

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES #141

John Jay College of Criminal Justice

May 23, 1996

3:00 PM

Room 630 T

Present (30): Yahya Affinnih, Michael Blitz, Dorothy Bracey, Elizabeth Crespo, Edward Davenport, Jane Davenport, Kojo Dei, John Donaruma, Janice Dunham, Arlene Geiger, P.J. Gibson, Elisabeth Gitter, Andrew Golub, Amy Green, Edward Green, Lou Quinta, Karen Kaplowitz, Kwando Kinshasa, Sandra Lanzone, Gavin Lewis, Tom Litwack, Barry Luby, Ellen Marson, Robert McCrie, Daniel Pinello, Carmen Solis, Davidson Umeh, Maurice Vodounon, Agnes Wieschenberg, Daniel Yalisove

Absent (8): Effie Cochran, Andrew Karmen, James Malone, Mary Ann McClure, Jill Norgren, Frederik Rusch, Adina Schwartz, William Stahl

Guest: Harold Sullivan (Chair, Council of Chairs)

AGENDA

1. Welcome and introduction of the 1996-97 Senators
2. Announcements from the chair
3. Approval of Minutes #140 of the May 10 meeting
4. Review of the history and role of the Faculty Senate
5. Senate representation on the College Council
6. Election of the Senate executive committee
7. Election of ex officio Senate representative to College Council
8. Discussion of day/night course offerings
9. Development of a response to the CUNY Taskforce Draft Report on Cross Registration, Common Calendars and Bell Schedules
10. Approval of candidates for the Committee on Honorary Degrees
11. Final Grades Distribution Report issued by OIR: Invited Guest: Professor Harold Sullivan, Chair, Council of Chairs

1. Welcome and introduction of the 1996-97 Senators

The 28 returning and 10 new Senators were welcomed and introduced.

2. Announcements from the chair

The Senate's recommendation to the Academic Program Planning Committee to endorse the proposal for the creation of a Gender

Studies Program, a proposal that Professor Jane Bowers developed with Professor Gerrie Casey and presented to the Senate this semester, was unanimously approved by the APP Committee.

Senator Lou Guinta has just been awarded a vocational education grant which had originally been written for \$130,000 and which quite wonderfully is being funded at \$516,000.

Professor Harold Sullivan (Government) has been re-elected the Chair of the Council of Chairs. The other members of the new Council's executive committee are Professors Ned Benton (vice chair), Robert Crozier, Mary Gibson, and Jerry Markowitz.

Professor Kaplowitz has been reelected to the University Faculty Senate's 1996-97 executive committee. Professor Sandi Cooper (CSI) has been re-elected as UFS chair. Also on the new UFS Executive Committee are: Bernard Sohmer (CCNY), David Speidel (Queens), Fred Greenbaum (QCC), Martha Bell (Brooklyn), James DeJongh (CCNY), Cecilia McCall (Baruch), Susan O'Malley (KCC).

The UFS Chair and the Professional Staff Congress have just filed a second lawsuit against the Board of Trustees and the Chancellor, this time for violating the Board's own guidelines when declaring fiscal exigency two months ago.

The faculty meeting that the Chairs and the Senate voted to have in the fall will be on Friday, September 27. The Chairs have agreed to schedule their September department meeting that morning and the faculty will lunch together and then meet. The agenda items will be developed by the executive committees of the Senate and of the Chairs. Professor Harold Sullivan has sent a phonemail message to the department chairs reminding them to schedule their department meeting on the morning of September 27. Professor Sullivan noted that it would be helpful if the members of the Senate reminded their department chairs of the date and reinforced the importance of participating by scheduling the department meeting that morning. He and President Kaplowitz noted that this meeting is not instead of but rather in addition to the meeting of the instructional staff that President Lynch holds each semester.

3. Approval of Minutes #140 of the May 10 meeting

Minutes #140 of the May 10, 1996, meeting were approved by a motion duly made and carried.

4. Review of the history and role of the Faculty Senate and its relation to other College and University bodies

President Kaplowitz gave a review of the Senate's history. A Faculty Senate was first created at John Jay in the early 1970s (very differently structured than the current Senate) but was disbanded during the fiscal crisis of the mid-1970s when John Jay's existence was threatened. The Senate was created again in 1986 because the faculty decided it is important to have an official faculty body, where faculty can discuss issues as official representatives of their faculty colleagues.

The governance body of the College is the College Council, which has existed since the late 1960s: it now has 56 members: **28** faculty,

15 students, 5 HEOs (higher education officers), 1 alumni/alumnae representative, 1 non-instructional staff, and 6 administrators (who are statutory members): the president, provost, vice president for student development, vice president for administration, dean of admissions and registration, and dean of graduate studies. (Four ex officio members can make motions but cannot vote: a member of the Faculty Senate; a member of the HEO Council; the business director; and the dean of undergraduate studies.)

The Faculty Senate is a deliberative and advisory body where issues can be considered from a faculty perspective. Any member of the faculty may submit agenda items and may attend Senate meetings and may participate in discussions. However, only Senate members may make motions and may vote.

The Faculty Senate comprises all the faculty members who are members of the College Council and also 15 faculty elected as at-large representatives by the entire faculty: the 15 at-large members are 13 full-time faculty elected by the full-time faculty and 2 adjunct faculty elected by the adjunct faculty.

Four years ago, the Charter of John Jay College was amended and as a result the Faculty Senate can now elect representatives to the College Council from among its at-large representatives. The amended Charter provides that each academic department has one seat on the College Council. The Senate may fill the remaining faculty seats from among its at-large members. Any seats unfilled by the Senate are allocated as a second seat to the largest academic departments.

The Constitution of the Faculty Senate was written by Professors Robert Panzarella, Lawrence Kobilinsky, **and** James Malone, and was approved by the Faculty Senate and **then** ratified by secret ballot of the entire full-time faculty during **the** Spring of **1988**: the faculty voted **168** to **10** to ratify the Constitution, which was a vote of support for the Senate, which had been in existence for two years.

The Faculty Senate Constitution was subsequently approved by the CUNY Board of Trustees when the John Jay Charter of Governance was amended to include the following language: "The Faculty Senate: The Faculty Senate shall meet at least once each semester during the regular academic year with the President of the College to discuss matters of particular concern to the teaching faculty" (Article 111. Section 2). (All Charter amendments must be approved by the Board of Trustees: when this amendment was sent to the Board, the Board reviewed and accepted the Faculty Senate's Constitution and, in voting to approve the Charter amendment, agreed that the Faculty Senate is the voice of the John Jay faculty.) The Faculty Senate Constitution is printed in the John Jay Faculty Handbook.

Each month a Senate meeting is scheduled prior to the College Council meeting so the Senate may discuss items on the College Council agenda for the purpose of informing itself about faculty concerns and faculty perspectives (as well as about the concerns of other groups whose perspectives are represented either in reports or directly when they write to the Senate or attend Senate meetings).

In addition, the Senate frequently adopts resolutions and sends them to the College Council for action by the Council. Or the Senate adopts a resolution and transmits it to the President of the College, or to the Provost, or to other members or organizations of the College, or to the University Faculty Senate, or to the Chancellor or to a Vice Chancellor, or to elected officials.

The "**Preamble**" of the Faculty Senate Constitution states:

The Faculty of John Jay College of Criminal Justice, having been entrusted by the by-laws of The City University of New York with responsibility for policy relating to admission and retention of students, health and scholarship standards, attendance, curriculum, awarding of college credit, granting of degrees, and the conduct of educational affairs customarily cared for by a college faculty, hereby establishes the John Jay College of Criminal Justice Faculty Senate in order to provide a formal means of representing faculty concerns to the administration of the College and the University and to provide a democratic forum for the deliberation of such matters and other matters upon which deliberation by the academic community may contribute to the well being of the University and the society which sustains it and looks to it for enlightenment.

(Preamble, Faculty Senate Constitution)

In writing the "Preamble," the authors of the Faculty Senate Constitution purposely included the language of the section of the CUNY Bylaws entitled "Duties of Faculty" (Section 8.6) because the duties and responsibilities and prerogatives of the faculty are not just what John Jay's Senate says they are but what the CUNY Board of Trustees states they are, which is what historically the role of a college faculty is:

The faculty shall be responsible, subject to guidelines, if any, as established by the board for the formulation of policy relating to the admission and retention of students including health and scholarship standards therefor, student attendance including leaves of absence, curriculum, awarding of college credit, granting of degrees. It shall make its own bylaws, consistent with these bylaws, and conduct the educational affairs customarily cared for by a college faculty.

(CUNY Board of Trustees Bylaws, Section 8.6)

The Senate issues resolutions because the Faculty Senate is the official "voice of the faculty" of John Jay College except in those areas (terms and conditions of employment) where the Professional Staff Congress is the voice of the faculty: Article I of the Faculty Senate Constitution: "Powers of the John Jay Faculty Senate" states:

The John Jay College Faculty Senate shall serve as one of the bodies of the College in the shaping of academic and educational policies. The John Jay Faculty Senate shall concern itself with matters of teaching, scholarship, research and any and all other matters related to faculty concerns as part of the educational mission of John Jay College. The Faculty Senate, acting through resolutions voted upon, shall be considered the voice of the faculty when making recommendations to the College Council, to administrative officials, or to other components of the College and the University, consistent with C.U.N.Y. by-laws, the Professional Staff Congress contract and academic freedom.

(Faculty Senate Constitution, Article I)

Examples of Senate advisory positions include letters to the CUNY Vice Chancellor of Budget about John Jay's inequitable underfunding; resolutions calling on City officials to restore the funding for the CUNY Police Cadet Program; a resolution to John Jay's administrators that computerized registration be accompanied by computerized checking and enforcement of prerequisites, etc.

President Kaplowitz noted that the Senate's work contributed to the establishment by the Chancellory last year of "Base Level Equity" -- by which funded lines are distributed among colleges and are embedded into the base budgets of the colleges that receive such lines -- after John Jay's Senate argued in quite a number of letters of which Senator Tom Litwack was the principal author -- that the inequitable funding of John Jay (and other colleges) must be remedied. Indeed, the Governor's Executive Budget released in December provides funding for the Base Level Equity initiative.

Several people from outside John Jay have been guests of the Senate: Chancellor W. Ann Reynolds earlier this month on May 3, who brought Vice Chancellor for Budget Richard Rothbard; Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Richard Freeland in December; and NYS Senators Catherine Abate and Franz Leichter and NYS Assemblymembers Richard Gottfried and Edward Sullivan earlier this semester.

In past years the Senate's guests have included Vice Chancellor for Budget Richard Rothbard; Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs & University Dean for Academic Affairs Elsa Nunez; Vice Chancellor for Construction Emma Macari; Assemblymember Scott Stringer; Trustee Sandi Cooper, chair of the UFS; and the then NYS Assemblymember and chair of the NYS Black and Puerto Rican Legislative Caucus Larry Seabrook, who has recently been elected to the NYS Senate.

Another important College body is the Council of Chairs, which is comprised of the chairs of all the academic departments, which currently number 20. Since the Senate's creation in 1986, the President of the Senate has attended the meetings of the Council of Chairs. There has always been an excellent working relationship between the Faculty Senate and the Council of Chairs.

Also important is the PSC Chapter, chaired by Professor Haig Bohigian, who was a member of the Senate for many years and who comes to the Senate when there are issues to discuss with us.

The College P&B Committee makes personnel and budget recommendations to the President. A subcommittee is the Budget Planning Committee, chaired by Professor Ned Benton. The President of the Senate attends meetings of that committee.

The University Faculty Senate comprises delegates from all CUNY colleges and the UFS chair is an **ex officio** member of the CUNY Board of Trustees. John Jay's delegates are Professors Haig Bohigian, Orlanda Brugnola, Karen Kaplowitz, Maria Rodriguez, Timothy Stevens. Professors Jane Davenport and Ned Benton are John Jay's two alternate delegates.

5. Senate representation on the College Council

The Senate may fill up to 8 of the 28 faculty seats on the College Council from among the incoming at-large members of the Senate, although the Senate may choose to fill fewer than 8 seats.

In April, the Senate elected five at-large Senators to next year's College Council: Arlene Geiger, P.J. Gibson, Edward Green, James Malone, and Karen Kaplowitz. (This election must take place prior to May 1 so that the academic departments can be informed by May 1 as to the number of Council seats it has been allocated.)

6. Election of the Faculty Senate executive committee

a. President. Karen Kaplowitz was nominated and seconded. Vice President Blitz assumed the chair and invited further nominations. There being none, the Senate voted to close nominations. A motion was made for the Secretary to cast a ballot on behalf of the Senate. Karen Kaplowitz said that it is the recommendation of the Executive Committee and the practice during the past several years and her own request that voting be conducted by secret ballot: she said the effectiveness of the Senate's officers is potentially weakened if there is no secret ballot and the converse is also true. Vice President Blitz distributed ballots and instructed the Senators to write "yes," "no," "abstain," or the name of a write-in candidate. The vote was **29** yes, 0 no, 0 abstention.

b. Vice President. Michael Blitz was nominated but declined the nomination. Daniel Pinello was nominated and seconded. There being no further nominations, the Senate closed nominations. Voting was by secret ballot: **29** yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions.

c. Recording Secretary. Edward Davenport was nominated and seconded. There were no further nominations. Voting was by secret ballot: **28** yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions.

d. Corresponding Secretary. Carmen Solis was nominated and seconded. There were no further nominations. Voting was by secret ballot: **28** yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions.

e. Officers at Large (2). Kwando Kinshasa and Amy Green were nominated. Voting was by secret ballot: Kwando Kinshasa: **28** yes, 0 no, 0 abstention; Amy Green: **27** yes, 0 no, 1 abstention.

7. Election of the Senate ex officio representative to the Colleeae Council

Senator Tom Litwack was nominated and elected by secret ballot. The vote was **27** yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions.

8. Discussion of Day/Night course offerings [Attachment A]

President Kaplowitz distributed a listing of the number of day/night sections scheduled for the Fall **1996** semester by department [Attachment A]. She noted the Senate's emphasis over the years of the importance of providing day/night courses for in-service students and said that the paucity of such sections is of great concern to her and to the Senate's executive committee which met with President Lynch and Provost Wilson just prior to today's Senate meeting. She said that President Lynch expressed surprise and disappointment at the few number of day/night sections.

The column on the left of the chart is the total number of sections being offered next semester by department. The number in the right hand column is the number of linked day/night sections that department is offering next term: that number, if doubled, reveals the number of actual day/night sections because the number represents the linked sections: in other words, if a department were to offer all its sections on a day/night basis, then the number in the column on the right would be exactly half the number in the column on the left.

Senator Gitter asked what is the desirable ratio between the numbers in the left and right columns. President Kaplowitz said we do not know because we do not know how many students do not come to registration or do not apply for admission or re-admission after seeing the registration schedule and deciding that there are too few day/night courses.

She said that an ad hoc committee which she and Senator Bracey and a few other faculty served on a number of years ago surveyed the in-service students who were attending John Jay. The anonymous open-ended questionnaire asked what are the best aspects and the worst aspects of John Jay. The largest number of respondents said that the best things about John Jay are its day/night schedule and its faculty. The largest number of respondents said that the worst aspect is that there are not enough day/night sections.

President Kaplowitz also reported that when she and Professor Litwack, Robert Loudon, Frank Marousek, and others conducted the 15 focus groups of NYPD officers last semester, every officer who had attended or who currently attends John Jay said that the biggest obstacle and their biggest complaint is the lack of day/night courses and that even when day/night courses are offered they were more often than not closed out of them even though they need day/night courses because of their rotating shifts.

She said this lack of support of in-service students is of especial concern in light of the college's new initiatives to recruit in-service students. She noted that all 75 sergeants and 25 lieutenants of the NYPD who do training for the Police Department are coming to John Jay on June 14 at the invitation of President Lynch and Dean Gray and with the permission of NYPD Commissioner Safire for a presentation about the educational opportunities for police officers that the College is committed to providing, one of which is day/night sections at the main campus. The other is the CHOICE program involving three sites in Queens and Brooklyn, and one-day a week courses at the main campus.

She said that day/night courses is a matter of major importance which we should further discuss in the fall because it requires the willingness of faculty to teach day/night courses and the willingness of the chairs to assign day/night sections to the increasingly senior faculty.

This is related to the next agenda item, she explained, because we have to choose to either make a commitment to staffing a full offering of day/night courses and thus request a waiver from a common calendar and bell schedule that will soon be imposed on the University or we must decide to abandon our day/night schedule and avail ourselves of the cross registration policy that the University is implementing (see agenda item #9). She said that she thinks that we must offer a day/night schedule but that if as few day/night courses as are being offered next semester continue to be offered then we should end what is really a sham. We advertise our

college as having day/night courses but we aren't abiding by our claims. This is not only false advertising but it is manifestly unfair to those faculty who regularly teach day/night courses when the majority of the faculty are not doing so.

Senator Davidson Umeh said there are more day students than night students and also that when courses are given during first or fifth or sixth periods they can't be paired with an evening section. Professor Harold Sullivan noted that the Government Department offers all its upper level electives as day/night courses even when multiple sections of a course are offered (except for rare exceptions such as when an odd number of sections are scheduled) but, he added, there is a shortage of classrooms and that requires courses to be scheduled during first, fifth, and sixth periods. But, he said, the fact that his department manages to schedule the majority of courses as day/night sections demonstrates that it can be done and, he added, those courses fill up as well as other courses offered by other departments.

President Kaplowitz, referring to the chart [Attachment A], noted that the Government Department has the best ratio of day/night courses: of 56 sections, 17 are linked as day/night, which means that 34 of the 56 sections are day/night. She said the Government Department requires all its full-time faculty to teach day/night courses as does the English Department.

Senator Gitter said faculty must teach the schedule that the chair assigns. President Kaplowitz agreed but noted that many chairs, for a variety of reasons, do not schedule day/night sections. Professor Sullivan said that when he asks his faculty what schedule they want, they all indicate day/night courses although he added that he doesn't know what they will say when they learn how few of the other faculty teach day/night.

Senator Gitter said that certainly the Provost can create a culture in which the expectation is that all faculty teach day/night. It was noted that the provosts who preceded Provost Wilson required each chair to schedule a specific percentage of day/night courses that that department had to offer, just as a certain ratio of Monday/Wednesday and Tuesday/Thursday sections is required. It was asked whether Provost Wilson requires this and whether each semester's section allocation sheets to the chairs specifically states the number of day/night sections required of each department.

Professor Sullivan said that there is no reference to day/night sections in the section allocation and schedule documents. Rather, all that is required is a certain percentage of sections assigned during each class period. Senator Bracey and Senator Litwack recalled that when they were the chairs of their departments they were indeed required to assign a certain percentage of day/night sections and that if the chair did not meet the target of day/night sections the schedule was sent back to the chair to be redone. Professor Sullivan said that the reason for the current system of requiring a percentage of courses in each time slot is the classroom shortage and said that because he offers day/night courses he does not even have the option of offering day/only sections even if he **were to wish to**.

President Kaplowitz said that because so many day/only sections are offered during periods two, three, and four there are **not** enough classrooms for day/night sections which require classrooms during those three periods: she suggested that only

day/night sections be scheduled for periods two, three, and four, and that day/only courses be limited to first, fifth, and sixth periods, which are not paired with an evening section.

Senator Gitter moved that an ad hoc committee of three Senators, three Chairs, the Dean of Admissions and Registration, and any designee(s) of the President study the day/night issue and make specific proposals to the faculty at the general faculty/staff meeting in the Fall. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

[The discussion of day/night courses continues as part of the discussion of the next agenda item.]

9. Development of a response to the CUNY Taskforce Draft Report on Cross Registration, Coordinated Calendars and Class schedules
[Attachment B & C]

A Draft Report has just been issued by a special CUNY taskforce as to the implementation of the Board of Trustees June 1995 policy resolution #25 mandating that registration of courses across CUNY be facilitated for students. The implementation of this policy requires a common academic calendar and a common bell schedule according to the Draft Report.

President Kaplowitz said that when Vice Chancellor Freeland put together the taskforce, the UFS executive committee was asked to nominate faculty members and **she** nominated Professor Ellen Marson specifically for the calendar subcommittee because of John Jay's unique calendar needs necessitated by the day/night schedule. However, Professor Marson was placed on the permit subcommittee and no one from John Jay was on the calendar subcommittee. The taskforce and its subcommittees met in secret session and were not permitted to discuss their deliberations with anyone. Their report is very lengthy [copies are available in the Faculty Senate office]: a member of the Queens College curriculum committee prepared a one-page summary (which she distributed with permission of its author) [Attachment B].

Senator Ellen Marson explained that under this plan students would be able to become ICAM [Intra-CUNY Academic Mobility] students instead of "**permit**" students. She explained that it was felt that even the term "**permit**" has a negative connotation and the taskforce was interested in making the process more positive and more appealing to the students.

President Kaplowitz noted that the Draft Report calls for the same academic calendar throughout CUNY (with the exception of two colleges, Kingsborough and LaGuardia, which are on the tri-semester system), and the same bell schedule (classes are to begin and end at the same time). Such a common calendar and bell schedule would make our day/night schedule impossible.

Senator Marson said at the Taskforce's last meeting, after the Draft Report was issued, the common bell schedule was raised again and the phrase "whenever possible" was added to the Report, which is not in the distributed version of the Report. There was a long discussion, she said, and everyone acknowledged that this is a very difficult issue and that each college would not be held to the bell schedule unless the college decided it could adhere to it.

The common academic calendar, however, is not possible at John

Jay because holidays that begin at sundown require us to not hold classes earlier that day because of the day/night schedule. At other colleges when evening classes are not scheduled because of holidays the day classes are held. Senator Dan Yalisove suggested that if the Senate approves the resolution, a cover letter should be sent explaining the College's special scheduling needs.

President Kaplowitz explained that immediately prior to the previous week's College Council meeting she consulted with Provost Basil Wilson and with Dean Don Gray, both of whom were very concerned about the implications for our day/night schedule of a common academic calendar, and that as a result of those conversations she moved a resolution to request a variance in the common calendar and bell schedule: the resolution was unanimously approved by the Council. She said that President Lynch today at the meeting with the executive committee agreed that we need to receive a variance. For action by the Senate, she moved adoption of the same Resolution, (to which were added two whereas clauses).

Senator Marson pointed out that at the same time we want to protect our ability to offer day/night courses, we do not want to cut off the possibility of John Jay receiving ICAM students who would presumably take our electives. Senator Betsy Gitter said that we are potentially great beneficiaries of the ICAM program, especially for the non-major departments unless the courses in those departments are excluded by the University by virtue of the fact that they are offered by departments without a major.

President Kaplowitz said that what complicates the issue is that the Draft Report calls for the classification of course "**comparability**" rather than "**equivalency**" and the Report defines "**comparability**" as courses that have the same "goal." Senator Gitter said that if colleges such as Queens reject John Jay's literature and history and foreign language courses then the ICAM program is meaningless for John Jay. Senator Blitz said this could become similar to the CUNY/BA Program which does not permit CUNY/BA students to take John Jay's courses given by departments that do not have majors. President Kaplowitz said her understanding is the model is not the CUNY/BA but rather the five college consortium at the University of Massachusetts, where Vice Chancellor Freeland came from. Senator Marson agreed, saying that the University of Massachusetts consortial arrangement is a very free and fluid one. The resolution was amended with the phrase "**as** needed" and was passed by unanimous vote.

The Senate agreed, however that should a full offering of day/night courses not be staffed henceforth, the position about the ICAM waiver should be revisited. It was agreed that John Jay should either have a full day/night schedule or full participation in the ICAM program. The day/night staffing is the purview of the chairs who are responsible for establishing teaching schedules and at the same time it depends on the cooperation of the faculty.

Senator Marson said that the ICAM program is not simply for students who want a course at a college that is conveniently situated or that is given at a more suitable time. ICAM will require compelling justification for taking a course at another college and the student must have the permission of the home college as well as of the host college. President Kaplowitz also noted that students will be limited to a cap of 30 percent of the residency requirements of her or his home college: John Jay has a 30 credit residency requirement for a baccalaureate (under the 120 credit degree) and so 30 percent of that equals a maximum of 10

credits taken at other colleges under the ICAM program. Senator Yalisove and Senator Amy Green both raised the concern that ICAM students from other colleges might fill up courses before the home college's students register since ICAM students are to register according to their class standing, Senator Marson said that is a real issue and a very important one.

Senator Arlene Geiger suggested that the ICAM approach is a way to implement the [Leon] Goldstein report of 1992 by eliminating the need for certain courses and departments. Senator Marson disagreed with that analysis. President Kaplowitz said she thinks the ICAM policy impulse comes from a wish to not retrench more CUNY faculty: if a college has insufficient students for its electives but there are students at other colleges that need or want those courses, perhaps because there are not sufficient faculty at their school to provide those courses (as a result of early retirements, for example), then that's a way of not having to retrench faculty. Senator Gitter said in that case one doesn't need Base Level Equity: instead of moving lines the University allows the students to move to where there is insufficient enrollment to support the number of faculty. President Kaplowitz agreed and said that, in fact, there are attempts on several fronts to stop Base Level Equity, including a delegation of presidents scheduled to meet with the Chancellor tomorrow to convince her to stop Base Level Equity. She said that a successful ICAM program would help those arguing against the reallocation of lines.

Senator Gitter said that given all the potential drawbacks of ICAM she moves that the Senate approve the two resolutions on the agenda and forward them to the chair of the Taskforce with a cover letter that neither endorses nor rejects the ICAM program but that instead states that the Taskforce needs to be informed that because of our unique schedule and mission John Jay will not be able to conform to a common academic calendar or bell schedule. President Kaplowitz agreed and added that if we find that after we raise everyone's awareness about the paucity of day/night courses despite its central role in our mission as a specialized college and of the choice that has to be made between day/night and ICAM and that nonetheless we continue to have an unacceptably low number of day/night courses and if we also are unable to be successful in our attempts to recruit in-service students then we have to rethink our entire day/night program: we cannot have it both ways, she said, whereby we advertise day/night courses, give few such sections, and in addition are not part of ICAM. She suggested this is a topic to discuss further in the Fall.

The Resolution, as amended, and with the plan to send a cover letter [Attachment C] neither praising nor criticizing ICAM, was moved and seconded:

Whereas, The CUNY Office of Academic Affairs has issued a "Draft Report on Cross Registration and Coordinated Scheduling" on the implementation of Resolution #25, one of the 37 Resolutions Approved by the CUNY Board of Trustees in June 1995, and

Whereas, The "Draft Report" includes among its recommendations a common academic calendar and a common bell schedule, therefore be it

Resolved, That the Faculty Senate of John Jay College of Criminal Justice reaffirms its commitment to educating law enforcement and other in-service students and reaffirms its accommodation of in-service students through the College's historic offering

of twice-a-week day/night courses taught by the same instructor and by offering, in some cases, once a week day/night courses taught by the same instructor and, therefore, requests that the CUNY Central Administration and the CUNY Board of Trustees grant John Jay College of Criminal Justice a variance from the proposed common academic calendar as **needed** for providing these special arrangements for our students and similarly requests a variance from the proposed common bell schedule for the same reason.

The Resolution, with a cover letter [Attachment C] as described by Senator Gitter, was approved by unanimous vote.

President Kaplowitz said the Draft Report is silent as to who will decide course "**comparability**" and a Taskforce member, Professor Eva Richter (KCC), has urged that Faculty Senates adopt the following resolution urging that the underlined words be added to the Report:

Resolved, That the Faculty Senate of John Jay College of Criminal Justice requests that the "Draft Report on Cross Registration and Coordinated Scheduling" be amended by the addition of the following underlined words to item 2 on page 6 of the document: "The role of the faculty is critical in determining course equivalencies. To safeguard this role, colleges, in consultation with the appropriate curriculum committee, will determine in each discipline who will represent the college for the review of the equivalency guide and the establishment of the course consideration. These representatives of each college in each discipline will then meet together to establish course comparabilities."

The Resolution was moved, seconded and approved unanimously.

10. Approval of candidates for the Committee on Honorary Degrees

The four members of the Committee on Honorary Degrees who continue to serve their 3-year term of office are Professors Jane Bowers (English), Jannette Domingo (African-American Studies), Daniel Gasman (History), and Antony Simpson (Library). The terms of three members, Professors Peter DeForest, Barry Latzer, and Maria Rodriguez, expire in June.

The Senate unanimously approved the following slate, to be voted on by secret ballot by the full-time faculty in September, for the three seats that become empty next month. All six have accepted nomination:

Peter DeForest (Science)
Lotte Feinberg (Public Management)
Betsy Hegeman (Anthropology)
Barry Latzer (Government)
Altagracia Ortiz (Puerto Rican Studies/History)
Eli Silverman (Law, Police Science, & CJ Administration)

11. Final Grade Distribution Report issued by office of Institutional Research: Invited Guest: Professor Harold Sullivan. Chair. Council of Chairs [Attachment D]

Professor Harold Sullivan, chair of the Government Department

and Chair of the Council of Chairs, discussed the report on final grades which the Office of Institutional Research (OIR) prepared at his and Karen Kaplowitz's request. He explained that his involvement in this issue began with his own experiences with students in his department, particularly students majoring in Criminal Justice who take 400-level Government courses who often come to him complaining that they have always received A grades and now are receiving a D grade in their 400-level Government course. Every chair receives a grade report that shows the grades of every instructor and of every course. He recalled that he did an analysis of his department's courses and of the courses of a few other departments and found radically different patterns and so he and Karen Kaplowitz did an analysis of all the departments.

After seeing the results they decided that an analysis would be more credible if the Office of Institutional Research prepared a report and so he and Karen asked OIR to prepare this report. He said that what is most important to him is the number of A and B grades that each department is giving. He noted that if 90% of the students receive grades which characterize their work as good or excellent, perhaps the terms good and excellent no longer have meaning. Although we have many incredibly excellent students and many who start out academically weak but who develop into first-rate students, we all know that all of our courses are not filled with A students, he said. After all, he noted, our admissions standards are not very high.

He distributed two summary sheets [Attachment D-1 and D-2] showing the number of A's and B's by department and also by full-time and adjunct faculty. The adjuncts in most departments are at least as demanding as full-time faculty and in many cases are more demanding as measured by their grades. He said one possible explanation, in addition to the seriousness of the adjunct faculty, is that adjuncts tend to teach 100-level courses, which are more likely to be characterized by lower grades than upper level courses, which are taught largely by full-time faculty.

President Kaplowitz said we should be grateful to Professor Sullivan for the work he has done on this and for raising this issue in every appropriate forum. Professor Sullivan noted that he and Professor Kaplowitz have conducted two Better Teaching Seminars, last semester and this semester, on this subject as much to raise consciousness as to understand the motivation and reasoning of faculty to give the grades that they do. He said that he has raised this issue at the Academic Program Planning Committee and at the Council of Chairs and that he sees the Faculty Senate as the place to raise it among the general faculty. He urged senators to raise the issue within their own departments if their departments have not adequately discussed the issue yet.

He noted there are dramatic differences between the number of A's and B's that departments give. He noted that some departments give a preponderance of P grades (in remedial courses for example) and this necessarily lowers the number of letter grades.

He drew attention to Table 1-B from the Spring 1995 report [Attachment D-1]. The first department, African-American Studies, for example, gave 53% of its students either an A or a B, and the breakdown is 44% A's and B's given by full-time faculty and 64% A's and B's assigned by adjunct faculty. Government faculty gave 39% A's and B's and the 39% figure was true of both full-time faculty and of adjuncts: both groups gave 39% A's and B's. In

some departments, full-time faculty give the preponderance of A's and B's as the charts show.

The full report breaks down the grades by 100-level, 200-level, 300-level, and 400-level courses [the full report is available from OIR and from Professors Sullivan and Kaplowitz.]

Professor Sullivan said that the next stage of the analysis will be a report that separates the disciplines in a department, so that there would be discrete data for Law, for Police Science, and so forth rather than have them all combined just because they are combined in a single department.

Professor Kaplowitz said she finds interesting how few C's and D's are assigned: other than A's and B's, the large proportion of grades are W, WU, and INC. Senator Betsy Gitter said she does not find this the least bit surprising because John Jay students have always been either functional or dysfunctional: we do not have and never have had many traditional C students. She said that while the report is interesting and important, the crucial question is which courses have prerequisites. As we also know, she said, John Jay is two colleges: to compare the grades of, for example, Communication Skills 110, which has one set of goals and whose students on the whole are not going to make it, with a 400-level seminar which has entirely different goals, does not make a whole lot of sense. Different departments have different purposes in the College and have different populations of students. That doesn't mean that this analysis isn't important but we should not be totally driven by it, she concluded.

Professor Sullivan said that he, too, noticed the seeming disappearance of the C grade four or five years ago when he saw **his** own grades inflating. He said he came to the conclusion that exactly because we have a **wide** gap in our student body when we see work that is even just acceptable we are so relieved that we give the student a B. He said just that morning an adjunct member of his department spoke about finding himself giving all A's and B's and when asked if those students' work is really so good the faculty member said that he really gave the A's and B's because the other students' work is so terrible. Professor Sullivan said the disappearance of the C grade is a mistake and that he has made a conscious effort to resurrect it in his own grading pattern, particularly in the lower level courses, not for punitive purposes but for when it is deserved. He said he does not believe that 70% of the students in our courses are doing B or A work.

Senator P.J. Gibson said her experience is that the C level students tend to withdraw or drop out. Senator Agnes Wieschenberg said we need to redefine what our grades mean because C used to be a good grade but students view it as a very poor grade. Professor Sullivan agreed, attributing that to the fact that in high school students get A's and B's for just showing up.

President Kaplowitz recalled Professor Sullivan showing her a paper written by a graduating senior in his 400-level course: the paper would have received a failing grade in English 99, the most remedial-level writing course at John Jay. Yet this student had passed all his courses, sometimes with quite good grades, but was not able to communicate a clear thought in written English. She asked whether we are being ethical educators **by** giving grades that **misinform** the students about their level of ability or knowledge. She asked why would a student work harder, seek tutorial help, and **so** forth, if we, the experts, are certifying their work as not

only acceptable but as very good or as excellent.

Senator Gitter said we are blaming ourselves, in part, for a problem that we can't do anything about. To teach students, to address their writing problems, would require much smaller classes than we have. The institution we work in is constructed to produce exactly this pattern: it is constructed so that we give multiple choice exams, machine graded exams. Furthermore, she said, there are absolutely no incentives for faculty in terms of promotion or anything else. Additionally, students take too many courses because of the financial construction. And so the whole system is set up on such a false basis that we should not berate ourselves about the grades we give although, she added, she does agree that it is important to raise our and our colleagues' consciousness.

Senator Gitter said that just seeing the data and talking about it is important but beyond that there is little to do. The system is set up to produce grade inflation and this has been the case since she started teaching here in the early 1970s. Until we get small classes, until we get incentives to work with students, nothing will change. What are we going to do, punish the students by giving them lower grades? That's not going to produce standards, she explained. Standards are improved by what the faculty do in the classroom and during office hours. Standards aren't improved by giving low grades.

Professor Sullivan said it is not a matter of punishing students by giving them lower grades. He said we are being unfair to the excellent students who truly deserve their A and B grades by giving inflated grades to students who do not deserve them. When an excellent student and a poor student apply to law school, the excellent student is harmed because the law school discounts good grades received at John Jay. We know this is happening. We are letting our excellent students be harmed by the reputation of inflated and inaccurate grades that the College has developed and that it continues to have. This is not responsible on our part as teachers, he said. We have a responsibility to the excellent students who work incredibly hard, who acquire excellent skills, and who achieve mastery over the subject matter.

And, Professor Sullivan said, when we tell students who are mediocre or poor students that they are doing excellent or very good work we are harming them: while they are in College and when they leave College they think they have a level of ability and of knowledge that they do not have and they are harmed by our telling them what is not true. Some students would become excellent students were we to tell them that they have to acquire skills and knowledge that they mistakenly think they already have.

Professor Sullivan was thanked for bringing this issue to the Senate. It was agreed that this is a matter to be considered by the full faculty in the fall.

The meeting was adjourned at 5 PM upon a motion made and carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Edward Davenport
Daniel Pinello

Recording Secretaries

ATTACHMENT A

**Day/Night Section Analysis
Fall 1996**

Dept .	Total Sections	#D/N Links (Double to find # Sections)
AAS	29	5
ANT	26	2
ART	22	4
SCIENCE	39	9
COM (NON-SK)	32	3
COR	16	5
CRJ 101	14	1
CRJ ALL OTHERS	9	2
CSL	17	0
DRA	8	0
ECO	14	3
ENG 099	14	0
ENG 100	30	1
ENG 101	34	3
ENG 102	32	3
ENG ALL OTHERS	26	5
FIS	9	3
FOR. LANG .	37	5
GOV	56	17
HIS	56	12
LAW	66	11
LIT	46	11
MAT 100	11	0
MAT 103	34	1
MAT 104	30	1
MAT 105	17	2
MAT 108	19	4
MAT ALL OTHERS	31	14
MUS	11	2
PAD	26	5
PED	33	1
PHI	29	4
PRS	24	5
PSC	44	10
PSY	71	7
SEC	11	1
SOC 101	20	2
SOC ALL OTHERS	47	5
SPE 113	44	3
SPE ALL OTHER	5	1

Report of the Working Group on Cross Registration and Coordinated Scheduling (4/29/96)

Summary

*Prepared by Ken Lord, Chair
Undergraduate Curriculum Committee
5/15/96*

Common Calendar

The common academic calendar will comply with all Board policies, PSC/CUNY contracts, New York State Laws, and State Education Department guidelines. Whenever possible, the calendar will be complementary to the NYC Board of Education calendar.

- 15 weeks of classes (14 weeks and up to 6 days of finals with one or two reading days).
- Reading days may be used as snow days.
- A University-wide coordinated bell schedule.
- First day of fall semester is the Monday preceding Labor Day.
- First day of spring semester is the Monday closest to but not preceding January 27th.
- Winter and spring recesses will be established by the Vice Chancellor for Faculty and Staff Relations.
- Covers all CUNY colleges except Kingsborough and LaGuardia.
- Approval process will emanate from Council of Registrars to the Chancellor.

Common Course Numbering

The term comparable is carefully used, as opposed to *equivalent*. Comparability means that "courses have similar educational goals, leading to a comparable background for advancement to a higher level course; comparability does not require that content and/or methodology be identical."

- Individual college course numbers will be supplemented with a CUNY course number.
- A course which is comparable at two or more CUNY colleges will have the same CUNY number.
- Faculty will select a college coordinator and will establish course comparability.
- The first step is to review the current *Equivalency Guide* for the two-year schools.
- Common course numbers apply only to those colleges which have established comparability.

Registration

- Access to uniformly formatted information on the WWW.
- Every CUNY student should have reasonable access to course numbers, schedules, policies and related information, and should be able to apply this information to an efficient system of registering for classes.
- Universal remote registration employing appropriate technology, including the web.

Permission for Cross Registration

The "ICAM" (Intra-CUNY Academic Mobility) policy should replace the current permit policy for courses taken at other CUNY schools. "While [the ICAM policy] is largely uniform, there will be room for some individualization by the Colleges. ... both the home and host colleges will have control over ICAM enrollments through policies which have been approved as complying with ICAM standards."

- For matriculated students eligible to register at the home college (i.e., no holds, etc.)
- Target primarily for students beyond the freshman year.
- Senior college juniors and seniors will be granted permits to take courses at community colleges.
- ICAM grades will be included in the home college GPA.
- ICAM Administrative approval limited to courses where comparability has been established.
- Departmental advisers must give permission for an ICAM course to be applied to a major or minor, regardless of comparability.
- Up to 30% of required residency credits (30% of 45 = 15 for Queens College) may be ICAM courses.
- ICAM students will register at host college according to their class standing at home college.
- ICAM students will register before transfer students, new freshmen and non-degree students.
- Host college receives FTE count, revenue and budgetary credit for ICAM students.
- Home college gets tuition and fees, revenue distributed to host college.

Coordinated Course Scheduling

"Lists will be prepared of suggested programs/courses targeted for ICAM coordinated scheduling. ... Coordinated course schedules will be designed to facilitate the enrollment of students in one or more courses at a host school, where targeted courses have been scheduled so that they are unlikely to compete with courses that the student would take at the home college"

ATTACHMENT C



JOHN JAY COLLEGE OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE

The City University of New York

445 West 59th Street, New York, N.Y. 10019

212 237-8000 /8724

May 30, 1996

Dr. Lois Cronholm
Chair, CUNY Taskforce on Cross Registration
and Coordinated Scheduling

Dear Dr. Cronholm:

At its meeting of May 23, the Faculty Senate of John Jay College of Criminal Justice discussed at great length the Taskforce's April "Draft Report." The discussion led to the unanimous approval of two resolutions, both of which are attached.

The first resolution concerns John Jay's unique day/night course schedule which enables law enforcement and other uniform officers who work rotating shifts to study the same course material with the same instructor either in the morning or in the evening of the same day. These courses meet either twice a week or once a week.

This accommodation of the needs of our in-service students (police officers, court officers, correction officers, fire fighters, and other public agency employees) requires a bell schedule that is coordinated with the shift hours of these students. Therefore, a common bell schedule, if different from ours, has the potential of harming our students and would thus impede the fulfillment of our College's special mission.

Similarly, our day/night schedule requires an academic calendar that takes into account the fact that holidays that begin at sundown require that no classes be held that evening or that same morning (because all morning and evening paired courses must be kept parallel). Other similar calendar adjustments are needed.

Therefore, the Faculty Senate unanimously approved the attached resolution which asks for a waiver from the common calendar and common bell schedule for John Jay, as needed, in order for John Jay to provide its unique class schedule. A similar resolution was approved unanimously by John Jay's College Council upon a motion which I introduced at its May 16 meeting.

The Senate also unanimously approved a second resolution, also attached, requesting that item \$2 on page 6 be amended.

I am available to discuss this with you and with your Taskforce. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the "Draft Report."

Sincerely,

Karen Kaplowitz
President, Faculty Senate

ATTACHMENT D-1

Table 1

Percent Distribution of fall 1995 Undergraduate Grades
by Department for All Faculty

		PERCENT FALL 1995 GRADES+												
Department Enrollment		A	B	C	D	F	IN	P	R	AU	W	WA	WU	
<u>A+B</u>		-----												
50	AAS	812	1 5 3 5 2 4	3	4	9	<1	.	.	7	<1	2		
48	AMP	1911	2 0 2 8 2 3	8	5	3	<1	.	.	10	<1	3		
57	ANT	1040	1 8 3 9 2 0	8	2	6	<1	.	.	4	<1	3		
30*	COM	920	8 22 14	2 3	5	28	6	.	.	5	<1	8		
22*	CSL	459	9 1 3 2 3	4	5	5	2	3	.	.	5	1 1 1		
35*	ENG	4886	11 24 17	4	3	5	13	9	<1	7	<1	6		
54	FLL	1027	3 2 2 2 1 8	7	3	6	.	.	<1	8	<1	3		
40	GOV	1965	14 26 25	9	7	4	<1	.	.	11	<1	5		
46	HIS	2139	1 7 2 9 2 2	9	5	6	<1	.	<1	8	<1	2		
61	LPS	3909	24 37 18	6	2	6	<1	.	<1	5	<1	2		
29*	MAT	4534	14 15 13	7	11	5	14	5	<1	9	<1	6		
66	PED	1054	4 3 2 3 1 3	2	3	4	.	.	<1	7	<1	5		
61	PRS	917	2 7 3 4 1 7	1	2	1	3	.	.	4	<1	2		
53	PSY	2214	2 0 3 3 2 2	7	4	6	<1	.	.	5	<1	2		
63	PUB	994	3 2 3 1 1 4	5	2	6	<1	.	.	7	<1	3		
42	SCI	1060	1 4 2 8 2 6 1 4	5	3	.	.	.	8	.	2			
17	SEK	1187	9 2 5	<1	2	a s 5	8	.	2	<1	3			
52	SOC	2318	16 36 25	6	2	7	<1	.	.	5	<1	3		
67	SPE	1524	3 0 3 7 1 3	2	4	4	<1	.	<1	5	1	5		
57	TSP	929	22 35 15	2	4	7	.	.	<1	11	1	4		
	TOTAL	35799	1 8 2 8 1 8	6	4	6	6	2	<1	7	<1	4		

Note:
+ Data come from the report, 'Grade Analysis for Fall Semester 1995', prepared by the College's Computer Center. CEP courses and courses for the branch campus program in Puerto Rico are excluded.

ATTACHMENT D-2

Table 1b

Percent Distribution of Spring 1995 Undergraduate Grades
by Department for All Faculty

A+B Grades combined			Percent Spring 1995 Grades+															
total	F+T	Adj	Department	Enrollment	A	B	C	D	F	IN	P	R	W	WU				
53	44	64	AAS	689	22	31	16	4	7	10	<1	0	6	3				
55	48	66	AMP	1896	22	33	20	6	4	2	<1	0	9	5				
51	47	59	ANT	908	20	31	23	7	2	5	<1	0	6	4				
24*	5*	37*	COM	647	7	17	12	4	5	7	26	5	9	10				
33*		33*	CSL	375	10	23	10	5	9	4	20	0	9	11				
40	50	30	ENG	4589	12	28	17	5	4	2	11	7	9	7				
59	55	66	FLL	980	34	25	17	6	3	3	0	0	10	2				
39	39	39	GOV	2088	14	26	23	8	8	4	<1	0	11	7				
52	51	52	HIS	1957	18	34	24	5	3	5	<1	0	9	3				
64	66	59	LPS	4120	2	7	3	7	1	7	5	2	4	<1	0	5	4	
27	35	33	MAT	3798	12	15	16	7	7	4	13	6	13	8				
73	70	76	PED	1124	45	28	7	2	2	2	<1	0	8	5				
57	50	65	PRS	830	22	35	18	2	1	9	<1	0	7	7				
52	48	54	PSY	2175	2	1	3	1	2	0	7	6	3	<1	0	7	3	
63	70	58	PUB	1259	3	5	2	8	1	3	5	2	5	0	0	8	5	
44	49	42	SCI	879	1	4	3	0	3	0	9	2	3	1	1	6	3	
18*	16*	21*	SEK	716	7	1	1	7	2	4	6	36	14	4	8			
57	50	50	SOC	2816	16	36	25	7	3	4	<1	0	6	3				
61	53	65	SPE	1349	28	33	13	2	2	3	e1	0	8	1	0			
68			TSP	867	2	3	3	5	1	0	2	6	7	0	0	1	2	4
total	49	51	46	TOTAL	34062	20	29	18	5	4	4	5	2	8	5			

* a substantial proportion of COM, CSL and SEK students received "P" grades

Note:
+ Data come from the report, 'Grade Analysis for Spring Semester 1995', prepared by the College's Computer Center. CEP courses and courses for the branch campus program in Puerto Rico are excluded.