

Faculty Senate Minutes #433

April 2, 2015

1:40 PM

Moot Court NB

Present (32): Ned Benton, Adam Berlin, James Cauthen, Kashka Celinska, Silvia Dapia, Artem Domashevskiy, Janice Dunham, Jennifer Dysart, Peggy Escher, DeeDee Falkenbach, Terry Furst, Katie Gentile, John Gutierrez, Maki Haberfeld, Hunter Johnson, Karen Kaplowitz, Maria Kiriakova, Louis Kontos, Tom Kucharski, Carmen Kynard, Anru Lee, Vincent Maiorino, Jay Pastrana, Edward Paulino, Dainius Remeza, Raul Rubio, Ian Seda, David Shapiro, Francis Sheehan, Charles Stone, Staci Strobl, Robert Till

Absent (12): Chevy Alford, Claudia Calirman, Marsha Clowers, Angelique Corthals, Joel Freiser, Kyoo Lee, Xerxes Malki, Frank Pezzella, Raul Romero, Jon Shane, Dennis Sherman, Daniel Yaverbaum

Invited Guest: Professor Charles (Chuck) Nemeth

Guest: Professor David Munns

AGENDA

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. Adoption of Minutes #432 of the March 19, 2015, meeting
3. Announcements & Reports
4. Part 1 of the Election of Senate representatives to 2015-16 College Council
5. Statement by Senate/Chairs Group on Review of Charter and College Organization
6. Community Hour Proposal: Senator Jen Dysart, Chair, Community Hour Committee
7. Review of the agenda of the April 21 meeting of the College Council
8. Housing of the Department of Security, Fire, and Emergency Management: Invited Guest: Professor Chuck Nemeth, Chair, SFEM Department

AGENDA

1. **Adoption of the agenda.** Approved.

2. Adoption of Minutes #432 of the March 19, 2015, meeting. Approved.

3. Announcements & Reports. Noted.

4. Part 1 of the Election of Senate representatives to the 2015-16 College Council

John Jay's Charter requires the Faculty Senate to elect all the faculty members on the College Council not elected by the academic departments, each of which has one representative. There are 24 academic departments; the College Council has 42 faculty members. Thus, the Faculty Senate must elect 18 faculty members to serve on next year's College Council. Any unfilled seats shall be filled by an election conducted by the Senate at its next meeting, on April 15.

Elected are the following fourteen (14) Senators:

Chevy Alford -- SEEK

Lou Kontos – Sociology

Ellen Belcher – Library

Anru Lee – Anthropology

Jennifer Dysart – Psychology

Dainius Remeza – English

Janice Dunham – Library

Raul Rubio – Modern Languages & Literature

Joel Freiser (adjunct) – Public Management

Francis Sheehan – Sciences

Maria Grewe (adjunct) – English

Daniel Yaverbaum – Sciences

Maki Haberfeld – Law, Police Science, CJA

Karen Kaplowitz – English

In addition, the Senate may elect up to eight (8) alternate College Council members, all of whom have speaking rights and all of whom may make motions and vote upon the absence of any of the 42 faculty members. The Senate, accordingly, elected the following two (2) members of next year's Senate as alternate College Council members:

Andrea Balis – History

DeeDee Falkenbach – Psychology

5. Statement by Members of the Senate/Chairs Ad Hoc Group on Review of Charter and College Organization: Ned Benton, Angela Crossman, Jay Hamilton, Karen Kaplowitz, David Shapiro, Francis Sheehan, Staci Strobl, Robert Till [Attachment A]

The Senate discussed the Statement issued by the Senate/Chairs Ad Hoc Group on the Review of the John Jay Charter and on the College's Organization and thanked the members – Professors Ned Benton, Angela Crossman, Jay Hamilton, Karen Kaplowitz, David Shapiro, Francis Sheehan, Staci Strobl, and Robert Till – on their work.

President Kaplowitz said she will send this Statement to President Travis and the other college administrators and to the faculty, the HEO Council leadership, and the Student Council leadership.

6. Community Hour Proposal: Senator Jen Dysart, Chair, Senate/Administration Ad Hoc Committee on the Community Hour [Attachment B]

Senator Dysart reviewed the several possible bell schedules for the master's courses if the College were to have a community hour that includes master's students and faculty. Senator Dysart reviewed the discussion by the Senate as to whether morning classes should begin 15 minutes earlier in the day or, alternately, whether evening classes should end 15 minutes later in the evening in order to enable the community hour to be 75 minutes, the length of all the other periods. She reported that she had obtained the following information: we offer 60 undergraduate class sections during the first period and we offer 13 undergraduate class sections during the ninth period. She said it, therefore, makes more sense to extend the evening schedule because far fewer students would be affected by a change.

In order for the options of the bell schedule for master's courses to be further clarified, the Senate postponed a vote on this issue.

7. Review of the agenda of the April 21 meeting of the College Council

<> Proposal from ISP for the creation of a Department of Interdisciplinary Studies:

President Kaplowitz explained that the Executive Committee of the College Council (ECCC) unanimously voted to not place this proposal on the agenda of the College Council's April 21 meeting for two reasons: the ISP resolution was not appropriate and no proposal for a simultaneous Charter amendment had been submitted. Instead, the ECCC unanimously agreed to recommend to the proponents of the proposal that they bring a revised proposal to the College Council on April 21 under "new business." There was brief discussion about team teaching – that ISP is treated differently – with several Senators saying that the Senate's position should be that all faculty wishing to team teach should receive full course credit, as do

ISP faculty, rather than that ISP faculty should receive half course credit, the way everyone else does.

<> Strategic Plan 2020 Proposal:

It was noted that the ordering of the seven proposed goals had been revised at the recommendation of the Senate because although the globalization goal had been added to the six other goals, it had been placed as goal #3. The globalization goal is now listed as goal #7.

<> Proposed 200-level General Education requirements:

The Faculty Senate concurred with the wisdom of this proposal to require students to choose two 200-level general education courses; currently, only 100-level and 300-level courses are required. It was pointed out that the proposal itself notes that most 200-level general education courses have only English 101 as a prerequisite. The question was asked as to why the proposal does not also include a requirement that sophomore-level status be required of 200-level general education courses. President Kaplowitz said she would inquire of Associate Provost Scott Stoddard, the chair of UCASC, and of Professor Allison Pease, who proposed this change and would report back.

8. Statement to the Senate by the Department of Security, Fire, and Emergency Management: Invited Guest: Professor Charles (Chuck) Nemeth, Chair, SFEM Department [Attachment C]

Professor Charles (Chuck) Nemeth, Chair of the Department of Security, Fire, and Emergency Management, thanked the Senate for inviting him and for considering his department's dilemma. He referred to the document he had sent Karen Kaplowitz [Attachment C] which had been included in the agenda packet for today's meeting. He also referred to the space consultant's analysis released the other day showing that his department is the fourth most space-deprived academic department at John Jay.

Professor Nemeth pointed out that his department is the only academic department that is to be located in Westport when North Hall is vacated around the end of December 2015. This is despite the fact that his department works closely with the Department of Public Management and the Department of Economics. This is also despite the fact that the lab built for his department is located in the New Building. And this is despite the fact that SFEM students will be taking most of their classes in the New Building and in Haaren.

Professor Nemeth also noted that the decision to locate SFEM in Westport was made several years ago, before he was hired to come to John Jay to chair the SFEM department, and before SFEM developed the several online programs it has created, and before SFEM hired so many additional faculty members. He said, furthermore, he has never been consulted about the relocation to Westport. He asked how a department could be isolated from every other

academic department. He also asked what process existed or exists for making these decisions. He asked for the Senate's guidance and advice.

President Kaplowitz noted that when the Department of Criminal Justice, the Department of Economics, and the Criminal Justice Ph.D. Program had been assigned to permanently be located in the BMW Building and the Department of English and the Department of Modern Language and Literature were assigned to permanently be located in the Annex (12th Avenue and 54th Street), the Faculty Senate had taken the position – adopted unanimously – that all academic departments must be located in either Haaren Hall or in the New Building. And all academic departments were. She proposed that the Faculty Senate reaffirm its position on this issue with particular reference to the Department of Security, Fire, and Emergency Management.

The following motion was made and seconded:

Resolved, That the Faculty Senate reaffirms its position that all academic departments must be located in either Haaren Hall or in the New Building, including the Department of Security, Fire, and Emergency Management.

The resolution was adopted by unanimous vote.

Professor Nemeth next reiterated his view that there has to be a transparent, understood, and fair process by which space is allocated, a process that permits all the important issues to be taken into account and good decisions made. The following motion was made and seconded:

Resolved, That it is the position of the Faculty Senate that the College must develop and adopt space management policies and priorities for both the short term and long term, comparable to those maintained by peer institutions and consistent with the mission of our College.

The resolution was adopted by unanimous vote.

President Kaplowitz noted that immediately following today's Senate meeting, at 4 PM, there is a scheduled meeting of the Strategic Planning Subcommittee (SPS) and the topic of space and facilities is on today's agenda. She suggested that Professor Nemeth and/or Senator Robert Till, who represents the Department of SFEM, attend if they are available. Senator Till said he would attend.

Professor Nemeth expressed his appreciation and that of his department.

By a motion made and carried, the meeting was adjourned at 3:30 PM.

ATTACHMENT A

Interim Report to the Faculty Senate and Council of Chairs by Members of the Faculty Senate/Council of Chairs Ad Hoc Group on the Administration's Proposed Initiatives on College Organization and Charter Review

from Ned Benton, Angela Crossman, Jay Hamilton, Karen Kaplowitz, David Shapiro,
Francis Sheehan, Staci Strobl, and Robert Till

March 18, 2015

Please Note: The discussions that led to this Report and the writing of this Report preceded Provost Bowers' announcement on March 20th of an administration-appointed faculty committee charged with studying these issues. The Faculty Senate and the Council of Chairs created a Senate/Chairs Ad Hoc Group in early February to study these issues before either body had any knowledge that the administration planned to create its own study group; indeed, the Senate/Chairs group invited the administration to join with it in studying these issues but that invitation was declined. This Report is in no way a comment on the faculty members of the committee recently named by the administration.

Introduction:

This analysis accepts as a foundation the idea that review and assessment of the ways our College operates is important. This is and should be a regular, integral part of our everyday and long-range activities.

With that over-arching principle in mind, the goal of this group was to explore three issues: (1) reorganization of the College; (2) review of the College Charter; and (3) organization of committees and committee work at the college. The third point was less central, however, in this analysis.

Summary of Conclusion:

Having researched, discussed, and debated the issues, our joint Ad Hoc Faculty Senate/Council of Chairs Group [the Group] came to the following conclusions regarding the three issues under consideration. (1) Reorganization of our entire College should not occur at this time. (2) Fundamental re-examination of our Charter is premature at this time, although some ideas for change are worth consideration. (3) There is room for further consideration of ways to streamline committee membership and participation to reduce redundancy in committee service. Below, in more detail, we provide our conceptualization of these issues and expound upon the basis for the conclusions above.

Analysis:

(1) Reorganization of the College

The Group explored reasons why the College might engage in reorganization and the benefits and costs of such a change. Goals that we thought might be addressed by reorganization are discussed below.

Goals

Enhance the reputation and profile of the college and its programs by featuring our academic strengths through the identities of the schools. It is true that having 'named' Schools could potentially enhance the college's reputation and profile. They could also potentially provide fundraising/naming opportunities (although the College has existing naming opportunities that have yet to be fulfilled).

In contrast to a complete reorganization, it is conceivable that organizing some departments into (a) school(s) would add benefit to those departments and possibly the campus. This possibility requires further investigation as to benefits and drawbacks. It seems likely that many potential benefits and drawbacks would be similar to those for the campus at large. However, additional questions are raised by this possibility. How would selective reorganization benefit departments and the College? Would non-reorganized programs not be in a separate school (i.e., just be in JJC) or would they default to a catch-all school? Would selective school creation challenge the brand of the College? In contrast, would it capture the brand (e.g., School of Criminal Justice; School of Liberal Arts) and thereby separate programs that are professional/practice oriented from liberal arts programs. If so, one might argue that defeats the original goal of the College – educate criminal justice professionals in a liberal arts tradition. However, this possibility requires additional study.

John Jay differs from other schools (e.g., Brooklyn College) in a key way – all of our programs share a unique mission and identity already. Division into schools could potentially undermine the shared core of the institution and dilute our brand. Some would argue this occurred at Brooklyn. John Jay educates for justice – we offer service providers a liberal arts education and it seems possible that splitting the College risks creating divisions that it was created to bridge.

Align the college's academic structure to the other CUNY senior colleges, all of which are organized with schools or divisions. It is difficult to determine the extent to which this factors into perceptions of the College. On one hand, it is important that John Jay be perceived as a "real" senior College, similar to other CUNY senior Colleges. On the other hand, our uniqueness may be to our advantage. The Group does not have clear evidence that our difference is currently an asset or a liability.

By way of comparison, however, we considered Brooklyn College's structure, as a recently reorganized CUNY senior College. Student enrollment at Brooklyn is approximately 16% higher

than ours. They have 35 academic departments (we have 23), they have 129 undergraduate majors/programs (we have 27), 127 MA programs, including a business school (we have 11), and 6 doctoral programs (we have 3). By comparison, we have a much more modest array of offerings at the present time, raising a question as to the necessity of reorganizing at this time. Again, the overarching mission of the College is somewhat unique and brand-focused and the committee is not clear whether this uniqueness is an asset or liability.

Enable the college to "respond nimbly and effectively to a rapidly changing world" particularly as this relates to enrollment management and program development opportunities. This item combines two issues – institutional agility and program development. There is no question it is advantageous for the College to respond nimbly and effectively to our world. But it is an open question whether adding a layer of administration would create a more nimble College. On its face, it seems unlikely. However, collecting like-minded colleagues in a school could facilitate more rapid decisions at the local level. Some might argue that this approach facilitated decision making in the faculty personnel process this year. At the same time, more streamlined processes within existing structures can accomplish this goal, and this approach has only begun to be tested at John Jay.

With regard to program development, it is possible that a School Dean would be able to prioritize program development more than our faculty, who are focused on research, teaching and service needs/goals. At Brooklyn College, it appears that this has been true in some Schools, but not in others (likely as a function of which departments had more scope for growth). However, one challenge the College faces is an insufficient number of faculty to mount our existing programs (Brooklyn faces a similar challenge) – raising questions about contemplating additional programs in the absence of additional faculty. This is not a simple issue, as new programs could possibly bring in revenue to facilitate additional hiring. Yet, the College has been adding programs without a reorganization, with our existing Deans and, for the time being, this appears to be sufficient to oversee our program development needs.

Improve the efficiency of academic administration at the administrative, governance, program and department levels, by centralizing some departmental functions within schools, and by decentralizing some academic coordination and oversight functions from central offices to the schools. Research on this issue at Brooklyn College suggests that the most likely decentralizing effect would be to allocate budgets and program development to Schools for dissemination to departments, rather than directly to departments. It is less likely that centralization would occur as departments would seek to retain much of their limited local decision-making authority and adding a school layer is simply likely to add a bureaucratic layer. This could benefit some decision-making, as like-minded colleagues would arguably be combined which could facilitate the distribution of resources. However, it can also reduce budget flexibility across the College, which could harm smaller "Schools" in particular. It could also add to questions of accountability and transparency at the College, which is not ideal given existing concerns about budget planning and transparency.

Mitigate the workload and more fully support the vitally important role of the Provost by reducing the number of positions that directly report to the Provost. Clearly, reorganization into schools would reduce the number of positions directly reporting to the Provost. This was the case at Brooklyn College as well. However, they have roughly 50% more academic departments than John Jay. In addition, some faculty members at Brooklyn preferred a system in which Chairs had a direct relationship with the Provost, as we do at John Jay. Their Provost had a more burdensome role in the reappointment process (i.e., 4th year reviews for all faculty), which is not shared by the John Jay Provost. There may be scope, without reorganization at this time, to mitigate some of the Provost's workload, perhaps through reconceptualizing the role of the Dean of Undergraduate Studies. While the Group members are not in the Provost position, the current state of the College's programs does not seem to require reorganization.

Additionally, a reorganization that concentrates on more limited departmental membership in schools, rather than comprehensive reorganization, might have some mitigating impact on Provost workload. This possibility requires further analysis.

Enhance the effectiveness of department chairs by reducing their involvement in ministerial functions while increasing their involvement in academic programs and services. It is possible that the substitution of School Deans for department chairs would, in some instances, reduce the workload of Department Chairs. One concern would be to ensure continued faculty input into the policies and decisions at the College and that the role of department chairs is not undermined. This would likely depend on the sensitivity of individual Deans. At Brooklyn, they already had to replace TWO of their five Deans.

Reduce the aggregate number of hours in committee meetings by administrators, faculty and students, by a) eliminating ongoing non-governance committees created by administrators, b) reducing on a proportionate and equitable basis the numbers of administrators, faculty and students on committees, and c) streamlining deliberative processes in a manner consistent with Roberts Rules. This is an important consideration, but reorganization is not the most parsimonious approach to accomplish this goal. Charter revision is one avenue for change (see below), as is alteration to existing structures and practices that do not require charter reform. One example is the changed College-wide Personnel process, which provided a more streamlined decision process. Similarly, the College Council is taking up courses for consideration as a slate, rather than individually, which both respects the work of the UCASC in reviewing courses and streamlines College Council business.

Empower chairs, program directors and major coordinators to make decisions affecting students, limiting additional levels of review/approval to instances of clear procedural error or student appeals. Any reorganization should reduce approval steps not increase them. This item is also not reliant on reorganization, but is a change that could be implemented now to reduce administrative workload in general.

Enhance structures and opportunities for fund-raising. As noted above, fund-raising through School-naming opportunities is a laudable goal. However, the College has yet to exhaust

existing naming opportunities. In addition, future opportunities can be considered if and when they arise. However, whether more narrow creation of schools including few departments has not yet been fully examined as a possible option.

General Considerations

Reorganization would be a significant and costly undertaking, both in terms of time and funds. There are a number of considerations that suggest this is not the best time for such an undertaking.

(1) We recently completed an exhaustive and time-consuming self-study and external study for our successful 10-year reaccreditation by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education, the conclusion of which, according to Middle States, is that our College is in excellent shape; indeed, we passed all 14 Middle States' Characteristics, including the one on governance, which is a very rare achievement. Furthermore, Middle States identified no problems and made no recommendations involving either our Charter or our governance or the organization of our college. The only changes that the Middle States Commission did require of us are that we update our mission statement; that we further implement an integrated strategic planning process linked to budgeting and resource allocation; and that we increase the numbers of our full-time faculty. We have done the first and we agree that we must focus our efforts on these other areas before we tackle more tangential activities. From the analysis above, it seems that reorganization could undermine our ability to accomplish the second and third items.

(2) We have been developing our College's Strategic Plan for 2015-20 and one of the possible goals proposed by the Ad Hoc Strategic Plan Committee, to study and possibly reorganize the College into schools or divisions, received virtually no support from any individual or organization. As a result, that goal is no longer part of our proposed Strategic Plan. This suggests that there is not widespread support for reorganization as a priority at the College during the next five years.

(3) The proposed Strategic Goals that received the greatest support – first, student academic and lifelong success and, second, support of faculty – do not require reorganization of the College.

(4) Our College is facing a terrible budget crisis, which will be even more serious in future years unless there is a significant and ongoing intervention from the CUNY Central Administration. Faculty and staff are faced with larger and larger portfolios and fewer and fewer resources, including less space with the impending stressful move out of North Hall. Contemplating significant, additional work associated with creating a new organization, which necessitates new governance, and hiring administrative personnel (e.g., Deans, Associate Deans, administrative assistants for Deans, etc.) do not seem appropriate at the present time.

Conclusion – Reorganization of the College

We can and should find ways to operate more nimbly and effectively, but we can and should do so organization by organization, committee by committee, and department by

department, without taking on the onerous and, in our opinion, unnecessary burden of reorganizing our College at this time. Let us revisit this matter in future years when, it is to be hoped, our budget and our space needs and the other realities that comprise our life at John Jay are not taking up all our time and energy, and when perhaps our additional programs require it. Research is ongoing into the more limited question of partial reorganization of some departments into school(s).

(2) Charter Reform

The Group evaluated Charters from across CUNY and discussed the issue of fundamentally re-examining the College's Charter. Charters from across CUNY reflected various models, from sole faculty membership to equal faculty, administration, student membership on policy-making bodies. Through this discussion, reasons for the existing governance at John Jay were explored and opportunities for change or improvement were shared.

It is important to note that we revised our Charter of Governance in 2008, seven years ago, and did so after much study and consultation throughout the College. The process extended over a two-year period. Generally speaking, it appears that the changes we made have worked. In researching this issue, we have been asking colleagues to identify problems with the existing Charter, but no critical or intractable problems have been identified. However, a few issues did emerge. For instance, there was discussion of the potential benefit of adding a College ombudsman.

Additional concerns were related to the third issue under consideration – the burden of committee work. First, over the years, various members of the administration have created and populated both ad hoc and permanent committees, often duplicative of existing committees, without going through governance. This is a violation of the most basic attributes of shared governance. Nevertheless, ceasing such actions does not require a revision of our Charter. Another concern involves faculty participation on existing Charter committees in a fashion that is redundant and wasteful. It is possible that charter revision could be implemented to address this issue – it would require a targeted examination of redundancies. It is also possible that it could be addressed through other means. For instance, managing meeting schedules and topics more effectively to reduce redundancy and increase efficiency would be worthwhile.

Finally, similar to above are problems of less than optimal efficiency and effectiveness of existing Charter committees. However, it seems that it might be possible to resolve this issue by changes initiated by governance committees themselves, through their own working procedures and traditions. Recently, for example, the College Faculty Personnel Committee (FPC) changed the ways it functions by adopting different procedures and operating rules. The FPC did so without any need to revise the Charter, even though the FPC is a College Council committee named and described in our Charter. These changes have enabled the FPC to be more “nimble”. Similarly, the College Council recently changed the way it functions by adopting different procedures and operating rules, at the recommendation of its Executive Committee,

without any need to revise our Charter. Other examples can be cited and other solutions can be effectuated without a revision of our organization or of our Charter.

Conclusion – Charter Reform

Our Charter is relatively new and has been robust in the face of necessary changes to enhance institutional effectiveness to date. It seems prudent to continue revising procedures where problems arise, until such time as it appears the Charter cannot accommodate necessary changes at the College. It is important for us to evolve as an institution, and it might be necessary to make some modifications to enhance our effectiveness. Yet, at this time, it does not appear that a complete re-envisioning of the Charter is necessary or worthwhile.

(2) Committee Structure

One of the concerns voiced by faculty is the amount of committee work, particularly redundant committee work, that faculty are engaged in. As noted above, fewer Ad Hoc committees would be beneficial, particularly where the committee is redundant with existing committees. However, it might be possible to make modifications to either committee practice or even the Charter, to streamline committee work. The Group did not contemplate in great depth how to streamline committee service, as that work is currently being undertaken elsewhere. Yet, it is clear that committee work for many faculty members is redundant and burdensome and it is worth additional effort to consider means of streamlining service.

Conclusion – Committee Structure

There is scope for consideration of ways to streamline committee work to reduce redundancy in committee service. It is beneficial to consider various means of reducing this burden.

A

B

C

D

E

F

	Undergraduate Twice per Week M/W, T/Th, M/F, T/F, W/F, or Th/F	Undergraduate Once per Week Any Day	Graduate Once per Week Any Day	Graduate Once per Week Any Day	Graduate Once per Week Any Day
1	8:00-9:15	8:00 to	8:40 to	8:40 to	8:00 to
2	9:25-10:40	10:40 (double period)	10:40	10:40	10:00
3	10:50-12:05	10:50 to	10:50 to	11:30 to	10:50 to
4	12:15-1:30	1:30 (double period)	12:50	1:30	12:50
Community Hour	(1:40-2:55)	(1:40-2:55)	(1:40-2:55)	(1:40-2:55)	(1:40-2:55)
5	3:05-4:20	3:05 to	3:45 to	3:45 to	3:05 to
6	4:30-5:45	5:45 (double period)	5:45	5:45	5:05
7	5:55-7:10	5:55 to	5:55 to	6:35 to	5:55 to
8	7:20-8:35	8:35 (double period)	7:55	8:35	7:55
9	8:45-10:00	7:20-10:00 (double period)	8:05-10:05	8:05-10:05	8:05-10:05
"Passing Period"	10 minutes	10 minutes	"Clustered" 10 minutes	Latest 50 minutes	Earliest 50 minutes
Effective CH length	95 minutes	95 minutes	175 minutes	135 minutes	135 minutes

This option extends the community hour by 15 minutes. Last undergraduate bell ends 15 minutes later to compensate. Last grad

Some explanations about the four graduate bell options:

Column D- "Clustered": Graduate bells are set as closely as possible to the two times that all rooms must empty out, clustered ar

Column E- Bells are set as early as possible within the span provided

Column F- Bells are set as late as possible within the span provided

Column G- Bells are distributed as evenly as possible within the span provided

Note that period 9 remains an outlier; setting that period with an extended passing would end the graduate day well later than 1

G

H

Graduate Once per Week Any Day	Graduate Twice per Week M/W, T/Th, M/F, T/F, W/F, or Th/F
8:40 to 10:40	8:00-9:00
11:10 to 1:10	10:50-11:50
3:25 to 5:25	3:20-4:20
5:55 to 7:55	6:10-7:10
8:05-10:05	7:35-8:35

Distributed

30 minutes

25 minutes

135 minutes

135 minutes

uate bell ends 15 minutes *earlier* (due to first class beginning at 3:45 vs. 4:05).

round the 10:40-10:50 and 5:45-5:55 passing periods

.0 pm

ATTACHMENT C

To: Karen Kaplowitz- President of the Faculty Senate
From: Chuck Nemeth, Chair and Professor of SFEM
Date: March 18, 2015
Subject: Agenda Item: SFEM and Space Plan

Dear Karen,

On behalf of my department, and after some significant interaction with its members over the last week, we are a bit concerned with how the decision to move this department to the Westport Building was reached. Nearly 18 months ago, the department visited the Westport location with promises of a move in the offing. That move never materialized and the College has since gone through a significant space analysis. All of us realize the problem of space is acute. All of us also recognize that nothing is in stone; nothing incapable of re-examination and reconsideration. And at the same time, the previous discussions about Westport engaged a department just beginning to cast off its reputation for being small and a department lacking in growth. Today, Security, Fire and Emergency Management, is clearly on the move and in the front of many new initiatives. For example, the office space discussions of nearly 2 years ago did not anticipate the dramatic growth in the undergraduate Security Management program, nor could it have computed the new and very large cadre of graduate students in the ONLINE Master's In Security Management. In addition, those same talks never envisioned that another Online graduate degree- the MS in Emergency Management was to be approved, nor was the newly minted online BS Transfer program in Security Management even in the conceptual stage. Those same discussions did not anticipate or consider the major revisions currently underway in Fire Science and Fire and Emergency Services. On top of this, the department's Center for Private Security and Safety, a busy and growing reality in continuing education, was not on the planner's radar either. The Center needs space to carry out its mission to the communities of practice it serves. No other Center engages the practitioner community as we do. Finally, the High Rise Simulator, in lower floor of the New Building, is now fully operational- filled with equipment and used as lab for our students. This too resulted since the initial Westport discussion.

All this being said, one wonders, whether there is a process by which Westport was arrived at? For how could a tentative thought of the original Westport move have the same feasibility as today's recommendation? At a minimum decisions on space need correlate to the demand of the occupants. And SFEM is no longer a sleepy department but a mover and shaker in all things developmental. It seems almost incongruous that we would be isolated as the only academic department at Westport. Aligned with this is SFEM's historic alignment with PAD which to this day, plays a role in our program delivery and in the online world of graduate study, will continue to be partners. Westport isolates the department from its historic stakeholders; provides no assurance that the Center for Private Security and Safety shall have its needed space nor image the setting that our corporate and business clientele traditionally expect. In the end, the Security industry is just that and to labor with insufficient or inadequate space, as we have done in North Hall, and bearing all that has been posed here, makes perplexing the Westport choice.

How space can advance the many programs and initiatives we currently support drives a large part of this request, and given this lack of a procedural template, I would respectfully request that the SFEM space allocation be an Agenda item for the April 2, 2015 meeting.

Respectfully,
Charles P. Nemeth JD, PhD, LL.M
Chair and Professor
Security, Fire and Emergency Management
Director, Center for Private Security and Safety