

Faculty Senate Minutes #333

Wednesday, October 22, 2008

3:20 PM

Room 630 T

Present (43): Simon Baatz, Andrea Balis, Elton Beckett, Adam Berlin, Teresa Booker, Marvie Brooks, Erica Burleigh, Elise Champeil, Shuki Cohen, Edward Davenport, JoEllen Delucia, Virginia Diaz, Janice Dunham, Marcia Esparza, Beverly Frazier, Gail Garfield, Katie Gentile, P. J. Gibson, Amy Green, Richard Haw, Maki Haberfeld, Jay Hamilton, Kim Helmer, Heather Holtman, Ping Ji, Karen Kaplowitz, Erica King-Toler, Ali Kocak, Tom Litwack, Vincent Maiorino, Evan Mandery, Nicholas Petraco, Michael Pfeifer, Tanya Rodriguez, Raul Romero, Francis Sheehan, Arthur Sherman, Richard Schwester, Staci Strobl, Shonna Trinch, Roberto Visani, Thalia Vrachopoulos, Valerie West

Absent (6): Michael Alperstein, Erin Ackerman, Kirk Dombrowski, DeeDee Falkenbach, Allison Kavey, Robert Till

Invited Guest: President Jeremy Travis

Guests: Professors Vincent del Castillo, Lior Gideon, David Kennedy, John Kleinig, James Lynch, Jeff Mellow, Peter Moskos, Norman Olch, Frank Pezzella, Adina Schwartz, Chuck Strozier, Hung en-Sung, Karen Terry

Agenda

1. **Adoption of the agenda**
2. **Approval of Minutes #332 of the October 6, 2008, meeting**
3. **Announcements & Information**
4. **Review of the agenda of the October 23 meeting of the College Council**
5. **Invited guest: President Jeremy Travis**
6. **Preliminary discussion about departmental reorganization proposals**

1. **Adoption of the agenda**

The agenda was amended so that President Travis could be invited to meet with the Senate earlier in the meeting than had been scheduled so as to include him in a preliminary discussion about a proposal for a new department of criminal justice. The agenda, as amended, was approved.

2. Approval of Minutes #332 of the October 6, 2008, meeting

Minutes #332 of the October 6, 2008, meeting were approved.

3. Announcements & Reports [Attachment A]

President Kaplowitz reported that President Travis appointed all the faculty members whom the Faculty Senate recommended to serve on the Search Committee for Associate Provost and also on the Search Committee for Dean of Undergraduate Studies.

She also reported that Provost Bowers has sent a written response [Attachment A] to some of the questions raised by Senate members at the Senate's last meeting on October 6 about the proposed Guidelines for Intensive Writing courses. In her memo Provost Bowers speaks about possible ways to compensate faculty who teach writing intensive courses. The proposal has been revised to address many of the concerns of the Senate.

4. Review of the agenda of the October 23 meeting of the College Council [Attachment B]

The agenda includes: a proposal to adopt the Faculty Personnel Process Guidelines; a revised proposal to adopt Guidelines for Writing Intensive Courses [Attachment B]; a new literature course proposal; and the ratification of student representatives to various College Council committees.

5. Invited Guest: President Jeremy Travis

President Travis thanked the Senate for inviting him. He then addressed the history of newly structured departments at the college, noting the changes that were approved by the College Council last semester and approved by the CUNY Board of Trustees in June. As a result we have new departments of Art and Music; Communications and Theater Arts; Economics; Philosophy; and Protection Management.

President Travis said that he and the Provost both support some version of the new proposal for a department of criminal justice. He said this means that he is open to modifications of the proposal. President Travis spoke about his concern that one of our undergraduate majors, that in criminal justice, is a very weak major, and he wants the major to be modernized and to be made more accountable. He said there are features of the new proposal for a criminal justice department which would support the strengthening of the major in the ways he envisions.

President Travis reiterated that the criminal justice major has been in trouble for a long, long time and needs to be fixed. He discussed his meeting during the previous week with the faculty of the Law and Police Science Department. He said he agreed with a statement made at that meeting that this would be a big step for the College and, he added, he thinks this is a step we need to take.

6. Preliminary discussion about departmental reorganization proposals [Attachment C, D, E]

In response to President Travis' memo to the faculty inviting proposals for reorganizing and renaming academic departments, three proposals [Attachment C] were submitted:

1. a proposal to change the name of the Department of Government to the Department of Political Science
2. a proposal to change the name of the Department of Physical Education and Athletics to the Department of Health and Physical Education
3. a proposal to create a new Department of Criminal Justice

The reason for the first proposal, it was explained, is that most departments at CUNY that teach government are called political science departments and John Jay's department plans to soon change the name of the major accordingly; furthermore, prospective students search the CUNY website for colleges at which they can study political science but John Jay is not listed in the search results because of the department's name.

The reason for the second proposal, it was explained, is that the current department of Physical Education and Athletics is no longer responsible for athletics; the athletics teams now report to the Vice President for Student Development and, therefore, the name of the department is no longer accurate. The Senate expressed its support for both proposals.

The third proposal [Attachment C] is to create a new Department of Criminal Justice. The 18 signatories to this proposal are from six academic departments: Todd Clear, William Heffernan, Stanley Ingber, Dennis Kenney, John Kleinig, James Lynch, Evan Mandery, Jeffrey Mellow, Frank Pezzella, Hung-En Sung, Karen Terry, and Valerie West from the Department of Law and Police Science (LPS); Joshua Freilich and Mangai Natarajan from Sociology; Marcia Esparza from Latin American & Latino/o Studies; David Kennedy from Anthropology; Barry Latzer from Government; and Charles Strozier from History.

President Kaplowitz said that she would call on speakers according to their position on this proposal, alternating between those supporting the proposal and those opposing it.

Professor Adina Schwartz spoke against the proposal for a new department, saying that the

proposal is not merely an attempt by some faculty to secede from the Law and Police Science Department, which she could agree with, but it is also an attempt to take over governance of the largest major in the College by a group of faculty with no track record of running a major.

Senator Evan Mandery spoke in favor of the proposal, saying that it is necessary to collect a core of full time faculty to teach criminal justice.

Professor Staci Strobl spoke against the proposal, saying that it edges out most of the faculty who currently teach criminal justice. She said the proposed governing body cannot govern the major. She said that she has been at John Jay for a long time, as a student and as a member of the faculty, and from her perspective this power grab will not be good for the College.

Professor Chuck Strozier said he is interested in the new proposal from the perspective of an historian. He said he is not interested in the politics of LPS and that he supports this new proposal because he believes it will facilitate discussions about teaching criminal justice among faculty from at least six departments in a way which would be good for the College.

Senator Maki Haberfeld spoke against the proposal, saying that the proposal had never been shown to her, the Chair of LPS or to other members of LPS, before its submission to President Travis. She said more transparency and accountability are needed than have been shown thus far. She also argued that the proposal would lead to no students for the LPS faculty to teach and thus would lead to the closing of the LPS Department.

Professor James Lynch talked about how criminal justice did not exist as a recognized social science discipline when John Jay began as a college. He said he signed on to the document because he thinks we are at a point that the College and the discipline are both ready for a new transition. He said he is not interested in power and he believes the governance issues can be negotiated but that it is important not to lose the momentum we now have to make an important change.

Professor Norman Olch spoke against the proposal. He is not against a separate department but disagrees with the proposal that the responsibility for the criminal justice major should be given to the new department. He disputed the deficiencies in the major alleged in the new proposal and objected to the clause which gives the new department all hiring authority in the criminal justice area. Professor Olch circulated two charts [Attachment D] that he created to show how much teaching in criminal justice is actually done by the signatories. He says most of the signatories are not currently participating in the criminal justice major as it now exists and the few who are participate to a very small degree.

Professor Kaplowitz distributed copies of a Resolution from the chairs of the three departments that have responsibility for the supervision of the criminal justice majors – Professors David Brotherton (Sociology), James Levine (LPS), and Harold Sullivan (Government) -- in support of relocating the criminal justice majors to a department of criminal justice and also in support of an advisory group to be created which would be “drawn from various departments which

contribute to the major which will work with the new department in providing guidance” [Attachment E].

Senator Teresa Booker asked why the proposal signed by the 18 faculty members had not been circulated for discussion by the LPS faculty. Senator Mandery said the discussion of these issues last year when a different proposal had been circulated for discussion had degenerated into ad hominem attacks against those who supported the proposal and he hoped this time the discussion could be based on what would be good for the College.

Senator Booker said that the proposal’s signatories allege a lack of racial inclusiveness in the major as currently constituted and she asked whether there is racial inclusiveness among the signatories themselves. Professor Frank Pezzella said that as an African-American and as a signatory, he has no reason to think that the proposed department would not be racially inclusive. It was pointed out that several other signatories are also faculty of color.

Senator Kim Helmer asked whether the opposition to the proposal is more on the basis of process or on the basis of the content of the proposal. She called the proposal short on substance. Senator Ping Ji asked who would be eligible to join the new department. The answer was that once the new department is formed, faculty members can petition the department’s P&B Committee to join. Senator Haberfeld said it is outrageous that the majority of members of the current department should have to apply for admission to the reconstituted department.

Senator Amy Green said it is important to try to separate the emotions from the content of this issue. She said she agrees with Senator Helmer that the new proposal is short on substance; she wants to know more about the vision for the new department. Senator Gail Garfield said she agrees with Senators Helmer and Green that more information about the new proposal is needed. She also agrees with Senator Green that we need to avoid last year’s trauma.

Senator Mandery said that the charts which Professor Olch distributed are not accurate; he said that as the person in LPS who schedules the courses that the faculty teach he knows that the numbers are not correct and, indeed, they are not correct about his own teaching schedule. He said that he regrets that Professor Olch had to leave the meeting right after distributing the chart because he would have wanted to confront him with the errors. He added that because he did not know that such a chart would be distributed, he does not have printed evidence with him to dispute the numbers.

Senator Valerie West spoke about why she is a signatory and said she would love to remove the emotion from the debate in order to see how we can have the strongest and best criminal justice major in the county. Senator P. J. Gibson said that like others she is concerned about her colleagues and about our students and she also wants more specificity about the proposal including matters such as tenure. She said that the fact that only a small number of members of LPS saw the proposal before it became the subject of open discussion seems like a disturbing lack of transparency and a flaw in process. Senator Gibson said she needs a lot more clarity.

Senator Beverly Frazier asked what the size of the new department would be and what protections are available under this proposal for the untenured faculty.

President Kaplowitz said that because so many questions are being raised about the proposals, she will email the Senate following the meeting asking Senators to email her their questions. She will then distribute the questions to the signatories, to the non-signatories, and to the College administration asking them to respond. Upon receiving emailed answers, she will organize the document as a series of Q&A's and will provide the document to the Senate to help in the deliberations.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:20 PM.

From Provost Bowers to the Faculty Senate

Writing Intensive Courses

Questions Raised by Faculty at Faculty Senate Meeting, October 6, 2008

What kind of incentives will be implemented to encourage faculty to become certified and to teaching WI courses?

1. Thanks to a grant from the University, we will be offering an honorarium \$300 to faculty (adjunct and full time) for each faculty development workshop in which they participate, up to the eight hours required for certification. This grant will cover at least the first wave of faculty who become certified this year. For faculty participating subsequently, the Provost will provide a small honorarium per workshop, amount to be determined.
2. The Provost is also considering adopting one of the following ways of compensating faculty for the extra work involved in teaching WI courses:
 - a. Allocating of one extra hour of teaching time for every 3-credit WI course taught.
 - b. Giving one course reassigned time for faculty who commit to teaching three WI courses, to be awarded in the semester following the completion of the third course.
 - c. Giving a stipend per course, to be paid as summer salary based on number of WI courses taught in previous year.
3. The Provost is considering reducing class size for WI courses to 22 or 20 students as a further incentive.

Can composition instructors be exempt from the certification requirement? No.

Which courses can be writing intensive? Courses at any level of the curriculum can be Writing Intensive. However, since we believe that WI courses offer an excellent way for students to extend their work in Freshman Comp into the disciplines and that WI courses are an excellent way for students to prepare to the CPE, we are imagining that most WI courses will cluster at the 200 & 300-level for maximum impact.

Why haven't I heard about the *John Jay Handbook: Rhetoric, Strategies, and Conventions* and where can I get a copy? We will communicate annually with faculty to tell them about the existence of the handbook. We are going to renegotiate our contract with Pearson so that they will provide desk copies for all John Jay faculty members. In the meantime, the handbook is available for purchase in the College Bookstore.

ATTACHMENT B

Proposal to Establish Requirements for Writing Intensive Courses

Submitted by Dean José Luis Morín
Prepared by Prof. Mark McBeth, Deputy Chair of Writing Programs/English
Kevin Murtagh, CUNY Writing Fellow
Last revised on May 9, 2008

Presently, we have a “Writing Intensive” (hereafter WI) designation for undergraduate courses at John Jay College, and the college assigns certain courses as WI. During the Fall 2007 semester, 39 courses carried this designation. Despite the fact that the WI designation exists, we do not have official criteria that state what requirements need to be met in order for a course to be considered WI, faculty development for instructors who teach these WI courses, or procedures by which department chair assign these courses. One purpose of this proposal is to establish clear guidelines for the WI courses.

In regard to the Writing Intensive courses, this proposal will also establish that faculty teaching WI courses be certified by participating in faculty development workshops. These workshops focus on issues concerning student writing, and eight hours of workshop attendance would be required for faculty with WI certification.

Rationale for Requirements for WI Designation:

By instituting these WI criteria as college policy, John Jay will commit to the university’s initiative of Writing across the Curriculum (WAC) and Writing in the Disciplines (WID). We can then guarantee to our students that we have provided them with ample opportunity and exposure to the high-level literacy abilities that they will need to continue to higher degrees and/or to compete in the job market.

By having official requirements, the College will be able to ensure that the designation is used consistently and that courses that carry it merit being called “Writing Intensive”. A student registering for a WI course will understand the demands of the course and, thus, must invest in the requirements explicitly mandated by college policy. Consequently, we

will be able to work towards ensuring that all of our WI-designated courses give the students the writing experience that they deserve. Clear criteria for our WI courses also make articulation agreements easier as CUNY is in the process of streamlining transferring between colleges.

Requirements for All WI Designated Courses

The following proposed WI Course requirements specify the types of writing assignments, classroom activities, and learning goals that students should experience in Writing Intensive courses.

- ***Qualitative Requirements for WI Courses (Instructional Methods & Assignments)***

The integration of the following WI course criteria will ensure that students, become fluent with the elements of academic writing, practice the processes and methods commonly used by effective writers, take ownership of the language and rhetorical strategies they employ, develop a working knowledge of the structures and mechanics of standard English, and experience a variety of writing tasks and scenarios. Engaging in these types of linguistic and rhetorical activities will broaden the scope of their reading and writing abilities as well as enhance their capacity for critical thinking.

Integration of “low-stakes” and “high-stakes” writing assignments

- Low-stakes assignments can be ungraded or count little toward the final course grade. Examples include freewriting, journals, and group writing activities. These types of activities can be incorporated as pre-reading activities to prepare students for classroom conversation, as in-class writing activities (informal “pop quizzes”), peer critique, or post-class annotations of lectures or discussions. These types of assignments help students retain important content information as well as explore how ideas and concepts in the course interrelate. They can contribute to their overall understanding of the coursework and build progressively toward more formal analytical assignments.

- High-stakes assignments typically weigh heavily on a student's course grade. Examples include lengthier essays, final papers, and structured group projects. These types of assignments allow students to demonstrate their level of comprehension and mastery of a subject. The style of presentation for these assignments is more formal, contrasted with the informal style of the low-stakes writing.

Integration of peer review of writing assignments

- Peer review allows students to read and critique the writing of their peers. With guidance from the instructor, this small group or homework activity helps students to promote their critical thinking about the content of a paper, to develop a language to discuss issues of writing, and to create a community of writers in the classroom.

Integration of self-reflective writing

- Self-reflective writing asks students to reflect upon and write about the processes they go through while composing a writing assignment. It helps students comprehend the purpose of the assignment, the difficulties they face when composing, and the successes they achieve once they resolve their writing challenges.

• ***Quantitative Requirements for WI Courses (Instructional Methods & Assignments)***

For 100-level WI courses:

- At minimum, 10 pages of formal graded writing.
- At minimum, 10 pages of informal low-stakes writing.

200-level WI courses:

- At minimum, 15 pages of formal graded writing.
- At minimum, 15 pages of informal low-stakes writing.

For 300-level WI courses:

- At minimum, 20 pages of formal graded writing.
- At minimum, 20 pages of informal low-stakes writing.

400-level WI courses:

- At minimum, 25 pages of formal graded writing.
- At minimum, 25 pages of informal low-stakes writing.

Note: The writing for any of these courses can be of varied lengths and grade value, depending up on the needs of the disciplinary field and the discretion of the individual instructors. The length and “weight” of each assignment should be explicitly expressed to students in written directions that articulate the expectations of the assignment.

Requirement for Certification of WI Instructors:

In order to be eligible to teach a WI course, a faculty member will fulfill a certification process. It should be noted that there is a precedent for this requirement, as many other CUNY Colleges have a certification process for WI instructors. Faculty members will receive WI Certification by participating in eight (8) hours of faculty development workshops specifically designed for WI instructors. These faculty development workshops will be provided by the college every semester and will be open both to full-time and part-time faculty. Once receiving this certification, fulfilling the criteria of WI courses, and teaching WI courses, The Dean of Undergraduate Studies will officially acknowledge this teaching and college service which should be included in Form C, tenure, and promotion materials.

Rationale for Requirement for Certification of WI Instructors:

By participating in these workshops, faculty members will learn about the requirements and expectations for WI courses and they will gain a variety of pedagogical techniques that will aid them in developing their students advanced literacy skills, processes, and behaviors. Workshops may address teaching issues of syllabus and/or assignment development, use of technology in the classroom, information-gathering techniques, or responses to student writing. Faculty could also accrue faculty development hours by receiving permission to visit a fellow instructor’s classroom, examining what takes place in the class, and then preparing a written report that they can share with the visited colleague as well as with the WAC Coordinator.

Introducing students to the array of reading and writing conventions of different disciplines make them more flexible and supple writers; it also demonstrates to them the unique methods of knowledge making of each discipline, thus inviting them into a rich academic discourse community. To guide students through these composing practices and getting them to fulfill writing expectations can often be difficult and perplexing, yet knowledge about the kinds of assignments and practices that are most effective is continually being updated, and research on effective pedagogy is ongoing. In these workshops, faculty members will learn innovative techniques to incorporate into their WI courses and be invited to reflect on the benefits and pitfalls of such practices. Consequently, not only will the students' college literacy experience be enriched but faculty will receive more satisfying student results

Process for Allocating and Verifying WI Courses

Department Chairs must present information to the Office of Undergraduate Studies, testifying that the faculty members chosen to teach WI courses are certified and that their syllabi integrate the writing techniques and teaching expectations outlined by these WI policies. Syllabi for WI courses will be submitted to the Office of Undergraduate Studies prior to the beginning of the semester in which the course will be taught.

Faculty Development for Writing-Intensive Certification

The following two-hour workshops offer a non-exhaustive list of the types of writing pedagogies and practices that faculty would examine in these faculty development workshops for Writing Intensive courses. Other workshops could also be offered that deal with discipline-specific writing issues. These workshops could either be conducted in two-hour increments during the regular school week or in longer six-hour sessions on the weekends, depending upon faculty needs and convenience.

These workshops will be coordinated and conducted by the WAC Coordinator, presently Prof. Mark McBeth, in collaboration with the Center for the Advancement of Teaching. He, and other writing directors who will subsequently take his place, will have PhDs in

English Composition and Rhetoric so will have the background knowledge and practical expertise to lead these writing seminars. Other faculty members, such as the librarian in charge of information literacy may also be invited to conduct workshops on research strategies and techniques.

The subject of these faculty development workshops have been based on the certification processes of other CUNY colleges, of other national writing programs, and the pedagogical queries that John Jay faculty have directed at Mark McBeth, both in his role as WAC Coordinator and Deputy Chair of Writing Programs. Beyond the practical application of writing techniques in courses, these workshops will also address issues such as students' advanced literacy anxieties, writer's block, and classroom dynamics.

In all of the following workshops, faculty will discuss how best to integrate writing into the classroom while not sacrificing the breadth of the course content. All writing-intensive workshops will be participatory and faculty will carry out the writing strategies that will be presented and discussed during each session.

Workshop 1. Reading to Better Writing: Strategies for “Bored” Readers

If we've heard it once, we've heard it a thousand times – “This reading was boring.” But what does that mean? Is the reading really boring or do students not have the strategies to engage in college-level reading material? There is a close relationship between the acts of reading and writing in students' acquisition and synthesis of knowledge. In this workshop, faculty will discuss the relationship between these two types of literacy; they will explore reading strategies that may enable better student reading habits and abilities and, consequently, better writing habits and abilities.

Workshop 2. Responding to and Evaluating Student Writing: Pain-free Grading

In his funny and thought-provoking article “Repetitive Strain: The Injuries of Responding to Student Writing,” Gordon Harvey writes, “[Evaluating and grading student writing] occupies an alarming portion of the collective educated mind: on a given weekday or Sunday evening between September and April, the number of people sitting down with

coffee and a batch of student papers, or actively avoiding this, must be roughly the population of Cleveland.” In this workshop, faculty read sample student writing and consider productive and economic ways of responding to student writing. Faculty will also share various approaches to grading.

Workshop 3. Transparent Assignments: Clearing the Way for Successful Student Writing

In this hands-on workshop, faculty investigate the five aspects of assignment construction: expectations, directions, classroom preparation, learning outcomes, and learning assessment. How can faculty best assign, direct, and guide their students’ writing? *and* How do we know if students learned anything from our assignments?

Workshop 4. Grammar: Global Perspectives/Local Practices – Using the John Jay Rhetoric, Strategies & Conventions

Grammar – the great bugaboo of the classroom! In this workshop, faculty discuss the issues and research about prescriptive grammar and, then, consider alternatives to the traditional red-inking approach of yesterday. You can leave your awk-frag-sp’s at home.

When incoming freshman enter the college, they must now purchase the John Jay Rhetoric, Strategies & Conventions – a handbook that offers students guidance about writing composing strategies, research methods, and standardized English conventions. This student-friendly handbook not only offers students advice about the composition classroom but also about writing across the curriculum. In this workshop, faculty will explore the contents of this now-college-wide writing manual and how to use it effectively with students – both for crafting essays and perfecting them.

Evaluation and Assessment of WI Faculty Development Workshops

Instruction with the integration of writing remains a difficult task. When instructors strive to balance the content breadth of a course while guiding and encouraging students to write about that content, they often face their own pedagogical challenges. The eight hours of faculty development workshops offer us a forum in which to discuss our

attempts, consider our successes and failures, and devise new methods and approaches to classroom writing. Eight hours may not be sufficient.

During these Faculty Development Workshops, responses from faculty will be solicited to assess the value of the workshops. Changes in WI certification requirement will be based upon these observations and evaluations by faculty. At the end of the year coordinators of this faculty development will report to the Curriculum Committee on how productive these workshops were for faculty.



JOHN JAY COLLEGE
THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK
OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE

ATTACHMENT C

PROPOSALS
FOR
REORGANIZATION AND RENAMING
OF
ACADEMIC DEPARTMENTS

OCTOBER 15, 2008

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Proposals for Department Renaming.....	2
“Government” to “Political Science”	2
“Physical Education and Athletics” to.....	3
“ Health and Physical Education”	3
Proposals for Department Restructuring	4
“Department of Criminal Justice”	4

**“PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND ATHLETICS” TO
“ HEALTH AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION”**

I am writing to inform you that the department met on Tuesday, May 27, 2008. The members voted to change the department name from the Department of Physical Education and Athletics to the Department of Health and Physical Education. The change of name is in consonance with the separation of the academic and athletic programs and reflects the offerings of the department and the department’s focus for the future.

The health and physical fitness condition of all students will be a primary focus of the new Health and Physical Education Department. The Surgeon General of the United States has recommended that all Americans do both aerobic and anaerobic exercises between three and five times a week. We will teach our students efficient ways to meet those recommendations.

In the light of the fact that over 65% of Americans are either overfat or obese, it is incumbent on us to make our students aware of the dangers of poor nutrition habits and lack of physical activity. Through our new focus we can provide the education that is needed to make our students aware and healthy.

Through an increased focus on health related courses, we can teach our students to be able to make appropriate lifestyle decisions for increased health and wellness.

John Jay College is in a unique position from which we can become a leader in health and physical education for uniformed services. The college is already in a leadership position in public service. With the addition of a select number of both academically and physically oriented courses the Health and Physical Education Department can move to a leadership position.

We will have dual directions:

a. Health courses to make our students aware of their health needs and what they can do to meet those needs as they prepare for the future.

B. Physical activity courses that will teach students how to participate in lifetime physical activities that will help in keeping them healthy enough to participate vigorously in their chosen lifetime careers.

Studies have indicated that college is the last time that many persons have the opportunity to be exposed to learning substantial and beneficial health and physical fitness experiences that can enhance their lives and increase their health and productive years.

Submitted by Davidson Umeh
Chair

PROPOSALS FOR DEPARTMENT RESTRUCTURING

“DEPARTMENT OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE”

Rationale

Last year, the college reorganized several departmental structures to align them with the educational priorities of the college, to support curriculum development and management, to promote student success, and to provide an appropriate academic home for faculty in particular disciplines including economics, philosophy, art, and music. This process of thinking about the best structures to promote student success continues this year at President Travis’s invitation, and must consider the majors at the center of John Jay’s mission. The Criminal Justice BA and BS are not currently administered by a single department. Rather, responsibility for Criminal Justice rotates every three years among the departments of Law, Police Science & Criminal Justice Administration, Government, and Sociology. The faculty who teach in the criminal justice program at the undergraduate and graduate levels have no common home. Yet, together these degree programs have enrolled over one-third of all undergraduate students for the past several years. In fall 2007, 34 per cent of undergraduates were majoring in Criminal Justice. In the past five years the College has awarded 1,656 BA degrees and 783 BS degrees in Criminal Justice.

The rotating administration of our criminal justice programs deviates from national practice. Furthermore, the vertical integration of undergraduate and graduate programs is a norm at the leading criminal justice programs in the country (see Appendix A). At least 31 universities, including the top-ranked programs at Arizona State, Florida State, Rutgers, Temple, SUNY Albany, and the University of Maryland, locate responsibility for both undergraduate and graduate criminal justice programs in a single entity. The vertical integration of degree programs enhances instruction and integrates teaching and research functions by bringing together distinguished professors, tenure-track faculty, adjunct faculty, and graduate teaching fellows in criminal justice under the oversight of one administrative unit.

The structural deficiencies of the criminal justice program have consequences for John Jay students at every level. In their 2007 external evaluation report on the Criminal Justice Ph.D. program, Professor Julie Horney, Dean of the School of Criminal Justice at SUNY Albany, and Professor Sally S. Simpson, Chair of the Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice at the University of Maryland, College Park, wrote, “The fact that the Ph.D. program is not affiliated with a single department means that the program officers have little or no control over program personnel . . . [and] little ability to insure that program needs are met.”¹ At the undergraduate level, the majors in Criminal Justice do not conform to national curriculum standards. Please see Appendix B for a description of these standards as defined by The Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences (ACJS). Specifically, the majors do not ensure that students are adequately prepared in each of the content areas recommended by the

¹ The review of the Criminal Justice Ph.D. Program is available in the Ph.D. program office.

ACJS: Administration of Justice, Corrections, Criminological Theory, Law Adjudication, Law Enforcement, and Research and Analytic Methods. Moreover, the current curriculum does not require the study of race, ethnicity, gender, and justice in core courses, as suggested by ACJS guidelines. The most recent external review report on the Criminal Justice major, written by Dr. Albert Roberts of Rutgers University in July 2001, subsequent to the May 2001 site visit of the external reviewers, recommended that the curriculum be revised “in accordance with the program standards of the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences.”² Specifically, Dr. Roberts recommended that criminal justice majors take “two courses on criminal justice statistics or sociological statistics” and a computer application course. Seven years after this report, the Criminal Justice curriculum has not been revised to meet ACJS standards.

Dr. Roberts’ report suggests that the structural problems are entwined with the substantive deficiencies of the majors. Indeed the very conduct of the self-study was symptomatic of the diffusion of administrative responsibility for the majors. Dr. Roberts was quite frank about the lack of faculty participation in the self-study. Few faculty provided CVs and syllabi. Similarly few participated during Dr. Roberts’ site visit. Dr. Roberts wrote, “The Coordinator of the BS in Criminal Justice was noticeably absent from the 3-hour meeting that we had with the associate provost, the department chairs, and other interested faculty.” He further wrote, “According to the *Undergraduate Bulletin* (2000-2001), there are 30 full-time faculty and 56 adjunct faculty in the Departments [sic] of Law, Police Science, and Criminal Justice Administration. Although an important part of the traditional protocol of external reviews/site visits involves meeting with and interviewing full-time faculty, it seemed that only one criminal justice faculty member was scheduled to meet with us.” The lesson of the self-study and the site visit is that no one took ownership of the major in 2001. This absence of ownership persists and the curricular changes recommended have still not been made.

We acknowledge and honor the history of criminal justice education at John Jay. Governance of the Criminal Justice majors has historically been shared. We therefore recommend that the college bring a proposal through the appropriate governance process to locate responsibility for the Criminal Justice BA and BS in a new Department of Criminal Justice. At the same time, we recognize and affirm that criminal justice is an interdisciplinary field of study and will continue to draw faculty from Sociology, Government, Law, Police Science and Criminal Justice Administration, Anthropology, Public Management, and other departments as appropriate. Indeed, the signatories to this proposal represent six different departments at the College. If established, the new Department of Criminal Justice will recommend to the Curriculum Committee the creation of an advisory board that will comprise faculty from departments historically connected to the undergraduate majors. The faculty members in these and other departments add great strength to the Criminal Justice programs at John Jay and make them distinctive. In a highly interdisciplinary field such as criminal justice, these cross-disciplinary ties are a benefit for faculty and students alike. We wish to preserve these ties in order to create a world-class criminal justice program at John Jay, led by the new department we propose.

² The External Review Report is available in the Office of Undergraduate Studies.

We recognize that the Master's program director, who represents the program on the Graduate Studies Committee, is elected by the faculty of the program. Consequently, we understand that the director may come from a department other than the proposed Department of Criminal Justice, although the current director is among the faculty group proposing the new department. We acknowledge too that the Ph.D. program in Criminal Justice is under the jurisdiction of the CUNY Graduate School, although again those who teach in the program are generally John Jay faculty members. We nevertheless believe that administration of all these degree programs will be facilitated by the creation of a single department, which is accountable for their effectiveness. A Department of Criminal Justice will take responsibility for hiring in the criminal justice field, will provide an academic home for faculty members who engage in criminal justice teaching and research, and will consolidate the administration of the criminal justice degrees to better support the curriculum and students.

Resolution

President Travis has expressed the admirable goal of establishing John Jay as the preeminent criminal justice program in the nation. We therefore seek to have degree programs that reflect national norms and standards in order to recruit and retain the best faculty and to produce graduates who are prepared for careers in criminal justice or for postgraduate study elsewhere. The current structure and practice of shared and rotating responsibility for the Criminal Justice major has not allowed for focused attention on the review and revision of the curriculum and has resulted in a lack of accountability for the major.

To better support John Jay College's criminal justice curriculum, students, and faculty, we the undersigned faculty, therefore, resolve to propose the creation of a Department of Criminal Justice, effective February 1, 2009.

Todd Clear, LPS
Marcia Esparza, Latin American & Latina/o Studies
Joshua Freilich, Sociology
William Heffernan, LPS
Stanley Ingber, LPS
David Kennedy, Anthropology
Dennis Kenney, LPS
John Kleinig, LPS
Barry Latzer, Government
James Lynch, LPS
Evan Mandery, LPS
Jeffrey Mellow, LPS
Mangai Natarajan, Sociology
Frank Pezzella, LPS
Charles Strozier, History
Hung-En Sung, LPS
Karen Terry, LPS
Valerie West, LPS

APPENDIX A

School	Department	Undergrad/Grad	Notes:
Arizona State University	School of Justice and Social Inquiry	Both	
Florida State University	College of Criminology and Criminal Justice	Both	
George Mason University	Public and International Affairs	Grad	Justice, Law & Crime MA, PhD Administration of Justice B.S.
Indiana University	Department of Criminal Justice	Both	
Indiana University of Pennsylvania	Department of Criminology	Both	
Michigan State University	College of Criminal Justice	Both	
North Dakota State University	Criminal Justice and Political Science	Both	
Northeastern University	College of Criminal Justice	Both	
Old Dominion University	Department of Sociology and Criminal Justice	Both*	MA in Applied Sociology (Soc + Crim)
	Department of Sociology & Crime, Law & Justice	Both	
Penn State University		Both	
Prairie View A&M University	College of Juvenile Justice and Psychology	Both*	MA & PhD in Juvenile Justice
Rutgers, State University of New Jersey	School of Criminal Justice	Both	
Sam Houston State University	College of Criminal Justice	Both	
Temple University	Department of Criminal Justice	Both	
School of Public Affairs at American U.	School of Public Affairs	Both	BA, MA & PhD in Justice, Law & Society
University of Pennsylvania	Department of Criminology	Both	
	School of Economic, Political & Policy Sciences	Both	
The University of Texas at Dallas		Both	
University at Albany	School of Criminal Justice	Both	
University of Arkansas at Little Rock	Criminal Justice	Both*	PhD in Public Policy w/ concentration in C
University of Cincinnati	Division of Criminal Justice	Both	
University of Delaware	Department of Sociology and Criminal Justice	Both	
University of Florida	Criminology, Law and Society	Both	

University of Illinois at Chicago	Department of Criminal Justice	Both	
University of Maryland	Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice	Both	
University of Missouri-St. Louis	Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice	Both	
University of North Dakota	Department of Criminal Justice	Both	
University of Nebraska at Omaha	School of Criminology and Criminal Justice	Both	
University of South Carolina	College of Arts and Sciences- Criminology & CJ	Both	
University of South Florida	Criminology	Both	
University of Southern Mississippi	Graduate Studies	M.A.	Administration of Justice
Washington State University	Program in Criminal Justice	Both	

APPENDIX B

John Jay College offers a BA and a BS in Criminal Justice. (See pages 7-11 of the 2008-2009 Undergraduate Bulletin for curriculum requirements.) Table 1 below shows the ACJS required content areas for Criminal Justice BA programs. There are no national standards for a B.S. degree.

Table 1: Required Content Areas and Related Topics (ACJS Guidelines)

Content Area	Related content topics include but are not limited to:
Administration of Justice	Contemporary criminal justice system, major systems of social control and their policies and practices; victimology; juvenile justice; comparative criminal justice
Corrections	History, theory, practice and legal environment, development of correctional philosophy, incarceration, diversions, community-based corrections, treatment of offenders
Criminological Theory	The nature and causes of crime, typologies, offenders, and victims
Law Adjudication	Criminal law, criminal procedures, prosecution, defense, and court procedures and decision-making
Law Enforcement	History, theory, practice and legal environment, police organization, discretion, and subculture
Research and Analytic Methods	Quantitative - including statistics - and qualitative, methods for conducting and analyzing criminal justice research in a manner appropriate for undergraduate students

ACJS requirements also state:

In addition to the content areas above, an undergraduate program in criminal justice includes a systematic examination of the issues of diversity in criminal justice through either specific required courses and/or the integration of these issues within the program's curriculum. Further, programs should provide evidence that students are taught to employ ethical perspectives and judgments in applying this knowledge to related problems and changing fact situations.

ATTACHMENT D -- part 1

Chart Provided by Professor Norman Olch to the Faculty Senate: October 22, 2008

FALL 2008: By Sections

	Undergraduate	Graduate
Todd Clear	1	0
Marcia Esparza	3	0
Joshua Freilich	1*	0
William Heffernan	0	1
Stan Ingber	2*	1
David Kennedy	0	0
Dennis Kenney	0	2
John Kleinig	0	0
Barry Latzer	1*	0
James Lynch	0	0
Evan Mandery	1	0
Jeff Mellow	0	1
Mangai Natarjan	0	0
Frank Pezzella	4****	0
Charles Strozier	1	1
Hung-En Sung	0	1
Karen Terry	0	0
Valerie West	3	1
TOTAL	17 (7*)	8

*Criminal Justice Major Courses

ATTACHMENT D – part 2

Chart Provided by Professor Norman Olch to the Faculty Senate: October 22, 2008

SPRING 2009 (TENTATIVE): By Sections

	Undergraduate	Graduate
Todd Clear	0	0
Marcia Esparza	3	0
Joshua Freilich	1*	0
William Heffernan	0	1
Stan Ingber	0	0
David Kennedy	0	0
Dennis Kenney	0	2
John Kleinig	0	0
Barry Latzer	1	1
James Lynch	0	0
Evan Mandery	0	0
Jeff Mellow	0	1
Mangai Natarjan	0	0
Frank Pezzella	3**	0
Charles Strozier	0	1
Hung-En Sung	1	1
Karen Terry	(26)<>	0
Valerie West	1	1
TOTAL	10 (3*)	8

*Criminal Justice Major Courses

ATTACHMENT E

Resolution Proposing Relocating Criminal Justice Majors at John Jay College in a Department of Criminal Justice

Since their inception, the B.A. and B.S. degrees in Criminal Justice at John Jay College of Criminal Justice have suffered from the lack of a single academic unit at the college which has responsibility for their supervision. Rotating governance of the criminal justice majors among three departments has resulted in administrative confusion and lethargy regarding the need to ensure the academic integrity of the majors. This was most notably manifested in the unresponsiveness to a call for significant revision of the majors recommended by an external reviewer in 2001. His strongly-worded suggestions for curricular overhaul have gone unheeded.

The unwieldy governance system in place has been harmful to students majoring in criminal justice. They currently take many of their courses in one department, Law, Police Science, and Criminal Justice Administration, only to be told that the coordinator of the major is in another department, Government, literally across the street in North Hall. Moreover, their education is impaired by out-of-date sets of required courses and concentrations that have resisted substantial revision. Unlike the major in criminology, which receives the full-fledged attention of the Sociology Department, or the major in government, which is constantly under the scrutiny of the Government Department, the majors in criminal justice seem to be on no one's radar screen. Given that one-third of all John Jay undergraduates receive either a B.A. or a B.S. in Criminal Justice, the current organizational scheme entailing diffusion of responsibility and seeming administrative indifference is untenable.

We, the three chairs of the departments now responsible for the criminal justice majors, therefore propose that criminal justice majors be put under the auspices of a single new Department of Criminal Justice, if the proposal for its creation is approved by College Council, the President of John Jay College of Criminal Justice, and the CUNY Board of Trustees. We also propose the creation of an advisory group drawn from various departments which contribute to the major which will work with the new department in providing guidance.

David Brotherton, Chair, Sociology

James P. Levine, Chair, Law, Police Science, and Criminal Justice Administration

Harold Sullivan, Chair, Government