

Faculty Senate Minutes #143

John Jay College of Criminal Justice

September 18, 1996

3:15 PM

Room 630T

Present (32): Yahya Affinnih, Dorothy Bracey, Effie Cochran, Elizabeth Crespo, Edward Davenport, Jane Davenport, John Donaruma, Janice Dunham, P.J. Gibson, Elisabeth Gitter, Andrew Golub, Amy Green, Edward Green, Lou Guinta, Karen Kaplowitz, Andrew Karmen, Kwando Kinshasa, Sondra Lanzone, Tom Litwack, Barry Luby, James Malone, Ellen Marson, Mary Ann McClure, Robert McCrie, Jill Norqren, Daniel Pinello, Frederik Rusch, Adina Schwartz, Carmen Solis, William Stahl, Maurice Vodounon, Daniel Yalisove

Absent (6): Michael Blitz, Kojo Dei, Arlene Geiger, Gavin Lewis, Davidson Umeh, Agnes Wieschenberg

Guest: James Levine (Executive Officer, Ph.D. Program)

Agenda

1. Announcements from the chair
2. Approval of Minutes #142 of the September 5 meeting
3. Discussion of the September 9 "Draft Report of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Doctoral Program Planning and Doctoral Faculty Replenishment." Invited Guest: Professor James Levine, Ph.D. Executive Officer
4. Proposal to change the Senate's all-day meeting from Friday, December 6, to Friday, December 13
5. Election of Senators to an ad hoc committee on day/night courses
6. Election of faculty to Senate Computing & Technology Committee
7. Proposed Resolution: Resolved, That the Faculty Senate requests that the College Personnel Committee re-establish to all faculty who are candidates for a personnel action the right to appeal to the College Personnel Committee a negative recommendation by that Committee
8. Report on changes in CUNY's use for budget allocation purposes of its Instructional Staffing Model (ISM) which establishes teacher/student ratios by discipline
9. Report on College-wide grading patterns 1987-1995
10. Discussion of the Friday, September 27, faculty retreat
11. Discussion of the September 26 College Council agenda
12. New business

1. Announcements from the chair

It was reported that in response to the Senate's position about the importance of scheduling an evening Dean's List Reception so that evening and in-service students would not be excluded, Vice President

Roger Witherspoon and Dr. Patricia Sinatra have added a second Dean's List Reception on November 8, from 5:30 to 7:00 PM [See Minutes #142.]

President Kaplowitz reported that at the September 9 College Budget Committee meeting, President Lynch reported that he is scheduled to meet with Vice Chancellor Rothbard to stress two issues: more equitable funding for John Jay (in light of the newest budget allocation [see Minutes #142]) and the necessity for identifying John Jay as a top priority in CUNY's asking budget for capital projects. Both the capital and operating asking budgets will be voted on by the CUNY Board of Trustees in October and will then be sent to Albany.

At the Budget Committee meeting, President Lynch also presented a proposal for holding two commencement exercises each year, one in February and the second in May/June. The two commencements could be held at Carnegie Hall and the 700 students graduating in February and the 700 graduating in the spring could receive a sufficient number of tickets for their guests. The importance of a reception for the graduates was part of the discussion. Last May, commencement was at the Paramount Theater on 33rd Street and there was no reception. The proposal was met with widespread support by the Budget Committee.

2. Approval of Minutes #142 of the September 5 meeting

Minutes #142 of the September 5, 1996, Senate meeting were accepted by a motion duly made and carried.

3. Discussion of the September 9 "Draft Report of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Doctoral Program Planning and Doctoral Faculty Replenishment." Invited Guest: Prof. James Levine, Ph.D., Executive Officer

President Kaplowitz welcomed Professor James Levine, the Executive Officer of the Ph.D. Program in Criminal Justice. She explained that she invited Dr. Levine to today's meeting upon reading the just issued September 9 "Draft Report of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Doctoral Program Planning and Doctoral Faculty Replenishment." She explained that the cover letter from Acting Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Anne L. Martin invites written responses to the Draft Report by October 22 and requests appropriate bodies to comment on the Report's recommendations. She noted that the central issue in the Draft Report is the division of CUNY doctoral programs into three categories, as described on page 6 of the document:

"Priority I: These programs are seen as particularly strong candidates for support and will have a claim on resources from the University in addition to support from the GSUC [Graduate School and University Center] and the colleges. Within Priority I there are two types of programs:

"Priority IA: These are programs that the University will seek to sustain at a level sufficient to achieve high national rankings based on programmatic strength as well as on faculty scholarship and research as measured by the NRC [National Research Council]. Some of these programs may not necessarily be covered by NRC rankings.

"Priority IB: These are programs that the University sees as essential to maintain at a high level either because they provide

critical support for priority IA programs or because they have particular importance in relation to our criteria for CUNY or for New York City. These programs are not necessarily candidates for top national ranking.

"Priority 11: These are programs that the University regards as important to sustain through the normal workings of the consortium but they are not candidates for special added investment from University resources."

"Priority 111: These are programs about which questions exist as to their long term viability."

President Kaplowitz said that Professor Levine deserves our congratulations for his direction of the Criminal Justice doctoral program, especially in light of the fact that the program has been rated in the Priority I division, the category which is to receive additional funding in the form of additional faculty lines, additional financial aid for the doctoral students in these programs, and additional OTPS [Other Than Personnel Services] budget. The Draft Report identifies programs granted Priority IA and IB status:

Priority I-Group A: Anthropology, Art History, Chemical Engineering, English, History, Mathematics, Music, Speech & Hearing Sciences, and Theater.

Priority I-Group B: Biochemistry, Criminal Justice, Geoscience/Geography [a new configuration], Linguistics, Sociology, and Education (a potential program).

The programs designated as Priority II and Priority III are not named in the Draft Report, which states that decisions about the other doctoral programs have not yet been made.

The Draft Report states that "There is no value in offering mediocre doctoral programs. CUNY should offer only those programs that can achieve and be sustained at a level of quality, with a select group of programs sustained at a high level of quality. The University should have some programs of acknowledged excellence that are ranked in the top ten or twenty nationally depending on the number of programs in the discipline. Our portfolio of programs should also reflect the particular mission and character of CUNY. Programs, including new programs, that contribute to these two goals, or have the potential to do so, should be assigned top priority for special University support.

"General criteria that should be applied to setting priorities for doctoral programs include: (1) the quality of the current program and faculty; (2) the capacity of the faculty to provide the necessary range of instruction; (3) student demand for the program; (4) national need for new Ph.D.s in the field.

"CUNY-specific criteria include the extent to which our overall set of top priority programs: (1) reflects CUNY's character as an urban university; (2) mission of public service; (3) represents an appropriate balance among the academic and professional disciplines at CUNY. In addition, assignment of top priority should be considered for programs that: (4) represent an opportunity for CUNY to achieve distinction within a particular substantive niche; (5) contribute critical support to a top-ranked program." (pp. iii-iv)

President Kaplowitz noted that unless the inevitable political

maneuverings that will take place and that are already taking place succeed in knocking the Criminal Justice program out of Priority I, this Report means that although the doctoral program is a Graduate School program and not a John Jay program (although it is housed at John Jay) it will, in fact, mean additional faculty lines and money for equipment and computers which will benefit John Jay.

The Report describes each of the doctoral programs that are being recommended as Priority IA and IB. The description of the Criminal Justice program states: "This program has recently revised its curriculum with the intent, among other goals, to form closer ties to the cognate fields (e.g. Sociology, Anthropology, Political Science) offered at the Graduate Center. It has the potential to use New York City as a laboratory as well as serving this City both by training a number of researcher/administrators and through specific sponsored and unsponsored projects. It is one of the few programs on the priorities list that distinctly reflects that element of the urban theme which focuses on issues of urban public policy. The current and future strength of this program, which is one of a relatively few number of doctoral programs in the field, is also a reflection of the prominence of CUNY's John Jay College of Criminal Justice, one of the largest and most renowned institutions specializing in this subject" (p 16). President Kaplowitz congratulated Professor Levine for what she called a vote of support for the Criminal Justice doctoral program.

Professor Levine thanked Karen Kaplowitz for inviting him so he can amplify the Report and he thanked her and the Senate for its support of the Ph.D. program, support which has been consistent and passionate. He said it is very appropriate that he talk about this Report to the Faculty Senate because if ever there was a program which has been almost totally dependent on faculty work and effort it is this.

Professor Levine said the doctoral program exists on an absolute shoestring and, in fact, on a frayed shoestring. The administrative resources are close to nil and faculty are asked to do all kinds of tasks over and above that which comes from the regular 21-credit load and all the other service responsibilities. He said that two people in this room exemplify the program's dependence upon the incredible activity of the faculty: Dorothy Bracey was on a previous committee, the Strategic Planning Committee, a couple of years ago, which developed some overall principles about the direction of the Graduate Center and doctoral education, principles stated at a fairly high level of abstraction, principles which can be seen articulated in the Report we are discussing today. And the second person, Tom Litwack, has been a very active member of the program, who contributed enormously in the effort to bring about massive changes in the Criminal Justice curriculum. These curricular changes have been put into place over the last few years, the result of a long, difficult, and sometimes hard-fought struggle to totally redo a curriculum involving faculty from more than 10 disciplines. Tom played a key role in this process and his efforts typify what is involved. So the Faculty Senate is the correct body, indeed, with which to discuss this Draft Report.

Professor Levine said that the priorities listed in the Report are rather striking because programs are named and, in fact, he said, he has never seen a more rapt meeting of doctoral executive officers than that of a week ago when the Report was distributed and each learned for the first time how their programs had been ranked. The meeting was devoted to Graduate School President Horowitz and Provost Marshall explaining the operation of the ad hoc working group,

defending what the ad hoc group had done, explaining the ramifications which, if all goes well, as Karen articulated, are going to be quite tangible, and taking the flack, which was substantial, from aggrieved executive officers.

Although Criminal Justice had not been nationally ranked, Professor Levine said he believes it was placed in Priority I for a number of reasons some of which have to do not so much with the doctoral Program per se but with John Jay, which furnishes the program with most, although not all, of the faculty. (There are six or seven people on the doctoral faculty in Criminal Justice who are at other CUNY colleges.) The Report conveys an appreciation of the interdisciplinary nature of the Criminal Justice program and that is one of the big themes, big priorities, of the Graduate School and, indeed, of the administration at 80th Street. Professor Levine noted that in daily life, in both the doctoral program and at John Jay, in general, we all routinely work with more people from more departments than probably is the case at any other college or program in CUNY. As Karen noted, Dorothy Bracey, an anthropologist, and he, a political scientist, are team teaching a course this semester. This interdisciplinary cooperation is a regular feature of the program. In addition, the Criminal Justice program, much more so than any other program, has reached out to other doctoral programs which is possible because of the faculty's experience at John Jay where there is so much interaction across departments, he explained.

Professor Levine noted that a second reason for the inclusion of Criminal Justice in Priority I, and this, too, is explicitly mentioned in the Report, is that our concerns reflect the concerns of New York City. We are properly located for the City University: crime is a going concern, we deal with it in an academic and scholarly way, and very few of the other doctoral programs in Criminal Justice are in urban environments (they are in places such as Michigan's East Lansing, a little town, where a bicycle theft is front-page news). Our program, he said, not only has an urban focus but the program has tried to take advantage of the urban context in framing the direction of the program.

This Report means, he said, that we are entering into a very important period during the next couple of months. First, as Yogi Berra rightly said: It isn't over until it's over. This is true because the battling is hot and heavy to have reconsiderations of the priorities. The battling is formal, and informal, and is taking place in every imaginable way. He said he doesn't expect wholesale revisions although he does expect there to be some adjustments. Our task will be to defend our rightful placement in Priority I. Secondly, this is a period when we are going to be asked to specify our needs and our needs are great because, he explained, in running the doctoral program he has to rely on the good will of everyone here and that includes not only chairs but all the faculty because obviously people who are teaching in the doctoral program are not doing other things and so it is really a cooperative adventure of the doctoral program and everyone else in the community. But more resources are needed that are earmarked for the doctoral program. The Senate knows all too well the burgeoning undergraduate student body, the burgeoning master's program, and so he will consult with the doctoral program's executive committee and then will put forth a statement of requests.

Referring to the invitation from Acting Vice Chancellor Anne L. Martin for written responses and comments to the Draft Report by October 22, President Kaplowitz asked Professor Levine whether a letter from the Faculty Senate, which is the official voice of the

faculty of John Jay, supporting the conclusions of the Draft Report with reference to the Criminal Justice doctoral program would be helpful especially if the letter supported those very elements praised in the Report in its description of the Criminal Justice program, especially its interdisciplinary nature. She praised the fact that Criminal Justice doctoral students must take at least one course given by a different doctoral program and at least one course at the Graduate Center and that faculty from 10 disciplines teach in the program. Such a letter, should the Senate decide to make such a statement, would endorse the very approach of the doctoral program. Would such a letter be helpful, she asked.

Professor Levine said such a letter would be very, very helpful. There are other CUNY colleges, he explained, at which the faculty have been quite hostile to doctoral education, at which department chairs have been hostile, at which chairs have absolutely refused to release their faculty to teach in the doctoral program, and sometimes with support from faculty who are not part of the doctoral program, although that support is often stated in the hallways but not in public. This real resistance to and maybe resentment of doctoral education is a serious problem for those colleges. And so a letter from the Senate would be extremely helpful.

He added he thinks John Jay, as a community, benefits from having a doctoral program. Having the doctoral program situated at the College adds to our national luster, and, in fact, the description of the program, on page 16 of the Report, cites John Jay's national reputation. From a dollars and cents standpoint, the College receives quite a bit of money by being a part of the Graduate School consortium, something which he said most people do not realize. There is a very complicated allocation system but, in essence, when John Jay or any other CUNY college faculty are released to teach in doctoral programs, a specific amount of money actually goes to the institution, according to a special formula, releasing them and that, for example at John Jay, is the equivalent of a good number of lines. In fact, there are people at John Jay (who probably do not realize this) who are on Graduate School lines and have been for a long time. If any college decides to opt out from doctoral education, either in so many words or de facto by not allowing people to teach, they are going to lose money. It is in our vested interest in a very real way, in addition to adding to our prominence, to participate in the doctoral program.

Senator Kwando Kinshasa asked what the arguments are against a department releasing a faculty member to teach in a doctoral program. Professor Levine said that chairs will say that the money goes to the central administration of each college, which is true, which can decide how to allocate it. If someone in Anthropology, for example, either teaches in the Criminal Justice program or in the Anthropology doctoral program, the money from the Graduate School goes to the Provost of the lending institution (in this case, John Jay) and he or she might decide that English or ESL or Mathematics is more deserving than Anthropology, in terms of needing resources. And so the department that gave the person permission to teach may not see any of that money and, at best, will see a replacement in the form of an adjunct, and chairs will say that they need full-time faculty, especially in an overworked college that has a heavy reliance on adjunct faculty. So that is a significant, although not a winning, argument, he explained.

President Kaplowitz said that she imagines that many faculty would like to know how faculty are chosen to teach in the doctoral

program. Professor Levine said that each doctoral program is in charge of its faculty and there are bylaws that define this and there are membership committees, rules, and procedures. Each program has a slightly different set of rules and procedures. As a general rule there are two ways that faculty are chosen: either the Executive Officer, in consultation with people active in the program, nominates people; or faculty who are interested in teaching in the doctoral program come forward. Perhaps today's meeting will tweak an interest among those here today who might, in a sense, nominate themselves or prior to doing so have a discussion with the Executive Officer about their appropriateness as potential doctoral faculty. He explained that he speaks of appropriateness because what is necessary is not only having the necessary qualifications, being a scholar and researcher, but filling a particular need in terms of the curriculum and student interest. There is nothing that is worse, from the Executive Officer's viewpoint, than running a course that doesn't get its enrollment minimum met and then having to say just before the semester starts that the course will not be offered and the faculty member has to have his or her program changed.

So the choice of faculty who are to teach is to a considerable extent student-driven. But having said that, he added, he likes to think of this as an open process and would like to see it even more open than it has been in the past. The Draft Report is accurately named when it talks of "doctoral faculty replenishment." We certainly need faculty replenishment in the Criminal Justice program, he said: we have expanded our numbers, there are now 89 doctoral students and if we continue at the same pace we have been going, we will have 100 students by next Fall which, he said, has to be our maximum, but these are students who need courses, who need mentors, who need dissertation committees, and so not only new faculty are needed but new blood, new ideas, new ways of thinking, are needed.

Senator Kinshasa asked why the Criminal Justice program is not ranked and why the program is in Priority IB and not in Priority IA? Professor Levine said that most of the programs in Priority IA fared well in the rating of the National Research Council. Criminal Justice was not rated at all because the NRC tends to rate the more established, more orthodox, doctoral programs, although there is a movement afoot to extend their activities into some of the unrated disciplines. That is one reason for the Priority IB placement. The other reason is that to some degree Priority IA is considered to represent those programs with established reputations and Priority IB represents programs that have been identified as having potential rather than national success. A couple of the programs in IB were, in fact, rated but did not fare all that well, such as Sociology, but it was felt there is considerable promise especially because those programs related positively to the various criteria listed in the Report, which Karen mentioned earlier.

Senator Dorothy Bracey said the Strategic Planning Committee which, as Jim said, laid the foundation for the Report, made the decision that CUNY should have some programs which are the best of their kind in the nation. Part of the work was to identify those programs that are in the top 10 or top 20 in the nation and to identify those programs that with a little bit of push could get to that status. It makes perfect sense, she said, that this is how the Criminal Justice program is viewed: that a small investment would put our program right at the top.

Senator James Malone noted with surprise the absence of the doctoral program in Social Work in the high-priority grouping. Professor Levine said that there are eight doctoral programs in the

social sciences but only three made it into either Priority IA or IB and that Social Work was not one of the three. He said we do not have write ups of the programs that did not make it into IA or IB; we only have write ups of those that did.

President Kaplowitz noted that of the \$5 million which Albany gave to CUNY this year for 100 new faculty lines, under the categories of Base Level Equity and Academic Program Planning, \$3.5 million has been allocated, but the other \$1.5 million has been held in reserve pending the issuing of this Report. She said that means that undoubtedly the \$1.5 million will be distributed to the programs in Priority IA and Priority IB.

Professor Levine said that John Jay's positive treatment in the Report is especially notable in light of the fact that the ad hoc working group included no Criminal Justice person. President Kaplowitz again congratulated Professor Levine and the doctoral faculty and thanked him for accepting the Senate's invitation. Dr. Levine expressed his appreciation at the opportunity of speaking with the Senate. [Dr. Levine left the meeting at this time.]

Senator Janice Dunham noted that one consequence of having the doctoral program at the College is that John Jay's Library must have the books necessary for doctoral level Criminal Justice students and at present we do not. Therefore, she said, if additional money is allocated, our Library should receive some of it. Senator Litwack said that this should be communicated by the Library faculty.

A motion was made and approved unanimously that the Senate issue a letter to Vice Chancellor Martin in support of the Criminal Justice doctoral program and its placement in Priority I in the Draft Report.

4. Proposal to change the Senate's all-day meeting from Friday, December 6, to Friday, December 13

A letter was just received from UFS Chair Sandi Cooper to all Faculty Senate chairs, department chairs, provosts, and others announcing an all-day conference co-sponsored by the UFS and CUNY's Office of Academic Affairs on implementing the Board of Trustees' Resolution #25 on cross registration. This is the ICAM [Intra-CUNY Academic Mobility] policy requiring faculty at all 17 colleges to determine the comparability of all their courses. [See Senate Minutes #141.] The conference will be on Friday, December 6, at John Jay, and will involve working groups determining either procedures for determining comparabilities or actually deciding the comparabilities of each course. The Senate's all-day Fall meeting was to be on that day. Senator Betsy Gitter said it is important that John Jay take part in the UFS conference. Senator Ellen Marson, a member of the Taskforce that issued the Report, agreed. The Senate voted to change its all-day Fall meeting date to Friday, December 13.

5. Election of Senators to an ad hoc committee on day/night courses

President Kaplowitz reported that Dean Donald Gray and Dean of Admissions Frank Marousek have agreed to serve on this ad hoc committee whose creation was established by the Senate on May 23 and which is to recommend policies with reference to the day/night schedule. The Senate elected Senators Karen Kaplowitz, Robert McCrie, and Jill Norgren. [N.B. The following week, the Council of

Chairs chose Professors T. Kenneth Moran, Harold Sullivan, and Jack Zlotnick as their representatives on the committee.]

6. Election to the Senate Computing & Technology Committee

The Senate elected Senators Yahya Affinnih, John Donaruma, Andrew Golub, Lou Guinta, Sondra Lanzone, and Professors Katherine Killoran, Bonnie Nelson, and Timothy Stevens. Senator Guinta said the Senate Computing Committee is extremely important so that decisions are not made solely by administrators without faculty input. He agreed to call the first meeting.

7. ~~Proposed Resolution: Resolved, That the Faculty Senate requests that the College Personnel Committee re-establish to all faculty who are candidates for a personnel action the right to appeal to the College Personnel committee a negative recommendation by that committee~~

This proposed resolution is presented by the Senate's Executive Committee at the request of a number of faculty. For more than 30 years, John Jay's Personnel Committee permitted any faculty member who received a negative recommendation by the Committee for reappointment, promotion, or tenure to appeal to the Committee that made the recommendation. A few years ago, the Personnel Committee voted to change its procedures: it retained the right of faculty to appeal who receive negative recommendations with regard to reappointment or tenure but limited the right of appeal to candidates for promotion to those who receive more than an established number of votes. Any candidate receiving fewer affirmative votes than that established by the Committee no longer has the option of appealing to the Committee.

Senator Adina Schwartz suggested that the union contract undoubtedly addresses this issue and suggested that the union be consulted. Senator Gittsr supported this recommendation. Senator James Malone asked whether the Personnel Committee has the right to set its own policies. President Kaplowitz noted that the College's Charter of Governance states that policies of the College Personnel Committee are to be approved by the College Council. Asked whether this policy change had been approved by the College Council, President Kaplowitz said that this issue has never been presented to the College Council for action.

Senator Jill Norgren said that this is an issue of due process and spoke in support of the proposed resolution asking the Personnel Committee to rescind the limitation on the right to appeal. Senator Ellen Marson said that the due process issue is an important one and said that this is really an issue of fairness. She asked whether other colleges similarly limit the right to appeal. President Kaplowitz said that to her knowledge none do and that University Faculty Senate Chair Sandi Cooper has said that she thinks this might be an illegal policy but that it certainly is uncollegial and that she knows of no other college that similarly limits the right of certain faculty members to present an appeal to his or her peers.

Senator Tom Litwack said there are two separate issues here, whether this restriction is fair and right, and whether it is permissible. He said the simple thing to do is to pass the resolution, transmit it to the Personnel Committee, and only consider

whether it is a union issue or a governance issue (in other words, a possible violation of John Jay's Charter of Governance) if the College Personnel Committee declines to make the change.

The proposed resolution was adopted by unanimous vote.

8. Report on CUNY's Instructional Staffing Model (ISM) which establishes teacher/student ratios by discipline and which is used to determine budget allocations [Attachment A]

In reference to the discussion at the Senate's last meeting [Minutes #142] about 80th Street having reportedly recomputed the Instructional Staffing Model (ISM), President Kaplowitz said that further investigation has revealed that the ISM has not been changed, but rather that in April 1996 80th Street mandated a change in the way the ISM is used in translating each college's Instructional Staff Workload Report into budget allocation dollars. Instead of Upper/Lower Division referring to the level of the courses a college mounts each year, each course listed in the class register now has an indicated faculty member and has each student enrolled in each course listed as either Upper or Lower Division: Upper Division students have completed more than 60 credits and Lower Division students have completed 60 or fewer credits. The listed faculty are now cross-referenced through the Central University Personnel (CUPS) file to determine tax-levy coverage. The Fall 1995 report was calculated using this new format in conjunction with the ISM.

The changes in input led to sizable changes in the distribution of Adjunct, Base Level Equity, and Graduate Teaching Fellow dollars from previous years for several colleges. Colleges receive lump sum budgets based on the ISM and the reconfiguration of the use of the ISM is the stated reason for increases in the budgets of such colleges as CCNY and Lehman, despite the fact that those colleges have experienced a drop in student enrollment, and the minimal budget increase for colleges such as John Jay, which received the smallest percent increase in its budget among senior colleges. The changed definition of Lower and Upper Division means that John Jay's greater number of freshman and sophomores as compared to juniors and seniors now leads to a smaller budget allocation for our College. President Kaplowitz said she will report on this again after the UFS Budget Committee meets with Vice Chancellor Rothbard next month.

9. Report on College-wide grading patterns 1987-1995 [Attachment B]

In May, the Senate looked at the difference in the percentage of A and B grades that various departments give, and that full-time and adjunct faculty in each department give. These charts show grade distributions since 1987 and shows marked College-wide grade inflation [Attachment B].

Senator James Malone said that these charts are really shocking and that this is an issue we must grapple with. Senator Litwack said that this is nobody's fault but our own: only faculty give grades. Senator Malone asked what is the proportion of our students who need remediation? Senator Guinta said it is 70%. Senator Malone asked how can we reconcile that fact to this pattern of grades? Due to the lateness of the hour, the Senate agreed to again place this on the agenda of an upcoming meeting.

10. Discussion of the Friday, September 27, faculty retreat

Plans are being developed for the September 27 faculty retreat. Most departments are holding meetings. Sign-up sheets will be sent to all faculty so that small discussion groups can be formed in advance and discussion leaders can be selected prior to September 27.

11. Discussion of the September 26 College Council agenda

The College Council agenda consists of approval of the calendar of meetings, election of the Council's Executive Committee, and election of the two student members of the College P&B.

12. New business

Senator Jill Norgren spoke about the crowded conditions in North Hall and asked when the situation will be called too dangerous to continue. Senator James Malone said it is time for the Senate to take a stand on our faculty teaching in unsafe and overcrowded conditions. Senator Norgren noted that the conditions are not only unsafe but create tremendously disruptive conditions that interfere with the classroom experience: students arrive late because the stairways and elevators cannot accommodate such numbers and because there are insufficient toilet facilities; then students leave the classroom in order to use the toilets which they are unable to do between classes. It was noted that in addition to the possible harm that could come to individuals if there were an accident resulting from the overcrowded conditions, the reputation of John Jay as a college that provides programs in public safety and fire science would be harmed if we could not apply that knowledge here.

Senator Norgren said that since the College's policy seems to be to continue to increase enrollment, as faculty we have a responsibility to ourselves, to our colleagues, and to our students to learn what the administration of the College plans to do to address the immediate situation. Senator Gitter noted that John Jay had only 49% of the space it needed given its student enrollment and programs, according to Vice Chancellor Macari more than a year ago and enrollment has increased significantly since then. Senator Gitter moved that the Senate place this issue on the agenda of the College Council in the form of a request for a report from the John Jay administration as to immediate and future plans to ensure the safety of the students, faculty, and staff, and to eliminate the disruptions to the teaching and learning activities that result from overcrowded conditions. The motion was seconded and carried by unanimous vote.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:10 PM upon a motion duly made and carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Edward Davenport
Amy Green

Recording Secretaries

ATTACHMENT A

CUNY INSTRUCTIONAL STAFFING MODEL (ISM)

Faculty/Student Ratios by Discipline

FACULTY/STUDENT RATIOS							
DISCIPLINE	NYCT/CSI					Ph. D.	
	UNDERGRAD *		UNDERGRAD	GRADUATE	Level 1	Level 2	
	LD	UP	LD	UP			
1. PHYS SCI AND ENG	22.84	10.63	19.16	10.63	6.05	7.01	5.2
2. EDUCATION	12.96	15.67	22.62	11.67	14.43		
3. OTHER	15.26	14.93	12.26	14.93	10.93		
4. BIO & HEALTH SCI	29.09	12.54	23.28	12.54	7.72	8.30	4.4
5. FINE & APPLIED ARTS	18.66	9.67	12.49	9.67	8.10	8.53	3.6
6. LANGUAGE & LETTERS	19.60	14.72	20.93	14.72	7.84	8.74	5.3
7. SOCIAL SCIENCES	27.17	17.32	23.26	17.32	11.16	11.30	5.1
8. MATH & COMPUTER SCI	25.15	15.00	25.22	15.00	10.02	7.94	7.1
9. PSYCHOLOGY	30.00	18.13	25.25	18.13	9.55	9.34	8.6
10. BUSINESS	30.00	24.00	14.67	24.24	12.00	15.64	7.3
11. AGR & NAT SCI TECH			17.45				
12. HEALTH SCI & PARAMED TECH			12.08				
13. FOOD		15.54	15.54	15.54			
14. PUBLIC SERVICE TECH			24.73	17.32			
15. BUSINESS & COMMERCIAL TECH			21.68	24.24			
16. COMM., PRINT MEDIA, DESIG		14.48	14.48	14.48			
17. DATA PROCESSING TECH			21.73	15.00	10.02		
18. EDUCATIONAL TECH			13.39				
19. MECHANICAL ENGINEERING			16.52	10.63			
20. REMEDIATION	16.00		16.00				
21. CLINICAL NURSING	6.00	6.00	6.00	6.00			

*EXCLUDES NYCT/CSI

UNDERGRADUATE GRADE DISTRIBUTION

	FALL 1987	SPRING 1988	FALL 1988	SPRING 1989	FALL 1989	SPRING 1990	FALL 1990	SPRING 1991
A	9%	10%	9%	10%	11%	11%	11%	11%
A-	6	6	6	7	7	7	7	7
B+	6	7	7	8	8	8	8	8
B	10	11	10	10	10	11	10	10
B-	6	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
C+	5	6	5	5	5	5	6	6
C	8	8	7	7	7	6	6	7
C-	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4
D+	1	1	2	2	2	1	1	2
D	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3
D-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
F	6	6	6	6	5	5	5	5
WU	7	7	8	7	5	6	6	7
P	8	5	9	5	8	7	8	5
R	3	2	3	2	3	2	3	2
W	10	10	9	10	9	9	10	8
INC	6	6	6	6	6	11	7	7

Francis M. McHugh
 Dean for Admissions & Registration
 7/16/92

UNDERGRADUATE GRADE DISTRIBUTION

	FALL 1991	SPRING 1992	FALL 1992	SPRING 1993	FALL 1993	SPRING 1994	SUMMER 1994	FALL 1994	SPRING 1995	SUMMER 1995	FALL 1995
A	11%	11%	11%	12%	12%	12%	13%	12%	11%	15%	10%
A-	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8%	10	8%
B+	8	8	8	9	9	9	10	9	9	11	9%
B	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	14	11%
B-	7	8	8	8	8	7	7	8	8	10	8%
C+	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	8	7%
C	6	8	7	7	7	6	6	7	7	9	8%
C-	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4%
D+	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	2%
D	3	3	2	3	3	2	2	2	2	3	3%
D-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1%
F	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	4	4	1	4%
WU	5	6	5	5	5	5	1	4	6	3	4%
P	7	5	7	5	7	5	21	7	4	1	6%
R	3	2	2	2	2	2	0	2	2	*	2%
W	8	8	7	8	7	8	5	8	8	3	7%
IN	7	6	6	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	6%

Donald J. Gray
Acting Dean for Admissions & Registration
March 1, 1996