

Faculty Senate Minutes #157

John Jay College of Criminal Justice

September 11, 1997

3:15 PM

Room 630T

Present (30): C. Jama Adams, David Brotherton, Effie Papatzikou Cochran, Glenn Corbett, Edward Davenport, Kojo Dei, John Donaruma, Arlene Geiger, P.J. Gibson, Edward Green, Lou Guinta, Karen Kaplowitz, Kwando Kinshasa, Sandra Lanzzone, Sondra Leftoff, Gavin Lewis, Barry Luby, Ellen Marson, Mary Ann McClure, Jill Norgren, Daniel Pinello, Jacqueline Jimenez-Polanco, Charles Reid, Frederik Rusch, Adina Schwartz, Lydia Segal, Ellen Sexton, Carmen Solis, Agnes Wieschenberg, Bessie Wright

Absent (7): George Andreopoulos, Michael Blitz, Jane Davenport, Amy Green, James Malone, Robert Rothchild, Davidson Umeh

Invited Guests: Haig Bohigian (PSC Chapter Chair), Student Council Vice President Jeannette Lopez

Agenda

1. Announcements from the chair
2. Approval of Minutes #156 of the May 22 meeting
3. Invited Guest: Student Council Vice President Jeannette Lopez
4. Invited guest: Professor Haig Bohigian, PSC Chapter Chair
5. Approval of calendar of Faculty Senate meetings
6. Proposal to co-sponsor November 7 Faculty Development Retreat
7. First reading of proposed amendments to Senate Constitution
8. Election of Faculty Senate representatives to College committees
9. Report on the proposed CUNY Proficiency Exam

1. Announcements from the chair [Attachment A]

New Senators were welcomed: C. Jama Adams (African-American Studies), David Brotherton (Sociology), Jacqueline Jimenez-Polanco (Puerto Rican Studies), Lydia Segal (Law, Police Science & Criminal Justice Administration), Ellen Sexton (Library), and newly returning Senator Charles Reid (Psychology).

2. Approval of Minutes #156 of the May 22 meeting

By a motion duly made and seconded, Minutes #156 of the May 22, 1997, meeting were adopted.

3. Invited Guest: Student Council Vice President Jeannette Lopez

Student Council Vice President Jeannette Lopez was welcomed. Student Council President Jose Frias, who had also been invited, had been unable to accept the invitation. Ms. Lopez, who was elected in May and who is majoring in Legal Studies and minoring in English, spoke about this year's Student Council's focus on encouraging students to use the College services that are available to them, such as the Writing Center, the Reading Lab, the Mathematics Lab, and the Foreign Languages Lab. She said that most students do not seem to be aware that these services and facilities exist and explained that the Student Council's plan is to concentrate on improving students' experiences at the College.

President Kaplowitz told Ms. Lopez that the Senate looks forward to working with her and with other student government leaders and that she, and her colleagues, welcome opportunities to meet with the student leadership and to help further their goal of improving students' experiences. President Kaplowitz noted that immediately prior to today's Senate meeting, she and Senate Vice President Daniel Pinello met with the new manager of John Jay's Barnes & Noble Bookstore in order to be briefed about the reasons for the problems that occurred this month and to help develop mechanisms to improve the system, for the benefit of both students and faculty. She and VP Pinello will report on this issue later in the meeting or at a future Senate meeting. The Senate applauded Ms. Lopez on her election as a student government leader.

4. Invited guest: Professor Haig Bohigian, PSC Chapter Chair
[Attachment B]

Professor Haig Bohigian (Mathematics), chair of John Jay's chapter of the Professional Staff Congress (PSC), the faculty union, was welcomed. Professor Bohigian was invited by the Senate to discuss two issues: independent study compensation and student evaluation of faculty. [See Minutes #155 for a report of the May 9 discussion that led the Senate to invite the PSC chapter chair.]

The first issue was an announcement in May in "The Week of" stating that any reassigned (released) time earned from the teaching of independent study courses would be eliminated if not used within two years. During the Senate's discussion in May, it was agreed that this is not a policy that is in the best interests of faculty, of academic departments, or of students. Furthermore, a unilateral change in policy by the College administration is not permitted by the procedure for compensating faculty for teaching independent study courses. This procedure was developed by the Faculty Senate, the Provost (Dr. Jay Sexter), and the PSC and was approved by the College Council in 1990. (Prior to 1990 when this procedure became College policy by action of the College Council, faculty at John Jay received no compensation for teaching independent study courses.)

President Kaplowitz said that in reviewing the history of this agreement, she was reminded that a year ago the College administration tried to unilaterally change the formula from 10 independent studies equalling 3 credits of reassigned time to 30 independent studies equalling the same compensation of 3 credits. In response to that attempt at a unilateral change in the policy, the Senate voted unanimously to reaffirm the College Council's 1990 policy [see Minutes #140 of the May 10, 1996, Senate meeting]

and the proposed change was not implemented.

However, her discussion with the Provost in the interim since May 1997 about the newly announced policy that reassigned timed be used within two years or be lost (unless a waiver is given by the Provost) has not resulted in the rescinding of the announcement.

Item #10 of the Procedure for Compensation for Independent Study, as approved by the College Council in 1990, states:

"If at some time in the future the College determines that there is a need to review this Independent Study course policy, the Faculty Senate shall be so informed, and changes shall take place only after negotiation with the Professional Staff Congress/CUNY. Under no circumstances shall faculty members lose accumulated Independent Study credits toward compensation."

President Kaplowitz said she remembers vividly that although the general compensation guidelines were developed by the Faculty Senate, it was Professor Bohigian who insisted on adding the provisions contained in item #10. She said that since this issue has to do with compensation for work by faculty, it is clearly a union matter as well as a governance matter.

Professor Bohigian said President Kaplowitz's explanation is exactly correct, noting that the Provost's decision to unilaterally try to change policy is in direct contradiction to College policy as established by the College Council. Professor Bohigian said that no one, including the Provost and the President, can change this policy because it was adopted by the College Council. He recalled that at the time the compensation guidelines were developed, he told Dr. Sexter that although the Provost was fully supporting the agreement, future Provosts might not do so and that, therefore, provision #10 was needed. A motion reaffirming the independent study compensation guidelines and authorizing President Kaplowitz to form a delegation together with Professor Bohigian to meet with Provost Wilson to review this matter was adopted by unanimous vote.

The second issue that the Senate invited Professor Bohigian to discuss is student evaluation of faculty. He was invited to discuss this both because due process in faculty reappointment, tenure, and promotion actions is a union matter and the student evaluations of faculty are used in making these personnel decisions, and also because the John Jay Charter mandates that two members of the 6-member College Council Committee on Student Evaluation of the Faculty be chosen by the PSC and Professor Bohigian has historically been one of the two PSC members and has traditionally chaired the Committee:

"A Committee on Student Evaluation of the Faculty shall consist of the following members: two teaching faculty members elected by the teaching faculty, two students elected by the Student Council and two teaching faculty members designated by the Professional Staff Congress. Members shall serve for a term of two years.

"The committee shall be responsible for a continuous review of faculty evaluation procedures; for the terms under which they are used; and for the development of guidelines, as may be necessary, for interpretation of the results of these procedures." John Jay Charter: Article I. Section 10.i.

President Kaplowitz summarized the concerns raised by the Senate at its May 9 meeting [Minutes #155]. She also explained that the CUNY Board of Trustees mandates that student evaluations of all faculty be conducted at least once a year but the evaluation instrument is developed by each CUNY college and the committee structure is also decided by each college (no other college requires that committee members be chosen by the PSC).

At the May 9 meeting the Senate discussed the difficulty students seem to have in using the John Jay instrument properly and also the unfairness to faculty (and students) of administering the evaluation only in the spring semesters, since certain courses are taught only in the fall and many faculty teach their 12-hour schedule in the spring semester. When the Senate's executive committee discussed this problem with the Provost, he said that since his staff is responsible for the P&B process (in the fall) and for conducting the student evaluation of faculty, the only time his staff can do the latter is during the spring semesters.

President Kaplowitz then showed the Senate the evaluation instruments of the other CUNY colleges and drew the Senate's attention to the physical difference between John Jay's evaluation instrument [Attachment B], which is physically difficult to read and structurally confusing, and the 14 different student evaluation instruments of 14 of the other CUNY colleges, all of which are professionally printed, extremely readable, and machine scannable. John Jay's instrument requires that the responses be individually keypunched which is not only costly and slow, but is vulnerable to errors. (Only two colleges, other than John Jay, do not have a professionally printed, machine scannable instrument: QCC, which does not have a quantitative instrument of any kind but only a written evaluation, and Hostos, which has a photocopied form with questions in English on one side and Spanish on the other.) Last year President Kaplowitz obtained copies of student evaluation instruments from the faculty governance leaders at the other CUNY colleges and then this past June the members of one of the Board of Trustees committees, the Committee on Faculty, Staff, and Administration, were provided a packet, for information purposes, of the student evaluation instruments of all 17 colleges (as well as the peer evaluation instruments of those colleges that have developed and use them).

Furthermore, President Kaplowitz reported, almost all the CUNY instruments ask students to provide such information as the grade the student expects to receive in the course, the student's GPA, the number of credits the student has completed, the student's major, and why the student is taking this course: whether the course is required for the major, required as a prerequisite, required for the degree, is an elective, fits into the schedule, because of genuine interest, for no clear cut reason, or another reason and, if so, that reason is to be specified. In addition, other colleges do not ask questions about the "fairness of assigned grades" and other inappropriate questions. Some colleges ask as few as 6 or 8 carefully worded questions. None reverses the rating system with the lowest and highest scores alternating in terms of placement: most ask if the students agree, strongly agree, disagree, strongly disagree, etc. Virtually all have a "not applicable" category for each item.

She said that although we have many tenured, full professors now, we also have many new and junior faculty. Furthermore, adjunct faculty are evaluated in large part on the basis of

student evaluation scores and comments. For these and other reasons we need to revisit the instrument as well as the schedule.

Professor Bohigian said that two members of this year's Senate have been on the Committee on Student Evaluation of the Faculty, John Donaruma and P.J. Gibson, and he said they can attest to the fact that his Committee has been asking the administration for quite some time to provide printed, machine scannable evaluation forms but the administration has responded repeatedly that the College can not afford to do so, and has given this response as recently as two years ago. The administration flatly said no to this issue, he explained. The point is how do we deal with this issue. The question is how much action does the Senate want the Committee on Student Evaluation of the Faculty to take. He said the Committee, too, has felt that the evaluation should be conducted every semester which the administration has also refused to do because of the logistics problem in the Provost's Office because the one person responsible for the P&B process is also the person responsible for the student evaluation process. He said that it is clearly not possible for the same person to do both at the same time but, he added, that is not our problem: it is the administration's problem and obligation to solve. Twice before the Committee has suggested revising the instrument by eliminating 7 of the 20 questions because those 7 recommended for deletion are inappropriate but no action has been taken by the administration on those recommendations.

On the other hand, Professor Bohigian said, it is somewhat difficult to convince faculty to change an instrument that is scoring people at about 6 or above (out of 7): the feeling is that if the instrument is changed the scores might go down. And then the question correctly becomes what is the correct way to change the instrument. He said there are so many different models to look at, such as those developed by the other 16 CUNY colleges, that revising our instrument would require additional study.

Professor Bohigian said that at the very least we should insist that a machine scannable system be adopted. He said the Committee already gave the administration the permission to separate the quantitative portion from the written portion (which used to be printed back to back) in order to make the staff work easier, because this change obviates the need to photocopy the written comments. Despite this, he said, the administration has not always been able to return the scores to the faculty: the 1995 evaluation results were never returned to faculty.

He said the Committee is prepared to do anything the Senate wishes. He added he is reluctant to suggest taking PSC action because it should not have to come to that point. And, Professor Bohigian said, at the very least the process should not be limited to only the spring semesters. He said that an agreement a few years ago to alternate fall and spring semesters was not honored by the administration. He said that in light of this history, in light of the failure to honor the agreement, the evaluations should take place every semester. President Kaplowitz noted that most colleges administer the student evaluation every semester.

Senator Arlene Geiger said that question #4 ("When needed the instructor was helpful... unhelpful") is unfair to adjunct faculty because adjunct faculty are not paid to nor are they required to hold office hours or to be available outside class. She said most adjuncts do hold office hours and are available but adjuncts should not be evaluated on the basis of something which if they do

they do on a voluntary basis. She said she does not know how to adapt this instrument for more than half of our faculty but the instrument should be adapted for them. Professor Bohigian agreed, explaining that this is one of the 7 questions that the Committee recommended dropping but the administration refused to deal with the proposed changes.

Senator Frederik Rusch asked who exactly refused to consider the recommendations of the Committee on Student Evaluation of the Faculty. Professor Bohigian said that the Executive Committee of the College Council refused to put the proposed revisions on the agenda of the College Council. The refusal to adopt the scannable format was a decision by the Provost's Office. Senator Rusch asked to see the Committee's proposed revision of the instrument. Professor Bohigian offered to send President Kaplowitz a copy which, he suggested, could be distributed to the Senate.

Senator Kwando Kinshasa asked whether the student evaluations of individual faculty are discussed when each faculty member comes up for reappointment or tenure or promotion during the Personnel Committee process. When told that the student evaluations are discussed, Senator Kinshasa said he is surprised that someone hasn't questioned the confusing structure of alternating the range of positive and negative scores which students have to decipher during a very rushed time period. He said that most faculty urge students to complete the form quickly because they want to get on with the important work of the class, which this cuts into. Senator P.J. Gibson agreed with both the confusing nature of the instrument and the difficulty of deciphering it in a limited time span. Senator Kinshasa said that structurally the instrument is just too confusing and vulnerable to students inadvertently scoring in the opposite way that they intended. Senator Mary Ann McClure agreed, saying if only one change could be achieved it should be to make the format of lowest to highest score the same for every question: this is something that is very simple to achieve, she noted.

Senator John Donaruma said the rationale, albeit a poor one as we now realize from the confusion that the format has evidently created, was that students would give all "7's" to someone they liked or all "1's" to someone they didn't like, without reading each question and rating the faculty on each individual item.

President Kaplowitz noted that at the May 9 discussion at the Senate, Senator Dorothy Bracey told about a study of student evaluations of faculty reported in the "Chronicle of Higher Education" that revealed that students evaluate faculty in a holistic way: if they like the course and the teacher, they will feel positively about everything, including, as Professor Bracey put it, the quality of the lighting in the classroom and the cleanliness of the toilets. And the corollary is true: a student who doesn't like a teacher will dislike everything. Therefore, Professor Bracey said, why not permit a student to score all "6's" or all "7's" or all "2's" or all "1's" especially in light of the fact that students may be inadvertently harming faculty because of the confusing structure of the instrument (which ironically is confusing in an attempt to be scrupulously accurate). President Kaplowitz said she is worried that faculty may be getting low scores because students are misreading the instrument. She said if we want students to read each item, we should use the "agree strongly to disagree strongly" continuum and weight the scores.

Senator Lou Guinta asked whether the Board of Trustees may be

creating one instrument for all colleges, since the Trustees were given copies of all the instruments. President Kaplowitz said that she does not think that is in the works: the evaluation instruments were given for information purposes, to educate the committee members.

Senator P.J. Gibson said that when she was on the Committee on Student Evaluation of the Faculty a few years ago, the administration's response to the request that the instrument be professionally printed and machine scannable was that the College cannot afford to do this. Is this still the administration's position, she asked? Professor Bohigian said the Committee has not discussed the issue with the administration since then because the administration flatly refused at that time.

President Kaplowitz said that the Student Evaluation of the Faculty Committee is a College Council Committee; she noted that we could put this issue on the College Council agenda and show that every CUNY college except for John Jay and Hostos (and QCC which asks for written comments only) use machine scanned forms that are extremely readable.

Senator C. Jama Adams suggested that as a matter of protocol, perhaps a discussion should first take place with the Provost who could be shown the other colleges' evaluation instruments. President Kaplowitz agreed it would be far better to resolve the issue directly with the Provost rather than bringing this to the College Council: she suggested that the meeting with the Provost about independent study banked time could be combined with a discussion about student evaluation forms and timetables.

Senator Frederik Rusch asked what is to prevent us as faculty, not as individuals but as faculty, to refuse to distribute an instrument that we consider to be flawed. If the instrument is not legitimate, why should we be victimized by it, he asked. He said that if the discussion with the Provost does not have a satisfactory result, he would like his question to be considered at a later meeting.

Professor Bohigian said that a few years ago the College P&B Committee voted to recommend that the evaluation instrument be administered prior to the final drop date (the last day students may withdraw from a course without penalty). He said he absolutely refused to adhere to this recommendation because students could remain in a course or even sign up for a teacher's course for the sole purpose of giving a very negative evaluation to a teacher who was particularly out of favor and then drop the course after handing in the evaluation form.

Professor Bohigian reviewed other issues from his long history with this instrument. He quoted from Article 2, Section 4 of the John Jay Charter which states that "each department is instructed to provide for systematic student input on curricular and personnel matters and to report to the College Council its arrangement for such input." Professor Bohigian said that the PSC brought this Charter provision up in a number of grievance cases and he asked the Senate what they think the official John Jay administration response has been as to how they implement this Charter provision. President Kaplowitz suggested that the answer is the student evaluation of the faculty instrument. Professor Bohigian said that is exactly right: the administration's claim is that we fulfill the Charter requirement with our student evaluation of faculty instrument and this interpretation has been

upheld by the CUNY Central Administration at 80th Street. Given that interpretation, Professor Bohigian said, we have an additional rationale for administering the evaluation every semester and for improving the instrument itself.

Senator Arlene Geiger asked that adjunct faculty be added to the Committee on Student Evaluation. Professor Bohigian said that would require amending the John Jay Charter. But he added that the Committee's philosophy has always been that although the Committee is a committee of the College Council, the Committee wants to clear any changes in the instrument with the Faculty Senate and so the Committee will always bring the instrument to the Senate first, which would provide the opportunity for adjunct faculty and others to comment and propose corrections.

Senator Arlene Geiger said that because there are different requirements for full-time and for adjunct faculty, some questions should not be asked about adjunct faculty. President Kaplowitz said such questions, if it is decided to not eliminate them entirely, could be computer coded so that the score of those questions are not scanned when the faculty member is an adjunct (adjunct forms could be programmed with a special code). She also suggested that we review the evaluation instruments of the other colleges to see how they provide fairness to their adjunct faculty, if they do. Also, she said, we need to add the category of "not applicable" or "not sure" to all the questions to be fair to all faculty, including full-time faculty.

Senator Sondra Leftoff questioned why we are not using a qualitative form only, rather than a flawed quantitative form. Senator Donaruma said he is most interested in how we can make use of the student responses to become better teachers: he said he is not sure we use them in this way. He said he recently read the written portions of the student evaluations of the faculty in his department, as a member of his department's P&B, and found the comments to be very general: faculty are characterized either as very good or as very inadequate but no specifics are provided. He said he is interested in the subscale of individual items over a period of time: whether he as an instructor has improved in a certain area over time or become weaker in a certain area over time. He said he is interested in what kind of instrument would provide that kind of information.

Senator Edward Green said that at Bronx Community College, each faculty member is given this term's evaluation results as well as his or her average score for the past three years for each item. The departmental average for each item is also printed on the instructor's form.

President Kaplowitz said the first thing is for Professor Bohigian and she (and any members of the Senate executive committee and perhaps the PSC executive committee who are available) to meet with Provost Wilson. She said she is certain the Provost will want to help the faculty and the students: many students do not feel the evaluations are taken seriously but her sense is that they are. She asked Senator Norgren, as someone who was on the College Personnel Committee for a number of years, her opinion about this. Senator Norgren said the degree to which student evaluations are looked at depends on the candidate but generally what is looked at is patterns over time. She also said some departments have different departmental averages than others and the Personnel Committee does understand that. She said there is a culture of understanding that the numbers are subject to

interpretation relative to the department the candidate is a member of. President Kaplowitz asked Senator Rusch, who has been on the English Department's P & B Committee for many years his sense of how seriously the evaluations are taken. Senator Rusch said the English Department P&B looks at the evaluations quite seriously and the department chair, Professor Crozier, takes them very seriously indeed. He said other things, obviously, are taken into consideration, but the student evaluations are not ignored.

Senator Kwando Kinshasa asked whether the instruments of the other CUNY colleges organize the questions into categories, such as academic, interpersonal, and so on. President Kaplowitz said that many do this (without headings that specify the categories). She added that the QCC instrument, which asks for only written comments, has instructions recommending that students write about two areas: "method of instruction" and "relationships with students." For the former, the instructions provide such suggested areas for comment as "presents material clearly, stimulates questions in class" and so forth. For the latter, the areas suggested for comment include: "displays courtesy and interest," "keeps appointments," "gives consideration to students' suggestions" and so forth.

Senator Jama Adams said that an instrument may list questions in a certain order but the analysis can provide information in a way that is not apparent from the design of the instrument. He explained that whether the questions are organized into such categories or not, because they are computer scanned, software can provide those kinds of analyses. Senator Kinshasa said that while that possibility may be available to the analyzer of the data, the student may not realize that such information is being elicited and may be frustrated in not being able to convey what is important to him or her. President Kaplowitz noted that in the written portion of the instrument of one CUNY college, the student is presented with two statements: "I would recommend this instructor to other students because _____" and "I would not recommend this instructor to other students because _____." Thus students are given prompts which can focus their assessment. At John Jay, the written form says, "Please use this space for written comments that may be useful to the instructor" but because this is a separate sheet, many students think they are writing directly to the instructor and that no one else is seeing their written comments. Also, it is not explained what "helpful to the instructor" is meant to refer to.

President Kaplowitz noted that the need to replace one of the faculty members of the Committee: Dr. Elizabeth Crespo was elected last year for the two-year term but she is no longer at John Jay. Professor Bohigian said that the College Council has to nominate candidates and the faculty then vote. Senator Ellen Marson said that at the September 4 meeting of the Executive Committee of the College Council she brought up the necessity of nominating a replacement for Dr. Crespo but VP Smith, who was chairing the meeting, was not familiar with the issue. We have received the agenda of the September meeting of the College Council and this item is not on it. It was suggested that this be submitted for the October College Council meeting.

Professor Bohigian said that if we want extensive changes in the evaluation instrument, the process could take an excessively long time. He said that it is a tricky issue as to whether quantitative or qualitative questions are the more harmful or the more helpful to faculty. Senator Edward Green asked whether the

results are truly confidential since the students at Brooklyn College publish them in their newspaper. President Kaplowitz said student evaluation scores and written comments are absolutely confidential: students at Brooklyn and at Baruch and at anyplace else where student evaluation scores and comments are published conduct their own evaluation, using their own evaluation instrument, administering it outside the classroom, and doing their own analysis. Often it is conducted by the Student Council, because in that way the students have funds (from student activity fees). But these publicly printed scores and comments are entirely separate from each college's official evaluation results, which are confidential. Senator Green said he had not understood that and appreciates the information and clarification.

President Kaplowitz thanked Professor Bohigian for coming to the Senate and providing information about the two issues.

5. Approval of calendar of Faculty Senate meetings

The Senate approved the calendar of Senate meetings proposed by the Executive Committee. The possible need for a December 9 meeting was explained: that month, the College Council meets on December 11, the day prior to the Senate's all-day meeting. Should any item on the December agenda of the College Council be of sufficient import to faculty to merit discussion prior to the Council meeting, the Senate's executive committee will call a meeting for December 9; otherwise, no meeting will be held on that date. Senators were asked to keep December 9 open in case that contingency arises.

Calendar of Faculty Senate meetings

<u>Fall 1997</u>	<u>Spring 1997</u>
Thursday, September 11	Thursday, February 5
Wednesday, September 24	Wednesday, February 18
Thursday, October 9	Thursday, March 5
Wednesday, October 22	Wednesday, March 18
Wednesday, November 12	Thursday, April 2
Tuesday, November 25	Wednesday, April 22
Tuesday, December 9 [if needed]	Friday, May 8
Friday, December 12	

First meeting of the 1997-98 Faculty Senate

Thursday, May 21 or 28

All meetings begin at 3:15 PM except the Friday, December 12, and Friday, May 8, meetings which start at 9:30 AM. Meetings are in Room 630 T. The Senate meetings are open to all members of the John Jay faculty, all of whom may participate in discussions. (Only members of the Senate may make motions and vote.) All faculty may submit agenda items in writing 10 college days prior to a Senate meeting to any member of the Senate's Executive Committee: Karen Kaplowitz, Daniel Pinello, Edward Davenport, Carmen Solis, Amy Green, and Kwando Kinshasa.

6. Proposal that the Senate co-sponsor a Faculty Development Retreat on November 7

The Senate considered a proposal from the Executive Committee to co-sponsor a Faculty Development Retreat on Friday, November 7. The Senate has co-sponsored the past two faculty development retreats, in Fall 1996 and Spring 1997. As in the past, the co-sponsors with the Faculty Senate would be the President, the Provost, the Vice President for Student Development, and the Council of Chairs, subject to the Council of Chairs' action on this issue at their September 16 meeting.

Senator P.J. Gibson praised the past two faculty development retreats, saying that faculty seemed to universally feel they were very worthwhile and helpful as well as enjoyable.

Asked the possible topic, President Kaplowitz said that the preliminary plans, because planning can not go forward without the Senate's endorsement (and also the endorsement of the Chairs), is to focus on academic standards and outcomes assessment. She explained that John Jay's 5-year Middle States accreditation review is due at the end of this academic year. In the interim since our accreditation review in 1993, Middle States has added a new requirement: colleges must now demonstrate in what ways they use outcomes assessment to improve teaching and learning. Provost Wilson has put together an outcomes assessment taskforce, which he has asked her to serve on, which met at the end of May with a consultant from a college in Pennsylvania that has been engaged in outcomes assessment for quite some time. Outcomes assessment is measuring to what extent students have actually learned that which a course or program is designed to teach.

She said outcomes assessment is also the focus of the new CUNY Board of Trustees, which is developing a CUNY proficiency exam for advancement beyond 60 credits [see agenda item #9].

Asked the preliminary plan for November 7, President Kaplowitz said that if the Council of Chairs votes to co-sponsor the faculty development retreat, which she said is crucial, the Chairs will be asked to schedule departmental meetings that morning. Then lunch will be provided, courtesy of President Lynch, and workshops will then meet: faculty will have a choice of workshops to attend from among 4 or 5 topics. A reception in the President's office will conclude the day.

Senator Jama Adams asked whether there is long range planning by the faculty. He said the mood in the larger academic community is for academic planning, especially with regard to standards, but this does not seem to be happening at John Jay to the extent that the new Trustees seem to want. President Kaplowitz said that she will report about the activities of the CUNY Trustees either today or at the next Senate meeting. She also explained that we do have a Comprehensive Planning Committee and an Academic Program Planning Committee (for which Senate representatives will be elected at today's meeting [agenda item #8] as well as an Undergraduate Standards Committee.

A motion to co-sponsor the November 7 faculty development day with the Council of Chairs and the President, Provost, and VP for Students was made, seconded, and carried by unanimous vote.

7. First reading of proposed amendments to Article VII of the Faculty Senate Constitution: Executive Committee [Attachment C]

The Executive Committee is proposing four amendments to the Senate Constitution to enable the Senate's committees to work more effectively [Attachment C]. It was explained that although the Constitution permits the Senate to elect non-Senators to College committees, it does not permit non-Senators to serve on Senate committees. The problem is that many Senate committees, such as the Senate's committee on computing and educational technology, require members with special knowledge and credentials.

Another proposed change would authorize the Senate's executive committee to appoint the committee chair. At times in the recent past, a chair has not called meetings, making the work of the Committee impossible. Another change would be to authorize the Executive Committee to designate liaisons between Senate committees and the executive committee to facilitate the work of the committees and of the Senate.

The proposed amendments are based on the procedures of the University Faculty Senate, whose committees work very well. Senator Guinta praised all the proposed changes. He urged the Senate's adoption of these changes, having recently been on a Senate committee that would have benefitted had these procedures been in place.

Amendments of the Senate constitution require a two-thirds affirmative vote of those present and voting at two consecutive, regular Senate meetings. A motion to approve the proposed amendments passed by unanimous vote. The second vote will be scheduled.

8. Election of Faculty Senate representatives to College committees

a. Faculty panel of the Judicial Committee

The Judicial Committee hears any charge brought against a student by another student or by a faculty member or by an administrator. Each case is adjudicated by a 5-member panel: two faculty chosen by random from a 6-member faculty panel elected by the Faculty Senate; two students chosen by random from a 6-member student panel chosen by the student body; and a chair, chosen by random from a 3-member faculty panel of chairs appointed by the President in consultation with the faculty leadership and these three rotating chairs are trained by the CUNY Office of Legal Affairs in due process issues. Senator Kwando Kinshasa, who served on the faculty panel last year, spoke of the critical importance of this Committee.

The Senate unanimously elected the following six faculty for the faculty panel: Professors Lotte Feinberg (Public Management); P.J. Gibson (English); Kwando Kinshasa (African-American Studies); Roy Lotz (Sociology); Carmen Solis (SEEK); and Martin Wallenstein (Speech & Theater).

b. Academic Program Plannins & Comorehensive Plannins Committees

The Comprehensive Planning Committee comprises 5 faculty elected by the Senate; 5 chairs elected by the Council of Chairs; 1 member of the Curriculum Committee elected by that body; 1 member of the Graduate Studies Committee elected by that body; several Higher

Education Officers elected by the HEO Council; several students; the VP of Administration; the VP of Community Relations; the VP of Student Development; the director of Institutional Research; the dean of admissions and registration; the associate provost; and the provost, who chairs the committee.

The Committee on Academic Program Planning comprises those 12 faculty who are members of the Comprehensive Planning Committee and the Provost who chairs the committee.

The Senate unanimously elected the following five faculty: Professors Lou Guinta (Communications Skills); Karen Kaplowitz (English); Tom Litwack (Psychology); James Malone (Counseling); and Adina Schwartz (Law, Police Science & CJ Administration).

c. Town Meeting Planning Committee

The Town Meeting Planning Committee plans the monthly Town Meetings, at which all members of the John Jay community are welcome to ask questions and raise issues. The Committee is chaired by Vice President Witherspoon and comprises faculty elected by the Faculty Senate, students chosen by the Student Council, VP John Smith, representing President Lynch, Ms. Rebecca Spath, and Professor Maria Volpe, director of the dispute resolution program.

The Senate unanimously elected Karen Kaplowitz, James Malone, and Carmen Solis.

9. Report on the proposed CUNY Proficiency Exam [Attachment D]

The CUNY Board of Trustees, conditional upon approval of a resolution by the Board at its September 29 meeting, will develop and pilot a proficiency exam that would be required for advancement beyond 60 credits. The exam is to be modeled on one used at Kingsborough Community College [Attachment D], where the exam score determines 30% of the final grade of the final course of KCC's composition sequence. The essay (in this case by Professor Stephen L. Carter) [Attachment D] is given in advance of the test and students have a copy of the essay in the test room and are given two hours to write about a series of prompts (questions) such as those developed by KCC [Attachment D]. The piloting of the proficiency test, which is to be developed in the next few months, would take place during this 1997-98 academic year and the proficiency test would be implemented, according to the current plan, in Fall 1998, a year from now. The choice of this test model and process was unanimously proposed by the English Discipline Council, which comprises the chairs of the English Departments of all the CUNY colleges.

Because of the lateness of the hour, this item was not discussed but will be on the agenda of future Senate meetings.

By a motion duly made and seconded, the meeting was adjourned at 5 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Edward Davenport
Recording Secretary

Announcements from the chair

At-large Faculty Senate election results

The following were elected as the at-large representatives of the full-time faculty on the 1996-97 Faculty Senate:

Michael Blitz (English)
Edward Davenport (English/SEEK)
Jane Davenport (Library)
John Donaruma (Communication Skills)
P.J. Gibson (English)
Lou Guinta (Communication Skills)
Karen Kaplowitz (English)
Kwando Kinshasa (African-American Studies)
James Malone (Counseling)
Ellen Marson (Foreign Languages & Lit)
Jill Norgren (Government)
Daniel Pinello (Government)
Carmen Solis (SEEK)

The following were elected as the at-large representatives of the adjunct faculty on the 1996-97 Faculty Senate:

Arlene Geiger (Public Management)
Edward Green (Mathematics)

Department representatives to the College Council and Faculty Senate

The following faculty were elected as department representatives to both the College Council and Faculty Senate:

African-American Studies: C. Jama Adams
Anthropology: Kojo Dei
Art, Music, Philosophy: Mary Ann McClure
Counseling and Student Life: Sandra Lanzone
English: Frederik Rusch
English: Effie Papatzikou Cochran
Foreign Languages & Literature: Barry Luby
Government: George Andreopoulos
History: Gavin Lewis
Law, Police Science, CJ Administration: Adina Schwartz
Law, Police Science, CJ Administration: Lydia Segal
Library: Ellen Sexton
Mathematics: Agnes Wieschenberg
Physical Education & Athletics: Davidson Umeh
Psychology: Charles Reid
Public Management: Glenn Corbett
Puerto Rican Studies: Jacqueline Jimenez-Polanco
Science: Robert Rothchild
SEEK: Bessie Wright
Sociology: David Brotherton
Speech & Theater: Amy Green
Thematic Studies: Sondra Leftoff

P&B at-large members elected for 1997-98 term

The faculty elected Professors Andrew Karmen (Sociology), Ellen Marson (Foreign Languages & Literature), and Zelma Henriques (Law, Police Science, & CJ Administration), as the three at-large faculty members on the 1997-98 College Personnel and Budget (P&B) Committee.

Better Teaching Seminars scheduled

The Faculty Senate's 20th semester of Better Teaching Seminars will be offered by John Jay faculty for John Jay faculty. This faculty development program is open to all faculty. No reservations are required (unless otherwise stated). All events are from 3:30 PM to 4:45 PM in Room 630 T.

- *** Wednesday, October 8: "Designing and Assigning Student Journal & Student Diary Projects Across the **Curriculum.**" Panelists: Daniel Yalisove (chair), Sondra Leftoff, and Abby Stein.
- ** Tuesday, October 28: "What Are the Characteristics of a Good Teacher: John Jay Student and Faculty **Opinions.**" Presented by Patricia Licklider and Karen Kaplowitz.
- ** Wednesday, November 5: "**Off-Campus** Course Assignments and Projects." Panelists: Sondra Leftoff, Anne Buddenhagen, Amy Green, and Kwando Kinshasa.
- ** Tuesday, November 11: "How to Mentor Aspiring Law School Students & How to be a Successful Applicant to Law School." Moderator: Christopher Morse. Other panelists, including John Jay graduates currently attending law school, will be announced.

New faculty appointed

George Andreopoulos -- Assistant Professor -- Government
 Anthony Carpi -- Assistant Professor -- Science
 James N. G. Cauthen -- Assistant Professor -- Government
 Enrique Chavez-Arviso -- Asst. Professor -- Art, Music, Philosophy
 Richard Curtis -- Associate Professor -- Anthropology
 Nancy Egan -- Instructor -- Library
 Salomon A. Guajardo -- Assistant Professor -- Public Management
 Maria Haberfeld -- Assistant Professor -- Law, Police Science, CJ Adm
 Farrukh Hakeem -- Assistant Professor -- Law, Police Science, CJ Adm
 Jacqueline Jimenez-Polanco -- Asst. Professor -- Puerto Rican Studies
 Matthew B. Johnson -- Associate Professor -- Psychology
 Stuart M. Kirschner -- Associate Professor -- Psychology
 Thurai Kugendran -- Assistant Professor -- Mathematics
 Shmuel Lock -- Assistant Professor -- Law, Police Science, CJ Adm
 Jane Beverley Malmo -- Assistant Professor -- English
 Christopher Morse -- Asst. Professor -- Law, Police Science, CJ Adm
 Maureen O'Connor -- Assistant Professor -- Psychology
 Ellen Sexton -- Instructor -- Library

Distinguished Visiting professor appointed

Matti Joutsen -- Visiting Distinguished Prof. -- Law, Police Science

Faculty appointed to substitute positions

Delores DeLuise -- Sub. Assistant Professor -- English
 Charles Jennings -- Sub. Assistant Professor -- Public Management
 Livia Katz -- Sub. Lecturer -- English
 Thomas Kubic -- Sub. Instructor -- Science
 John Matteson -- Sub. Instructor -- English
 Bettina Murray -- Sub. Lecturer -- Counseling
 Debra Nelson -- Sub. Instructor -- Science
 Fahrettin Okcabol -- Sub. Associate Professor -- Public Management
 Caridad Sanchez -- Sub. Instructor -- Counseling
 Nilsa Santiago -- Sub. Asst. Professor -- Law, Police Science, CJ Adm

3 new Trustees appointed to the CUNY Board of Trustees

The Board of Trustees comprises 10 gubernatorial and 5 mayoral appointees and the UFS Chair and USS Chair (ex officio). A year ago, the 9 appointed empty or expired seats were filled by nominations by Governor Pataki and Mayor Giuliani and approval by the NYS Senate. Since then, Charles Inniss died and Jerome Berg and Robert Price stepped down. The new trustees appointed since May are Kenneth E. Cook, Alfred B. Curtis, and John Morning.

College Council Schedule

All meetings of the College Council are at 3:15 PM in Room 630 T and are open to all members of the John Jay community, all of whom may speak and all of whom may submit agenda items (by sending them to Council Secretary Patricia Maull, 6th floor, T Building). The right to make motions and to vote is restricted to Council members.

<u>College Council meeting</u>	<u>Agenda Deadline</u>	<u>CC Exec Committee</u>
Wednesday, Sept. 17	Tues. Sept. 2	Thur. Sept. 4
Thursday, Oct. 16	Tues. Sept. 30	Tues. Oct. 7
Thursday, Nov. 13	Tues. Nov. 4	Thur. Nov. 6
Thursday, Dec. 11	Tues. Nov. 25	Thurs. Dec. 4
Wednesday, Feb. 11	Wed. Jan. 28	Mon. Feb. 2
Thursday, Mar. 19	Thur. Feb. 26	Wed. Mar. 4
Tues. Apr. 7	Wed. Mar. 25	Wed. Apr. 1
Tues. May 12	Tues. Apr. 21	Tues. May 5

CUNY Board of Trustees calendar of meetings

<u>Board of Trustees Meeting</u>	<u>Deadline to sign up** for public hearing</u>	<u>Public*** Hearing</u>
Mon. Sept. 29	Fri. Sept. 19	Mon. Sept. 22
Mon. Oct. 27	Fri. Oct. 17	Mon. Oct. 20
Mon. Nov. 24	Fri. Nov. 14	Mon. Nov. 17
Mon. Dec. 22	Fri. Dec. 12	Mon. Dec. 15
Mon. Jan. 26	Fri. Jan. 16	Tue. Jan. 20
Mon. Feb. 23	Fri. Feb. 13	Tue. Feb. 17
Mon. Mar. 23	Fri. Mar. 13	Mon. Mar. 16
Mon. Apr. 27	Fri. Apr. 17	Mon. Apr. 20
Tue. May 26	Fri. May 15	Mon. May 18
Mon. June 22	Fri. June 12	Mon. June 15

* All Board of Trustee meetings are at 4:30 PM in Room 104 at 535 East 80 Street and are open to the public

** Sign-up deadline is 3 PM. To sign up to speak at the public hearing, telephone the Office of the Secretary of the BoT; 212: 794-5450 or 794-5377 any time up until 3 PM on the date listed above. You must give your name and the calendar (agenda) item you wish to speak about. The calendar is published a week prior to the sign-up deadline and is available in the office of the President of the Faculty Senate (x8724), in the John Jay Library, and in the Office of the President of the College. Any member of the public may sign up to speak: speaking time is limited to 3 minutes and a copy of the written statement may be submitted to the Board which may be the exact text of the oral statement or may be a more lengthy statement.

*** BoT public hearings are at 4 PM in Room 104 at 535 East 80th Street and are open to the public. They are attended by members of the Board of Trustees and members of the Chancellory.

Calendar of the committees of the Board of Trustees

The four standing Board Committees are on academic affairs; fiscal affairs; student affairs; and faculty, staff, and administration. Committee meetings begin at 3 PM in Room 104 at 535 East 80th Street on September 8, 9; October 6, 7; November 3, 6; December 1, 2; January 5, 6; February 2, 3; March 2, 3; April 30, 31; May 4, 5; June 2, 3. Committee meetings are open to the public.

ATTACHMENT B

JOHN JAY COLLEGE OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE
STUDENT EVALUATION OF FACULTY, SPRING 1996

Faculty name

course
LAW- ~~CRIME~~ #

LAW AND EVIDEN

723

46

INSTRUCTION: Circle the number that most accurately represents your feeling toward the statement. Please circle only one number, and circle it clearly.

1. The instructor's attitude toward viewpoints other than his/her own:
TOLERANT 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 INTOLERANT
2. Interaction IN CLASS with the instructor is:
DIFFICULT 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 EASY
3. The instructor's use of class time was:
WASTEFUL 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 EFFICIENT
4. When needed the instructor was:
HELPFUL 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 UNHELPFUL
5. The instructor's presentation of the course material was:
UNCLEAR 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 CLEAR
6. The amount of material covered in the course was:
SATISFACTORY 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 UNSATISFACTORY
7. The assignment of grades in this course was:
UNFAIR 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 FAIR
8. In class, the difficult points in reading assignments were:
CLARIFIED 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 NOT CLARIFIED
9. The way the instructor answered questions in class was:
UNSATISFACTORY 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 SATISFACTORY
10. The instructor's interest in students was:
WEAK 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 STRONG
11. The course was organized:
ILLOGICALLY 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 LOGICALLY
12. Independent or creative thinking in this course was:
DISCOURAGED 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ENCOURAGED
13. The tests or other methods of evaluation measured knowledge or skills developed in this course:
FAIRLY 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 UNFAIRLY
14. Asking questions in the class of this instructor was:
DISCOURAGED 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ENCOURAGED
15. The instructor missed class:
FREQUENTLY 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 INFREQUENTLY
16. Independent of the personality of the instructor, I feel the opportunities for learning in this course were:
LIMITED 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 EXTENSIVE
17. This instructor motivated me to want to learn the skills or subject matter of this course for its own sake:
A GREAT DEAL 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 NOT AT ALL
18. In most classes there is material assigned OUTSIDE of class that is never covered IN class. How helpful was this material to you in learning the skills or content of this course?
VERY HELPFUL 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 NOT HELPFUL
19. How does this instructor compare with other teachers at John Jay College?
AMONG THE WORST 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 AMONG THE BEST
20. All things considered, this course was:
UNSATISFACTORY 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 SATISFACTORY

ATTACHMENT C

Agenda item #4: Proposed amendments to the Senate Constitution:

1. Non-senators shall be permitted to serve on Senate committees
2. Members of Senate standing committees shall be self-nominated and nominated by the Executive Committee and the Executive Committee shall recommend the membership slates for election by the full Senate.
3. The Senate's Executive Committee shall be authorized to select the chair of Senate committees.
4. A member of the Executive Committee shall be designated as liaison to each Senate Committee.

The four proposed amendments from the Executive Committee involve deleting the text within the brackets and adding the text that is underlined:

**Faculty Senate Constitution
Article VII: Committees**

The Faculty Senate shall create committees which are necessary to advance the activities of the Senate. Standing or ad hoc committees may be established, as needed. [All members of committees shall be members of the Senate.]
Members of standing committees shall annually be self-nominated and nominated by the Executive Committee, and the Executive Committee shall then recommend to the Senate membership slates for election by the full Senate [be elected or re-elected annually through open nominations from the floor at the September meeting of the Senate].
The Executive Committee shall designate the Chairperson of each committee. Each committee shall elect its own [Chairperson,] Assistant Chairperson and Recording Secretary, as it deems necessary. A member of the Executive Committee shall serve as liaison to each committee.

A committee may act upon items referred to it by the Senate as a whole, by the Executive Committee or by any member of the faculty. All committees shall report directly to the Senate as a whole, providing reports and offering motions at meetings of the Senate.

Positions on College or University committees designated for Faculty Senate shall be filled as follows: individuals shall be nominated by the Executive Committee and approved by a majority vote of the Senate.

Please Note:

**Faculty Senate Constitution
Article XI: Amendments**

This constitution can be amended through a motion made and passed by a vote of at least two-thirds of members present and voting at two consecutive regular meetings of the Senate.

ATTACHMENT D

KINGSBOROUGH COMMUNITY COLLEGE
of The City University of New York

Department of English

ENG 12

Spring 1997

The Insufficiency of Honesty

Reading selection for Departmental Writing Examination. Students should be given this reading passage in advance and are encouraged to bring it with them to the examination.

1. A couple of years ago I began a university commencement address by telling the audience that I was going to talk about integrity. The crowd broke into applause. Applause! Just because they had heard the word "integrity"; that's how starved for it they were. They had no idea how I was using the word, or what I was going to say about integrity, or, indeed, whether I was for it or against it. But they knew they liked the idea of talking about it.
2. Very well, let us consider this word "integrity." Integrity is like the weather: everybody talks about it but nobody knows what to do about it. Integrity is that stuff that we always want more of. Some say that we need to return to the good old days when we had a lot more of it. Others say that we as a nation have never really had enough of it. Hardly anybody stops to explain exactly what we mean by it, or how we know it is a good thing, or why everybody needs to have the same amount of it. Indeed, the only trouble with integrity is that everybody who uses the word seems to mean something slightly different.
3. For instance, when I refer to integrity, do I mean simply "honesty"? The answer is no; although honesty is a virtue of importance, it is a different virtue from integrity. Let us, for simplicity, think of honesty as not lying; and let us further accept Sissela Bok's definition of a lie: "any intentionally deceptive message which is stated." Plainly, one cannot have integrity without being honest (although, as we shall see, the matter gets complicated), but one can certainly be honest and yet have little integrity.
4. When I refer to integrity, I have something very specific in mind. Integrity, as I will use the term, requires three steps: discerning what is right and what is wrong; acting on what you have discerned, even at personal cost; and saying openly that you are acting on your understanding of right and wrong. The first criterion captures the idea that integrity requires a degree of moral reflectiveness. The second brings in the ideal of a person of integrity as steadfast, a quality that includes keeping one's commitments. The third reminds us that a person of integrity can be trusted.
5. The first point to understand about the difference between honesty and integrity is that a person may be entirely honest without ever engaging in the hard work of discernment that integrity requires; she may tell us quite truthfully what she believes without ever taking the time to figure out whether what she believes is good and right and true. The problem may be as simple as someone's foolishly saying something that hurts a friend's feelings; a few moments of thought would have revealed the likelihood of the hurt and the lack of necessity for the comment. Or the problem may be more complex, as when a man who was raised from birth in a society that preaches racism states his belief in one race's inferiority as a fact, without ever really considering that perhaps this deeply held view is wrong. Certainly the racist is being honest—he is telling us what he actually thinks—but his honesty does not add up to integrity.

TELLING EVERYTHING YOU KNOW

6. A wonderful epigram sometimes attributed to the filmmaker Sam Goldwyn goes like this: "The most

important thing in acting is honesty; once you learn to fake that, you're in." The point is that honesty can be something one *seems* to have. Without integrity, what passes for honesty often is nothing of the kind; it is fake honesty--or it is honest but irrelevant and perhaps even immoral.

7. Consider an example. A man who has been married for fifty years confesses to his wife on his deathbed that he was unfaithful thirty-five years earlier. The dishonesty was killing his spirit, he says. Now he has cleared his conscience and is able to die in peace.

8. The husband has been honest--sort of. He has certainly unburdened himself. And he has probably made his wife (soon to be his widow) quite miserable in the process, because even if she forgives him, she will not be able to remember him with quite the vivid image of love and loyalty that she had hoped for. Arranging his own emotional affairs to ease his transition to death, he has shifted to his wife the burden of confusion and pain, perhaps for the rest of her life. Moreover, he has attempted this at *the one time* in his life when it carries no risk: acting in accordance with what you think is right and risking no loss in the process is a rather thin and unadmirable form of honesty.

9. Besides, even though the husband has been honest in a sense, he has *now* twice been unfaithful to his wife: once thirty-five years ago, when he had his affair, and again when, nearing death, he decided that his *own* peace of mind was more important than hers. In trying to be honest he has violated his marriage vow by acting toward his wife not with love but with naked and perhaps even cruel self-interest.

10. As my mother used to say, you don't have to tell people everything you know. Lying and nondisclosure, as the law often recognizes, are not the same thing. Sometimes it is actually illegal to tell what you know, as, for example, in the disclosure of certain financial information by market insiders. Or it may be unethical, as when a lawyer reveals a confidence entrusted to her by a client. It may be simple bad manners, as in the case of a gratuitous comment to a colleague on his or her attire. And it may be subject to religious punishment, as when a Roman Catholic priest breaks the seal of the confessional--an offense that carries automatic excommunication.

11. In all the cases just mentioned, the problem with telling everything you know is that somebody else is harmed. Harm may not be the intention, but is certainly the effect. Honesty is most laudable when we risk harm to ourselves; it becomes a good deal less so if we instead risk harm to others when there is no gain to anyone other than ourselves. Integrity may counsel keeping our secrets in order to spare the feelings of others. Sometimes, as in the example of the wayward husband, the reason we want to tell what we know, is precisely to shift our pain onto somebody else--a course of action dictated less by integrity than by self-interest. Fortunately, integrity and self-interest often coincide, as when a politician of integrity is rewarded with our votes. But often they do not, and it is at those moments that our integrity is truly tested.

ERROR

12. Another reason that honesty alone is no substitute for integrity is that if forthrightness is not preceded by discernment, it may result in the expression of an incorrect moral judgment. In other words, I may be honest about what I believe, but if I have never tested my beliefs, I may be wrong. And here I mean "wrong" in a particular sense: the proposition in question is wrong if I would change my mind about it after hard moral reflection.

13. Consider this example. Having been taught all his life that women are not as smart as men, a manager gives the women on his staff less-challenging assignments than he gives the men. He does this, he believes, for their own benefit: he does not want them to fail, and he believes that they will if he gives them tougher assignments. Moreover, when one of the women on his staff does poor work, he does not berate her

as harshly as he would a man, because he expects nothing more. And he claims to be acting with integrity because he is acting according to his own deepest beliefs.

14. The manager fails the most basic test of integrity. The question is not whether his actions are consistent with what he most deeply believes but whether he has done the hard work of discerning whether what he most deeply believes is right. The manager has not taken this harder step.

15. Moreover, even within the universe that the manager has constructed for himself, he is not acting with integrity. Although he is obviously wrong to think that the women on his staff are not as good as the men, even were he right, that would not justify applying different standards to their work. By so doing he betrays both his obligation to the institution that employs him and his duty as a manager to evaluate his employees.

16. The problem that the manager faces is an enormous one in our practical politics, where having the dialogue that makes a democracy work can seem impossible because of our tendency to cling to our views even when we have not examined them. As Jean Bethke Elshtain has said, borrowing from John Courtney Murray, our politics are so fractured and contentious that we often cannot reach *disagreement*. Our refusal to look closely at our own most cherished principles is surely a large part of the reason. Socrates thought the unexamined life not worth living. But the unhappy truth is that few of us actually have the time for constant reflection on our views--on public or private morality. Examine them we must, however, or we will never know whether we might be wrong.

17. None of this should be taken to mean that integrity as I have described it presupposes a single correct truth. If, for example, your integrity-guided search tells you that affirmative action is wrong, and my integrity-guided search tells me that affirmative action is right, we need not conclude that one of us lacks integrity. As it happens, I believe--both as a Christian and as a secular citizen who struggles toward moral understanding--that we *can* find true and sound answers to our moral questions. But I do not pretend to have found very many of them, nor is an exposition of them my purpose here.

18. It is the case not that there aren't any right answers but that, given human fallibility, we need to be careful in assuming that we have found them. However, today's political talk about how it is wrong for the government to impose one person's morality on somebody else is just mindless chatter. Every law imposes one person's morality on somebody else, because law has only two functions: to tell people to do what they would rather not or to forbid them to do what they would.

19. And if the surveys can be believed, there is far more moral agreement in America than we sometimes allow ourselves to think. One of the reasons that character education for young people makes so much sense to so many people is precisely that there seems to be a core set of moral understandings--we might call them the American Core--that most of us accept. Some of the virtues in this American Core are, one hopes, relatively noncontroversial. About 500 American communities have signed on to Michael Josephson's program to emphasize the "six pillars" of good character: trustworthiness, respect, responsibility, caring, fairness, and citizenship. These virtues might lead to a similarly noncontroversial set of political values: having an honest regard for ourselves and others, protecting freedom of thought and religious belief, and refusing to steal or murder.

HONESTY AND COMPETING RESPONSIBILITIES

20. A further problem with too great an exaltation of honesty is that it may allow us to escape responsibilities that morality bids us bear. If honesty is substituted for integrity, one might think that if I say I am not planning to fulfill a duty, I need not fulfill it. But it would be a peculiar morality indeed that

granted us the right to avoid our moral responsibilities simply by stating our intention to ignore them. Integrity does not permit such an easy escape.

21. Consider an example. Before engaging in sex with a woman, her lover tells her that if she gets pregnant, it is her problem, not his. She says that she understands. In due course she does wind up pregnant. If we believe, as I hope we do, that the man would ordinarily have a moral responsibility toward both the child he will have helped to bring into the world and the child's mother, then his honest statement of what he intends does not spare him that responsibility.

22. This vision of responsibility assumes that not all moral obligations stem from consent or from a stated intention. The linking of obligations to promises is a rather modern and perhaps uniquely Western way of looking at life, and perhaps a luxury that the well-to-do can afford. As Fred and Shulamit Korn (a philosopher and an anthropologist) have pointed out, "If one looks at ethnographic accounts of other societies, one finds that, while obligations everywhere play a crucial role in social life, promising is not preeminent among the sources of obligation and is not even mentioned by most anthropologists." The Korns have made a study of Tonga, where promises are virtually unknown but the social order is remarkably stable. If life without any promises seems extreme, we Americans sometimes go too far the other way, parsing not only our contracts but even our marriage vows in order to discover the absolute minimum obligation that we have to others as a result of our promises.

23. That some societies in the world have worked out evidently functional structures of obligation without the needs for promise or consent does not tell us what we should do. But it serves as a reminder of the basic proposition that our existence in civil society creates a set of mutual responsibilities that philosophers used to capture in the fiction of the social contract. Nowadays, here in America, people seem to spend their time thinking of even cleverer ways to avoid their obligations, instead of doing what integrity commands and fulfilling them. And all too often honesty is their excuse.

STEPHEN L. CARTER

Law professor and writer Stephen L. Carter (b.1954) is a critic of contemporary cultural politics. His first book, Reflections of an Affirmative Action Baby (1992), criticizes affirmative action policies that reinforce racial stereotypes rather than break down structures of discrimination. Carter's critique emerges from his own experience as an African American student at Stanford University and at Yale University Law School. After graduating from Yale, he served as a law clerk for Supreme Court justice, Thurgood Marshall and eventually joined the faculty at Yale as professor of law. Carter has published widely on legal and social topics, including his books The Culture of Disbelief: How American Law and Politics Trivialize Religious Devotion (1993) and The Confirmation Mess: Cleaning up the Federal Appointments Process (1994). "The Insufficiency of Honesty" appears in his most recent book, Integrity (1996).

KINGSBOROUGH COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Of the City University of New York
Department of English

Final Examination
ENG 12

Spring 1997
Page 1 of 2

The questions below refer to the essay "The Insufficiency of Honesty." Copies were distributed in advance by the instructor. Students are urged to use their own marked-up copies. Extra copies are available in the English Department (C309) for students who have not brought their own.

Answer all parts in your exam booklet.

Part I

30 points. Answer **all** questions in Part I

1. What is the connection between *the* title of this essay, "The Insufficiency of Honesty" and the last two sentences of the essay? (10 points)
2. Summarize the example Carter discusses in paragraphs 7-9 and tell what significance it has to his discussion of integrity. Be sure to use your own words as much as possible. (10 points)
3. Paraphrase paragraph 20. (10 points)

Part II

20 points. Choose **two** of the following questions. Answer in **short** paragraphs. using your own words as much as possible.

1. In terms of this essay, how are *honesty* and *integrity* related? In what important ways are honesty and integrity different? (10 points)
2. Although it is essential to Carter's point that he define the words honesty and integrity, he chose not to define the words according to their common dictionary meaning. Why do you think he chose not to? How does he define them? (10 points)
3. Explain briefly and in your own words why the manager described in paragraphs 13-15 is, in Carter's view, failing to act with integrity. (10 points)
4. What point is Carter making with the example he offers in paragraph 21? (10 points)

Examination continues on the back of this page

Part III--Essay

50 points. **Choose one** of the topics below, **Write a** logically organized, well-developed, **and carefully proofread** essay on the topic. In your **essay**, **refer to Carter's essay** and quote from it **at least once**. Write your essay in your **examination booklet**.

1. Having read Carter's essay, consider this situation:

Mr. and Mrs. X have been married for many years when Mrs. X falls ill. The doctors tell Mr. X that the illness cannot be treated, and Mrs. X is not expected to live more than a month or two. Mr. X must now decide whether or not to tell his wife.

Write an essay in which you discuss, in terms of the steps Stephen L. Carter says integrity requires, how Mr. X should proceed. Quote from Carter's essay at least once and refer to it in your essay.

2. Many Americans fear that a moral disintegration is taking place in American life, Stephen L. Carter acknowledges this concern in his essay. At the beginning he states that Americans feel a need for integrity. Later, in paragraph 19, he writes that "there is far more moral agreement in America than we sometimes allow ourselves to think." He suggests that Americans might adopt a "noncontroversial set of political values; having an honest regard for ourselves and others, protecting freedom of thought and religious belief, and refusing to steal or murder."

Do you believe that this is, in fact, "a noncontroversial set of political values"? Is it possible for large numbers of Americans to commit themselves to these values? What effect would such a commitment have on American life? Write an essay in which you consider the need for integrity that Carter describes and evaluate the response he offers in paragraph 19. (Remember to quote from the article at least once and refer to it in your essay).

3. Perhaps Carter's discussion brings to mind another issue or situation involving a question of integrity that you are familiar with from your experience or your reading. Write an essay in which you describe the issue or situation and analyze it from the perspective that Carter has presented. Note that Carter's terms will ordinarily lead to an identification of principles that must be examined, but will not necessarily result in a resolution of a conflict or issue. Quote from "The Insufficiency of Honesty" at least once and refer to it in your essay.
4. Americans have often been told that "Honesty is the best policy." How well has Carter made his case that honesty is "insufficient"? Write an essay in which you evaluate his argument and the support that he offers for it. Quote from "The Insufficiency of Honesty" at least once and refer to it in your essay.