

Faculty Senate Minutes #144

John Jay College of Criminal Justice

October 9, 1996

3:15 PM

Room 630T

Present (31): Yahya Affinnih, Michael Blitz, Dorothy Bracey, Effie Cochran, Elizabeth Crespo, Edward Davenport, Jane Davenport, John Donaruma, Janice Dunham, Arlene Geiger, P.J. Gibson, Elisabeth Gitter, Andrew Golub, Amy Green, Edward Green, Lou Guinta, Karen Kaplowitz, Andrew Karmen, Kwando Kinshasa, Sondra Lanzzone, Tom Litwack, Barry Luby, James Malone, Ellen Marson, Mary Ann McClure, Robert McCrie, Jill Norgren, Daniel Pinello, Frederik Rusch, Carmen Solis, William Stahl, Maurice Vodounon, Daniel Yalisove

Absent (7): Kojo Dei, Andrew Karmen, Gavin Lewis, James Malone, Adina Schwartz, Davidson Umeh, Agnes Wieschenberg

Guest: Peter Barnett (Executive Director, Computer Information Systems)

Agenda

1. Announcements from the chair
2. Approval of Minutes #143 of the September 18 meeting
3. Audit of prerequisite enforcement: Invited Guest: Dr. Peter Barnett, Executive Director of Computer Information Systems
4. Report on John Jay's enrollment and full-time/adjunct ratios
5. Preliminary report on day/night course offerings

1. Announcements from the chair

The plan to have two commencements, one in February and one in late May or early June, announced at the last Senate meeting, is now in flux. President Kaplowitz said that although the students support the idea of two commencements, they want each graduating student to have the right to choose which commencement he or she will attend which could vitiate the purpose of the two commencements since most students would probably choose to attend the Spring commencement. Senator Janice Dunham said that she is a faculty representative on the Ceremonial Occasions Committee at which this issue is being decided. She reported that although the student members did vote to have two commencements they did so because they were told that that is the only way that graduates would be able to invite more than one guest each, but that they do associate graduation with May/June and they want each graduate to have the option of attending either commencement. She noted that the students really want only one Commencement. She said another

meeting of the Ceremonial Occasions Committee has been set for October 24 to revisit the issue and that she would report back to the Senate.

Senator Carmen Solis asked whether the student body has been polled and reported that upon hearing about the plan for two commencements at the last Senate meeting she informed her students of the plan and that those scheduled to receive their diplomas in February were very happy to learn that there would be a graduation ceremony in February. She said it would be interesting to learn how the general student body feels about this. Senator Dunham said that to her knowledge there has been no attempt to poll the students and added that there are five or six student representatives on the Ceremonial Occasions Committee, all of whom favor one commencement in the Spring. Senator Jill Norgren said her experience was identical to Senator Solis' in that her students were incredibly enthusiastic about having two commencements, including the half of her students scheduled to graduate in February. She said they were pleased not only about having the right number of tickets for guests but of a ceremony taking place close in time to the actual point of completion of their studies and departure from the College and of, thus, having a commencement ceremony that is not anticlimactic. She, too, spoke in support of a poll of the students.

Senator Dunham said she would convey these reports to the Committee and to members in advance of the October 24 meeting, but she noted that two of the student members of the Committee are graduating in February and they, too, are opposed to having two commencement ceremonies.

When asked to suggest that the administration conduct a poll, Senator Dunham said she would convey that suggestion but noted that if we are going to have commencement in February, the hall must be booked and other arrangements must be made almost immediately and that there is little time in which to conduct such a poll. She added that the request for such a poll would be most appropriately made by the students, especially in light of the fact that the entire cost of commencement is paid for from the \$50 a semester Student Activity Fee which every student must pay and which generates more than \$1 million a year. Senator Dunham suggested that, therefore, perhaps Vice President Witherspoon should be approached about this issue. Senator Golub asked for a clarification about commencement and graduation dates. It was explained that until now, students who graduated in February and those who graduated in May all attended one commencement in the Spring. Senator Dunham was asked to report to the Ceremonial Occasions Committee the reports by Senator members that their students favor two commencements.

2. Approval of Minutes #143 of the September 18 meeting

By an action duly made and carried, Minutes #143 of the September 18, 1996, meeting were adopted.

3. Audit of prerequisite enforcement: Invited Guest: Dr. Peter Barnett, Executive Director of Computer Information Systems

Dr. Peter Barnett, Executive Director of Computer Information Systems and the Director of the Computer Center, was welcomed. It

was noted that Dr. Barnett was a long-standing member of the Department of Art, Music, and Philosophy, where he taught Philosophy for many years before taking on his current responsibilities.

President Kaplowitz thanked Dr. Barnett for responding to the Senate's request for an audit of prerequisite enforcement. She reviewed the fact that until computerized registration, faculty from every department handed out course cards at each registration and in doing so provided advisement and were able to check whether students were eligible to take the courses they requested. When computerized registration was developed, the Senate passed a resolution stating that prerequisite checking and enforcement must be incorporated into the registration system. The Council of Chairs separately, but in conjunction with the Senate, passed a similar resolution. But anecdotal reports indicate that prerequisites are not enforced. To compare these subjective reports with hard data, the Senate formally requested an audit of prerequisite enforcement.

Dr. Barnett explained that since Fall, 1993, students appearing for registration have been directed to obtain a "prerequisite check sheet" and an "advising sheet" (unofficial transcript) prior to programming. The prerequisite check sheet instructs the student to circle the courses she/he plans to take and to present this list to the terminal operator. The sheet should actually be presented at the programming level, on the second floor where the students present their trial programs, he explained. The check sheet is divided into five parts:

- courses open to any student
- courses for which the student has met the prerequisite
- courses for which the student requires permission of the instructor
- courses requiring a corequisite
- recommended placement in English, Math, and Communication Skills

Dr. Barnett explained that the courses open to any student and the courses for which the student has met the prerequisite (the first and second categories) are actually combined into one list. It is, he added, a very dense and rather difficult sheet to read but it was necessary to do it in this way in order to get the information onto one piece of paper.

The advising sheet (the unofficial transcript) lists all transfer and John Jay course work, skills results, GPA, total credits attempted and achieved, and field of major interest. This is available on-line to the Counseling Department, which uses it fairly extensively, to Undergraduate Advising (Paul Wyatt) and to whoever else wants it. There is also a special version, also on-line, for the Graduate Coordinators and a special version for SEEK.

Starting with Spring 1996 registration, Dr. Barnett said, he has delivered these documents to students by printing them on demand (when the students are funnelled into a room adjacent to the programming office), rather than preprinting all of them and then having volunteers search through mounds of paper. This revised procedure has greatly improved the efficiency of the process, he said, and has allowed us to detect errors, such as students who should be in the system but are not. This new procedure also allowed us to run the prerequisite check closer to the start of registration, so we picked up considerably more late admits than in the past. Still, there are several groups of students who cannot be included, Dr. Barnett said. This will be discussed in some detail.

The other thing Dr. Barnett reported to have achieved for the first time in Spring 1996 was that the grades from the previous semester were included in time to represent them in the prerequisite check. In previous years, the Fall grades were not available in time to incorporate them into the system and, as a result, we had to assume students had passed courses they had already dropped. This was not a valid assumption in skills areas and in some other areas and by tightening this we might have made it appear that fewer people are meeting prerequisites than was true in the past, he said.

The process by which the prerequisite check is generated may be inverted so as to produce an audit, that is we feed in the students' actual registrations and report out whether they met the prerequisite or not, Dr. Barnett explained.

This audit was performed once before, after Spring 1995 registration. It showed, for example, that about 5% of students overall failed to meet a prerequisite; that in Literature courses, about 90% met the prerequisite, and that there was an alarmingly high rate of "permission required" among registrations in Government (and that again showed up in this audit).

The present audit, Dr. Barnett explained, is somewhat more sensitive and its results are more ambiguous.

First, for an overview of the population of courses and students:

- * The prerequisite check only applies to Undergraduate courses.
- * 362 distinct Undergraduate courses (not meaning sections) were offered in Fall 1996.
- * 67 had no prerequisite (18.5%).
- * 295 have some prerequisite (81.5%)
- * Of those having a prerequisite, 168 (55%) have a "permission override."

A "permission override" means that the course shows on the student's prerequisite check sheet as a course the student may take with the permission of the department. That is, over half of all the courses that have a prerequisite also have a "permission" catch.

About 7,500 undergraduate students are represented in the prerequisite check. Entering Freshmen, new transfers, late readmits and late direct admits are not included in the audit. The late readmits and late admits are those who do not come through University Admissions processing -- they basically come in off the streets -- and are admitted late in the process and are, therefore, not reflected in the prerequisite check because we have no record of their previous academic work. That is a serious liability, Dr. Barnett explained, because these students don't get caught in the prerequisite checking net. We have to deal with them on faith or through Freshman Programming or by taking the transfers on an individual basis through Paul Wyatt. So this is a very serious liability: we are talking about 2500 students although the number we are worried about, those that should be identified and counseled, is 1500.

This Fall, approximately 1500 students were admitted or readmitted after the registration appointment cards were mailed out (which is the cutoff for prerequisite checking). Many of these students came into the very end of registration, had inadequate orientation and little choice of courses. But they are not represented in the prerequisite check (nor in the audit --it works both ways and an audit of this could be done if a special request for such as audit is made because such an audit involves a lot of work.) The very fact that these students came in too late to be included may have had a negative impact on the academic programming. Not only can we not assess how many students violated prerequisites but we also know they did not receive adequate counseling, they were registering at the tail end when everyone is hysterical, when the floodgates are opened and permission is given to waive all sorts of prerequisites, he said. This tends to happen at the end of registration when the least prepared, the least counseled students, the ones who have not been to Freshman Orientation, the ones who have been readmitted in a hurry or admitted in a hurry, are registering. This is an institutional problem and we have to address it, Dr. Barnett noted.

The actual number of students in courses in which they do not belong may be as much as 20% higher than the prerequisite audit indicates for this reason. In other words, Dr. Barnett said, he is showing an overall number of 7.6% lacking prerequisites. It may be closer to 9% or 10% and quite a few of those might be latecomers.

Conversely, there are factors that may inflate the overall numbers of students missing prerequisites:

(1) There have been changes in the skills placement criteria for SEEK to bring them into conformity with the one-year-remediation mandate. This may account for the very high number of students missing the prerequisite in Communications (which is an anomaly). Senator John Donaruma said that in the recent past, the number of students who were misplaced has decreased. Senator Sondra Lanzone agreed. Dr. Barnett said the old SEEK requirements may have been used to place students but that he used the new SEEK requirements for the audit and that might account for the high number of misplacements in the audit.

(2) A significant number of courses require a specific FOMI (field of major interest) to qualify for a course. But since at John Jay we have no formal declaration of major, such a prerequisite may be disregarded.

(3) In Fire Science, Forensic Science and other sciences, many substitutions are made because the prerequisite courses are not offered frequently enough.

(4) Transfer students may not have evaluated credits on record and thus are placed based on eyeballing a transcript, or on faith. They will show up as missing prerequisites.

When all is said and done, the results must be treated with great caution. A factor which inflates the missing rate in one department may have no impact on another.

The sample is 25,500 registrations, about 3 1/2 per student on average of the 7,500 students we are looking at. The undergraduate population is approximately 9,500.

Of these:

- * 1.2% show as "already took the course."

Dr. Barnett said that these are probably transfer students. President Kaplowitz said that they may not be transfer students: because we have changed our numbering system several times, students often do not realize they have taken a course until they receive the syllabus. She cited as an example Literature 231 and 232 which were previously Literature 121 and 122 and before that were Literature 111 and 112.

- * 26.0% show as "open to any student." (This corresponds more or less to the overall percentage of courses without prerequisites.)

- * 59.0% met the prerequisite if there was one.

- * 7.6% lacked a prerequisite if there was one.

- * 5.1% "obtained" permission of the instructor or department.

- * 0.7% could not be placed (in skills courses) owing to lack of score. Dr. Barnett said this happens every year but was more pronounced this year because of 80th Street's new policy. President Kaplowitz explained that the Board of Trustees mandated centralized testing and centralized scoring of the placement tests and at all of the colleges this has led to disastrous delays in transmitting test scores to the colleges, the need for retesting, and a host of other problems, which all the colleges have complained about. She said her sense of the situation is that centralized testing may be abandoned next year. Dr. Barnett said that there have been many meetings at the College about how we can better address the problems next semester because the centralized testing and scoring created havoc with Freshman Orientation, with placement, with ESL (we had a backsliding in terms of our ability to capture and place ESL students, which is something we do dynamically throughout registration: every day we run a report and give it to Nydia Flores and Ben Hellinger who chase down students who get into the wrong courses).

- * 0.8% required a co-requisite (and very largely had it). Co-requisite courses are Philosophy 231, Corrections, History 231, and a couple of Chemistry courses. That is not one of our problems.

Looking just at registrations with prerequisites (19,000):

- * 10% lacked a prerequisite
- * 7% "obtained" permission

About 12.6% of all registrations and about 17% of registrations into courses with prerequisites are thus questionable. Therefore, if one looks at this in terms of the success of students getting into courses that they should be in, the number is 88%. If you look at just courses with prerequisites, the number is 83%. That is making

the rather cynical assumption that none of the students who ask for permission slips had them and were registered for those courses anyway.

The following are some sample departmental results for courses with prerequisites:

ANT 13% missing prerequisite or permission
 CHE 26% missing prerequisite or permission
 COM 29% missing prerequisite -- this is an anomaly.
 COR 10% missing prerequisite or permission (about average for JJ)
 CRJ 78% missing prerequisite or permission (almost all permissions)
 The raw numbers are: 502 students took courses open to any student. But of the courses with prerequisites, 25 students met the prerequisites, 75 entered with permission, and 14 neither met the prerequisites nor had permission slips (these were presumably upper level courses).
 ECO 20% missing prerequisite or permission (somewhat above average for the College)
 ENG 17% missing prerequisite, 24% missing prereq or can't determine
 FIS 32% missing prerequisite
 These are probably cases where the College is not offering the prerequisites and, therefore, substitutions are being made.
 FOS 40% missing prerequisite, 45% missing prereq or permission (in other words, 5% have neither the prerequisite nor permission)
 GOV 23% permission
 This is a pretty large number because of the sample: only one student got into a course without the prerequisite and so there are a lot of permissions, Dr. Barnett noted. This was true in the previous audit. Professor Harold Sullivan maintains that nobody is giving permission slips and so somebody is manufacturing permission slips for those students. This will be discussed later on.
 HIS 6.5% missing prerequisite or permission
 This is a low number considering the anecdotal information from that department.
 LAW 12% missing prerequisite or permission
 LIT 8% missing prerequisite
 A low number and, again, not reflective of the anecdotal information from the department.
 MAT 18% missing prerequisite or permission (about average for JJ)
 NSC 7% missing prerequisite
 PAD 17% missing prerequisite or permission
 PHI 5% requiring permission
 All those receiving permission are taking Philosophy 310, which does have a permission override. In this sample, only one student in Philosophy 231 did not take the English prerequisite or co-requisite. Dr. Barnett said he finds this difficult to believe since so many students have difficulty reading the material. Senator Mary Ann McClure said that the students in her Philosophy 231 courses could not have completed the English requirement, given the level of their work, or else, she added, with due respect there is something wrong with their English courses. She said so many of her students cannot read. President Kaplowitz noted that we have a tremendous number of students who

transfer from other colleges, who have taken and passed English 101 and English 102 at their colleges, and we at John Jay are expected to accept those grades according to Board of Trustee policy (even though many of the other senior colleges do not comply with Board policy: they retest transfer students and require students who do not do well to retake those courses). She said that we should look at the extent to which the students who have taken their writing courses and are not functioning at the level that they should be are transfer students who took these courses elsewhere and to what extent these students took their courses here.

PSY 11% missing prerequisite or permission
SOC 15% missing prerequisite, 23% missing prereq or permission
STA 14% missing prerequisite

Dr. Barnett apologized for not doing the calculations for all disciplines, explaining, for example, that Puerto Rican Studies is broken down into so many disciplines that it is very difficult to do the calculations, but offered to do them if requested. Senator Elizabeth Crespo said she would appreciate Dr. Barnett doing the analysis of the Puerto Rican Studies courses.

Dr. Barnett reported that he took a closer look at History 232 because it is a course which seems to have a large percentage of misplaced students:

Total registration: 851
In prerequisite check: 761 (89%)
Missing prerequisite: 72 (under 10% of those in prereq system).

Dr. Barnett explained that there is, therefore, a difference of 90 students in History 231 who were not caught in the prerequisite enforcement and that it is quite possible that what he is hearing from History faculty may be true. If a third of those 90 students, in other words, another 30 students who were not caught by the prerequisite audit (because they were late admits, etc.), were added to the 72 students who lack the prerequisite, that means that 100 students lacked the History 231 prerequisite and if those 100 students were spread among the History 232 sections, it begins to sound like what he is hearing: one faculty member reported having 35 students in his or her History 232 sections who did not have the prerequisite.

Obviously, he said, the students who are not reflected in the prerequisite system are swelling the numbers of misplaced students. But there is no mechanical way in which the system can be improved, because these are the students who have either no John Jay history or else their history is not available at the time the prerequisite check has to be run.

He said the number of misplaced students this time is worse than the number revealed by the previous audit and this is because the last audit was done during a Spring semester and in Spring semesters there are few students being admitted or readmitted at the last minute. Also, when the previous audit was done, John Jay was not as desperate about enrollment as it now is, and so, therefore, the College last time closed off admissions earlier and got every student through orientation and through preprogramming. At that time we were not preprogramming entering freshmen on the last day of registration as we did this semester. Evidently we have a vicious cycle because the students who are coming in last are becoming hysterical when they enter the gymnasium and see all the red dots

(indicating closed sections) on the posted course lists and they are then begging to get into any courses and there are either people who are telling them that they do not really need History 231 to get into History 232 or that if they cannot get into Philosophy 231 (Introduction to Philosophy) they should take Philosophy 310. He said that at the beginning of the registration, student volunteers and everybody else are gung-ho and try to do their best to deal with prerequisites but during the last couple of days of registration everybody is just completely off the charts and it is the least prepared students who are registering at that point.

He said that the audit shows that we have two big problems. One problem is that we have massive numbers of unadvised late admits, who are not going through the normal orientation process by any means. The second problem is that we have a "permission" override to a majority of courses with prerequisites, which is being misused. He said we have talked over the years about prerequisite checking blocking, which means that when a student goes to the terminal and asks for a course for which the student is unqualified, the computer will not permit the student to be registered for the course. He said there are several reasons that nobody has fully attempted to implement this kind of system. The SIMS [Student Information Management System] system permits a college to do some rather unsophisticated restrictions (such as restricting courses to juniors and seniors and restricting courses to students who have taken core courses). He added that no CUNY college does full blocking of courses based on whether prerequisites have been taken.

One reason, he explained, that we cannot perform full blocking of courses at John Jay is because of the "permission" override of prerequisites: 55% of all courses with prerequisites have an override. That is going to create so much negotiation at the terminals that everything will break down. And so, he said, the first thing the faculty must do, if the faculty wants to increase enforcement of prerequisites, is to consider getting rid of the "permission" overrides. He said that the history of the "permission" override is a very noble one. He explained that when Eli Faber was Dean of Undergraduate Studies, Eli said loudly and clearly to the Curriculum Committee that if a department wants "permission" overrides, the department should put the overrides clearly and explicitly in the College bulletin.

President Kaplowitz explained the ethical reason for this, which was something discussed at the time at the Faculty Senate. Eli Faber, as Dean, asked each department to review the course numbers of the courses they offer and to review the prerequisites of each course, since many 100-level courses, such as the required History and Literature courses, had prerequisites and yet were at that time 100-level courses and students, rightly, complained that the amount of work required in these courses was more than their other 100-level courses require and that their transcripts did not reflect the level of many of the courses they were actually taking. The general rule that was agreed upon was that any course that lists a college-level course as a prerequisite would be listed as at least a 200-level course.

At that time, the bulletin listed prerequisites whenever a department had decided there should be prerequisites but was silent about the possibility of permission to waive the prerequisite(s). But although some students knew, through experience or through word of mouth, that they could receive a waiver of the prerequisite from the instructor (or from the department chair), other students had no knowledge or inkling that this was possible. And not knowing that

they had suck an option put those students at a disadvantage. Eli Faber and others felt it was not ethical that students in the know should have opportunities to take courses that other students did not have the opportunity to take. And complaints had arisen from students who discovered classmates in a course without the prerequisite(s) that were listed in the bulletin when they themselves had made sure to take the prerequisite(s) before enrolling in that course. And so it was decided that each department should decide the following about each of its courses: the course number, the prerequisite(s), if any, and whether the prerequisite(s) could be waived by permission of the instructor teaching the particular section and this information was to be listed as part of the course description in the bulletin. (It was agreed, however, that a prerequisite for a core course must eventually be taken in order for a student to receive a degree even if the prerequisite was waived to take the core course.)

As a result, more than half the courses in the next bulletin that listed a prerequisite also stated that the prerequisite(s) may be waived by "permission of the section instructor." And whereas only a few students previously knew about the possibility of waivers of prerequisites, now all students for the first time became aware that prerequisites are negotiable because it was so stated over and over in the College bulletin.

President Kaplowitz noted that another problem is that registration is now so early, beginning in mid-August, which is long before the contract requires faculty to be at work and the College administration feels it does not have money to pay faculty to work during this "annual leave." But, on the other hand, the bulletin lists 55% of the courses with prerequisites as being waivable by "permission of the section instructor." But the section instructors are not present to consider requests for a waiver and, therefore, other people who are there do grant waivers: students working at terminals, faculty who do work registration (several chairs regularly do so as do a few others), staff, and administrators. She said the faculty cannot have it both ways: be willing to consider waiving prerequisites but not making themselves available to do so.

Senator Kwando Kinshasa said that Eli Faber had made the case to the Curriculum Committee at a time when faculty still all worked at registration, giving out course cards for the courses in their own department, and that was a very different situation and a very different context than now exists. He added that no one realized that computerized registration would take far more days, rather than fewer as we had expected, and that, therefore, registration would have to begin much earlier in the summer than it had previously. He said that, thus, the Curriculum Committee and the individual departments had made their decisions not understanding the implications for students or for faculty once computerized registration replaced the arena registration that all faculty participated in. President Kaplowitz agreed.

Senator Kinshasa added that he had thought that it had been subsequently decided that department chairs (or their designees) would be required to be present during the entire registration process. President Kaplowitz said that had been true but then it was decided that only six chairs or their designees need be present as long as departments provided written instructions about such issues as course substitutions. She added that if a student needing courses approaches a Literature or a Sociology teacher about a Psychology or Law or Government course, and a waiver provision is in the bulletin, and lots of courses are closed, the likelihood is that

that Literature or Sociology teacher will sign the waiver slip and, she added, that presumes the student will even approach any of the faculty who are there. They can also make their case to staff, to administrators, and to the students who work at the terminals who do the actual registering of students into courses.

President Kaplowitz also agreed with Dr. Barnett's description of the students who register during the last days as the least prepared students. She said that the literature and the data show that the students who apply for admission at the last minute, and those who apply for readmission at the last minute, and those who show up to register on the last days (assuming they were assigned an earlier date but missed that date) are the ones who are almost invariably the most anxious, have the weakest academic skills, and the least success in their previous studies.

Senator Kinshasa asked whether we have data about the number of course sections students drop within the ten-week "permission to withdraw without penalty" period. President Kaplowitz said that the average number of courses dropped is 1.8 per student (the total number of sections is divided by the total number of students who registered). Senator Kinshasa asked whether the number of drops has increased as the number of unqualified students who have registered for courses has increased? The suggestion, he said, is that students may be taking courses for other reasons than academic ones and that may be reflected by the rate of dropped courses and the type of dropped courses. Dr. Barnett said that such data can be obtained. President Kaplowitz said some students take several extra courses with the plan of dropping the courses they are having the most difficulty with (which might be the ones for which they have not taken the prerequisite) and in doing so shut out students from registering for those sections. She noted that one of the recommendations made at the September 27 faculty retreat is to limit the number of courses students may enroll in each semester and this, she says, is an argument in support of such a proposal.

Dr. Barnett said that another issue involving prerequisites is that some prerequisites are so complicated and so baroque that it is impossible for anybody to understand them. He said his staff have translated all prerequisites into mathematical logic and normalized and verified the data with the departments. He said in many instances departments did not know what the prerequisites, as listed, really meant. So now the computers, at least, can understand the prerequisites although, he said, he does not think anyone else can. And he said it may be that it is because so many of the prerequisites are so difficult to follow and to meet that they are not being enforced.

Senator P.J. Gibson asked whether a student who is registered for a course for which he or she has not met the prerequisites is identified by the computer at some time during that semester? Dr. Barnett said this could be done but it has not been done yet. He said that it might have to be done if things get out of hand and the reason it may have to be done is that with the world moving toward telephone registration (and perhaps, even before that, registration by the World Wide Web), we won't even have as much prerequisite checking as we do now. In that case, he said, we might have to resort to auditing students as they register and pulling their registrations if they don't meet the prerequisites. That, he said, would generate an awful lot of mail to students. He said another suggestion has been that students should be removed from classes for which they registered without the

prerequisites and, he noted, that is currently being done at some colleges. Dr. Barnett said that Senate could propose a procedure that should be followed. Senator Gibson reported that this semester a student in her Literature 231, who is expecting to graduate this June, has never taken English 101 or English 102 (both of which are prerequisites for Literature 231).

Senator McClure asked whether she may tell students who have not met the prerequisite for her course that they must drop the course immediately because they are not legally enrolled? Senator Norgren said she believes this is within the faculty's right because students receive due notice of the prerequisite requirement because the prerequisites are in the College bulletin. President Kaplowitz said the problem is that a student could argue that officials of the College (and it could presumably be argued that even student volunteers at the computer terminals are officials of the College in the registration process) registered the student for the course and the student could even claim to not have requested that particular course because we keep no records of the courses the students ask for. She said she would seek a legal reading to the question but that if the legal position is such as she described it might be possible to have a College policy passed by the College Council and printed in the bulletin and in the course schedule addressing this issue, which would then provide due notice to students.

Senator Gitter said that there is also the issue of a student who, if told by the instructor to drop the course, would then be taking fewer than 12 credits and who would, therefore, lose financial aid, and this would create even greater problems and an even greater impetus for challenging removal from the course. President Kaplowitz noted that some colleges do not count toward graduation any course a student takes for which the student has not met the prerequisites and in that way avoids the issue of removing students from courses, or of jeopardizing financial aid, job advancement requirements, and so forth, and in that way the responsibility is truly the student's. Dr. Barnett said that those courses that have the "permission" loophole might not be eligible for any of the suggestions that have been mentioned by virtue of the override clause. He said the most effective approach is probably a statement to the student that he or she is not going to be able to pass the course. Senator McClure said that the students in her advanced Philosophy course who have not had the prerequisites just do not believe her. She called this incredible optimism on their part. President Kaplowitz said it is also evidence of denial on their part.

Senator Stahl asked about the audit with regard to Forensic Science and whether the audit refers only to Natural Science 108 because he would be surprised if the Forensic Science courses had students who had not met the prerequisites. Dr. Barnett said that of 164 students, 34 required permission and 7 had not met prerequisites. Senator Stahl said he finds it unlikely that these are Forensic Science courses. Dr. Barnett said one reason for his report is so people have the opportunity to ask questions and he offered to doublecheck the Science courses. He invited anyone with questions about his data to raise them with him.

Dr. Barnett said the bottom line is that there are prerequisites that are too complicated, there are too many courses that feature permission overrides, and there is the problem of some of the least prepared people not being included in the prerequisite system.

President Kaplowitz said we also have the problems associated with accepting more and more students because of the political realities facing CUNY and John Jay and, thus, we have fewer and fewer resources with which to offer the basic courses, tutoring, and other services that students need in order to succeed.

President Kaplowitz said it is also important to consider in this context the fact that for budgeting purposes, CUNY's ISM (Instructional Staffing Model), which designates student/faculty ratios by disciplines, no longer defines lower level or upper level courses according to the course number (200, 300 or 400) but rather according to whether the students in each course have completed more than 60 credits or fewer than 60 credits. Upper level courses (those with students who have completed more than 60 credits) are funded more richly than lower level courses. Thus students with fewer than 60 credits who are taking upper level courses (and we have to analyze to what extent this is happening) may be causing those courses to be funded as lower level courses.

Senator Kinshasa asked whether there is any way to marry the good features of the old registration system to the good features of the new one. Dr. Barnett said that now that faculty are not required to work registration, it is becoming more difficult to find faculty to give advice and/or permissions. If faculty were to do the advising and sit behind the computer terminal operators, they might catch gross violations.

Senator Arlene Geiger suggested that adjunct faculty should be the ones to work the registration terminals and should be paid to do this work, which would be much less costly than paying full-time faculty. She said that in this way adjunct faculty, many of whom are very experienced and have been at the College for many years, would be supported in a very welcome way and could be required to and expected to enforce prerequisites. She said that having students register other students puts the student terminal operators in an inappropriate position and opens the way for undermining the prerequisites.

President Kaplowitz said that she, too, had thought of this as a possible solution and had done a quick calculation, which she would want to doublecheck, but that her calculations show that adjuncts, paid at 60% of their hourly rate (which is their non-teaching pay rate), working every day at all 14 registration terminals, would cost a total of \$7,800 for an entire registration. Senators characterized this as a nominal expense for such an important activity. President Kaplowitz recalled that when computerized registration was first being implemented, the plan was that John Jay staff would be trained and assigned to work the terminals at registration but that was abandoned after the first year and student volunteers were substituted. (Students who volunteer to work the terminals are able to register before everyone else.)

Senator Lou Guinta said the administration should once again train John Jay staff to operate the terminals, which should be part of their professional responsibility. President Kaplowitz explained that some members of the administration do not see the need for prerequisite enforcement because they believe that students are intelligent enough to register only for those courses for which they are qualified.

Senator Norgren asked about preregistration, which could be scheduled when faculty are on campus, during the regular semester. President Kaplowitz said that she and Dr. Barnett served together on an ad hoc committee on preregistration appointed by President Lynch and chaired by Associate Provost Kobilinsky. The biggest obstacle to preregistration, it turns out, is that each year 40% of the students (4,000 students) at the College are new to the College and were not here the previous year. This means that in addition to having preregistration twice a year (and it would be conducted for many, many students who ultimately will not return), an additional registration for students new to the College would have to be conducted twice a year as well.

Senator Tom Litwack asked whether the computers could be programed so that it is impossible for a student to register for courses for which they do not have the prerequisites. Dr. Barnett said technologically it could be done, but there are reasons that one would not want to do it: for example, when a student is blocked from a course, he or she would have to redo their program and start again and the lines and number of days for registration would increase enormously. Senator Litwack noted that many courses have several prerequisites, but that some prerequisites are more essential than others for each course. He asked whether it would be possible for faculty to decide the essential prerequisite(s) for their courses and have those courses programed so that students who have not taken those crucial prerequisites would be blocked. Dr. Barnett said that if we are going to block registration, it little matters whether registration is blocked for one prerequisite or for several prerequisites since the same problems would accrue.

Senator Betsy Gitter said she sees two issues: the first is who should operate the computer terminals at registration and the second is the complexity of the prerequisites required for courses. She moved that the Senate's Executive Committee develop resolutions about each issue for consideration and possible action by the Senate at our next meeting. The motion carried by unanimous vote.

Dr. Barnett was thanked for conducting the audit and was applauded for his comprehensive and enlightening report.

4. Report on John Jay's enrollment and full-time/adjunct ratios
[Attachment A &B]

President Kaplowitz explained that each September, at the first meeting of the University Faculty Senate (UFS), the liaison between the UFS and each college's UFS delegation is asked to report both orally and in writing about her or his college's enrollment, budget, hirings, and so forth. In preparing her report [Attachment A], she was provided with data from many sources at the College, including a report about the number of sections taught, the number taught by adjunct faculty, and the percent of adjunct-taught sections for each department [Attachment B].

5. Preliminary report on day/night course offerinas

The ad hoc committee on day/night courses, created by the Senate on May 23, is meeting the following day and this is an

opportunity for the Senate to provide ideas to the committee, The ad hoc committee comprises Karen Kaplowitz, Robert McCrie, and Jill Norgren from the Senate, T. Kenneth Moran, Harold Sullivan, and Jack Zlotnick from the Chairs, and the two deans responsible for admissions and registration, Donald Gray and Frank Marousek,

At the Senate's May 23 meeting the point was made that the Provost had changed the reporting requirements in that the number of day/night sections are no longer part of the report the Chairs receive and return to the Provost. President Kaplowitz said she reviewed a copy of the section assignment document sent to the Chairs by the Provost last semester, to verify if what was said at the Senate in May was true and, indeed, there is no longer a requirement for reporting the number or the percentage of day/night sections that each department will be offering.

Senator Jill Norgren said the day/night schedule could very well be a union issue since we were all hired to teach the same general job, but those who teach a day/night schedule semester after semester, year after year, are teaching a very different job from those who teach either day only or evening only courses and who never or virtually never teach a day/night schedule.

Senator Tom Litwack noted that it is not just a matter of the percentage of day/night courses offered. It is a matter of whether we have an adequate number of such courses for our students. Senator Litwack said that not even the absolute minimum is being offered. The absolute minimum, he said, is that core courses and courses in majors be offered at least once a year as a day/night course.

Senator John Donaruma spoke against recommending that the Provost assign a proportion of course sections to each department to be taught as day/night sections because the nature of the students that each department serves and other factors require a more thoughtful approach than an across-the-board percentage. Senator Litwack said that obviously the need for day/night sections must be tempered by other relevant factors. At the same time, Senator Litwack noted, he was hired on the understanding that he would teach day/night courses and he asked whether this was the case with the other Senators, all of whom concurred.

Senator Litwack asked why we should not send our recommendation directly to the Chairs rather than to the Provost? President Kaplowitz spoke in favor of sending our recommendation to the Provost and asking that he make the request to the Chairs because that process would make it easier for the Chairs, who may be reluctant, and understandably reluctant, to schedule their increasingly tenured and senior faculty to teach day/night sections. Thus this would be a College-wide policy that is not within the discretion of each Chair instead of a decision to be made by each individual Chair. Senator Pinello and others agreed,

By a motion duly carried, the meeting was adjourned at 5:00.

Respectfully submitted,

Edward Davenport
Amy Green

Recording Secretaries

ATTACHMENT A

Report for the University Faculty Senate's
October 1, 1996, Plenary

John Jay College of Criminal Justice

Prepared by Karen Kaplowitz

John Jay's enrollment is 10,700. This is an annual increase of 6% over the Fall 1995 enrollment target.

Over the past 10 years, John Jay's enrollment has increased by 70%. Yet the number of full-time faculty is approximately the same as it was then and the number is the same now as the number of full-time faculty when the budget cuts began in 1988-89, Ten years ago, John Jay's adjunct budget was \$700,00. It is now \$4 million.

John Jay is the only college whose revenue target for next year has been set by 80th Street at a level that is higher than last year's.

58.3% of the undergraduate course sections are now taught by adjunct faculty and 55.3% of all course sections are taught by adjunct faculty.

90.0% of writing course sections are taught by adjuncts as are 60% of Mathematics Course sections.

John Jay offers the only Forensic Psychology major in CUNY and one of only a few in the country and yet 68.7% of Psychology course sections are taught by adjunct faculty. John Jay offers the only Forensic Science major in CUNY and is only one of several such programs in the United States and yet 65.3% of the Science course sections are taught by adjuncts. 70.6% of the Law course sections and 72.7% of the Criminal Justice course sections are taught by adjuncts despite the fact that these are two of the "special mission" programs offered by John Jay.

John Jay added 6C sections this semester to the number offered last spring. The decision by the faculty and administration to not increase class size if at all possible has been honored: the class size average is 30, which is an increase of about 1.5 students per class over the past 8 years.

There were 3 faculty separations since the spring: 2 ERI's and one resignation and 11 staff separations: 7 ERI's and 4 resignations.

John Jay received 7 Base Level Equity lines last year, of which none were filled. All 22 of the Academic Program Planning lines were filled. John Jay has received 14 new Base Level Equity lines in the most recent budget allocation.

SECTION AND ADJUNCT BUDGET REPORT FALL 96

DEPT	TOTAL SECTION	NUMBER OF ADJUNCTS	ADJUNCT PERCENT	COST OF ADJUNCTS	GRAD C
AAS	7	2	28.6%		
ETH	24	13	54.2%	25282	1
ANT	25	10	40.0%	24525	1
ART	21	7	33.3%		
MUS	13	3	23.1%		
PHI & REL	28	23	82.1%	81862	
CSL	20	6	30.0%	15628	
COM SKILL	37	20	54.1%	38688	
ENG	128	116	90.6%		2
LIT	48	1	2.1%		
ESL	13	11	84.6%	445535	
grad	1				
FOR LANG	41	14	34.1%	37800	1
GOV	52	25	48.1%	65990	5
LGS	2	0	0.0%		
CRJ 101	5	2	40.0%		
grad	1				
HIS	54	12	22.2%		2
ETH	5	0	0.0%	28520	
LAW	55	31	56.4%		
PSC	42	23	54.8%		
COR	18	4	22.2%		
CRJ	19	11	57.9%		
SEC	9	3	33.3%	177455	
grad	13	2			
MAT	150	92	61.3%	237680	2
STA 250	1	0			
PHY ED	26	18	69.2%	48690	
PRSD	11	7	63.6%		
ETH	16	9	56.3%	36635	
PAD	21	13	61.9%		
ECO	12	7	58.3%		
FIS	6	4	66.7%	105768	
grad	37	19			
PSY	67	42	62.7%		
STA	6	4	66.7%		
grad	36	14		160525	

SCI	75	49	65.3%	138610	
SEEK	38	9	23.7%	40132	
SOC	65	30	46.2%		5
STA	3	0	0.0%		
CRJ	2	2	100.0%	65986	
grad	8				
SPE	55	36	65.5%		3
DRA	6	2	33.3%	92015	
TSP	44	19	43.2%	48350	1
TOT UNDER	1300	715	55.0%		23
GRAD STUD CHOICE	95 3	adj cnted indept's			
GRAND TOT	1398	715	51.1%	\$1,915,676	
Fall 95	1296	699	53.9%	\$1,869,380	