

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES #94

John Jay College of Criminal Justice

September 22, 1993

Time 3:15 PM

Room 630 T

Present (33): Yahya Affinnih, Arvind Agarwal, Michael Blitz, Janice Bockmeyer, James Bowen, Orlanda Brugnola, Edward Davenport, Jane Davenport, Peter DeForest, Koto Dei, Vincent Del Castillo, Robert DeLucia, P.J. Gibson, Elisabeth Gitter, Robert Grappone, Lou Guinta, Holly Hill, Lee Jenkins, Karen Kaplowitz, Andrew Karmen, Tom Litwack, Barry Luby, James Malone, Peter Manuel, Jill Norgren, Bruce Pierce, Charles Reid, Ronald Reisner, Vilma Santiago-Irizarry, Peter Shenkin, Chris Suggs, Agnes Wieschenberg, Bessie Wright

Absent (5): Chris Hewitt, Laurence Holder, Gavin Lewis, Davidson Umeh, Martin Wallenstein

AGENDA

1. Announcements from the chair
2. Approval of Minutes 1/93 of the September 9 meeting
3. Update on Chancellor's Academic Planning Process and responses of CUNY colleges and other groups
4. President Lynch's request to the Faculty Senate re: Middle States site visit report
5. Prerequisite checking and course availability at Fall 1993 registration. Guest: Dean of Undergraduate Studies Eli Faber
6. Guest: Geraldine Casey, (Acting) Director: Women's Center

1. Announcements from the chair [Attachment A]

The Senate was directed to the written announcements [Attachment A]. President Kaplowitz reported that she had just learned earlier in the day at the President's Cabinet that faculty who wish to attend the September 30 lecture by University of Pennsylvania Law Professor Lani Guinier are required to have a ticket and that tickets are available from Dean Hank Smit. She reported that approximately two-thirds of the 600 seats have already been reserved for students in classes that are being brought to the lecture by their instructors.

Upon being elected as acting chair of the Department of Speech and Theater (upon Professor Ray Rizzo going on medical leave), Professor Martin Wallenstein vacated his seat as an at-large member of the College Personnel and Budget Committee (because he will serve on the P&B in his capacity as the acting chair). The Committee on Faculty Elections has determined that the next highest vote recipient, Professor William Heffernan (Law,

Police Science, and CJ Administration), received the requisite 40 percent of the ballots cast and, therefore, is the new at-large member of the P&B. The other two at-large representatives are Professors Rubie Malone (SEEK) and Bonnie Nelson (Library). Also, Professor Dorothy Bracey is the acting chair of the Anthropology Department during the Fall semester: Professor Serena Nanda, who is not on leave, will resume as department chair in the spring after meeting a publication deadline.

Professor Tom Repetto, the president of the Citizen's Crime Commission, is teaching a graduate course on Wednesday evenings. Tonight his guest speaker is David Durk who, with Frank Serpico, exposed the police corruption in the NYPD and testified to the Knapp Commission 20 years ago. WABC-TV is taping the class for a program on police corruption and Professor Repetto has invited faculty to attend and to participate in the discussion.

Professor Horace Banbury has asked that the Benate be informed that the Harlem Vocal Arts Ensemble will perform on Wednesday, November 3, at 7 PM in the theater. Professor Yvonne Hatchett of the Department of Art, Music, and Philosophy will be conducting.

Senator Suggs reported that Professor Norval Morris is speaking at John Jay on December 2 as part of a series of explorations by the College about criminal justice and the humanities. He praised Professor Morris's new book which is being used in several courses this semester.

President Kaplowitz reported that Professor Charles Piltch (English) has asked her to bring to the Senate's attention his concern about the ID card policy as a result of an episode that occurred two mornings ago. Now that Professor Piltch's ID card is on a chain, it does not fit in his wallet and as a result he discovered he did not have his ID card with him when he arrived at the College. The student security officer explained that because it is not yet October 1, when the mandatory ID card policy goes into effect, there would be no difficulty. When Professor Piltch asked what the procedure will be if this were to happen after October 1, he was told that he would be instructed to return home. When he asked the security officer to repeat this, she again explained that the security officers have been told to tell anyone without an ID card that she or he has to return home. Professor Piltch said that he told the security officer that he is the teacher and must teach his classes: he simply can not return home. The security officer then told Professor Piltch that she had thought he was a student and that those had been the instructions that security officers had been told to tell students: she said she did not know what faculty members are supposed to be told.

Professor Piltch conveyed his concern to President Kaplowitz about two aspects of this: one, he does not want any student to be told to return home, and, two, he does not want any student to be provided with a true or false excuse for not being in class to take an exam or to hand in a paper: he does not want any student claiming truly or falsely that she or he would have been in class but could not be because of instructions from a security officer to return home because of a forgotten ID card.

Senator Norgren said that she, too, has an incident to report but that hers is about a CUNY security officer, the full-time officers of which John Jay now has four, according to the "Announcements from the chair" [see Attachment A - p. 1].

President Kaplowitz said that she included in her written announcements information about the new Level 3 CUNY security officers and also about the President's Cabinet meeting of September 8, at which the ID policy and other security issues were reported about. She said she included this information in the announcements in part because when she met with President Lynch earlier in the month (with Professor Crozier) at which the vice presidents and Dean Rothlein were present, she reported the issues about security that had been raised by the Senate at two Senate meetings last spring and she reported that the consensus of the Benate was that the College should not go ahead with any of the security measures until everything is in place that is needed for the policies and procedures to be properly implemented. She said she reported the Senate's concern that the policies be well thought out, that training be thorough, and that we do everything possible to make the security measures succeed. She said that although (Acting) Security Director Brian Murphy had told the Faculty Senate on April 13, when he met with the Senate, that there would be a committee, to which he planned to invite her and others to join, so that all of this can be done and so that the community can participate and be fully informed, there has been no such committee formed to date.

Benator Norgren reported that two days ago she had a very negative experience with a CUNY security officer. She reported that the episode occurred as she entered T Building for the Fall faculty meeting and that she had not been wearing her ID card since it was not yet October 1 and, therefore, the policy of wearing or showing the ID card was not yet mandatory. She reported that one of the CUNY security officers grabbed her arm from behind and physically restrained her as she walked by him. Benator Norgren said that an incident proceeded from that during which the officer maintained a very high level of temper. She said he exhibited totally non-professional behavior, all of which she has reported. She said she is concerned that training has not been adequate, that selection of personnel has not been adequate, and that if this is what can happen during a non-mandatory period where someone is just walking into the building, someone who is preoccupied, who does not say or do anything disruptive, and then is grabbed in that fashion, then she is more than a little concerned about what will happen when we get crowds of people exiting and entering the two buildings during the change of class times, when we have students in a panic who have forgotten their card and have an exam to take or a paper to hand in. She explained that she has asked that this security officer be transferred out of John Jay.

Senator Norgren said she is asking for counsel from the Faculty Senate as to what the Senators think and whether they consider the action she has described as qualifying as acceptable behavior by a professionally trained security officer. Benator Norgren asked whether we are going to create a climate of violence here which we have not had: she said that in twenty years as a member of the faculty here, no one has ever laid a hand on her at the College and now someone who has been hired to protect her has accosted her.

Senator Pierce asked for more information about these CUNY security officers. President Kaplowitz explained that when Chancellor Reynolds came to CUNY three years ago, she created a task force to study security and the task force, one of the members of which was President Lynch, recommended that instead of contracting private guards from companies such as Pinkerton (John

Jay is the only college that hires its own students as its security force), in light of the fact that Pinkerton guards who have no allegiance to CUNY or to the college to which they are assigned and in light of the fact that the Pinkerton guards make only \$5 or \$6 an hour, a small percentage of the money paid by CUNY to Pinkerton, CUNY should hire and train its own full-time security officers who will be and who will feel they are a part of the community of the college and the University by whom they are employed. These officers would be permanent members of the College's staff and would, therefore, know the culture of a college which transient, contracted guards do not. The thinking, with which many people have concurred, is that as members of the college and of the University they will care about the people and the property in a different way and to a greater extent than if their allegiance is to an outside agency which pays them very little and whose training is out of CUNY's hands. The plan is to have officers who will be responsive in a positive way to the students and faculty and who will identify with and understand the students and faculty and the culture.

Senator Pierce asked who provides the training for the CUNY security officers and what kind of training is provided. Senator Norgren said that she has been informed that the CUNY Security Officers are trained by John Jay's Criminal Justice Center and that the officers are extensively trained and are well paid. President Kaplowitz explained that there are two groups of CUNY Security Officers: the Level 3 officers, who are supervisors, who receive six to eight weeks of training, and who are paid a little over \$32,000 a year. We now have four such Level 3 officers at John Jay: last semester we were assigned one Level 3 officer and this month we were assigned three more Level 3 officers. There are also Level 1 officers who receive three weeks of training and who are paid somewhat more than 20,000 a year but none has been assigned to John Jay (presumably because we have a student security force and not Pinkerton guards). The other CUNY colleges have been assigned a large number of Level 3 and Level 1 officers: to date several hundred officers have been trained,

President Kaplowitz said that she is familiar with the program because she has provided training since the program was begun more than a year ago: she does training about dealing with people who are disabled and she teaches the legal issues as well as practical ways of dealing with the day-to-day implementation of the legal (and moral) mandates: she became knowledgeable about this subject during the Faculty Senate's protracted efforts to make John Jay's buildings and facilities accessible to people with disabilities. She said that other John Jay faculty also provide training as do non-John Jay experts. She noted that the fact that a section on the topic of the disabled is included for both Level 3 and Level 1 trainees is praiseworthy, especially in light of the fact that no such training has ever been provided to John Jay's student security force, although plans are underway as of yesterday, she said she was told, to provide such training to the student officers. President Kaplowitz added that one of the things she teaches is not to touch anyone, unless the person gives explicit permission and instructions, even if the purpose is to help, because one never knows what hidden disability a person may have: for example, someone who has recently had a mastectomy will suffer agonizing pain if her arm is grabbed, notwithstanding that the purpose may have been to help that person.

Senator Pierce asked whether this then is an individual personality anomaly, in other words, whether it is a violation of

the stated operating procedure policy. He suggested that we meet with the director of security to get clarity about the procedures and policy. He reported that earlier in the day he saw incidents involving the ID card check that he called frightening: one episode occurred when one of the security officers at the door was only partially paying attention to the people entering the building and when she looked up she started screaming at the people who had walked past her. Senator Pierce said that what that says to him is that we could be in for confrontations on an almost daily basis. He added that this is something the Senate has talked about: ID checking can be done, it is being done to our right and left, but what he wants to know is how the training actually went on, how are people assessed for the kind of interaction that Senator Norgren has reported and, he said, if we are using terms like 'highly trained' about people engaged in these kinds of events then this is critical enough to stop the ID policy from going into effect October 1. He said that if we inform the security administrator immediately we can stop the problems before they begin.

Senator Guinta asked what has been the response of the administration. Senator Norgren said that to date she has not been shown nor asked to sign an incident report, she was never asked if she was hurt, never asked if she would like any counseling nor whether she had been traumatized. Senator Norgren said that she told the security director that she thought it was fortunate that this happened to her and not to someone else because her response to being grabbed was not a violent one and that if it had been someone else who was grabbed there might have been a fistfight or a knife fight. She said that the proposal by the security director was that the person be retrained and that she was asked if this would be a satisfactory solution but that she said she wants him transferred because she thinks this person is bad news for our students and for our faculty. Senator Norgren said that she was told that this person comes from a corrections background and is used to a different environment and is having a little trouble adjusting.

Senator Jenkins said that what he has heard today graphically shows that training of the security officers is not adequate.

Senator Norgren added that after she did not show the kind of empathy a social scientist is obviously expected to show and after saying that she wanted the person to be transferred and had suggested he be transferred to CUNY's Central Administration building at 80th street where there are few young students it was suggested by the security director that she wants to ruin this security officer's life. She said that during the meeting, as she took notes of what was being said, she felt that she was writing a textbook chapter on the phenomenon of blaming the victim. And so, she said, she has written a long memorandum and has asked the Human Resources (Personnel) Director Margaret Schulze how to enter something into someone's personnel file and asked what is owed to the employee and what is owed to the victim and, Senator Norgren said, Ms. Schulze was very surprised to hear her refer to herself as the victim. Senator Norgren said she explained that she certainly does not think of herself as the perpetrator. The memorandum has been sent to the head of security at John Jay, to his superior Vice President John Smith, to President Lynch (to whom she reported this episode just prior to the faculty meeting), to Ms. Schulze, and to our PSC representative.

Asked what happened after she was grabbed, Senator Norgren

said that not being able to judge what might happen, she used the phone at the security desk and called President Lynch's office during which time the officer was verbally abusive. She said that not wanting to be grabbed again, she took her ID card out of her purse and showed it to him but that she held her thumb over her social security number: she explained that one reason she does not wear the ID card is because it has her social security number on it. She said she explained why she had her finger over the number and then there was a second incident in which the security officer grabbed the ID card out of her hand. After reading her name out loud he gave it back and she headed to the faculty meeting and saw Vice President Smith and told him what had happened and suggested that the two of them go back up the escalator and meet with the officer but VP Smith declined to do so. Vice President Smith did say to Senator Norgren that what the officer did was absolutely incorrect and that he would look into it. But she did not have a phonemail or other message as of midnight that night, nine hours later, and so she left a message on Security Director Murphy's phonemail saying she would like to hear from someone before deciding whether to file battery and assault charges.

Senator Malone asked Senator Norgren whether she has yet signed an incident report and she answered that she has a phonemail message asking how to go about this but has received no answer. Several senators urged her to go to the security office or to a security desk and request an incident report form. Senator Norgren said that the problem is that the incident involves a security officer and that, furthermore, there is no clear, easily determined procedure for filing an incident report.

Senator Norgren added that here we are teaching conflict resolution and other such concepts and skills in our classrooms but we are engaged in seemingly opposite behavior as a College.

Senator Litwack asked whether there is a stated, written, policy about what will happen after October 1 if a person comes to John Jay without an ID card. President Kaplowitz said that at the President's Cabinet that morning, it was explained that visitors will be asked to show some form of ID and people who are here for training such as at the Criminal Justice Center or by Dean Curran's Office will be given a temporary ID card for the period of the training. But, she said, this appears nowhere in writing as far as she knows, and furthermore there has been no discussion of which she is aware about what will happen if a John Jay student, faculty member or staff member arrives without a John Jay ID card. She said that Vice President Smith told the Cabinet today that they are studying the feasibility of purchasing a machine that makes ID cards and stores the photo image on a computer disk so that a person who has been issued an ID card can have that confirmed by having the security officer type in the person's name and then the officer can compare the photo image on the monitor with the person asking for entrance. But VP Smith had reported that purchase of such a machine is quite a ways off.

Senator Litwack asked whether there is a written policy from the John Jay administration to the security officers about physical contact by officers. President Kaplowitz said that she does not know whether there is such a policy and if there is one she does not know whether it is in writing. She said that she does not know what either the student security officers or the CUNY security officers are told about physical contact or physical restraint or force. She said she only knows that in the context of teaching about dealing with people who are disabled she makes

the point about not touching because the instinct, often a very caring instinct, is to physically help a disabled person, someone for example who has fallen out of a wheelchair: she teaches them to first ask if the person needs or wants help and, if the person says yes, to ask for specific instructions about the kind of help that is needed or desired. She said she explains that even an obviously disabled person may also have another, hidden disability, may be physically harmed by being touched in a certain way, may have a medical device under his or her clothing, may want or need to be independent, may have been the victim of an assault and be traumatized by unwanted physical contact, and that ultimately no one should ever touch anyone without their explicit permission and instructions (unless, of course, a person's life or safety is in imminent danger). But, she said, she does not know what is taught about touching in other contexts, such as when a criminal event is taking place or when an intruder appears or when someone doesn't show an ID card.

Senator Litwack said that between now and October 1 there should be very clear guidelines in place that the security force is very well aware of and that the rest of us are also aware of as to what happens if a person comes to John Jay without an ID and also about the use of hands by a security officer. He suggested that we express our sense that this is necessary before October 1.

Senator Agarwal suggested that the Senate send a letter expressing the consensus of the Senate that the use of hands or any physical violence should be totally prohibited regardless of the situation. He said that not showing an ID is not an especially significant event and should not trigger such a response. Furthermore, systems can be set up for people who have forgotten their ID card. He said that he visits institutions that provide access only by the mechanical scanning of an ID card and even in these places systems are in place that accommodate those who have forgotten their ID card. It is a simple process: near the entrance is a computer into which one punches one's name and the machine issues a temporary ID card for that day. Senator Agarwal said that we should express in very strong terms that the behavior reported by Senator Norgren is totally unacceptable.

Vice President Blitz said that before we send a memorandum we need to know what it is that the security officers, both student and full-time officers, are told to do and not to do. He said that several incidents have been reported today, and he knows of two others, and these have taken place in just two weeks during a practice period and that these incidents reveal a breakdown of, if nothing else, knowing what the regulations are. The officers seem not to know what to do: there does not seem to be an 'if then' protocol. He said, on the one hand, a security officer assaults a member of the faculty. On the other hand, his own observation is that the security officers can't actually keep track of all the people entering the buildings because there are only two buildings with hundreds and hundreds of people going in and out. He noted that more often than not the ID card hanging from the chain is flipped over and there is no way for a security officer to know what is hanging around the person's neck. One has to wonder when a security officer will make the mistake of reaching to flip over the ID card and the consequences of such a mistake. He said we do not know if the officers have been explicitly instructed to not do such a thing. Vice President Blitz agreed with Senator Litwack: he said it is mandatory that there be written guidelines and that we should ask for a copy: we need to know what guidelines the officers have been given, what is in

writing, and to evaluate these guidelines.

Senator Guinta said he is very concerned about the way Senator Norgren was treated by the officer, the lack of respect for her person, the lack of respect for her position, and the subsequent lack of respect and concern for her. He noted that Senator Norgren is a long-standing and highly respected member of the faculty: if this is the way she is treated and continues to be treated, what, he asked, will be the treatment of those who are unknown and who lack her position and resources.

Senator Del Castillo said that there has to be a policy about how to deal with the escalating of confrontation. He said that obviously putting one's hands on someone should not be the first stage but it is important to understand what those policies are. We must know what the policies are and what the officers have been instructed to do. He said that there are really two issues to this: on the one hand, the officers are responsible for a policy that all of us must adhere to, both students and staff, although some of us may forget or fail to show our ID card ; but their other obligation is to keep intruders out, to keep out people who do not have a legitimate reason for being in the College, and the security officers have to be trained to at least recognize the difference and to respond appropriately. The first step, he said, is for us to know what training they have received and what the policies are for escalating situations: when do they call the police, how far do they go before they call the police.

Senator Gitter suggested that we crystallize the many excellent suggestions into a motion. She moved that a letter be sent to Acting Security Director Brian Murphy expressing our concern about the incidents that have happened so far, asking what the regulations are, suggesting that he avail himself of the expertise of faculty who teach criminal justice at a college of criminal justice and asking him to come to the next Senate meeting to answer peoples' concerns. Vice President Blitz suggested amending the motion: instead of coming to the next Senate meeting which is after October 1, the letter should include a request for a meeting before October 1 between Mr. Murphy and the Senate's executive committee and other members of the Senate, such as Senators Pierce and Del Castillo who are experts in the criminal justice field. He also suggested that the letter be copied to President Lynch because it is President Lynch alone who can decide to postpone the beginning of the mandatory ID card policy until a date later than October 1 and also to copy the letter to Vice President Smith, who is Mr. Murphy's immediate supervisor. Senator Suggs supported the amendment for the additional reason that the Senate does not have time to devote its meetings to again meeting with the security director. He moved to further amend the motion by requiring the Senate group to report back to the Senate at its October 7 meeting about its meeting with Mr. Murphy. Senator Gitter accepted Vice President Blitz's amendment as further amended by Senator Suggs. The motion as amended was carried by unanimous vote.

2. Approval of Minutes #93 of the September 9 meeting

By a motion duly made and seconded, Minutes #93 of the September 9, 1993, meeting were approved.

3. Update on the Chancellor's Academic Planning Process and responses of CUNY colleaes and other groups

President Kaplowitz reported that she sent the Faculty Senate's resolution endorsing the July 27 resolution of the Council of Faculty Governance Leaders to Chancellor Reynolds, to Professor Robert Picken (the UFS chair and faculty trustee) and to President Lynch. She also reported that in a conversation with Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Richard Freeland the previous week she noted that one of the concerns of the John Jay Faculty Senate was that the Chancellory was meeting with various colleges at the Chancellory's initiation and that it seemed as if again there is a multi-tier approach to the colleges, such as the one delineated in the Cole memorandum, with some colleges being visited and some being ignored. She explained that she told Vice Chancellor Freeland that she was not asking for such a meeting but was reporting the impression that is being created at John Jay and at other colleges.

President Xaplowitz reported that she subsequently received a call from Vice Chancellor Freeland two days ago, requesting a meeting with the faculty leadership of John Jay before the next Faculty Senate meeting. Vice Chancellor Freeland explained that he was requesting the meeting to answer our questions and to hear our concerns both about events to date and also about the academic program planning that the College is required to be engaged in henceforth. He offered to come to John Jay for the meeting. President Kaplowitz also reported that Vice Chancellor Freeland had asked whether the Senate has any further action on its agenda regarding these matters and she said that she explained that we do not and that we are respecting the Chancellor's plan to meet with the Council of Faculty Governance Leaders on September 24, that we see that as an important response to the Council's July 27 resolution, and that we at John Jay are awaiting to see what happens at that September 24 meeting before considering other possible actions.

President Kaplowitz said that she suggested to Vice Chancellor Freeland that the meeting be with the Senate's executive committee and also with the newly created joint Faculty Senate/Council of Chairs Committee on Academic Program Planning and Review. She said that Vice Chancellor Freeland thought that this was an excellent suggestion and he expressed his approbation upon hearing that such a committee has been formed. She said that she consulted with the Senate's executive committee and with Professor Robert Crozier and all agree that this group, plus the Senate's legal counsel, Senator Litwack, should meet with the Vice Chancellor, if the Senate concurs. The consensus of the Senate was that this group should meet with the Vice Chancellor and report back to the Senate on October 7.

President Kaplowitz also reported that this afternoon the Lehman faculty are meeting to consider a proposed resolution of no confidence in Chancellor Reynolds. Also, the Delegate Assembly of the PSC is scheduled to vote the following day, December 23, on an excellent resolution.

4. President Lynch's request to the Faculty Senate re: Middle States site visit report [Attachment B]

It was explained that President Lynch has written 17 people

asking for a letter by October 1 which gives a timetable and the procedures by which the group or office each of these people is responsible for will implement those Middle States site report recommendations identified by him as the responsibility of that group or office [Attachment B].

The first item from the Middle States visiting team report that is identified as the responsibility of the Faculty Senate is as follows: "Faculty can be most useful to the College in the areas of curriculum and academic policy. It has particular expertise in these areas which can be an enormous assistance to administrators who are often confronted with problems of academic programs, curriculum, grading and academic standards. Only genuine cooperation between faculty and administrators will enable the College to deal successfully with this issue."

President Kaplowitz noted that the Senate regularly takes up issues of standards, curriculum, etc., and in terms of academic planning, which President Lynch refers to in his letter, the Senate at its last meeting created, with the Council of Chairs, a joint committee on academic program planning and program review. This committee and the Senate's executive committee are meeting together next week with Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Richard Freeland to discuss academic planning and program review.

However, President Kaplowitz said the second and third items, which have to do with faculty development and workshops, were couched in language that is unintelligible to her. Senator Gitter said that the two items are unintelligible to her as well and the Senate concurred. Senator Gitter proposed that the required letter state that as for the first item, we have created the joint Faculty Senate/Chairs Committee on Academic Planning and Program Review, and that items two and three are incoherent and incomprehensible. The Senate concurred. President Kaplowitz said that she will also include in the letter information about the Better Teaching Workshops that the Senate has been providing for the past 12 semesters, with a list of the topics given to date.

5. Prerequisite checking and course availability at fall 1993 registration. Guest: Dean of Undergraduate Studies Eli Faber [Attachment C]

President Kaplowitz welcomed Dean Eli Faber. She explained that in May 1991 (Faculty Senate Minutes #62), when it became clear that John Jay would in fact be getting on-line registration, which the faculty had been promised for almost two decades, the Faculty Senate approved a resolution stating that on-line registration not be implemented unless and until a system for checking and enforcing prerequisite checking was developed for the on-line system. The Faculty Senate took this position, and it was the unanimous position of the Faculty Senate, both because we believe it to be essential educationally and because after being troopers all these years, sitting day after day at registration, handing out course cards and checking prerequisites (although not all faculty did so) we did not want to provide less for our students in terms of prerequisite checking now that we were finally getting an on-line system. The Council of Chairs also unanimously adopted the same position at that time. Thus it became the mandate of the Faculty Senate and of the Council of Chairs that prerequisite checking be part of computerized registration. This mandate was honored by the administration.

She explained that during this past summer, Registrar Donald Gray and Dean Frank McHugh had alerted members of the College administration and of the faculty leadership that for many reasons the implementation of prerequisite checking and enforcement should be phased in and should not be universally implemented during fall registration, even though as of May the plan had been that all prerequisites would be checked and enforced. A meeting was held at the end of June to discuss the situation: those attending were three members of the Senate's executive committee, herself, Michael Blitz, and Edward Davenport; the Chair of the Council of Chairs, Robert Crozier; Dean Frank McHugh; Registrar Donald Gray; Computer Director Peter Barnett; Advisement Director Paul Wyatt; and Provost Basil Wilson.

The reasons given for recommending that prerequisites not be universally enforced were that this is the first use of on-line registration for all 9,000 students; the course numbers had been changed to rationalize the numbering system (not for prerequisite checking); many prerequisites had been changed resulting in far more prerequisites rather than fewer (as the administration had expected); the College bulletin (with the new numbers and new prerequisites) would not be ready until August 1 at the earliest; and, for one reason or another, insufficient numbers of introductory courses were being offered, which meant that students would not be provided with courses they were eligible to take. Because of these compelling reasons and the administration's commitment to phase in the enforcement of prerequisites, the faculty leadership agreed that the approach being proposed was a reasonable one and all agreed that meetings would take place in the fall to assess the process and to plan the implementation. In the meantime, at fall 1993 registration, prerequisites for all 400-level courses and for all required core courses (except foreign languages) would be checked and enforced. These courses represent approximately one-third of the sections; another one-third of the sections offered have no prerequisites; this means that one-third, or approximately 360 sections, all of them 200-level and 300-level courses, would not be checked.

President Kaplowitz noted that Dean McHugh, Registrar Gray, and Computer Center Director Barnett are meeting with the Senate on October 20. Today, Dean Eli Faber is reporting to us about the on-line process, especially prerequisite checking and the availability of courses at this past registration. She directed the Senate's attention to the summary of a survey conducted by the Office of Institutional Research during the Spring 1993 registration in which students were asked which courses they had wanted to take but could not take either because the sections were closed, or the courses were offered when the students were not available, etc. [see Attachment C: a copy of the entire survey report, including the tables, is available from the Office of Institutional Research.]

Dean Faber explained that the Senate's executive committee has kindly invited him to report on those aspects of our new on-line registration system with which he is most familiar and that means, specifically, the enforcement of prerequisites. He noted that as President Kaplowitz had explained, about two years ago the Faculty Senate and the Council of Chairs voted unanimously and independently of each other that no on-line registration system should be introduced without provision for mandatory checking and enforcement of course prerequisites.

Subsequent to those votes and the discussions that ensued,

Dean Faber explained, the Provost directed as stated on page 47 of the Middle States Report that "those who are to design the [on-line] system will . . . fashion the technology for this [prerequisite] enforcement." Also subsequent to those votes, the Curriculum Committee, following a study by every academic department (or by their curriculum committee) engaged in a huge review of every course offering to clarify what the prerequisites are, to adjust them in many cases, and to adjust course numbers accordingly. A course numbering system was worked out that for the first time is internally consistent with reference to the prerequisites. This undertaking, this overhaul of our prerequisites and our renumberings, he added, was approved last May by the College Council and was sent on to the Central Administration at 80th Street in time for the introduction of the on-line system during this past registration. The new 1993-95 catalog which came out this summer at the time of registration lists all the new prerequisites and the new numbers.

The third development, in response to the resolutions of the Faculty Senate and the Council of Chairs, was that the Office of Administrative Computing, together with advising director Eaul Wyatt, developed a "prerequisite check sheet," which was tailored to each student: this sheet showed which courses, among all those scheduled for the forthcoming semester, could be taken on the basis of already completed prerequisites. Dean Faber distributed copies of a student's prerequisite check sheet (the name and social security number of the student had been deleted) and explained that each student was to be required to present this sheet to the terminal operator before the operator would register the student for the course or courses he or she requested. He noted that during the fall registration process, the terminal operators stopped registration in the following cases only: skills coarsest all general education courses; and all 400-level courses and this was because of an important development over the summer to which President Kaplowitz has referred.

Dean Faber said that the administration was positioned, with the prerequisite check sheet developed by the Office of Administrative Computing, to proceed with prerequisite checking enforcement for all courses but that during the summer the administration decided on another course of action: a phase-in of prerequisite enforcement, arising out to the belief that this was so momentous a change in our registration procedure, coming at the same time as the changes in course numbers and the first trial of the on-line system, that we were afraid that we would overburden everybody and that we would have a disaster at registration. The administration decided to begin the phase-in this semester, he said, with the enforcement of prerequisites for only three categories of courses: all skills courses (English 099; Mathematics 103; Communication Skills 101; and similar courses); the general education requirements (the requirements in English, history, literature, philosophy, science, mathematics, and sciences) with the exception only of the foreign language courses; and all 400-level courses. The administration also decided to conduct an educational program during the current semester to apprise the student body of this important change in registration procedure and it was also decided that the Provost and the Chairs would discuss how the phase-in would next proceed.

Dean Faber said that he thinks that this was the right decision, calling it a sage, sound and thoughtful way to proceed and we did avoid any tremendous blowup. The next step, of course, he added, would be to figure out how and when to phase-in our

200-level and 300-level courses.

Dean Faber noted that the question, therefore, is how well did our modified prerequisite checking work during this past registration. To answer, he made a number of observations: first, the terminal operators sent enough students to the Undergraduate Studies table, where he and Paul Wyatt sat, in connection with prerequisite checking to warrant the conclusion that the operators had been well trained by Registrar Donald Gray for this function and that the computerized signal that questions and checks for prerequisite completion before a student is permitted to register for a requested course works. Secondly, the faculty and chairs who worked at registration appear to have issued waivers, that is, invoked "or permission of the section instructor" to students who had not taken the prerequisites, to only approximately 80 students, which he called a drop in the bucket of the approximately 8,300 undergraduate students who registered.

Dean Faber said that regarding the waivers made by the faculty and chairs he wants to note that very few such waivers, only 22, were given in 400-level courses (none in the important Legal Studies 420, for example) but of the 22 such waivers of which he has records, 7 (or one-third) were in Government 430; 5 were in our most advanced science courses; and 3 were in Security 405, which has a very very small registration and therefore this represents a considerable proportion. He said that there may be some room for concern in these instances but, then again, there may not be for as the instructor of Security 405 noted in a subsequent conversation with Dean Faber, he knew the students in question and knew their capabilities from previous courses and, therefore, decided that they qualified academically, which is supposed to be the only grounds for a waiver as agreed upon at the Curriculum Committee and then at the College Council last semester. In addition to the 400-level waivers, there were 14 waivers in mathematics and there were 11 waivers in the sciences (in addition to the 5 already noted in connection with the 400-level courses). Dean Faber said that he must confess a bit of concern about the pattern of waivers in the science and mathematics upper-level courses and that perhaps this is an issue for the individual departments to examine (and also that the Government 430 waivers should be studied by that department).

A third observation about how well the system worked, Dean Faber noted, is that he and Paul Wyatt verified that prerequisites had been met by close to 700 students who were stopped by the terminal operators and sent back to the Undergraduate Studies table nearby. While some of those 700 students were seniors on the first day of registration (who needed entry into a required 400-level course in their major), almost all of these students were either transfer students or readmitted students, for whom we did not produce prerequisite check sheets but the administration was able to present the following documentation: in the case of transfer students, a form called the "preliminary evaluation of transfer credits," which is completed by Frank Marousek or by Bill Devine in the Admissions Office; in the case of readmitted students, there is a written prescription of courses already successfully taken which is completed by Frank McHugh or Donald Gray when they interview all readmitted students one by one, and, in the case of both groups, there was a call to Virginia Gardner for proficiency examination results. In the case of seniors on the first day of registration, a certain code number verified that the students were, in fact, seniors. In this manner Paul Wyatt and he were able to ascertain that the required previous course

had been completed or that the choice of a skills course was based properly on proficiency examination scores.

Dean Faber stated that he wanted to emphasize that Mr. Wyatt and he adhered scrupulously to the regulation that "members of the administration shall not have authority to admit students to courses if they have not satisfied the listed prerequisites, including class standing" as required by the College Council in setting the policy. He added that he wanted to praise the quality of the work of Frank Marousek and Bill Devine, who are unsung heroes, in advising transfer students as to what courses they are qualified to take on the basis of the work completed elsewhere and Dean Faber also praised the quality of the individual attention given by Frank McHugh and Donald Gray to readmitted students for the same purpose. Dean Faber said the fidelity of these people to the curricular policies that the College has enacted over the years is, to put it quite mildly, exemplary.

As to our experience in enforcing prerequisites during this first go-round, Dean Faber said he would conclude that it went pretty well, at least as far as he can tell. He added that predictions of disaster, of angry students prevented from finding courses for which they could register, did not prove to be the case from where he sat, and doubtlessly the decision to phase in the enforcement of this activity had a role to play in this. Dean Faber also noted that a rumor raced about the gymnasium on the second or third day of registration to the effect that students were filching prerequisite waiver forms and forging faculty signatures. He said that while he is not a handwriting expert, he sees very little evidence to support this allegation.

Furthermore, he said, many students appear to have learned about prerequisite requirements and their enforcement; in other words, word seems to have gotten around suggesting that if we plan wisely for an adequate number of courses that students are qualified to take, there should not be any problem with another gradual phase in. He cited examples of frantic telephone calls he received from students after they had registered who had gone home and read the catalog and discovered they had not taken the prerequisites for courses they had registered for and wanted to know what they should do. There were also students who requested waiver forms for 200-level and 300-level courses because they had not taken the prerequisites and they did not know that prerequisites were not being enforced for those courses (and were so informed). And so during the period since we began talking about prerequisite enforcement, two or three years ago, this has really entered the consciousness of the student body, he said.

As for the future, Dean Faber made the following suggestions: we should definitely continue the phase in of this new procedure. He said he sincerely hopes that the Chairs and the Provost will, in fact, have the opportunity to plan the next step and it has to be soon so that there is sufficient lead time before our next registration period. Also, the education process to introduce these changes to our students must get underway.

Dean Faber said that he believes that the policy of enforcing prerequisites is the best curricular device we have found to achieve the blend of access and excellence that we frequently invoke since we introduced the remedial skills courses in the early- and mid-1970s. Excellence: because the level of classroom instruction, assignments, and so forth will rise as students are better prepared. Access: because we will no longer knowingly

permit students, as we have done all these years, whom we know to be unqualified to enroll in classes in which we know they are doomed to fail.

In this connection, Dean Faber said, he wants to share the case of 'K' with the Senate. He distributed the fall registration record of 'K' whose name and other identifying information had been deleted. Dean Faber explained that 'K' is a freshman who after registering came to see Dean Faber to ask him for a waiver from the late registration fee. He wanted to go to late registration to drop History 235 because the instructor told him on the first day of class that as a freshman he was not qualified to take the course, which had as its prerequisite junior standing or above. Dean Faber noted that before the renumbering process, History 325 had been a 400-level course. It is, thus, an advanced course on the history of crime and criminal justice in European society from 1750 to the present. The readings include Lombroso, Durkheim, and is clearly not a freshman course. 'K' was also registered for Government 371: American Political Philosophy, which is one of the most sophisticated courses offered in this college. He was also registered for Sociology 203, which has as its prerequisite Sociology 101, which 'K' has not taken. Dean Faber went on to explain that 'K' (the student's first initial) is a Pre-Core student whom he taught last spring, that is to say 'K' is unqualified even to get into English 100, which is the second level remedial English course because he has not yet passed English 099, the most remedial of the English courses. Dean Faber explained that the Pre-Core program is a special experimental program for students who failed both the reading and the writing proficiency examinations and who are our very weakest students. Dean Faber said that Professor Michael Blitz, the director of the Pre-Core program, has told him that he has run into other Pre-Core students who have registered for 200-level and 300-level courses. To be fair, Dean Faber said, he must add that even if 'K' were limited to 100-level courses he is not going to make it because he has very serious impediments to making it and in that sense he is a poor example of why we need prerequisite enforcement. He said he often does wonder, however, about those who do not have serious impediments, who can make it, but who are doomed to fail (we know from long experience) by drifting into 200-level and 300-level courses. On the other hand, enforcement of prerequisite checks will enable those who are capable, those who we can bring along in a sequential course of development of study, to succeed.

As to the next phase-in stage, Dean Faber suggested that the 300-level courses be added to those for which prerequisites are checked and enforced since fewer students take 300-level courses than 200-level courses and we want to avoid unplanned for situations at registration and also since the 300-level courses presume a higher level of prior preparation. He suggested that one or two 200-level courses should be phased in as well, notably Statistics 250 (which has a Mathematics 108 prerequisite and yet a lot of Mathematics 103 students drifted in this semester since we were not enforcing prerequisites of any 200-level courses). Other recommendations are to refine the prerequisite check sheet: continue to provide more sections at the 100-level for which Provost Wilson deserves to be complimented because he heeded this cry over the summer and granted authorization to schedule a lot more 100-level courses because now that students cannot go into upper level courses without the prerequisites they are going to need those 100-level courses: Dean Faber remarked that it was a very bold decision on Provost Wilson's part to do this because there are financial problems: one never knows what the budget will

be and Provost Wilson agreed that we had to do this right and serve the needs of students in the name of access; the Chairs should schedule enough 100-level and 200-level courses: and the faculty must get to know the system better than they do. Finally, Dean Faber praised the idea of 100-level elective bridge courses, which several faculty have been suggesting recently in informal discussions: he said such 100-level content courses will provide courses for students not yet ready for upper level courses. These are students who are not yet ready to take 200-level courses but who need content courses such as computer literacy courses.

Dean Faber thanked the Faculty Senate for its previous interest in this issue as reflected in its unanimous vote of two years ago calling upon the development of an enforcement system for prerequisites as part of on-line registration and for the Senate's very kind attention today.

Senator Del Castillo asked how many violations were there among the courses for which prerequisites were not enforced. Dean Faber said he did not know how one would do such an audit. President Kaplowitz noted that during the summer meeting on this issue, Computer Director Peter Barnett did say that the computer could generate this information. She suggested that we ask Dean McHugh, Mr. Gray and Dr. Barnett when they come to the Senate.

President Kaplowitz asked Dean Faber to comment on the course availability survey that OIR Director Gail Hauss conducted during Spring 1993 registration, a summary of which had been attached to the agenda [Attachment C]. The survey indicates the number of students who said that they could not get courses, primarily because the sections were closed. She noted that one of the reasons all prerequisites were not checked and enforced was the realization during the summer that sufficient numbers of 100-level courses had not been scheduled: prerequisite enforcement is predicated on the offering of sufficient numbers of courses so students are provided with courses they are eligible to register for. She asked to what extent the course offerings this semester were based on the results of the survey. Dean Faber said that the survey was taken into account and served as the basis for making decisions about course offerings during both the summer and the current semester.

Senator Gitter said that Dean Faber spoke about increasing the number of 100-level courses but at the same time those faculty who were at registration talked to numbers of advanced students who could not get courses that they needed for their majors: obviously, she said, there is an inevitable tension because when one increases the number of lower level courses one must decrease the number of upper level courses. She asked whether we are planning for this. Dean Faber said that in the last year or two we have been reforming some of our majors: we have so many courses we are required to offer for our majors that this became a source of the problem. He cited as an example the fact that we have eliminated most of the concentrations in the criminal justice major, which is the major with the most number of students. Our second largest major, the police science major, has also been reformed along similar lines. We will have to wait to see the effect of such reforms, he said, but predicted that this will have a very positive effect. He noted that the Middle States visiting team endorsed this as a solution to the insufficient number of upper-level courses. Second, by enforcing the prerequisite requirement for the 400-level courses this is the first time in the seven years he has been working registration as a dean that he

has not been inundated by seniors complaining that they could not get their senior-level required courses. This is because juniors and sophomores can no longer get into those courses which means the courses are available to the seniors. 80 these are some of the steps that are being taken. But as the numbers of students coming through the system increase, we no longer have the old yardsticks to go by. The percentage of students being retained is not necessarily increasing, but the overall number of students who are here and who are proceeding to upper levels is increasing because we took in more students in the last couple of years. How many more we take and how many more stay on will influence the availability of these upper level courses and this is a very difficult factor to predict. He gave as an example Psychology 311 (experimental psychology) which needs more sections because more students are prepared to take it and there are never sufficient numbers of sections.

Senator Malone asked about the overtally policy. Dean Faber said there is supposed to be a discussion between the Chairs and the Provost about this. He said he does not know whether such a discussion has occurred to date.

Senator DeLucia said that from the point of view of the Department of Counseling, Dean Faber's work on enforcing prerequisites and making 100-level courses available has been probably the single most important retention effort this College has made. He said he wanted to acknowledge the fact and thank Dean Faber. Senator DeLucia also said that the idea of bridge courses is so important because there are so many thousands of students who will not make the gateway courses that are required for the 200-level courses which leaves them short of courses to take.

Senator Litwack urged that some thought be given to offering some large lecture courses even though this is very much against the tradition of our College. On the other hand, many colleges in this country do give 100-level courses with 500 students and so it would hardly be heretical to have lecture courses for Psychology 101 or History 101 taught in at least one section to 200 students at a time. Dean Faber said that he takes great pride in having thwarted two such attempts over the years because philosophically he disagrees. He said that one of the best things that we have succeeded in doing at this College is preserving the so-called 'small' classes that are already ranging in size from 40 to 45 students. Furthermore, historical precedent is that we used to have large lecture classes in Criminal Justice 101 and six or seven years ago we reformed Criminal Justice 101 by going away from that model because the testimony from people such as Professor Harriet Pollack was that the large lecture classes were a disaster, that the large lecture simply did not work in our environment and, he said, he agrees. Dean Faber said that if large lectures became necessary, he would urge that at the very least we do an outcomes assessment study, that we look at the results of how students do (in terms of pass rates, etc.) in a large lecture class as compared to how students do in classes of the current size. Senator Litwack said that it seems to him to be worth at least one experiment to see what the results are. Dean Faber said that he did agree to such an experiment in the two cases he thwarted: he explained that he had said he would agree to a lecture course as long as the same instructor would agree to teach a regular size course, the same course, at the same time period, in order to have a control for all variables except for class size. The instructor refused, however, and so the lecture course was not offered.

Senator Wieschenberg asked how the maximum class size is determined. Dean Faber said that his understanding of the Bylaws of CUNY is that it is within the purview of the Provost to set class size. President Kaplowitz disagreed, saying that the Bylaws of the CUNY Board of Trustees explicitly states that each academic department shall control the educational policies of the department and that the chairperson of the department is to carry out the department's policies and that the University Faculty Senate in 1990 adopted a resolution reminding administrators in all the CUNY colleges to abide by the Bylaws and calling on the, Chancellor to see to it that the Bylaws are honored. This resolution specifically named the setting of class size as one of the educational policies established by each department.

Senator Wieschenberg asked what the largest class size is at John Jay. Dean Faber said that there are several sections of Natural Science 107 that have a lecture class with 120 students. Regular classes are pegged at 42 students but with overenrollments they are larger: the subject of overenrollments is where there is disagreement: the computer were to be programmed for only two overenrollments but somehow, he does not know how, the overenrollments went to six or seven instead of two.

Senator Wieschenberg asked about the fact that many students who enroll for the night section of a day/night course attend during the day and the day classes are, therefore, extremely overcrowded. Dean Faber said that the instructor has the right to enforce the rule that students are to attend only the section he or she registered for unless the instructor gives permission to attend the matching section and this is stated throughout, the course offering booklet as Dean McHugh reminds us again and again.

Senator Suggs referred to the summary about Table 3 of the OIR survey which shows that insufficient sections of Literature 121 (now 231) were available according to the students surveyed [Attachment C]: he pointed out this survey was conducted during the spring 1993 registration and that the English Department offers fewer Literature 121 sections in the spring because even though one course is not a prerequisite for the next, the English Department tends to offer more Literature 121 courses in the fall and more Literature 122 courses in the spring, as if they were to be taken sequentially. And so, if the survey were conducted during fall registration, the results might be very different. He said that, therefore, the decisions about the numbers of sections that need to be scheduled must be made in the context of the semester involved and not be an across the board decision based on a survey done during one particular semester. Dean Faber said that is a very interesting point, one which has never before been made to him or to anyone else, to his knowledge. Senator Suggs added that if we were to have real associate degree programs rather than the mythological ones we have now, students who are actually associate degree students would not need both History 121 and 122 nor both Literature 121 and 122 because only one course in each discipline is required for the associate's degree. To the extent that students answered the survey as associate degree students they would not perceive the absence of the second course in the sequence because they would not need that second course. Therefore, there is a certain level of complexity to the reading of these surveys that is necessary.

Senator Gibson said she is opposed to larger classes but that if there were ever to be larger classes, teaching assistants should be provided to the faculty, which opens up an entire

Pandora's box of its own. Senator Guinta said that an urban, public institution of higher education that serves students who come from urban, public schools has a moral obligation to provide courses that students have a chance of succeeding in and they do not have a chance of succeeding in large lecture classes. Senator Grappone said that the suggestion about large lecture classes is similar to the suggestion that the Library videotape its Library orientation sessions and he said he has been opposed to that because personal interaction is crucial for the students.

Senator Karmen suggested that while the prerequisite enforcement is being phased in, the course rosters should include a class code for each student that easily reveals the number of credits a student has completed and in this way the instructor would be better able to determine whether a student is properly registered for the course. This is a way of actively engaging the faculty in prerequisite checking.

The Senate thanked Dean Faber for his thorough report and he expressed his appreciation for the opportunity to report.

6. Guest: Geraldine Casey, (Acting) Director of the Women's Center

The newly appointed (Acting) Director of the Women's Studies Committee, Geraldine (Gerrie) Casey, was introduced and was asked to report on the most recent news, that of a decision by the Student Council to provide supplemental funding for the Women's Center. Ms. Casey said that the previous night the Student Council voted to accept the Women's Center budget proposal so that the Women's Center can commission Professor P. J. Gibson (who is a member of the Faculty Senate), to write a play about domestic violence and rape based on the collective memory of John Jay students and the many papers they have written for their classes. The play will be produced by John Jay students and will be performed during International Women's History Month in March.

Ms. Casey explained that she is a member of the instructional staff, having been appointed to a (substitute) line in the Department of Counseling and Student Life. She explained she is an anthropologist, her area of work being women in Latin America, and has taught anthropology at other branches of CUNY, including Hunter, City, and Baruch. At John Jay she is teaching an ethnic studies course about Puerto Ricans and other Hispanics in the United States for the Puerto Rican Studies Department. Part of her job as the head of the Women's Center is to teach, which she described as a very good way of gaining a sense of the students.

Ms. Casey explained that the Women's Center emerges from the work that John Jay faculty have been doing for a number of years. And so she said she wanted to congratulate the faculty for its accomplishments in this area. She said that as a result of the work by the faculty, she was given a full-time appointment this year as the head of the Women's Center (last year she was the director on a part-time basis). The very good beginning budget passed through the Student Council the previous night provides money for more activities. Among the activities and services of the Women's Center are a lending library, free women's information services, a career development resource file, reference files for term papers or for personal use, student support groups, projects for International Women's History Month, and the Welfare Education and Advocacy Project.

The purpose of the Women's Center is twofold: it is grounded in the connections between scholarship and the providing of services to students. The issues of gender studies across the curriculum and of women in criminal justice are an important theoretical focus. Strengthening students' participation and success in their courses is also a very important effort. Ms. Casey explained that this is similar to many other projects within the feminist trajectory: the integration of theory and practice. The Women's Center is committed to both providing services to students and assisting them in their intellectual empowerment.

The Women's Center, Ms. Casey explained, was formed as the result of the work of the Women's Studies Committee, which is a standing committee of the faculty, and the supporters they gathered around them from the administration, particularly the Provost and the Vice President for Student Development, who then developed funding to hire a director of the Women's Center, first on a part-time basis and now on a full-time basis. An office is provided in Room 1110 North Hall (extension 8184).

In terms of the Women's Center's thematic focus on women and criminal justice, Ms. Casey said, there are many groups at the College to work with, and many of the courses the faculty give speak directly to the students. Students are referred to the Center by faculty who want the students to either work on various projects or because of the student's personal needs. She said that she also hopes the Center will be referring students to courses that speak to gender issues across the curriculum.

Ms. Casey thanked those faculty who have directed students to the Women's Center, explaining that there have been a notable number of occasions when crisis interventions that the Women's Center, through the referral of faculty, have been able to provide and that they have made an important difference in students' lives. She praised the professional counselors and also the peer counselors who provide essential backup.

Ms. Casey noted that the students are learning what already exists in the discourse of gender but are themselves able to make new contributions because of their experiences as people of color and members of the working class. The Center is able to challenge some of the perceived categories about what is gender, what are the different experiences of family, how issues like domestic violence and sexual harassment differ and also need to be addressed in ways that meet the students' reality. The way this works out in practice, she explained, is that the programs the Center offers are often also services for students who have needs around some of these very issues. At the same time the Center helps the students to rethink what they are going to do about these issues. For example, the Center's Welfare Advocacy Project provides students with information about their rights which is especially important because frequently their benefits are arbitrarily cut. The Center also wants the students to engage in the debate about welfare. Ms. Casey thanked the Senate for the opportunity to report about the work of the Center thus far.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Edward Davenport
Recording Secretary

Announcements from the Chair

Committee on honorary degree election results announce⁴

Professor Katherine Killoran (Library), the newly elected chair of the Faculty Elections Committee, announced the results of the election of three members to the Committee on Honorary Degrees: Professors Peter DeForest (Science), Barry Latzer (Government), and Maria Rodriguez (Speech and Theater/SEEK), were elected to the Committee for three-year terms. They join continuing committee members Professors Jane Bowers (English), Jannette Domingo (African-American Studies/Economics), Daniel Gasman (History), and Robert Panzarella (Law & Police Science), the chair. The Committee on Honorary Degrees is beginning consideration of candidates for honorary degrees: nominations with supporting biographical information should be sent to Professor Panzarella.

New level 3 CUNY security officers hired

John Jay has hired three new CUNY Level 3 (highest level) security officers: Louis Brooks, Joseph Pagano, and Frank Serafino. Last year the first Level 3 CUNY officer was hired, Saleem Hassan, which brings the total of CUNY officers employed by John Jay at four.

Council of chairs: September 1 meeting

The Council of Chairs approved the formation of a committee on space utilization at John Jay. The issue is the lack of sufficient classrooms for the numbers of students we are enrolling. Options to be studied are Friday and Saturday classes (which the Council of Chairs favors); Monday, Wednesday, Friday classes which would meet for 50 minute sessions; limiting the number of credits students may take. Other issues include rights of retired faculty to have offices and office space currently provided for outside (non-John Jay) organizations in light of the fact that four, five, and sometimes six adjunct faculty currently share a single office. Professors Crozier and Goddard and Registrar Donald Gray will serve with others to be named later to the Committee.

The Council of Chairs agreed to request that the Provost's Office duplicate and distribute to the faculty the "Personnel Process Guidelines Report" which was adopted by the College P&B in a series of meetings during the 1992-93 year, concluding on May 17, 1993. These guidelines are in effect for the Fall 1993 P&B.

The Chairs discussed various ways that the on-line registration process could be improved. The following were noted: hourly departmental print-outs; the need for primary and secondary over-tally limits; the disparity in size of the day/night sections; problems of empty class periods, most notably fifth period; the possibility of training and paying a small number of faculty to work registration.

The Chancellor's Task Force on Science, Engineering, Mathematics, and Technology (SETM) Report and the requirement by 80th Street that each college issue a report in December 1993 of the college's response to the SETM Report was noted.

President's cabinet: September 8

VP Smith reported on the ID card checking policy: the newly designed ID cards are free; daily passes will be given when lists of guests are provided to the Security Office; temporary cards will be issued for people who will be at John Jay for two or three weeks (such as people here for training); people with other CUNY ID cards will have to sign in; people who RSVP to events will not have to go through security (this will be stated on invitations).

Personnel Director Schultze reported that John Jay has hired

President's cabinet: September 8 (cont)

three new Level 3 (highest level) CUNY Security Officers (who are part of the CUNY Security Initiative whereby personnel are hired to be CUNY security officers and are trained by John Jay's Criminal Justice Training Center). The three are: Louis Brooks., Joseph Pagano, and Frank Serafino. One Level 3 officer was hired last year: he is Saleem Hassan.

President Lynch reported that the issue of smoking on campus will be decided after the ID card checking process is in place.

Dean McHugh reported about registration: every college is mandated by the Central Administration of CUNY to increase enrollment by 2.5% which means John Jay must enroll 8840 students this semester. A total of 9,000 students were registered as of the previous day and West Point and other off-campus locations must still register and then there is late registration that will take place, as well. Dean McHugh also reported that even with a letter from an instructor of a course, a student will not be overtallied beyond the number of overtallies programed into the computer. He said that the previous day a faculty member gave letters to 15 students authorizing them to be registered in her or his courses as overtallies but that this was not done because the computer is programed to not permit overtallies beyond the secondary level. VP Smith noted that our two buildings were projected for 7,200 students and that we do not have room for the 9,000 students registered this semester.

President Lynch reported that there will be a fall faculty meeting on September 20 and that a memorandum is due out about group three as defined in the Susan Cole June 25 memorandum and that we will not be in group three if we close the associate degree program in government and public administration.

Dean Rothlein reported that the National Endowment for the Humanities is holding four workshops at CUNY, one in each borough except Staten Island, which is being invited to the Manhattan event which will be at John Jay on the morning of September 20.

Dean Capecci reported that a new room has been built on the third floor of North Hall to house the Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) machine acquired through a grant and matching funds by Professor Robert Rothchild (Science). Other physical plant changes include a new copy center and mailroom in North Hall and imminent renovation of the North Hall lobby. There will be a new air conditioning unit for NH and maybe two units.

Dean Curran reported that 102 CUNY Police Cadets entered the NYPD on July 2 for their second year in the program and that on September 1, all 102 Cadets were still with the Department as Police Cadets. Six other cadets were appointed NYPD officers.

Vice President Witherspoon spoke about his concern about minor children on campus in terms of their safety, John Jay's liability, the lack of seats in classrooms for John Jay students, and the potential for disruption of classes.

Provost Wilson announced the Provost's Lecture Series.

College Council committee election results announced

The College Council in May elected the following:

Faculty Elections Committee: P.J. Gibson, Katherine Killoran, Bobbye Troutt, Davidson Umeh, and Agnes Wieschenberg.

Committee on Undergraduate Honors, Prizes, Scholarships and Awards: P. J. Gibson, Billie Kotlowitz, [tie between Nydia Flores and Marie Umeh to be determined by a run-off].

Committee on Ceremonial Occasions: Al Higgins, Karen Kaplowitz, Rubie Malone, Rebecca Spath.

Committee on Student Interests: Suzanne Iasenza, Nick McNickle, [run-off to determine tie between Marie Umeh and Carmen Vega].

University Faculty Benate to meet with chancellor September 28

The September meeting of the University Faculty Senate is on Tuesday, September 28, at 6:30 PM, at the Graduate Center. The UFS meetings are open to all faculty (although only delegates and senate chairs may speak, unless permission is granted by the body). Professor Robert Picken will report about the September 24 meeting of Chancellor Reynolds and the Council of Faculty Governance Leaders and about any actions taken by the Council. Chancellor Reynolds will be meeting with the UFS, as she does at each meeting, and will report and answer questions. Also on the agenda is invited guest Assemblyman Edward C. Sullivan, chair of the Assembly's Higher Education Committee. (Assemblyman Sullivan has been very critical of the Goldstein Report.) Later in the fall, State Senator Kenneth LaValle, the chair of the Senate's Higher Education Committee, will address the UFS.

Town Hall meeting on innovations at JJ

The first Town Hall meeting of the semester is September 29 from 4:30-6:00 in the Faculty Dining Room. The topic is "What is New at John Jay" and will focus on the ID card policy, on-line registration, increased enrollment, and renovations in North Hall, although members of the JJ community may make statements or ask questions about any aspect of John Jay or of CUNY.

Ph.D. program in cj to be evaluated in spring 1994

Graduate School president Frances Degen Horowitz has established a schedule whereby all doctoral programs will be formally evaluated. John Jay's Ph.D. criminal justice program will be evaluated during the spring 1994 semester.

Orientation of new faculty held September 3

A day-long faculty orientation program for new faculty was held on Friday, September 3. The morning session featured President Lynch, Provost Basil Wilson, VP Roger Witherspoon, VP John Smith, Dean Mary Rothlein, Dean Frank McHugh, Dean Barbara Price, and Chief Librarian Marilyn Lutzker. The afternoon session featured Dean Eli Faber; sponsored programs director Jacob Marini; Professor Haig Bohigian, the PSC chapter chair; and Professor Karen Kaplowitz, president of the Faculty Senate.

Board of Trustees appointments

The Board of Trustees made the following appointments:

The new Vice Chancellor for Facilities Planning, Construction and Management is Emma E. Macari, effective September 20. Ms. Macari is a registered architect and was the director of facilities planning division of the University of South Florida in Tampa since 1992. Before that she was at the University of Wisconsin-Madison.

The new Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs is Dr. Elsa Nunez-Wormack. She had been acting vice chancellor and she continues in her post as University Dean for Undergraduate Studies. Dr. Nunez-Wormack had been associate dean of faculty at the College of Staten Island.

Dr. Leo Corbie was named acting president of Bronx Community College while the search for president is reopened. Dr. Roscoe Brown, who retired as BCC president, is a University professor of education at the Graduate School this academic year. Dr. Corbie had been acting president of York and of Medgar Evers. While serving as acting president of BCC, Dr. Corbie is on leave from his position as senior vice president for student development at York College.

JOHN JAY COLLEGE OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE

The City University of New York
John Jay Square
899 Tenth Avenue
New York, N.Y. 10019
(212) 237-8600

Office of the President

September 7, 1993

TO: Provost Basil Wilson
Vice President John Smith
Vice President Roger Witherspoon
Dean Mary D. Rothlein
Dean Frank McHugh
Dean Barbara Price
Dean Eli Fabsr
Professor Robert Crozier
Professor Karen Kaplowitz
Professor Marilyn Lutzker
Mr. Robert Sermier
Ms. Gail Hauss
Mr. Donald Gray
Mr. Peter Barnett
Ms. Mary Koonmen
Ms. Bonnie Nelson
Ms. Gael Schatz

FROM: Gerald W. Lynch, President

As you know, the College received its renewal of accreditation in June from the Commission on Higher Education of the Middle States Association. While we are all satisfied with the successful conclusion of this phase, the process of institutional self-improvement has not ended. Now we must begin the next phase. Throughout the long and sometimes arduous process of self-study questions were raised, understandably, about the use of time and resources. People asked: Is this just an exercise or will it make a difference?

I am convinced that, in order for the process to have integrity, we must begin to examine the many fine ideas that were raised over the past two years and operationalize those that have wide consensus. The most useful map for us to follow is the Evaluation Team's Report. First, it has the advantage of being an objective report from outsiders, free from internal influence. Second, it is based on our Self-Study, both in structure and content, so it has relevance as judged by the community at large.

ATTACHMENT B (cont)

Please read the Recommendations in the report that deal with your area of responsibility and let me know how you intend to review them with a view to implementation. Keep in mind that we are under no obligation to follow any recommendation, we need only show that we have seriously considered them. There may be many reasons why recommendations are rejected or modified, including fiscal constraints and lack of consensus.

I have divided the Recommendations among various offices and committees at the College, according to their areas of responsibility. Attached are those assignments. In most instances, I have indicated that more than one office or committee should work on a Recommendation, but in all instances the person at the top of the page is accountable. I would like to know how you plan to proceed with this process of review and what is a realistic timetable for completion and action. This need only be brief and preliminary, but will allow us to establish a follow-up process. If you have any questions, contact the Dean for Planning and Development. Please submit your outline to Dean Rothlein by October 1, 1993.

As you all know, the Board of Trustees passed a resolution in June regarding Academic Program Planning. It sends a clear message to the colleges that planning in all areas has become a priority. I welcome this development because we have all come to realize that our success is dependent on careful use of scarce resources.

Throughout this next phase, it is essential that we cooperate, focusing on results, so we are all moving in the same direction. That is, all recommendations should be held against the standard of what is best for our College.

Gerald W. Lynch

Office of Institutional Research
John Jay College of Criminal Justice

Course Availability Survey Spring 1993

The Office of Admissions and Registration conducted a Course Availability Survey during the Spring 1993 registration period. A potential maximum of eight thousand three hundred seventy four (8,374) questionnaires were distributed.. A total of four thousand five hundred one (4,501) questionnaires were completed and are included in this analysis.. This represents a response rate of 54%.

Table 1 presents the frequencies for a variety of items included on the questionnaire. If a student has not indicated a response for a specific item, he/she is not counted in the table. The valid percent is generated only from the actual responses, not missing responses.

From the survey, students indicated the following: 35% are freshmen, 19% are sophomores, 20% are juniors, 20% are seniors, 6% are graduate students. In terms of registration Status, 63% are full time and 37% are part time. Students attend classes predominately during the day (46%); 32% attend evenings, and 22% attend day and evening.. A majority of students (58%) are either employed part time (25%) or not employed at all (34%). Of those who are employed full time, 17% are employed in the private sector and 25% are employed in the public sector.

The sample is representative of the John Jay Spring 1993 population. Actual figures from the Office of the Dean of Admissions and Registration show: for class, 34% of the students are freshmen, 21% are sophomores, 15% are juniors, 15% are seniors, 8% are graduate students; for registration status, 62% are full time and 33% are part time; for class attendance, 49% attend day only, 28% attend evening only, 23% attend day and evening.

In terms of satisfaction with the Spring 1993 course schedule, 69% of the students who responded are satisfied or very satisfied with the course schedule. For students who were unable to take a course or courses that they wanted, 61% indicated that the reason was that sections for that course or courses were closed.

Table 2 presents information on the degree of satisfaction* with the course schedule compared to class status and to the time of day a student attends classes. The rate of satisfaction with the course schedule by class status is as follows: freshmen, 77%; sophomores, 52%; juniors, 64%; seniors, 71%; graduate students, 78%. The rate of satisfaction in terms of the time of day when classes are taken is as follows: day only attendance, 73%; evening only attendance, 69%; day and evening attendance, 59%.

Tables 3 through 10 present information on the courses students indicated they wanted but were unable to take during the Spring 1993 semester. Students were given the option of listing up to six courses. Consequently, a student's response is counted as many times as the number of courses he or she lists.

NOTE:

* The categories 'very satisfied' and 'satisfied' are combined when reporting on satisfaction in Table 2.

ATTACHMENT C (cont)

Table 3 lists those courses most frequently wanted in descending order of frequency. Only courses with 20 or more responses are listed. History 121, Mathematics 108, Literature 121, Forensic Science 108, Philosophy 121, and Mathematics 104 received frequencies in excess of 100.

Table 4 shows the number of responses courses received by discipline for courses that students indicated they wanted but were unable to take. Table 4 includes all courses that were listed with a prefix. In some instances, for example, students listed only the prefix of a course and not a number. This response is included in presenting the discipline frequencies. The five disciplines with the highest responses are:

Mathematics (n = 621),
Law (n = 382),
Psychology (n = 371),
History (n = 370),
and Literature (n = 249).

The departments with the highest number of responses for courses wanted are:

Law, Police Science, Criminal Justice Administration (n = 778),
Mathematics (n = 621),
English (n = 486),
Psychology (n = 405),
and Sciences (n = 393).

Table 5 represents responses for courses wanted but not taken by discipline and course level. In this table, if a course prefix were listed without a course number, it is not included in the table. Responses indicate that 100-level courses are wanted the most (n = 2595). The five disciplines with the highest number of 100-level courses wanted are: Mathematics (n = 501), History (n = 305), Literature (n = 238), Philosophy (n = 175), and Forensic Science (n = 169).

At the 200 level, the top five are: Law (n = 288), Psychology (n = 101), Mathematics (n = 86), Police Science (n = 72), and Sociology (n = 64).

At the 300 level, the top five are: Psychology (n = 116), Corrections (n = 103), Sociology (n = 95), Law (n = 74), and Speech (n = 54).

At the 400 level, the top three are: Government (n = 48), Police Science (n = 36), and Psychology (n = 21).

At the 700 level, the top three are: Criminal Justice (n = 45), Public Administration (n = 22), and Psychology (n = 18).

Tables 6 through 10 are organized by class standing and indicate the total number of responses a specific course received as well as information on registration status, class attendance, and the reason the course was not taken during the Spring 1993 semester. Courses are listed in alphabetical order and only those that received a response rate of five or above are listed for undergraduate students (Tables 6 through 9); those courses with a response of three or higher are listed for graduate students (Table 10). Because students were allowed six choices, the total number of courses wanted but not taken can exceed the total number of students responding. Consequently, the 'n' is determined by the number of times a course receives a response irrespective of the course being listed first or sixth on the survey.

ATTACHMENT C (cont)

To read the tables, it is best to identify a specific course and then look at the information across the row. For example, in Table 6, 17 responses are listed for Anthropology 101; of those 17, 11 are full-time students, 7 attend day only classes, and 16 responses indicate the course was not taken because the sections were closed.

The courses that freshmen (Table 6) want are: Mathematics 103 (n = 89), Psychology 101 (n = 62), History 121 (n = 61), Mathematics 104 (n = 54), and English 102 (n = 53).

Sophomores (Table 7) want: History 121 (n = 130), Literature 121 (n = 125), Philosophy 121 (n = 110), Mathematics 108 (n = 84), and Natural Science 107 (n = 64).

Juniors (Table 8) want: Forensic Science 108 (n = 70), History 121 (n = 67), Mathematics 108 (n = 67), Corrections 301 (n = 58), and Natural Science 107 (n = 46).

Seniors (Table 9) want: Forensic Science 108 (n = 69), Psychology (n = 19), Corrections 301 (n = 17), Government 435 (n = 14), and Mathematics 108 (n = 14).

Graduate students (Table 10) want: Criminal Justice 710 (n = 6), Criminal Justice 711 (n = 6), Criminal Justice 716 (n = 5), and Psychology 752 (n = 5).