



## JOHN JAY COLLEGE OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE

*The City University of New York*  
 445 West 59th Street, New York, N.Y. 10019  
 212 237-8000 /8724

December 1998

Dear Colleagues,

On November 23, the CUNY Board of Trustees approved a resolution creating a CUNY-wide Proficiency Examination to be used to determine student readiness to engage in upper-division study at CUNY.

The resolution requires that beginning Fall 1999, all new first-time freshmen admitted to a degree program will be required to pass this new proficiency exam in order to advance beyond 60 credits and also in order to graduate from any associate degree at any of the constituent colleges.

The resolution also requires that beginning Fall 2000, all students seeking to transfer into any upper-division baccalaureate degree program in any of the constituent colleges from any CUNY college and from any non-CUNY college must also pass this new proficiency test.

The enclosed Faculty Senate Minutes #175 report the Senate's discussion about the pilot of the CUNY Proficiency Exam conducted last semester throughout CUNY and also about a second pilot that will take place next semester. Attachments D, E, and F comprise sample pages of the essays given to students to read in advance of the pilot test, the essay topic the students were required to write about during the two-hour test -- which they saw for the first time when they took the exam, and the scoring sheet developed by the faculty committee that designed the pilot and that was used by the faculty trained to score the essay exams.

Cordially,

Karen Kaplowitz  
 President, Faculty Senate

Faculty Senate Minutes #175

John Jay College of Criminal Justice

October 21, 1998

3:20 PM

Room 630 T

Present (25): C. Jama Adams, Dorothy Bracey, James Cauthen, Effie Papatzikou Cochran, Glenn Corbett, Edward Davenport, Janice Dunham, Nancy Egan, P.J. Gibson, Edward Green, Lou Guinta, Karen Kaplowitz, Jane Katz, Kwando Kinshasa, Stuart Kirschner, Patricia Licklider, Tom Litwack, James Malone, Patrick O'Hara, Dagoberto Orrantia, Daniel Pinello, Lydia Segal, Carmen Solis, Martin Wallenstein, Bessie Wright

Absent (11): David Brotherton, Anthony Carpi, Enrique Chavez-Arviso, Holly Clarke, Amy Green, Sandra Leftoff, Gavin Lewis, Mylithi Mantharam, Ellen Marson, Jill Norgren, Jacqueline Polanco

AGENDA

1. Announcements from the chair
2. Adoption of Minutes #174 of the October 8 meeting
3. Student Evaluation of the Faculty: proposed revisions
4. Proposal: That the Faculty Senate sponsor a "Course Fair"
5. Report on the proposed CUNY Proficiency Exam: Senator Patricia Licklider

1. Announcements from the chair [Attachment A & B]

President Karen Kaplowitz circulated preliminary data about the Fall 1998 fall freshmen and overall student enrollment at the CUNY units [Attachment B]. The startling decline in freshmen enrollment at almost of the colleges was noted [Attachment B - p. 2]. John Jay's overall headcount enrollment, given our adherence to the 75%/25% baccalaureate/associate degree policy, was favorably noted. Asked whether the enrollment figures might reflect the number of students who passed all three placement tests, the answer was no: only Baruch has implemented that requirement because only Baruch adopted such a policy prior to the Board's May 26 meeting and the subsequent open meetings lawsuit which thus far prohibits implementation of the Board policy. Senator Patricia Licklider pointed out that since the previous year, Queens College has raised its admissions requirement to a high school average of 85 (of academic courses only) and this might explain Queens' decline.

President Kaplowitz also circulated a letter, dated September 22, 1998, from Chair Anne Paolucci of the Board of Trustees to Presidents Sessoms (Queens) and Schmeller (QCC), in response to their joint preliminary proposal to merge their two colleges into a

University at Queens. The letter (copies of which are available from the Senate Office) comprises a list of very critical and hard-hitting questions, followed by her own responses or commentaries about each question.

President Kaplowitz congratulated Senator Lou Guinta on being one of three honorees -- and the one John Jay honoree -- at the College's second annual Italian-American Breakfast on October 23. [The Senate enthusiastically applauded Senator Lou Guinta.]

The University Faculty Senate Fall Conference is November 20 and will feature, among other, NYS Comptroller Carl McCall, who just issued a major report on public higher education in NYS. Other participants are NYS Assemblyman Ed Sullivan, Chair, Assembly Higher Education Committee, and Professor Vincent Acevedo, chair of the SUNY University Senate. A panel of CUNY faculty will respond.

The Better Teaching Seminar on November 19 is on strategies to create and maintain a classroom environment conducive to teaching and learning and what to do if those strategies don't work. The panelists are Professors P.J. Gibson, James Malone, Karen Kaplowitz, Dean Hector Ortiz, and Security Director Brian Murphy.

2. Adoption of Minutes #174 of the October 8 meeting

By a motion made and carried, Minutes #174 of the October 8 meeting were adopted.

3. Student Evaluation of the Faculty instrument [Attachment C]

Because of the press of Senate business, the Faculty Senate's Executive Committee communicated previously to the Senate its recommendation that no further discussion on this item take place at today's Senate meeting and that Senate members record on the tally forms [see Attachment C] their opinion of each item, by checking yes or no, prior to the conclusion of today's meeting. The tally sheets will be tabulated by the Senate's Executive Committee and will be forwarded as a report from the Senate to the Committee on Student Evaluation of the Faculty [Attachment C].

The Committee on Student Evaluation of the Faculty is meeting on October 27 to decide on the final version of its proposed instrument and will submit that instrument for adoption by the College Council at its November 24 meeting. The Committee's decision to bring this forward in November will leave time for revisions and further Council actions, if necessary, at the December College Council meeting. The Senate supported the Executive Committee's recommendation that there be no further discussion at this time, except that further information, if available, be provided to the Senate.

President Kaplowitz said that there is further information: Professor Gwen Gerber, an expert on evaluation instruments, having read the Senate's minutes, communicated to her earlier that day by phonemail her opinion that evaluation instruments should have as many questions as possible because the more questions contained in an evaluation instrument the more reliable the instrument, with 10 questions being far too few; also, that evaluation instruments should include multiple questions about topics, especially topics

of significance; and that a 7-point scale is more reliable than a scale with fewer distinctions because a 7-point scale provides more "discrimination" between those who are being evaluated.

[Professor Gwen Gerber arrived at the Senate meeting at this time and gave President Kaplowitz this same information in writing, which was read to the Senate.]

Also, in light of the discussion at the October 8 Senate meeting about the use of student evaluations in the personnel process, President Kaplowitz read two statements of the CUNY Board of Trustees, saying these are the Board's only official statements, as far as she has been able to ascertain, about the role and purpose of the student evaluation of the faculty:

"After September 1972, no recommendations for reappointment, tenure or promotion should be granted without evidence given to the Board of systematic student evaluation, except in such cases where the Chancellor presents a cogent reason for further delay. (Board Minutes 1972, p. 43 and p. CC 30) (Previous reference, Board Minutes 1971, p. 236.)

"The Board reaffirmed in its policy statement on Academic Personnel Practice its commitment to the consideration of student evaluations in faculty personnel decisions involving reappointment, promotion and tenure, according to the provisions in the governance plan in effect in each college. (Board Minutes 1975, pp. 122-8)."

CUNY Manual of General Policy. p. 248

4. Proposal: That the Faculty Senate sponsor and organize a "Course Fair"

This proposal from the Executive Committee that the Senate sponsor and organize a "Course Fair" is in response to the extension of Spring telephone registration for all students (except freshmen who are block registered). The Course Fair is a response to not only telephone registration but to the praiseworthy implementation of prerequisite checking and blocking, which resulted this semester in lower course enrollments than expected and is also a response to the virtual elimination of arena registration, which had been an opportunity for faculty to answer students' questions and provide information about courses, including new courses and electives.

Because telephone registration for the Spring is to take place during this semester (rather than during intersession), the proposal is that the Course Fair be held in the North Hall lobby prior to telephone registration and that faculty who participate would do so on a voluntary basis. If there is a positive response by faculty, the Course Fair could be held each semester: if not, it need not be repeated. Senators Martin Wallenstein and Patrick O'Hara praised the proposal. Senator Kwando Kinshasa, noting that counselors were always present at arena registration, suggested that counselors be invited to participate. Senator Lou Guinta also praised the proposal and especially the suggestion that counselors be included. Senator O'Hara asked who would staff the tables. President Kaplowitz said a sign-up letter could be sent to all faculty, including counselors, inviting them to sign up if they wish to provide information about their courses or their department's courses. They could sign up for specific times on specific days.

Senator Kinshasa suggested that the Course Fair include information about independent study courses, electives, minors, and that it could also be an opportunity for faculty to sign "waiver of prerequisite" forms, if they wish, or to explain alternate courses if students do not have the necessary prerequisites. Senator P.J. Gibson enthusiastically praised the proposal, saying it would be especially valuable to departments that do not have a major and whose faculty would especially miss the opportunities that had been presented to them by arena registration.

Senator Jama Adams called the Course Fair an excellent idea but suggested that the Senate should also explore the larger issue of what kinds of courses students need and want. Noting the short time frame to organize this, Senator Adams urged that the event not be too complex or too big but instead be designed with the goal of making sure it gets off the ground this year. Senator O'Hara suggested that truth in advertising would require faculty to include information about courses or majors any new course links to.

The proposal to organize a Course Fair this semester passed by unanimous vote. Senators James Cauthen, Glenn Corbett, Amy Green, Karen Kaplowitz, and Pat O'Hara volunteered to plan the event.

[Because the planning group and the Senate's executive committee subsequently learned that telephone registration would begin on November 16, much earlier than had been reported, letters were sent to every department chair rather than to every faculty member, as had been originally proposed and planned.]

5. Report on the proposed CUNY Proficiency Exam: Senator Patricia Licklider [Attachment D, E & F]

Senator Patricia Licklider, a long-time member of the English Department who teaches future college writing teachers and who is an expert on the CUNY WAT (the freshman writing assessment test) and on writing assessment, in general, was asked to provide background about the proposed CUNY Proficiency Exam.

Senator Licklider circulated a copy of one of the sets of readings [Attachment D] and the rubric by which the students' essays were scored [Attachment E]. The essay topic, a set of questions, used in the pilot with that set of readings [Attachment F] was seen by students taking the exam only when they actually took the exam.

Senator Licklider explained that as many know, there was an attempt to put forward a rising junior proficiency test when Ann Reynolds was Chancellor. As soon as Dr. Reynolds left CUNY, the entire process was scuttled. The test that had been developed at that time was interdisciplinary and was extremely expensive, both to make and to score. As a result there was not much unhappiness when that test was scuttled. But this new Board of Trustees is very focused on standards and mandated that the faculty develop a new rising junior exam (an exam that students would have to pass to move beyond 60 credits, that is into their junior year). The faculty committee is chaired by Professor Bonne August, a member of the Kingsborough Community College faculty.

The pilot of this new test was given last spring for the purposes of testing the test and the pilot went very well. Several thousand students participated in the pilot and about 75% of the students did well enough to have passed the test, although a passing

score has not yet been set: the second pilot is for norming the test. ESL students did only slightly worse than non-ESL students.

The exam consists of two readings [see Attachment D for excerpts of the readings: the complete readings are available from the Faculty Senate Office]. These two readings were distributed to students in advance of the test, about a week in advance: the exact amount of time is still to be determined. The two readings have some tangential relationship, although they are not on the same topic. The set of two readings entailing 10 pages that Senator Lickliger distributed comprise "To Err is Human," by Lewis Thomas from his 1976 book The Medusa and the Snail, which is about the importance of error in scientific discovery, and excerpts from Howard Gardner's The Unschooled Mind -- "The Central Puzzles of Learning," and "The Difficulties Posed by School" -- which explore why students don't learn in school. Various combinations of the readings totalled 6 possible sets of different readings that students might receive in advance. The students receive the set of readings in advance. The essays are not freshman-level readings: they are high-level readings that require significant vocabulary skills and quite a bit of reading comprehension skills.

On the day of the exam, which is two-hours in length (there is some talk of the exam being three hours), the students receive questions, which they have never seen before [Attachment F]. The instructions tell the student to write an essay that contains four integrated parts, which demonstrate an ability to: "1. understand what you read by summarizing appropriate sections of the readings; 2. develop a coherent and organized analysis, point of view, or argument of some substance that does more than merely summarize the reading or recount personal experience; 3. incorporate, without plagiarizing, ideas from background reading using formal or informal references to identify sources; and, 4. write in clear prose with an appropriate level of correctness."

Students are given a sample essay question in advance with the set of readings: the sample essay question is about a different set of readings the student has not and will not see. For example:

"Write a unified, coherent paper discussing these two pieces. In the course of your paper, address all of the following questions:

- \* What is alike and what is different about the two authors' ideas about scientific progresses?
- \* To what degree do the authors agree about the definition and importance of 'normal science'?
- \* How is Kuhn's discussion of 'paradigm' related to Asimov's 'crazy ideas'?
- \* To what degree does your own experience with the same issues, perhaps in your own field of study or other college courses, support or not support the conclusion of the two authors?"

The actual essay question for the Lewis Thomas and Howard Gardner readings was first seen at the exam [Attachment F].

Senator Lickliger explained that students can not pass this exam by merely writing a narration of their life experiences. They

must, instead, respond to and critically analyze the readings and discuss both readings within one essay in a coherent way. Furthermore, what is required is not just a response to a single reading: rather, it involves comparing and analyzing two texts.

Senator Lickliger explained further that one version of the pilot that the faculty committee liked very much has a third reading, which is given to the students (for the first time) at the time of the exam. This third reading is much shorter and is also related to the other two readings. The students given that version are given questions based on all three readings. Interestingly, the students did just as well on that version **as** they did on the other version, which involved only readings given in advance. The hypothesis is that third reading helped students focus their thoughts and helped them to zero in on a key idea that they could then develop into an essay.

Faculty who scored these essays were very pleased with the quality of the writing. Few expected that to happen. And this was especially surprising because the students were only freshmen and sophomores: they were not rising juniors. The hope, therefore, is that the results will be even better when the target group takes the test. Some English faculty do not agree because the further away in time from students' enrollment in English composition courses, the more students' writing skills tend to decline.

The exam is not to be used to place students in courses, the way the current CUNY Writing Assessment Test (CWAT) and the CUNY Reading Assessment Test (CRAT) and the CUNY Mathematics Assessment Test (CMAT) are used. Those tests would continue to be used as placement tests. They work fairly well as placement tools, she said.

Instead, the Proficiency Test would be used to determine whether a student should move beyond 60 credits. It still is undecided, but it looks as if, this Proficiency Test will also be used to determine whether a student would earn an associate degree: that is a major issue for the community colleges because they want their students to earn their degrees and now there would be an additional fence the students would have to jump over. But it looks as if it will be mandated for that purpose as well.

Grading the essays was a very long and tedious process. The scorers were faculty who were already skilled in reading essays for the CWAT. But, additionally, they were especially trained by experts and were arranged at tables around the room. Our colleague, Charles Piltch of our English Department, was one of the table leaders, and he provided her invaluable information and insights as to what transpired.

The scoring rubric [Attachment E] is a grid: each essay had to be scored 1 to 4, with a 1 as the lowest score and a 4 as the highest for each of the components of the student's essay. And so the reader had to know whether the student correctly and effectively summarized appropriate sections; the reader then had to determine whether the essay developed a coherent analysis or point of view or argument of some substance: then the reader had to grade how well the student incorporated quotations and references to the sources; and, finally, the scorer had to determine whether the essay was written in clear prose with an appropriate level of correctness. So each essay received four scores. Then, the grader had to give the essay an holistic score, which is a judgment that a grader makes as to whether the essay deserves a grade of pass or fail on a first impression of the essay: the scorer reads the essay through and

decides whether the essay is a pass or fail.

The readers are all calibrated and this is where many testing people criticize the evaluation of writing. But it is shown to have quite a bit of validity. The readers are normed ahead of time: this means that they are given sample essays that are deemed passing and sample essays that are deemed failing and several essays in between: the readers in the room all have to come to an agreement as to what a passing and what a non-passing essay is.

This system, as one can imagine, took a great deal of time. First, there is the training, the norming. Then there is the rating on the 4-point scale. Then the holistic scoring. The reports are that by the second day everyone at the table was reading much, much more slowly than they had read on the first day. The hope had been to read all the essays in a weekend but it took two entire weekends. The readers were paid and they will have to be paid because it is extremely unlikely that anyone will volunteer to do this. A third weekend was also necessary.

Each essay was read twice (by two different readers) and is holistically scored twice (once by each reader) but when the holistic scores did not agree or when the analytic scores were more than two points apart, a third reader had to read the essay. And that process took another entire weekend in July.

This is a very weighty exam and the essays require time to be read carefully. About 25% of the essays required reading by a third reader which, Senator Licklider said, is a large number of essays requiring a third reading.

At this point there is no set passing score. The pilot was designed to test the test. The faculty committee wants to conduct another pilot in the spring which would be more focused: the second pilot would involve rising juniors, students who have completed between 45 and 60 credits. Of course there is no incentive for these students to take this two-hour grueling test. First the students have to take the readings home and read them very carefully and then they have to take the test for two hours.

The first pilot did not involve this problem because the students took the exam as part of a course. So every faculty member who volunteered to have his or her class take the test used the grade of the essay that was produced in determining the student's final grade in the course. So the students really had a lot riding on the test. But the faculty can't think of an incentive that would force rising juniors to take this second pilot test seriously.

And yet, Senator Licklider explained, a second pilot is necessary because there are many unanswered questions: one is what the passing score will be since the students who participated in the pilot were not in the target group, that is, they had not completed between 45 and 60 credits. Other questions that have to be answered include: what happens when students fail -- do they take the test again or are they given some form of further instruction or tutoring or do they have to produce a portfolio. The writing consultant from outside CUNY suggested that students who fail be required to produce a portfolio of his or her writing which would be certified by various instructors and that this would attest to the student's ability to do this level of work. Reviewing and certifying student portfolios is a very tedious process, she explained. Another question is about ESL students: should they be given more time to take the test, should they be given any other special consideration.

Another question is about security: how could the essays and the test questions be kept secure -- we are talking, she noted, about thousands and thousands of students taking these tests on all the campuses across CUNY and so there is a tremendous logistical problem.

The scoring would have to be done centrally if the test is to have any credibility: originally when the CWAT (the placement test), exams were read on individual campuses with the faculty of each campus reading the exams of the students at their own campus a distrust developed of the test scores that came from certain campuses. But central grading year after year after year will be a very expensive undertaking. The CUNY Central Administration would have to pay not only the scorers but would have to pay for the making of the tests, which requires a lot of time and work.

The external testing consultant suggested that a book of essays be chosen every year as the source from which the sets of essays would come because that would narrow the selection process for those designing the tests each year and would make their work easier.

Those are the big questions that have to be answered but, Senator Licklider said, it does look as if this test will be implemented. The members of the Board of Trustees to whom the faculty committee reported two weeks ago sounded very positive about the test and seem ready to commission the faculty to do another pilot. The plan is that the class that enters in Fall 1999 is the class that would have to pass the test and so that gives us two years.

Senator Edward Green asked if there is any estimate as to the cost of this exam and he asked how long it takes to grade each exam. Senator Licklider pointed out that this exam and the scoring system were new to all the readers and with this in mind, Professor Piltch reported to her, each reader at the best of times (when the person was most fresh) could read and score five exams an hour. It is very expensive, she said, but the Board wants a test to show that CUNY is raising standards.

Senator Licklider repeated that the reports that 75% "passed" is not really meaningful because no "pass" score has been determined because the test has not yet been normed. The 75% figure is derived from the supposition that if  $x$  were the passing score, then 75% would have passed.

Senator Gavin Lewis asked how John Jay students fared. Senator Licklider said that every campus participated in the pilot except John Jay and that several classes from all those campuses participated in the pilot. Senator Edward Davenport asked whether the students who participated in the first pilot were a representative sample. She explained that the courses were all freshman composition classes, usually the last course of the required composition sequence (at John Jay, for example, that would have been English 102).

Faculty from across the academic disciplines were asked to volunteer but very few faculty except those in English Departments agreed to participate. Senator Licklider said that John Jay's English Department did not participate because the faculty are already perceiving that this is becoming an English Department test. Unlike the ACE -- which was developed under Chancellor Reynolds' leadership -- there is no mathematics in this proficiency test, for example. She said there will probably be an attempt to involve the

sciences and the social sciences by having readings relevant to those disciplines but, she said, this is basically a reading and writing test.

Senator Licklider said the English Department does not want to be viewed as the faculty who have to prepare all our students to pass the test. The premise of the test is that all faculty are to require this level of reading and writing in all their courses and as a result students who are rising juniors -- who will have taken their English composition courses two years or one and a half years earlier -- will not have forgotten everything they learned in their composition courses but rather will be able to pass the test because the skills they learned in their composition courses will be required and reinforced in all their subsequent courses.

President Kaplowitz said that there are two reasons this proposed Proficiency Exam is on the Senate's agenda: one reason is to inform the Faculty Senate; the second reason is to inform the entire John Jay faculty because this will require all departments to rethink their freshman and sophomore courses and the kinds of reading and writing assignments that the faculty require in every course. She said the test requires the kind and level of work that, quite frankly, students going into their junior year should be able to do, but unless they have practice in all their courses they will not be able to pass the exam, even if they are taught these skills in their two required composition courses. These skills will have to be reinforced in course after course after course. She said this is not necessarily happening now.

This is, therefore, an opportunity to alert all the departments, all the faculty, through the Senate representatives' reports to their departments and through the vehicle of the Senate's minutes. She noted that the Senate minutes, because of budgetary reasons, go only to full-time faculty (and select administrators) but not to adjunct faculty and so adjunct faculty will have to be alerted in other ways. This is a window to rethink our approaches to teaching our courses, she said, so that our students will be able to pass. President Kaplowitz said that this test will not only be used to determine whether students may go beyond 60 credits or get their associate degree (if that is decided by the CUNY Board of Trustees) but this test will also be a report card on each college and the faculty of each college. If faculty certify a student by giving a passing grade -- and if faculty certify a student as having excellent skills by giving such grades as A or B -- and if those students then do not pass the test, this will be a test which the faculty and the college will be seen to have failed as well.

Senator Lou Guinta said he agrees completely. He said it also means that the Curriculum Committee must revisit the policy of writing across the curriculum, a policy which will henceforth have to be enforced and the faculty will have to -- although undoubtedly most do -- give writing assignments in every course that are similar in scope and depth to those of the proficiency test.

Senator Licklider reported that Associate Provost Kobilinsky has just appointed a Curriculum Committee subcommittee, of which she is a member, which will examine this proficiency exam vis a vis the core because those are the courses -- history, literature, philosophy, and ethnic studies -- that students take as sophomores. And so if those courses do not require writing of this kind the students will not be able to succeed. Senator Guinta said that many students also take 100-level and 200-level courses in their major and those courses will also have to require this kind of writing.

Senator Licklider agreed.

Senator Guinta said that one of the things that will have to take place is faculty development, so faculty will know how to design assignments and how to grade them in a meaningful way. He suggested that an analytic scale such as the one used for grading the pilot of the proficiency exam [Attachment E] would be extremely useful to faculty in their grading of their students' writing. Senator Licklider said she doesn't think the Board has thought that far ahead. Senator Guinta said we have to engage in such thinking ourselves at John Jay.

President Kaplowitz reported that she was at the Board -- it was a meeting of the Board's Committee on Academic Affairs -- when Professor Bonne August made her report two weeks ago. She said that Bonne August had done an excellent job. She added, as Senator Licklider has said, that the Board is absolutely committed to this proficiency exam. President Kaplowitz noted that some trustees are opposed to students receiving the readings in advance and want, instead, to have the students see all the readings for the first time in the exam room at the time of the exam. Various trustees question why students should be permitted to read the essays in advance and suggested that this is a form of cheating. Professor August explained to them that this is what college work comprises: students read texts, think about them, and then write about it. Professor August explained that the design of the test is precisely what students are supposed to do and are required to do.

Senator Guinta said many students will undoubtedly want to use a laptop. Senator Licklider said it is clear that this will not be permitted. President Kaplowitz agreed, explaining that the readings and a series of pre-written paragraphs (which could be written or edited by others) could be on the hard drive and then students could cut and paste and put together an essay of sorts even without having seen the questions in advance. Plus grammar check (and spell check) would undermine the requirement that students demonstrate the ability to write "with an appropriate level of correctness." Senator P.J. Gibson also noted that not all students can afford to purchase laptops and those that can would be at an unfair advantage.

President Kaplowitz said the trustees are already worried about inequities whereby students with money could hire tutors who could help prepare them for the test and this is one of the reasons some trustees want all the readings to be seen for the first time in the exam room at the time of the test.

The Senate thanked Senator Licklider for her excellent report and asked her to keep the Senate informed. Senator Licklider said she is a member of the CUNY Association of Writing Supervisors (CAWS), as is Bonne August, who is its co-chair. The group meets each month and so she will be able to provide updates.

Upon a motion duly made and adopted, the meeting was adjourned at 5 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Edward Davenport

Recording Secretary

## Attachment A

### Announcements from the Chair

#### Board of Trustees October 7 joint meeting of the Fiscal Affairs and Academic Affairs Committees on the 1999-2000 budget request

Present were Trustees Alfred Curtis (who chaired the meeting), Satish Babbar, Kenneth Cook, John Morning, Paolucci, Kathleen Pesile, Bernard Sohmer, and Ronald Marino (who arrived late): Faculty representatives Karen Kaplowitz (Fiscal) and Cecilia McCall (CAPPR); Student representatives Stuart Zimble (Fiscal) and Rob Hollander (CAPPR). Also, Presidents Caputo (Hunter), Cozzi (acting; NYCTC), Fernandez (Lehman), Horowitz (Graduate School), Lattin (Brooklyn), Moses (CCNY), Sessoms (Queens), and Provost B. Wilson (John Jay).

Also: Chancellor Kimmich, Deputy Chancellor Hassett, VC Rothbard, VC Mirrer, VC Macari, VC Moskowitz, VC Hershenson.

The most recent draft of CUNY's proposed 1999-2000 asking budget, which was released on October 6, was the subject of this special October 7 joint meeting of the Fiscal Affairs Committee and the Academic Affairs Committee (CAPPR) of the Board. The next draft of the budget request will be released prior to the Friday, October 16, deadline to sign up to speak at the special public hearing on 3 PM on October 19 about the proposed budget request.

Chancellor Kimmich explained that the final version of the budget request document will also include a page devoted to each college which will provide a profile of each college's programs, special characteristics, and strengths. The deadline to submit the final version of CUNY's budget request to the Governor is November 6.

Vice Chancellor Rothbard distributed information about the "Preliminary Distribution of 5% Program Increase" in the form of 3 pie charts: total CUNY, senior colleges, community colleges.

For CUNY as a totality, the proposed preliminary distribution is as follows: \$17.5 million for full-time faculty: \$8.9M for instructional support: \$15M for technology: \$5.2M for student services: \$9.7M for libraries; and \$6.8M for graduate education. Total = \$63.1 Million.

For the senior colleges, the proposed preliminary distribution is: \$12.5M for full-time faculty: \$6.3M for instructional support: \$10M for technology: \$3.6M for student services; \$7M for libraries: and \$6.8M for graduate education. Total = \$46.2 Million.

For the community colleges, the proposed preliminary distribution is: \$5M for full-time faculty; \$2.6M for instructional support: \$5M for technology: \$1.6M for student services; \$2.7M for libraries. Total = \$16.9 Million.

Vice Chancellor Rothbard also gave an oral report as to how this preliminary distribution of the requested 5% program increase would translate into lines:

Full-time faculty:		
250 lines @ 50K at the senior colleges	=	\$12.5 Million
100 lines @ 50K at the community colleges	=	\$ 5.0 M
		\$17.5 M
Instructional support:		
160 lines @ 39K at the senior colleges	=	\$ 6.3 M
65 lines @ 39K at the comm. colleges	=	\$ 2.6 M
		\$ 8.9 M
Technology:		
hardware, software & maintenance senior	=	\$10.0 M
comm.	=	\$ 5.0 M
		\$15.0 M
Student Services:		
90 lines @ 40K at the senior colleges	=	\$ 3.6 M
40 lines @ 40K at the comm. colleges	=	\$ 1.6 M
		\$ 5.2 M
Libraries:		
acquisitions & expanded hours senior	=	\$ 7.0 M
comm.	=	\$ 2.7 M
		\$9.7 M
Graduate Education:		
doctoral programs, student support, Altman	=	\$6.8 M
GRAND TOTAL:		
Senior colleges		\$46.2 M
Community colleges		\$16.9 M
		\$63.1 M

These projected preliminary dollar figures and numbers of lines are contingent upon CUNY receiving the budget it is requesting. The final decision about those dollars and lines would be made only after the budget is allocated to CUNY and is, therefore, not in the budget request document.

The budget request does contain requests for the following dollars: \$1.4 billion, which is an increase of \$111.1 million (8.4%) over the 1998-99 appropriated (not requested) level. This \$1.4 billion represents collective bargaining and other increases in the amount of \$47.9 million, and "critical program improvements" of \$63.1 million.

These dollar amounts are explained as follows:

SENIOR COLLEGES:

The overall request for the senior colleges is \$1.1 billion, which is an increase of \$80.7 million (8.2%) over the 1998-99 allocated amount.

Of this \$1.1 billion, an increase of \$34.5 million (3.5%) is being asked for new collective bargaining requirements and other mandatory needs, and \$46.2 million (4.7%) is sought for critical program improvements that will be allocated in accordance with a strategic multi-year plan."

COMMUNITY COLLEGES:

\$367 million is requested for the community colleges from the State and this amount represents an increase of \$30.4 million (9.0%) over the 1998-99 adopted budget.

Of this, \$13.5 million (4.0%) is requested for new collective bargaining requirements and other mandatory needs, and \$16.9 million (5.0%) is requested for critical program improvements that will be allocated in accordance with a strategic multi-year plan."

The budget request proposes a 5-year budget plan that would add a single real budget increase of 5% (\$60 million) a year after mandatory costs, including collective bargaining and inflation), are met.

The resolution approving the budget request includes the following explanation: "The 1999-2000 Budget Request proposes a course of action that will bring the University, over a multi-year period, to a significantly higher level of quality than is currently the case. The University seeks support for programs that will help the University address the larger strategic issues it confronts. The University is committed to enhancing current, and developing new structures, mechanisms, and programs to assure the preservation of Standards, Opportunity, Service, and Accountability. The multi-year planning process will contain appropriate measures designed to ensure compliance with college and University goals and objectives. These include the use of such performance measures as: administrative productivity; graduation and retention rates; commitment to full-time faculty; student satisfaction; and sponsored research. CUNY will also employ financial and program audits and other verification procedures to assure that expenditures are consistent with intended purposes and achieve expected results. CUNY proposes a 5-year budget plan that after providing for mandatory cost increases (collective bargaining, inflation, etc.) adds a single real budget increase of 5% (before collective bargaining) to achieve its overall objectives. The request anticipates that CUNY will continue to implement productivity and program savings to support partially the cost of new and ongoing initiatives."

This operating budget request differs from previous ones not only because it is a 5-year budget request but because there is no "laundry list," as Chancellor Kimmich has explained. For example,

last year's budget request listed more than **60** programs and initiatives and asked for a specific dollar amount for each item. This 1999-2000 request does not include any such listing.

The budget request document explains that the reason for this new approach is to provide the University with "maximum flexibility" and states that "funds will be distributed to college or University programs based upon measurable achievement or potential to contribute to fulfillment of the University's objectives and attainment of its strategic goals within a defined period. College presidents will be accorded wide latitude in using the funds to establish and maintain high levels of program performance."

During the meeting, it was reported that performance budgeting will be expanded to incorporate between **8** to 10 factors which have yet to be decided.

Four overarching themes are presented in this budget request: "Standards, Opportunity, Service, and **Accountability**." The theme of accountability did not appear in the previous draft of September 21.

The concern about language in the September 21 draft about a strong core curriculum (the term "**common**" did NOT appear) that many have raised has resulted in the following rewording: "A strong, comprehensive liberal arts component of undergraduate degrees, whether designed as a core curriculum or as a distribution requirement, is the fundamental expression of a college's educational values and character. In recent years, CUNY faculties have been reviewing their colleges' general education requirements. It is thus an appropriate moment to take stock of where the University stands with respect to the liberal arts and to ensure that, without losing the distinctiveness of individual campus programs, all CUNY graduates achieve a set of competencies appropriate to a quality institution. We also need to ensure that there is sufficient commonality across the system so that students are able to transfer easily among CUNY campuses, and so that the outcomes of the liberal arts component of their degrees are adequately **assessed**."

And then a new initiative is announced: "The Liberal Arts at CUNY: Serving Urban Higher Education for the 21st century," which will entail a University-wide forum on liberal education which will "stimulate campus-by-campus re-examination" of the issue and also a "definition and adoption of a common set of educational goals for our liberal arts **components**."

Another initiative focuses on Writing Across the Curriculum which is to be linked to a new CUNY Writing Fellow Program: interested doctoral students (in all disciplines) would receive training and would then work on the campuses assisting CUNY faculty and at the same time receiving mentoring and experience.

Also, a faculty hiring initiative is described whereby faculty would be hired in "clusters of quality faculty" in -- as yet to be determined -- specific disciplines.

Also, listed is the hiring of faculty to achieve the goal of 70% to 30% ratio of course sections taught by full-time to adjunct faculty, which is part of CUNY's Master Plan (which must be revised by the year 2000). According to the budget request, in

the Fall of 1997, 35% to **58%** of instruction was taught by adjunct faculty at the senior colleges and 50% to **64%** at the community colleges. Other initiatives are listed including a strong emphasis on technology enhancement.

The section on accountability states that because of CUNY's need to be accountable, "a distinguishing feature of the 1999-2000 budget request is the incorporation of a set of performance measures designed to link the expectations of our funding partners with specific outcomes. These measures will serve to publicly confirm our success in reaching stated goals and objectives; guide and facilitate improvement of all units of the University; link planning, evaluation, and resource allocation, so that performance in a desired direction can be supported and rewarded through the budgeting process; provide a means for comparison with peer institutions, in search of best practices for the accomplishment of our goals."

During the meeting, it was reported that performance budgeting will be expanded to incorporate between **8** to 10 factors which have yet to be decided.

Although the previous draft did not include any reference to "access and excellence," the current draft states: "The City University recognizes a two-fold responsibility to New York: access and **excellence**." On the same page, however, is the statement that "**All** students, who are qualified for, and can benefit from, a college education should have access to CUNY's undergraduate, graduate, and professional **programs**." When questioned about the seemingly contradictory language, Chancellor Kimmich said that the language is not contradictory and does not mean to contradict our commitment to access and excellence.

Mr. Zimble and Mr. Hollander, the student representatives, spoke of their concern about the statement that "All of CUNY's programs should remain affordable," saying that "**affordable**" is a relative term and asked that a statement calling for "tuition stabilization" be used instead. Vice Chancellor Rothbard responded that the term "**affordable**" was purposely used because tuition could be stabilized but if financial aid is decreased CUNY would become less affordable.

The public hearing on the budget request is Monday, October 19, at 3 PM at 80th Street. The signup deadline is 3 PM on Friday, October 16.

Table 2. Total Admittance Enrollment\*

	Fall 1998 Preliminary**	Fall 1997 Actual	Percentage Change
<b>Senior Colleges</b>			
Baruch	14,922	15,071	-1.0
Brooklyn	15,060	14,964	0.6
City	11,650	12,083	-3.6
Hunter	20,040	19,689	1.8
John Jay	10,860	10,834	0.2
Lehman	9,053	9,283	-2.5
Medgar Evers	4,392	5,063	-13.3
New York City Technical	11,496	11,124	3.3
Queens	16,195	16,381	-1.1
Staten Island	11,922	12,023	-0.8
York	5,650	6,030	-6.3
Graduate School	3,773	3,813	-1.0
Law School	377	467	-19.3
<b>Total Senior</b>	<b>135,390</b>	<b>136,825</b>	<b>-1.0</b>
<b>Community Colleges</b>			
Borough of Manhattan	15,891	16,141	-1.5
Bronx	7,250	7,600	-4.6
Hostos	3,710	4,177	-11.2
Kingsborough	14,932	15,218	-1.9
LaGuardia	10,900	10,925	-0.2
Queensborough	10,713	10,299	4.0
<b>Total Community</b>	<b>63,396</b>	<b>64,360</b>	<b>-1.5</b>
<b>TOTAL UNIVERSITY</b>	<b>198,786</b>	<b>201,185</b>	<b>-1.2</b>

\*Includes students enrolled in Regular and Special Programs. Kingsborough includes Winter module. LaGuardia includes Fall I and Fall II semesters.  
\*\*Preliminary figures are based on the first day of classes.

**Table 10p. First-time Freshmen - Regular\***

	Fall 1998 Preliminary**	Fall 1997 Actual	Percentage Change
<b>Senior Colleges</b>			
Baruch	903	1,113	-18.9
Brooklyn	890	1,126	-21.0
City	665	736	-9.6
Hunter	1,501	1,563	-4.0
John Jay	1,445	1,437	0.6
Lehman	450	524	-14.1
Medgar Evers	425	480	-11.5
New York City Technical	2,530	2,103	20.3
Queens	1,012	1,135	-10.8
Staten Island	1,694	1,627	4.1
York	300	398	-24.6
<b>Total Senior</b>	<b>11,815</b>	<b>12,242</b>	<b>-3.5</b>
<b>Community Colleges</b>			
Borough of Manhattan	2,186	2,703	19.1
Bronx	1,050	1,016	3.3
Hate	482	582	17.2
Weglesborough	1,881	1,863	1.0
LaGuardia	1,700	1,844	-7.8
Queensborough	2,065	1,632	26.5
<b>Total Community</b>	<b>9,364</b>	<b>9,640</b>	<b>-2.9</b>
<b>TOTAL UNIVERSITY</b>	<b>21,179</b>	<b>21,882</b>	<b>-3.2</b>

\*Kingsborough includes Winter module. LaGuardia includes Fall I and Fall II semesters.

\*\* Reported by college within one week following the first day of classes.



JOHN JAY COLLEGE OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE

*The City University of New York*

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

212 237-8000 /8724

October 24, 1998

The Committee on Student Evaluation of the Faculty:

Professor Haig Bohigian  
Professor P.J. Gibson  
Mr. Steven Seow Chee Kwang  
Ms. Evelyn Maldonado  
Professor Daniel Pinello  
Professor Peter Shenkin

Dear Committee Members,

On behalf of the Faculty Senate, thank you, again, for meeting with the Senate on October 8. We hope that the meeting was as useful for you as it was for us.

Because the Senate recognizes that the format, content, and method of administering the faculty evaluation instrument is the charge and responsibility of the Committee on Student Evaluation of the Faculty, subject to approval by the College Council, the Faculty Senate is sending the attached report as information which we hope you will take into consideration as you engage in your important work.

On behalf of the Faculty Senate, I'd like to make several observations:

- \* The Faculty Senate members recognize that we are not experts in the construction of evaluation instruments and, thus, we are conveying our recommendations in our role as non-experts who care about both the faculty who are evaluated and about the students who use the evaluation instrument to assess their instructors.
- \* The members of the Senate who chose to fill out the tally sheets (18 Senate members of the 25 present at the Senate's October 21 meeting) did so by responding to each question and item as a single entity and not to each question or item in the context of other questions which should or might be included or excluded. Thus a compilation of all the questions that received a majority of 'yes' votes does not necessarily constitute a viable instrument but rather constitutes a series of opinions about the worthiness of individual and unconnected questions that Senate members considered.
- \* The Senate members recognize that some questions for which they voted "yes" may have to be altered to ensure consistent question wording and that the choice of questions for inclusion in the instrument is necessarily a function of the need for internal consistency and other requirements of a proper instrument.

- \* After Senate members handed in their tally sheets, including yes/no responses to the demographic question about the final course grade the student expects to receive, the Senate's Executive Committee learned that the College Personnel Committee and its subcommittees do not have access to grade distribution sheets of faculty as they did in the past. Thus, because this fact was not known by the Senate because of the chronology of events, I and others with whom I have been able to consult recommend that the Committee delete this question from the form for the following reason: students may think that they will be receiving an A or A- or a similarly high grade and if the instructor's actual final grade distributions are not provided to the P Committees, the impression may erroneously be created by students' expectations that the instructor inflates grades and gives an unusual preponderance of A's, A-Is, etc. (The corollary is also possible.) Such a demographic question should only be included if the Personnel Committees have access to all instructors' final grades and to comparative analyses of other instructors' grading practices both within the department and within the course level (i.e. 100-level, 400-level courses).
- \* Many Senators have recommended that the instrument that is ultimately adopted this semester be reviewed by instrument design experts after its administration in the Spring of 1999.
- \* Many Senate members consider the type and range of the scale to be used to be an issue that especially requires the expertise of an instrument design specialist.

In addition, there are several recommendations that the Senate did not have time to consider (and, indeed, they were not presented to the Senate because of time constraints) but which I and those with whom I have been able to consult believe to be worthy of transmitting to your Committee for consideration:

- \* Using a separate scan sheet (separate from the evaluation instrument) should absolutely be avoided because of the potential for confusion as was the case last semester in May.
- \* Having the written comment sheet physically separate from the numerical sheet makes it impossible for both the Personnel Committee(s) and the faculty members themselves to evaluate the numerical, demographic, and written comments in the context of each other. Written comments, when one doesn't know the demographic information, for example, makes that demographic information less than useful. Similarly, numerical scores without the benefit of written comments make both less useful than if the two can be reviewed together.
- \* The instructions for students' written comments would benefit from revision because in the past those instructions erroneously indicated that only the instructor sees the written comments. Not only is this not the case, but written evaluations are heavily relied on by Department Chairs and by Personnel Committees (both Department and College) in evaluating an instructor's numerical assessment and in assessing the instructor overall.

Furthermore, in light of the discussion at the October 8 Senate meeting, which you attended, about the use of the results of the student evaluation of the faculty in the personnel process, I also wish to share with the Committee the following statements of the CUNY Board of Trustees. These are the Board's only official statements about the role of the student evaluation of the faculty:

"After September 1972, no recommendations for reappointment, tenure or promotion should be granted without evidence given to the Board of systematic student evaluation, except in such cases where the Chancellor presents a cogent reason for further delay. (Board Minutes 1972, p. 43 and p. CC 30) (Previous reference, Board Minutes 1971, p. 236.)

"The Board reaffirmed in its policy statement on Academic Personnel Practice its commitment to the consideration of student evaluations in faculty personnel decisions involving reappointment, promotion and tenure, according to the provisions in the governance plan in effect in each college. (Board Minutes 1975, pp. 122-8)."

CUNY Manual Of General Policy, p. 248

Also, Professor Gwen Gerber, having read the Senate minutes reporting the Committee's original proposal of a 10-question, 5-point scale, came to the October 21 Senate meeting to present a written note, which I read to the Senate with her permission and at her request, which expressed her opinion as an expert in test construction that (a) the more questions contained in an evaluation instrument the more reliable the instrument is, with 10 questions being far too few; (b) the instrument should include several questions about each topic; and (c) a 7-point scale is more reliable than a 5-point scale because the former provides more **"discrimination"** between those being evaluated than does the latter.

Thank you again for the opportunity to meet with you, for your interest in the Senate's ideas, suggestions, and concerns, and for the opportunity of providing the attached report for your consideration. The yes/no responses contained in the report were tallied by three members of the Senate's Executive Committee working together: Professor Edward Davenport, Professor Kwando Kinshasa, and myself.

I and my colleagues on the Senate appreciate the difficult and important work you are doing and look forward with respectful interest to the instrument you ultimately develop for consideration and vote by the College Council.

Sincerely,

Professor Karen Kaplowitz  
President, Faculty Senate

c. Professor Keith Markus  
att.

**ATTACHMENT C**

**Tallies :**

**Student Evaluation of the Faculty Instrument**

**Scoring Sheet: Recommendations from the Senate**

This is a tally sheet Senate members used for expressing their opinion about the items presented in **Version #1 and Version #2 from the Committee on Student Evaluation of the Faculty**. The tally sheets were collected at the Senate's October 21, 1998, meeting and were tabulated by members of the Senate's Executive Committee and were transmitted to the Committee on Student Evaluation of the Faculty for its consideration.

**Vote**

**Committee's Proposed Version #1**

Yes 3 No 8

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

Yes 1 No 0

**Committee's Proposed Version #2**

Yes 10 No 4

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

Yes 6 No 5

- |   |                           |
|---|---------------------------|
| 1. Class lessons are well organized.  | Yes <u>13</u> No <u>7</u> |
| 2. The instructor presents course material clearly.   | Yes <u>13</u> No <u>2</u> |
| 3. The instructor effectively deals with comments and questions raised in class.                | Yes <u>13</u> No <u>1</u> |
| 4. When appropriate, the instructor allows the expression of different points of view in class. | Yes <u>13</u> No <u>2</u> |
| 5. The instructor treats students with courtesy & respect.                                      | Yes <u>14</u> No <u>2</u> |
| 6. The instructor is interested in students' success.   | Yes <u>9</u> No <u>7</u>  |
| 7. The instructor motivated my interest in the subject matter.                                  | Yes <u>12</u> No <u>4</u> |
| 8. The instructor encourages students to think and reason for themselves.                       | Yes <u>13</u> No <u>2</u> |
| 9. The instructor's grading is fair.  | Yes <u>10</u> No <u>5</u> |
| 10. Overall, the instructor teaches effectively.  | Yes <u>13</u> No <u>7</u> |

**Demographics** (vote on the topic, not on format)

Yes 0 No 1

Required course? Yes No Not Sure

Yes 11 No 1

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

Yes 10 No 3

Total college credits completed at John Jay or elsewhere?

Yes 11 No 2

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

Yes 11 No 2

Credits taken this semester? 1-4 5-8 9-11 12-14

Yes 12 No 1

15-17 18 or More

**Student Evaluation of the Faculty Instrument  
Recommendations from the Faculty Senate**

This section of the tally sheet reports the opinion of Senate members about items presented below as **recommended changes (deletions/ additions/ revisions) from members of the Senate**. The tally sheets were collected at the Senate's October 21, 1998, meeting and were tabulated by members of the Senate's Executive Committee and transmitted to the Student Evaluation of the Faculty Committee for its consideration.

**A: Proposed questions to be included in the aggregate score:**

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1. The instructor is enthusiastic about teaching.<br>OR, The instructor teaches with enthusiasm.  | Yes <u>15</u> No <u>3</u>                                  |
| 2. The instructor returned graded quizzes, tests, papers, and assignments soon enough to be helpful<br>OR, During the semester, the instructor has informed me about my progress and performance in the course, either by grades, comments, or personal discussion. | { Yes <u>13</u> No <u>4</u><br>Yes <u>9</u> No <u>7</u>    |
| 3. The instructor's communicates effectively.<br>OR, The instructor's speech and presentation are clearly understandable.   | { Yes <u>14</u> No <u>4</u><br>{ Yes <u>10</u> No <u>5</u> |
| 4. The instructor shows thorough knowledge of the subject matter.   | Yes <u>15</u> No <u>2</u>                                  |
| 5. The instructor generally meets the class on time and holds class until the end of the period.<br>OR, The instructor meets the class regularly and punctually.  | { Yes <u>10</u> No <u>5</u><br>{ Yes <u>9</u> No <u>6</u>  |
| 6. Overall, the instructor is an effective teacher.   | Yes <u>15</u> No <u>3</u>                                  |
| 7. I would recommend this instructor to other students.<br>OR, Overall, I would recommend this instructor to other students.  | { Yes <u>14</u> No <u>2</u><br>{ Yes <u>9</u> No <u>6</u>  |
| 8. I would recommend this course to other students.   | Yes <u>13</u> No <u>5</u>                                  |
| 9. The instructor spends the entire class period on instruction and course-related activities.  | Yes <u>9</u> No <u>9</u>                                   |
| 10. The instructor maintains order in the classroom.<br>OR, The instructor maintains proper order in the classroom.   | { Yes <u>10</u> No <u>6</u><br>{ Yes <u>8</u> No <u>7</u>  |
| 11. The instructor encourages and welcomes questions and comments from the class.   | Yes <u>15</u> No <u>3</u>                                  |
| 12. The instructor has clearly explained the grading system for this course.  | Yes <u>15</u> No <u>3</u>                                  |
| 13. The instructor maintains my attention in class.   | Yes <u>8</u> No <u>9</u>                                   |
| 14. The instructor clarifies difficult material.  | Yes <u>15</u> No <u>2</u>                                  |
| 15. The instructor's organization of the course and of individual classes is:   | Yes <u>9</u> No <u>5</u>                                   |

**B. Recommended additional section: questions which are not to be calculated in the aggregate score: Respond with Yes/No/Unsure**

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 1. "Did you receive a syllabus at the beginning of the semester?<br>OR, Did you receive an adequate syllabus (course outline) at the beginning of the semester?" | { Yes <u>13</u> No <u>5</u><br>{ Yes <u>4</u> NO <u>10</u> |
| 2. "Is the final examination for this course scheduled during Final Exam Week?"  | Yes <u>13</u> No <u>4</u>                                  |
| 3. "Other than during class, was your instructor available, by phone or in person, to answer your questions or to talk to?"                                      | Yes <u>13</u> No <u>4</u>                                  |
| 4. "Did the instructor begin and end class on time?"<br>OR, Did the instructor begin and end class essentially on time?"   | { Yes <u>6</u> No <u>9</u><br>{ Yes <u>6</u> No <u>8</u>   |
| 5. "Did the instructor miss or cancel many classes?"   | Yes <u>14</u> No <u>4</u>                                  |

**C: Recommended changes in Version #1:**

- |  |                |
|--|----------------|
| 1. Change past tense to present tense (i.e. "The instructor's presentation of the course material <b>is</b> " instead of " <b>was</b> ") | Yes—11— No—4—  |
| 2. Delete question #7 in version #1 and substitute with question #8 in version #2.   | Yes__6_ NO__5_ |

**D: Recommended changes in Version #2:**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1. Change question #9 to "The instructor has clearly explained the grading system for this course"   | Yes —7— No —7—                            |
| 2. Delete question #6: it is impossible for anyone to know whether an "instructor is interested in students' success"<br>OR change the question to "The instructor seems concerned about whether I learn the subject matter" | { Yes__6_ NO__6_<br>{<br>{ Yes__5_ No__8_ |

**E: Demographic questions:**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1. Put into full sentences: for example, "How many credits are you taking this semester?"  | Yes —7— No__6_  |
| 2. Divide first demographic question into two: "Is this course required for the degree you are seeking?"<br>"Is this course required for your major?"  | { Yes —6— No__6_<br>{<br>{ Yes__7_ No__4_<br>Yes —6— NO__7_ |
| 3. Delete the question about the expected grade in the course because it will bias the student negatively if the student expects a low grade and positively if the student expects a high grade. |   |

**B: Recommended RATING SCALES (instead of the Version #1 & #2 scales]**

Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Sure or Neutral	Yes__3_ No__8_
Disagree	Strongly Disagree		

**OR:**

Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Yes__2_ No__7_
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	

**OR:**

Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Yes__7_ No__8_
Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	

**Written comments:**

- > Ask students how many courses, rather than how many credits, they are taking this semester.
- > The scale should go from "**poor** to excellent" or from "strongly disagree to strongly agree" (i.e. from negative to positive rating)
- > Use a seven-point scale and no demographics
- > There should be a minimum of 20 questions
- > Delete question #6 on the Committee's proposed version #2
- > I defer to testing experts on the question of the scale
- > Pay attention to the comments to the Senate of testing expert Professor Gwen Gerber.
- > A Likert scale should be used because a Likert scale provides ordered categories, with numbers ascribed to each category: neither of the 5-point scales presented in the Committee's two proposed versions fulfills this characteristic.

## To Err Is Human

Lewis Thomas

Everyone must have had at least one personal experience with a computer error by this time. Bank balances are suddenly reported to have jumped from \$379 into the millions, appeals for charitable contributions are mailed over and over to people with crazy-sounding names at your address, department stores send the wrong bills, utility companies write that they're turning everything off, that sort of thing. If you manage to get in touch with someone and complain, you then get instantaneously typed, guilty letters from the same computer, saying, "Our computer was in error, and an adjustment is being made in your accounts."

These are supposed to be the sheerest, blindest accidents. Mistakes are not believed to be part of the normal behavior of a good machine. If things go wrong, it must be a personal, human error, the result of fingering, tampering, a button getting stuck, someone hitting the wrong key. The computer, at its normal best is infallible.

I wonder whether this can be true. After all, the whole point of computers is that they represent an extension of the human brain, vastly improved upon but nonetheless human, superhuman maybe. A good computer can think clearly and quickly enough to beat you at chess, and some of them have even been programmed to write obscure verse. They can do anything we can do, and more besides.

It is not yet known whether a computer has its own consciousness, and it would be hard to find out about this. When you walk into one of those great halls now built for the huge machines, and stand listening, it is easy to imagine that the faint, distant noises are the sound of thinking, and the turning of the spools gives them the **look** of wild creatures rolling their eyes in the effort to concentrate, choking with information. But real thinking and dreaming are other matters.

On the other hand, the evidences of something like an *unconscious* equivalent to ours are all around, in every mail. As extensions of the human brain, they have been constructed with the same property of error, spontaneous, uncontrolled, and rich in possibilities.

Mistakes are at the very base of human thought, embedded there, feeding the structure like root nodules. If we were not provided with the knack of being wrong, we could never get anything useful done. We think our way along by choosing between right and wrong alternatives, and the wrong choices have to be made as frequently **as** the right ones. We get along in life this way. We are built to make mistakes, coded for error.

We learn, as we say, by "trial and error." Why do we always say that? Why not "trial and rightness" or "trial and triumph?" The old phrase puts it that way because that is, in real life, the way it is done.

A good laboratory like a good bank or a corporation or government, has to run like a computer. Almost everything is done flawlessly, by the book, and all the numbers add **up** to the predicted sums. The days go by. And then, if it is a lucky day, and a lucky laboratory, somebody makes a mistake: the wrong buffer, something in one of the blanks, a decimal misplaced in reading counts, the warm room off by a degree and a half, a mouse out of his box, or just a misreading of the day's protocol. Whatever, when the results come in, something is obviously screwed up, and then the action can begin.

*In these two excerpts from his book, The Unschooled Mind, Howard Gardner first introduces an important question that he will explore and then begins to find an answer to it.*

### **The Central Puzzles of Learning**

Many a person who has tried to master a foreign language in school has thought back wistfully to his (or her\*) own learning of his native tongue. Without the help of a grammar book or a trained language instructor, without the sanctions of a course grade, all normal children readily acquire the language spoken in their vicinity. More remarkably, children who are too young to sit at a school desk but who happen to grow up in a polyglot environment can master a number of languages; they even know under which circumstances to invoke each tongue. It is humbling to realize that language learning in early life has operated exquisitely over the millennia, yet linguists are still unable to describe the grammar of any naturally occurring language in a completely satisfactory way.

One can, of course, attempt to dismiss language as a special case. After all, we are linguistic creatures, and perhaps we have special dispensation to speak, just as warblers and chaffinches sing as part of their avian birthright. Or one can stress the immense importance of language in all human intercourse; perhaps therein lies the solution to the question of why all children successfully master language within a few years of their birth.

Upon examination, however, language turns out to be unexceptional among human capacities. It is simply the most dramatic instance of one puzzle in human learning—the facility with which young humans learn to carry out certain performances that scholars themselves have not yet come to understand. During the first years of life, youngsters all over the world master a breathtaking array of competences with little formal tutelage. They become proficient at singing songs, riding bikes, executing dances, keeping scrupulous track of dozens of objects in their home, on the road, or along the countryside. In addition, though less visibly, they develop powerful theories of how the world works and how their own minds work. They are able to anticipate which manipulations will keep a machine from functioning properly; they can propel and catch balls hurled under various conditions; they are able to deceive someone else in a game even as they can recognize when someone is trying to play a trick on them. They evolve clear senses of truth and falsity, good and evil, beautiful and ugly—senses that may not always be consistent with communal standards but that prove remarkably serviceable and robust.

#### **Intuitive Learning and Scholastic Learning**

We are faced with another puzzle. The very young children who so readily master symbol systems like language and art forms like music, the same children who develop complex theories of the universe or intricate theories of the mind, often experience the greatest

---

\*For expositional ease, I vary the gender forms from **now** on.

### **The Difficulties Posed by School**

Going beyond simple literacy, a further mission of the schools is to transmit concepts, networks of concepts, conceptual frameworks, and disciplinary forms of reasoning to their students. These topics generally bear some relation to the areas in which students are ordinarily interested and about which they have already developed intuitive theories, schemes, and kindred explanatory constructs; after all, science treats the natural world, even as history relates the story of one's group and of other relevant friendly or hostile groups.

To the extent that these materials are presented simply as lists or need to be able definitions to be memorized, they can usually be mastered by students who apply themselves to the task at hand. The curriculum of school ought to go beyond a rehearsal of facts, however, and introduce students to the ways of thinking used in different disciplines. Such an introduction would involve exposing students to new ways of conceptualizing familiar or unfamiliar entities, be they the laws that govern objects in the physical world or the ways in which events are conceptualized by historians.

The content of the various disciplines is typically encountered in forms quite remote from the conceptions the student brings to the class. The student learns about the laws of physics or the causes of war by reading a textbook or by hearing the teacher lecture. Hence the challenge for the educator is threefold: (1) to introduce these often difficult or counterintuitive notions to the students; (2) to make sure that this new knowledge is ultimately synthesized with earlier ideas, if they are congruent with one another; (3) to ensure that the newer disciplinary content supplants previously held conceptions or stereotypes that would in some way collide with or undermine the new forms of knowledge.

At last we can confront directly the primary reasons why school is difficult. It is difficult, first, because much of the material presented in school strikes many students as alien, if not pointless, and the kinds of supporting context provided for pupils in earlier generations has become weakened. It is difficult, second, because some of these notational systems, concepts, frameworks, and epistemic forms are not readily mastered, particularly by students whose intellectual strengths may lie in other areas or approaches. Thus, for example, students with strengths in the spatial, musical, or personal spheres may find school far more demanding than students who happen to possess the "text-friendly" blend of linguistic and logical intelligences. And it is difficult, in a more profound sense, because these scholastic forms of knowing may actually collide with the earlier, extremely robust forms of sensorimotor and symbolic knowing, which have already evolved to a high degree even before a child enters school.

Education for understanding can come about only if students somehow become able to integrate the prescholastic with the scholastic and disciplinary ways of knowing and, when such integration does not prove possible, to suspend or replace the prescholastic ways of knowing in favor of the scholastic forms of knowing. Finally, students need to be able to appreciate when a prescholastic form of knowing may harbor a different or even a deeper form of understanding than the discipline-related form of knowing learned in school.

*CUNY Proficiency Examination--First Pilot Study  
Scoring Guide (Draft 7)*

<p>1. Understand what they have read by summarizing appropriate sections of the readings.</p> <p>Superior understanding of readings expressed through accurate summary or full explanation. 4 (<i>Superior</i>)</p> <p>Adequate understanding of readings expressed through summary or explanation. 3 (<i>Adequate</i>)</p> <p>Indicates some understanding of readings through summary or explanation, but understanding is flawed or explanation is incomplete. 2 (<i>Limited</i>)</p> <p>Demonstrates little or no understanding of text or complete misunderstanding of text. 1 (<i>Seriously Flawed</i>)</p>	<p>2. Develop an essay that presents a coherent, organized analysis, point of view, or argument of some substance that does more than merely summarize the reading or recount personal experience.</p> <p>Able to address the writing assignment fully and perhaps critically, with clear interrelationship of parts. 4 (<i>Superior</i>)</p> <p>Able to address all parts of the writing assignment with adequate focus and coherence throughout. 3 (<i>Adequate</i>)</p> <p>Able to address some but not all parts of the assignment or addresses all parts but superficially; focus or coherence breaks down at several points. 2 (<i>Limited</i>)</p> <p>Little or no ability to address the assignment; unable to link thoughts between paragraphs. 1 (<i>Seriously Flawed</i>)</p>	<p>3. Incorporate, as support for own ideas, quotations and references from background reading using formal or informal references to identify the sources.</p> <p>Able to integrate references to background reading smoothly into own essay and identify references consistently. 4 (<i>Superior</i>)</p> <p>Able to select material from background reading and make it relevant and appropriate; identify cited material consistently although perhaps awkwardly at times. 3 (<i>Adequate</i>)</p> <p>Limited ability to use background reading; may identify background reading inconsistently or incorrectly, or simply summarize reading to show it has been read. 2 (<i>Limited</i>)</p> <p>Little or no ability to refer to background reading or to make distinctions between background reading and own ideas. 1 (<i>Seriously Flawed</i>)</p>	<p>4. Write in clear prose with an appropriate level of correctness (grammar, spelling, punctuation).</p> <p>Able to achieve enhanced clarity through elaboration, detail, vocabulary use, or sentence complexity and variety. 4 (<i>Superior</i>)</p> <p>Able to write clearly throughout the essay; sentences may contain occasional errors, but the errors rarely impede comprehension. 3 (<i>Adequate</i>)</p> <p>Able to be clear and intelligible at some times, but several sentences or whole sections are not clear or comprehension may be impeded by errors. 2 (<i>Limited</i>)</p> <p>Unable to sustain intelligibility over more than a few sentences; little or no ability to write sentences without basic errors that severely impede comprehension. 1 (<i>Seriously Flawed</i>)</p>
---	--	---	--

## **ATTACHMENT F**

### **DIRECTIONS FOR FORM 21**

This examination is based on the articles printed in the booklet that was distributed by your instructor: Lewis Thomas, "To Err Is Human" (pp. 3-4) and Howard Gardner, "The Central Puzzles of Learning" and "The Difficulties Posed by School" (pp. 5-11).

You will have two hours to plan, write, revise, and edit a paper on Writing Assignment 11 below. Be sure to read each question carefully. Papers will be judged both on how well you respond to *all* parts of the topic and on the quality of the writing.

Your paper will be graded according to the degree to which you demonstrate that you **can**:

1. understand what you read by summarizing appropriate sections of the readings;
2. develop a coherent and organized analysis, point of view, or argument of some substance that does more than merely summarize the reading or recount personal experience;
3. incorporate, without plagiarizing, ideas from the background reading, using formal or informal references to identify sources; and
4. write in clear prose with **an** appropriate level of correctness.

### **WRITING ASSIGNMENT 21**

Write a unified, coherent paper discussing the two pieces. In the course of your paper, address *all* of the following:

- What **does** Lewis Thomas mean by "error," and what importance does he give to this concept?
- What does Howard Gardner mean by "understanding," and why does he find that schools often fail to help the majority of students to achieve it?
- What connections (similarities, differences, or other relationships) can you make between these two pieces?
- To what extent does your own experience of learning, either in school or out of school, support or not support the conclusions of the two authors?

### **SUGGESTIONS**

- **Ty** to use your own words as much as possible. When you quote from sources, be sure to identify the quotations.
- You may organize your paper to address the four parts of the assignment in any order that you choose.

