added that we are now competing for in-service students with many private colleges which offer very attractive tuition reductions to police officers (two courses for the tuition of one course and sometimes even better financial arrangements) in part because colleges like having a big police officer presence because it gives a college community a perception of safety.

Senator Rubin said that we have to remember that the 60 credits now required by the NYPD can be taken in any discipline, in any subject, and that our special mission and unique majors are not necessarily going to be a factor in their decision. In fact, she said, police officers can go to any community college and to any senior college that is convenient for them. So our competition is not only the private colleges and Empire/SUNY but the other CUNY colleges.

Senator Litwack said that is true but that police officers who are assigned to Manhattan need day/night courses, which other colleges do not provide. Also, he said, the participants in the focus groups express widely differing attitudes about the kinds of courses they would like: some do say they want liberal arts, but others say they want courses related to law enforcement and criminal justice. He said that the class schedule and the location are more important than anything else.

President Kaplowitz said the question is whether the Senate thinks this is an initiative that the College should go forward with. The steering committee meets again next week and the position of the Faculty Senate, which is the official voice of the faculty, is a crucial element in the College's decision about whether to proceed. She said that the issue before us is whether John Jay should be devoted to pre-service students and to those in-service students who seek us out or whether we should develop and implement a program to actively and affirmatively recruit and retain in-service students by developing satellite courses, one-day a week courses, special registration procedures, and so forth.



President Kaplowitz said that earlier in the meeting the question was asked about the possible implications that the "rising junior" exam might have for John Jay. She said that in 1976, at the time of the last fiscal crisis, when John Jay was targeted for closing by the CUNY Board of Trustees, John Jay had a constituency -- the police officers and other in-service students who attended this College in very large numbers -- who said this College exists for them and that they did not want it closed. The police literally stopped traffic so that John Jay students, staff, and faculty could march in protest from here to East 80th Street to the CUNY Central Office. If John Jay were in trouble now, she said, the police who do not see us as reaching out to them would not be speaking out on our behalf. Now is the opportunity to reverse that, she said. But, she added, the faculty is the key. It is we who have to be willing to teach in the program.

Senator Litwack concurred that the experience of 1976 informs his and President Kaplowitz's conviction that this is a critical issue for the College and that the recruitment and education of in-service students is critically important to John Jay College.

Senator Orrantia said he remembers that many years ago, both when we were located on Park Avenue South and also when we moved to our current location in 1974, we had large numbers of in-service students and, so, he said he does not think the most important issue for police officers is the location of the College. Rather, he said, the problem is our class schedule. Classes that begin at 5 PM are too early for in-service students to attend. He said that he agrees with President Kaplowitz that in-service personnel see John Jay as a very prestigious college, one that they would like to attend. They know the reputation of the College and they also know the lesser reputation of some of the other colleges and this is important to them. He said that the focus groups comprise a very small sample and, as explained, are not really randomly selected. He said he believes that if we provide a better class schedule more students would come despite our location.

Senator Orrantia also noted the need for Saturday classes, which police officers would like to take, and said he is teaching a course on Saturday this semester and that when he looked at the class schedule he did not see many Saturday courses listed.

President Kaplowitz said that she feels very strongly that we do have to make our main campus as attractive to in-service students as possible and that by improving the main campus we will be enhancing the experience of all our students, both in-service and civilian. She said that with 38,000 police officers now required to attend college if they want to be promoted we should try various programs to attract as many in-service students as possible. Unless we develop a program we will not know whether in-service students are interested in attending John Jay. The question, she said, is whether we think we should be engaged on creating such a program. The question, she said, is whether we think this is our mission.

Senator Orrantia said that of course it is. The real problem, he said, is that our class schedule is not good for in-service students. He suggested that perhaps weekend courses should be offered in greater numbers. He said that, in addition, we must uphold academic standards: he noted the earlier discussion about the Dean's List having 1000 students on it.

Senator Guinta said it is important to develop a program for in-service students which is substantive but that we should not be engaged in a knee-jerk reaction to the EdTel program. He said we are not in a crisis at the College. We have just had an increase of 5.4% students. We do have students. Therefore, we should take our time to create a program that is substantive so that we don't attract police officers for one or two semesters and then lose them but rather create a program that will retain them once they decide to take our courses. He said that he is glad the President of the College is seeing this situation as he does but we should not do what we have done in the past which is to offer something helter-skelter that is not substantive and then lose the constituency, perhaps, next time, for ever.

The question was called.

Resolved, That the Faculty Senate supports and endorses the position that John Jay College must, without delay, develop and implement a program that will effectively recruit and retain In-Service and other Public Service students and that the specifics of such a program be submitted to the Faculty Senate for discussion and comment by the Faculty Senate before the program is implemented.

The Resolution was approved by a vote of 28 yes, 0 no, and 2 abstentions, and thus passed without dissent:

5. Proposed Resolution: Resolved, That the Faculty Senate proposes that the policy of John Jay College of Criminal Justice be revised so that all undergraduate students (both associate and baccalaureate students) automatically receive a John Jay College of Criminal Justice associate degree in Police Science, in Corrections Administration, or in Security Management as soon as the student completes John Jay College's requirements for the specific associate degree (without the student having to apply for such a degree) and that this Resolution, if approved by the Senate, be transmitted to the College Council for action

Many students, both SEEK and non-SEEK students, enter John Jay as baccalaureate degree students and many students who enter as associate degree students transfer into the baccalaureate program upon completing 12 credits with a 2.0 or higher GPA. Few of the students in either group apply to receive the associate degree. This proposal is designed to enable students who meet all the College's requirements for a specific associate degree to receive that associate degree from John Jay at whatever point in their college education that they meet those degree requirements and without the necessity of applying for the degree: this means that at 70 credits or 75 credits or 85 credits they would receive the associate degree upon meeting all the degree requirements. (Few students meet all the requirements within the 64 -- and soon to be 60 -- credits required as a minimum for the degree.) This proposal would mean that many students on their way toward attaining a baccalaureate degree would receive an associate degree, which is a meaningful accomplishment both educationally and in terms of the demands of the workplace. Receiving such a degree would also be an important achievement that would encourage students to continue their educational studies toward the baccalaureate degree.

It was noted that this procedure might increase student retention as students see themselves succeeding and would also

increase the graduation rate of our students who enter as associate degree students. President Kaplowitz said there is no down side to this and that she had spoken to Dean Gray about it and that he thinks it is a very good idea. Senator Guinta spoke in enthusiastic support. The proposal was approved by unanimous vote.

6. Proposed Resolution: Resolved, That the Faculty Senate proposes that a generic Associate Degree be developed whereby a student may earn an associate degree by fulfilling the associate degree general education requirements and at least 18 credits in courses offered by the college's majors, with any remaining credits to be selected from elective courses and that this Resolution, if approved by the Senate, be transmitted to the College Council for action

Right now a student must complete **24** credits in one of three areas -- police science, corrections, or security -- to receive an associate degree. The steering committee developing ways to retain and recruit in-service students has discussed the possibility of a more generic associate degree, perhaps one in the general area of public service.

Senator Guinta spoke in support, noting there is precedent for this at the College of Staten Island. He said an associate degree makes a job applicant much more employable in today's job market. Because it takes so long for many of our students who have families and other considerations to graduate with a baccalaureate degree, having an associate degree provides a midway achievement that is meaningful evidence of higher education study.

Senator DeLucia said he thinks this is a complex and complicated issue. He said he was not in favor of our terminating our Government and Public Administration associate degree because it was the one associate degree we offered in an area other than criminal justice and many in-service students, for example, do not necessarily want to major in criminal justice areas. He said that a proposal for 18 credits loosely put together for an associate degree requires much thought and study in terms of majors, disciplines, and career tracks.

Senator Guinta noted that the College of Staten Island's generic associate degree is in liberal arts and he agreed that a generic associate degree at John Jay should be substantive.

Senator DeLucia said he would support a generic criminal justice associate degree, which would involve courses in various criminal justice areas, but he would not support a degree for which students could take courses in any of our many departments because that would not provide coherence as a course of study. He said that he does agree that we have to make the associate degree more attainable for our students, especially since they do not aim for the degree if they are not specifically interested in police science, security, or corrections.

Senator Gitter moved to amend the proposal so that it is transmitted not to the College Council but rather to the Curriculum Committee and also to change the proposal to a request that the Curriculum Committee study the feasibility of developing a generic associate degree. She said that the first step is to determine whether there is support for such an associate degree at the Curriculum Committee.

Senator Blitz said that this proposal seems to go against our efforts to strengthen standards and to offer degrees that are meaningful for our students. He said the idea of students taking twenty 100-level courses in various disciplines adding up to a degree is not something we should support. Senator Litwack said that he is in favor of the proposal for a generic degree but agrees that it should be sent to the Curriculum Committee: he noted that Senator Blitz is correct that a degree of 100-level courses would not be acceptable and suggested that the degree could require, for example, a specific minimum number of credits in 200-level courses and a maximum number of disciplines in which the 18 or 24 credits of "specialization" can be chosen from. But he supported Senator Gitter's approach that it is the Curriculum Committee that should develop the model if it agrees that a generic criminal justice or a generic public service degree is something the College should pursue.

The Senate approved Senator Gitter's motion authorizing the executive committee to transmit this suggestion and request to the Curriculum Committee.

7. Proposed Resolution: Resolved, That the Faculty Senate recommends that the President of the College continue the established tradition of consultation with and recommendation by the Faculty Senate and other groups in determining the membership of search committees and that there having not been consultation nor recommendations in the formation of the three search committees announced last week for the positions of Associate Provost, SEEK Director, and Dean of Admissions and Registration, that the President appoint to each search committee two additional faculty members selected by the Faculty Senate, but not limited to members of the Faculty Senate

President Lynch issued a memorandum dated February 13 announcing the formation of three search committees. President Kaplowitz said that in the past, President Lynch asked the Senate and the Council of Chairs to recommend faculty to serve on search committees and that both faculty groups then elected faculty for such committees. This time the President named the search committees without consulting with any faculty. She said the issue is not the ability of those who have been named but rather the process. She reported that the previous day, the Council of Chairs voted to ask President Lynch to suspend the searches for this reason. The Senate's Executive Committee is recommending a different course of action: that the Senate propose to the President that two faculty be added to each search committee and that those faculty be nominated by the Senate. The proposal was moved and seconded and passed by unanimous vote.

To facilitate this recommendation, the Senate authorized the executive committee to solicit nominations for a mail ballot to be sent to the Senate members so that we can have names to transmit to President Lynch in a timely manner.

8. Proposed Resolution: Resolved, That the Faculty Senate establish a Legislative Action Committee

The proposal passed by unanimous vote. The Senate then unanimously elected Senator Daniel Pinello to the position of chair. Senator Pinello was praised as an energetic, creative,

tireless lobbyist and organizer of lobbying efforts and was thanked for his excellent work both last year and this year.

Senator Pinello thanked the Senate and reported that faculty should inform him if they would like sign-up sheets to circulate in their courses whereby students could authorize him to prepare letters or flyers to be sent to their State representatives. Also, he has prepared form letters for faculty, staff, and administrators who wish to prepare their own letters to legislators and he will provide those by computer disk.

9. Proposed Resolution: Resolved, That the Faculty Senate endorses the bill introduced and co-sponsored by NYS Senator Franz S. Leichter and Assemblymember Scott Stringer

It was recalled that Assemblyman Ed Sullivan told the Senate at our last meeting, on February 8th, that he hoped we would lobby against the implementation of the next stage in the tax cut because that next step would create an additional State budget deficit of \$2 billion.

Senator Franz Leichter and Assemblyman Scott Stringer have introduced a bill which they are co-sponsoring that would lessen the deficit by nearly \$1 billion by eliminating the second and third years of the personal income tax cut for households that earn more than \$100,000 a year and by closing tax loopholes used primarily by large corporations. When Senator Leichter spoke at the Student Council breakfast, he asked for support for this bill.

Senator Rubin said she knows there is a lot of discussion in the Assembly and in the Senate about the Leichter-Stringer bill and that she expects that the bill will be brought up but not for quite a while. She said in the meantime she would want to study the particulars of the bill. Senator Litwack said he understands that we want to give moral support to Senator Leichter and Assemblyman Stringer and to what they are doing but that he, too, does not feel comfortable about endorsing a bill about a complicated issue that he is not sufficiently knowledgeable about. The Senate agreed that instead endorsing the bill, they would inform their colleagues about the tax cut and its implications and about possible responses such as the Leichter-Stringer bill.

10. Invited Guest: Dr. Peter Barnett, Executive Director of Computer Information Services [Attachment A]

Dr. Peter Barnett was introduced in his new capacity: Executive Director of Computer Information Services. The Senate congratulated him.

Dr. Barnett explained that President Kaplowitz had suggested that he provide an outline of the range of computing issues that he is addressing at the College level and that the Faculty Senate would be interested in [Attachment A]. He suggested that these are areas that should be considered in much greater depth at a later time and that today's discussion would be an overview.

Dr. Barnett reported that, finally after 6 months, he has a dedicated person for PC support: David Eng, who decided to move from the Science Department to his shop so that he can spend all

his time with computers. Dr. Barnett said that this is a wonderful development and that he is issuing a memorandum to all department heads. The procedure for requesting PC support is to call Barbara Natow at x8202 and ask her to set up an appointment with David Eng. He said he expects a higher level of technical expertise and tools than before and that he continues to back up this particular individual with several crackerjack problem solvers, although PC support is not their primary responsibility: they are called in as needed.

Senator Karmen asked Dr. Barnett to enumerate the kinds of tasks that David Eng might be asked to engage in as the dedicated PC support person. Dr. Barnett explained that David Eng will install hardware and software that the faculty member or the department has acquired: departments are responsible for acquiring hardware for their faculty and software can be obtained in any of three ways: a huge amount of software is on site licenses that are maintained by the Academic Computing Center, other software is in the public domain, or if the software is not available from either of those sources the faculty member can purchase software. The only thing his shop can provide, he explained, is public domain software. David Eng will: install hardware, such as disk drives and monitors; install and configure software: do troubleshooting such as diagnostics; do repairs that can be done at the desktop without new components; install an anti-virus software once his office gets the site license; offer limited hands-on tutorial type training: soon there will be access directly to the Internet as opposed to the present system of using CUNYVM and David Eng will configure the software for that and provide basic instruction about how to use it.

Senator Karmen asked if this support is provided in both faculty offices and the graduate computing lab. Dr. Barnett said that these services are provided only in faculty and department offices and that he does not have jurisdiction over the graduate computing lab which is under Dean Barbara Price's jurisdiction and which is maintained by the Academic Computing Center.

Dr. Barnett said he is trying to move ahead in many areas with very little money. He is trying to accelerate the SIMS [Student Information Management System] process and that once SIMS is in place the College will save approximately \$70,000 a year in terms of the use of mainframe hardware and software licensing and maintenance. That will be his department's contribution to the 15% cut and it will also move the College very strongly in the direction of networking and telephone registration (and the elimination of arena registration and the equipment and temporary services associated with that). He noted that Mary Koonmen and the Academic Computing Center have recently done very exciting things with the World Wide Web site and are getting quite a bit of feedback from people using the Web-site who are interested in enrolling in the College: the next goal is developing ways of providing personal responses from the appropriate John Jay people.

Dr. Barnett said he is trying to have telephone registration ready by next February. There will be interesting enhancements of faculty involvement such as ways to program advance permission lists so that a student whose name is on the permission list can register for a course that requires permission of the instructor.

Prerequisite checking is going to be difficult under the new system, he said, but added that he will develop a way to do it. President Kaplowitz said that prerequisite checking, which is a

longstanding policy recommendation of both the Faculty Senate and of the Council of Chairs, is not really working now and asked Dr. Barnett to comment. Dr. Barnett said from a technical point of view his shop delivered two major innovations: one is the distribution of the prerequisite check list to students on demand rather than by mail and this meant that it got into the hands of many, many more students than before. He said he had his top assistant monitoring the distribution of these sheets, which tell each student which courses he or she is eligible to take by virtue of having taken the prerequisites. He added that the problem is that often when students get to the computer terminals where they actually request courses the prerequisite sheet is ignored by the students and by the people working at the terminals and, he said, that is a problem they have not been able to solve.

The other big problem, he said, is that the permission of the instructor loophole to prerequisites is misused. Last spring, after registration, an audit revealed a 95% compliance with prerequisite enforcement when the prerequisites do not include permission of the instructor but that when "or permission of the section instructor" appears in the bulletin course description there is chaos. In some cases 60% to 70% of the students who are in those courses do not belong: they have neither the course prerequisites nor permission of the instructor. That has not been addressed. He said he has taken this up with Associate Provost Kobilinsky. President Kaplowitz asked whether Dr. Barnett is saying that the signatures are not legitimate. He replied that students are not even getting signatures. She asked whether he is saying that students who ask for those courses at the terminals are simply registered for them and he said that is correct. He explained that he did a very close study of upper-level Government courses, for example, and found that more than 50% of the students in the courses had never sought permission of the instructor and did not meet the other prerequisites. In Professor Harold Sullivan's own courses more than 50% of the students who were registered did not have the course prerequisites nor had Professor Sullivan given permission to any of those students and, nonetheless, they were registered for his courses. So, he said, we know that is a huge watermain break and not just a loophole.

President Kaplowitz said that perhaps we should revisit the question of whether "permission of the instructor" should be permitted for students who have not met the course prerequisites that the department, the Curriculum Committee, and the College Council have set for each course. Dr. Barnett agreed that we have to get this problem under control. He said he knows that most of the courses offered by the Puerto Rican Studies Department have the "or permission of the instructor" provision in the bulletin even though that Department does not want it. In this case, the Department feels it is a deterrent to students who believe they cannot register without permission and are unable or unwilling to ask for permission and, therefore, don't register for those courses. He said there are also some courses that have no prerequisites but are limited to students who have sophomore or junior standing and that, too, is something we should revisit.

Dr. Barnett said that this semester is the first time that between fall and spring semesters the Registrar received final grades from faculty in time to do prerequisite checking. He said that was a major accomplishment which involved reprogramming the grading system but that there was also much greater compliance on the part of the faculty in terms of getting the grades in on time. There were only six sections without grades on the very last

possible date that the system could have been operated to permit prerequisite checking and the students in those six sections were given the grade of **"Incomplete"** by the administration.

President Kaplowitz said that in reading the bulletins of the other CUNY colleges she discovered that Baruch has a **"Z"** grade for one purpose only: when a faculty member has not handed in final grades, the students receive a **"Z"** grade: this lets the students and others know that it was the teacher who was at fault and not the student (which an **"Incomplete"** grade inaccurately conveys) and yet the administrative work of running grades and conducting the next semester's registration can take place. Dr. Barnett said the **"Z"** grade sounds like an approach we should adopt. He added that the grades usually do come in on time for the transcript to go out and so the student usually never sees the **"Incomplete"** that was given because the instructor has not handed in the grades but it is, he said, risky to give entire classes of students the grade of **"Incomplete."**

He also reported that as a result of getting most grades on time (and using the **"Incomplete"** grade) there was an improvement in the area of registration for ESL courses: the courses that **ESL** students registered for were monitored through audits that were conducted every day.

The problem that still remains, he said, is the computer terminal operators -- particularly when students start to panic about getting courses -- who are not abiding by the prerequisite sheets or who just do not know that they are supposed to do so. President Kaplowitz asked whether terminal operators may be opposed to prerequisite enforcement. Dr. Barnett noted that, as President Kaplowitz knows, there are a number of quarters within the College who are opposed to prerequisite checking and that this does create a problem.

But Dr. Barnett added that we are the only senior college that attempts to do full-fledged prerequisite checking. President Kaplowitz said that after hearing this assertion from several John Jay administrators she began looking into what the other CUNY colleges do and learned that at many of the colleges students cannot register for most college-level courses unless they have passed all three proficiency tests. We, however, permit students who haven't passed the reading or writing proficiency tests to take 200-level and 300-level courses. We have students in 300-level courses who haven't passed what until this year was an 8th grade reading test. We have to do something and what we decided to do as a College was to enforce course prerequisites.

Senator Edward Davenport asked if Dr. Barnett's Office is taking an interest in the fact that many faculty still do not have a computer in their office. Dr. Barnett said he is, indeed, taking an interest in this. The Academic Computing Center is hoping to upgrade its computers and will be distributing perhaps as many as 43 or 46 machines. And, he said, he has been making a fundraising/donation campaign by going to corporations, begging them to give their used PC's to us. He said he is hopeful about one particular corporation. Up to now, acquisition of PC's has been a departmental responsibility and he said he thinks this should be taken up as an issue at this time. Even in terms of the T Building with its F&E [Furniture and Equipment] budget, departments had to and have to still go to Vice President Smith to tell him what they need. If this were a College-wide responsibility, the question would be what is the priority of PC



acquisition as compared to other activities: in other words, is the College priority such that money should be going to networking the computers of the fortunate departments and faculty that already have computers or should money be used to provide every faculty office with a computer? Another issue is whether it is worth our while to go after obsolete hardware, meaning 386 computers, or is it better to hold out for contemporary equipment that has the capacity for access to the World Wide Web. He said he does not know the answer. He noted that he is personally very fond of old equipment and never uses the Web.

Senator Litwack asked, when it comes to prioritizing, who makes the final decision? Dr. Barnett said there is a new computing structure now in place: until now there had been no computing committee structure. But, he added, the computer committees are all ad hoc. There is now a Computer Policy Committee on which he, the Vice Presidents, Dean Gray, and the Chief Librarian serve. Presumably, he said, the Vice Presidents are the ones who are going to make the final decisions. There's a Computer Infrastructure Committee, which is the technical committee, which grapples with wiring and management issues. And there has been a Computer Utilization Committee, which has strong faculty representation, but which is meeting for the first time in nine months.

Dr. Barnett said he considers that it is his mandate to be advised by the broadest possible constituency which, he said, is exactly the reverse of the way things have been done in terms of computing until now.

Senator Litwack said he believes that everyone at the College will agree about what the ultimate goals should be: the question will be, however, given our limited resources, which of those goals should be met first. He said he does not have an agenda but he does think it is important at least to know who the final decision maker is and that there be adequate opportunities for expressing diverse opinions to that final decision maker (whether it is a committee or an individual). Dr. Barnett said one of the things he is really trying to do is to achieve a collective climate rather than have a "technology czar" kind of mentality. That's why the Computer Policy Committee has been formed. Senator Litwack said the question then becomes how does the Committee get input regarding the diverse opinions of the faculty as to what the priorities should be? He noted that there is not a single faculty member on the Computer Policy Committee and certainly **no** faculty member who was elected by the faculty. Director Barnett said that is an issue for the faculty to take up with Provost Wilson. He noted that the Committee will have to address questions of student access to the College net as well as questions of free speech, privacy, and standards.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Edward Davenport  
Daniel Pinello

Recording Secretaries

**ATTACHMENT A**

Feb. 21, 1996

To: The Faculty Senate

From: Peter Barnett, Executive Director, Computer Information Systems

Re: Brief outline for future discussion of College-wide computing issues

1. College wide initiatives

- a. Networking "to the desktop"
- b. College-based network management
- c. College-based Electronic Mail
- d. Desktop PC support

2. Academic Computing Initiatives

- a. World Wide Web
- b. Site License software support, including anti-virus
- c. Enhanced hands-on workshop training
- d. Forwarding WWW-induced inquiries to appropriate faculty and staff

3. Administrative Computing Initiatives

- a. SIMS system
- b. Interactive Voice Response (Telephone) continuous registration
- c. Automated classroom and event scheduling
- d. Point-of-Sale bursaring
- e. Mag-stripe card access system
- f. Enhanced computerized support for advising (PACE)
- g. Networked Purchasing, Accounting, Time and Leave systems

4. Library Initiatives

- a. Library WWW Home Page
- b. Make CD-Rom network available over the network
- c. Establish Criminal Justice information database
- d. Develop electronic classroom for multimedia research and training

5. Issues for discussion

- a. The CUNY-mandated Goals and Missions statement and Technology Survey
- b. Prerequisite checking under SIMS/IVR registration
- c. Upgrading faculty desktop computers: whose responsibility?
- d. Grant funding and gift solicitations made and planned
- e. Distance learning initiatives and their priority.