

Faculty Senate Minutes #171

John Jay College of Criminal Justice

May 21, 1998

3:15 PM

Room 630 T

Present (30): David Brotherton, Anthony Carpi, James Cauthen, Holly Clarke, Effie Papatzikou Cochran, Glenn Corbett, Edward Davenport, Kojo Dei, Janice Dunham, Nancy Egan, P.J. Gibson, Amy Green, Edward Green, Lou Guinta, Karen Kaplowitz, Kwando Kinshasa, Stuart Kirschner, Sandra Leftoff, Gavin Lewis, Patricia Licklider, Tom Litwack, Mylithi Mantharam, Ellen Marson, Patrick O'Hara, Dagoberto Orrantia, Daniel Pinello, Lydia Segal, Carmen Solis, Martin Wallenstein, Bessie Wright

Absent (6): C. Jama Adams, Enrique Chavez-Arviso, Sandra Lanzone, Jill Norgren, Jacqueline Polanco, Davidson Umeh

Guest: Arlene Geiger

AGENDA

1. Welcome & introduction of the 1998-99 Senators
2. Announcements from the chair
3. Approval of Minutes #170 of the May 8 meeting
4. Review of the history and work of the Faculty Senate
5. Election of the Faculty Senate executive committee
6. Update: Board of Trustees May 26 resolution on phasing out remediation and data on the projected impact
7. Discussion about John Jay's advertising/recruitment campaign
8. Proposal to improve student retention: Professor Arlene Geiger
9. Update on the Student Evaluation of the Faculty process: Senators P.J. Gibson and Daniel Pinello
10. Report on the Faculty Senate's legislative action activities: Vice President Daniel Pinello
11. New business

1. Welcome and introduction of the 1998-99 Senators

The members of the 1998-99 Senate were welcomed and introduced.

2. Announcements from the chair

President Karen Kaplowitz said she is pleased to report that two days ago she was elected Treasurer of the University Faculty Senate (UFS) for the 1998-2000 term and, thus, continues as a member of the UFS Executive Committee, but now as an officer of the UFS. [The

Senate applauded this news.] She said that she does think it is important that John Jay be represented on the 9-member UFS executive committee and said she is proud to be the first John Jay faculty member to be elected an officer of the UFS. The other UFS executive committee members are: Bernard Sohmer (City), chair; Cecelia McCall (Baruch), vice chair; Susan O'Malley (Kingsborough), secretary; and five at-large members: Stefan Baumrin (Graduate School & Lehman), Martha Bell (Brooklyn), Anne Friedman (BMCC), Fred Greenbaum (Queensborough), and Ken Sherrill (Hunter). Sandi Cooper (College of Staten Island) is an ex officio member as the previous UFS chair.

On May 19, Professor Harold Sullivan, Government Department, was re-elected as the 1998-99 Chair of the Council of Chairs.

Faculty are encouraged to attend the third annual student academic awards ceremony on June 1, which will honor students whose academic achievements and accomplishments deserve celebration. Senator P.J. Gibson has been asked to write a poem for the occasion, which she will read at the ceremony.

President Lynch will honor the honorary degree recipients -- Louis Freeh, Tom Grisso, Claiborne Pell, and Patricia Smith -- at a dinner in his office the night prior to commencement. Also invited to the dinner are those who nominated these honorary degree recipients as well as the members of the Committee on Honorary Degrees, and the president of the Faculty Senate. The Honorary Degree Committee members are: Professors Daniel Gasman (chair), Jannette Domingo, Lotte Feinberg, Elizabeth Hegeman, Eli Silverman, and Tony Simpson. The Committee will be seeking nominations again in early fall for the June 1999 commencement.

3. Adoption of Minutes #170 of the May 8 meeting

By a motion duly made and carried, Minutes #170 of the Friday, May 8, 1998, meeting were adopted.

4. Review of the history and work of the Faculty Senate and its relation to other College and University bodies

President Kaplowitz gave a review of the Senate's history. A Faculty Senate was first created at John Jay in the early 1970s (very differently structured than the current Senate) but was disbanded during the fiscal crisis of the mid-1970s when John Jay's existence was threatened. The Senate was created again in 1986 because the faculty decided it is important to have an official faculty body, so that faculty can discuss issues as official representatives of their faculty colleagues.

The governance body of the College is the College Council, which has existed since the late 1960s: it now has 56 members: 28 faculty, 15 students, 5 HEOs (higher education officers), 1 alumni/alumnae representative, 1 non-instructional staff, and 6 administrators (who are statutory members): the president, provost, vice president for student development, vice president for administration, dean of admissions and registration, and dean of graduate studies. (Four ex officio members can make motions but cannot vote: a member of the Faculty Senate; a member of the HEO Council; the business director; and the dean of undergraduate studies [associate provost].)

The Faculty Senate comprises all the faculty members who are members of the College Council and also the 15 faculty elected as at-large representatives to the Senate by the entire faculty: the 15 at-large members comprise 13 full-time faculty elected by the full-time faculty and 2 adjunct faculty elected by the adjunct faculty.

The Faculty Senate is a deliberative and advisory body which considers issues from a faculty perspective. *Any* member of the faculty may submit agenda items and may attend Senate meetings and may participate in discussions. However, only Senate members may make motions and may vote.

Six years ago, the Charter of John Jay College was amended and, as a result, the Faculty Senate may elect representatives to the College Council from among its 15 at-large representatives. The amended Charter provides that the 28 faculty seats on the 56-member College Council shall be allocated as follows: "Each academic department shall be allocated one seat and the remaining seats shall be allotted according to any method duly adopted by the Faculty Senate" (1.3.a). The Senate, thus, may fill up to 8 of the 28 faculty seats on the Council from among the incoming at-large members of the Senate, although the Senate may choose to fill fewer than 8 seats. Any seats unfilled by the Senate are allocated as a second seat to the largest academic departments. In April the Senate elected seven of its 15 at-large members of next year's Faculty Senate as representatives on the 1998-99 College Council: Professors P.J. Gibson, Amy Green, Edward Green, Karen Kaplowitz, Patrick O'Hara, Daniel Pinello, and Carmen Solis. (This election must take place prior to May 1 so the academic departments can know whether any have been allocated a second College Council seat.)

In the Spring of 1988, the Constitution of the Faculty Senate was ratified by secret ballot of the entire full-time faculty: the vote was 168 to 10 to ratify the Constitution, which was a vote of support for the Senate, which had been in existence for two years.

The Faculty Senate Constitution was subsequently received by the CUNY Board of Trustees when the John Jay Charter of Governance was amended to include the following language: "The Faculty Senate: The Faculty Senate shall meet at least once each semester during the regular academic year with the President of the College to discuss matters of particular concern to the teaching faculty" (Article 111. Section 2). (All Charter amendments must be approved by the Board of Trustees: when this amendment was sent to the Board, the Board reviewed and accepted the Faculty Senate's Constitution and, in voting to approve the Charter amendment, implicitly agreed that the Faculty Senate is the voice of the John Jay faculty.) The Senate's Constitution is printed in the John Jay Faculty Handbook.

Each month a Senate meeting is scheduled prior to the College Council meeting so the Senate may discuss items on the College Council agenda for the purpose of informing itself about faculty concerns and faculty perspectives (as well as about the concerns of other groups whose perspectives are represented either in reports or directly when they write to the Senate or attend Senate meetings).

In addition, the Senate frequently adopts resolutions and sends them to the College Council for action by the Council. The Senate also adopts resolutions for transmittal to the President of the College, to the Provost, to other members or organizations of the College, to the University Faculty Senate, to the Chancellor, to Vice Chancellors, to the CUNY Board of Trustees, and to elected officials.

The "**Preamble**" of the Faculty Senate Constitution states:

The Faculty of John Jay College of Criminal Justice, having been entrusted by the by-laws of The City University of New York with responsibility for policy relating to admission and retention of students, health and scholarship standards, attendance, curriculum, awarding of college credit, granting of degrees, and the conduct of educational affairs customarily cared for by a college faculty, hereby establishes the John Jay College of Criminal Justice Faculty Senate in order to provide a formal means of representing faculty concerns to the administration of the College and the University and to provide a democratic forum for the deliberation of such matters and other matters upon which deliberation by the academic community may contribute to the well being of the University and the society which sustains **it** and looks to it for enlightenment.

(Preamble, Faculty Senate Constitution)

In writing the "**Preamble**," the authors of the Faculty Senate Constitution purposely included the language of the section of the CUNY Bylaws entitled "Duties of Faculty" (Section 8.6) because the duties, responsibilities, and prerogatives of the faculty are not just what John Jay's Senate says they are but what the CUNY Board of Trustees states they are, which is what the role of a college faculty historically is:

The faculty shall be responsible, subject to guidelines, if any, **as** established by the board for the formulation of policy relating to the admission and retention of students including health and scholarship standards therefor, student attendance including leaves of absence, curriculum, awarding of college credit, granting of degrees. It shall make its own bylaws, consistent with these bylaws, and conduct the educational affairs customarily cared for by a college faculty.

(CUNY Board of Trustees Bylaws, Section **8.6**)

The Senate issues resolutions because the Faculty Senate is the official "voice of the faculty" of John Jay College except in those areas (terms and conditions of employment) where the Professional Staff Congress is the voice of the faculty: Article I of the Faculty Senate Constitution: "Powers of the John Jay Faculty Senate" states:

The John Jay College Faculty Senate shall serve as one of the bodies of the College in the shaping of academic and educational policies. The John Jay Faculty Senate shall concern itself with matters of teaching, scholarship, research and any and all other matters related to faculty concerns as part of the educational mission of John Jay College. The Faculty Senate, acting through resolutions voted upon, shall be considered the voice of the faculty when making recommendations to the College Council, to administrative officials, or to other components of the College and the University, consistent with C.U.N.Y. by-laws, the Professional Staff Congress contract and academic freedom.

(Faculty Senate Constitution, Article I)

Examples of Senate advisory positions include letters to the CUNY Chancellor, Vice Chancellors and Trustees about John Jay's inequitable underfunding and resolutions to John Jay's administrators calling for computerized registration to be accompanied by computerized checking and enforcement of prerequisites, etc.

President Kaplowitz noted that the Senate's work contributed to the 1994 establishment by the CUNY Chancellory of "Base Level Equity," whereby funded faculty lines are distributed among colleges and are embedded into the base budgets of the colleges that receive such lines. This policy was implemented after John Jay's Senate argued in a number of letters to and in meetings with the Chancellory that the inequitable funding of John Jay must be remedied. Governor Pataki's budget for CUNY then provided funding for Base Level Equity.

This past year, several people from outside John Jay have been guests of the Senate: Interim Chancellor Christoph Kimmich, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Louise Mirrer, CUNY Trustee John Morning, and Manhattan Borough President C. Virginia Fields.

The previous year, some guests with whom the Senate met were: Trustee George Rios, Trustee Jerome Berg, Trustee Michael Crimmins; NYS Assemblyman Denny Farrell and NYS Assemblyman Scott Stringer.

In past years the Faculty Senate's guests have included Chancellor W. Ann Reynolds; Vice Chancellor for Budget Richard Rothbard; Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs & University Dean for Academic Affairs Elsa Nunez; Vice Chancellor for Construction Emma Macari; Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Richard Freeland; NYS Senators Catherine Abate and Franz Leichter; NYS Assemblymembers Edward Sullivan, Scott Stringer, and Richard Gottfried; NYS Assemblyman and chair of the NYS Black and Puerto Rican Legislative Caucus Larry Seabrook, who has recently been elected to the NYS Senate; CUNY Trustee Sandi Cooper, chair of the UFS.

Another important College body is the Council of Chairs, which comprises the chairs of all the academic departments, which currently number 20. Since the Senate's creation in 1986, the President of the Senate has attended the meetings of the Council of Chairs. There has always been an excellent working relationship between the Faculty Senate and the Council of Chairs.

Also important is the PSC Chapter, chaired by Professor Haig Bohigian, who meets with the Senate when there are issues to discuss with him.

The College P&B Committee makes personnel and budget recommendations to the President. A subcommittee is the Budget Planning Committee, chaired by Professor Ned Benton. The President of the Senate attends meetings of that committee.

The University Faculty Senate comprises delegates from all CUNY colleges. John Jay's 1998-99 UFS delegates are Professors Haig Bohigian, Holly Clarke, Jane Davenport, Karen Kaplowitz, and Maria Rodriguez. Professors Ned Benton and Edward Davenport are John Jay's two alternate delegates.

Among the Senate's additional responsibilities is voting on honorary degree candidates recommended by the Committee on Honorary Degrees. Also, the Senate sponsors the Better Teaching Seminars and has done so since 1988, as well as the Faculty Mentor Program.

5. Election of the 1998-1999 Faculty Senate Executive Committee

a. President. Karen Kaplowitz was nominated and seconded. Vice President Pinello assumed the chair and invited further nominations. There being none, the Senate voted to close nominations. A motion was made for the Secretary to cast a ballot on behalf of the Senate.

In response to a motion for the Secretary to cast a single ballot on behalf of the Senate, Karen Kaplowitz explained that it is the Executive Committee's recommendation and has been the practice of the Senate during the past several years and also her own personal request that voting be by secret ballot: she said the effectiveness of the Senate's officers is potentially weakened if there is no secret ballot and the converse is also true. Vice President Pinello distributed ballots and instructed the Senators to write "yes," "no," "abstain," or the name of a write-in candidate. The vote was 30 yes, 0 no, 0 abstention.

b. Vice President. Daniel Pinello was nominated and seconded. There being no further nominations, the Senate closed nominations. Voting was by secret ballot: 30 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions.

c. Recording Secretary. Edward Davenport was nominated and seconded. There were no further nominations. Voting was by secret ballot: 30 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions.

d. Corresponding Secretary. Amy Green was nominated and seconded. There were no further nominations. Voting was by secret ballot: 30 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions.

e. Officers at Large (2). Kwando Kinshasa and Carmen Solis were nominated. Voting was by secret ballot: Kwando Kinshasa: 30 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions; Carmen Solis: 30 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions.

All the officers were applauded by the Senate.

6. Update: Board of Trustees May 26 resolution on the phasing out of remediation and data on the projected impact [Attachment A]

Two resolutions on remediation are expected to be on the May 26 Board of Trustees agenda: the first is the resolution developed and supported by Trustees Herman Badillo and John Callandra, which although defeated at the May 6 meeting of the Board's Long Range Planning Committee, will nonetheless be presented for a vote by the full Board on May 26. This is the resolution that would phase out remedial course instruction at all the senior colleges:

"RESOLVED, That all remedial course instruction shall be phased-out of all baccalaureate degree programs at the CUNY senior colleges as of the following dates: September 1999, for Baruch, Brooklyn, Queens, and Hunter Colleges; September 2000 for Lehman, John Jay, Staten Island, New York City Technical, and City Colleges; and September 2001 for York and Medgar Evers Colleges. Following a college's discontinuation of remediation, no student who has not passed all three Freshman Skills Assessment Tests, and any other admissions criteria which may exist, shall be allowed to enroll and/or transfer into that college's baccalaureate

degree programs. Students seeking admission to CUNY senior college baccalaureate degree programs who are in need of remediation shall be able to obtain such remediation services at a CUNY community college, at a senior college only during its summer sessions, or elsewhere as may be made available. This resolution does not apply to **ESL** students who received a secondary education abroad and who otherwise are not in need of remediation; and be it further

"RESOLVED, That the Interim Chancellor and the senior college presidents shall, after consultation with the faculty, present a detailed plan for implementation of this resolution at the respective colleges to the Remediation and Long Range Planning Committees by September 1998."

A second resolution expected to be on the Board's May 26 agenda was first proposed as an alternate approach at the May 6 Long Range Planning Committee by Trustee John Morning and was released in the form of the following resolution on May 12:

"WHEREAS, The Board of Trustees has adopted policy stipulating that students will be admitted to baccalaureate programs only if the remedial instruction they need can be completed with two semesters,

"THEREFORE, BE IT **RESOLVED** TEAT colleges with baccalaureate degree programs wishing to offer less than, or greater than, one semester of remedial course work, but no more than one year, may make special application to the Chancellor based on a relationship between student preparation and the college's academic program: and

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED TEAT students who fail to complete their remedial work within the stated time frame will be referred to a community college or intensive skills program for further remedial work and will be readmitted once they are successful in meeting the college's admissions criteria."

On May 19, Interim Chancellor Christoph Kimmich released a memorandum to the Board of Trustees stating: "As requested at the meeting of the [Board's] Long Range Planning Committee on 6 May, the Central Office has prepared data-based projections of the effect the elimination of remediation at colleges with baccalaureate programs might have on enrollment, budget, and the ethnic distribution of students." With the memorandum was released a table [Attachment A] that, as the memorandum explains, charts "the potential impact of the elimination of remediation over a three-year period on the ethnic distribution of students by college and overall, together with assessment of the trends and issues." A second chart, a financial analysis, is promised under separate cover.

As Chancellor Kimmich further notes: "In preparing such an impact study, we face an obvious dilemma: a potential outcome can be affected by any number and any variety of possible interventions. Thus, while we are on relatively firm ground in dealing with the impact in the first Year [italics added], it becomes less firm in subsequent years" because of "possible student shifts from one CUNY college to another, the success of new immersion and other remediation programs, the improvements generated by CPI [College

Preparatory Initiative], by our collaborative programs with the high schools, and by the implementation of the Board of Regents standards, but also the negative effect of more stringent admissions policies at CUNY and of student enrollment lost to increased recruitment by private institutions -- all these may (or may not) play a role."

Also accompanying the chart [Attachment A] is a May 19 memorandum from Interim Deputy Chancellor Patricia Hassett to Chancellor Kimmich explaining that the chart shows percentage changes relative to base line enrollments in the 1997/98 academic year. She notes that "the last line (total bachelor's entrants) is useful as an overview of the first year. Yet it both underestimates and overestimates the impact. It underestimates the impact to the extent to which it presumes application rates will remain constant through 2001/02. And it overestimates the impact to the extent to which we do not consider the reallocation of students from one college to another."

The Deputy Chancellor also notes three points: the "snapshot of 97/98 base is taken after the effects of existing summer immersion opportunities have been realized" but what has not been factored in are "potential improvements associated with expanded immersion programs on campus or through College Now"; also, "while all groups are impacted, Hispanics and Asians are especially affected"; and thirdly, five campuses would "experience over a 50% decline in entering students in the first year of implementation." The Deputy Chancellor, noting this may present the worse case scenario, also notes possible "incremental success of proarammatic intervention or mitigation factors such as stronger yield rates, demographic growth, the impact of Regents requirements, CPI, etc."

The chart [Attachment A] shows that were the Badillo/Calandra resolution to be adopted and implemented, during the first year of the first phase of implementation, 1999-2000, the percentage decline from the 1997-98 base enrollments of new bachelor's students, both regular and SEEK students, including freshmen and transfer students, would be: Baruch -34%; Brooklyn -46%; Hunter -38%; and Queens -43%.

In the first year of the second phase (2000-02), the declines would be: City College -57%; John Jay (bachelor's) -64%; Lehman -58%; NYC Technical (bachelor's) -55%; and Staten Island (bachelor's) -46%.

In the first year of the third phase (2001-02), the declines would be: Medgar Evers (bachelor's) -39%; and York -53%. The Total Bachelor's entrants (freshmen and transfers) would decline by 46%.

7. Discussion of John Jay's advertisins campaign to recruit students

President Kaplowitz reported that the advertising campaign that the College has initiated in the New York Times and other papers about which President Lynch reported to the Senate on May 8, and for which the Senate applauded him, involves a very handsome ad but, it turns out, the ad is aimed only at recruiting students for our araduate programs. A campaign to recruit students, including an advertising campaign, is an action the Senate has long recommended and, indeed, urged, but we did so the explicit statement that the advertising campaign would be directed to potential undersraduate students, especially transfer students, and not graduate students (or, certainly not, exclusively graduate students).

The Senate agreed there are many compelling reasons to conduct

an advertising campaign for undergraduate students as part of the College's effort to recruit students, specifically students who are better prepared academically: CUNY's measure of each college's graduation and retention rates is based on undersgraduate students only: graduate students, while bringing in larger tuition revenue than undergraduates per course, generate far, far fewer FTEs because graduate students tend to take many fewer courses each semester than do undergraduate students: CUNY's budget allocation (of lump sums) is based on the total FTEs enrolled at each college: John Jay's argument of inequitable underfunding in comparison with the CUNY other senior colleges is based on our student FTE enrollment which necessarily declines as we admit more graduate rather than undergraduate students.

Additional arguments to engage in an advertising and recruitment campaign for undergraduate students are: performance based budgeting will undoubtedly continue at CUNY and in measuring each college's performance only the graduation and retention rates of undergraduate students are measured, not those of graduate students: the NYS Department of Education is scrutinizing the graduation and retention rates of undersgraduate students but not of graduate students and, indeed, Commissioner of Education Richard Mills has spoken of issuing a report card about each college, including its graduation rates: the proposed CUNY-wide proficiency test, which is widely expected to be implemented, is a quite rigorous writing (and reading) test which students will be required to pass in order to move beyond 60 credits and which will also serve as a report card about each college and unless we recruit better prepared undergraduate students, the test scores of our students and the percentage who pass may very well be less than is desirable for our College: academically better prepared students raise the level of discussion and learning in the classroom and the result is that other academically better prepared students are attracted to the College and are motivated to stay rather than transfer elsewhere and the opposite tends to also be true: and the increase in graduate course sections may result in a further decline in the percentage of undergraduate course sections taught by full-time faculty, which is already much too low.

Secretary Edward Davenport moved that the Senate urge President Lynch to at least match the advertising budget given to recruiting graduate students with an advertising budget for recruiting undergraduate students. Senator Lou Guinta noted that the College used to widely, regularly, and effectively advertise for undergraduate students. Leftoff suggested advertising among women's groups and Professor Arlene Geiger suggested advertising in high school newspapers. Senator Ed Green suggested that faculty volunteer to recruit students and Senator Tom Litwack responded that he has made presentations about our forensic psychology program to students who have visited the College. Senator Kwando Kinshasa noted that members of some of our student clubs have been speaking at high schools, telling students about John Jay.

Senator Davenport's motion urging that an advertising campaign be conducted that focuses on recruiting undergraduate students and that it match the extent and cost of the current campaign that focuses on graduate students and that this request and recommendation be transmitted to the President passed by unanimous vote.

8. Proposal for improving student retention: Professor Arlene Geiger

Professor Arlene Geiger (Public Management) explained that the

goal of her proposal is to increase retention of students by paying adjuncts to conduct lab and tutoring sessions for students who are in the instructors' introductory courses as a way to supplement classroom instruction, particularly for "at risk" students. Her proposal calls for all adjunct faculty who teach two or three sections of an introductory course to conduct two hours of lab/tutoring sessions and, in addition, to hold a half hour of office hour weekly so that non "at risk" students would also have access to their instructors. The proposal calls for adjunct faculty to be compensated for two and a half hours per week at 60% of their hourly contact rate in addition to their regular compensation for teaching.

Senator Carmen Solis noted that SEEK has been providing tutoring for a long time but does this by placing tutors in the classroom. Senator Pat O'Hara said tutoring is conducted several places in the College and he questioned to what extent this proposal duplicates what is already done, Senator Edward Green and Professor Geiger explained that such tutoring is currently conducted largely by students, who are less effective than students' instructors would be.

Senator Martin Wallenstein said he believes no one would disagree with the goal of more tutoring and with paying adjuncts for office hours but there are many things we need to know, such as how much money would be needed. Senator Edward Davenport said he agrees with Senator Wallenstein that the general principles behind the proposal are supportable but we are lacking information necessary for us to take an informed vote on the specifics of the proposal. One such detail is the cost mentioned by Senator Wallenstein and another are any PSC contractual issues that might have to be resolved. Senator Ed Green said that the PSC grants waivers of the contract at many campuses so adjuncts may teach more than the contractual number of hours and he believes the PSC would do so in this case.

Senator Holly Clarke suggested that the Senate vote to express support for the spirit of the resolution and then form a committee to study these issues. Senator Tom Litwack spoke emphatically of the need to investigate this complex matter more fully before passing a resolution of any kind. He pointed to the problem, for example, of tutoring sessions offered by faculty to which not all the students of that instructor's course could attend because some students are registered for other courses at the same time as the tutoring sessions. He said it would be discriminatory if tutoring by students' instructors were offered if some students in the course were not available to attend. Senator Litwack said there may be ways to address such issues and he that the Senate send Professor Geiger's proposal to the Academic Program Planning Committee, which includes five Senate representatives, early in the Fall. He added that it is meaningless for us to try to develop too specific a proposal until we meet with the Provost to ascertain what resources would be available.

Senator Litwack moved that the Senate ask the Provost to schedule an Academic Program Planning Committee meeting early in the Fall, and to include Professor Geiger's proposal on the agenda, and to invite adjunct faculty guests to attend that session. Senator Litwack's motion was seconded and approved.

9. Update on the Student Evaluation of the Faculty process: Senators P.J. Gibson and Daniel Pinello, Members of the Committee on Student Evaluation of the Faculty

The Committee on Student Evaluation of the Faculty comprises 6

members as required by John Jay's Charter of Governance: two faculty elected by the faculty members of the College Council; two faculty appointed by John Jay's chapter of the PSC; and two students elected by the Student Council. The two elected this month by the College Council are Professors P.J. Gibson and Daniel Pinello, who are also members of the Senate. The two PSC appointed members are Professors Haig Bohigian and Peter Shenkin.

Vice President Pinello reported that the first meeting of the new Committee on Faculty Evaluation took place this month and that the goal is to prepare a new instrument by the beginning of the Fall semester so it can be ready for use during the Spring 1999 semester. The Committee is considering reducing the 7-grade scale to a 5-grade scale and adding questions about demographic information. He distributed the Committee's preliminary draft of a new instrument for the Senate's comment, emphasizing that this is a very early draft:

Rating Scale: 1 = Poor 2 = Satisfactory 3 = Good,
 4 = Very Good 5 = Excellent 6 = NA

1. The instructor's presentation of the course material was:
2. The method of determining grades in this class was:
3. The difficult points of assignments were clarified or explained:
4. The instructor's interest in student success was:
5. The instructor allows the expression of different viewpoints in the class:
6. The organization of class lessons was:
7. Opportunity to demonstrate creative thinking was:
8. The instructor's method of dealing with student questions was:
9. This instructor motivated/inspired me to want to learn the subject matter:
10. Overall, the instructor's performance in teaching this course was:

Senator Martin Wallenstein suggested that the demographic information include the number of credits the student has completed. Senator Bessie Wright urged that the items be rephrased into the present tense since the course is still meeting when the evaluation is administered. President Kaplowitz suggested that #4 and #7 be removed because item #4 -- "The instructor's interest in student success" -- has two problems: no one can correctly determine a person's "interest" only a person's actions, and the term "success" is ambiguous: does it mean earning a high final grade, learning the subject matter, graduating, getting a job? And the difficulty with Item #7 -- "Opportunity to demonstrate creative thinking" -- presumes an understanding of the term "creative thinking" and, also, the term "demonstrate" could mean many things to many people.

Senator Pat O'Hara said that questions #5, #7, and #8 -- "The instructor allows the expression of different viewpoints in the class"; "Opportunity to demonstrate creative thinking"; and "The instructor's method of dealing with student questions was" -- seem redundant. Senator Sondra Leftoff said the questions all focus on the instructor rather than on the course. She posed such alternative wording as: "The instructor presented different viewpoints for consideration." Senator Kwando Kinshasa said he feels strongly about the need to divide the questions into sections so the evaluation instrument could more specifically address those teaching issues that the Personnel Committee uses in making decisions about an instructor's teaching performance. Senator Wallenstein said too few of the questions make fine distinctions.

Senator O'Hara asked whether the reliability of these questions has been measured: he asked whether students have been asked what each question means to them. Vice President Pinello said he does not know, having only attended a single meeting. Senator O'Hara suggested a follow-up test might be administered, asking such questions as, "When you answered the question about . . . what did you mean?" Senator Leftoff raised the problem of the lack of context for the questions, since there is no quantitative testing. President Kaplowitz reported that this Spring she has received many messages from faculty urging that experts in the design of evaluation instruments be asked to help develop the new instrument. She named several John Jay faculty who are specialists in this field who might be called upon to help. Vice President Pinello asked whether a Senate recommendation for a delay in the September deadline might slow the process so that a valid instrument can be developed.

Senator P.J. Gibson reported that she was on this Committee five years ago and the instrument has not been changed since then. She said the Committee has looked at a 13-question version, edited by Professor Bohigian, the chair of the Committee, who told the other Committee members that faculty have earned relatively high scores with the 20-question instrument that has been long in use. She said just seeing redundancies removed and the reversed order of responses corrected is rewarding for her. She, too, reported that the Provost wants a proposed instrument to be ready by September. She added that the student Committee members were helpful in giving their reading of the questions. Senator James Cauthen said most instruments he has seen comprise three sections: teacher evaluation, course evaluation, and the value of course and instructor. He suggested that the Committee consider looking at evaluation instruments used at campuses outside of CUNY. President Kaplowitz noted that the Senate will have at least another opportunity to see and comment on the instrument before it goes to the College Council.

10. Report on the Faculty Senate's legislative action activities:
Vice President Daniel Pinello [written report]

At the May 8 meeting, the Senate authorized a legislative activities committee, co-chaired by Daniel Pinello and Karen Kaplowitz. Vice President Pinello, who organized and carried out the activities, presented a written report of his actions thus far:

"To: John Jay Faculty Senate

"Copies to: Vice President Mary DePiano Rothlein
Robert Pignatello, Director of Public
Relations and Governmental Affairs
Harold Sullivan, Chair, Council of Chairs

"From: Dan Pinello, Vice President, Faculty Senate

"Subject: Protest Flyers Regarding CUNY Budget Vetoes

"I am pleased to report that, with the indispensable help of more than 30 faculty members distributing flyers (in class and the cafeteria) protesting Governor George Pataki's vetoes of CUNY budget items, 6,210 flyer copies signed by John Jay students, faculty, and staff were mailed to Albany during the last two weeks, as follows: (A) 1,252 each to Assembly Speaker Sheldon Silver, Senate Majority Leader Joseph Bruno, and Governor Pataki; and (B) the remainder of

2,454 copies to the representatives listed below.

"I personally identified the state assembly and senate districts for each signer of the flyer by means of street finders and district maps. Accordingly, the second group of flyers was sent to legislators from their verified John Jay constituents.

"The following legislators received the number of flyers indicated. Republican representatives' names are in bold."

[Vice President Pinello's written report then lists the names of the 88 Assembly members, including 15 Republicans, who received the signed flyers (and the number of signed flyers each received) and the names of the 37 State Senators, including 16 Republicans, who received them as well. A copy of the report with the full list of recipients is available in the Faculty Senate Office. The signed flyers urge the restoration of items approved by the NYS Legislature but vetoed by Governor Pataki: \$7.5 million for new full-time CUNY faculty members; \$5 million in financial aid for part-time CUNY students; and \$2 million for child care at CUNY.]

11. New business

Senators reported being pressured by students whose other instructors are not giving a final exam at all or who are giving the final exam during class instead of during the final exam week. Senators said some students are angry with them for giving a final, unlike their other instructors, while other students are angry at those other instructors for not providing them with the time to study for a final and for not giving them the full two hours they would have for the final exam were it given during final exam week.

New York State requires a specific number of minutes of class meetings each semester for a course to merit three credits, or four credits, etc. The 120 minutes scheduled for each final exam is part of the required total number of class meeting time for the semester.

John Jay's policy is that all courses except a few specified remedial English and mathematics courses, for which there are departmental finals and for which no credit or 1 credit is given, must meet during final exam week and that the two hours must be devoted to either a final exam or to course instruction.

It was suggested that faculty may not be aware of the State and College policies and that the Senate Minutes are one way to apprise faculty of these policies both to inform and protect faculty.

By a motion duly made and carried, the meeting was adjourned at 5:20 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Edward Davenport

Amy Green

Recording Secretaries

Phase-In Schedule, Proposed Resolution
Percentage Decline from 1997-98 Base Enrollment of New Bachelor's Students: Regular and SEEK
(First Year Impact by College and Race/Ethnicity)

Phase 1	1997-98 Baseline Enrollments					First Year (1999-00)				
	W	B	H	A	Total*	W	B	H	A	Total*
Baruch	1,168	1,012	851	1,102	4,180	-31%	-28%	-35%	-40%	-34%
Brooklyn	1,693	1,030	422	335	3,382	-40%	-40%	-52%	-51%	-45%
Hunter	2,022	884	1,084	818	4,785	-32%	-30%	-41%	-48%	-38%
Queens	1,867	413	535	889	3,509	-38%	-42%	-49%	-51%	-43%
Phase 2	1997-98 Baseline Enrollments					First Year (2000-01)				
City	W	B	H	A	Total*	W	B	H	A	Total*
John Jay (bachelor's)	289	1,012	795	415	2,521	-44%	-46%	-66%	-64%	-57%
Lehman	762	780	857	118	2,520	-50%	-72%	-70%	-68%	-64%
NYC Technical (bachelor's)	255	878	1,134	91	2,458	-50%	-47%	-64%	-63%	-58%
SUNY Island (bachelor's)	37	50	22	5	114	-35%	-63%	-67%	-63%	-55%
	763	102	98	118	1,084	-42%	-38%	-53%	-60%	-46%
Phase 3	1997-98 Baseline Enrollments					First Year (2001-02)				
Medgar Evers (bachelor's)	W	B	H	A	Total*	W	B	H	A	Total*
York	67	187	8	7	260	-13%	-47%	-25%	-43%	-39%
	114	1,020	257	193	1,587	-35%	-61%	-60%	-54%	-53%
Total Bachelor's Enrollments	9,978	7,428	9,041	3,892	28,380	-38%	-48%	-65%	-61%	-48%

* Total column includes American Indians/Alaskan Natives, as well as the four racial/ethnic groups reported here.

Note: Table includes freshmen and transfer students enrolling CUNY in the fall and spring semesters as well as SEEK students, and excludes ESL students who received a secondary education abroad and who were not in need of remediation. In this analysis, ESL students who graduated from a foreign high school and who passed the math skills assessment test are excluded. Estimates for entering fall freshmen are based on the most recent skills test scores as of the first day of classes. The estimates take into account progress made in the University Summer Immersion Program (USIP).

W=Whites; B=Blacks; H=Hispanics; A=Asians