

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES #24

John Jay College of Criminal Justice

Date: January 4, 1989 Time: 3:00 PM Place: Room 630 T

Present (29): Haig Bohigian, Jane Bowers, Orlanda Brugnola, Lily Christ, Lorraine Colville, Robert Crozier, Migdalia DeJesus-Torres de Garcia, Janice Dunham, Robert Fox, Mary Gibson, Donald Goodman, Lou Guinta, Jane Hurni, Karen Kaplowitz, Lawrence Kobilinsky, Richard Korn, Barry Luby, Nyamazao Maliwa, Rubie Malone, Ron Mason, T. Kenneth Moran, Mary Regan, Lydia Rosner, Herb Ryan, David Schulman, Natalie Sokoloff, Timothy Stevens, Charles Stickney, George Tulley

Absent (10): Jose Arcaya, David Brandt, Austin Fowler, Elizabeth Hegeman, Irving Klein, Sondra Leftoff, Robert Panzarella, Eli Silverman, Ben Sloan, Timothy Stroup

Agenda

1. Approval of the Minutes
2. Invited Guest: Student Council President Reginald Holmes
3. Announcements
4. Reports from Committees
5. Report from Faculty Senate representative to the College Calendar Committee & Discussion of College Calendar Committee's proposed changes in the class schedule: Senator Fox
6. Proposed Amendments to the Resolution on Honorary Degrees
7. Discussion of President Lynch's recommendations regarding the Resolution on Honorary Degrees: Report by President Kaplowitz of her January 3 meeting with President Lynch
8. Resolution on Faculty Meetings
9. Discussion of the Library's proposed changes in Inter-Library Loan Services
10. Discussion of policy regarding use of Room 630 T
11. Election of two Senate representatives to the College's Committee on Cultural Diversity and Pluralism
12. Discussion of proposal to recommend to appropriate College committees that issues of cultural diversity and pluralism be incorporated in the Personnel process and in Student Evaluation of Faculty process
13. Discussion of proposal to have teacher-of-the-year awards
14. Proposed Amendment to Faculty Senate Constitution
15. Declaration of a vacancy in membership, and discussion of action, if any, to be taken in response to resignation from Senate by At-Large Senator Altagracia Ortiz

1. Approval of minutes

The minutes of the November 14 meeting were presented for approval. A motion to approve passed unanimously.

2. Invited Guest: Student Council President Reginald Holmes

Student Council President Reginald Holmes said that the Student Council favors working with the Faculty Senate because of the commonality of interests between the two bodies. He discussed the need on the part of students to understand the faculty's interests and points of view, just as the faculty needs to understand the interests and points of view of the students.

Describing the Senate's invitation to him to report about issues of concern to the students as a positive approach, Mr. Holmes began his presentation by reporting that there is a small number of faculty who do not seem to be sensitive to student needs. Among the criticisms which he made of these individuals are the lack of sufficient student contact with professors (office hours that are not always posted or that are inadequate, telephone messages that are not returned, difficulty in scheduling appointments, etc.) and what some students perceive as prejudiced comments by some of the faculty toward certain students. Because most of the faculty are tenured, many students believe that they have no effective leverage or outlet of criticism against such individuals.

Mr. Holmes also spoke about the problem whereby some professors teach the same material year after year without making substantial changes in the content of their courses. He noted that these also were usually tenured professors.

In addition, Mr. Holmes noted the special learning needs of the CUNY student body and the occasional lack of faculty effectiveness in addressing those needs, and in that context asked that more emphasis be placed on the skills of all the students rather than on just the entering freshmen. Mr. Holmes stated that many students progress from course to course without their basic academic deficiencies ever being resolved.

Mr. Holmes suggested that the faculty identify those among their colleagues who appear to be using inappropriate language or who needlessly badger students which he described as an ineffective and insensitive way of communicating with students. In discussing ways to help students, Mr. Holmes noted the importance of increased involvement of faculty in student counseling and other support services, and the general need for joint student-faculty efforts to improve education at John Jay.

He concluded his comments by stating that as Student Council president he was open to working with the faculty and with the Faculty Senate on all these matters as well as on other issues.

Asked by Senator Stickney what he, as president of the Student Council, does when a student approaches him to complain of insensitivity by a faculty member, Mr. Holmes said that he encourages the student to make use of available administrative avenues for complaint. He said that his policy is to present the student with many avenues of action, allowing that student to choose among several alternatives, and that on occasion he has also set up meetings between the faculty member, the student, and the Provost.

President Kaplowitz said that she and the Faculty Senate's Executive Committee plan to meet regularly with Mr. Holmes and with the other members of the Student Council and that, furthermore, she and Mr. Holmes have agreed to discuss the specifics of these and other issues that are of concern to students and faculty.

3. Announcements

The special significance of the next two College Council meetings, on February 9 and on March 7, was noted because of the importance of passing the Senate's proposed amendment to the College's Charter of Governance whereby the Faculty Senate will be recognized as the official body representing the faculty of the College [see Attachment A]. The proposal to so amend the Charter was passed at the Senate's December 9 meeting but because the College Council does not meet in January, the proposed Charter amendment will be discussed for the first time by the College Council on February 9. Since this is a Charter amendment, it requires two readings, that is, discussion at one meeting of the Council before it can be voted on at the subsequent meeting.

President Kaplowitz said that this proposed Charter amendment is both important and timely because, having had its Resolution on Honorary Degrees passed by the College Council in November, the Faculty Senate is now responsible for nominating the candidates for the Committee on Honorary Degrees, for holding deliberations on the proposed recipients for the honorary degrees, and for voting to approve or reject the recipients proposed by the Committee on Honorary Degrees. Because of this, it is essential that the Faculty Senate be named in the College's Charter of Governance so that no one can challenge the legitimacy or viability of the honorary degree recipients on the basis of the "unofficial" status of the Faculty Senate.

She reminded the Senate that this proposed Charter amendment was put forth by a member of the Senate in response to Dean Barbara Price's contention, at the November 15 meeting of the College Council when the Resolution on Honorary Degrees was debated, that the Resolution should be rejected because the Faculty Senate is not an "official" body.

Other members of the administration had made similar statements and Vice President John Smith had told President Kaplowitz that he would not send copies of memoranda to her or to any member of the Faculty Senate, even when the memoranda are in response to issues raised by the Faculty Senate, because the Senate is an "unofficial" body.

President Kaplowitz pointed out that the Constitution of the Faculty Senate was ratified in May 1988 by a vote of 168 faculty in favor and ten opposed. In addition, President Lynch has met with the Faculty Senate twice and is scheduled to do so again in March and she, in her capacity as president of the Senate, was invited to bring greetings from the faculty at the November 17 convocation of the new building. In addition, the Faculty Senate has representatives on the College Calendar Committee, on the

Exemplary Programs Committee, on the College Space Committee, on the Committee on Pluralism and Cultural Diversity, on the Council of Chairs, and on the Budget Planning Committee. Furthermore, the Senate provides Better Teaching Seminars, Better Teaching Workshops, and Faculty Mentor programs.

Noting that the Faculty Senate is clearly an official body of the College, President Kaplowitz said that nevertheless its existence obviously needs to be named in the Charter of Governance, for the sake of those administrators who clearly demand such de jure status, and for the sake of the faculty and the students, indeed the entire College community, in whose interests the Faculty Senate operates.

4. Reports from Committees

The members of the Senate Elections Committee said they will report at the February meeting about procedures for electing the at-large members of next year's Faculty Senate.

5. Report from Faculty Senate representative to the College Calendar Committee & Discussion of College Calendar Committee's proposed changes in the class schedule: Senator Fox

Senator Fox, the Senate's representative on the College Calendar Committee, reported that the Committee had its first meeting on December 20, at which time Donald Gray, the Registrar, explained the proposed changes. The Committee will meet again on February 8. Questionnaires, which will be distributed during Spring semester registration to both undergraduate and graduate students, are being formulated to ascertain student needs so those needs can be taken into account in considering proposals to reduce the number of class periods and to change the times when class periods will begin and end. The Committee's next meeting, on February 8, will be devoted largely to studying the results of the questionnaires.

President Kaplowitz noted that one proposal has already been put forth by Provost Sexter [see Attachment B] and that this proposal was endorsed by the Council of Chairs on December 14. Senator Crozier (co-chair of the Council of Chairs) said that year after year the Council of Chairs has endorsed similar proposals to change the class schedule, but that because so many proposed alternatives are simultaneously put forth, all of the proposals collapse with no changes ever being made.

Senator Christ said that working students have difficulty in attending classes scheduled at 5:30 PM. Senator Sokoloff addressed the problems of faculty schedules if graduate and undergraduate class periods do not mesh.

Senator Fox said that Professor Pat O'Hara is designing the survey of the graduate students and that Registrar Donald Gray and another committee member are designing the survey of the undergraduate students. A question was raised as to whether the Committee would be reviewing the questionnaires before their

distribution at registration and the reply was that it had been decided that the Committee had insufficient time to do so.

Senator Rosner voiced concern about the scheduling of day/night courses. Senator Moran said that the new schedule would make the scheduling of day/night courses easier. President Kaplowitz explained that Senator Moran was elected by the Council of Chairs in December to represent the Chairs on the Calendar Committee and that the Senate, therefore, has the benefit of reports from both Senator Moran and Senator Fox.

Senator Moran reported that the 6th period would be more or less optional, in that it would be up to the discretion of each academic department as to whether or not it would schedule classes during this otherwise "free period." Another plan is to keep the 6th period as a free period and to make it only 50 minutes in length. He said that the probable alignments would be: 1st & 7th periods; 2nd & 8th periods; 3rd & 9th periods.

President Kaplowitz said that the 6th period meeting time is already so short that little can be accomplished in a single meeting and that this necessitates not only frequently scheduled meetings but often Friday all-day or half-day meetings to get work done. She said that the other proposal, to make the 6th period an optional class period, would undermine the faculty's ability to hold meetings as well as students' involvement in extra-curricular activities.

Rather than taking a vote on the proposal that the Provost presented to the Chairs, the Senate decided to wait for the results of the survey and for further reports from Senators Fox and Moran. Senator Fox noted that several proposals are expected to be presented to the Committee and Senator Moran said that the Committee is also studying the feasibility of a calendar whereby classes and final exams would end before Christmas.

President Kaplowitz pointed out that any change in the class schedule or the calendar must be approved by the College Council.

Senator Kobilinsky noted that last year's Calendar Committee had conducted a survey of the students such as the one about to take place, but no one seemed to remember what had happened to it.

Senator Brugnola asked about the proposed schedule's possible impact on adjuncts. Senator Crozier noted that it would probably lead to fewer adjuncts. Senator Sokoloff asked whether the proposed schedule might lead to fewer sections and to an eventual increase in faculty workload and class size due to a reduction of class periods. Senator Crozier said that we have to be very careful that the ramifications of a proposal that looks good do not in the long run render the proposal ill-advised and in the worst interests of faculty and of students. He urged that this issue be studied very carefully by the Senate.

Senator Guinta asked about problems related to both the percentage of students willing to register for 1st period classes and students arriving late to those classes. Senator Moran said that the data show that such sections are popular and that latenesses occur no more than at other class times.

Senator Fox and Senator Moran were also asked to report back as to the precise times that the morning courses would be offered, especially whether the first, second, and third periods would be the same as they are now, which would render the day an even longer one for faculty teaching day/night courses.

President Kaplowitz pointed out that the issues being raised by the faculty are, understandably, different than those raised by the administration.

6. & 7. Proposed Amendments to the Resolution on Honorary Degrees

President Kaplowitz reviewed the background. The Faculty Senate's Resolution on Honorary Degrees was passed by the College Council on November 15. At its next meeting, on December 9, the Faculty Senate determined that the minutes of the November College Council meeting inaccurately reported the Resolution as it had been passed. The Faculty Senate decided to correct the minutes at the December College Council meeting and to propose, as new business, additional changes. Although the minutes were corrected at the Council's December meeting, the proposed changes were tabled until the subsequent (February) Council meeting.

President Kaplowitz further explained that after the December meeting of the College Council President Lynch and Provost Sexter made recommendations to her about the Resolution on Honorary Degrees and that she met again with President Lynch the previous day. She asked the Senate to consider further amendments to the Resolution on Honorary Degrees which, if passed by the Senate, would be presented for the Council's approval on February 9. She then distributed a revised version of the proposed amendments [see Attachment C]. She also recommended that the Provisions for Implementing the Faculty Senate's Resolution on Honorary Degrees, which the Senate approved at its November 22 meeting, be presented to the College Council for its approval as additional amendments to the Resolution on Honorary Degrees [see Attachment D]. She explained that President Lynch has asked for a change in this document and she asked the Senate to deliberate on that also.

Senator Sokoloff and Senator Moran wondered if the ten-day period mandated in item #5 of the Resolution is sufficient. President Kaplowitz said that this was the one change President Lynch had requested the previous day. His reason for the request was to ensure an expeditious process because after the candidates are chosen, there must be sufficient time for approval by the Chancellor and by the Board of Trustees and then sufficient time to ask the approved recipients of the honorary degrees whether they will accept the degree and whether they are available to accept the degree in person, a condition which is mandated by the Board of Trustees.

Senator Moran suggested that the wording be changed to "ten class days." President Kaplowitz said that was exactly the issue President Lynch was addressing because he was concerned that there not be a hiatus of several weeks (for example, during the Christmas break or during intercession). President Kaplowitz recommended that the Senate accept this amendment for several reasons: it is important that the Faculty Senate ensure that the

process take place in a timely manner; the Senate could have ballots and envelopes pre-printed which would enable the mailing to be taken care of in a matter of the few hours it would take to stuff the envelopes.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the amendments to the Resolution on Honorary Degrees. The motion passed unanimously.

President Kaplowitz said that President Lynch requested the addition of the word "research" in item #5 of the Provision for Implementing the Resolution on Honorary Degrees [see Attachment D] because he was concerned that the original wording could result in requests by the Committee on Honorary Degrees that might be inappropriate and immoderate. She said that the term "research" was the result of negotiations as to who would have the responsibility for performing this work for the Committee on Honorary Degrees and she recommended that the Senate to accept the amendment. A motion was made to approve the Provisions for Implementing the Resolution on Honorary Degrees as amended and to present the document for College Council approval as additional amendments to the Resolution on Honorary Degrees. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

8. Resolution on Faculty Meetings

In explaining the rationale of the proposed resolution [see Attachment E], President Kaplowitz noted that the College's Charter of Governance mandates that the President of the College hold at least one meeting each semester with the instructional staff. She said that the resolution was an attempt to make this mandated meeting a more substantive one and to focus the meeting on academic issues. Senator Christ wondered if the resolution limited the President's right to call additional meetings at which only he spoke. President Kaplowitz said that her understanding of the purpose of the resolution, which was submitted by Senator Stroup, was not to limit the President's right to call as many meetings each semester as he wished but rather to have the one mandated meeting a semester be as useful and as informative as possible. Senator Christ said that the wording of the resolution needed to be amended to clear up this confusion.

Senator Ryan asked whether the College Council meetings do not already serve the function that the resolution is trying to address. In response, Senator Sokoloff stated that the ineffectiveness of the College Council in voicing College concerns meant that the President's meeting with the faculty was necessary as a forum where the faculty's concerns could be raised and where information important to the academic side of the College could be promulgated. Senator DeJesus-Torres de Garcia defended the Council's work. President Kaplowitz noted that the College Council meetings are quite different from the mandated once-a-semester meeting called by the President in that the College Council is composed of students, alumni, and non-instructional staff, as well as faculty, and because its monthly meetings are not meant to be attended by the entire faculty as is the once-a-semester meeting.

Senator Christ said that she supported the resolution and urged the Senate to approve it but suggested a phrase or a

sentence so as to ensure that these procedures would be met once each semester but that they not be required for every meeting the President might wish to call. Senator Sokoloff seconded Senator Christ's motion, which passed without dissension.

President Kaplowitz reported that at the Council of Chairs' December 14 meeting, Professor Basil Wilson (Chair of the African-American Studies Department) had asked that the Chairs explain the Honors Program, which he directs, to the faculty members of their departments so that the faculty can be sufficiently knowledgeable about the program to recommend students to it and to answer students' questions about it. She said that she told the Chairs about this resolution, which had just been submitted by Senator Stroup for the Senate's consideration, and that she had pointed out that the resolution provides for reports from directors of academic programs, such as the Honors Program, at a meeting of the entire faculty because such programs often need a forum for the exchange of information and for questions to be raised and answered. President Kaplowitz said that a motion was then made by one of the Chairs calling for the Council of Chairs to endorse this resolution and that the Council of Chairs unanimously endorsed the Senate's proposed resolution.

President Kaplowitz said that it was clear that the will of the Senate was to pass this resolution, with the amended language, but she said that the Senate, before voting, should determine whether to pass this as a resolution addressed to President Lynch, or as a resolution for the College Council's consideration, or as an amendment to Article III of the Charter of Governance which is the article that mandates that the President of the College meet with the instructional staff at least once a semester. A motion to table the resolution so that these three options can be considered at the next Senate meeting passed with no negative votes and with one abstention. President Kaplowitz said that she would provide, as an attachment to the next agenda, the text of Article III of the Charter of Governance as well as the reworded resolution.

9. Discussion of the Library's proposed changes in Inter-Library Loan Services

Senator Dunham and Senator Hurni addressed the Senate concerning proposed changes in the Inter-Library Loan (ILL) program as described in a November 10 memorandum from the Library [see Attachment F]. Senator Dunham said that she and her colleagues welcomed the faculty's viewpoint on the Library's services. Noting that the Library's move to the new building has resulted in the need to manage more physical space than before, she explained that the Library had also found that the ILL program had become unmanageable and needed revision. John Jay's policies affect not only internal but also reciprocal ILL policies insofar as any library that honors John Jay's requests must, in turn, have its requests honored. She said that the Library does not consider ILL requests for books inside the CUNY system to be reasonable due to the CUNY open-library system, whereby students and faculty have borrowing privileges at all CUNY libraries. She said that the decision to cease inter-library loan services from libraries in Manhattan had been done so as to conserve resources so that the Library's resources could be better expended elsewhere.

Senator Dunham explained that there are two parts to the inter-library loan process: outgoing requests to other institutions and incoming requests from other institutions. It is the latter part which is the most unmanageable aspect of the service. As a way of reducing its workload, the Library decided to not honor any incoming requests from within Manhattan. This decision made it, therefore, incumbent that outgoing requests be similarly refused. Nevertheless, because of objections raised by the John Jay faculty regarding this new inter-library policy, the whole matter is now under reconsideration.

Senator Dunham said that several matters must be taken into consideration. First, the new computer catalogue system contains not only John Jay's holdings but those of two other CUNY colleges, Baruch and Brooklyn. Since the library user now has knowledge that books are owned by those institutions, this discovery acts to overwhelm the inter-library system by encouraging borrowers to use the service more than previously. And the demand for inter-library loans is expected to increase as more and more CUNY colleges are put on-line. She noted that it should be remembered that all CUNY students and faculty have on-site borrowing privileges at all CUNY libraries.

Second, the inter-library loan system has been viewed by some faculty as a way of obtaining free photocopying services since ILL does not charge a fee for photocopies. Senator Dunham said that faculty have gone to other libraries, identified the materials they wanted, and then ordered them through inter-library loan to avoid the photocopying fee they would have had to otherwise pay. This is a practice which the Library wants to discourage.

Furthermore, she said that ILL is not used by many members of the faculty at all, noting that a couple of faculty members abuse the system and that a small number make regular use of it. She said the Library did not expect such a heated response to its memorandum partly because so few of the faculty avail themselves of the service.

Senator Dunham also noted that the Library is very willing to buy books to support faculty research, course preparation, and student work and that the Library is willing to process inter-library loan requests for material that is only available outside Manhattan. She said that the Library's initial position, as stated in the November 10 memorandum, was to refuse inter-library loan requests for material that is owned by other libraries located within Manhattan and to concentrate on obtaining international and interstate borrowings rather than local ones from libraries within the five boroughs. She explained that the Library's memorandum had been sent to the Council of Chairs for its deliberation, and to the Committee on the Library, and to the Faculty Senate.

As a result of formal and informal talks to date, the Library is in the process of modifying its original position possibly by processing ILL requests for material owned by other Manhattan libraries but with a cap on the number of such requests each faculty member can submit each semester. She added that exceptions to the cap could be made for faculty working under extraordinary circumstances. Senator Dunham said that the Library lacks the funds to support everything the Library would like to do.

Senator Goodman said that he appreciated the memorandum from a member of the faculty [see Attachment G] because it clarified the issue from the perspective of the faculty, especially those faculty in fields that do not fall within the mission of the College. Senator Crozier said that two-thirds of the faculty were being wiped out by the new policy as stated in the Library's November 10 memorandum.

Senator Bowers asked whether the modifications in the policy that were being contemplated meant that requests for material from other libraries in Manhattan are once again being honored. She also asked why purchasing a book was considered a viable alternative to borrowing it. Senator Hurni responded that the specifics in the modifications were not yet determined. In her capacity as the acquisitions librarian, she explained that the Library has an acquisitions budget and that material that is valuable to faculty or to students will be purchased. Senator Dunham added that many faculty think that the acquisitions freeze imposed on the Library at the time of the City's fiscal crisis was still in effect. She said that discussions prompted by the Library's memorandum had revealed that part of the reason ILL requests are made is that faculty do not realize that the Library can and usually will purchase books when asked to.

Senator Hurni noted that before the fiscal crisis, book purchase requests had to be made on special forms and that although the forms still exist they are no longer distributed to the faculty because the new technology enables the ordering of books with a minimum of publication information. She added that an advertisement for a book clipped out of a newspaper, for example, would provide her with sufficient information for purchasing it.

Senator Kobilinsky said that ILL is important to the research obligations of the faculty, especially for those in the natural sciences, and that it should be given a high priority. Saying that over the years the Library appeared to be offering fewer and fewer services because of budget constraints, he pointed out that at the same time, because of tenure and promotion policies, the faculty is expected to increase scholarly production. He said that inter-library loan services should be amplified rather than restricted and he mentioned a proposal he had made to have the College hire a runner, someone to go to various Manhattan libraries for the faculty. He said that the College administration has an obligation to support faculty research through ILL. Since the Library says that historically there has been comparatively little demand for ILL from the faculty, he asked what the problem was.

Senator Dunham responded that the problem lies in the tremendous number of requests from those few who do use the system. To the argument that the natural sciences need special consideration for inter-library services, Senator Dunham said that a better alternative would be for those members of the science faculty who do research to have direct contact with those libraries that have holdings that meet their needs.

Senator Brugnola said that the faculty needs telephone verification of the presence of books on shelves. She said that it is frustrating to go to another library that owns the material only to find it has been checked out. Senator Hurni said that the

CUNY Plus system does provide that information but that most of CUNY is not yet on-line although John Jay is. Senator Rosner spoke about the superior services of out-of-town libraries such as those in the community in which she lives and wondered if they could provide models for us. Senator Hurni said that it is the tremendous number of requests that creates a problem for John Jay, not merely the internal requests but the ILL requests from other libraries. She noted that whereas many people see our library as having small holdings in their fields, other libraries see ours as having unique and tremendous holdings in areas that they have virtually none. Senator Guinta wondered about ways of increasing "soft" money for the Library, perhaps in the form of a small percentage, perhaps one percent, of each grant to be allocated to ILL for faculty.

Senator Korn asked if the Library was still entertaining requests from other libraries within Manhattan. Senator Hurni said that these had been suspended and that the suspension had positively affected the Library's work load. Senator Korn wondered what the discussion was about since the policy had already been implemented. Senator Hurni said that it had been enacted as an experiment and because the Library felt it had to free itself of its overwhelming workload in some immediate way.

Senator Bohigian said that it was not the role of the Library to unilaterally establish policy in this area, but rather that of the entire faculty and the students, who should then put pressure on the administration to provide the Library with sufficient funding. He urged the Library, in rethinking the ILL policy, to establish a series of priorities and to ask for faculty support in achieving them.

Professor Jim Cohen, a member of the Committee on the Library (which is a committee of the College Council), requested a report from Professor Bonnie Nelson, the chair of that Committee. Professor Nelson said that research into ILL demands indicated that the bulk of requests were external, that is from other libraries for material from John Jay. She noted that this had not been realized when the new ILL policy was articulated and that it was discovered when the Committee on the Library asked for this and other data in order to study this issue.

Professor Nelson said that she and the other members of the Library recognize that it is not fair to penalize the faculty for external overuse but that it is impossible to refuse external requests from other Manhattan libraries and then to expect those libraries to honor John Jay's requests. The system is reciprocal. This is a problem that has no easy solution, she said.

Senator Stevens noted that the Committee on the Library met in December, at the end of the fall semester, and that it was the first time the Committee had met all semester. He said the members of the Committee, of which he is one, still need additional information for their deliberations and that such information was promised them for their next meeting, which will be in January.

Senator Crozier noted that the Council of Chairs had tabled discussion of this issue pending a report from the Committee on the Library and he moved that the Faculty Senate also table discussion until after the Committee on the Library meets again

and has specific information and specific proposals to report. The motion to table passed with 3 opposed.

President Kaplowitz said she would entertain a motion to invite the Committee on the Library to report to the Senate at the Senate's February 7 meeting. A motion to extend this invitation was made, seconded, and passed unanimously. Professor Nelson said that as the chair of the Committee she accepted the Senate's invitation and would report to the Senate on February 7.

10. Discussion of policy regarding the use of Room 630 T

Vice President John Smith has established a policy whereby Room 630 T can be used only if refreshments are catered. President Kaplowitz noted that Room 630 T is the only room sufficiently large (aside from classrooms) for Faculty Senate meetings. She reminded the Senate that the Senate's previous meeting, on December 9, was an all-day meeting and that it included a working lunch and that, therefore, the requirement that food be catered was not an issue when the Senate used Room 630 T for the first time for that meeting. (She also said that she thought that the requirement that the catering be done by the College's cafeteria was not the issue.)

President Kaplowitz asked if the Senate wished to challenge this seemingly obstructionist policy or whether it was the will of the Senate to enjoy the refreshments they would have to consume. If the Senate chose the latter course, she said she would ask for a volunteer to be responsible for ordering the refreshments for each meeting, collecting the money, and paying the bills. Asked how much the refreshments for the current meeting cost, she said that she had not yet received the bill for it.

President Kaplowitz said that President Lynch, who told her he was unaware of the policy until she brought it to his attention the previous day when they met to discuss the Resolution on Honorary Degrees, rejected her suggestion that the Senate be given a budget to pay for the mandated refreshments.

Senator Fox recommended that the Senate negotiate a compromise with the administration and volunteered to try to do so. Senator Korn, alluding to the tennis court down the hall from Room 630 T and to a meeting at another indoor tennis court two hundred years ago, made a motion calling upon President Kaplowitz to prepare a copy of the bill for the Senate, which would then decide what to do with it. The motion passed with 3 opposed.

A motion to adjourn passed unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 5:15 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Timothy Stevens
Corresponding Secretary

Jose Arcaya
Recording Secretary

Please note: Underlined material is to be added.

JOHN JAY COLLEGE OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE
CHARTER OF GOVERNANCE

ARTICLE III
THE INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF

SECTION 1. Meetings

The entire membership of the instructional staff shall be convened at least once each semester during the regular academic year by the President of the College to hear and discuss important issues affecting the College. Other meetings of the instructional staff may be called by the President of the College or by petition of any ten members of the instructional staff.

SECTION 2. The Faculty Senate

The Faculty Senate shall be the official body representing the faculty of the College.

PROPOSED CHANGE IN EVENING CLASS SCHEDULE

The Senate had been presented with an agenda item by Professor Betsy Gitter asking this body to study ways to improve the class schedule, especially the evening schedule. Her point was that the 7th and 10th periods are underutilized (with 7th period classes disrupted by late-arriving students due to the 4:40 PM starting time) and that there are, therefore, really only two viable evening class periods: 8th and 9th. She suggested that there be three evening periods, all of them viable, starting at a time when most working students could attend but not ending at an hour that is later than many students find feasible or safe.

In response to, or coincidental to, this November 22 agenda item (which an extremely lengthy agenda precluded the Senate from considering), a similar recommendation was put forth by Provost Jay Sexter. As a result, last year's College Calendar Committee has been reactivated and the Faculty Senate was asked to select a representative to serve on it. Any changes recommended by the College Calendar Committee must ultimately be approved by the College Council.

On December 9, the Faculty Senate decided to participate on the College Calendar Committee and elected Senator Bob Fox to represent the Senate's views and to report back to the Senate as to the Committee's deliberations and actions.

The College Calendar Committee met on December 20 and will meet again on February 8 (the day after the Senate's next meeting).

At the December 14 meeting of the Council of Chairs, Provost Sexter presented the following proposal which the Council of Chairs, after long and thorough discussion, endorsed. This proposal has not yet been formally presented to the College Calendar Committee but it is the one that the Provost says he plans to propose. The Senate should decide whether it wishes to approve of the proposal in principle, whether to approve of the proposal as presented, whether to reject the proposal completely, or in part, or whether to suspend judgment, so that Senator Fox knows the will of the Senate and can represent us accordingly. The following is the Provost's proposal:

	<u>Current evening schedule</u>	<u>Proposed evening schedule</u>
per. 7	4:40 - 5:55 PM	5:30 - 6:45 PM
per. 8	6:05 - 7:20 PM	6:55 - 8:10 PM
per. 9	7:30 - 8:45 PM	8:20 - 9:35 PM
per. 10	8:55 - 10:10 PM	

Material that is underlined is to be added; material in brackets is to be deleted. These proposed changes are amendments to the Resolution on Honorary Degrees as it appears in the corrected minutes of the November 15, 1988 meeting of the College Council; the minutes were corrected at the December 12 meeting of the Council.

Resolution on Honorary Degrees

Honorary degrees shall be awarded according to the following procedure:

1. Any member of the John Jay community may nominate a person for an honorary degree. To be valid, nominations for honorary degrees must be received by [a] the Committee on Honorary Degrees.
2. The Committee on Honorary Degrees shall consist of faculty nominated by, but not restricted to, members of the Faculty Senate and elected by the full-time faculty in a mail ballot.
3. The Committee on Honorary Degrees shall examine, on a confidential basis, the credentials of nominees for honorary degrees and shall recommend worthy candidates. The Faculty Senate will announce a discussion of candidates to be held at its next regularly scheduled meeting or at a sooner, special meeting.
4. At this meeting, the Faculty Senate shall, after deliberation, vote on the proposed candidates[.] and shall immediately notify all faculty of the results of those votes.
5. Within a month after the faculty has been notified, the votes of the Faculty Senate may be challenged upon petition to the Senate by 50 faculty members. If such a petition is presented to the Faculty Senate, the Senate shall [then] conduct a mail ballot, within ten days after the month has elapsed, of the entire full-time faculty, which may reverse any specific vote of the Senate by a two-thirds majority of those eligible to vote.
6. One month after the faculty has been notified by the Faculty Senate of the candidates it has approved, or after a mail ballot to reverse any decision of the Faculty Senate has been completed, the names of approved candidates for honorary degrees shall be forwarded by the Faculty Senate to the President of the College for his or her approval and [subsequent final] transmission to the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees[.] for their approval.
7. It will be the responsibility of the President of the College, or of his or her designee, to inform each candidate selected by the faculty to receive an honorary degree that he or she has been so selected.
8. The Committee on Honorary Degrees shall suggest to the President of the College which candidate shall be invited to deliver the commencement address, although it will be the right of the President to make the final decision as to who will be the commencement speaker.
9. The awarding of honorary degrees shall accord with the principles of pluralism and diversity to which the University is committed.

Provisions for Implementing
The Resolution on Honorary Degrees

1. The Committee on Honorary Degrees shall be comprised of seven tenured full-time members of the teaching faculty, who hold the rank of associate professor or above, each of whom shall be elected for a term of three years. Members of the Committee may stand for election to additional three-year terms, upon nomination by the Faculty Senate.
2. Upon a Committee member's inability to serve because of illness, leave, or cause, the Faculty Senate shall determine whether a special election shall be held to replace that Committee member.
3. The members of the Committee on Honorary Degrees shall elect the chairperson of the Committee, from among the members of the Committee.
4. All elections by the entire faculty mandated by the Faculty Senate's Resolution on Honorary Degrees (Resolution on Honorary Degrees items #2, #5) shall be conducted by the Committee on Faculty Elections, a subcommittee of the College Council.
5. Such research support staff and research services as the Committee on Honorary Degrees requires to fulfill its charge shall be provided by the Office of the President of the College, upon the request of the Committee on Honorary Degrees.
6. The Faculty Senate shall create a Faculty Senate Nominating Subcommittee. The function of this Nominating Subcommittee is to propose to the Faculty Senate those members of the teaching faculty whom the Senate shall consider for nomination to the Committee on Honorary Degrees.

- Approved by the Faculty Senate 11/22/88
and 12/9/88

November 10, 1988

TO: The college community
 FROM: The Library
 RE: Rethinking Inter-Library Loan Services

Periodically tensions arise concerning some aspect of library services. Currently the sore spot relates to ILL but it could just as easily have been something else. What follows is an attempt to go public not only with changes in policy, but with the context in which those changes are being made. We hope that by treating this particular service in the framework of services as a whole we can soften what some users will see as a blow, reveal the essentially reasonable nature of our decisions, and/or open the way to useful and collegial discussion of educationally defensible priorities.

The general setting

Given the incredibly rapid changes in the information environment, time honored virtues like resource-sharing and inter-library cooperation have moved from the rhetorically-desirable to the fantastically-attainable. With a few deft computer commands we can locate material in the Vatican Library as readily as in our own collections; different strokes can isolate data from files as voluminous as the US Census; it's no great effort to place orders, register complaints, and, of course, initiate and follow up on inter-library loan requests.

What then is the problem? Exactly what it has always been: resources fall short of demand. This issue is not moral or theoretical; it is economic.

The Library's Service Priorities

I. On-site Reference, Circulation and Reserve...

Obviously our highest priority with no distinctions made between status of client except in a crunch. When that does occur, we lean toward working with students and asking administration, faculty, and outsiders to hold back. Exceptions, of course, are always an option.

Involves library faculty and staff on all levels

Ideally, but not always in real life, the "top priority" for these services applies not only to physical coverage of the Reference Desk by Library faculty and of the Circulation Desk by support staff, but also to collection mainte-

RESOLUTION ON FACULTY MEETINGS

The Faculty Senate calls upon President Lynch to:

1. Announce the date of his meeting each semester with the faculty at large at least one month in advance; and
2. prepare an agenda for his meeting each semester with the faculty at large and distribute the agenda to all faculty at least one week before the meeting; and
3. include on all such agenda reports by the Faculty Senate; the Council of Chairs; the Professional Staff Congress; and the College's University Faculty Senate delegation; and
4. entertain the request of members of the faculty to be placed on the agenda, with requests from those faculty who direct academic programs (such as the Honors Program; the Advising Program; the Linkage Program; etc.) given preference (if time constraints is a factor); and
5. include on all such agendas a question period.

nance activities such as reshelving and shelf-reading...

While we never call non-faculty (almost never) into Reference Desk service on a pinch-hitter basis, in the not infrequently occurring Circulation and Reserve area crises, Library faculty have been known to charge out books, wrestle with equipment, and participate in efforts to get the books back on the shelves. We would be glad to hear from members of the John Jay community who would argue that these activities are not a suitable first priority, but it would be difficult indeed to persuade us...

- II. Bibliographic Instruction... Despite the fact that all classes were suspended for the Fall '88 semester, this is a very high priority. Our goal, never fully realized, is to reach all entering students with an introduction to the facility and to basic library tools and strategies; to introduce all English students in classes embarking on a "first" research paper to basic library methodology; to customize lectures for advanced courses at the point where research assignments are handed out; to familiarize graduate classes with state-of-the-art approaches to information and information technologies.
- Involves library faculty only, with occasional clerical assistance to prepare handouts

Falling short of our goals, we compromise with an ever-changing mix of handouts, workbooks and ingenuity. We'd like to do better. Group instruction helps students work independently with a sense of control rather than helplessness. It also cuts down on the need to answer the same reference question for each student in a class...

- III. Computerized Bibliographic Searching... As esoteric as this activity still seems, it is really a simple extension of Reference service. Instead of directing upper level students or faculty researchers to the print indexes that have graced library shelves throughout our lifetimes, we now have the choice of recommending on-line versions that can manipulate the files in ways that used to be impossible given the limited life-span of mortals such as ourselves. Because there is hardly a user-friendly file in this particular universe and because telecommunication costs are not to be believed, the Reference librarians must first evaluate a request in terms of its suitability for computer access, and then make an appointment to conduct the search in the presence of the patron so that the process can be refined as it moves through the
- Involves library faculty only

file. While this service is available to students, faculty and administration at no cost, its cost to the library in terms of dollars and time limits the extent of the program. Nevertheless we consider it well worth the balancing act it takes to maintain the service. Our students must learn what the potentials of such a research tool are even if it is not always on tap at the moment they feel the need.

Students, as implied above, are our first priority. They work on limited time-frames and we try to accommodate them (if the search is appropriate). Faculty are not denied but they may be post-poned. Here again, the librarian must pass on the appropriateness of the search.

Happily, expansion of the program is not only on the horizon, but the first pieces are already in place. Beyond the computer is the CD-ROM! This wonderful device looks like a computer, acts like a computer but is something else altogether. It is a compact disc that can contain, for instance, ca. ten years of Psych Abstracts. Since it operates without the benefit of a telecommunication hook-up, the user can experiment with it to his/her heart's content. The initial subscription cost (high) covers the basic file and bi-annual updates. No need to wait for a librarian to mediate between yourself and the data base - go right to it on your own. Currently we have access to Psychology and Sociology data bases. More will appear in time...

- IV. Inter Library Loan... Despite its relatively low status in our service priorities, we nevertheless feel very strongly that ILL is a vital service. Research of high quality requires access not only to convenient resources but to appropriate resources. When a home library cannot provide such resources on-site, it should be prepared to offer reasonable assistance in the interest of improving or providing such access. It must be noted, however, that ILL is a last step in the provision of access - not necessarily the best step and certainly not always an appropriate step. It may be helpful to go over what ILL is and what it is not in a general sense. ILL is simply an agreement between libraries to share resources, either through the loan of materials or through the provision of photocopies. The terms of the loan are set by the lending institution, ie libraries accept full responsibility for the sins of their clientele.

Involves library faculty to validate citation, support staff to search data base, initiate loan requests, maintain records, pack, mail, etc.

Limiting factors of some kind are always present: many kinds of materials are excluded from the shared-pool; some kinds of libraries may not be welcome as loan recipients; net lenders are apt to create explicit "caps" for particular resource-poor libraries or to resort to fees that discourage all but the rich and desperate. Service hierarchies according to the status of borrower are universal: many institutions exclude students from the bounty; other cast a cold eye on all but senior faculty and administration.

Here at John Jay we have moved from little demand in the 1970's, into a no-win corner by 1988. In the early '80s the library made the strongest possible commitment to an active ILL program by assigning arguably the most energetic member of the department faculty to expand the service with a promise that the expansion would be supported. Embracing each new technological advance, we extended an enthusiastic welcome to established researchers and encouraged hesitant scholars as well. We refused to ban undergraduates arguing that any student with needs that could wait out the arrival of a loan should be rewarded for good planning and foresight. And growth did indeed take place. Every year. That includes the years in which we imposed temporary bans during exam periods or put particularly active borrowers on an "allowance". We are now forced to admit that temporary bans and heavy-handed curtailments no longer work. The clientele is irritable; the providers of services feel abused and misunderstood. We must be very explicit at this point about what ILL at John Jay is, as well as what ILL at John Jay is not. We must define and spell out limits that will assure the fairest distribution of this very limited resource.

1. When does ILL become an option (you might ask)?

After a patron has ascertained that the library does not own a desired book or journal, the next question might well be: does the library own other material that can serve the need. If the answer is "no" we move along to other alternatives. At present, CUNY+ (our on-line catalog) includes the holdings of Baruch and Brooklyn College libraries; a slightly out-of-date union catalog can be consulted for other CUNY units. Having fought the good fight for many years, univer-

sity libraries are proud of a generous open access program for all but the Graduate Center and Mt. Sinai libraries and a reasonably arranged partial access to those places. With a validated ID any member of our community has on-site and borrowing privileges; computer searches can, in some instances, also be arranged.

We expect that persons living close to libraries in the outer boroughs will arrange to use proximate CUNY collections as necessary; we expect that other members of the John Jay community will in general consider CUNYb and NYPL in Manhattan as a kind of "quad" that contains numerous rich and valuable "branch" libraries. We are fortunate indeed that faculty in the Humanities can adopt as their own home base such collections as those at Hunter, Queens, or Brooklyn. Similarly, Science faculty can find a resource-rich home-away-from-home at CCNY or Mt. Sinai. It is hard to imagine any member of the Public Administration faculty who does not want and need to become comfortable with the resources and facilities of Baruch.

When CUNY cannot answer to a need we have other consortial arrangements that can be called upon. METRO cards can provide entry to a wide assortment of private and special libraries, albeit on a limited basis. In addition, collegiality can sometimes be brought into play to provide access not covered by formal agreements. Check it out with us.

Typically, an ILL loan becomes the option of choice only when all of the above have been exhausted.

2. Any exceptions?

Certainly, but not many. If a faculty member only needs one article from Brooklyn/Queens et al (this means, of course, that it is not also available in the "quad") we will certainly try to accomodate the request. If however, the need is for an on-going association with the Brooklyn/Queens et al collections, we will hold back. Under extremis we'll be kind but it would be kinder to your colleagues to do the holding back yourselves.

3. Who may use ILL services?

Naturally, the bulk of the interest in this service comes from graduate students and faculty. Graduate students will generally have priority but given the good will of the

From: A member of the faculty
To: The Faculty Senate
Date: November 29, 1988
Re: Cutting back of faculty Interlibrary Loan privileges

The faculty has been told that, because of lack of funds, the John Jay library can no longer support Interlibrary Loan (ILL) requests for publications available elsewhere in this borough. We are directed to use the other CUNY libraries in Manhattan and the NYPL for any research we need. (The NYPL, being a non-circulating library, is often not useful.)

Most of the books we request are, in fact, in other CUNY libraries, simply because their libraries are larger and more varied than ours. These better-stocked CUNY libraries, by the way, have not cut back their faculty's ILL privileges.

Indeed, these other CUNY libraries actively support faculty research, in contrast to John Jay, for they process ILL requests three to four times faster than this college did even before cutback. Before cutback, John Jay used to take one to two months to process ILL requests, devoting only eight hours a week to the whole college—to staff, administration, students and faculty. In addition, during every semester in the pre-cutback period, there were long weeks when John Jay faculty was not permitted to use ILL at all. The reason, we were told, was that the library needed to reapportion those eight hours periodically because of heavy student demands. There was no corresponding period when students were excluded from ILL to accommodate faculty needs.

It seems bizarre that we should have to explain to one college in a large research university why cutting back ILL from what was already a very limited operation has now seriously obstructed professional research—especially since that college's library has restricted holdings to begin with. It is equally bizarre in a university setting to have to explain why scholars must read in order to keep up with work in their disciplines.

We shall not, therefore, attempt to explain why scholars need access to ordinary library holdings. Instead, we shall mention one matter only: cutting back ILL will severely reduce our competitiveness for grants.

In the first place, to repeat a painfully obvious truism, grants are awarded on the basis of how proposed projects add to or improve existing research. Those of us who also referee grants know first-hand that one of the most common reasons for rejecting grant applications is that applicants have not built upon extant published work.

Secondly—and probably more potentially devastating—should funding institutions become aware that John Jay does not provide conventional library support, they may well turn their back on this college, no matter how good the individual scholars' research design may be. Grant proposals, as we all know, especially those submitted to the government, have a section requiring the applicant to discuss such matters as the home institution's library support. This section must affirm that the college provides ordinary (and in some cases, extraordinary) support to the scholar.

Traveling to several libraries all over the borough each week is now consuming the meager time and energy we formerly devoted to reading and

community on alternatives outlined in the previous sections of this memo, we should be able to take care of everyone with a legitimate need including undergraduates.

4. What isn't a legitimate need?

We hope that the research you are asking assistance with is your own and not a favor to a fourth cousin. We hope that the book you are requesting from Hong Kong will satisfy a need stronger than proving a point to an older sibling. We hope that you will respect the validity of our priorities. We don't plan to interrogate you or question your purposes...

Involves half the library faculty, 3/4 of its full-time support staff, 15% of its part-timers.

Priorities I-IV and beyond... There is no simple way to incorporate non-public service priorities into an array like this. All public services are made possible by a smoothly functioning unit that selects, orders, receives, catalogs, binds, and makes shelf-ready all of the materials in the collection. Every time members of this behind-the-scene cadre are called upon to step in for ailing or called-away members of the Reference/Circulation/Reserve staff, there is a price to pay. It is simple to recommend that some portion of this sizable human resource be shifted to this or that public service (ILL for instance) but it is always a troublesome maneuver and ultimately self-defeating as well.

.....

Questions? Comments?

writing. Anyone needing more than one publication usually has at least two, and often five, libraries to go to. Last week, for example, several of us each went to from two to five libraries, and each put in a half to a whole day travelling around Manhattan, searching books and xeroxing articles. In some cases we found that the items we wanted were not available—a fact that meant repeat trips with no guarantee of future success.

It should be underlined that in every case the publications we were searching for were ordinary in-print university press books and ordinary journals that other CUNY libraries own as normal holdings. This is one more reason why it is critical that John Jay faculty have minimally the same ILL privileges that faculty do at the other four-year CUNY colleges where library holdings are already more substantial than ours.

This kind of time consumption in traveling around the city to collect materials cannot go on. We have now given up such research for lack of time, and in fact, some of us ended up even worse off than before since the time consumed in traveling was fruitless. To exacerbate matters, cutting back ILL is going to undermine our publishing, for we shall no longer be sufficiently competitive for the prestigious refereed journals of our disciplines. And again, as we know too well, reducing the rate of publication in prestigious journals will further undermine our capacity to compete for grants.

The memo from the library states frankly that students' research needs come before those of the faculty. We do not accept this as evidence that the library is a devoted teaching institution (which we sincerely believe it to be) but, rather, as further evidence of how little the faculty is respected.

If the John Jay faculty is to be even minimally competitive with faculties in other CUNY schools and other universities, we must be able to have the kind of access that they, with their better libraries and their attendant ILL privileges, continue to have. Since grant deadlines are coming up in the next several months, it is essential that full ILL privileges be re-instated immediately, and that faculty ILL research have precedence over that of students.

We further state that, given the limited holdings of the John Jay library, the eight hours per week that the library formerly spent on ILL were insufficient. Since ILL requests formerly took from four to eight weeks to process, we urge that ILL support be expanded immediately, or within the next few months at most. John Jay cannot expect its faculty to write grants if it fails to give this faculty the same conventional support that other four-year CUNY colleges give to their faculties as a matter of course.