

Faculty Senate Minutes #271

Friday, December 10, 2004

9:30 AM

Room 630 T

Present (32): Andrea Balis, Teresa Booker, Marvie Brooks, Orlanda Brugnola, James Cauthen, Effie Cochran, Edward Davenport, Robert DeLucia, Kirk Dombrowski, Janice Dunham, Joshua Freilich, Konstantinos Georgatos, P. J. Gibson, Elisabeth Gitter, Heath Grant, Carol Groneman, Jennifer Groscup, Jennifer Jackiw, Karen Kaplowitz, Tom Litwack, Vincent Maiorino, James Malone, Evan Mandery, John Matteson, Jodie Roure, Francis Sheehan, Liliana Soto-Fernandez, Thalia Vrachopoulos, Alisse Waterston, Robin Whitney, Susan Will, Kathryn Wylie-Marques

Absent (5): Judith Hawkins, Kwando Kinshasa, Edward Paulino, Rick Richardson, Marilyn Rubin

Guests: Professors Ned Benton, Dan Judah, Marlene Kandel, Jose Morin, Catherine Rovira, Itai Sneh, Marny Tabb

Invited Guests: Dean James Levine, Executive Vice Chancellor Selma Botman

Agenda

1. Report and Announcements from the chair
2. Approval of Minutes #269 & Minutes #270 of the November 16 & December 3 meetings
3. Discussion of proposed Doctoral Program recommendations: Invited Guest: Dean James Levine
4. Discussion of the December 13 College Council agenda, with particular consideration of the Proposed Academic Integrity Policy and the Proposed Grade Appeals Policy/Procedures
5. Report on discussions about the proposed reorganization of the academic administration
6. Report on John Jay budget analysis presented to the College Budget Committee
7. Invited Guest: CUNY Executive Vice Chancellor Selma Botman
8. Discussion of the Draft Strategic Plan required by Middle States

1. **Report and Announcements from the chair** [Attachment A, B1, B2, B3]

CUNY Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Selma Botman [Attachment A] will be joining the Senate for lunch and informal discussion, after which the Senate's formal meeting with her will proceed. Affirmative action data newly released by CUNY was distributed about CUNY-wide faculty disaggregated by college [Attachment B1], about new CUNY-wide faculty hires disaggregated by college [Attachment B2], and about faculty at John Jay from 1991 through 2004 [Attachment B3]. These data were provided for future Senate discussion.

2. Approval of Minutes #269 & Minutes #270 of the November 16 & December 3, 2004, meetings

By a motion made and carried, Minutes #269 of the November 16 meeting and Minutes #270 of the December 3 meeting were adopted.

3. Discussion of the December 13 College Council agenda, with particular consideration of the Proposed Academic Integrity Policy and the Proposed Grade Appeals Policy/Procedures [Attachment C]

The agenda of the December 13 College Council meeting includes a Proposed Academic Integrity Policy, which was jointly developed by the Undergraduate Standards Committee and the Graduate Studies committee. The proposed policy is John Jay's implementation of the CUNY Policy on Academic Integrity, which was approved by the Board of Trustees in June. Senator James Cauthen proposed language changes in those parts of the proposed policy that describe the plagiarism prevention service the College subscribes to, Turnitin.com, and the use of that service [Attachment C]. Senator Cauthen explained that he consulted with Senator Francis Sheehan in developing the recommended amendments. Having researched Turnitin.com and having taught faculty to use it, Senator Cauthen said the proposed language changes are necessary and he explained each of the proposed changes [Attachment C]. Senator Francis Sheehan, who also researched Turitin.com and taught the faculty to use it, called the proposed changes necessary.

The proposed changes were approved by unanimous vote and President Kaplowitz was directed to move these amendments, on behalf of the Senate, at the College Council meeting. She said she would alert President Travis, who chairs the College Council, and Associate Provost Kobilinsky and Dean Levine, the chairs of the two committees, so they won't be blindsided at the College Council meeting. She said she will also email them the proposed changes so they can review them prior to the Council meeting. Senator Cauthen was thanked for his close textual review of the proposed policy and Senator Sheehan for working on this.

Also on the Council agenda is a proposed Grade Appeals Policy/Procedure. This is not a new policy or procedure but rather a codification of current policy and procedure as a way of making the implementation of the policy uniform throughout the College. Senator Sheehan raised a series of issues about the wording of the document, including wording that would create a substantive change in policy because students would be able to avoid the departmental appeals step simply by delaying their grade appeal beyond one year. President Kaplowitz said the document that's on the Council agenda is not the document that had been approved by the Standards Committee, because that error had been identified and was to have been corrected. Senator Sheehan identified other errors. The Senate approved Senator Sheehan's proposed amendments to the Grade Appeals Policy/Procedure and authorized President Kaplowitz to move these amendments, on behalf of the Senate, at the College Council meeting. She said she would alert President Travis and Associate Provost Kobilisky about this, so they won't be blindsided, and would email them the proposed changes prior to the Council meeting. Senator Sheehan was thanked for his work.

Senator John Matteson asked whether the burden of proof in the grade appeals process is

on the faculty member. He explained he is asking because the faculty member may have thrown out exam books after a year. Some Senators said that student work must be saved two years, others said three years, others said one year, and yet others had not known there is a requirement to save student work for a period of time. It was agreed that the fact that this information is not known should be communicated to the appropriate administrators who should be requested to provide information to the faculty. Senator Andrea Balis asked what is expected of adjuncts, in terms of keeping student work if, for example, the adjunct does not have adequate office space or if the adjunct is no longer teaching at the college. It was suggested that it is the departments' duty to keep the student work in such cases. Senator Brugnola said this would be difficult for departments, like English, which has 100 adjuncts, and it was agreed that the College needs to further consider the logistics of grade appeals for adjuncts and for students in courses taught by adjuncts.

4. Discussion of the Proposed Doctoral Program Recommendations: Invited Guest: Dean James Levine [AttachmentD]

Dean of Graduate Studies and Research James Levine was welcomed. He expressed his appreciation at having been invited and noted that the document distributed to the Senate [AttachmentD] has already been amended in the interim since he gave Karen a copy. He explained that within a week of President Travis' arrival at the College last summer, he had briefed President Travis about problems and challenges associated with doctoral education such as the lack of money for doctoral students and the fact that faculty teaching in the doctoral program are stretched too far. President Travis asked for proposals to resolve the problems and so a series of meetings took place between Todd Clear, the executive officer of the criminal justice doctoral program, and Barbara Stanley, the executive officer of the forensic psychology doctoral program, and himself, as dean of graduate studies and research, which resulted in these proposals.

The proposals are both to enhance doctoral education and also to improve and facilitate and enforce the research agenda of the College and to, hopefully, enhance one part, at least, of the undergraduate curriculum. The three of them and President Travis decided that the discussion had to be broadened to include doctoral faculty and the chairs of those departments that would be significantly affected by a rather dramatic change in the way the 101 courses are taught. And so a series of meetings is taking place. There is no question, he said, that the document the Senate has will be significantly amended before it comes even close to reality.

The gist of the proposals, he said, is to provide resources so we can recruit some of the really top doctoral students. And, he added, the only way we can convince them to come, at least if we're talking about full-time students, is with financial packages. Routinely, in the criminal justice doctoral program, which he headed for six years, we lose fine people whom we accept into the program because we can't give them stipends and often can't even give them tuition. To address that problem the proposal is to use some non-tax levy money in addition to a strategic use of Graduate Center resources to support these students. It can only happen for prospective students because it is way beyond our means to do this for current students.

The second idea is to use our doctoral students in the classroom in a way that both enhances their learning of how to be teachers as well as, hopefully, enhancing the learning experience in our Psych 101 and CJ 101 classes. Those sections are largely taught by adjuncts

and by doctoral students, some of whom are just out of undergraduate school, who are simply thrown into the classroom with a syllabus and told to teach. The notion is that this is not necessarily the best way for our freshman and sophomore undergraduate students to learn and, perhaps, could be improved. He added that he said “perhaps” because this could be totally wrong. Research was conducted through Richard Saulnier’s Office about who teaches our freshman and sophomores and the answer is that the overwhelming majority of our freshman do not see a single full-time member of the faculty, which he called a real shame and a real slight to their education. So the notion is to excite some full-time faculty, especially those known for teaching prowess, to teach large lectures – which is contrary to the John Jay tradition of small classes, he knows – and then to have recitation sections conducted by carefully supervised doctoral students. There’s nothing all that new in this approach, he acknowledged.

A third piece of the proposal is to imagine a cadre of faculty – there is no question, he said, that they will get rid of the notion of “core faculty,” saying that was ill-chosen language implying different classes of citizenship in doctoral education which was not intended – and this cadre of faculty would be the worker bees of the doctoral programs. There is an enormous amount of drudgery, of scut work, such as written and oral examinations, serving on a whole set of doctoral committees on curriculum, admissions, and so forth, which can be very satisfying but also very time consuming. These are an additional set of assignments for doctoral faculty. So the idea is to provide some faculty – there are no numbers attached to this – with reassignment of some of their teaching load so they can take on these tasks and so they can be routinely available for mentoring. This need is particularly pronounced in the criminal justice doctoral program, which partly by design and partly not, has grown to 160 doctoral students. The need for mentoring these large numbers of students, especially as they move toward the dissertation stage, is really a challenge. If done right, these are very demanding assignments. Dean Levine said that if these proposals are implemented correctly, the faculty identified for this work will know that this is work they are required to do, that it is part of their total teaching package. He called the proposed recommendations a work in progress.

Professor Ned Benton praised the spirit of this proposal. However, he said he has several questions for which he would appreciate more information. He said that the psychology and criminal justice doctoral programs are quite different and questioned treating them as if they are the same. Furthermore, he said he knows many quite extraordinary doctoral students who would have no interest in a financial package because it would cut their salary as full-time professionals from \$70,000 to \$12,000. In many cases these are people holding significant policy positions who have the ability to complete their doctoral work fairly quickly. He said to tell such people to give up their full-time salary because only full-time students may enroll in the doctoral program would mean losing those students. He called the idea that only students who take a vow of poverty may henceforth enroll in doctoral study with us an idea that simply does not make sense.

Professor Benton also warned that the fiscal analysis is not an accurate one, either in terms of the cost of the initiatives or in terms of the money to be saved. His third concern is about the large lecture classes. He said he has yet to see any analysis that shows that large lecture classes would result in any savings. If a faculty member is credited with, for example, three classes for teaching a large lecture course, there are no savings accrued. He said it’s important to lay out just what these proposals mean for the College, what they mean in terms of facilities and space, what they mean in terms of writing across the curriculum, in terms of the workload implications. There may be aspects of the proposal that are good but we shouldn’t make assumptions, we should do the analyses.

Senator Betsy Gitter said she had a rather angry reaction on a number of levels when she read the document. She said that the 2-2 teaching load particularly angered her. The Graduate Center teaching load, except for distinguished professors, is higher than 2-2. Graduate Center faculty teach an ordinary load. Are we saying, she asked, that John Jay faculty who teach in the doctoral programs housed at John Jay are somehow more fragile than our John Jay faculty who teach at the Graduate Center in other doctoral programs and who teach the regular teaching load.

Then there is the question of collegiality. Is this, Senator Gitter asked, a good moment in the history of the College to undermine collegiality by making people feel like second-class citizens, a moment when people are already feeling insecure about their position at the College, who are already wondering if we're going to have a three-tier system, like Plato's *Republic*, except in our system the philosophers will be at the very bottom, along with other drones who have no major and who simply do service labor. And then we'll have the major departments who will be like the soldiers in the *Republic*, who will be in the middle tier. And then at the top will be a select group who do less labor but who presumably operate at a higher intellectual level.

Senator Gitter identified her favorite department in the College as the SEEK Department, whose members she regards as the unsung heroes at the College, who do a fabulous job, who take care of every student, who don't whine, who are good to each other, who care about the things that make John Jay meaningful to her. Every student whom she has taught who comes from SEEK is in good psychological shape. If she were to give any goodies to anyone in the College she'd give them to the SEEK Department before she'd give them to faculty who are teaching doctoral students in small classes. She said everyone works hard. This is New York City where everyone works hard. She asked to be shown anyone in this room who doesn't work hard. She called it offensive to single out doctoral faculty as the people at the College who work hard.

Senator Gitter called the timing of this proposal extremely poor. If there's a time when faculty who want majors have them, if there's a time when all faculty have opportunities to teach courses that are exciting and meaningful to them, if there comes a time when we have more full-time faculty so that the same faculty aren't serving on countless committees and writing countless reports – when that time comes, we may feel a greater spirit of magnanimity to the doctoral program, she said, adding that she is not alone in her reaction.

Senator John Matteson said his major concern is about writing instruction at the College, and he asked a question about writing instruction for freshmen and sophomores in large lecture classes, especially about the way writing across the curriculum would be addressed if large lecture classes and doctoral student-taught recitation sections were, indeed, adopted. He said not only faculty but students regularly express concern about the level and effectiveness of writing instruction here.

Senator Alisse Waterston said her experience is that students in large lecture courses easily become turned off and disengaged. Senator Jodie Roure said she agrees with Betsy Gitter's comments and, in addition, reported that her experience in recitation classes, which were supposed to supplement large lecture classes at Rutgers, was that the recitation sections, which were taught by doctoral students, were horrendous. She also said that the doctoral program is one part of the College which needs to improve the diversity of its students and that needs to be a priority.

Senator Jennifer Groscup said that, as someone who is part of the Psychology Ph.D. Program, she responded positively to the memo from Dean Levine, especially the proposals about providing support to students. She said she understands the concerns about large classes but thinks that with thoughtful organization these courses can be done well. She said she does have questions about “core faculty” and about concerns already expressed about differential levels of faculty. She said that perhaps it would be better instead of identifying a core group of faculty to instead compensate faculty who mentor doctoral students.

Senator Orlanda Brugnola spoke about own her experience as a student in large lecture classes, saying that the small discussion sections were terrible and that many students did not attend the lectures, but instead purchased the class notes. She also questioned whether doctoral students are really able to do a good job teaching our undergraduate students. Senator Robin Whitney said she was *sorry* to see that the proposals made no mention of adjuncts, many of whom are practitioners as well as academics and who garner respect from students for that reason, and she also was disappointed by the negative attitude toward adjunct faculty during the presentation of the proposals.

Dean Levine said he takes all the comments as constructive and will respond at a different time as he has been told by Karen that Vice Chancellor Botman is about to arrive, President Kaplowitz thanked him for consulting with the Senate at an early stage of deliberations.

5. Report on discussions about the proposed reorganization of the academic administration

President Travis will not be implementing his plans for reorganizing the academic side of the administration. President Travis agreed with the faculty leadership that the administration proposals would require amendments to the College Charter. Charter amendments require an affirmative vote of 75 percent of College Council members present and voting and the faculty hold 50 percent of the College Council seats. Because the faculty, certainly the faculty on the Faculty Senate and College Council are, without exception, in disagreement with the proposed restructuring of the academic side of the administration, the necessary Charter amendments would not garner the necessary votes. Therefore, the proposed restructuring has been jettisoned by the administration.

Some changes will take place, but they are mostly changes in titles. The College will continue to have a graduate dean, although the title will change from the current title, dean for graduate studies and research, to the title of dean for research and graduate studies, to signal the added emphasis on research. There will be no divisional deans and, thus, the department chairs will continue to report directly to the Provost and not to divisional deans. There will be a dean of professional studies, which will replace the position of dean for special programs. There will be a director for academic support services, an expansion of the current position of director of freshman services. The position of senior policy analyst is new. And two new higher education officer (HEO) positions are being created: academic director of graduate studies, reporting to the dean of graduate studies, and academic director of undergraduate studies, reporting to the dean of undergraduate studies.

6. Report on John Jay budget analysis presented to the College Budget Committee [Attachment E]

At the December 3 College Budget Committee meeting, chaired by President Travis, Vice President for Finance and Administration Robert Pignatello distributed and presented a series of charts [Attachment E], which provided an evaluation of John Jay's expenditures by major purpose in comparison to those of the other senior colleges, using the FY04 University Expenditure Report, which had recently been published by the CUNY Central Administration.

These expenditures are based upon last year's tax levy expenditures, which in John Jay's case include our base budget of \$38,027,700 as well as \$8,803,600 in additional supplements and lump sum allocations, and also \$7,126,015 in CUTRA funds (tuition overcollection as a result of student enrollment in excess of the revenue target assigned to John Jay by CUNY). The charts developed for last week's Budget meeting show the percent of John Jay expenses in relation to those expenditures at all senior colleges and also provide a comparison of our expenditures per FTE (full-time equivalent student) to those of the average senior college.

To understand the charts [Attachment E], it is necessary to know that the categories are by major purpose, which are established and defined by the University as follows:

Instruction and Departmental Research: academic departments constitute Instruction while Instructional Support comprises the office of the provost, graduate and undergraduate deans, tutoring, the writing center, and related units; within this is the sub-section call organized research.

Academic Support: media services and the library

Student Services: office of the vice president for student development and dean of students, registrar, admissions, counseling, financial aide, career development, and so forth

Maintenance and Operations: custodial, maintenance, labor, trades, facilities planning

General Administration: president, administrative affairs, public relations, business services, and other offices that support the general management

General Institutional Support: security, print shop, mail room, instructional technology, and other technical support area

SEEK Program: counselors and tutoring coordinator

7. Invited Guest: Executive Vice Chancellor Selma Botman [Attachment A]

Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Selma Botman was welcomed and invited to describe her vision for CUNY. She explained that she joined CUNY during the summer and after reviewing her scholarly and administrative experience said that nothing is more important than student success and that teaching and research have to be priorities to ensure student success. She described a number of initiatives that she is overseeing.

Senator Carol Groneman gave an overview of the kind of institution John Jay has grown to be. Various faculty described College programs to demonstrate to VC Botman that John Jay is unique within CUNY and that the College is engaged in critically important work. Professor Ned Benton spoke about the public management and inspector general programs; Senator Heath Grant described College initiatives related to Homeland Security. Senator Jodie Roue spoke about efforts to reach underserved communities of students. Professor Jose Luis Morin spoke

about the honors program offered by the Department of Puerto Rican/Latin American Studies. VP Kirk Dombrowski spoke about the flourishing of the Anthropology Department and then described the massive growth in student enrollment in recent years, noting that John Jay could use support from the Central Administration as it makes a transition from one kind of college into becoming another. VC Botman suggested that we should look for a sister campus within CUNY which may have already made this kind of transformation and which might, therefore, serve as a model for John Jay. Senator Francis Sheehan spoke about forensic science and cutting edge work being done. Senator John Matteson spoke about the opportunity the English Department envisions for creating a center for the study of literature and law at John Jay. He also spoke about the importance of teaching our students the joy of learning things they may not think they have to know. Vice Chancellor Botman seconded this idea. [Because of a lack of time, it was not possible for Professor Marny Tabb to speak about the Justice Studies program but she availed herself of her attendance at the Senate meeting to email Vice Chancellor Botman about the program.]

Vice Chancellor Botman expressed appreciation at having been invited and about having been afforded the opportunity to learn much more, at this first visit, about John Jay than she had known. The Senate expressed its appreciation with applause.

8. Discussion of the Draft Strategic Plan

Senator Marilyn Rubin was unable to attend today's meeting but sent her proposed language about access for consideration by the Senate, as she offered to do at the Senate's December 3 meeting. Before discussion began about the proposed language, Professors Jose Luis Morin and Timothy Stevens distributed a joint statement written by them to the Faculty Senate. President Kaplowitz asked Professor Morin to summarize the statement. He explained that in response to criticism of our current Draft Strategic Plan by an outside consultant, which took place this past week at the most recent meeting of the Comprehensive Planning Committee (CPC), he and Professor Stevens are asking the Senate to request President Travis to form a small but diverse group of committed members of the College community and charge them with formulating a vision statement for the College. He said he and Professor Stevens are asking for a halt to the drafting of the strategic plan because the process under which it has been drafted thus far is so flawed that it is at a stalemate. He explained that the consultant had told the CPC that the process of developing a strategic plan can't be rushed and that the College community must have sufficient time to have the necessary discussions. He said the consultant also said he had found the draft plan lacking a guiding vision for the College.

Senator James Malone said that because most Senators had not heard the statements by the consultant, Michael Dolence, we should not react to them unless he comes to the Senate to present his views. Senator Tom Litwack said that the consultant had been brought to John Jay as an expert on enrollment management, not as an expert on strategic planning.

Senator Malone said that by proposing that the Senate take up their proposal, Professors Morin and Stevens are asking the Senate to jettison its own agenda. Professor Morin said that their proposal is related to the agenda item, which is a discussion of the draft strategic plan for the College, and that it resulted from new information about the strategic plan.

President Kaplowitz noted that we all find ourselves in a difficult situation that is not of our making: Middle States sent a letter to the College in July 2003 requiring three planning

documents by April 2005; in other words, Middle States gave the College almost two years to do this **work** but because the process wasn't truly begun until June 2004, a year after the letter was received and less than a year before the deadline, in trying to meet the deadline set by Middle States we find ourselves in a rushed situation that is creating tremendous anxiety and we are witnessing our College community for the first time in a very, very long time, becoming divided against itself.

Senator P. J. Gibson agreed saying that this sense of urgency is eroding the sand under our feet adding that once we get this document on paper, nothing is to say that we will not be married to it forever and people are understandably anxious about it. President Kaplowitz urged the Senators and other faculty to assume good faith on everyone's part and to resist divisiveness.

Professor Morin explained that his main concern is that students have not yet been integrated into the strategic planning process. Senator Effie Cochran said the tone of the draft strategic plan is its major problem. Senator Malone said that Professor Morin's and Stevens' statement proposes another committee to duplicate the work of the Comprehensive Planning Committee, and since the two authors are already on the Comprehensive Planning Committee, this statement should be brought to the Comprehensive Planning Committee, not to the Senate.

Senator Robert Delucia said he wants to take issue with Professor Morin's claim that the process is at a stalemate. He said the CPC is making headway and, furthermore, he feels privileged to be a member of that Committee. Senator Tom Litwack said that he had asked several meetings ago at the CPC that an extension of the Middle States deadline be requested and he would be willing to ask again. President Kaplowitz said that when she described these problems to President Travis five weeks ago, he said he is not willing to request an extension. She said it is possible that during the past five weeks he had reevaluated the situation, although she doubts it.

She added that Senator Rubin, who teaches strategic planning, told her that when she heard the consultants remarks she was in strong disagreement with them and that from what she has heard the consultant had not given sufficient reasons for his views. Senator Litwack said that although he is not the most objective observer in the world, there are two major reasons why he disagrees with the consultant. The first major reason is that he thinks the current draft already sets out a vision for the College. He added that if President Travis is not willing to ask for an extension then we will not have time to properly debate the substance of the document, including the suggested actions. President Kaplowitz said that since President Travis had not made any initial criticisms of the first draft, she had assumed that he, who is someone who has done strategic planning in his professional career, considers this to be a viable document.

Senator James Cauthen said he agrees that since this is going to be the defining document for the College, it is important for it to be an excellent document. Senator Jennifer Groscup said that it might be good to get more time to discuss this, but she thinks we are not that far from having a good document. Senator Malone said he is a stickler for procedure, because procedure keeps us honest. Since our procedure has been to delegate the drafting of the strategic plan to the CPC, we should let them deal with the Morin/Stevens document. Senator Balis said she had never seen the College community so exercised about any issue as about this draft plan.

Professor Morin said that what we have is a document that it is still missing its essence, its soul, because we have not reconciled the two major parts of our mission, the liberal arts part

and the criminal justice part, adding that we need open forum discussions of the draft documents. Senator Jodie Roure asked whether President Kaplowitz had asked President Travis for his opinion about the document. She replied that she had been at the CPC meeting that President Travis attended and that President Travis had said nothing at that meeting about any reservations he might have had about the document. Indeed, when the CPC voted to distribute the draft to the entire College community, President Travis' decision to not speak against that motion indicated, to her mind, his affirmative support of not only that decision but of the document itself.

Senator Litwack moved that the Senate call upon President Travis to seek an extension of the Middle States deadline. Senator Wylie-Marques seconded the motion. President Kaplowitz said that it is not the Senate's place to seek an extension because the Senate is not the body responsible for developing the draft plan. Because quite a number of Senators are on the CPC it may seem as if we are responsible but the CPC comprises about 25 members with only five members who are representatives of the Senate. Senator Susan Will said while that is true, we do not want to submit a Plan that is not fully developed and vetted. Senator P. J. Gibson agreed.

President Kaplowitz offered a compromise plan of action. She said that were the Senate to ask President Travis to request an extension, the Senate would be bypassing the CPC, which we should not do. She proposed, instead, that the Senate recommend that the CPC, which is meeting next week, consider asking President Travis to request a deadline extension. She said any Senator who wants to attend is welcome to attend the CPC meeting and can present their concerns there without disrespecting the process that has been set up. This proposed compromise was supported by Senators Sheehan, Gibson, Litwack and others.

Senator Sheehan said we are going to have to live with each other well past the development of the strategic plan and so that has to be our top priority. Senator Cochran said the reason for all this dissension is that people are anxious about things said behind closed doors and the solution is to have more open discussion of this plan. She said people are becoming concerned that the plan is moving the College's focus and attention away from the undergraduate students who have been its mission clientele all these years and toward serving doctoral students in small seminars. Senator Gibson said the reason there is so much tension is because this process has put us on roller-blades going downhill on ice.

President Kaplowitz restated the motion that the Senate request the CPC to consider asking President Travis for an extension of the Middle States April 1 deadline and, thus, for an extension of the March deadline for the Plan to be approved by the College Council. The motion passed with no opposition and with one abstention.

President Kaplowitz also proposed that the Senate recommend to the CPC that it consider inviting President Travis to a meeting of the CPC so there can be a full and frank discussion. She noted that if Professors Morin and Stevens redirect their joint statement to the CPC, the Committee could discuss the concerns identified in it, perhaps directly with President Travis. The motion passed without dissent.

President Kaplowitz also proposed a motion whereby the Senate recommend that the CPC determine the meaning of the phrase "Suggested Actions" as it exists in the draft strategic plan because many faculty consider the phrase to mean that these items are examples of possible actions while other faculty consider these items to be actions the College would be committing itself to if they were included in the document that is voted on by the College Council. She said that this motion, if adopted, would communicate the fact that it is the opinion of the Senate that

the meaning of the phrase "Suggested Actions" must be defined in order for the faculty to proceed with the necessary work with a common understanding of what is being discussed. The motion was adopted without dissent.

By a motion made and seconded, the meeting was adjourned at 5 pm.

Submitted by,

Edward Davenport
Recording Secretary

&

James Cauthen
Associate Recording Secretary

&

Jodie Roure
Associate Recording Secretary

ATTACHMENT A

CUNY EXECUTIVE VICE CHANCELLOR DR. SELMA BOTMAN

Dr. Selma Botman is Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs at The City University of New York, having been appointed in June 2004. Her predecessor, Dr. Louise Mirrer, left the position after seven years to become President of the New York Historical Society.

Dr. Botman previously served, from 2003-4, as Special Assistant to the Chancellor at the University of Massachusetts Lowell, where she had a wide-ranging portfolio. In addition to teaching courses on the Middle East and on international development, she crafted a model of civic engagement for the campus that involved faculty, staff and students in meaningful outreach to the community. This involved linking curricular development, outreach activities and administrative structures and restructuring the schools, departments and majors to be multidisciplinary and to include service-learning opportunities for students.

In post previous to that was as Vice President for Academic Affairs at the University of Massachusetts, from 1996-2003, she was the chief academic officer of the five-campus University System. She worked closely with faculty and administrators on academic and strategic initiatives, encouraged inter-campus collaboration, evaluated and approved new campus-based academic programs and degrees and reviewed all tenure cases. Dr. Botman also worked closely with the University's Board of Trustees, providing policy recommendations, and assistance.

Responsible for creating an Intercampus Graduate School of Marine Sciences and Technology, a national model, Dr. Botman was also involved in linking the University with the state's K-12 system. She initiated partnerships with the Massachusetts Department of Education and brought the University's message to students, teachers and guidance counselors while visiting over 60 high schools across the state during a five-year period.

Dr. Botman played an active role in efforts to increase student diversity at the University of Massachusetts, and worked with the Raytheon Corporation on a project to increase the number of women and minorities in the engineering field. She brought together K-12 teachers, university faculty and retired engineers to develop new curricular modules central to engineering education, which have been introduced into specific secondary schools. She has also taught seminars in Modern Middle Eastern Politics in the Department of Political Science at the University of Massachusetts' Boston campus. Her most recent book is entitled *Engendering Citizenship in Egypt* (1999, Columbia UP). Her previous books are *From Independence to Revolution: Egypt 1922-52* (1991, Syracuse UP) and *The Rise of Egyptian Communism: 1931-1907* (1988, Syracuse UP).

Prior to joining the University of Massachusetts she spent nine years on the faculty of the College of the Holy Cross in Worcester, Massachusetts, as a member of the Department of Political Science. Dr. Botman earned her bachelor's degree, cum laude, from Brandeis University; holds a B.Phil in Middle Eastern Studies from Oxford University; and a master's in Middle Eastern Studies and doctorate in History and Middle Eastern Studies from Harvard University.

In addition to her activities listed above, in her administrative positions, Dr. Botman reviewed all tenure cases and presented them to the Board of Trustees; raised academic and intellectual standards across all campuses leading to higher SAT scores and higher GPAs; developed a performance measurement system to track academic, fiscal, and student satisfaction indicators, working with provosts, financial officers, and student affairs personnel; crafted and negotiated with the union a post-tenure review policy; led reviews of Intellectual Property policies;

The City University of New York
WORKFORCE ASSESSMENT OF DIVERSITY BY CAMPUS
FACULTY NEW HIRES (7/1/04 to 10/12/04 - Fall 2004)

includes sub titles and visiting titles Sorted by FEMALE and TOTAL MINORITY Percentage Representation
 Source: CUPS miniflat file as of October 12 2004

		ETHNIC Number & Percentage Representation												GENDER				TOTAL NEW HIRE FACULTY
	TOTAL MINORITY	BLACK		HISPANIC		ASIAN AM. PAC. ISL.		AM. IND. / AL. NAT.		ITAL. AMER.		WHITE (incl. His. Am.)		FEMALES		MALES		TOTAL NEW HIRE FACULTY
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
MEDGAR EVERS	6	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	6	0	0.0%	6
BOR. OF MAN. CC	31	53.4%	11	19.0%	6	10.3%	13	22.4%	1	1.7%	4	6.9%	23	39.7%	40	18	31.0%	58
LA GUARDIA CC	16	51.6%	4	12.9%	5	16.1%	7	22.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	15	48.4%	4	66.7%	6	
CUNY LAW SCHOOL	3	50.0%	0	0.0%	2	33.3%	1	16.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	50.0%	38	65.5%	58	
HOSTOS CC	9	42.9%	0	0.0%	7	33.3%	2	9.5%	0	0.0%	3	14.3%	9	42.9%	8	61.5%	13	
YORK	5	41.7%	2	16.7%	1	8.3%	2	16.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	7	58.3%	19	57.6%	33	
CITY	5	38.5%	3	23.1%	0	0.0%	1	7.7%	1	7.7%	1	7.7%	7	53.8%	275	52.2%	527	
LEHMAN	12	37.5%	5	15.6%	3	9.4%	3	9.4%	1	3.1%	4	12.5%	16	50.0%	18	51.4%	35	
COL. OF STAT. ISL.	13	37.1%	2	5.7%	4	11.4%	7	20.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	22	62.9%	28	50.9%	55	
JOHN JAY	8	34.8%	5	21.7%	1	4.3%	2	8.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	15	65.2%	16	50.0%	32	
UNIVERSITY-WIDE	182	34.5%	59	11.2%	48	9.1%	71	13.5%	4	0.8%	21	4.0%	324	61.5%	11	47.8%	527	
GRAD. SCH. & UNIV.	3	33.3%	1	11.1%	2	22.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	6	66.7%	10	47.6%	23	
HUNTER	18	31.0%	4	6.9%	5	8.6%	8	13.8%	1	1.7%	0	0.0%	40	69.0%	16	45.7%	21	
BARUCH	9	27.3%	2	6.1%	1	3.0%	6	18.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	24	72.7%	14	45.2%	35	
KINGSBORO. CC	9	25.7%	4	11.4%	2	5.7%	3	8.6%	0	0.0%	3	8.6%	23	65.7%	4	44.4%	31	
QUEENS	14	25.4%	2	3.6%	4	7.2%	8	14.5%	0	0.0%	3	5.4%	38	69.0%	9	42.9%	9	
BROOKLYN	10	24.4%	4	9.8%	3	7.3%	3	7.3%	0	0.0%	1	2.4%	30	73.2%	17	41.5%	21	
BRONX CC	5	23.8%	2	9.5%	2	9.5%	1	4.8%	0	0.0%	1	4.8%	15	71.4%	11	39.3%	41	
QUEENSBORO. CC	6	21.4%	2	7.1%	0	0.0%	4	14.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	22	78.6%	3	30.0%	28	
NYC COL. OF TECH.	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	10.0%	9	90.0%	3	25.0%	10	
YORK	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	75.0%	12	

JOHN JAY TOTAL FULL-TIME FACULTY

	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
TOTAL	242	230	235	256	240	242	263	272	273	271	260	290	320	334
Female	84 34.7	86 37.4	91 38.7	101 39.5	96 40.0	97 40.1	107 40.7	113 41.5	118 43.2	120 44.3	109 41.9	122 42.1	147 45.9	156 46.7
Male	158 65.3	144 62.6	144 61.3	155 60.5	144 60.0	145 59.9	156 59.3	159 58.5	155 56.8	151 55.7	151 58.1	168 57.9	173 54.1	178 53.3
TOTAL MINORITY**	52 21.5	52 22.6	51 21.7	60 23.4	62 25.8	61 25.2	73 27.8	65 23.9	68 24.9	66 24.4	63 24.2	76 26.2	87 27.2	83 24.9
Black	31 12.8	31 13.5	30 12.8	33 12.9	34 14.2	32 13.2	33 12.5	33 12.1	35 12.8	36 13.3	35 13.5	38 13.1	41 12.8	40 12.0
Hispanic	16 6.6	15 6.5	15 6.4	17 6.6	20 8.3	19 7.9	30 11.4	20 7.4	18 6.6	16 5.9	16 6.2	22 7.6	29 9.1	27 8.1
Asian Am./Pac. Isl.	5 2.1	5 2.2	6 2.6	10 3.9	8 3.3	10 4.1	10 3.8	12 4.4	15 5.5	14 5.2	12 4.6	16 5.5	17 5.3	16 4.8
Am. Indian/Al. Nat.	0 0.0	1 0.4	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
White	176 72.7	163 70.9	168 71.5	180 70.3	163 67.9	167 69.0	175 66.5	192 70.6	191 70.0	189 69.7	183 70.4	198 68.3	217 67.8	233 69.8
Italian American	14 5.8	15 6.5	16 6.8	16 6.3	15 6.3	14 5.8	15 5.7	15 5.5	14 5.1	16 5.9	14 5.4	16 5.5	16 5.0	18 5.4

EINSTEIN AND DISTINGUISHED PROFESSOR

	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
TOTAL	1	1	1	1	2	3	2	0	1	3	5	4	5	6
Female	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 50.0	1 33.3	1 50.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 33.3	1 20.0	1 25.0	1 20.0	1 16.7
Male	1 100.0	1 100.0	1 100.0	1 100.0	1 50.0	2 66.7	1 50.0	0 0.0	1 100.0	2 66.7	4 80.0	3 75.0	4 80.0	5 83.3
TOTAL MINORITY**	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
Black	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 4.8	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
Hispanic	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
Asian Am./Pac. Isl.	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
Am. Indian/Al. Nat.	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
White	1 100.0	1 100.0	1 100.0	1 100.0	2 100.0	3 100.0	2 100.0	0 0.0	1 100.0	3 100.0	5 100.0	4 100.0	5 100.0	6 100.0
Italian American	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0

PROFESSOR

	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
TOTAL	77	74	79	86	85	89	89	85	83	76	78	79	71	73
Female	19 24.7	19 25.7	20 25.3	26 30.2	26 30.6	29 32.6	30 33.7	29 34.1	27 32.5	25 32.9	24 30.8	24 30.4	22 31.0	25 34.2
Male	58 75.3	55 74.3	59 74.7	60 69.8	59 69.4	60 67.4	59 66.3	56 65.9	56 67.5	51 67.1	54 69.2	55 69.6	49 69.0	48 65.8
TOTAL MINORITY**	4 5.2	3 4.1	3 3.8	5 5.8	8 9.4	8 9.0	9 10.1	9 10.6	9 10.8	8 10.5	7 9.0	7 8.9	6 8.5	6 8.2
Black	2 2.6	1 1.4	1 1.3	2 2.3	4 4.7	4 4.5	5 5.6	5 5.9	5 6.0	5 6.6	4 5.1	4 5.1	5 7.0	5 6.8
Hispanic	1 1.3	1 1.4	1 1.3	2 2.3	2 2.4	2 2.2	2 2.2	2 2.4	2 2.4	2 2.6	2 2.6	2 2.5	1 1.4	1 1.4
Asian Am./Pac. Isl.	1 1.3	1 1.4	1 1.3	1 1.2	2 2.4	2 2.2	2 2.2	2 2.4	2 2.4	1 1.3	1 1.3	1 1.3	0 0.0	0 0.0
Am. Indian/Al. Nat.	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
White	71 92.2	69 93.2	72 91.1	76 88.4	71 83.5	75 84.3	74 83.1	71 83.5	69 83.1	63 82.9	66 84.6	67 84.8	60 84.5	62 84.9
Italian American	2 2.6	2 2.7	4 5.1	5 5.8	6 7.1	6 6.7	6 6.7	5 5.9	5 6.0	5 6.6	5 6.4	5 6.3	5 7.0	5 6.8

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
TOTAL	92	92	87	81	73	74	80	82	83	82	82	85	85	94
Female	35 38.0	35 38.0	32 36.8	30 37.0	30 41.1	29 39.2	29 36.3	30 36.6	31 37.3	33 40.2	36 43.9	36 42.4	39 45.9	41 43.6
Male	57 62.0	57 62.0	55 63.2	51 63.0	43 58.9	45 60.8	51 63.8	52 63.4	52 62.7	49 59.8	46 56.1	49 57.6	46 54.1	53 56.4
TOTAL MINORITY**	17 18.5	18 19.6	17 19.5	15 18.5	13 17.8	15 20.3	18 22.5	18 22.0	20 24.1	20 24.4	21 25.6	24 28.2	21 24.7	25 26.6
Black	9 9.8	10 10.9	9 10.3	9 11.1	7 9.6	9 12.2	11 13.8	11 13.4	12 14.5	12 14.6	13 15.9	15 17.6	12 14.1	13 13.8
Hispanic	5 5.4	5 5.4	5 5.7	3 3.7	4 5.5	4 5.4	5 6.3	5 6.1	5 6.0	5 6.1	5 6.1	6 7.1	7 8.2	9 9.6
Asian Am./Pac. Isl.	3 3.3	3 3.3	3 3.4	3 3.7	2 2.7	2 2.7	2 2.5	2 2.4	3 3.6	3 3.7	3 3.7	3 3.5	2 2.4	3 3.2
Am. Indian/Al. Nat.	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
White	67 72.8	64 69.6	61 70.1	59 72.8	53 72.6	53 71.6	56 70.0	58 70.7	58 69.9	55 67.1	54 65.9	55 64.7	56 65.9	62 66.0
Italian American	8 8.7	10 10.9	9 10.3	7 8.6	7 9.6	6 8.1	6 7.5	6 7.3	5 6.0	7 8.5	7 8.5	6 7.1	8 9.4	7 7.4

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
TOTAL	45	46	41	52	52	53	55	67	71	60	69	65	114	117
Female	24 50.0	22 57.9	26 63.4	29 55.8	26 50.0	27 50.9	27 49.1	35 52.2	41 57.7	45 56.3	38 55.1	45 52.9	67 58.8	73 62.4
Male	24 50.0	16 42.1	15 36.6	23 44.2	26 50.0	26 49.1	28 50.9	32 47.8	30 42.3	35 43.8	31 44.9	40 47.1	47 41.2	44 37.6
TOTAL MINORITY**	17 35.4	14 36.8	15 36.6	20 38.5	22 42.3	25 47.2	24 43.6	23 34.3	25 35.2	24 30.0	20 29.0	26 30.6	38 33.3	37 31.6
Black	12 25.0	11 28.9	10 24.4	13 25.0	13 25.0	12 22.6	10 18.2	10 14.9	12 16.9	10 12.5	7 10.1	8 9.4	13 11.4	14 12.0
Hispanic	4 8.3	3 7.9	3 7.3	2 3.8	5 9.6	7 13.2	8 14.5	6 9.0	5 7.0	5 6.3	6 8.7	8 9.4	13 11.4	10 8.5
Asian Am./Pac. Isl.	1 2.1	0 0.0	2 4.9	5 9.6	4 7.7	6 11.3	6 10.9	7 10.4	8 11.3	9 11.3	7 10.1	10 11.8	12 10.5	13 11.1
Am. Indian/Al. Nat.	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
White	27 56.3	21 55.3	23 56.1	28 53.8	28 53.8	26 49.1	28 50.9	40 59.7	42 59.2	52 65.0	47 68.1	56 65.9	74 64.9	79 67.5
Italian American	4 8.3	3 7.9	3 7.3	4 7.7	2 3.8	3 5.5	4 6.0	4 5.6	4 5.6	4 5.0	2 2.9	3 3.5	2 1.8	1 0.9

INSTRUCTOR

	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
TOTAL	5	7	12	10	7	7	9	18	15	14	14	14	8	21
Female	3 60.0	5 71.4	9 75.0	8 80.0	5 71.4	5 71.4	8 88.9	12 75.0	12 80.0	10 71.4	6 50.0	8 50.0	8 47.1	9 42.9
Male	2 40.0	2 28.6	3 25.0	2 20.0	2 28.6	2 28.6	1 11.1	4 25.0	3 20.0	4 28.6	6 50.0	8 50.0	0 0.0	12 57.1
TOTAL MINORITY**	4 80.0	5 71.4	6 50.0	5 50.0	6 85.7	3 42.9	3 33.3	4 25.0	5 33.3	5 35.7	7 58.3	6 37.5	8 47.1	7 33.3
Black	3 60.0	3 42.9	6 50.0	3 30.0	5 71.4	2 28.6	2 22.2	1 6.3	1 6.7	2 14.3	5 41.7	4 25.0	5 29.4	3 14.3
Hispanic	1 20.0	1 14.3	0 0.0	2 20.0	1 14.3	1 14.3	1 11.1	2 12.5	2 13.3	2 14.3	1 8.3	2 12.5	2 11.8	4 19.0
Asian Am./Pac. Isl.	0 0.0	1 14.3	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 6.3	2 13.3	1 7.1	1 8.3	0 0.0	1 5.9	0 0.0
Am. Indian/Al. Nat.	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0
White	1 20.0	2 28.6	6 50.0	5 50.0	1 14.3	4 57.1	6 66.7	12 75.0	10 66.7	9 64.3	5 41.7	9 56.3	9 52.9	11 52.4
Italian American	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 8.3	0 0.0	3 14.3

LECTURER

	1991	19
--	------	----

ATTACHMENT C

Policy and Procedures: Academic Integrity, Draft 3.0

Suggested changes relating to Turnitin (includes editing references)

1. **Suggested change #1:** Page 2, Section B(2), first bullet:

- Maintenance of electronic plagiarism prevention services; Director of Educational Technology.

Deleted: detection

2. **Additional suggested changes:** Pages 5-6, Section B(6). The words “Turnitin.com” should be changed to “Turnitin” throughout (done below without including editing references). The remaining suggested changes are set out below with editing references:

6. Electronic Plagiarism Prevention

The College has contracted with Turnitin for electronic plagiarism prevention services. The following is the College’s official policy with respect to this service.

John Jay College of Criminal Justice is committed to the fundamental values of preserving academic integrity as defined in CUNY and John Jay College policies. John Jay College has contracted with Turnitin, a plagiarism prevention system that uses proprietary search technology to check assignments against Internet resources, proprietary databases, and previously submitted student assignments. Faculty members reserve the right to use this and other electronic means to detect and help prevent plagiarism. By registering for courses offered by the College, students consent that all assignments are subject to submission for textual similarity review to Turnitin. Assignments submitted to Turnitin may be included in Turnitin's restricted access database solely for the purpose of detecting plagiarism. The faculty member may require students to submit their assignments electronically to Turnitin, or the faculty member may submit all or some student assignments to Turnitin. The terms that apply to the College’s use of the Turnitin service are further described on the Turnitin website.

Deleted: as source documents
Deleted: in such documents
Deleted: F
Deleted: questionable text on behalf of a student

Faculty members are authorized to use this service, and the following procedures apply:

- The Director of Educational Technology is designated as the administrator of the Turnitin service for the College.
- Faculty members must apply for accounts through the Director and obtain the College’s Turnitin account ID and join password from the Director.
- The College’s Turnitin account ID and join password may not be further disclosed or distributed without the written permission of the Director. Should the College’s Turnitin Account ID or Join password be inadvertently disclosed, the Director must be notified.
- Faculty members must notify students, in their course syllabi, how written assignments may be subjected to review by Turnitin. The course syllabus should address the following points:
 - o Whether the faculty member requires students to submit written assignments directly to Turnitin, and/or whether the faculty member may submit all or some written assignments to Turnitin.

Deleted and students
Deleted: using a web page maintained by
Deleted: for this purpose
Formatted: **Bullets and Numbering**

ATTACHMENT C (cont)

- o The faculty member's decisions relating to other Turnitin options at the faculty member's discretion, such **as** the opportunity to submit papers to Turnitin for reporting in advance of the final assignment deadline.
- o Whether students must be prepared to submit to Turnitin or to the faculty member electronic file versions of their written assignments (Word, Wordperfect, RTF, PDF, or HTML format) in addition to any paper version that may be required to be turned in to the faculty member.
- o The faculty member's policy for the course with respect to use of the student's original written material that has been or is being used for written assignments in other courses - such **as** the submission of a paper or report in multiple courses that contain the same or substantially the same text.

Deleted: term

| If a faculty member suspects plagiarism based on a Turnitin originality report, and the faculty member intends to base a grading decision substantially on the report or file disciplinary charges based on the report, the faculty member will provide the student with access to the Turnitin report if the student does not already have such access.

JOHN JAY COLLEGE OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE

MEMORANDUM

To: President Jeremy Travis

From: Todd Clear, James Levine, Barbara Stanley

Date: October 8, 2004

Re: Doctoral Program Recommendations (revised)

The purpose of this memo is to propose a strategy that reconfigures John Jay College's doctoral programs to help us become a premier research institution. The doctoral programs are central to this mission, and by restructuring them we can simultaneously optimize doctoral education, scholarship, and undergraduate education. Our strategy has three aims:

- Increase the quality of doctoral education so that John Jay College can recruit the best scholars in criminal justice and forensic psychology, enroll the top doctoral students in its programs, and produce graduates who compete for positions at the best academic institutions around the country.
- Bolster the college's scholarly research environment by supporting the research careers of the most productive research scholars and offering resources to support faculty growth toward increased scholarly activity.
- Reinforce the contribution of doctoral programs to undergraduate education in criminal justice and forensic psychology through early exposure of undergraduates to our most productive scholars and by enhancing their tutoring in small sections.

A. To increase the quality of doctoral education

First-rate doctoral programs possess three characteristics: (1) They are staffed by highly-regarded active scholars whose work is known widely throughout the scholarly community, (2) they attract the brightest and most promising young doctoral students to full time study, and (3) they support those students with research assignments, teaching assignments, and scholarly mentoring so that their accomplishments during graduate study enable them to compete for the most prestigious entry-level assignments at highly-ranked institutions. We therefore recommend:

ATTACHMENT D [cont)

Faculty: To establish a stable faculty for doctoral success, a core group of faculty with outstanding scholarly credentials whose main assignment is doctoral training, research and mentoring will be designated. These *core doctoral faculty* would have standard research university teaching loads: four courses per year, most of which would be satisfied through doctoral-level assignments, including committee work, advisement, and traditional classroom teaching, subject to renewal based upon continuing evidence of scholarly productivity. To fully support the wide range of curricular and mentoring needs of doctoral students, there would be a larger group of *affiliated doctoral faculty* who regularly teach courses in the doctoral program and mentor doctoral students, but whose primary affiliation and identification is with a college department.

Students: To create a learning environment in which high-profile academic research careers by our students is encouraged and facilitated, we propose an intensive mentoring system, selective admission, dependable financial aid, and systematic institutional assignments. Under a strategy of excellence, doctoral programs would admit select full-time students whose career goal is to make scholarly contributions to the field and for whom we can provide intensive mentoring. To attract the best students, we should guarantee student aid during the years of full-time course work for every student admitted to study. A combination of tuition remission and a competitive stipend would be fulfilled through research and teaching assistant assignments for first-year students and adjunct teaching assignments in more advanced students. Baruch College successfully follows this strategy for its doctoral students in business.

Courses: The College should provide faculty resources that enable the doctoral programs to offer courses and mentor students beyond the Graduate Center reimbursement, as may be needed to promote excellence in doctoral training.

Resources: Resources need to be increased in order to reimburse targeted faculty and student travel, to fund topical seminars, and to enable other doctoral program activities. One way of accomplishing this is by reworking the formula for distribution of indirect costs from grants to more effectively encourage a research environment that takes advantage of doctoral education. We also need to create an environment where students *think* of graduate training as their full-time job. In order to do this, offices and/or space in faculty research labs must be a priority.

B. Bolster the College's scholarly research environment

Many John Jay faculty exhibit admirable success in scholarship, but working under a teaching load of seven classes per year, our faculty have not reached their full potential as research scholars. Although doctoral programs will be immeasurably strengthened by having a core faculty, an active and effective affiliate faculty will be the essential ingredient of a diverse research program that filters throughout the college. Therefore, we recommend:

Research Environment: The college needs to devise mechanisms that reduce teaching for those who publish extensively in highly-regarded journals or publish books with prominent presses, yet

ATTACHMENT D (cont)

are not members of the core doctoral faculty. Stringent criteria should be used to determine who will qualify for reassigned time, with renewal based on continuing scholarly productivity.

Reporting: The doctoral programs should have a formal place in the administrative structure of John Jay College, reporting to the Dean of Graduate Studies.

C. Reinforce the contribution of doctoral program to undergraduate education

At John Jay College, a number of forces interact to discourage the assignment of our highest-profile faculty to teach undergraduates, and this deprives our undergraduates of important exposure to our foremost scholars. The emerging emphasis on research productivity promises to exacerbate the problem further. To address this, we recommend:

Criminal Justice 101 and Psychology 101 could be reconfigured to accommodate large lectures that are conducted by high-profile senior faculty supported by recitation sections led by doctoral students. This is a common format in colleges and universities, and our Psychology department is now experimenting with this model. Required large lectures may be repeated at multiple points throughout the week, with specific recitation sessions of small groups offered as designated sections. Thus, students will have both lectures from prominent scholars and a small-group classroom experience with carefully supervised doctoral students in the same course,

Resource Implications

We recognize that our proposal implies a shift in resource allocation. In particular, reduced teaching loads for core doctoral faculty and stipend guarantees for doctoral students will have to be funded, and faculty lecturing roles in introductory courses will have to be created.

When our proposal is taken as a whole, however, the resource implications, while important, are not as sizeable as they seem. In its various forms of grants and fellowships, the Graduate Center already makes a major contribution toward the student portion of these costs, and current plans promise to increase these levels of support. The College is already heavily contributing to support for doctoral study, as well. This semester, for example, doctoral students are teaching about 80 sections of undergraduate classes across the college. As regards students, then, our vision does not require a wholesale change in resource strategies, but implies a more strategic use of existing commitments and, where necessary, a measured increase in those commitments in order to accomplish the three aims of doctoral excellence, baccalaureate enhancement, and increased research productivity.

A similar resource picture emerges for faculty reassignment. The Graduate Center reimbursement to the College now funds eleven senior-level lines. By reconfiguring the undergraduate classes as large-section/recitation gateway classes, further saving in faculty teaching assignments will accrue. This provides a strategic rationale for reduced teaching loads for research-productive faculty, a goal already proposed for the college and endorsed in its 2003 *Middle States Report*.

**John Jay College
FY '04 Expenditure Analysis
FTE Chart 1**

Major Purpose Categories	Total Expenditure \$ Per FTE	Senior College \$ Benchmark	Rank John Jay College
Instructional and Department Research	\$3,364.00	\$4,483.00	Lowest
Academic Support Services	186.00	367.00	Lowest
Student Services	564.00	562.00	Average
Maintenance & Operations	383.00	777.00	Lowest
General Administration	443.00	527.00	2 nd Lowest
General Institutional Services	521.00	764.00	2 nd Lowest
SEEK	81.00	69.00	

Major Divisions

Student/Instruction Related	4,194.00	5,481.00	Lowest
Institutional Support Services	1,347.00	2,060.00	

Expenses Per FTE

Total Expenditures \$ Per FTE	5,541.00	7,550.00	Lowest
-------------------------------	----------	----------	--------

John Jay College
 FY '04 Expenditure Analysis
 Chart 2

Major Purpose Categories	% of Total Expenditure by College	Senior College % Benchmark	Rank John Jay College
Instructional and Department Research	60.7	59.4	Average
Academic Support Services	3.4	4.9	2 nd Lowest
Student Services	10.2	7.4	Highest
Maintenance & Operations	6.9	10.3	2 nd Lowest
General Administration	8.0	7.0	One Of The Highest
General Institutional Services	9.4	10.1	Average
SEEK	1.5	.9	

Major Divisions

Student/Instruction Related	75.7	72.6	Highest
Institutional Support Services	24.3	27.4	Lowest

% of Total Senior Expenses

% Spent as Part of Senior Total	7.4		3 rd Lowest
---------------------------------	-----	--	------------------------

When we look at the percentages of expenditures, we have to remember that John Jay College is working with a smaller budget allocation than most of the other Senior Colleges. As you can see in the chart which follows, a 2.8% greater percentage in Student Services (10.2% expended at John Jay vs. 7.4% as the Senior College benchmark) only calculates to \$2.00 more per FTE when discussing dollars and a 1.3% greater percentage expenditure in Instruction and Departmental Research (60.7% expended at John Jay vs. 59.4% as the Senior College Benchmark, translates into \$1,119 less per FTE when discussing actual dollars.

**John Jay College
FY '04 Expenditure Analysis
FTE Chart 3**

Major Purpose Categories	Total Expenditure \$ Per FTE	Senior College Benchmark	Less per FTE Benchmark By \$x	If JJC had \$x Per 9,373 FTE We would gain ...
Instructional and Department Research	\$3,364.00	\$4,483.00	\$1,119	\$10,895.7
Academic Support Services	186.00	367.00	\$181	\$1,762.4
Student Services	564.00	562.00	(\$2)	(\$19.5)
Maintenance & Operations	383.00	777.00	\$394	\$3,836.4
General Administration	443.00	527.00	\$84	\$817.9
General Institutional Services	521.00	764.00	\$243	\$2,366.1
SEEK	81.00	69.00	(\$12)	(\$116.8)

Major Divisions

Student/Instruction Related	4,194.00	5,481.00	\$1,287	\$12,531.5
Institutional Support Services	1,347.00	2,069.00	\$722	\$7,030.1

Expenses per FTE

Total Expenditures Per FTE	2,241.00	1,550.00	\$2,009	\$19,561.6
----------------------------	----------	----------	---------	------------

If you exclude John Jay from the calculated average, you would have \$8,071 as the average Senior College Benchmark. Our \$5,541 expenditure per FTE would make us \$2,530 less than the revised benchmark of \$8,071. Multiplying that \$2,530 by the 9,737 FTE we had, would have us under funded by \$24,635.0

ATTACHMENT

p. 4

FTE 9737

City University of New York
Senior College Year-end Expenditures by Major Purpose, FY 2004 (Summary Sheet)

	Baruch	Brooklyn	City	Hunter	John Jay	Lehman	M.Evers	NYC Tech	Queens	CSI	York	Benchmark (No Grad Clr.)	Total (With Grad)
Instruction & Departmental Research**													
Total Expenditure	48,348,440	47,561,489	53,333,347	59,084,489	32,750,435	32,980,386	17,227,701	32,654,300	53,714,870	35,593,120	16,594,692	431,833,289	472,327,842
Total MP / Total College Exp.	53.3%	53.5%	63.1%	61.8%	60.7%	59.1%	54.2%	57.3%	61.9%	56.5%	55.7%	59.4%	58.3%
Total Expenditure \$ per FTE	\$ 4,132	\$ 4,565	\$ 6,736	\$ 4,170	\$ 3,864	\$ 5,083	\$ 5,399	\$ 3,936	\$ 4,604	\$ 4,107	\$ 4,506	\$ 4,483	\$ 4,752
Academic Support Services													
Total Expenditure	3,793,145	5,683,993	4,785,233	3,886,260	1,908,854	3,176,818	1,866,104	2,892,821	3,773,246	1,916,859	1,642,999	35,326,251	39,961,110
Total MP / Total College Exp.	4.7%	6.8%	5.7%	4.2%	3.4%	5.7%	5.9%	5.1%	4.4%	3.0%	4.9%	4.9%	5.0%
Total Expenditure \$ per FTE	\$ 324	\$ 548	\$ 604	\$ 281	\$ 186	\$ 490	\$ 385	\$ 349	\$ 323	\$ 221	\$ 398	\$ 367	\$ 402
Student Services													
Total Expenditure	6,012,463	6,135,257	4,386,051	6,791,965	5,494,072	4,205,432	2,773,505	5,484,996	5,938,707	4,748,357	2,720,222	54,111,037	65,273,286
Total MP / Total College Exp.	7.4%	7.3%	5.2%	7.1%	6.9%	7.5%	8.7%	9.6%	6.2%	7.5%	8.2%	7.4%	8.2%
Total Expenditure \$ per FTE	\$ 514	\$ 591	\$ 554	\$ 479	\$ 564	\$ 648	\$ 869	\$ 661	\$ 459	\$ 548	\$ 659	\$ 562	\$ 657
M & O PLANT													
Total Expenditure	6,599,164	8,341,502	8,972,096	10,768,132	3,727,209	6,397,146	2,903,177	3,891,570	10,089,868	8,943,348	4,259,190	74,893,002	79,919,431
Total MP / Total College Exp.	8.1%	9.9%	10.6%	11.3%	8.0%	11.5%	11.0%	8.7%	11.6%	14.2%	12.8%	10.9%	10.0%
Total Expenditure \$ per FTE	\$ 504	\$ 551	\$ 600	\$ 484	\$ 443	\$ 883	\$ 1,155	\$ 595	\$ 410	\$ 455	\$ 634	\$ 777	\$ 804
General Administration													
Total Expenditure	5,894,336	5,714,466	4,753,749	7,006,375	4,316,055	3,131,148	3,685,681	4,894,891	4,781,804	3,989,819	2,618,392	74,893,002	79,919,431
Total MP / Total College Exp.	7.2%	6.8%	5.6%	7.9%	8.0%	9.5%	11.0%	5.5%	6.3%	3.5%	7.0%	10.9%	10.0%
Total Expenditure \$ per FTE	\$ 504	\$ 551	\$ 600	\$ 484	\$ 443	\$ 883	\$ 1,155	\$ 595	\$ 410	\$ 455	\$ 634	\$ 777	\$ 804
General Institutional Services													
Total Expenditure	10,200,666	10,237,397	7,791,025	7,149,809	5,074,940	5,236,842	2,819,780	6,270,335	8,461,596	7,393,517	3,041,228	75,607,115	79,504,778
Total MP / Total College Exp.	12.5%	12.2%	9.2%	7.5%	9.4%	9.4%	8.8%	11.0%	9.8%	11.6%	9.1%	10.1%	10.0%
Total Expenditure \$ per FTE	\$ 872	\$ 987	\$ 984	\$ 505	\$ 521	\$ 807	\$ 884	\$ 756	\$ 725	\$ 845	\$ 737	\$ 764	\$ 800
SEEK													
Total Expenditure	631,000	504,092	489,954	764,403	785,770	600,708	498,531	882,097	559,280	486,705	491,717	6,694,257	6,694,257
Total MP / Total College Exp.	0.8%	0.6%	0.8%	0.8%	1.5%	1.1%	1.6%	1.1%	0.9%	0.8%	1.5%	0.9%	0.8%
Total Expenditure \$ per FTE	\$ 54	\$ 49	\$ 62	\$ 54	\$ 81	\$ 93	\$ 156	\$ 108	\$ 48	\$ 56	\$ 119	\$ 89	\$ 87
TOTAL - Tax Levy													
Total Expenditure	81,479,214	84,178,206	84,570,068	95,552,247	53,957,315	59,770,945	31,774,459	57,011,010	86,739,371	62,943,920	33,368,380	727,345,135	797,032,589
% of Individual College Total	11.6%	11.3%	11.9%	13.4%	7.7%	7.8%	4.2%	7.9%	12.0%	8.1%	4.4%	100.0%	100.0%
% of Total Colleges	11.1%	11.3%	11.9%	13.4%	7.7%	7.8%	4.2%	7.9%	12.0%	8.1%	4.4%	100.0%	100.0%
Student Related Spending per FTE	\$ 5,029	\$ 5,773	\$ 4,956	\$ 4,985	\$ 4,194	\$ 6,814	\$ 7,009	\$ 5,052	\$ 4,932	\$ 5,434	\$ 5,682	\$ 5,481	\$ 5,678
Institutional Support Services Related	\$ 22,694,166	\$ 24,283,965	\$ 21,517,470	\$ 24,592,316	\$ 13,119,204	\$ 17,665,136	\$ 9,408,318	\$ 15,086,786	\$ 23,333,268	\$ 20,206,584	\$ 9,918,810	\$ 189,276,633	\$ 212,643,605
% of Total Colleges	11.4%	12.2%	10.8%	12.5%	6.6%	7.4%	4.7%	11.7%	10.1%	10.4%	5.0%	100.0%	100.0%
% of Individual College Total	27.9%	28.9%	25.4%	26.1%	24.3%	26.5%	29.6%	26.5%	26.9%	32.1%	23.7%	100.0%	100.0%
Non-Student Related Spending per FTE	\$ 1,840	\$ 2,342	\$ 2,718	\$ 1,759	\$ 1,347	\$ 2,276	\$ 2,948	\$ 1,820	\$ 2,000	\$ 2,382	\$ 2,403	\$ 2,069	\$ 2,139
FTE Enrollment Annual Average '04	11,701	10,373	7,918	14,169	9,737	6,488	3,191	8,296	11,668	8,664	4,127	96,332	99,406
Sophie Davis													
Total Expenditure	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total Expenditure \$ per FTE	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Law School													
Total Expenditure	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total Expenditure \$ per FTE	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Grand Totals, Inc. Sophie Davis and The Law Sch.	\$ 81,479,214	\$ 84,178,206	\$ 84,570,068	\$ 95,552,247	\$ 53,957,315	\$ 59,770,945	\$ 31,774,459	\$ 57,011,010	\$ 86,739,371	\$ 62,943,920	\$ 33,368,380	\$ 747,071,979	\$ 797,032,589
Total Expenditure	\$ 9,064,055	\$ 25,108	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 9,064,055	\$ 9,064,055
Total Expenditure \$ per FTE	\$ 25,108	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 25,108	\$ 25,108
Total Expenditure	\$ 10,662,789	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 10,662,789	\$ 10,662,789
Total Expenditure \$ per FTE	\$ 18,464	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 18,464	\$ 18,464
Grand Totals, Inc. Sophie Davis and The Law Sch.	\$ 916,730,412	\$ 747,071,979	\$ 69,658,433	\$ 33,368,380	\$ 97,940,160	\$ 92,943,920	\$ 57,011,010	\$ 97,011,010	\$ 10,662,789	\$ 18,464	\$ -	\$ 9,064,055	\$ 9,064,055

NOTE: City College and Queens College Totals DO NOT include expenditures for Sophie Davis and The Law School.
**Excludes expenditures for fringe benefits, energy, building rentals, and tuition reimbursement.
*FTE includes Worker Ed for City, the Puerto Rican Institute for Hunter, and the Calandra Institute for Queens.