

Faculty Senate Minutes #370

March 23, 2010

3:20 PM

Room 630 T

Present (42): William Allen, Andrea Balis, Spiros Bakiras, Elton Beckett, Ben Bierman, Erica Burleigh, Sergei Cheloukhine, Demi Cheng, Kathleen Collins, Lyell Davies, James DiGiovanna, Jennifer Dysart, DeeDee Falkenbach, Beverly Frazier, Terry Furst, Robert Garot, Jay Gates, Lior Gideon, Demis Glasford, Norman Groner, Maki Haberfeld, Jay Hamilton, Veronica Hendrick, Olivera Jokic, Karen Kaplowitz, Vincent Maiorino, Nivedita Majumdar, Xerxes Malki, Evan Mandery, Gerald Markowitz, Isabel Martinez, Sara Mcdougall, Richard Ocejo, Richard Perez, Rick Richardson, Raul Rubio, Richard Schwester, Francis Sheehan, Staci Strobl, Pat Tovar, Monica Varsanyi, Valerie West

Absent (6): Elise Champeil, Virginia Diaz-Mendoza, Edgardo Diaz Diaz, Katie Gentile, Paul Narkunas, Frank Pezzella

Invited Guest: Professor Amy Green

Guests: Professors Valerie Allen, Kimora, Tara Pauliny, Lisandro Perez, Marny Tabb, Dean Anne Lopes, Director Katherine Killoran, VP Richard Saulnier

Agenda

1. Announcements
2. Adoption of the Agenda
3. Approval of Minutes #369 of the March 10, 2011, meeting
4. Review of the agenda of the March 24 meeting of the College Council
5. Election of the 2011-12 Faculty Senate at-large reps to the 2011-12 College Council
6. Ratification of the slate for the 6 at-large members (3 members and 3 alternates) of the 2011-12 College Faculty Personnel Committee
7. Gen Ed Proposal: Professor Amy Green, Chair, Gen Ed Steering Committee

1. Announcements. Noted.

2. Adoption of the Agenda. Approved.

3. Review of the agenda of the March 24 meeting of the College Council

The March 24 College Council agenda includes: the second reading and vote on a charter amendment proposed by the Faculty Senate whereby candidates for promotion to full professor will continue to be voted on by the candidate's department P&B Committee as the first step in the process; a proposed 2+2 joint degree with BMCC for an A.S. in Accounting for Forensic Accounting and a B.S. in Economics (Forensic Financial Analysis and Specialization); new courses from English, Sociology and Political Science; course revisions from Psychology; a proposal to revise the standards for Latin Honors; a proposal on extra work assigned after final grades are submitted to the registrar; new courses from the Criminal Justice Master's Program; a proposal for a new advanced certificate program in the Forensic Computing Program title "The Computer Science for Digital Forensic Bridge Program"; a resolution to change the prerequisites for the completion of the Master of Arts in Criminal Justice.

4. Election of the 2011-12 Faculty Senate at-large reps to the College Council

By secret, written ballot, the Senate elected the following 2011-12 members of the Faculty Senate to next year's College Council: Andrea Balis – History/ISP; Elton Beckett – Communication & Theater Arts; Erica Burleigh – English; DeeDee Falkenbach – Psychology; Maki Haberfeld – Law, PS, CJA; Karen Kaplowitz – English; Richard Ocejo – Sociology; Francis Sheehan – Science; Staci Strobl – Law, PS, CJA.

The Senate also elected four alternate representatives to next year's College Council: Janice Dunham – Library; Beverly Frazier – Law, PS, CJA; Jay Paul Gates – English; Nivedita Majumdar – English.

5. Ratification of the slate of candidates for the at-large members of the 2011-12 College Faculty Personnel Committee

The Senate ratified the following slate of candidates for the election for the at-large members of the 2011-12 College Faculty Personnel Committee: Bettina Carbonell – English; Joshua Freilich – Criminal Justice; Mangai Natarajan – Sociology; Nicholas Petraco – Science; John Pittman – Philosophy; Chitra Raghavan – Psychology; John Staines – English; Carmen Solis – SEEK. (The Senate ratified another, ninth, candidate who was subsequently found to be ineligible because she is an assistant professor.)

6. General Education Revision Proposal: Professor Amy Green, Chair, Gen Ed Steering Committee [Attachment A, B, C]

In addition to Professor Amy Green, the Chair of the Gen Ed Steering Committee, other members of the Steering Committee were welcomed and introduced: Professors Valerie Allen, Kimora, Tara Paulino, Lisandro Perez, Marny Tabb, Director Katherine Killoran, Dean Anne Lopes, and VP Richard Saulnier.

President Kaplowitz reported that Professor Amy Green had notified her that the Steering Committee has decided not to revise its original proposal to include a discipline overlay, which had been recommended by the Faculty Senate on April 23.

Professor Amy Green, Senator James DiGiovanna, Senator Andrea Balis explained the various parts of the proposal [Attachment A, B] and of the FAQ document [Attachment C], noting that this is the same gen ed revision proposal that the Steering Committee issued in January except that now the specific numbers of total credits – 47 – and the numbers of credits for each of the six clusters is being specified by the Steering Committee. The reason the number of credits for each cluster does not add up to 47 credits but rather to many, many more credits is because some courses can count twice; in other words, courses that fulfill the requirements for cluster X might also fulfill the requirements for cluster Y. The Steering Committee said that they hope their proposed revision, which requires 47 credits, which will be a cut from our current gen ed curriculum of 59 credits, will help persuade the CUNY Central Administration to be more flexible about the number of gen ed credits they are permitting. Questions were answered by members of the Steering Committee, such as about science: it was explained that the 7 credits allotted for science is for one lab science course and for one non-lab science course. A question was asked about double counting for all students, since science majors are being permitted to double count courses for their major which will also count as gen ed science courses.

President Kaplowitz said that originally today's meeting was to be devoted to a presentation by Professor Green and the Steering Committee members and questions and comments by the Senate of and to the Steering Committee; furthermore, the plan had been for a proposal by the Senate regarding a distribution overlay would be prepared by the Executive Committee for discussion and vote at the Senate's April 6 meeting. President Kaplowitz explained that an hour prior to today's meeting it had been pointed out to her that for a proposal from the Senate to be transmitted to the Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee (UCASC) in time for UCASC's April 8 meeting, the Senate would have to adopt a proposal at today's meeting. President Kaplowitz said that she feels it is much more appropriate and respectful of the process for the Senate to transmit a proposal prior to that deadline; therefore, she is

bringing a proposal to the Senate today but it is not one that has been yet vetted by the Executive Committee.

Accordingly, a motion was made and seconded that the Senate endorse the proposed gen ed revision with the condition that the revision include the requirement that students shall fulfill their gen ed courses by taking at least one course in five different disciplines. A question was asked as to the number of disciplines offered at John Jay and a member of the Senate, using the internet, reported that there are 61 disciplines

Many Senators praised the proposed gen ed revision. Several said they saw no need for a discipline overlay now that they have seen the revision. Others spoke in favor of an overlay. Others said that an overlay is desirable but questioned the number of disciplines and the use of "disciplines" for an overlay.

The motion to support the proposed revision but with an overlay was adopted by a vote of 19 yes, 5 no, 11 abstentions. President Kaplowitz said that in light of the questions asked and the problematic nature of the term "discipline" and the high number of abstentions, which she said she assumes is connected to these questions and to the use of the term "disciplines," the Executive Committee will develop a revised proposal for our April 6 Senate meeting. She said she would also email the Senate to invite comments and suggestions prior to the date when the Executive Committee meets so that the Executive Committee can develop a revised proposal informed by the Senate's comments and suggestions.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 PM.

Education for Justice: the General Education Curriculum of John Jay College of Criminal Justice

47 credits in 6 clusters

<p>Reasoning & Communication 21 credits</p> <p><i>Essential Knowledge: familiarity with</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •mathematical skills •at least one language other than English <p><i>Reasoning, Analysis and Critical Thinking:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •formulate questions •distinguish between evaluative and factual statements •gather & analyze data using quantitative & qualitative methods •sort, prioritize, and structure evidence •solve problems through evidence-based inquiry •apply informal and formal logic in problem-solving, analysis, and developing arguments <p><i>Communication:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •listen effectively •express oneself clearly in forms of written and spoken English •target an audience •work collaboratively •maintain self-awareness and critical distance •use technologies to construct and disseminate knowledge •use common academic and workplace software <p><i>Research and Information Literacy:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •understand how information is generated and organized •conduct effective Internet and database searches •comprehend and discuss complex materials •critically evaluate information •understand plagiarism, cite sources •use information effectively and responsibly 	<p>The Justice Core 9 credits*</p> <p>Themes:</p> <p>100 - Justice and the Individual [FYS] 200 - Struggles for Justice and Equality in the United States 300- Justice in a Global Context 400 -Capstone in the major</p> <p><i>Essential Knowledge: familiarity with</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •issues and institutions of justice •the history, cultures, social, political, and economic institutions of the U.S. •global interdependence <p><i>Reasoning, Analysis & Critical Thinking</i> <i>Communication</i> <i>Research and Information Literacy</i></p> <p><i>Ethical practice:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •articulate the ethical dimensions of personal, academic, social, economic, and political choices •use cross-cultural knowledge •communicate and collaborate with people of diverse age, class, ethnicity, gender, nationality, race, religion, and sexuality <p><i>Civic engagement:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •develop the habits of introspection, personal and civic responsibility, and communication •be informed and responsible citizens of the world <p><i>Intellectual maturity:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • persist in the face of obstacles; • navigate ambiguity and disagreement •cultivate self-understanding •cultivate curiosity and embrace learning as a life-long process <p><i>*Credits in the core satisfy requirements in other clusters.</i></p>	<p>The Creative Dimension 6 credits</p> <p><i>Essential Knowledge: familiarity with</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •formative ideas and works in the arts and humanities •artistic work as a form of inquiry, problem solving, and pleasure <p><i>Reasoning, Analysis and Critical Thinking</i> • <i>Communication</i> <i>Research and Information Literacy</i> <i>Creativity</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •understand the role of creativity in all fields of inquiry and expression •develop their own creativity <p><i>Intellectual Maturity</i></p> <hr/> <p>Learning from the Past 6 credits</p> <p><i>Essential Knowledge: familiarity with</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •formative ideas and works in the arts, humanities, mathematics, natural sciences, and social sciences •U.S. and world history •global interdependence <p><i>Reasoning, Analysis and Critical Thinking</i> • <i>Communication</i> <i>Research and Information Literacy</i> <i>Intellectual Maturity</i></p> <hr/> <p>The Natural and Physical World 7 credits</p> <p><i>Essential Knowledge: familiarity with</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •formative ideas and works in mathematics & science •science and scientific reasoning <p><i>Reasoning, Analysis and Critical Thinking</i></p> <hr/> <p>Self, Culture, and Society 7 credits</p> <p><i>Essential Knowledge: familiarity with</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •formative ideas and works in the humanities and social sciences •the history, cultures, social, political, and economic institutions of the U.S. •global interdependence •habits and choices that create and maintain wellness <p><i>Reasoning, Analysis and Critical Thinking</i> • <i>Communication</i> <i>Research and Information Literacy</i> <i>Personal Development and Social Responsibility</i></p>
--	---	---

ATTACHMENT A

Education for Justice

The General Education program of John Jay College of Criminal Justice

Education for Justice is a 47-credit, outcomes-based general education curriculum. It includes requirements in six clusters:

Reasoning and Communication 21 credits*

To include courses in writing, math and quantitative reasoning, critical thinking or scientific reasoning, oral communication, and foreign language

Justice Core 9 credits*

Justice Core credits satisfy requirements in the other clusters.

Three 3-credit courses

- EFJ 100 series: Justice and the Individual (FYS)
- EFJ 200 series: Struggles for Justice and Equality in the United States
- EFJ 300 series: Justice in Global Perspective
- Capstone Proficiency

This is a non-credit bearing component of the major capstone through which students demonstrate mastery of *Education for Justice* learning outcomes.

The Creative Dimension 6 credits*

Learning from the Past 6 credits*

Natural and Physical World 7 credits*

Self, Culture, and Society 7 credits*

*Justice Core courses may satisfy requirements in the other clusters.

The curriculum diagram (over) lists the outcomes to be addressed in each cluster. Departments may propose courses in one or more clusters, as long as those courses substantially address one or more of the Essential Knowledge outcomes and academic competency outcomes in the cluster. Departments may, for example, develop disciplinary versions of the Justice Core courses. A course in The Creative Dimension might focus on feminist art and include activities and assignments that develop students' critical thinking and communication skills.

Courses in the Justice Core may be applied to partially satisfy requirements in other clusters. For example, the Philosophy Department might offer an EFJ 100 series course on Justice and the Individual. That course might also satisfy learning outcomes in Self, Culture, and Society. In that case, the philosophy course would satisfy both the EFJ 100 requirement and 3 credits in Self, Culture, and Society. If Communication and Theater Arts were to offer an EFJ 200-series course on the rhetoric of Struggles for Justice and Equality in the United States, that course would satisfy both EFJ 200 and the oral communication requirement in Reasoning and Communication.

Education for Justice is not organized by disciplines but ensures broad exposure by requiring courses that address the full range of the Essential Knowledge Learning Outcomes for Undergraduate Education at John Jay College that were adopted by the College Council in May 2009. To assist students in selecting an appropriate balance of courses across disciplines, in-person advising will be

provided to all freshman and transfer students. Online advising tools are also being developed. Insert diagram here.

ATTACHMENT C

Education for Justice

The General Education Program of John Jay College of Criminal Justice

FAQs

Why should we change our existing general education program?

John Jay's general education has been in place since 1975, with only minor changes made to it fifteen years ago. Since 1975, much in our environment has changed. Thirty-five years ago the internet did not exist and globalization was not yet a household word or every-day reality. Our college has also changed. We are reinstating the liberal arts majors whose loss prompted the creation of our very large set of distribution requirements. Phasing out associate degree admissions, we have become a senior college (the only one in CUNY that has not yet reformed its general education). We will soon have an undergraduate population made up entirely of baccalaureate degree students. Our student body is more diverse than it was in 1975, with over 60% of it minority students and 42% Hispanic. And our students are younger than ever before, with 85% of them under 25, coming to us directly from high school with few of the life and work experiences that our primarily in-service adult learners had in 1975. A static 1975 curriculum does not serve the John Jay students of today nor prepare them for the challenges of the twenty-first century.

In addition, as many of you know, John Jay will undergo a Middle States re-accreditation evaluation in 2013. One of the things Middle States is particularly interested in is general education reform. Our reaccreditation is at risk if we do not update our program. Our current gen ed does not meet the requirements in Middle States Standard Twelve. The new proposal does.

How can John Jay afford this expense at this time?

The College administration has committed to set aside funds to ensure that the exciting new curriculum can be developed and implemented.

Why a smaller gen ed?

There are four reasons why the new general education program should be smaller than the existing program, which comprises up to 60 credits. First, such a large gen ed makes it difficult for many students to complete their degrees in a timely manner. A less credit intensive requirement promotes retention and degree completion., Second, a large gen ed severely limits the number of electives students may take. Students can use the elective credits available under the proposed *Education for Justice* program to take a minor, a double major, or to explore topics outside their majors. Third, extensive general education requirements create problems for transfer students, who now comprise more than 50% of the John Jay student body. Third, the 80th Street initiative to establish University-wide general education requirements includes a proposal to cap those requirements at 42 credits for senior colleges. We will make a strong case to CUNY that 47 credits is the absolute minimum.

Why clusters of outcomes rather than specific courses, disciplines, or disciplinary distribution requirements?

Outcomes-based education is predicated on the idea that everyone should understand the purpose and goals of the curriculum. One problem we discovered in our probe of John Jay's current general

education program is that students saw the strict course requirements as hurdles to “get out of the way,” rather than meaningful goals for their education. The learning outcomes on which this proposal is based make clear to students what we expect them to learn and offers them choices of how to achieve those goals. We also discovered that nearly 70% of general education courses are currently taught by adjuncts, while full-time often faculty opt to teach major or elective courses. If faculty have the opportunity to develop and teach general education courses that speak to their specialties, they are more likely to participate in general education. The literature shows that freshmen who are taught by full-time faculty are more likely to become attached to the institution and be retained into their sophomore year and beyond. In addition, not limiting this smaller gen ed to disciplines/departments invites a wider range of disciplines and departments to participate in gen ed. Disciplinary distribution requires privileging specific departments over others – when their offerings might meet similar student learning objectives, albeit from a slightly different perspective (including an interdisciplinary perspective). This approach allows students to gain the appropriate knowledge and skills and make connections between them, while offering some choice in their requirements.

What did the Steering Committee do with the feedback to the draft proposal?

The Steering Committee published a *Digest of Feedback to the Draft Proposal* on February 14, 2011. Since then, we met five times to discuss the concerns expressed. The most frequently cited concern was for the addition of transparent distribution requirements, either by discipline, department, or broad liberal arts areas, such as humanities, social sciences, arts, etc. This was the main topic of debate by the Steering Committee in the post-feedback period. The Committee rejected the call for specific disciplines or departments to be privileged over others but was receptive to the idea of a broad-area overlay. We brainstormed a number of different ways to require distribution. We considered distribution requirements within the gen ed framework and beyond the gen ed framework, as degree requirements. The scenarios that called for distribution within the gen ed were determined to be too small and too stifling to the range of courses that might be proposed. Distribution in the form of degree requirements beyond the gen ed would be met by courses in gen ed, the major or minor, or electives. The problem with this approach is that the overall number of credits ballooned from 47 to 55 or more depending on the size and nature of the student’s major. This was particularly detrimental for our larger majors (Forensic Science is 73 credits), and those in such professional areas as Public Administration, which is now 39 credits with a potential of 0-9 credits in the liberal arts that would count toward the degree requirements. After deciding that none of these solutions was workable, and confident that the original proposal will generate appropriate distribution, the Committee voted overwhelmingly to put forth the current proposal.

How will courses be proposed and approved?

Courses will be proposed by departments and designed to address the learning outcomes in a particular cluster. Departments will indicate the cluster in which they believe the course should be located. A gen ed subcommittee of UCASC will be established to review proposals, make recommendations, and forward them to the full curriculum committee, the same way they do now.

How will students select courses?

Students will choose from lists of approved courses in each cluster to meet the required number of credits in that cluster. This provides maximum flexibility to students while simultaneously ensuring

that they take courses in a broad array of disciplines. Thus, students can become well-rounded by taking courses that interest them, producing, we believe, a better classroom experience for both students and instructors.

How can we be sure that students are exposed to appropriate disciplinary breadth?

The six clusters force students to take a wide array of courses in different departments in order to achieve the diverse learning outcomes in each cluster. Students will create well-rounded, individualized programs with the aid of in-person and online advising. The Office of Academic Advising meets with all freshman and transfer students. Online tools are being developed for continuing students. To ensure breadth, those tools will take into consideration the student's major, minor, and elective credits and guide them to select courses that will balance their degree.

Why should we give students choice?

When students choose their courses, they are more motivated to engage with the material and achieve the learning outcomes. The learning outcomes are common to all courses in the cluster, so the end result is the same no matter which courses the student chooses. Research shows that if students are not engaged by learning in the first thirty credits, they are likely to never become engaged over the course of their careers. This means, as we have seen, that many students drop out because they have already been turned off to learning as freshmen

How will the College maintain rigorous standards in a curriculum that gives students choice?

Appropriate standards will be maintained through several oversight mechanisms. First, courses in gen ed will be approved through UCASC, just as are any other courses at the college. The new UCASC gen ed subcommittee will review course proposals to be sure that they meet a sufficient number of both the Essential Knowledge and academic competency learning outcomes for the cluster. (Single courses do not need to meet all of the cluster outcomes. For example, in Learning from the Past, students will need to take at least one course that focuses on the U.S. and another with a global perspective.) Second, the faculty director of general education will oversee regular syllabus review and classroom observations to insure the integrity of gen ed courses. Third, and perhaps most important, department chairs are ultimately responsible for the effectiveness of teaching in their departments. They will continue to have those powers of oversight for the gen ed courses they offer. In addition, rigor involves standards, which are based on levels of ability and knowledge that students achieve. We would be hard pressed currently to demonstrate rigor since we do not have assessment processes in place, which allow for such evaluations and characterizations of the curriculum. By moving to an outcomes based curriculum, we can establish benchmarks and scaffold skills and knowledge throughout the curriculum. The degree to which students meet Gen Ed outcomes can then be determined through assessment processes that meet standard best practices. This is one way that the rigor of the curriculum can be demonstrated—through the assessment of clear and appropriate student learning outcomes.

How will this program affect enrolment in my department? What about our jobs? If students aren't forced to take our courses, we could lose our positions in a period of retrenchment.

All 12,000 of our undergraduates will still need to take 120 credits to earn their degrees. The reduced gen ed requirements frees up space in their programs to take more electives, a minor, or a double major. There will be plenty of work for all. All full time faculty are welcome to propose, develop, and teach courses in one or more of the clusters of the proposed general education program. Rather than teaching the same introductory level course semester after semester, faculty will be able to teach a variety of courses that draw on their own strengths and interests. Those electives that faculty now try to offer as experimental courses, only to have them cancelled due to under-enrollment, will be excellent candidates for the general education curriculum where they will flourish. Regarding retrenchment, Chancellor Goldstein has said publicly and often that we will not “eat our seed corn.” In other words, he did not exponentially increase the number of faculty at the university over the years of his tenure only to see their ranks decimated by retrenchment.

How will this affect transfer students?

The cluster model will make it much easier for students to transfer in general education credits because they do not have to demonstrate a course-for-course match. Any course that meets the outcomes in a particular cluster will satisfy requirements in that cluster.

How will this be affected by the 80th street initiative to have University-wide general education requirements? Shouldn't we just wait for CUNY to tell us what to do? We may have to change what we decide on anyway.

We do not want to wait for CUNY to dictate our general education program. We prefer to exercise faculty control over the curriculum by adopting a John Jay general education program before CUNY issues its mandate. We are in an unusually fortunate position in regard to the CUNY initiative. First, CUNY is looking to create an outcomes-based framework, which we are proposing. Second, Academic Affairs personnel at CUNY have seen our proposal and said that it could well be the model for the entire University. The 80th Street resolution restricts the number of credits for general education to 42 at the senior colleges. Our 47-credit proposal is the absolute minimum to achieve our learning outcomes. In the fight against such draconian limits, the College can use our program as evidence that it is impossible to deliver an adequate general education in 42 credits.