

Faculty Senate Minutes #173

John Jay College of Criminal Justice

September 23, 1998

3:15 PM

Room 630 T

Present (27): C. Jama Adams, David Brotherton, Anthony Carpi, James Cauthen, Effie Papatzikou Cochran, Glenn Corbett, Edward Davenport, Nancy Egan, P.J. Gibson, Edward Green, Lou Guinta, Karen Kaplowitz, Jane Katz, Kwando Kinshasa, Stuart Kirschner, Sandra Leftoff, Tom Litwack, James Malone, Mylithi Mantharam, Ellen Marson, Jill Norgren, Dagoberto Orrantia, Daniel Pinello, Lydia Segal, Carmen Solis, Martin Wallenstein, Bessie Wright

Absent (9): Dorothy Bracey, Enrique Chavez-Arviso, Holly Clarke, Janice Dunham, Amy Green, Gavin Lewis, Patricia Licklider, Patrick O'Hara, Jacqueline Polanco

Invited Guest: Provost Basil Wilson

AGENDA

1. Announcements from the chair
2. Adoption of Minutes #172 of the September 10 meeting
3. Report on letter written to Chancellor Kimmich at the authorization of the Senate on September 10
4. Discussion of the Committee on Student Evaluation of the Faculty's two proposed versions of a new instrument
5. Invited Guest: Provost Basil Wilson

1. Announcements from the chair [Attachment A]

President Kaplowitz announced that the previous night a panel of the Appeals Court ruled that CUNY must continue to refrain from all efforts to implement the May 26 resolution of the Board of Trustees which calls for a phasing out of remediation in baccalaureate programs. This means that no college can end remediation this September, except Baruch, which had its plans to do so in place before the May 26 resolution.

2. Adoption of Minutes #172 of the September 10 meeting

By a motion duly made and seconded, Minutes #172 of the September 10 meeting were adopted.

3. Report on letter written to Chancellor Kimmich on behalf of the Faculty Senate

President Kaplowitz reported that because of developments at 80th Street, she and Senator Litwack agreed that this is not the right time to write to 80th Street, as they had been authorized to do so at the previous Senate meeting, about John Jay's need for additional funding, in addition to the \$1.5 million that John Jay received during the summer. Instead, she has written to Chancellor Kimmich thanking him for the \$1.5 million addition to John Jay's base budget, a letter which the Senate had also authorized. She and Senator Litwack will write a letter on the need for additional funding later in the CUNY budget process.

The letter to Chancellor Christoph M. Kimmich on behalf of the Senate was dated September 15, 1998:

Dear Chancellor Kimmich,

On behalf of and at the direction of John Jay's Faculty Senate, which has just met for the first time this semester, I am writing to thank you for adding \$1.5 million to John Jay's allocation, and to especially thank you for allocating the funds in the form of an addition to our College's base budget next year.

I and my colleagues on the Faculty Senate speak for all John Jay's faculty in expressing appreciation for your recognition of and responsiveness to John Jay's needs.

Please also convey our appreciation to the members of your administration who supported you in this action.

We all wish you a wonderful and fulfilling academic year and recall with great fondness and respect your meeting with John Jay's Faculty Senate last May.

Yours sincerely,

Karen Kaplowitz  
President, Faculty Senate

4. Discussion of the Committee on Student Evaluation of the Faculty's two proposed versions for a new evaluation instrument [Attachment B]

Vice President Pinello, as a member, reported on the Committee on Student Evaluation of the Faculty's two proposed versions of a new evaluation instrument. He said the most overriding consideration was that the instrument be universal, that is that the questions apply meaningfully to all types of courses. Another major shift is the asking of demographic data which occurs on both proposed forms. Senator P.J. Gibson, who is also on this Committee, concurred.

Senator Norgren asked what happens to the reliability of the

instrument when redundancy is pared down as VP Pinello reported it is, partly in response to faculty reports of time constraints in class for students to fill out the form, and partly to fit the form on one side of one sheet to save costs. Senator Norgren added that these evaluations have a sizeable role in the evaluation of our colleagues, and so, she asked, how can we pare down the form on the ground that many faculty have decided to go their own way in presenting the forms. She said it seems to be a potentially grievable issue.

Senator Gibson said very little of the paring down was done because of faculty refusing to administer the instrument correctly but that questions were deleted because of redundancy. She said that in any case she would be glad to be informed about any questions which faculty feel should not have been deleted.

Senator Tom Litwack said he wants to thank the Committee for providing two forms which are good starting points. He said we should conduct a pilot study of both forms this fall to test the reliability of each. He said it would not be difficult to do and would be much better than guessing. Senator Kwando Kinshasa spoke of the importance of the timing of the administration of the evaluation.

Senator Martin Wallenstein said the wording of the scale of Version #2 is problematic. Senator Jama Adams reported the same experience as Senator Litwack had earlier talked about: students whip through the form with very little reflection and, when asked, students say the evaluation makes no difference. Senator Leftoff said she is not clear as to the actual way the form is used and she would like an explicit statement about this.

President Kaplowitz said that there are several ways the evaluation instrument is used and several ways it can be used: the results of the evaluation are used in personnel decisions about faculty reappointments, tenure, and promotion: this is true on both the departmental and college level: the results are used in the departmental determination of whether adjunct faculty are to be reappointed; the results provide feedback to the instructor as to students' perception of the instructor and of the course: the instrument itself is a statement to students that their opinions are valued by the faculty: and the instrument is a statement to the faculty as to what we, as a College, and what we, as a faculty, expect of ourselves and of our colleagues on the faculty: it is a statement as to what we consider to be important values and behavior by the faculty of John Jay.

She said the Senate or the Provost could send a letter to faculty at the beginning of each semester, with a copy of the instrument, explaining how the evaluation will be used and that these are the teaching issues important to the College. Such a letter should also be given to every newly hired full-time and adjunct faculty member.

Senator Jane Katz proposed that the scale of numbers be replaced with an ABCDF scale so that students feel they are grading the faculty. Senator Edward Green said that many students believe that the forms are not used to remove bad teachers and they do not see the point of the forms. President Kaplowitz agreed, saying that her students, not understanding tenure, often say that if the forms mattered then Professor X would not still be teaching here. Vice President Pinello said that many questions being raised are beyond the jurisdiction of the Committee and he

suggested raising these questions when the Provost arrives later during today's meeting.

Senator Lou Guinta said that in his experience what makes a good teacher includes enthusiasm for the subject and knowledge of the subject and he suggested that these items be included in the instrument. Senator Gibson said that the problem of the semantics of measuring "**enthusiasm**" had led to endless discussion by the Committee. Senator Lydia Segal asked about the question which measures the professor's interest in the student's success. She suggested substituting the word "learning" for "**success**," because faculty can not be interested in all students getting A's which is how students often interpret "**success**." VP Pinello said that these issues were all discussed thoroughly by the Committee.

Senator Kinshasa asked whether there should not be a question about whether the instructor had distributed a syllabus at the beginning of the semester. Senators Gibson and Pinello said this question ran into the criterion of universal applicability and also a question calling for evaluating the syllabus was considered unfair because instructors are not always in charge of their own syllabi, especially those who teach courses for which the department decides the text and provides the syllabus.

The discussion was suspended upon the arrival of the Provost. [See page 5 for the text of a motion made and approved later in the meeting about the process of developing a new evaluation instrument.]

##### 5. Invited Guest: Provost Basil Wilson

Provost Basil Wilson said it is important to him that the evaluation instrument be decided on as early as possible so that the forms could be printed and prepared in time for use in the Spring 1999 semester.

Senator Litwack said that he is speaking as a tenured full professor who is as disinterested as possible in judging this form and it is his opinion that the Senate is not yet ready to vote its recommendation about the instrument. He said important issues had not yet been resolved and he suggested that the Faculty Senate needs more time to discuss these issues.

Provost Wilson said that he understands the need for discussion but a time comes when we need to decide and move on and it is important to have a form ready for use in the Spring.

VP Pinello said that the Committee on Student Evaluation of the Faculty has the authority to propose an instrument to the College Council. He said that he and Senator Gibson are only a minority of the 6-member committee and so that if an additional Faculty Senate meeting is devoted to this topic he advises that there be participation by more, and if possible by all, members of the Committee on Student Evaluation of Faculty.

Provost Wilson said VP Pinello is making an important point that this has to be a proposal that the Committee can recommend but it also has to be a proposal that the College Council will pass. It was noted that half the members of the College Council are faculty, all of whom are on the Senate, and so the Senate's views are extremely important not only because the Senate is the

official voice of the faculty but because of the role of 28 Senators who, as voting members of the College Council, will be voting on the proposed evaluation that is ultimately submitted to the College Council by the Committee on Student Evaluation of the Faculty.

At some point, Provost Wilson said, we have to come to closure. Senator C. Jama Adams said he is having trouble with the idea that in the interest of expeditiously getting a new form we would be willing to put in place a flawed form that would seriously affect the careers of faculty for a long time.

Provost Wilson said we are not going to get a perfect instrument and that we have to accept the fact that we are going to have to proceed with an improved form, at best, and he said administrators have to make decisions like this all the time.

Senator Litwack proposed that at the next Senate meeting members come prepared with criticisms of any of the items on the forms so that the Senate can vote each up or down. It was noted that the Committee's next meeting will most likely be after the Senate's next meeting.

Senator P.J. Gibson asked the Provost what deadline he has in mind and VP Pinello asked what is the absolute deadline. Provost Wilson said that if the form is approved by the College Council by the end of this semester he would be satisfied because there would then be time to print and prepare the forms. The Senate agreed on the reasonableness of this deadline and agreed that this deadline permits further discussion by the Senate.

Senator Litwack moved that the members of the Committee on Student Evaluation of the Faculty be invited to the next meeting of the Senate, October 8, 1998; that the Committee be requested to postpone its final recommendations for a new instrument until after the Senate's October 8 meeting; that Senators who wish to do so should submit in writing recommendations for the Senate's consideration at its October 8 meeting involving proposed additions, deletions, and revisions in the language of the Committee's proposed instrument and also submit in writing proposed questions which students can answer with a yes or no and which would not be calculated in the numerical score and that any such suggestions be submitted to the President of the Senate by Friday, October 2, and that each of the Committee's evaluation questions and each recommended change by members of the Senate be voted up or down at the Senate's October 8 meeting.

The motion was approved by unanimous vote. President Kaplowitz was asked to convey this action to the members of the Committee on Student Evaluation of the Faculty, with an invitation to come to the next Senate meeting, and to also inform those Senators not present at this part of the meeting.

Senator Kinshasa asked the Provost by what means it is determined that some course sections are cancelled with one number of students and another section is cancelled at another level of enrollment. Provost Wilson mentioned some of the considerations taken into consideration and said a written agreement states that a course have 14 students and if it does not the section runs the risk of being closed. Senator Kinshasa asked what impact the SIMS system has had on the filling of sections and the Provost answered that the impact was mainly with relation to the enforcement of prerequisites, which he said was done effectively for the first

time this year, and that this influenced the number of students in sections.

Senator Effie Cochran asked what the Provost is doing to ensure that all faculty are provided with computers. The Provost said that soon all faculty will have a desktop computer. Senator Kinshasa asked when printers will be provided to faculty. The Provost said that the photocopiers that we now lease can also be used to print documents and the College intends to purchase attachments for the copiers which will permit faculty to print their documents by using the copiers. The problem of copiers that are invariably out of order was spoken about.

President Kaplowitz asked the Provost whether he has any questions for the Senate members and Provost Wilson asked for an assessment of the prerequisite checking and blocking system. VP Pinello said it had worked very well for him and for those he has spoken with, and Senator Cochran said it had worked at almost a 100% level for the English Department.

The Provost spoke of his concern about increasing levels of cheating by students. President Kaplowitz said that a Better Teaching Seminar on this topic could be conducted and Provost Wilson praised the idea.

Senator Litwack asked about the preprogramming of freshmen and Provost Wilson said this has been extended to second-semester freshmen. Senator Litwack noted that the high dropout rate seems to be in students' third semester and Provost Wilson agreed, adding that is why the funds given to the Counseling Department have been targeted for this population.

Senator Cochran praised John Jay's handsome ad in the NY Times Magazine and said she was very pleased to see it. Provost Wilson spoke of this as the beginning of the College's efforts.

Provost Wilson was thanked for accepting the Senate's invitation and he thanked the Senate for inviting him.

By a motion duly made and seconded, the meeting was adjourned at 4:50 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Edward Davenport

Recording Secretary

## Announcements from the Chair

**Honorary Degree Committee election results announced**

The four new members of the Committee on Honorary Degrees, elected by the full-time faculty who cast their secret ballots at the end of May, are: Professors William Coleman (English), Peter DeForest (Forensic Science), Jannette Domingo (African-American Studies), and John Kleinig (Law, Police Science, and CJ Adm).

They join the three continuing members: Professors Lotte Feinberg (Public Management), Betsy Hegeman (Anthropology), and Antony Simpson (Library).

The Committee will elect a chair from among its members and will be calling for nominations for honorary degree recipients for the June commencement. [Prof. Antony Simpson was elected chair.]

**October 14 Better Teaching Seminar on IRB**

On Wednesday, October 14, at 3:15 in Room 630 T, a Better Teaching Seminar will be presented, sponsored by the Faculty Senate, on "Protocols Required of All Faculty and Students Whose Research Involves Human Subjects." Both NYS and Federal law require all who conduct research that involves human subjects to receive approval before beginning their research. Both John Jay's and CUNY's Institutional Review Boards (IRB) must review and grant approval for all research -- funded or not, conducted by both faculty and students (undergraduate and graduate) -- involving human subjects. This Seminar will explore the ethical and procedural protocols designed to protect human subjects from harm and to protect researchers, the College, and the University from the possible loss of research funding and other negative consequences.

The panelists include members of JJ's Institutional Review Board (IRB) and faculty whose research has required IRB approval:

- \* **Martin Wallenstein (Speech & Theater)**, Chair of John Jay's IRB Committee, who will facilitate the discussion.
- \* **Xwando Kinshasa (African-American Studies)**, an IRB member
- \* **Janice Bockmeyer (Government)**
- \* **Dorothy Bracey (Anthropology)**
- \* **Maki Haberfeld (Law, Police Science & CJ Adm)**
- \* **Mangai Natarajan (Sociology)**
- \* **Barry Spunt (Sociology)**

Also present will be resource experts: **James Levine**, Dean of Graduate Studies; **Lawrence Kobilinsky**, Associate Provost; **Jacob Marini**, Director of Sponsored Programs; **Carol Btanger**, IRB staff; **Nancy Jacobs**, director of the Criminal Justice Research Center.

Among the topics to be discussed are:

- \* Ethical issues in conducting research on human subjects
- Protecting the researcher and the College and University
- Protecting confidentiality
- \* Obtaining informed consent
- \* Deciding what risks are acceptable
- \* Recognizing special requirements for protected populations such as inmates, drug users, and psychiatric patients
- What to include in requests for IRB approval
- \* Protocol for collecting information
- \* Assessment of risk
- \* Obtaining approval for student research
- \* Master's and Doctoral research
- Undergraduate course assignments and IRB requirements

**The College will rent caps and gowns for faculty for convocation**

At the recommendation of the Senate, the College will pay for the rental costs of caps and gowns for faculty who attend the convocation at 2 PM on October 30 in the JJ Theater at which former Senator George Mitchell will receive an honorary degree.

## ATTACHMENT B

The following are the two proposed revised instruments developed by the Committee on Student Evaluation of the Faculty:

### Proposed Version #1

Rating Scale: 1 = Poor, 2 = Satisfactory 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good  
5 = Excellent 6 = NA

1. The instructor's presentation of the course was:
2. The instructor's method of determining grades was:
3. The instructor's clarification of difficult material was:
4. The instructor's interest in student success was:
5. The instructor's willingness to allow the expression of different points of view was:
6. The instructor's organization of the class lessons was:
7. Opportunity to demonstrate creative thinking was:
8. The instructor's method of dealing with student comments and questions was:
9. The instructor's motivation of my interest in the subject matter was:
10. Overall, the instructor's teaching in this course was:

### Demographics:

Required course? Yes No Not Sure

Expected grade in the course? A B C D F Not Sure

Total college credits completed at John Jay or elsewhere?  
0-30 31-60 61-90 91-120+ Graduate Student

Student Status? Part-Time and Not Working Part-Time  
and Working FT and Not Working FT and Working

Credits taken this semester? 1-4 5-8 9-11 12-14  
15-17 18 or More

### Proposed Version #2

Rating Scale: 1 = Never, 2 = Rarely, 3 = Sometimes, 4 = Often,  
5 = Always, 6 = Not Applicable

1. Class lessons are well organized.
2. The instructor presents course material clearly.
3. The instructor effectively deals with comments and questions raised in class.
4. When appropriate, the instructor allows the expression of different points of view in class.
5. The instructor treats students with courtesy & respect.
6. The instructor is interested in students' success.
7. The instructor motivated my interest in the subject matter.
8. The instructor encourages students to think and reason for themselves.
9. The instructor's grading is fair.
10. Overall, the instructor teaches effectively.

Demographics: Same as in Proposed Version #1