

Faculty Senate Minutes #174

John Jay College of Criminal Justice

October 8, 1998

3:20 PM

Room 630 T

Present (29): C. Jama Adams, Dorothy Brace, James Cauthen, Effie Papatzikou Cochran, Glenn Corbett, Enrique Chavez-Arviso, Holly Clarke, Edward Davenport, Janice Dunham, Nancy Egan, P.J. Gibson, Amy Green, Lou Guinta, Karen Kaplowitz, Jane Katz, Kwando Kinshasa, Stuart Kirschner, Sandra Leftoff, Gavin Lewis, Patricia Licklider, Tom Litwack, Mylithi Mantharam, Jill Norgren, Patrick O'Hara, Daniel Pinello, Jacqueline Polanco, Carmen Solis, Martin Wallenstein, Bessie Wright

Absent (7): David Brotherton, Anthony Carpi, Edward Green, James Malone, Ellen Marson, Dagoberto Orrantia, Lydia Segal

Invited Guests: Professors Haig Bohigian, Keith Markus, Peter Shenkin; Ms. Evelyn Maldonado; Vice President Robert Pignatello

AGENDA

1. Announcements from the chair
2. Adoption of Minutes #173 of the September 23 meeting
3. Ratification of membership of Senate committees
4. Discussion of the Committee on Student Evaluation of the Faculty's two proposed versions of a new instrument and of recommended changes submitted by members of the Senate
5. Invited Guest: Robert Pignatello, VP for Administration

1. Announcements from the chair [Attachment A]

Invited guests, Professors Bohigian, Shenkin, and a student, Ms. Maldonado, of the Student Evaluation of the Faculty Committee, and Professor Markus, consultant to the Committee, were welcomed.

2. Adoption of Minutes #173 of the September 23 meeting

By a motion duly made and seconded, Minutes #173 of the September 23 meeting were adopted.

3. Ratification of the membership of Faculty Senate committees

The members of the Senate's Committee on Computing and

Educational Technology, recommended by the Executive Committee, were unanimously approved by the Senate: Professors Yahya Affinnih, Ira Bloomgarden, Lou Guinta (co-chair), Farrukh Hakeem, Robert Hong, Katherine Killoran, Sandra Lanzone, Bonnie Nelson (co-chair), Peter Shenkin, and Margaret Leland Smith, All served on the Committee last year and their re-election was strongly recommended by co-chairs Bonnie Nelson and Lou Guinta.

The members of the Senate's Committee on the Budget, Tom Litwack (chair) and Karen Kaplowitz, were unanimously approved.

4. Discussion of the Committee on Student Evaluation of the Faculty's two proposed versions of a new evaluation instrument and of recommended changes submitted by members of the Senate [Attachment B-1 & B-2, and Attachment C].

The six members of the Committee on Student Evaluation of the Faculty had been invited to this meeting: Professors Haig Bohigian, and Peter Shenkin (appointed by John Jay's chapter of the PSC); students Evelyn Maldonado and Steven Seow Chee Kwang (elected by the Student Council); and Professors P.J. Gibson and Daniel Pinello, who were elected by the College Council and who are, also, members of the Senate. Professor Keith Markus (Psychology), who serves as a consultant to the Committee, was also invited.

Last May's Student Evaluation of the Faculty will not be used in personnel decisions. This was a recommendation of the Senate and of the Chairs. The decision to not use the results was made by the Provost, who announced it at the Senate's previous meeting.

President Kaplowitz distributed the Student Evaluation of the Faculty Committee's two proposed versions [Attachment B] as well as recommendations submitted in writing by members of the Senate, in the form of a tally sheet, as agreed upon by the Senate at its previous meeting [Attachment C]. Senators' yes and no votes on each item will be tabulated and transmitted as recommendations to the Committee, which will develop the final proposed instrument for vote by the College Council.

Professor Haig Bohigian, the chair of the Committee, said the Committee's new proposed versions are, indeed, only proposals and that the Committee welcomes suggestions. He noted that student input has been especially helpful because students come to the discussion with a completely different perspective. He said the Committee would like to bring its final draft back to the Senate before submitting it to the College Council for a vote. He noted the importance of the evaluation instrument and the overdue nature of this revision process. He also asked the Senate to examine the College's personnel guidelines, adopted in 1992 by the Personnel Committee, which he were never considered by the College Council, even though the Charter of the College states that the College Council must approve all proposed Personnel Committee policies. He said that those guidelines are at least 10 times more important in the personnel process than the student evaluation of the faculty.

President Kaplowitz reported the Senate's consensus at its last meeting that the purposes of the student evaluation of the faculty instrument are four-fold: 1. Feedback to the instructor of students' perceptions of the instructor and of the course; 2. Information to the department P&B and to the College P&B for use in personnel decisions involving reappointment, tenure, and

promotion; 3. Information to department chairs for use in semester reappointments of adjunct faculty; 4. A statement of what the College and its faculty expect of its teaching instructional staff. She suggested the new document be given to new faculty hires and distributed to all faculty at the beginning of each academic year.

Professor Bohigian said the main purpose of the instrument is the improvement of instruction at the College and he stated that the student evaluations are not used in the personnel process. Senator Tom Litwack strongly disagreed, based on his experience on both departmental and College personnel committees, including this current year as an at-large member of the College P&B Committee. Senator Jill Norgren supported Senator Litwack's assertion, having served in the past on the College P&B as well as on her department's PCB Committee, including this very year. She added that candidates themselves sometimes quote student evaluations in their own Form C (self evaluation) statements. She noted that there is an enormous book of evaluation data in the Provost's office to be consulted by P&B committee members when considering each candidate. Senator Litwack added that in his estimation, the student evaluations play a major role in personnel decisions.

Professor Bohigian questioned Senator Litwack's assertion by asking whether he is saying that the student evaluations play more than a 50% role since he had used the word "major" as in "majority." Senator Litwack said by "major" he means a very significant role. Senator Stuart Kirschner, who began teaching as a full-time member of the faculty a year ago, said that he was explicitly told that his students' evaluations of him would be considered in P&B decisions relating to his career at the College. Professor Martin Wallenstein said that quantifying the percentage of influence of the student evaluation is not helpful, but he added that as someone who has also served on both the College P&B Committee and on his department's committee, it is necessary to recognize that student evaluations do play a very important role in the personnel process.

Senator Litwack suggested we choose which of the Committee's proposed formats the Senate recommends and then rewrite the questions so as to conform to that version. Senator Jama Adams asked the time frame for this process. Professor Peter Shenkin said that unless the Committee finishes its work in a timely manner, the administration might be unable to prepare the new instrument for use in the Spring 1999 semester. President Kaplowitz noted that the Provost told the Senate at its previous meeting, on September 23, that he is comfortable if the process is completed by the end of this semester. Professor Shenkin reiterated his concern in light of the minimal financial and staff resources allocated to this function. Professor Bohigian added that the Committee had nothing to do with last Spring's troublesome evaluation process and that the problems were a function of insufficient resources.

Professor Wallenstein spoke of an imbalance in the content of the questionnaire. He pointed to the absence of questions concerning the instructor's enthusiasm for and ability to interest students in the subject matter and the instructor's knowledge of the subject. Professor Adams urged again that the body decide how to proceed before continuing the content discussion. Senator Norgren suggested that the next meeting agenda be limited to this issue, if necessary, so that we can conclude our deliberations by then.

Professor Jane Katz asked if Ms. Maldonado could provide a student perspective about the Committee's two proposed forms [Attachment B-1 and B-2]. Ms. Maldonado said she prefers the

Committee's version #2. President Kaplowitz noted that various members of the Senate have also expressed their preference for version #2. By a show of hands, the Senate indicated its overwhelming preference for the structure of Version #2 [Attachment B-2], which provides declarative statements rather than fill-in-the-blank questions.

Professor Sondra Leftoff asked whether the instrument had been piloted for structural bias. Professor Keith Markus said no piloting had yet been done, but that it would be necessary to test the efficacy of the instrument. Professor Dorothy Bracey asked whether there is literature on testing structure. Professor Markus said this proposed revision is intended to correct a bias in the previous instrument. Professor Litwack said that contrary to his comments at previous meetings, there might not be time to pilot test and that the Senate has a responsibility to recommend a reasonable, if not perfect, instrument. Senator Norgren questioned the validity of changing from the current 7-point scale to a five-point or six-point scale and she asked whether there is not a responsibility to pilot test: otherwise we are making decisions blindly in terms of the impact of language and structure. Senator Litwack reiterated his concern with the time frame. Senator Katz asked Professor Markus to comment. He responded that a small pilot study (100-500) students might be enough to pre test. President Kaplowitz noted that the Provost seemed amenable to the idea of a pilot.

Senator Litwack suggested that in the meantime the Senate discuss types of rating scales as applied to version #2. Professor Bohigian, noting that the rating scale in version #1 cannot be used in version #2, said that students are reluctant to choose such strong terms as "never" and "always," which appear in version #2. President Kaplowitz said one scale recommended by a member of the Senate [Attachment C] includes the choice of "not sure or neutral" as part of the 5-point scale and she questioned the validity of such a choice in a agree/disagree scale. Senator Cauthen concurred that "not sure or neutral" is not an actual designation in a scale.

In response to Senator Norgren's concern about a new numerical scale (6 or 5 elements rather than 7), Professor Shenkin said it is better to demarcate the College's change in instruments by adopting a new scale, one different from the 7-point scale used to date, so that ratings faculty receive with the new instrument are not treated as comparable to the ratings received with the previous instrument.

Senator Litwack moved that the Senate recommend the 6-point "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree" scale [Attachment C]. Senator Guinta seconded the motion. Senator Leftoff suggested we add a proviso that we reevaluate this recommendation after a pilot study. Senator Leftoff asked Professor Markus what the ideal pilot would entail. He responded that the best pilot would ask students to use both scales.

[The discussion resumed after a brief meeting with Vice President Pignatello, who arrived at this point. See pp 5-6.]

5. Invited Guest: Robert Pignatello, Vice President for Administration [see Attachment A]

Vice President Pignatello arrived, as scheduled, and was congratulated on his appointment as Vice President for Administration. [The Senate applauded.] President Kaplowitz

praised his performance at the meeting of the Fiscal Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees the previous day at which he presented John Jay's request that the College be permitted to expend funds for an expansion of our telephone system. He, in turn, said he was very proud that Professor Kaplowitz is the faculty member on this important Board committee.

President Kaplowitz explained that the Senate is working on an important project which must meet a strict deadline assigned by the Provost and she explained that, in addition, several non-Senators, faculty and a student, have come to this meeting as invited guests. She asked Vice President Pignatello if he would accept the Senate's apology and meet with the Senate again on the soonest meeting date that is convenient to him. Vice President Pignatello said he understands completely and looks forward to returning when the Senate's business permits. He said he is especially looking forward to communicating with the Senate about many important issues.

President Kaplowitz noted that at the first meeting of the Quality of Life Committee [see Attachment A - p. 13, which Vice President Pignatello now chairs, and which Senator Glenn Corbett and she attended last week, Vice President Pignatello stated that his policy is to treat T building and North Hall equally, that whatever is done to and for T Building will be done to and for North Hall. [This was applauded.] Vice President Pignatello said he considers us to be one campus and explained that in his view the purpose of his Office is to support all our efforts to fulfill the mission of the College. [Vice President Pignatello left at this point.]

4. Discussion of the Committee on Student Evaluation of the Faculty's two proposed versions of a new evaluation instrument and of recommended changes submitted by members of the Senate  
[Attachments B-1 & B-2, and Attachment C] (continued)

Returning to the evaluation discussion, Senator Pat O'Hara said the new instrument would set a new baseline to which the College would adjust. Secretary Edward Davenport said the current process will yield a useful instrument for the Spring and we could evaluate it through a pilot study later. Senator Gavin Lewis concurred.

Vice President Daniel Pinello reported as a member of the Committee that the Committee is concerned with creating an improved instrument and he requested that the discussion return to the substantive issue of content and structure. Senator Adams said that this body uses an exciting reflective process, but that he would like to see us devote time to the larger philosophical issues and the larger framework related to student evaluation of faculty.

Senator Pinello began the discussion of Senator Litwack's motion to recommend the six-point "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree" scale [Attachment C] by reporting that the Committee considers it important to change the 7-point scale. He said that while he does not necessarily like the "not sure or neutral" choice, he prefers a 5-point scale. A suggestion was made to delete "neutral or not sure" and adopt a 4-point scale. Senator Wallenstein spoke in favor of the motion to adopt the 6-point scale. Senator Holly Clarke asked the difference between "somewhat agree" and "somewhat disagree," which are two choices in the 6-point scale, and she asked Ms. Maldonado her reaction. Ms. Maldonado said the "somewhat" choices are, indeed, confusing. Senator Amy Green

questioned whether it is possible to make fine distinctions with a 4-point scale 4. Professor Markus said he is uncomfortable about using a 4-point scale, if important decisions are to be based on this data. He added that another possible middle choice on a 5-point scale could be "neither agree nor disagree." Senator Cauthen said that as a junior faculty member, he prefers the 6-point scale.

Senator Pinello asked Senator Litwack if he would accept as a friendly amendment to his motion the recommendation of a 5-point scale. Senator Litwack said he will defer to Professor Markus about the validity of a 5-point scale.

A straw vote was requested which would only communicate preference and which would be non-binding: nine senators indicated preference for a 5-point scale and one senator supported a six-point scale. The other senators abstained and explained they do not feel sufficiently knowledgeable to indicate a preference about such an issue. It was agreed that this issue, of whether the scale be a 5-point or 6-point scale, be decided upon by testing experts.

Professor Shenkin spoke against the entire category of Section III [Attachment C], as recommended by the Senate. He said that although such questions are not to be included as part of the aggregate score, in the future someone could try to include this information in the evaluation of a candidate. Thus, if we include such questions, we may be letting ourselves in for unintended consequences. President Kaplowitz explained that this is a proposed solution by the Senate to address the Committee's decision to delete all questions, including important questions, that do not have universal applicability to all full-time and adjunct faculty. Senator Dorothy Bracey said we should not include questions about campus facilities because of the "halo effect," whereby, as the literature shows, those who think highly of an instructor will think highly of everything else asked on an evaluation form. She said she does find interesting the idea of a separate questionnaire asking students about the College's classroom and other facilities.

In summary: the Senate voted to recommend the format of the Committee's version #2, which presents each question in the form of a declarative statement and to recommend a scale that extends from "Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree" rather than either scale proposed by the Committee, and to defer to testing experts as to whether a 5-point or 6-point scale be used. The Senate also agreed to further revisit the issue.

The Committee on Honorary Degrees members were praised for their diligence and thanked for accepting the Senate's invitation.

5. Invited Guest: Vice President Robert Pignatello

[See pp. 4 - 5, above.]

By a motion adopted, the meeting was adjourned at 5:30 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Edward Davenport  
Amy Green

Recording Secretaries

## Attachment A

### Announcements from the chair

#### Honorary Degree Committee elects chair and calls for nominations

The members of the Committee on Honorary Degrees has elected Professor Antony Simpson (Library) as chair and has announced November 6 as the deadline for receiving nominations for candidates for honorary degrees to be conferred at our June commencement exercises. Send a nominating letter and supporting documents to Professor Simpson.

#### Women's History Month annual student writing contest announced

Faculty are asked to announce to their students the theme for JJ's 1999 Women's History Month writing contest: "Writing Women's Rights." Original written work -- a play, poetry, a short story or an expository essay -- may be submitted in Room 1253 N by February 15 by any currently enrolled undergraduate JJ student, male or female. The student's social security number must be on the top of each typed, double-spaced page, and a separate cover sheet must include the student's social security number, name, and telephone number. The prizes of money, books, and plaques will be presented at the annual Women's History Month Literary Lecture on March 18.

#### Quality of Life Committee meeting

On October 1, the first meeting of this year's Quality of Life Committee was held: in attendance were VP Rob Pignatello (chair); Dean Hank Smit; Dean of Facilities Robert Huffman; and Professors Glenn Corbett (Public Management/Fire Science) and Karen Kaplowitz. This committee was created by President Lynch in response to issues that the Faculty Senate brought to the College Council for action by that body. Professors Corbett and Kaplowitz praised various innovations and conditions: the art reproductions on the walls of NH; the additional pay telephones, long requested by students; the renovated restrooms in North Hall; and the improved noise level in the cafeteria (but it turns out that this is due to the fact that the radio station, a student club, has not yet begun broadcasting). A list of 40 quality of life problems were identified. (For a copy of the list, call the Senate office or review the list in forthcoming Senate minutes.)

VP Pignatello reported on his plans: the North Hall lobby will be given a facelift; wall ads will be permanently removed; security issues are being studied, including whether the current number of security officers is sufficient. The issue is being considered of whether a principle B&G supervisor should be hired to supervise from 2 PM to 10 PM (currently a supervisor is present only from 7 AM to 3 PM); a Facilities Management Working Group now meets every Friday and includes VP Pignatello, Miriam Mucchi, Irwin Strickler, Robert Huffman. VP Pignatello said his philosophy is that anything that is done for T Building must **also** be done for NH. He asked to be apprised of all problems and said he welcomes suggestions. The Committee next meets on October 29.

#### Student papers being accepted for 1999 'John Jay's Finest'

Each year, faculty in all disciplines are invited to submit outstanding writing by their students in undergraduate courses for inclusion in John Jay's Finest. The deadline for submission for the Spring 1999 edition is January 15. The anthology, published yearly, includes student writing of all kinds: essays, fiction, and term papers. Send submissions to the editor, Professor Jane Mushabac, English Department. Include your name, the course for which the piece was written, and your student's name, address, and telephone number. If the work is on disk, send the disk with the typescript.

NYS Task Force on Higher Education and Disability Issues

Karen Kaplowitz has been appointed by NYS Commissioner of Education Richard Mills to the newly established NYS Task Force on Postsecondary Education and Disabilities. The task force has been established by the NYS Board of Regents and the State Education Department, SUNY, CUNY, and the Commission on Independent Colleges and Universities. The task force is charged with developing a "global vision and strategic plan for higher education" to increase postsecondary education opportunities for New Yorkers with disabilities and to issue recommendations for review by the leadership of the postsecondary education sectors in NYS.

Election results

The Committee on Faculty Elections has announced the results of the election of the faculty members on the College Council Executive Committee: Professors Effie Cochran, Glenn Corbett, Amy Green, Gavin Lewis, James Malone, and Lydia Segal. The students elected to the College P&B are McLawrence David and Edgar Lopez.

Board of Trustees September 28 meeting

Chancellor Kimmich reported that preliminary enrollment figures show that the Fall 1998 headcount has declined by less than a fraction of 1% since Fall 1997 and that FTEs declined less than 1%. He called this a victory for CUNY. He reported that the new freshman classes at the senior colleges have the highest number of high school mathematics and English units since the May 1995 Board resolution and that these students also passed the three FSAT's in significantly higher numbers than in the recent past.

The Chancellor reported about the Open Meetings lawsuit: the Appeals Court, the previous week, upheld earlier rulings enjoining CUNY from implementing the May 26 Board resolution phasing out remediation. He noted that the court's ruling permits CUNY to plan immersions programs, collaborative programs with the Board of Education, and Baruch's elimination of remedial course instruction because all these actions preceded the May 26 Board meeting.

The Chancellor reported that the Task Force headed by Benno Schmidt will be issuing reports on remediation, faculty, governance, budget, and student retention at CUNY. He noted that Mr. Schmidt had said two to three reports would be released before the end of the year, with the first report to be on remediation, but because of delays those first reports will probably be released in November with a final report probably issued by the end of December and that both the Rand report and the report by PriceWaterhouseCoopers are to be issued separately.

The budget request being prepared for submission to Albany for the 1999-2000 year is a five-year budget plan. The Board will be asked to vote on the request at its October 26 meeting. Chancellor Kimmich also reported on CUNY's voter registration drive which reflects Federal and NYS Laws as well as BoF policy.

The Board approved a series of college budget items (none involving John Jay). Two academic programs were approved: a Bachelor of Technology in Computer Systems at NYCTC and a Master of Arts in Business Journalism at Baruch.

CCNY's Academic Governance Organization was amended by the Board, effective January 1, 1999, whereby CCNY's school of education will be moved into its College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. Each of CCNY's seven academic divisions will have its own dean, faculty and/or faculty council, and P&B committee.

Trustee Ronald Marino questioned why CCNY is proposing the merger of its School of Education while at the same time Queens College is proposing (as the next agenda item) to establish its School of Education as a separate unit. He questioned the lack of consistency in the two proposals and also noted that earlier in the day he received a letter from the CCNY School of Education



Board of Trustees September 28 meetina (cont)

faculty saying that they oppose CCNY's proposed reorganization. Trustee Marino questioned why the CCNY education faculty did not speak at the October 8 open forum of the Board Committee on Faculty, Staff, and Administration at which time the proposal was approved for action by the Board. President Moses said the proposed reorganization follows one and a half years of consultation on campus. The proposed reorganization passed (Trustee Marino voted no and Trustee Biswas abstained).

The proposed Queens reorganization is the creation of an additional (fourth) division: a School of Education. The school of education has been in the social science division. Pres. Sessoms said the plan is consistent with the fact that Queens' education program is the best in CUNY. The proposal passed unanimously.

The establishment of the Dr. Betty Shabazz Chair at Medgar Evers was approved. The NYS Legislature has appropriated \$200,000 for the chair for the 1998-99 fiscal year.

A modification in the salary supplements and titles for REM positions was approved, effective Sept. 1, 1998. The REM (Reimbursement supplement above base salary for excluded titles) will be: \$4,260-\$14,700 for titles of university assistant dean and university assistant administrator; the REM will be \$3,834-\$13,231 for titles of assistant dean and assistant administrator.

Also approved, effective September 1, 1998, are two visiting distinguished professors: Andreas Dress, Chemical Engineering, at CCNY; and Twyla Tharp, Music (Dance Program), at Hunter.

An added item: approval of opening and closing dates for the new Early Retirement Initiative: for faculty, the open period begins Nov. 3, 1998, and ends on Jan. 31, 1999. For eligible employees other than faculty, the closing date is Dec. 31.

Various construction projects were authorized for Brooklyn and Lehman and the Board approved a 10-year lease of 25,000 square feet at One Metro Tech for use by Medgar Evers College.

The Board then went into executive session to discuss real estate matters (concerning John Jay College).

Sept. 24 joint meeting of the BoT Fiscal and Academic Committees

On September 24, a specially scheduled joint meeting of the Fiscal Affairs Committee and the Academic Affairs (CAPPR) Committee was held to discuss a preliminary version of the budget request being prepared for vote by the Board at its October 26 meeting and submission to Albany in early November.

Chancellor Kimmich called the budget document a work in progress and explained that it counts the current base budget as a given and requests a 5% increase over the base each year for the next five years. This 5% increase is \$60 million and, therefore, the request is an additional \$300 million added to CUNY's operating budget over the next five years. He noted this is the first time CUNY is asking for a multi-year budget.

The Chancellor explained that the budget request, in its preliminary form, contains four assumptions: 1) this budget request begins the process of articulating and setting a long range vision for CUNY: CUNY's new Master Plan is due in 2000. 2) The multi-year approach parallels the Governor's 5-year capital budget allocation for CUNY which was approved by the Legislature last spring. Furthermore, the budget request does not ask for a set amount of money but, rather, requests an annual increase (of 5%) and thus this is a novel approach. 3) The budget request takes a thematic approach and, thus, is not the traditional laundry list that CUNY has previously submitted to Albany and this represents a significant cultural change. The purpose of this thematic approach is to permit the college presidents as much flexibility as possible and also provides a powerful case for CUNY to request and receive external funding. The thematic list is

Sept. 24 joint meeting BOT Fiscal and Academic Committees (cont)

illustrative and, thus, is not designed nor meant to box CUNY in. 4) To the extent practicable, the budget request aligns CUNY's priorities with New York State's priorities. The Chancellor said this budget document embodies the principle of our setting goals and measuring ourselves as a University by these goals. The final version of the document will contain a profile of each college to take advantage of colleges' special interests.

Vice Chancellor Mirrer said the budget request reflects the Trustees' emphasis on quality and on our belief that CUNY has turned a corner: first-time freshmen this term have significantly improved academically, based on both their high school records and their placement scores. Honors programs have been introduced at the colleges. She said we have a strong responsibility to have a strong core curriculum at every college both so that core courses are transferable throughout the University and so that all students receive the general education each student needs. The need to improve communication skills will be addressed by a new initiative in which doctoral students, after receiving training, would work at the campuses to assist in the Writing Across the Curriculum work of grading papers. Two collaborative programs with the Board of Education are proposed so as to support the Board of Education's need for a scholar enhancement program in mathematics and science and to train paraprofessionals to become teachers. The College Now program at KCC will be extended to all the community colleges. The budget request also calls for a 70%/30% ratio of course sections taught by full-time/adjunct faculty. The budget request also introduces the idea of hiring faculty in cohorts to build faculty strengths in specific academic disciplines so as to provide both an intellectual resource for the University and to also provide faculty in needed disciplines at individual colleges.

Vice Chancellor Rothbard said this budget request is unique in two ways: it seeks a multi-year (5-year) budget and it provides for flexibility. He said CUNY will be saying to the City and State that if we can agree upon a set of objectives and if the City and State agree that CUNY needs flexibility in terms of the way we achieve our goals and in terms of our timeframe, then 80th Street will have a dialogue with each college as to what each college needs in terms of funding.

In response to Chair Paolucci's question as to whether the Trustees will be part of the process of making the determination as to what each college needs, Vice Chancellor Rothbard responded that he would say that the Trustees should drive the process. Trustee Curtis asked how many colleges have already reached the 70/30 full-time/adjunct goal and was told that one college [Brooklyn] is almost at that level. As to Trustee Curtis' question as to whether it will take 3 to 5 years for all colleges to achieve that goal, VC Rothbard agreed.

Trustee Murphy praised the multi-year approach saying that in light of the Schmidt Task Force, Comptroller Carl McCall's report, the NYS Regents initiatives, and other external forces, a multi-year budget is excellent because it will permit CUNY to simultaneously work on its vision, mission, and structure.

In response to Trustee Babbar's question as to how the 5% increase was arrived at, VC Rothbard explained that such an increase would permit CUNY to cover mandatory costs and at the same time make real improvements and, furthermore, it is not an unreasonable request. In a follow-up question, Trustee Babbar asked whether we could ask for a larger increase, to which VC Rothbard said that every year we would reassess our situation and we could amend our budget request. Trustee Babbar noted that over the past ten years only four colleges have increased their

Sept. 24 joint meeting BoT Fiscal and Academic Committees (cont)

enrollment and VC Rothbard responded that the funding increases we are requesting are independent of enrollment.

In response to a question about the 70/30 goal, VC Mirrer said this goal of 70% course sections taught by full-time faculty is modest and that institutions we'd like to be parallel with have a higher than 70% proportion of course sections taught by full-time faculty. VC Rothbard added that CUNY's Master Plan expressly states the 70/30 goal not for individual academic departments but for each college.

Trustee Bernard Sohmer's questions about the item having to do with strengthening the core received VC Mirrer's response that the strengthening of the core is the job of each college's academic vice president and faculty and that this is something we have to do. Mr. Hollander spoke of the students' wish to have language included in the document about no increase in tuition, the need for increased financial aid especially for part-time students, and distance learning for those who are homebound. Chancellor Kimmich said tuition stabilization and financial aid will be put into the framework and that the 70/30 goal is for CUNY as an aggregate and is not necessarily the goal for each college.

Professor Kaplowitz noted that the first budget request draft, the budget framework released on September 7, included a request for funding to address the "structural deficits" of certain colleges and she noted that this language, which she had been pleased to see, is not in the current document. The Chancellor said that although it is true that language about structural deficits is not in this version, the increased funding being requested will be allocated in part to address structural deficits and funding inequities. Professor Kaplowitz also spoke in support of the 70/30 goal for each college, rather than for CUNY as an aggregate and noted that the campus flexibility being referred to about such matters can only be a reality if colleges have the real fiscal capacity of making such decisions as a 70/30 ratio, which is not now true for all colleges. She praised the appended charts, several of which show how small a percentage of course instruction involves remedial and ESL courses at every college and suggested an additional chart showing the current funding per student FTE at each college, since this reflects each college's fiscal capacity to offer full-time taught course sections rather than the choices colleges are making. She urged a goal of a fiscal level playing field for all the colleges, a goal to be achieved by adding to the base budgets of historically and inequitably underfunded colleges.

President Gerald W. Lynch (JJ) noted that some colleges are funded at \$4000 per FTE and others at \$8000 per FTE, with the average at \$6000 per FTE and he urged that enrollment be related to base budgets. President Marlene Springer (CSI) said that base budgets have been historically set and that if the 5% increase is added to the base budgets then the fiscal inequity is perpetuated. Acting Provost David Speidel (Queens), representing the president, said the Trustees should make the campuses the center of the budgetary process. President Leon Goldstein (KCC) praised the 5-year approach and the goal of flexibility, saying this is the first time presidents and faculty will have the chance to do planning on their own. Presidents Edison Jackson (Medgar) and Frances Degen Horowitz (Graduate School) also praised the five-year approach.

Comments about this draft of the budget request will be accepted through October 5. The next day a final version will be released, which will be the subject of a joint meeting of Fiscal and CAPP on October 7. On October 19, as required by law, a special public hearing on the budget request will be held. The Board will vote on the budget request at its October 26 meeting.

**Oct. 2 UFS Budget Comm. meeting with VC Mirrer & Director Malave**

On Friday, October 2, the UFS Budget Committee met for several hours with VC Louise Mirrer and Budget Director Ernesto Malave. The faculty at this meeting were Stefan Baumrin, Stanly Chu, Brian Gallagher, Karen Kaplowitz, Steve London, Cecilia McCall, and Bernard Sohmer. New language for the budget request document has been and is being written addressing many concerns and issues raised at and since the Sept. 24 joint CAPP and Fiscal meeting.

**External reviewers' analysis of JJ's Middle States Report received**

The external reviewers' analysis of JJ's 5-year mandatory Periodic Review Report (PRR) for the Commission on Higher Education for the Middle States Association will be used by Middle States when it meets later this Fall to consider John Jay's accreditation. The reviewers are John D. Haeger, Provost and VP for Academic Affairs, Towson University in Maryland, and Dr. Robert Secor, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs & Personnel, Pennsylvania State University. The report was issued on August 3 and analyzes John Jay's required report at the five-year mark after the Middle States accreditation review in 1993. The report was prepared by JJ's Comprehensive Planning Committee and by Dr. Dymna Bowles.

The reviewers praised four areas: the quality of the periodic report; the fact that the report was prepared by the Comprehensive Planning Committee, in light of the fact that the creation of a comprehensive planning committee was recommended by Middle States in 1993; the creation of the planning process: JJ's relationship with the branch campus and with Puerto Rico; and, in light of the high percentage of students needing remedial instruction and the "not particularly high" six-year graduation rates, the reviewers praised the College's expansion of academic support services for students, especially in the areas of advising, basic skill courses, and tutoring.

The reviewers found four areas of "significant strides" but where are additional challenges that await resolution":

1. Curriculum. While praising the development of new academic programs and the commitment to the general education core, the reviewers urge that one recommendation made five years ago by Middle States be reconsidered: "As an institution with strong professional programs, it is hard to imagine how curricula can maintain 'currency' without constant interaction with the professional community. We would, again, urge more formal external advisory groups in relation to the curriculum." They also recommend that periodic reviews, at least in terms of courses and content, take place more often than the current 10-year cycle.

2. Graduate Education, Research, and Scholarship. Noting that graduate enrollment has increased by 49% since 1993, the reviewers express concern about "major burdens" on the College as a result, including faculty loads. They praise the increase in external funding and the international programs and conferences.

3. Library and Technology. While praising the library as the premier criminal justice collection in the world, the reviewers' opinion is that there is not "significant planning" for the library of the 21st century. They also recommend a technology plan for teaching, learning, and research.

4. Outcomes Assessment. They praise improvement in institutional research (OIR) and the creation of an Outcomes Assessment Working Group.

5. Budget and Facilities. The external reviewers write: "If one theme dominates the Periodic Review Report, it is the lack of funding for JJC from CUNY central." The reviewers call John Jay's the per FTE student funding rate of \$4055 as "perhaps the most alarming" statistic. The reviewers criticize the resulting 55% of classes now taught by adjunct faculty and the similarly resultant deficits in technology, office space, student study space, etc.

**External reviewers' analysis of JJ's Middle States Report (cont)**

"In the absence of significant changes in System philosophy (ie the funding by CUNY centrally), the College must inevitably assess the wisdom of allowing enrollment to increase. It may be important for the quality of academic programming to reduce enrollment significantly. . . . Aligning budget to program realities and deciding a realistic enrollment strategy seems an absolute necessity in the near term."

The reviewers conclude with three formal recommendations:

"1. JJC should utilize outside professional expertise in the designing and updating of the curriculum. It might provide additional ties to the external community and provide potential funding sources for internships and fellowships.

"2. The College should consider developing a technology plan which projects needs and costs in developing a technology enhanced teaching and learning environment for the future.

"3. The College should develop an enrollment management plan which aligns program development, student enrollments, and funding. John Jay College may need to consider restricting admission to programs without additional funding from CUNY."

**Dean of Graduate Studies Provides doctoral program update**

On September 18, Dean James Levine issued a written update about the criminal justice doctoral program. The new Graduate School provost, Bill Kelly, has assured him that a central GSUC faculty line for JJ's doctoral program in criminal justice is a top priority of the Graduate School's administration. Also, a graduate student complex is being planned for T Building, including a lounge and computer lab. Fifteen new doctoral students have enrolled this semester. He also reported the conclusions of a Fall 1998 article in the Journal of Criminal Justice Education, "Assessing the Quality of American Doctoral Program Faculty in Criminology and Criminal Justice, 1991-1995," by Ellen Cohn and David Farrington, in which, based on the number of citations that appear in six criminal justice and criminology journals of the work of faculty members in 20 doctoral programs, and other similar measurements, John Jay's doctoral program is ranked last, that is, 20th out of 20 programs. John Jay's faculty had fewer citations per faculty than the faculty in any other criminal justice or criminology doctoral program. In his communication, Dean Levine states that there are flaws in this study: the inclusion of 30 John Jay doctoral faculty while only 20 John Jay faculty are really actively engaged in the program; the interdisciplinary nature of our faculty, which means that many never publish in social science journals, which is especially true of our forensic science and forensic psychology faculty, for example; also, authors of books are less prolific than authors of journal articles; the quality of faculty publications is not measured by the authors' criterion of number of citations; and the quality of faculty should be based on other criteria than solely publications records and he notes that "also to be taken into account are effectiveness of teaching, success in mentoring, and accessibility to students" and additionally, faculty who are practitioners provide other useful areas of expertise to students and "faculty quality is simply not synonymous with publishing output." Dean Levine concludes that "these shortcomings in the study notwithstanding, there may well be more than a kernel of truth to the findings: our doctoral faculty may not be publishing enough." He concludes: "we need to take a candid look at our performance in the scholarly area and figure out strategies for doing better."

ATTACHMENT B [B-1 and B-2]

Faculty Senate Tally Sheet to provide recommendations  
from the Faculty Senate  
to the Student Evaluation of the Faculty Committee

This is a scoring sheet for voting on the items presented in Version #1 and Version #2 and on the recommended changes (deletions, additions, revisions) submitted by members of the Senate. The tabulated votes will be presented to the Student Evaluation of the Faculty Committee as recommendations of the Faculty Senate, the official voice of the faculty of John Jay.

	Vote	
Committee's Proposed Version #1 [B-1]	Yes _____	No _____
Rating Scale: 1 = Poor, 2 = Satisfactory 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good 5 = Excellent 6 = NA	Yes _____	No _____
1. The instructor's presentation of the course was:	Yes _____	No _____
2. The instructor's method of determining grades was:	Yes _____	No _____
3. The instructor's clarification of difficult material was:	Yes _____	No _____
4. The instructor's interest in student success was:	Yes _____	No _____
5. The instructor's willingness to allow the expression of different points of view was:	Yes _____	No _____
6. The instructor's organization of the class lessons was:	Yes _____	No _____
7. Opportunity to demonstrate creative thinking was:	Yes _____	No _____
8. The instructor's method of dealing with student comments and questions was:	Yes _____	No _____
9. The instructor's motivation of my interest in the subject matter was:	Yes _____	No _____
10. Overall, the instructor's teaching in this course was:	Yes _____	No _____
Demographics (vote on the topic, not on format)	Yes _____	No _____
Required course? Yes No Not Sure	Yes _____	No _____
Expected grade in the course? A B C D F Not Sure	Yes _____	No _____
Total college credits completed at John Jay or elsewhere? 0-30 31-60 61-90 91-120+ Graduate Student	Yes _____	No _____
Student Status? Part-Time and Not Working Part-Time and Working FT and Not Working FT and Working	Yes _____	No _____
Credits taken this semester? 1-4 5-8 9-11 12-14 15-17 18 or More	Yes _____	No _____

	Vote	
Committee's Proposed Version #2 [B-2]	Yes _____	No _____
Rating scale : 1 = Never, 2 = Rarely, 3 = Sometimes, 4 = Often, 5 = Always, 6 = Not Applicable	Yes _____	No _____
1. Class lessons are well organized.	Yes _____	No _____
2. The instructor presents course material clearly.	Yes _____	No _____
3. The instructor effectively deals with comments and questions raised in class.	Yes _____	No _____
4. When appropriate, the instructor allows the expression of different points of view in class.	Yes _____	No _____
5. The instructor treats students with courtesy & respect.	Yes _____	No _____
6. The instructor is interested in students' success.	Yes _____	No _____
7. The instructor motivated my interest in the subject matter.	Yes _____	No _____
8. The instructor encourages students to think and reason for themselves.	Yes _____	No _____
9. The instructor's grading is fair.	Yes _____	No _____
10. Overall, the instructor teaches effectively.	Yes _____	No _____

Demographics: same as in proposed version #1

Recommended changes to Versions #1 and #2 submitted by Senate members

---

A. Additional questions recommended for inclusion in version #1 or #2:

1. The instructor is enthusiastic about teaching. Yes  No   
 OR, The instructor teaches with enthusiasm.
2. The instructor returned graded quizzes, tests, papers, and assignments soon enough to be helpful. Yes  No   
 OR, During the semester, the instructor has informed me about my progress and performance in the course, either by grades, comments, or personal discussion. Yes  No
3. The instructor's communicates effectively. Yes  No   
 OR, The instructor's speech and presentation are clearly understandable. Yes  No
4. The instructor shows thorough knowledge of the subject matter. Yes  No
5. The instructor generally meets the class on time and holds class until the end of the period. Yes  No   
 OR, The instructor meets the class regularly and punctually. Yes  No
6. Overall, the instructor is an effective teacher. Yes  No
7. I would recommend this instructor to other students. Yes  No   
 OR, Overall, I would recommend this instructor to other students. Yes  No
8. I would recommend this course to other students. Yes  No
9. The instructor spends the entire class period on instruction and course-related activities. Yes  No
10. The instructor maintains order in the classroom. Yes  No   
 OR, The instructor maintains proper order in the classroom. Yes  No
11. The instructor encourages and welcomes questions and comments from the class. Yes  No
12. The instructor has clearly explained the grading system for this course. Yes  No
13. The instructor maintains my attention in class. Yes  No
14. The instructor clarifies difficult material. Yes  No
15. The instructor's organization of the course and of individual classes is: Yes  No

B. Recommended additional section: questions which are not to be calculated in the aggregate score: Respond with Yes/No/Unsure

1. "Did you receive a syllabus at the beginning of the semester? Yes  No   
 OR, Did you receive an adequate syllabus (course outline) at the beginning of the semester? Yes  No
2. "Is the final examination for this course scheduled during Final Exam Week?" Yes  No
3. "Other than during class, was your instructor available, by phone or in person, to answer your questions or to talk to?" Yes  No
4. "Did the instructor begin and end class on time?" Yes  No   
 OR, Did the instructor begin and end class essentially on time? Yes  No
5. "Did the instructor miss or cancel many classes?" Yes  No

Recommended changes to Versions #1 & #2 submitted by Senate members(cont)

---

C: Recommended changes to Version #1 [B-1]:

- |   |                    |
|---|--------------------|
| 1. Change past tense to present tense (i.e. "The instructor's presentation of the course material is" instead of "was") | Yes _____ No _____ |
| 2. Delete question #7 in version #1 and substitute with question #8 in version #2.                                      | Yes _____ No _____ |

D: Recommended changes to Version #2 [B-2]

- |   |                    |
|---|--------------------|
| 1. Change question #9 to "The instructor has clearly explained the grading system for this course"                    | Yes _____ No _____ |
| 2. Delete question #6: it is impossible for anyone to know whether an "instructor is interested in students' success" | Yes _____ No _____ |
| OR change the question to "The instructor seems concerned about whether I learn the subject matter"                   | Yes _____ No _____ |

E: Recommended changes to the demographic questions:

- |  |                    |
|--|--------------------|
| 1. Put into full sentences; for example, "How many credits are you taking this semester?"  | Yes _____ No _____ |
| 2. Divide first demographic question into two: "Is this course required for the degree you are seeking?"   | Yes _____ No _____ |
| "Is this course required for your major?"  | Yes _____ No _____ |
| 3. Delete the question about the expected grade in the course because it will bias the student negatively if the student expects a low grade and positively if the student expects a high grade. | Yes _____ No _____ |

F: Recommended RATING SCALES (instead of the B-1 & B-2 scales]

Strongly Agree	Yes _____ No _____
Agree	
Not sure or Neutral	
Disagree	
Strongly Disagree	

OR:

Strongly Agree	Yes _____ No _____
Agree	
Not sure or Neutral	
Disagree	
Strongly Disagree	

OR:

Strongly Agree	Yes _____ No _____
Agree	
Somewhat Agree	
Somewhat Disagree	
Disagree	
Strongly Disagree	