

## FACULTY SENATE MINUTES #33

John Jay College of Criminal Justice

Date: Sept. 19, 1989

Time: 3:15 PM

Place: Room 630 T

Present (32): Arvind Agarwal, Haig Bohigian, Lily Christ, James Cohen, Lorraine Colville, Robert Crozier, Edward Davenport, Jannette Domingo, Janice Dunham, Austin Fowler, Robert Fox, David Goddard, Donald Goodman, Lou Guinta, Elizabeth Hegeman, Jane Hurni, Susan Iasenza, Karen Kaplowitz, Rubie Malone, Jill Norgren, Robert Panzarella, Bruce Pierce, Lydia Rosner, Herb Ryan, David Schulman, Chuck Stickney, Timothy Stroup, Antoinette Trembinska, George Tulley, Daniel Vona, Maureen Wilson, Fred Wright

Absent (8): Migdalia DeJesus-Torres de Garcia, Paula Humphreys, Lawrence Kobilinsky, Nyamazao Maliwa, Altagracia Ortiz, Natalie Sokoloff, Barbara Stanley, Steven Wasserman

### AGENDA

1. Approval of Minutes of May 17 and May 31 meetings.
2. Approval of Proposed Calendar of Faculty Senate meetings.
3. Announcements
4. Reports from Committees
  - a. Executive Committee of Faculty Senate
  - b. Senate Evaluation Committee: Senator Stroup
  - c. Budget Planning Committee: Senators Goddard, Crozier, Kaplowitz
  - d. Cultural Diversity and Pluralism Committee: Pres. Kaplowitz
5. Resolution Declaring a Vacancy in Membership in response to resignation of at-large Senator Natalie Sokoloff and determination of action to be taken
6. Second Reading of proposed amendment of Article XI of the Senate Constitution: Senator Panzarella
7. The issue of security of persons, personal property, and exams at the College: Senator Crozier
8. Discussion of Agenda Items of September 21 College Council meeting
9. Discussion of draft of Dean Mary Rothlein's FIPSE grant proposal to establish an assessment center at John Jay College
10. Discussion of the Task Force
11. Invited Guest: President Gerald W. Lynch
12. New Business

1. Approval of Minutes of the May 17 and May 31 meetings.

A motion to accept the minutes of both the May 17 and May 31 meetings was duly made, seconded, and carried.

2. Approval of Proposed Calendar of Faculty Senate meetings

The proposed calendar was approved by a motion duly made, seconded, and carried. The calendar is as follows:

<u>Meeting Date</u>	<u>Deadline for Agenda Items</u>
Tuesday, September 19	September 5
Wednesday, October 18	October 3
Thursday, November 2 [with Pres. Lynch]	pre-meeting discussion 2:00 PM -3:15 PM
Friday, November 17 [all-day meeting]	November 1
Monday, December 11	November 27
Wednesday, February 7	January 17
Thursday, March 8	February 20
Friday, April 20 [all-day meeting]	April 3
Tuesday, May 15	May 1

[Meetings are in Room 630 T and begin at 3:15 PM  
except for all-day meetings on 11/17 and 4/20]

3. Announcements

The 25th Anniversary celebration of the college will take place on March 5, 6, 7. On Monday, March 5 an academic convocation will be held at which honorary degrees will be awarded. Although Dr. Timothy Healy was scheduled to receive an honorary degree from John Jay at this event, he is no longer eligible because he accepted an honorary doctorate from Baruch in June. Nominations for honorary degrees for both the March 5th event and for June commencement are to be sent to Professor Tom Litwack, chair of the Committee on Honorary Degrees.

President Kaplowitz reported that upon receiving a request the previous day from Jacob Marini, the director of sponsored programs, for a Senate representative in the humanities to evaluate applications for the NEH Summer Stipend competition (along with Mr. Marini and the chairs'

representatives), she recommended Senator Davenport because of his experience in this area. Because the deadline to complete the work is tomorrow and because Senator Davenport, who is willing to do the work despite the short notice, was deemed an excellent choice by Mr. Marini, she is asking the Senate to ratify Senator Davenport as its representative for this task. A motion to do so was made and carried by unanimous vote.

Professor Barbara Stanley will be replacing Professor Irving Guller as the Psychology Department's College Council and Faculty Senate representative. Professor Guller resigned from the Council and, therefore, from the Senate last week because of health reasons. Because of a commitment made previous to her election by her department, Senator Stanley is unable to attend today's meeting but will attend the Council meeting and the Senate's October meeting.

#### 4. Reports from Committees

##### a. Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate

President Kaplowitz reported that in June she and the co-chairs of the Council of Chairs, Professors Dorothy Bracey and Robert Crozier, and the chair of the Budget Planning Committee, Professor David Goddard, established weekly meetings with President Lynch. These meetings are for the purpose of facilitating recommendations put forth by these three faculty bodies and to channel information to the President of the College about faculty issues and concerns.

She also reported that President Lynch invited her, as president of the Faculty Senate, to attend his weekly cabinet meetings. With the concurrence of President Lynch, Vice President Fox will attend the cabinet meetings in her stead as the Faculty Senate representative.

In addition, Vice President Fox has offered to serve as the Faculty Senate's liaison with the Student Council.

President Kaplowitz explained that these three announcements represent the executive committee's actions on a resolution unanimously approved last year by the Faculty Senate, at its December 9 meeting, calling for the Faculty Senate's executive committee to establish regularly scheduled meetings with the president of the college and with the executive officers of the Student Council.

In addition, Provost Sexter has established monthly meetings with representatives of the leadership of the Faculty Senate, the University Faculty Senate, and the Professional Staff Congress. These meetings are scheduled for the day following the monthly meeting the Provost has with the Council of Chairs. The provost has also established monthly meetings with the leadership of these three groups plus the leadership of the Student Council.

The membership of the 1989-1990 Faculty Senate committees was announced:

Elections Committee: Bruce Pierce, Herb Ryan, George Tulley, Daniel Vona

Evaluation Committee: Haig Bohigian, Lorraine Colville, Jane Hurni, Karen Kaplowitz, Rubie Malone, Robert Panzarella, Timothy Stroup

Fiscal Advisory Committee: James Cohen, Ed Davenport, Jannette Domingo, Maureen Wilson

Charter Committee: Robert Crozier, Karen Kaplowitz

Constitution Committee: Lorraine Colville, Robert Panzarella

Buildings, Facilities, and Services Committee: Arvind Agarwal, Lorraine Colville, Ed Davenport, Austin Fowler, Paula Humphreys, Jill Norgren, David Schulman

Ad Hoc Committee on Excellence in Teaching Awards: Lily Christ, Migdalia DeJesus-Torres de Garcia, Lou Guinta, Chuck Stickney

Research: Janice Dunham, Altagracia Ortiz, Maureen Wilson

Parliamentarian: Robert Panzarella

b. Senate Evaluation Committee: Senator Stroup

In his capacity as chair of the Senate's Evaluation Committee, Senator Stroup submitted a report of the committee's work during the 1988-89 academic year. A motion to accept the report was made and carried [Attachment A].

Senator Stroup also distributed a list of college services and departments that the Evaluation Committee has designated for evaluation by the faculty through an evaluation instrument that the committee is designing. When the questionnaire is ready and after the committee meets with President Lynch, the committee will present the final version to the Senate.

Senator Hurni noted that the Evaluation Committee had decided to remove the Library from this list, and hence from the questionnaire being designed. Instead, the committee will develop a separate instrument by which the faculty can evaluate the Library.

Senator Stroup explained that when the agenda for today's meeting was being prepared, he had felt that his report and agenda item #9 should be separated but that subsequent to the agenda's preparation, the Evaluation Committee met with Dean Rothlein and he now thinks that that meeting should be part of his report to the Senate. President Kaplowitz said that unless she heard an objection, Senator



Stroup should proceed with his report.

Senator Stroup then reported on the Evaluation Committee's September 14 meeting with Dean Mary Rothlein. Senator Stroup explained that in May, Dean Rothlein had asked to meet with the Senate's Evaluation Committee to consult about her plans to apply for a FIPSE grant to establish an assessment center at the College. At that May 17 meeting, Dean Rothlein had no written material to show the committee members, except excerpts from the FIPSE guidelines. Senator Stroup explained that during the summer Dean Rothlein sent members of the Evaluation Committee a draft of her FIPSE grant proposal, a copy of which is appended to the agenda of today's Senate meeting.

Senator Stroup explained that because of the October 17 deadline, today's is the only scheduled Senate meeting at which it will be possible to discuss the issue before the proposal is submitted to FIPSE and that, therefore, it is important that the Faculty Senate give this issue thorough attention.

Senator Stroup also said that upon learning of this deadline from President Kaplowitz, he immediately scheduled a meeting between the Evaluation Committee and Dean Rothlein and that meeting took place on September 14. The members of the Evaluation Committee present at the September 14 meeting with Dean Rothlein were himself, Haig Bohigian, Lorraine Colville, Jane Hurni, Karen Kaplowitz, Rubie Malone, and Robert Panzarella.

Senator Stroup reported that Dean Rothlein was very cooperative in scheduling the meeting and expressed her desire for Senate feedback on the proposal. He said that as the result of the Evaluation Committee's meeting with Dean Rothlein, Dean Rothlein decided to have the grant proposal completely rewritten and that, therefore, the draft of the proposal that had been distributed to the Senators as an agenda attachment is no longer operative. He said that Dean Rothlein expressed concern that this -- now inoperative -- draft had been distributed to the Senate and he said he was sympathetic to her concern.

President Kaplowitz praised Senator Stroup's quick action in scheduling the meeting with Dean Rothlein and also praised his memorandum of the May 17 meeting that he wrote and that is appended to the Minutes of May 17 (Minutes #31). She said that Dean Rothlein's proposal, although a draft, was the only document available when the Senate agenda was mailed a week ago and is, indeed, the only document available even now and, therefore, in the absence of any other version and in the light of the very tight deadline it is essential for the members of the Senate to have read it.

Senator Malone said that the deadline was too soon for proper and necessary input from the many groups of the college that have important perspectives to voice, groups that would be affected by an assessment center. Senator Malone noted, for example, that as far as she knows, her

department, SEEK, was not consulted. Many Senators also voiced concern about the impending deadline and what was termed by many a seemingly hasty preparation of a proposal that has far-reaching implications.

Senator Stroup was asked whether the proposal involves an evaluation of academic departments or of administrative units. Senator Stroup said that although at the May meeting Dean Rothlein had said that no academic departments would be evaluated (as his memorandum of record of that meeting so states), the draft of the grant proposal appeared to call for evaluating academic departments.

President Kaplowitz said that she was speaking as a member of the Evaluation Committee. She noted that Dean Rothlein explained at last week's meeting that each academic department would be required to conduct an evaluation of itself and, upon being questioned about this, Dean Rothlein explained that this self-evaluation would be mandatory. Each academic department would be required to conduct assessments of itself but the design of the instruments for assessment and the analysis of the data gathered by each department would be the responsibility of a three-person assessment team, to be funded by the grant.

Senator Panzarella, also a member of the Evaluation Committee, noted that there are many unanswered questions, all of which raise important issues. Who would be chosen to be this three-member assessment team, for example.

Senator Crozier pointed out that the provost is responsible for quality control at the college. He asked where these self-assessments go now. He also noted that the Modern Languages Association, the professional society for teachers and scholars of literature, already has a pamphlet for such an assessment, and so must other disciplines. He said that he had made Dean Rothlein aware of this during the summer in a memorandum he sent to her upon receiving the draft of the proposal from her.

President Kaplowitz explained that Dean Rothlein had sent the draft of the proposal to the members of the Evaluation Committee and to the co-chairs of the Council of Chairs, Professors Bracey and Crozier. No one else received it as far as she knew. She added that she had sent a copy of the proposal to Dean of Undergraduate Studies Eli Faber and to Provost Jay Sexter and had informed Dean Rothlein that she had sent them copies.

President Kaplowitz noted that the college does have an Office of Institutional Research, which reports to Dean Rothlein, and which is supposed to do this kind of assessment and analysis, although the position of Director of Institutional Research has been empty since some time last year.

Professor Crozier noted that the English Department once contracted such an assessment from an outside group, and it was the English Department members who ended up doing all the

work. He said that the work was tremendously time-consuming and tedious and advised us, the faculty, to be extremely cautious and skeptical. He said that as written, the grant proposal was extremely ill-advised.

Senator Guinta said that if faculty evaluation occurs, and only the most naive would believe that evaluation of academic departments is not an evaluation of the faculty, then the faculty should be brought into the discussions very early on. He said there is insufficient time to give this the attention and work it merits and requires.

Senator Tulley said that our concern, as faculty, should be what students learn. How can we measure this? It is commendable to state our objectives as teachers, but more importantly we must achieve these objectives.

Senator Stroup said that the Committee had conveyed to Dean Rothlein that it is not opposed to evaluation per se, if it is done wisely and if the college provides us with all that we need in order to succeed as an academic institution.

President Kaplowitz concurred. She said that the Evaluation Committee had stated in May and again last week that the faculty knows very well what is needed to improve the academic side of the college and that the faculty knows what the problems are. The committee told Dean Rothlein that we do not need assessments if what we already know we need is not provided by the administration. The committee questioned the wisdom of having an assessment program that may eventually show our failures publicly (since this assessment center is being proposed as a model for CUNY and SUNY).

She said that the Evaluation Committee cited many factors that undermine students' ability to succeed at a higher rate. Among those factors are the lack of on-line registration (students register for courses that they are not academically prepared to take, and chairs do not know how many course sections the students will need until after registration, when it is too late); overcrowded classes; too few full-time faculty; and a disproportionately high (although insufficient) number of adjuncts.

Until the College can correct these problems, there is little point in assessing and, indeed, assessment could be damaging for the College. She said that when only one in seven of John Jay's entering freshmen (ever) graduates, much is needed and an assessment center is not it.

Senator Panzarella said that the entire premise of the grant proposal is flawed. Goal-oriented assessment is the wrong approach. As he told Dean Rothlein at the meeting last week, Operation Head Start was created for the purpose of enhancing children's cognitive and intellectual abilities. When the children were evaluated, it was discovered that within a year or two of completing the program there had been little improvement in those abilities. But the children had developed skills which had not been the goals of the program: they had developed better social skills, better hygiene habits, and better health than children not in the program.



Objectives had little to do with some of the very positive things happening in the program. If only goal-oriented assessment had been conducted, the program would have been viewed as a failure and might have been scrapped.

Senator Stroup agreed and said that cost effectiveness is the unspoken but worrisome thread that is usually woven through assessments such as the one the grant proposal envisions. He said, in response to Senator Crozier's concerns, that it does not automatically follow that if the grant proposal is funded, the faculty has to go along with the assessment. He said that Dean Rothlein should know that the faculty might not, in fact, participate if we believe that such assessments are not in the best interests of the departments or, ultimately, of the college.

Senator Agarwal said that the Science Department had conducted a sophisticated and exhaustive self-study and that he saw this grant proposal as unnecessary and as duplicative. Since the Science Department has performed such a study, and since, as Senator Crozier reported, the English Department has also done one, he suggested that many other departments may have also done so and that such studies can be done without outside funding.

President Kaplowitz pointed out that there are other important assessments that are regularly conducted -- the most comprehensive is the Middle States self-study which we are scheduled to conduct the year after next.

She noted that there is also the problem of institutional support for the grant: after the life of the grant is ended (three years), the college is committed to providing the funds to continue the project or program that had been created by the grant. In other words, the three people hired with grant money would have to be paid by the college and that could mean that faculty lines will be taken for such use. Senators Hegeman and Norgren agreed that this is a serious issue and of great concern to them.

Senator Stroup said that it is clear that the Faculty Senate, like the Senate's Evaluation Committee, is opposed to the grant proposal in its present form. He asked how the Senate's views should be conveyed. Senator Panzarella said that the Senate's minutes state what the members of the Senate think and it is through the minutes that the will of the Senate is known.

Senator Stroup said he wanted to commend Dean Rothlein for her collegial and congenial manner and for consulting with the Faculty Senate, through its Evaluation Committee.

President Kaplowitz said that she would convey to Dean Rothlein the concerns of the Faculty Senate, as expressed at today's meeting, and as recorded in the minutes.

[N.B. Dean Rothlein has informed Senator Stroup that she has decided to withdraw the FIPSE grant proposal and that it will not be submitted.]



c. Budget Planning Committee: Senators Goddard, Crozier, Kaplowitz

President Kaplowitz explained that the Faculty Senate had decided last semester to create a Senate committee on the budget, to complement the work of the Budget Planning Committee, which is a subcommittee of the Personnel and Budget Committee. Last year Professor Ellen Rosen chaired the Budget Planning Committee and it was under her leadership that the directory of administrative personnel was compiled and issued. The current chair of the Budget Planning Committee is Professor David Goddard, who is also a member of this year's Faculty Senate.

Senator Goddard was asked to provide an update on the budget to the Senate so that the faculty might be brought up to date about the budget situation and about developments since the spring.

Senator Goddard said that there really is not a great deal to report. The financial plan for the college was formulated by the administration and was accepted by the university. John Jay did not lose as many teaching positions as might have been expected and, indeed, three new teaching positions were acquired.

The Budget Planning Committee will be meeting the next day to establish the committee's agenda for the semester. This year's committee members, in addition to Senator Goddard, as chair, are Professors Robert Crozier, Rod Davis, Samuel Graff, Susan Larkin, T. Kenneth Moran, and Charles Ryan. As president of the Senate, Karen Kaplowitz sits as an ex officio member at the invitation of the committee.

Senator Goddard said that the administration of the college should be commended for providing intelligent and intelligible information, and it was hoped that it would continue to do so.

Senator Cohen asked what John Jay's situation is this year as compared to other years. Senator Goddard said that the college had lost 20 lines (although no one was fired as the lines had been vacant).

Senator Bohigian said that since the administration was expected to absorb cuts by a 1.5:1 ratio of administrative lines to faculty lines, as recommended by the Budget Planning Committee, he wanted to know which 12 positions were eliminated administratively. That is, he said, which administrative departments lost lines? Senator Bohigian said that there is reason to believe that the administration did not absorb its share of 12 lines to the faculty's 8 lines. He said that the Chancellor's office had recommended that the cuts be in the proportion of 2:1.

Senator Goddard said that the Budget Planning Committee had recommended that if the college lost 20 lines or more, that the ratio be 1.5:1 to avoid administrative cuts so large that it would cripple the college. He said the committee had felt that such a cut might inflict unacceptable

and damaging loss to the college.

Senator Bohigian questioned why the Budget Planning Committee had not identified the administrative lines, if any, that have been cut. President Kaplowitz asked Senator Bohigian whether he, as the Professional Staff Congress delegate, had tried to obtain this information and whether he had been able to do so. Senator Bohigian said that he had, indeed, asked for this information repeatedly from the administration and he acknowledged that he had not been successful in obtaining any answers.

President Kaplowitz said that while Senator Bohigian's frustration is, perhaps, understandable, it is not appropriate for Senator Bohigian to subject Senator Goddard to these questions. She noted that Senator Goddard is being extremely collegial in giving the Senate an update on the budget situation although his committee is not a committee of the Senate and, thus, does not answer to the Senate. She added that Senator Goddard is certainly not required to defend his committee's work to the Senate. She thanked Senator Goddard for his report.

d. Cultural Diversity and Pluralism Committee: President Kaplowitz.

President Kaplowitz explained that she was reporting on behalf of the Cultural Diversity and Pluralism Committee, on which she has served since its creation four semesters ago.

The committee is proposing that an Office of Ombudsperson be established at the college and rather than decide the particulars in advance, the committee is first soliciting ideas from the entire college community. After receiving the ideas, the committee will formulate a detailed proposal which it will then present to the College Council for approval by that body.

A delegation of the Cultural Diversity Committee had asked to meet with the Senate today, but because of the Senate's very full agenda, the executive committee of the Senate suggested that President Kaplowitz give a preliminary report and that the delegation be invited to the October meeting of the Senate, with the Senate's concurrence.

The members of the delegation are Professors Jerry Markowitz, Maria Volpe, Barbara Wallace; Dean Eli Faber; and Ms. Sancha Burnett, a student. The delegation has met with the Student Council, and during the summer three of its members (Professors Volpe and Wallace and Ms. Burnett) met with the Task Force because one of the items the Task Force was to study and make a recommendation about is the students' demand for an expedited grievance procedure. In addition, two public hearings are scheduled: Thursday, October 12 from 7:30-9:30 PM and Monday, October 16 from 3:30-5:30 PM, both in the Faculty Dining Room.

To help elicit comments from the Faculty Senate, from

the Student Council, and from the college community in general, the Cultural Diversity and Pluralism Committee issued an eight-point commentary outlining the decisions that need to be made in formulating a final proposal. This commentary, written by Professor Maria Volpe, is attached to the agenda of today's meeting and has been published in The Week of and has been circulated to the students.

Senator Norgren questioned the need for an ombudsperson. She said she is concerned that this is simply another in a series of already unwieldy structures of administrators, offices, and functionaries and, further, that it reflects a history at the college of accretion rather than of working to improve that which already exists.

Senator Colville recommended that an outside person, someone not connected to the college, be chosen for the position in order to have someone who is independent. However, she wanted to know where the monies will come from to pay for an ombudsperson. She suggested that if there is money for such a person, she would prefer that such money be used to hire more faculty so that the number of students in each class could be reduced.

Senator Panzarella said that there is simply not sufficient information for the Senate to comment on the issues raised in the Cultural Diversity Committee's document. Senator Fox agreed with Senator Panzarella. He said it is impossible to comment without more information.

Senator Stickney said the ombudsperson idea is just a burgeoning of the bureaucracy that already exists at Jay.

Senator Ryan said that the Faculty Senate should appoint an ombudsperson, rather than have such a long and unwieldy process that probably will doom the idea.

Senator Rosner asked what kind of complaints the ombudsperson would handle. She asked whether any other CUNY colleges have an ombudsperson. President Kaplowitz said that Baruch, City, and Hunter do. She said that the way the ombudsperson is chosen varies among the colleges as do many other aspects of the office and offered to send the Senators the relevant pages of those colleges' charters of governance.

Senator Bohigian suggested that the Senate invite Professor Watkins, the Baruch ombudsperson, to its next meeting. President Kaplowitz said that the Cultural Diversity Committee planned to invite the ombudspersons of Baruch, City, and Hunter to the October 16 public hearing.

Senator Rosner said that the key question in the document issued by the Cultural Diversity Committee is item #8: what should be the relationship between an Office of Ombudsperson and the existing college complaint-handling structures. She said that this is the question she would like to hear the answer to.

Senator Malone spoke of the history of this idea at John



Jay. She said that it was not motivated by the recent unrest at the college, but rather by the general racial, class, and other tensions that exist in our city and, thus, at John Jay.

Senator Norgren asked how an impartial person could be selected, whether the person is chosen from outside or from within our community. She questioned how such a person would be able to satisfy a community as pluralistic and as diverse as John Jay.

President Kaplowitz said that an important role of the ombudsperson, as envisioned by the Cultural Diversity Committee, although not reflected in the committee's document, is to be not merely reactive to complaints and disputes but pro-active. The ombudsperson would be charged with studying and assessing existing programs and mechanisms and would be required to issue regular reports as to what works, and what does not work, and with recommending ways to make improvements. These reports would be issued to the College Council or to whatever office or body is named in the formal proposal. One job of the ombudsperson would be to study to what extent college and university policies and bylaws are matched by actual practices at the college.

The Senate directed the executive committee to invite the delegation from the Committee on Cultural Diversity and Pluralism to attend the October 18 meeting of the Senate.

5. Resolution Declaring a Vacancy in Membership in response to resignation of at-large Senator Natalie Sokoloff and determination of action to be taken

It was explained that because of a severe health problem Senator Sokoloff has resigned from all committee work at the college this semester in the hopes of being physically able to teach her courses. President Kaplowitz said that Senator Sokoloff had telephoned her and had expressed her anguish at having to resign from the Senate and that, in adherence to the Constitution of the Senate, Senator Sokoloff had also written a formal letter of resignation.

President Kaplowitz called Senator Sokoloff a truly outstanding member of the Faculty Senate and said that she found it hard to imagine the Senate without her as a member.

Senator Panzarella moved to accept Senator Sokoloff's resignation, with regret, and to declare a vacancy in membership, and to declare the recipient of the next highest number of votes in the at-large election a member of the Senate. The motion carried unanimously.

President Kaplowitz reported that the recipient of the next highest number of votes and, therefore, the new member of the Senate is Professor Tom Crawley of the Speech and Theater Department. She said she would notify him of his election.



6. Second Reading of proposed amendment to Article XI of the Faculty Senate Constitution: Senator Panzarella

The following proposed amendment to Article XI of the Senate Constitution was presented by Senator Panzarella for a second reading, as required by the Senate Constitution. The first reading took place at the Senate's May 31 meeting. The proposed amendment is the addition of the underlined word:

The Constitution of the Faculty Senate "can be amended through a motion made and passed by a vote of at least two-thirds of members present and voting at two consecutive regular meetings of the Senate."

Because special or emergency meetings of the Senate are sometimes called, the proposed amendment would prevent the nullification of successful first readings of proposed amendments of the Senate Constitution.

Senator Guinta moved the motion to amend. The motion carried by unanimous vote. Because this is the second reading, the amended language is now incorporated into the Senate Constitution.

7. The issue of security of persons, personal property, and exams at the College: Senator Crozier

Senator Crozier said that he wanted to make the Senate and, through the Senate, the entire college community aware of security problems at the college.

He said that there have been reports from faculty who live across the street from the college of lights on in his office and in other faculty offices late at night and that the intruders (whether Security or Buildings & Grounds personnel or others) do not have permission to enter any faculty offices without authorization. He said that several issues are involved: issues of privacy, of protection from theft, as well as potential issues of safety, since sometimes faculty unexpectedly enter their offices at night and on weekends when the buildings are quite empty. He pointed out that it would be not only frightening but potentially dangerous were a faculty member to surprise an intruder.

Senator Crozier noted that the security of examinations is also an important issue. He said that departmental examinations are housed in his office, for example, and he suggested that sightings of unauthorized people in his office at night might not be coincidental to this fact.

He also noted that he and others have had property stolen from their desks and offices. Many faculty and staff have reported their wallets and purses stolen, sometimes money is taken, sometimes keys to dwellings. In addition, he has had costly sports equipment stolen from his gym locker.

He asked that the various aspects of this be looked into: what is the college's liability, if any, and what insurance policies, if any, could be bought by the college or

by individuals. Also, what is done to keep exams secure, not only in offices but in the copy centers where they are duplicated. Furthermore, how secure are our offices, and who has keys and why.

President Kaplowitz thanked Senator Crozier for bringing the issue to the Senate's attention and thereby making it part of the record. She said that she understood that he had tried to ascertain some of the answers himself and she assumed that he had not been satisfied with the replies to his inquiries. Senator Crozier said that he certainly had not been satisfied.

President Kaplowitz suggested that this issue be referred to the Senate Committee on Buildings and Services and that the committee make formal inquiries on behalf of the Senate and report back to the Senate. Senator Crozier accepted this approach. Hearing no objection, President Kaplowitz directed the committee to study the issue as described and to report back to the Senate.

#### 8. Discussion of Agenda Items of September 21 College Council meeting

The key item of relevance to the faculty on the September 21 agenda of the College Council is a proposal by Florence Grossman and Billie Kotlowitz that HEOs be given five seats on the College Council.

Senator Tulley asked whether the rationale to justify this addition is reasonable.

Senator Bohigian said that the justifications presented in the agenda item are not germane to the issue. He noted that HEOs are subject only to the HEO Screening Committee and to the whim of the administrators they serve.

Senator Goddard asked Senator Bohigian whether he is suggesting that HEOs should be subject to the College P&B Committee or to an equivalent system of peer review and rigorous criteria for reappointment and promotion. Senator Bohigian said that that was not what he was proposing.

Senator Crozier said that this is a key issue. HEOs are not subject to the same scrutiny as faculty and yet this proposal suggests that they be given the same rights. Senator Crozier said that it was well known at the college, by both faculty and the administration, that there are two promotion tracks at John Jay: the fast track and the faculty track.

Senator Tulley asked what the consequences of the allocation of five seats to HEOs, as proposed, would be.

It was explained that there are 50 seats on the College Council. They are allotted as follows: 25 to academic departments (there are currently 21 academic departments and each department has one seat and the four largest departments, based on the number of full-time faculty, each

has a second seat); two members of the non-teaching instructional staff (these are statutory members: Dean Frank McHugh and Financial Director Robert Sermier); 16 student seats; one alumni seat; one Gittleson seat; 5 administrative seats (president; provost; vice president for administrative services; dean of graduate studies; dean of students).

President Kaplowitz noted that realistically there is no group that would give up 5 seats; the only alternative is to increase the Council from 50 to 55 seats. This would mean that the teaching faculty, who currently have 50 percent of the seats (the lowest percentage, she said, of any college governance body she is familiar with) would then have less than 50 percent of the seats.

In addition, there is no faculty representation, as such, just representation of academic departments. Faculty members of the College Council do not represent faculty interests, only departmental interests. That is why the Faculty Senate was created, as a body with both departmental and at-large faculty representation where faculty interests and concerns could be voiced and debated.

President Kaplowitz further explained that although seven administrators are statutory members and although four student council executive officers are statutory members, no faculty member is a statutory member of the College Council. The president of the Faculty Senate, for example, should be but a statutory member but is not and can not sit on the Council unless elected as a representative of her or his academic department. Yet the proposal is for five seats for HEOs, without designating what department or functions these HEOs would represent.

Furthermore, HEO, which stands for Higher Education Officer, is really a meaningless title in terms of governance. It is a bargaining unit title and does not speak to function. HEOs span a wide range of diverse functions: some HEOs are secretaries, others are arms of the administration, and others have truly academic functions. But the vast majority have very little if any relationship to academic or curricula concerns.

Senator Tulley said that when he first read the agenda item he felt great sympathy for the request but now he feels very differently.

Senator Ryan said he does not see how the faculty members on the Council can vote for the proposal in light of the context in which this request exists and the consequences for the academic departments.

President Kaplowitz said that certainly as faculty struggling constantly for participation in college governance we have natural sympathy for this request. And she said, since many faculty work closely with many HEOs we know that quite a few HEOs do, in fact, have a direct involvement in academic issues at the college.

President Kaplowitz said that perhaps a way could be

found to have one seat on the Council allotted to HEOs without changing the total number of 50 seats (and without reducing the percentage of faculty seats). One seat for the HEOs would be in keeping with the pattern of one seat for the Gittlesons, and one seat for the (15,000) alumni.

9. Discussion of draft of Dean Mary Rothlein's FIPSE grant proposal to establish an assessment center at John Jay College

[This was discussed as part of agenda item #4.b.]

10. Discussion of the Task Force

Senator Bohigian told the Senate that the Task Force had issued a report, including a list of recommendations, to President Lynch and that the Task Force has asked the president to distribute the recommendations to the faculty by September 22.

Senator Bohigian said that the members of the Task Force do not wish to answer questions nor to comment until the faculty has received the Task Force recommendations.

11. Invited Guest: President Gerald W. Lynch

President Lynch's flight from Europe has not yet landed. Thus the President will not be meeting with the Senate today.

12. New Business

President Kaplowitz said that a few hours before today's meeting of the Senate, a member of the faculty had given her a copy of an advertisement announcing three faculty lines at John Jay that appeared in the September 17 issue of the Week in Review section of The New York Times. The announcement directed applicants to send a resume and cover letter to the affirmative action officer, not to the provost as has been the procedure at the college to date.

Senator Crozier said that he was very surprised to learn of this as his is one of the departments advertising an opening. He also said it was most inappropriate. He said that applications for a faculty position should be sent to the provost, who is also the academic vice president.

Senator Goddard concurred. He doubted, too, that Farris Forsythe, the affirmative action officer, had been given the additional support staff that such a change would require and that the provost's office does have. The receipt of each application must be recorded, a letter acknowledging receipt must be sent to each applicant, and then the applications



must be sent to the appropriate department chairs.

The general sentiment of the Senate was that applications should be received directly by the provost's office. It was noted that at other colleges, applications are received by either the provost, the department chair, or by the chair of a search committee. No other advertisement in the September 17 Week in Review, for example, directed applications to be sent to an affirmative action officer.

President Kaplowitz said that she would convey the Senate's position on this matter to the provost immediately and she asked Senators Crozier and Goddard if they thought that the Council of Chairs might want to address this issue also. Senator Crozier, co-chair of the Council of Chairs, said he would bring this to the Council of Chairs' executive committee.

[N.B. Provost Sexter has informed President Kaplowitz and Senator Crozier that he will change all subsequent announcements of faculty positions. Henceforth applicants will be directed to send their resumes and cover letter to the office of the provost, as had been previously done.]

In another item of new business, President Kaplowitz reported that Dean Hank Smit has formed an Ad Hoc Committee on the Bookstore, at Vice President Smith's recommendation. Barnes & Nobles' contract with John Jay expired in June and the student action at the college last semester interfered with plans to evaluate the bookstore and the contract.

As a result, the contract was renewed for only one year with the option for a longer contract if renewal is decided. Because so many Senators had raised issues about the bookstore to the Senate last year, President Kaplowitz suggested to Dean Smit that he include a member of the Senate on the committee and he has agreed to do so but he would like the committee to hold its first meeting as soon as possible. The committee will comprise Dean Smit, two faculty members (one of whom is the Senate representative), and two students.

Because of the lateness of the hour, the Senate directed the executive committee of the Senate to select a member of the Senate to serve on this ad hoc committee.

A motion to adjourn was made, seconded, and carried. The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Antoinette Trembinska  
Recording Secretary



JOHN JAY COLLEGE OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE

*The City University of New York*

*899 Tenth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10019*

*(212) 237-8000*

TO: The Faculty Senate

FROM: The Faculty Senate Evaluation Committee

(Professors Haig Bohigian; Lorraine Colville;  
Jane Hurni; Karen Kaplowitz; Sondra Leftoff;  
Robert Panzarella; and Timothy Stroup, chair)

RE: Yearly Report on Activities: 1988-89

DATE: September 8, 1989

On May 5, 1988, the Faculty Senate passed a resolution establishing "a system of evaluating College units by the Faculty" and entrusting this evaluation to a Senate Evaluation Committee. On September 15th the Senate appointed the present committee. During the 1988-89 academic year the Committee has engaged in three activities:

1. Building survey. The Committee decided to conduct a preliminary survey of facilities and services in the new building. In September we developed a draft questionnaire and sent it to President Lynch and Vice-President Smith for their comments. No objections or suggestions were registered, and the Committee mailed the questionnaire to all faculty in October. Respondents were asked to discuss good features, poor features or problems, and suggestions, grouped according to six categories: classrooms, library, offices, building in general, services, and other. Fifty-five replies were received, and the Committee also obtained information directly from individual members of the faculty, conducted its own discussions, and heard opinions expressed on the floor of the Faculty Senate.

The Committee delivered its report to the Faculty Senate on December 9th, and the report was approved subject to minor revisions. The report noted many good features cited by the respondents and also recommended that the administration pay immediate attention to problems of physical safety, classroom conditions, faculty offices, and access for the physically

disabled. More generally, the report concluded that "faculty opinions have not been sufficiently taken into account in the design, planning, development, and installation of the new building" and that "faculty have not been adequately informed about facilities in the new building and about proposed policies concerning the use of those facilities." In accepting the report, the Faculty Senate urged that the administration:

- \* institute regular, formal consultation with the faculty through the Faculty Senate; such consultation should include faculty representation at all decision-making levels associated with the further development and installation of the new building and with the design, planning, development, and installation of Phase II; and
- \* increase communication with the entire faculty about facilities in the new building and about proposed policies relating to the use of those facilities.

The Committee has received no response to its report from President Lynch. Vice President Smith appeared before the Senate to discuss the report at the meeting of March 2, 1989. His comments are summarized in the minutes of that meeting.

2. Questionnaire preparation. In keeping with its charge to develop a system for evaluating units of the college, the Committee met several times to determine which units should be evaluated and what questions should be asked. We have prepared a tentative list of units and questions, and we intend to submit it to the Senate for suggestions at a fall meeting. As a courtesy, we scheduled a meeting with President Lynch to notify him of our plans and to receive any advice he might care to offer. Unfortunately, this meeting was to be held on a date during the student occupation of the buildings, and hence it has been postponed until the fall. We expect to conduct the survey of units during the 1989-90 academic year.

3. Grant consultation. In May, Dean Mary Rothlein informed the Committee that she is preparing a grant proposal for evaluating various college programs and services. On May 17th we met with Dean Rothlein to discuss her proposal. Since she was at an early stage in developing her ideas, we could not report to the Senate then about the substance of her ultimate proposal. We did, however, note her general intentions that any assessment must reassure those being assessed that it is not punitive and that the assessment would not be directed towards academic departments. We also stated our collective belief that her proposal might supplement, but would not replace, our own efforts to evaluate college units. On July 25th we received a draft of the proposal from Dean Rothlein; the committee will meet with her in September and will report to the Senate about our discussions.