

## **Faculty Senate Minutes #277**

### **John Jay College of Criminal Justice**

**Wednesday, April 20, 2005**

**3:15 PM**

**Room 630 T**

**Present (26):** Teresa Booker, Marvie Brooks, Orlanda Brugnola, James Cauthen, Edward Davenport, Virginia Diaz, Kirk Dombrowski, Janice Dunham, Joshua Freilich, P. J. Gibson, Elisabeth Gitter, Heath Grant, Carol Groneman, Jennifer Jackiw, Karen Kaplowitz, Tom Litwack, Vincent Maiorino, John Matteson, Rick Richardson, Jodie Roure, Francis Sheehan, Liliana Soto-Fernandez, Alisse Waterston, Robin Whitney, Susan Will, Kathryn Wylie-Marques

**Absent (11):** Andrea Balis, Effie Cochran, Robert DeLucia, Konstantinos Georgatos, Jennifer Groscup, Kwando Kinshasa, James Malone, Evan Mandery, Edward Paulino, Marilyn Rubin, Thalia Vrachopoulos

**Guests:** Professors Desmond Arias, Michele Galietta

#### **Agenda**

1. Report and Announcements
2. Approval of Minutes #276 of the April 7, 2005, meeting
3. Election of at-large 2005-6 Senate at-large representatives to the 2005-6 College Council
4. Election of an *ex officio* Senate representative to the 2005-6 College Council
5. Ratification of the election of John Jay delegates to the University Faculty Senate
6. Update on the John Jay budget: Senators Tom Litwack and Karen Kaplowitz
7. Discussion of the agenda of the April 21 meeting of the College Council
8. Report of the Faculty Senate's Committee on the Concerns of Untenured Faculty

#### **1. Report and Announcements**

President Kaplowitz announced that the date of the June 2005 Commencement has been changed again and, as a result of the changed date, two of the five individuals approved to receive honorary degrees have intractable schedule conflicts and, therefore, will not be able to attend commencement on the new date, which is June 3: the two are Paul Farmer, the anthropologist, and

## Faculty Senate Minutes #277 – April 20,2005 – Page 2

Joan Wallach Scott, the historian. A third, Judge Baltasar Garzon, is trying to change his schedule and his availability is still not known.

The policy of the CUNY Board of Trustees requires honorary degree candidates to be physically present at the commencement or convocation ceremony in order to be awarded the degree. She explained that it turns out that the contract with Madison Square Garden has a clause that permits bumping a renter within 60 days if someone who wishes to rent the Garden is willing to pay a higher rental fee.

Vice President Kirk Dombrowski said he intends to henceforth abstain during all Senate votes on honorary degree candidates until the Senate receives assurances that honorary degrees recipients will be treated with the respect they deserve and in a way that reflects credit on the College and on those who nominate these individuals. He urged Senators to take the same position.

Senator P. J. Gibson proposed that President Travis be urged to request a waiver from the Board of Trustees in this case so that those unable to attend because of the change in date be awarded the degree in abstentia.

Senator Carol Groneman stated that the College needs to be responsible which means apologizing to each of these individuals and that the College President should personally be doing this. She suggested we propose that these individuals be the recipients for next year and take steps to make sure this does not occur again in the future.

Senator Alisse Waterston said we should not wait until next year and suggested a convocation in the fall at which we could grant the honorary degrees to those unable to attend in June. Senator John Matteson spoke in support of a convocation in the fall.

Senator Betsy Gitter said it is not up to the Senate to decide upon a remedy, that it is up to President Travis to do this, and she said we need to have a conversation with him about this. President Kaplowitz said she has a meeting with President Travis in two days, on Friday, and she will raise this issue with him and if this is not resolved satisfactorily, the Senate can discuss it with him at our May 6 meeting, when President Travis will be our guest.

Senator Janice Dunham said the Senate's list of possible solutions should be reported to the President. It was agreed that President Kaplowitz would present the Senate's concerns to President Travis as well as the suggestions that have been made and that she would report back to the Senate at its next meeting as to whether this issue is being resolved, prior to our voting on next year's candidates for honorary degrees, which the Senate is scheduled to do on May 6.

Senator Rick Richardson made an announcement on behalf of Senator James Malone, who can not be at today's meeting, about the Committee on the Outstanding Teaching Awards, which Senator Malone chairs. Senator Richardson reported that the administration unilaterally decided that an administrator would be added to the Committee, which has been a faculty committee since its formation, and that since neither the Committee nor Senator Malone was consulted, Senator Malone has resigned as the chair of the Committee.

The winners in the election of at-large representatives of the full-time faculty who will serve on the 2005-6 Faculty Senate were congratulated: Marvie Brooks; James Cauthen; Edward Davenport; Robert DeLucia; P. J. Gibson; Heath Grant; Amy Green; Betsy Hegeman; Holly Hill;

Karen Kaplowitz; Tom Litwack; Francis Sheehan; Susan Will. Also congratulated were the winners in the election of at-large representatives of the adjunct faculty: Andrea Balis; Orlanda Brugnola; Rick Richardson; Robin Whitney.

**2. Approval of Minutes #276 of the April 7,2005, meeting**

By a motion made and carried, Minutes #276 of the April 7 meeting were approved.

**3. Election of at-large 2005-6 Senate at-large representatives to the 2005-6 College Council**

The following faculty elected as At-large Representatives on the 2005-6 Faculty Senate were elected to the eight Faculty Senate seats on the 2005-6 College Council:

Marvie Brooks	Holly Hill
Orlanda Brugnola	Karen Kaplowitz
James Cauthen	Rick Richardson
Heath Grant	Francis Sheehan

**4. Election of an *ex officio* Senate representative to the 2005-6 College Council**

The Senate elected Senator Tom Litwack as the *ex officio* representative of the Senate

**5. Ratification of the election of John Jay delegates to the University Faculty Senate**

The following faculty were elected to serve as delegates to the University Faculty Senate:

Roslyn Caldwell (Psychology)  
Tom Kubic (Science)  
Raul Romero (Foreign Languages & Literature)  
Liliana Soto-Fernandez (Foreign Languages & Literature)

Continuing their 3-year terms are:

Karen Kaplowitz (English)  
Tom Kucharski (Psychology)  
Orlanda Brugnola (AMP) – delegate representing adjunct faculty

Also elected were three alternate delegates:

Ned Benton (Public Management)

Anthony Carpi (Science)

Angela Crossman (Psychology)

**6. Update on the John Jay budget: Senators Tom Litwack and Karen Kaplowitz  
[Attachment A, B]**

The faculty leadership has written President Travis about their concerns regarding the College's fiscal outlook [Attachment A].

Also, as was reported at the last Senate meeting, the University's assessment of fringe benefit costs to the senior colleges and its implementation of this action has affected John Jay's Financial Plan this year and poses potential adverse affects for the future. The imposition of about \$1 million in fringe benefits costs had the potential to balloon to almost \$2 million the following year.

John Jay was assessed the largest amount, \$946,000, of all the senior colleges. The total assessment to the 11 senior colleges was \$3 million and, yet, John Jay had been assessed a third of the amount. President Travis wrote to 80<sup>th</sup> Street about this and he, VP Pignatello, and Budget Director Angela Martin met with 80<sup>th</sup> Street budget officials, most recently this morning.

As a result of these communications and a review by the University Budget Office, John Jay's assessment was reduced by \$253,000. In other words, our projected assessment this year is \$693,000. The College administration plans to continue these discussions regarding possible reductions to next year's assessment.

President Kaplowitz reported that Professor Ned Benton and she will be writing to Vice Chancellor Malave about the fringe benefit issue because the issue is not resolved for next year or for future years and, thus, remains a threat to our fiscal status [Attachment B].

**7. Discussion of the agenda of the April 21 meeting of the College Council**

The April 21 agenda of the College Council includes proposals from the Curriculum Committee: minor revisions in the Government Major and new courses proposed by the Departments of Government, Public Management, Speech, Theater and Media Studies, and Law and Police Science.

Also included are proposals from the Graduate Studies Committee: a change in a course title. Also on the agenda is the approval of proposed student awardees recommended by the Committee on Undergraduate Honors, Prizes, Scholarships, and Awards.

**8. Report of the Faculty Senate's Committee on the Concerns of Untenured Faculty**  
**[Attachment C]**

A Report of the Faculty Senate's Committee on the Concerns of Untenured Faculty [Attachment C] was reviewed and formally received by the Senate. The Report was written by the Committee after the Committee developed a questionnaire, which the Senate approved, and which was sent to all untenured faculty. The comments were analyzed and summarized and the Report was written.

Senator Carol Groneman noted that the first of the recommendations in the concluding section of the Report is for an improved orientation for new faculty and she asked who is responsible for faculty orientation. President Kaplowitz said it is the Office of the Provost. Senator Litwack added that the new Comprehensive Action Plan for the College names the Provost and also the Senate as the parties responsible for faculty orientation.

Senator Michelle Galietta reported ways that the Security staff interferes with the ability of Psychology faculty, whose offices are in North Hall, to engage in their research. She also reported that the College had not renewed the site licenses for statistics software which she and other faculty were promised when they were hired. She said that untenured faculty are leaving the College and that the disarray in the College is apparent to faculty who are being interviewed and as a result we are losing new faculty because of the lack of faculty support.

President Kaplowitz said in response to problems with the Security staff, she has discussed this with Security Director Murphy and that many problems derive from our having a student Security staff, which is characterized by a very high turnover. We do have the option of hiring a more professional security staff—ours is the only CUNY college that has a student security staff and ours is the only CUNY college that does not participate in the CUNY Security Officer Initiative – but we can only do this if we are willing to spend the additional costs which would result from the much higher salaries which would have to be paid from our operating budget.

Senator Teresa Booker said there should be a middle way between finding funds for a professional security staff and simply accepting that our student security staff is going to be rude and is going to harass faculty and students. Senator Jodie Roure agreed with both the problems identified regarding the security staff and with Senator Booker's conclusion.

With reference to another aspect of the Report, Senator Betsy Gitter said the current standards for publication for tenure are not consistent with the level of faculty support or with the conditions that exist at the College and that we need to have more realistic standards for tenure.

Professor Galietta said she is glad that Senator Gitter spoke about unrealistic tenure standards, but she doesn't so much want the standards to be changed as she wants to be supported and permitted to do her work, her teaching and research, so she can meet those standards.

Senator Litwack said the main culprit in most of these problems is CUNY and not John Jay, that these are resource problems because we are not funded fairly by CUNY and we may have to take more direct action to convince CUNY that this has to be changed.

Senator Dunham said it is really scandalous how bad things are at this campus and that we

are not taking further action to fight the underfunding of the College.

Senator Litwack agreed, saying that we should make it clear that we have been patient and waited long enough to get the funding issue rectified. Indeed, it has been twelve years since the Central Administration at 80th street publically acknowledged the underfunding of John Jay, thanks to the work of the John Jay Faculty Senate, and we should say that unless the situation is rectified we will take action.

By a motion made and adopted, the meeting was adjourned at 5:10pm.

Submitted by,

Edward Davenport  
Recording Secretary

&

James Cauthen  
Associate Recording Secretary



JOHN JAY COLLEGE OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE

*The City University of New York*  
445 West 59th Street  
New York, NY 10019  
(212) 237-8000

**ATTACHMENT A**

April 15, 2005

Dear President Travis:

We write out of concern about the College's financial situation. We recently learned about the University's fringe benefit policy and about the extent of our hirings thus far during this year – 24 new positions since last Fall, at least 19 of which are *not* faculty appointments. Today another 6 administrative positions close their posting period on the College website and an additional 8 administrative positions close within the next 30 days.

We are concerned that it may be ill-advised, given our current information, to make employment offers for these positions, however meritorious. We should have a clear assurance of the College's capacity to pay for the salaries and fringe benefits involved, in the context of our joint priority to continue to address the critical need for more full-time faculty.

Angela Martin expressed concerns about our financial situation in an email yesterday: "I don't think the College can make any commitment of full-time positions for the future."

We, therefore, ask to meet with you about this situation as soon as possible. We also request that you consider not filling any more positions until we meet, except for the conversions of substitute professorships to full-time professorships for which searches were authorized last Fall.

Sincerely,

Karen Kaplowitz  
Harold Sullivan  
Ned Benton  
Tom Litwack

cc: Angela Martin  
Basil Wilson  
Robert Pignatello

## ATTACHMENT B

John Jay College of Criminal Justice  
The City University of New York  
445 West 59th  
New York, NY 10019

May 4, 2005

Vice Chancellor Ernesto Malave  
535 East 80th Street  
New York, New York 10021

Dear Ernesto:

The CUNY Board of Trustees, under the leadership of Chancellor Goldstein, has enacted policies and undertaken budgetary initiatives to hire new faculty and to design and implement objective and fair resource allocation policies. The university's accomplishments are highlighted in the 2004-2008 Master Plan:

*Over the past four years, the University has engaged in a massive hiring effort designed to restore the ranks of full-time faculty to levels not seen in three decades. Just this year more than 400 new faculty joined the system in full-time professorial titles at the senior and community colleges. Another major wave of new hires - more than 300 alone under the Community College Investment Program - is anticipated for next year. All the colleges are aggressively recruiting to fill empty lines and new lines continue to be allocated. Our purpose in this effort has been two-fold: to increase disciplinary strength and to reach the point where 70% of instruction is taught by full-time faculty. (Page 10)*

University policy is also reflected in the University Performance Goals and Targets. Goal #3 is the "Increase instruction by full-time faculty."

### **Fringe Benefit Administration Should Reinforce University Goals**

On April 8, 2005, we were present when the UFS Budget Advisory Committee was briefed on a new initiative in fringe benefit administration: charging campuses for fringe benefits of certain positions. As members of the Committee, we have profound reservations about aspects of this initiative. The purpose of this letter is to explain our concerns and to proffer an alternative view.

The funding and administration of fringe benefits has traditionally been a policy-neutral function of the central administration of the University. However, the University recently initiated charges to campuses for the full cost of certain positions. If a campus hires additional positions, above the maintenance of effort faculty position floors, and above the administrative and support position ceilings adjusted for centrally authorized and funded positions, the campus is to be charged the full



## ATTACHMENT B (cont)

33% fringe benefit cost on such positions.

The new policy is no longer neutral – applying the same rule to all positions. Instead, the policy targets particular positions for additional cost burdens - those positions that exceed the ceilings and floors that have been in place for several years.

Much of the discussion about fringe benefit administration at the April 8<sup>th</sup> meeting of the UFS Budget Advisory Committee turned on the meaning and purposes of these position ceilings and floors. Our understanding has been that the clear purpose of the ceilings on non-teaching positions was to discourage additional employment in these categories, unless clearly justified. The clear purpose of the floors applied to teaching positions was to reinforce the “maintenance of effort” policy designed to increase the number of faculty members.

### **The New Fringe Benefit Policy in Relation to University Goals**

The new fringe benefit charges discourage and impair new faculty hiring. If a campus hires additional faculty positions, above the maintenance of effort floor adjusted for centrally authorized and funded positions, the campus is to be charged the full 33% fringe benefit cost on such faculty positions.

We listened carefully for the explanation of the rationale for such a policy. The Committee was told that the Chancellory had announced in the past that these charges might be imposed if they became necessary.

The explanation does not address the substantive rationale for the policy in the first place. At best, it justifies the charges based on an “administrative process” and “moral hazard” rationale: The central administrators told the campuses that they might do this, and therefore it is being done. The current charges are being presented as the fault of the campuses that incur them, because of their poor planning and inattention to instructions and warnings.

But there is no substantive rationale for this policy that can be reconciled with University policy. The Board of Trustees recognizes that all CUNY campuses need new faculty members, and that some campuses have comparatively urgent and severe needs for new faculty members. This is reflected in their policy objective “*to increase disciplinary strength and to reach the point where 70% of instruction is taught by full-time faculty*,” -- and as reflected in the ongoing use of the Instructional Staffing Model, and as reflected in University Performance Goal #3, to “Increase instruction by full-time faculty.”

What could be the substantive rationale of a policy to centrally pay for fringe benefits for professorships at or below the campus ceiling and to charge the full cost of fringe benefits for professorships above the ceiling? University policy might justify an incentive for a campus that exceeds expectations in a critical area of performance. In fact, the University has approved performance targets for campuses that involve hiring new faculty members in excess of the “maintenance of effort” floor. Why would the University approve executive incentives for new

## ATTACHMENT B (cont)

faculty hiring above the maintenance of effort floor, and then construct a policy of budgetary disincentives for the same accomplishments: targeting the new positions for special fringe benefit burdens?

The principle should be clear: Fringe benefit administration should encourage and support campuses when they prudently invest available resources in hiring additional full-time faculty. If fringe benefit administration cannot encourage university goals, at least its administration should be as neutral as possible.

### **Identifying Dollars to Reallocate to Unfunded University Needs**

The only substantive rationale that we can imagine is that the central administration needs to identify sources of dollars that can be reallocated to address unfunded needs. We believe that fringe benefit administration can be an appropriate area of attention, both to assure spending within budget limits and to identify dollars that can be reassigned to other needs.

But at the BAC meeting, we were told that this was not the rationale – that there was no shortage of fringe benefit funds and that there was no intention to tap the central fringe benefit account for other University purposes. If that remains the situation, then there is no corresponding policy rationale -- based on University goals and performance objectives – for charging campuses for 100% of fringe benefit costs when campuses exceed University expectations in faculty hiring.

### **Fringe Benefit Administration as an Instrument of University Policy**

Fringe benefit administration could be a legitimate instrument to further the achievement of University goals. Policies could be established that charge full costs for certain classes of “discouraged” positions or types of programs and functions, while centrally paying for other classes of “preferred” positions or types of programs and functions. However, the policy would have to be clearly aligned with University goals. We believe that each of the following policy options could be selected and implemented in a manner that would be consistent with University policy, and with the support of the Budget Advisory Committee.

**Policy Option A:** If fringe benefit administration is to be policy-neutral and fully funded, as has traditionally been the case, then all positions should be treated the same and no campus charges should be applied. This is the default position – the starting point for discussion – and departures from this approach should be deliberately designed and chosen.

**Policy Option B:** If fringe benefit administration is to be policy neutral, but funding shortfalls are also to be addressed, then all positions should still be treated the same. If, for example, the central account can only cover 95% of all fringe benefit costs, then campuses should be charged for the shortfall in proportion to their share of salaries involved. This can be done in a variety of simple and predictable ways, such as charging campuses for the first \$300 of fringe benefits for each position, or charging campuses for a percent of the personal services expenditures.

## ATTACHMENT B (cont)

**Policy Option C:** If fringe benefit administration is to become an active and intentional policy instrument – to encourage and discourage campus financial behavior – then the policy objectives should be clearly aligned with defined University goals. For example, fringe benefits could be charged for campus positions that are above the limits in a resource allocation model. Since most campus have faculty lines far below the 70% goal as operationalized using the Instructional Staffing Model, it is hard to imagine a policy that would generally discourage faculty hiring by imposing local fringe benefit costs on faculty hiring. However, there might be instances where administrative and support positions exceed levels defined in the forthcoming model, and local charges for fringe benefits of the additional positions might be a logical step.

We appreciate the opportunity for consultation and dialogue about University fiscal policy and administration. We recognize that these are challenging times for financial planning and administration. For that reason, our comments are not limited to raising concerns and objections. We have also proffered a range of constructive policy options that we are prepared to actively support.

Sincerely,

Ned Benton and Karen Kaplowitz

## ATTACHMENT C

### Report of the Faculty Senate Committee on the Concerns of Untenured Faculty April 2005

#### A. Introduction

This report will consider the research, teaching, and administrative environment in the school, will outline the challenges facing junior faculty today, and will offer some limited suggestions as to how faculty and college leadership could help facilitate the work of untenured faculty in our college. Feedback from untenured faculty and deliberations among committee members reveal a mixed picture about the life of junior faculty within our institution.

On the one hand, many of those we talked with or received feedback from indicate that they have had moderate to severe difficulties in engaging in effective research, writing, and teaching while at John Jay as a result of burdensome teaching loads, a lack of resources, and inadequate school infrastructure.

On the other hand, most report that a strongly supportive culture exists within the school that has led many untenured faculty to praise their peers and senior colleagues as major forces pushing them to achieve despite the difficult environment in the college and university. This supportive personal environment suggests that many of the obstacles to junior faculty achieving their research and teaching potential could be resolved with a relatively small number of careful and cost effective changes.

#### B. Teaching

One of the five goals of the college outlined in the recent report of the Middle States evaluation team is the “improvement of the quality of the instruction and fulfilling a commitment to a culture of learning” (page 4, Report to the Faculty..., 2003). Given this stated aim of the school, we feel confident that voicing our concerns about the teaching environment at John Jay College will be particularly useful to the administration and the college as we plan for our future.

Our discussions have identified teaching as a major cause of concern for untenured faculty, with the majority of our respondents reporting that both the quantity and quality of teaching resources ranged from average to very poor. Fewer than a third rated

## **Report: Faculty Senate Committee on the Concerns of Untenured Faculty – p. 2**

teaching resources as good or very good. Dirty, smelly, unventilated, crowded classrooms with non-functioning clocks, no chalk or transparencies, and broken departmental photocopiers were some of the problems reported.

### **1. Teaching Experiences**

Heavy course loads and large class sizes make effective teaching particularly challenging for new faculty and leave little, if any, time during the semester for research and writing. Of particular concern are semesters when faculty are required to teach four courses, which makes any additional work beyond teaching virtually impossible.

Added to the burdensome teaching load was a sense, expressed by some respondents, of a lack of opportunity to teach in their areas of specialization. Inequitable distribution of classes was reported by some who felt that they were responsible for teaching more of the lower level classes than the tenured faculty.

This may be a particular problem in the departments that do not have majors or participate in graduate programs, where there is limited opportunity to teach non-general education core courses, all of which are now taught at the 100 or 200 level.

On a positive note, respondents appreciated having freedom to design their own courses and curricula. Departments were reported to be very supportive in helping faculty develop new courses that met their own interests.

### **2. Faculty Preparedness and Information**

Junior faculty arrive on campus with little idea of how to direct students to the appropriate services. The college needs to deal with this problem much more comprehensively by providing a framework to help faculty direct students to support services. Moreover, there appears to be no mechanism to help students with particular medical and personal problems to communicate with school officials. Students with serious personal problems often appear unaware of how to get help from the Dean of Students Office for problems that interfere with their academic progress. Incoming faculty need to be informed of existing services on campus and contact people in those areas.

### **3. Media Services**

The Media Services Department was identified as problematic. Respondents reported that bringing media equipment into traditionally-designed classrooms is time consuming

## **Report: Faculty Senate Committee on the Concerns of Untenured Faculty – p. 3**

to arrange and set up, intrudes into class-time, and, at times, equipment has failed to arrive at all. The department was seen by some as being less than helpful and even unresponsive to faculty needs. **An** orientation for faculty outlining the best way of taking advantage of the services offered by the department might improve the situation.

### **C. Research**

The survey results indicate that most junior faculty members have experienced difficulties in engaging in effective research at John Jay College. Many respondents referred to a number of aspects of College life that, in some fashion, hampered their ability to conduct serious academic research.

Common complaints were that: the culture of the college was not sufficiently research oriented; the teaching load of seven courses per year was too high; the system of travel reimbursement for academic conference presentations was flawed; the library was both under-stocked and under-funded; there was a lack of necessary resources, and that DoIt was inefficient in responding to faculty concerns.

#### **1. Work Load and Research Productivity**

Faculty indicated that they had substantial difficulties commencing their research agendas at the College. **An** overwhelming number expressed frustration with the current teaching load and argued that it hindered their ability to write. One respondent wrote that “it is virtually impossible to do your own research while teaching 4 courses... The most important issue [is] course reduction” and another succinctly answered that a “reduced teaching load!” is the most important change that could be done to improve the workplace environment for untenured faculty.

Some also noted that, unlike many other institutions which purposely shield junior faculty from non-research and teaching areas of college life during their initial years of service, John Jay operated in an opposite fashion. Paradoxically, in many departments it was invariably the lowest ranked faculty who assumed the highest teaching and service loads. For example, one respondent recounted that his/her first semester’s responsibilities at John Jay included: teaching four courses, which included one new preparation; one committee assignment; and successfully completing and defending his/her dissertation by the end of the term deadline he/she was given. While the respondent successfully completed all these responsibilities, he/she was forced to work eleven to twelve hours a day, seven days a week for the entire semester.

## **2. Travel Reimbursement**

Respondents also expressed serious concerns about the current system of travel reimbursements for conference presentations. Both the formula/criteria and the amounts of reimbursement were questioned. For instance, one response argued that “expecting faculty to make a name for themselves and John Jay with their colleagues but not providing financial support for the necessary travel and research infrastructure is absurd.”

Other respondents expressed puzzlement about how the amounts to be reimbursed were calculated. Further, many noted that the uncertainty about the amount of reimbursement, or even if any reimbursement would be obtained at all, sometimes negatively affected their decision to attend the conference.

The increased amount of travel support this year does not obviate this concern. Without a transparent system for the distribution of travel funding, junior faculty find it very difficult to plan travel for conferences. Recent increases in overall funding for conference travel have ameliorated some of this problem but the administration could be more transparent about how funding is distributed.

## **3. Library Services**

Respondents praised the library for its inter-library loan service, electronic resources, and the library faculty. However, the library acquisitions policy focuses on criminal justice and related areas, and faculty whose research interests do not fall under these categories reported that the library collections are insufficient to support research. This was particularly true in the humanities. These faculty are forced to rely extensively on interlibrary loan and on whatever access arrangements they are able to make with other area libraries.

Interesting suggestions to overcome these difficulties included establishing a fund to pay for individual memberships at local university libraries, and/or establishing some access relationship/agreement with local humanities research libraries. These suggestions are problematic, though, in that they would involve CUNY effectively subsidizing private universities.

Another suggestion was for the library to make available brief faculty biographies, so colleagues could identify others with similar research interests. It would be of great help to junior faculty if library, administration, and senior faculty found more effective ways to inform junior faculty about ways to gain access to research collections around the city especially in areas not related to criminal justice. This would help new faculty in non-mission fields to hit the ground running on their research.

## **Report: Faculty Senate Committee on the Concerns of Untenured Faculty – p. 5**

Oddly enough, no mentions were made of having access to other CUNY libraries, with the exception of the Graduate Center library. As a relatively new CUNY library, the Graduate Center has a fairly small collection – much smaller than that of Hunter, City, or Baruch, to mention the three largest CUNY libraries in Manhattan. The library at John Jay needs to do more to publicize the options available to humanities-oriented faculty, and certainly could do more to publicize the nature of faculty borrowing privileges at other CUNY libraries.

Other problems voiced about the library included providing out of date materials and, in spite of the recent infusion of electronic resources in the humanities (eg MLA, JSTOR, Project Muse, etc), the inadequacy of electronic resources in non-mission areas.

The inequality of library faculty with the rest of the faculty regarding research time, flexibility, and teaching opportunities was pointed out. Librarians are required, by contract, to work in the library 35 hours a week year round – unlike the rest of the faculty, librarians are required to be at the college throughout the year, and not just during the spring and fall semesters.

### **3. Research Resources**

Finally, a number of respondents complained about a lack of resources at the college and maintained that this also undermined their ability to conduct research. Common criticisms included receiving computers and printers that soon broke as well as having to endure extended waits to receive new computers and printers.

One respondent wrote that there is “currently no infrastructure [at the college] to support research: no fax machines, no long distance on phone, and I did not receive a computer for two months.” Another noted that the first two computers he/she was given by the college were recycled “hand me downs” which both soon broke and, in one instance, resulted in his/her losing the research that he/she was working on. Further, a number of faculty expressed frustration with DOIT, noting that requests to make repairs often took a long time to be addressed.

### **4. Conclusions on Research**

Despite these problems, the majority of faculty indicated that they were excited to be part of CUNY and participate in its unique mission. Most believe that all of these problems could be solved given the proper resolve. The overwhelming consensus that emerged from the survey was not a desire to avoid required obligations but, rather, quite the opposite.



## **Report: Faculty Senate Committee on the Concerns of Untenured Faculty – p. 6**

The responses clearly demonstrate that the vast majority of respondents have an overwhelming sense of purpose, motivation, drive and excitement that if properly funded and nurtured would result in personal and institutional success. As one respondent wrote “Invest in the faculty and it will earn a return.”

### **D. Security, Physical Plant, Orientation, and Family Leave**

Four other issues stood out in the junior faculty survey that are worth mentioning in this report: security, physical plant, new faculty orientation, and family leave.

#### **1. Security**

Despite an ostentatious uniformed presence at the entrance of college buildings, security services at John Jay are inadequate and poorly managed. Junior faculty have reported harassment by security guards and interference of security guards with legitimate faculty access to the building. Security guards have been known to go to faculty offices on weekends and demand to see faculty identification.

To make matters worse there is a grave lack of transparency around security issues at the school. While theft and assaults have happened on campus, security rarely publishes systematic accounts of these events. While we recognize the need to protect victim privacy, it is important that the college know what types of crimes are happening on campus, where those crimes are happening, and how often they are happening. As it stands now, faculty are forced to rely on rumor to know about the security problems facing the school.

Improved training and leadership of the security staff as well as regular and consistent publication of on-campus crime statistics would help a great deal in providing faculty a feeling of safety in their work place environment.

#### **2. Physical Plant**

The physical plant at John Jay is woefully inadequate. While the Tenth Avenue building is an excellent facility, the North Building is a hazard to those who have to work and study in it. Twice in the last two years there have been small fires in the building. Stories circulate among junior faculty of senior faculty working in the building developing odd illnesses. The North Building is often broiling in the summers and extremely cold in the winters especially on the weekends when many untenured faculty, whose schedules are otherwise full with heavy teaching and service obligations, come to

## **Report: Faculty Senate Committee on the Concerns of Untenured Faculty – p. 7**

the office to complete writing tasks. At times North Hall is so cold that coats have to be worn in offices and hands hurt to the point that typing is virtually impossible.

Without tenure and buried under serious teaching and research obligations, junior faculty appear to make up a disproportionate number of the faculty in the building at nights and on weekends when facility conditions are at their worst. Encouraging optimum output from new faculty and retaining those faculty as they are promoted through the system requires that the school address the woeful conditions in North Hall before the new building is opened.

### **3. Faculty Orientation**

Finally, the school's orientation program for new faculty is inadequate. Faculty arrive on campus and receive only a very limited orientation that covers briefly some of the basics about the school, research expectations, and a short meeting on grant writing that focuses on CUNY resources and put faculty in touch with Jacob Marini (who is recognized by many faculty to be a huge help in putting together grant applications). After this meeting faculty are cut loose and, outside of normal channels in their own department, have little connection to the rest of the school. Faculty arriving in the Spring Term complained that they received no orientation at all.

### **4. Family Leave**

Some concern was also expressed by junior faculty about the inadequacy of CUNY family leave policy. The inability to take leave without resetting the clock was a concern raised by some.

## **E. Conclusions and Recommendations**

This situation clearly must change. If the school is serious about improving teaching and retaining junior faculty the orientation process must be much more comprehensive and professional. At orientation faculty must be made aware of the various services and facilities available at the school especially the role of the Counseling Department and the Dean of Students Office in dealing with personal and academic problems which their students may confront.

To address these concerns the Committee offers the following recommendations to the Faculty Senate:

## **Report: Faculty Senate Committee on the Concerns of Untenured Faculty – p. 8**

1. The faculty orientation process should play an important role in answering faculty questions and concerns, and preparing them for a productive future at the College. Although the current orientation for new faculty provides a great opportunity to meet College administration and other new faculty, many participants often remain confused about the day-to-day logistics of College activity (e.g., copying, inter-library loans, etc.) that are essential in minimizing frustration and enhancing first semester productivity. Additionally, new faculty have noted that they leave the orientation with very little appreciation for the important student support services offered at the College (e.g., Writing Center, Students with Disabilities, student clubs, etc.).

We recommend devoting time at the faculty orientation to include forums related to support services for students and faculty at the College. To offer continuous support to faculty throughout their career at the College, revisions to the faculty handbook should also ensure that adequate information is provided for faculty and student support services as well as the possibilities and process of conducting research within the College, CUNY generally, and through other university campuses.

2. The culture of research at the College could be strengthened by granting reassigned time to faculty actively engaged in research. While the school currently grants reassigned time for all sorts of administrative assignments (such as coordinating majors, graduate programs, senior seminars, etc.) it does not do so for research. Granting reassigned time to faculty actively involved in research would represent a commitment from the College to foster scholarly research. We strongly encourage the administration to consider this proposal as well as other creative uses of reassigned time to encourage and foster a culture of research at John Jay.

3. Junior faculty also identified a lack of transparency regarding campus security issues as a source of concern. While theft and assaults have happened on campus, security rarely publishes systematic accounts of these events. As it stands now, faculty are forced to rely on rumors. While we recognize the need to protect victim privacy and understand that security staff can not reliably predict future incidents on campus, early notification is the best protection against potential dangers; however, there are general preventive measures security staff can take to keep the college environment safe for learning and work.

3a. We recommend the administration regularly provide faculty with incident reports to advise them of security issues on campus either by e-mail or by posting reports in all buildings. Such reports should include the times, dates, locations, and nature of the incidents. Further, faculty should have access to on-campus crime statistics through a creation of a security alert website. The creation of such alert would enable the campus

**Report: Faculty Senate Committee on the Concerns of Untenured Faculty – p. 9**

community to report and direct questions and concerns about their personal safety while promoting caution on campus.

3b. Another suggested action in relation to security is to implement a mandatory sensitivity training to ensure that security staff are aware of the appropriate conduct standards for their positions. The underlying theme of such training should be on treating all members of the John Jay community with respect and dignity and to highlight unacceptable behaviors, conduct, or comments that may be perceived as demeaning, offensive, or hostile.

4. We recommend that the Faculty Senate adopt a resolution to respond to the physical plant issues highlighted in this report. Specifically, heat and air conditioning should be in operation in the buildings on weekends and days that the College is closed; chalk should be distributed to each classroom at the end of each teaching day; media services should be modified to ensure that media are delivered and set-up on time and to ensure prompt confirmation of media bookings made by faculty and support staff; and every effort should be made to increase the number of "smart" classrooms throughout the College.

5. Finally, we recommend that the Faculty Senate provide support to bring junior faculty together in a more informal context to discuss issues related to the school, to communicate to them the role that the senate plays in faculty life, and to provide a more direct conduit between junior faculty and the senate. This could be an ongoing concern of the Committee on the Concerns of Untenured Faculty.