

Faculty Senate Minutes #339

Thursday, March 5, 2009

3:20 PM

Room 630 T

Present (36): Andrea Balis, Elton Beckett, Adam Berlin, Teresa Booker, Marvie Brooks, Elise Champeil, Shuki Cohen, Edward Davenport, JoEllen Delucia, Virginia Diaz, Janice Dunham, Josh Freilich, Gail Garfield, P. J. Gibson, Amy Green, Jay Hamilton, Kimberly Helmer, Heather Holtman, Ping Ji, Karen Kaplowitz, Joseph King, Tom Litwack, Vincent Maiorino, Evan Mandery, Nicholas Petraco, Michael Pfeifer, Tanya Rodriguez, Francis Sheehan, Richard Schwester, Arthur Sherman, Robert Till, Shonna Trinch, Roberto Visani, Thalia Vrachopoulos, Valerie West, Joshua Wilson

Absent (14): Michael Alperstein, Simon Baatz, Erica Burleigh, DeeDee Falkenbach, Beverly Frazier, Maki Haberfeld, Richard Haw, Allison Kavey, Mickey Melendez, Erica King-Toler, Ali Kocak, Raul Romero, Jodie Roure, Staci Strobl

Guests: Professors Dara Byrne, Jane Katz, Jill Stauffer; Director Kathy Killoran; CAT Director Meghan Duffy

Invited Guests: Provost Jane Bowers, Vice President Vivien Hoexter

Agenda

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. Announcements & Reports
3. Adoption of Minutes #338 of the February 18, 2009, meeting
4. Election to fill a vacant Faculty Senate seat
5. Election to fill an alternate College Council seat
6. Invited Guest: VP for Strategic Marketing and Development Vivien Hoexter
7. Review of the agenda of the March 18 meeting of the College Council
8. Report of the Task Force on General Education: Amy Green, Chair, Task Force
9. A Workload Requirement from the Task Force on Faculty Workload
10. Preliminary proposals for changing the class schedule grid
11. Proposed amendments to the Faculty Personnel Guidelines
12. Revised Draft of the Template for Department Bylaws for review and comment
13. Invited Guest: Provost Jane Bowers

1. **Adoption of the agenda.** Approved

2. **Announcements & Reports.** Noted.

Senator Evan Mandery has just been elected chair of the new Department of Criminal Justice. The Senate applauded at hearing this news.

VP Pignatello has said he will announce changes in the policy on receiving mail at the College, which will address the concerns raised by faculty and by the Faculty Senate.

3. **Adoption of Minutes #338 of the February 18, 2009, meeting.** Approved

4. **Election to fill a vacant Faculty Senate seat**

A vacancy had been declared by the Senate at its last meeting upon receipt of a letter of resignation from Kirk Dombrowski. The Senate then determined that the seat shall be filled by the next highest vote recipient in the election for at-large members if that person, whose identity was not revealed, agrees to serve. Subsequently and accordingly, Professor Joseph King was nominated and elected.

5. **Election to fill a vacant alternate College Council seat**

Senator Joseph King was elected to serve as an alternate member of the College Council by unanimous vote.

6. **Invited Guest: VP for Strategic Marketing and Development Vivien Hoexter**

Vice President Vivien Hoexter, who is a new member of the John Jay administration, was welcomed to the Senate. She spoke about her plans and her hopes of working closely with the faculty and the Faculty Senate. She said that a search will be opened for more staff to work on development, that is, on raising money for the College.

7. Review of the agenda of the March 18 meeting of the College Council

The agenda includes: a proposal for a B.A. degree in Global History; proposed revision of the general education requirements for History; new proposed courses in Government, Economics, History, Art, Literature; proposed course revisions in English and Sociology; a proposed cross listing of a English and an Anthropology course; as well as a proposed graduate course and a proposed revision.

8. Report of the Task Force on General Education: Amy Green, Chair, Task Force [Attachment A, B, C]

Professor Amy Green, Chair of the Task Force on General Education, introduced members of the Task Force who were able to attend the meeting with her: Professors Dara Byrne, Jane Katz, Jill Stauffer as well as Director Kathy Killoran and CAT Director Meghan Duffy.

Professor Green reviewed the 93 page December 1, 2008, report, "The Future of General Education at John Jay College of Criminal Justice: A Report from the Task Force on General Education," a copy of which was included in the agenda packet of this Senate meeting [see Attachment A for the Executive Summary]

Professor Green said that she is hoping that the College community will come to a consensus about the proposed learning objectives [Attachment B] and the proposed principles [Attachment C] that are included in the Report which will inform John Jay's new general education curriculum and program. Senator Edward Davenport said the Report has already been discussed by the English Department and some faculty had dissented from the statement in the Report that neither faculty nor students enjoy the current Gen Ed courses. He said he tremendously enjoys teaching his 200-level general education literature courses and he believes that many students have enjoyed them as well. Professor Green said that she hopes that there was no such blanket claim in the report. She said she believes that most of the faculty who complained about core courses had been teaching 100-level core courses. Professor Green asked Senators to look carefully at the document and to send written comments directly to her.

Senator P.J. Gibson raised a question about studying "major" writers and Senator Gail Garfield raised a question about the meanings of "culture." Senator Adam Berlin proposed having students read a common book or list of books as a way of giving students the "Common Experience" asked for in the report. Senator Tom Litwack took issue with the wording of the section on a common experience section on page 6. He said he wants it to be clear that this should not mean necessarily adding a new course. Professor Green agreed and said her task force does not want to expand our current large core. Senator Shuki Cohen praised the Report's emphasis on providing what students need and want and he asked whether data have been collected from students. Professor Green said her task force would welcome any further

survey data on student opinion beyond what they have already collected. Other Senators asked various questions as well.

Professor Green asked the Senators to discuss the General Education Report with their departments and to bring comments and questions back to her, in writing if possible.

9. A Workload Requirements from the Task Force on Faculty Workload: Karen Kaplowitz

President Kaplowitz introduced a new workload requirement that the Provost and the Task Force on Faculty Workload have developed that requires all full time faculty members to teach at least one course on campus each semester. This was developed in response to the discovery that 40 full-time members of the faculty did not teach at all last year.

The proposal is as follows: All faculty members must teach a minimum of one course on campus (including the Graduate Center or John Jay College satellite campuses) during the fall semester and one course during the spring semester

The revised provision, at the recommendation of the Faculty Senate, is as follows:

All full-time faculty members who are not on sabbatical or other leave must teach a minimum of one course on campus (including the Graduate and University Center and approved John Jay satellite campuses) during the fall semester and one course on campus during the spring semester. Exceptions to the policy must be approved by the Department Chair and the Provost in advance of submission of the schedule for the given semester. Factors that may be considered when a waiver is requested include, but are not limited to, the following:

- The faculty member is untenured and has a rationale for using a portion of his/her 24 hours of contractual reassigned time for scholarly purposes requiring reassignment from all teaching during a semester.
- The faculty member has a fellowship that requires reassignment from all teaching.
- Upon recommendation of the Chairperson to fulfill essential departmental academic needs.

10. Preliminary proposals for changing the class schedule grid: Karen Kaplowitz and Tom Litwack [Attachment D]

Karen Kaplowitz and Tom Litwack, representing the Faculty Senate on the Scheduling Task Force, reported the preliminary scenarios [Attachment D]. The Task Force is to meet again on

March 10 and they will report at the next Senate meeting.

11. Proposed amendments to the Faculty Personnel Guidelines [Attachment E]

Proposed amendments to John Jay's Faculty Personnel Guidelines [Attachment E] will be voted on the following day by the Faculty Personnel Committee.

A series of changes were developed as recommendations from the Senate for discussion with the Provost when we meet with her today and for discussion by President Kaplowitz at the Faculty Personnel Committee meeting the following day.

12. Revised Draft of the Template for Department Bylaws for review and comment [Attachment F]

The amended Charter of John Jay requires each department to adopt bylaws which must be vetted by Counsel Rosemarie Maldonado and approved by the Executive Committee of the College Council. A draft template [Attachment F] for bylaws for academic departments was briefly reviewed. The template was developed by Professors Ned Benton, Karen Kaplowitz, Francis Sheehan, Harold Sullivan, and Counsel Rosemarie Maldonado.

13. Invited Guest: Provost Jane Bowers

Senator P. J. Gibson asked the provost to explain how it is possible for 40 full-time faculty members to have done no teaching at all last year, as has been reported. Provost Bowers said that arrangements had been made between faculty members and the provost who preceded her in this position, sometimes in writing and sometimes not, and that these arrangements had not previously been audited or reviewed and some agreements that were meant to expire long ago never did and the existence of other agreements cannot even be verified.

Senator Gibson also asked about the possibility of a faculty members transferring from a lecturer line to an assistant professor line. The Provost said that the College is not required to transfer a lecturer to an assistant professor line, so this is not a "right" but it is a possibility, an option which the College has. The Provost said that all lecturers -- even those on adjunct conversion lines -- may request such a transfer but, she explained, whether the transfer is granted would depend on the College's needs at the time. She said that such transfers from lecturer to tenure track assistant professor are not going to happen often, because lecturers are

usually hired to meet specific teaching needs and these needs have to be considered when considering transfer requests.

The Provost said that before coming to John Jay she had taught as a lecturer in a system in which lecturers taught all the composition courses and the professors did not speak to lecturers, even in the elevator, so to speak. Thus, she said, she had initially been opposed to appointing lecturers at all. But the union contract gave her no option because of the adjunct conversion lines, and one department made a convincing argument to her about how they could make especially good use of lecturer lines. Nevertheless, she said, she is opposed to setting up a two-tier faculty.

Senator Ping Ji asked about the service credit given to faculty making such transfers; she said that might shorten the tenure clock for them too much. The Provost agreed, saying that while some faculty teaching the heavy lecturer workload can still publish enough to get tenure, not all would want to try to do this.

VP Francis Sheehan noted that there have been a lot of questions about the draft workload document, and he suggested that some confusion may have arisen from there being no clear distinction made between lecturers and instructors. He pointed out a confusing passage. The Provost said that this passage comes directly from the contract and so cannot be significantly changed.

The Provost said that the Faculty Personnel Committee will discuss these issues the following day but will not vote on them until March 20th. President Kaplowitz noted that the Senate will be meeting again on March 16th, so we will have another opportunity to discuss the document.

President Kaplowitz reviewed revisions which the Senate wants made to the Workload Guidelines and the Provost agreed to them.

The Provost was asked whether she would publish a transparent inventory of reassigned time. The provost said she thought not since she does not publish faculty salaries, and reassigned time is a kind of compensation. But she said she would probably publish a formula for assigning reassigned time which would provide some transparency. VP Sheehan suggested that even if a reassigned time inventory is not to be published, we still need to have good records of what reassigned time is given and why. The Provost agreed.

Senator Litwack questioned whether the distinction between courses taught on-line and those taught at the Graduate Center is a valid one. In both cases, he said, they are not on John Jay's campus. Provost Bowers said that someone teaching at the Graduate Center is actually working with students face to face, unlike an on-line teacher, and that is a goal of this provision. The Provost said that personal contact is essential for teaching undergraduates although she could imagine entire programs being taught on-line, perhaps at the master's level.

Senator JoEllen Delucia reported that at a union meeting she had been told that she can take her contractual reassigned time at her own discretion. The Provost said she does not think such a right exists in the contract but rather the reassigned time is for scholarly purposes and the Provost has to approve the scholarly purpose being proposed.

Senator Helmer said she had been at the same union meeting and heard new faculty complaining that they are having a lot of trouble getting their chairs to approve their taking of the contractual reassigned time. She asked whether people who are having trouble with their chairs about this should go to the Provost. The Provost said that might sometimes work, but she cannot guarantee that she could successfully intercede with the chair. She explained that provosts must consult with chairs on such an issue, because the chair has the responsibility of scheduling all department courses and the responsibility for deciding the teaching schedule of all of her/his faculty.

The meeting was adjourned at 6 PM.

ATTACHMENT A

Executive Summary

The Task Force on General Education was convened in the Spring of 2007 by Jane Bowers, who was then Dean of Undergraduate Studies and is now Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs. Dr. Bowers charged the group to study General Education at John Jay, at our sister CUNY campuses, and at colleges and universities around the country and to produce a report to the community that would help us to assess the status of our nearly four-decades- old General Education program in the contexts of a national General Education reform movement and a parallel CUNY-wide initiative. This report is the result of the Task Force's research and deliberations. It does not propose a new or modified curriculum but rather lays out an array of issues and options that may guide curricular development.

“General Education is so important to our students that institutions should always be seeking to improve the program,” says a leader in the field.¹ John Jay's General Education program was first developed in the 1960s and underwent revision in 1975 and 1989 when requirements in ethnic studies, philosophy and physical education were added. In the 1990s, the General Education program requirements were reduced slightly because CUNY mandated a cap of 120 credits for the baccalaureate degree at all campuses. Beyond these minor modifications, however, the structure of the program has remained essentially unchanged for more than thirty years.

The Task Force found that the original design, intent, and coherence of our General Education program have eroded over the years, due in large part to fiscal constraints and a lack of program oversight, and that today's students and faculty are neither aware of its pedigree nor excited about teaching or taking the courses. By examining both traditional and innovative General Education programs at institutions from the Ivy League to urban community colleges, the Task Force discovered a wide variety of designs and strategies that might serve as models for revitalizing our own program. For example, while our current program is foundational—all of the courses are at the 100 and 200 levels—many campuses have General Education programs that scaffold the undergraduate experience from first semester to senior year.

In June 2008, six members of our Task Force attended the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) Institute on General Education, a selective, annual program that brings together campus representatives and national and international experts in establishing goals and devising General Education programs tailored to the specific needs of individual institutions. One of the most important ideas the team brought back from the experience was the value of adopting a set of transparent learning objectives, not just for the General Education program, but across all aspects of the undergraduate curriculum, including majors and co-curricular activities (e.g., internships, study abroad, service learning, club activity, student governance, etc.).

The report offers two sets of goals and objectives gleaned from the Task Force's multi-faceted study of best practices in General Education. First are the Proposed Learning Objectives for Undergraduate Education at John Jay College. Second are Guiding Principles for Effective General Education at John Jay College (see pages 3 and 5). The Task Force invites the College community to participate in a campus-wide conversation about the Learning Objectives and

¹ Ann Ferren. “Models of General Education,” AAC&U Institute on General Education (2008), p. 1.

Guiding Principles so that they can be revised and presented for adoption by the Committee on Undergraduate Curriculum and Standards and, ultimately, by the College Council in Spring 2009.

The report is organized into seven chapters on

- Rethinking General Education at John Jay College
- The Process and Methodology used by the Task Force on General Education at John Jay College
- The History and Status of the General Education program at John Jay College
- Proposed Institutional Learning Objectives for Undergraduate Education at John Jay College
- Proposed Principles for Effective General Education at John Jay College
- Models of General Education
- The Future of General Education at John Jay College

John Jay's General Education program is poised at the confluence of sweeping transformations. We are witnessing the rapid emergence of what President Jeremy Travis calls "the New John Jay." Among the many changes underway, we are in the process of phasing out associate degree programs and transitioning to senior college status; raising admissions standards; reintroducing liberal arts majors; reorganizing academic departments; and assimilating more than 145 additional tenure-track faculty hired since 2005. We are also stepping up our emphasis on global study, implementing educational partnerships with the six CUNY community colleges, and preparing to welcome the additional transfer students those partnerships will channel to the College in the next couple of years.

In this context, the Task Force offers its findings and is excited to welcome the rest of the faculty, as well as students, staff, and administrators into the conversation about the purpose, goals, and strategies that will re-shape our General Education program. Over the coming months, members of the Task Force will meet with the Committee on Undergraduate Curriculum and Standards, the Council of Chairs, the Faculty Senate, the Council of Coordinators of Majors and Programs, the Student Council, and individual departments when invited, to hear feedback on the report and its recommendations.

We understand that discussions about changes to John Jay's General Education program have been difficult in the past and that caring and well-intentioned people may hold widely divergent views about what will best serve the College and our students. The Task Force intends the process of sharing our findings and collecting reactions to be positive, transparent, and inclusive. We are confident that the mutual commitment to student success that has always distinguished the John Jay College community will keep our purpose, our discourse, and our aspirations high.

ATTACHMENT B

Proposed Learning Objectives for Undergraduate Education at John Jay College of Criminal Justice

Reasoning and Analysis: the ability to

- observe, sort, prioritize, and structure evidence;
- analyze different kinds of data;
- understand the distinction between evaluative and factual statements;
- solve problems through evidence-based inquiry (i.e., recognizing, using, and evaluating evidence in support of a hypothesis, theory, or principle);
- employ mathematical methods in the service of inquiry and quantitative and comparative analysis.

Communication Literacy: the ability to

- communicate clearly in standard written and spoken English;
- understand and target an audience;
- comprehend and discuss complex material, including texts, media, and numerical data;
- comprehend not only the broad or general points, but also the small details and nuances that contribute to (or complicate) the larger meanings of texts and other sources of information and knowledge;
- maintain self-awareness and critical distance as a reader/viewer/listener or as a producer of texts and other sources of information.

Information Literacy: the ability to

- understand how information in various formats is generated and organized;
- find and navigate appropriate resources in print and electronic formats;
- critically evaluate information for usefulness, currency, authenticity, objectivity and bias;
- recognize the importance of point of view in understanding, interpreting, and evaluating sources of information;
- understand issues surrounding plagiarism, copyright, and intellectual property and cite sources appropriately;
- use information in an effective and responsible manner.

Technological and Computer Literacy: the ability to

- conduct complex and dynamic Internet and database searches;
- use technologies to construct and disseminate their own knowledge and opinions;
- use common workplace software applications.

Ethical Practice: the ability to

- cultivate self-understanding by situating one's own experiences and perceptions in historical, cultural, and psychological contexts;
- use cross-cultural knowledge to explore multiple perspectives and ways of understanding;
- articulate the ethical dimensions of personal, academic, social, and political issues and choices;
- be an informed and responsible citizen of the world.

Creativity: the ability to

- understand artistic expression as a form of inquiry and problem solving, and problem-solving as a form of creativity;
- recognize and experience some of the methods and forms of artistic and imaginative expression.

Intellectual Maturity: the ability to

- be curious, tolerate ambiguity and disagreement, persist in the face of obstacles, and achieve critical distance;
- live a "good life" by developing the habits of introspection, personal and civic responsibility, and communication necessary for effective interaction with others;
- understand and embrace learning as a life-long process that enriches and gives meaning to daily experience.

Essential Knowledge: some familiarity with

- world history and the historical contexts of world languages, religions, and cultures;
- science and scientific methodologies and approaches to knowledge;
- the ideas of major thinkers and the works of major writers and artists;
- the nature and operations of various economic and political systems;
- the grammar, vocabulary, and syntax of another language;
- the social, political, and economic institutions of the United States;
- global interdependence; the impact on other parts of the world of seemingly disparate social, political, economic, cultural and environmental phenomena;
- the ways that technologies, information, and culture interact.

Proposed Principles for Effective General Education at John Jay College

To provide a framework for decision-making and the design of a revised General Education program at John Jay, the Task Force on General Education distilled its findings of best practices into a set of nine guiding principles. They are presented below and followed by extended discussions of Principles 1, 3, 5 and 9. We also provide examples of those principles in action at other institutions. As with the Learning Objectives, our goal is to achieve campus-wide consensus and have the principles ratified by the College Council in Spring 2009.

An Effective General Education Program at John Jay will:

1. **Have a clear purpose** that can be succinctly stated and explained and has a distinct identity at and beyond our campus. The purpose can relate directly or indirectly to the mission of the college.
2. **Foster, assess, and certify an agreed-upon set of learning objectives**, including skills and/or areas of knowledge.
3. **Scaffold undergraduate education at all stages and include cornerstone, milestone, and capstone experiences.** Learning objectives should be embedded across the curriculum at developmentally appropriate stages throughout the student's career. The General Education program should include upper-level courses that provide opportunities to integrate and apply the skills and knowledge acquired in lower-level courses and to demonstrate progress toward meeting the learning objectives. There should also be a reciprocal relationship between General Education and the majors, so that the learning objectives are reinforced consistently across all facets of the student's academic program. Co-curricular activities might also be incorporated into the overall structure of the General Education program.
4. **Enjoy high institutional priority.** The college could demonstrate this by: 1) establishing a faculty committee to oversee General Education; 2) creating the position of a faculty coordinator or dean for General Education; 3) funding faculty development programs and providing incentives for faculty to create, teach, and assess the General Education program and courses; 4) recognizing the scholarship of teaching and learning as equal to traditional disciplinary scholarship (thus the Office for the Advancement of Research would value and reward both, as would the faculty personnel process); and 5) recognizing faculty participation in pre-major advising.
5. **Focus on pedagogy.** An integrated General Education program considers not only what is to be taught but how. A variety of learning-centered teaching strategies should be marshaled to meet the Learning Objectives. The college should provide significant support for teaching faculty through formal training and informal curricular and pedagogical exchange. The new Center for the Advancement of Teaching provides a faculty-centered venue for these development activities.

6. **Be deliberately and explicitly student-centered.** The General Education program should be tailored to the particular needs and interests of the John Jay student body and responsive to changes over time in those needs and interests. This student-centered approach might be achieved by some or all of the following: 1) availability of pre-major academic advisement for students; 2) acknowledgement and accommodation of different perspectives, learning styles, and “ways of knowing”; 3) development of interactive pedagogies; and 4) engagement with Student Development staff to develop a holistic approach to supporting student achievement.
7. **Provide one or more common experiences for ALL students.** General Education puts its “signature” on all graduates. All students would share one or more common academic experience(s): these might be one or more core courses, a research project, a service-learning experience, or something else yet to be imagined.
8. **Build community among all JJC constituencies** by: 1) building on a shared commitment to the Learning Objectives; 2) encouraging cross-disciplinary and interdisciplinary communication and collaboration among faculty; 3) developing a sense of “JJC citizenship” in students; and 4) creating and strengthening connections among students, faculty, administrators, staff, and alumni/ae through research projects, discussions, mentoring and advisement, internships, and other activities.
9. **Be Flexible and Accountable.** Assessment, review, and revision should: 1) be built into the General Education program; 2) occur regularly and systematically; and 3) involve alumni, potential employers, and graduate programs, as well as current students and faculty.

ATTACHMENT D

Proposed Grids from Schedule Task Force

Proposal # 1 - All classes begin at the same time Monday through Friday. Classes would begin earlier at 8:00 AM. There would be 10 minutes between classes. Free time each day would occur between 2:55 and 4:05 PM

Period	Begin	End
1 st	8:00 AM	9:15 AM
2 nd	9:25 AM	10:40 AM
3 rd	10:50 AM	12:05 PM
4 th	12:15 PM	1:30 PM
5 th	1:40 PM	2:55 PM
Free time	Free time	Free time
6 th	4:05 PM	5:20 PM
7 th	5:30 PM	6:45 PM
8 th	6:55 PM	8:05 PM
9 th	8:15 PM	9:30 PM

Proposal # 2 – This alternative proposes that the current schedule would remain in effect for Monday, Wednesday, and Friday. On Tuesday and Thursday the alternate schedule from proposal #1 would be in effect.

Period	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
1 st	8:15 AM	8:00 AM		8:00 AM	
2 nd	9:40 AM	9:25 AM		9:25 AM	
3 rd	11:05 AM	10:50 AM		10:50 AM	
4 th	12:30 PM	12:15 PM		12:15 PM	
5 th	1:55 PM	1:40 PM		1:40 PM	
Free time	3:10-3:35 PM	2:55-4:05 PM	3:10-3:35 PM	2:55-4:05 PM	3:10-3:35 PM
6 th	3:35 PM	4:05 PM		4:05 PM	
7 th	5:00 PM	5:30 PM		5:30 PM	
8 th	6:25 PM	6:55 PM		6:55 PM	
9 th	7:50 PM	8:15 PM		8:15 PM	

The members of the Workload Task Force are: VP Richard Saulnier (chair); Karen Kaplowitz and Tom Litwack (Faculty Senate); Ned Benton and Glenn Corbett (Council of Chairs); Karen Terry (Ph.D. Program); Joan Antonelli (Registrar); Gail Hauss (Director of OIR and Interim VP)

The proposals are designed to address the problems of students arriving late to their 7th period classes, which start at 5 pm, and the lack of a club hour.

ATTACHMENT E

Amendments to the Faculty Personnel Guidelines

Spring 2009

Faculty Personnel Committee

Approved March 6, 2009

Lecturers and Instructors

III.E. Lecturers and Instructors

III.E.1 Lecturers

III.E.1.a. The title of Lecturer is used for full-time members of the faculty who are hired to teach and perform related faculty functions, but who do not have a research obligation.

III.E.1.b. The guidance for reappointment of Lecturers is the same as for Assistant Professors, in all areas, except for research and scholarship, which are not required.

III.E.1.c. Lecturers may be eligible for a Certificate of Continuous Employment (CCE) after five years of continuous service.

Deleted: are

III.E.1.d. The College has the option to convert a Lecturer line to an Assistant Professor line, and, if the Lecturer holds a Ph.D. or equivalent terminal degree, to appoint the Lecturer to the Assistant Professor line. The action is initiated by the Department and subject to approval by the Provost and President, consistent with other standards and procedures for the appointment of Assistant Professors. However, the College does not have an obligation to move a Lecturer who has obtained a Ph.D. to an Assistant Professor title.

Deleted: , without a search

III.E.1.e. A Lecturer with CCE may apply for appointment to the title of Assistant Professor. A Lecturer with CCE receives no service credit toward tenure. While working toward tenure in the Assistant Professor title, the lecturer with CCE is on leave from the Lecturer title and retains the right to return to the title with CCE.

Deleted: can be

Deleted: ed

III.E.1.f. The Distinguished Lecturer title is a full-time, non-tenure-bearing, faculty title. Distinguished Lecturers are eligible for annual reappointment but may not serve in the title for more than a total of five seven years. The guidance for reappointment for Distinguished Lecturers is the same as for Lecturers as explained in III.E.B above.

III.E.2. Instructors

III.E.2.a. The title of Instructor is used for full-time members of the faculty who are hired to teach and perform related faculty functions.

III.E.2.b. Instructors may apply to become Assistant Professors once they complete the Ph.D. or equivalent terminal degree.

Deleted: have a right

III.E.2.c. The criteria for reappointment of Instructors are the same as for Assistant Professors, in all areas except for research and scholarship. With respect to research and scholarship, the following expectations apply:

- active progress toward the award of a terminal degree that would qualify the candidate for appointment as Assistant Professor within five years of initial appointment;

Deleted: if they were offered appointment as an Assistant Professor and placed in the Instructor title pending completion of the Ph.D. or equivalent terminal degree. They have a right to become Assistant Professors once they complete the Ph.D. or equivalent terminal degree if they were reappointed as Instructors pending completion of the Ph.D. or equivalent terminal degree. ¶

- demonstration of the capacity to maintain an active research program.

III.E.2.d . The title of Instructor can be held for no more than five years.

III.E.2.e. An Instructor may be appointed in the title Lecturer immediately following five years of continuous full-time service as an Instructor in the same department, in which case he or she may receive a CCE as a Lecturer. This is an option, not a right. The Department/College has the right to non-reappoint an Instructor who has not made satisfactory progress toward the Ph.D. or equivalent terminal degree or has not satisfied any other requirement of the position.

~~Deleted:~~ shall

III.E.2.f. The Faculty Personnel Committee (FPC) will apply the following standard of review in evaluating cases of conversion from Instructor to Lecturer:

- The performance of the candidate in the position of Instructor.
- The departmental need for a faculty member serving as a Lecturer.

~~Deleted:~~ Lecturer

The prospect of attainment of the Ph.D. or equivalent terminal degree shall not be a consideration, since the candidate has not succeeded for five years.

III.E.3 Waiver of Service Credit by Instructors and Lecturers

III.E.3.a. An Instructor or Lecturer who has been appointed in the title Assistant Professor shall, by August 31st preceding the first full-year appointment to the title of Assistant Professor, state in writing his/her preference regarding whether or not he/she wishes to waive the contractually-authorized two (2) years of service credit toward tenure.

III.E.3.b. If the employee wishes the service credit waived and the President or the President's designee approves, the service credit shall be waived irrevocably. If the employee wishes to have the service credit applied or does not state a preference, the service credit shall apply. Approval or denial of this request (to waive the service credit) is not grievable.

Sabbatical Leave

(All new language.)

II.E Sabbatical Leave

II.E.1. The policy of the College is to support timely sabbatical leaves for eligible members of the faculty. The standard of review is that the application must define a general plan for scholarship and research, which may include study and related travel, instructional enhancement, and/or creative work in literature and the arts. The application must explain how the sabbatical leave will advance this plan. The sabbatical does not have to result in an immediate work product, but should advance the prospects for a work product, such as a new course design or a publication, in the future.

II.E.2 The faculty member shall file an application using the leave application form maintained on the Provost's website.

II.E.3 Applications must first be voted on by the Department Personnel and Budget Committee. A committee may vote to deny an application based on insufficient merit and also on the basis that the number of leaves being applied for at one time is impractical for the department.

II.E.4 Before consideration and vote by the FPC, sabbatical proposals shall be reviewed by the FPC Review Committee assigned responsibility for promotions.

II.E.5 The recommendations of the FPC are forwarded to the President who makes an independent determination that is forwarded to the Board of Trustees.

II.E.6 Full-pay one semester leave applications shall also be considered by the Promotions Review Committee and the FPC. The application process shall be the same as for regular leaves. The recommendations are advisory to the Provost and the President.

II.E.7 Within 30 days following the completion of the leave, the faculty member shall submit a report to the Chair and the Provost documenting how activities during the leave advanced the plan as proposed in the application.

Deleted: However, if the only reason for denial is the impracticality of the number of leaves, absent extenuating conditions the Department Personnel and Budget Committee must approve the application for the following year. ¶

Deleted: (at least one every other year as provided for under the labor contract)

Assignment of Faculty to Secondary Program or Department

(All new language.)

II.F. Assignment of Faculty to Secondary Program or Department

II.F.1. The Provost, with the consent and participation of a faculty member, his or her department chair in consultation with the Department Personnel and Budget Committee, and another program or department, may assign a faculty member to programs and to secondary departments, while retaining the faculty member's formal relationship to a single academic department as required under CUNY Bylaws. The College has developed and the College Council has adopted guidelines that provide a formal process to define responsibilities and expectations with respect to teaching, service, and participation in program and departmental administration and activities. The process protects the faculty member and also provides stability and predictability to the home department and to the secondary department or the interdisciplinary or non-departmental academic program to which the faculty member is assigned.

II.F.2. When a faculty member agrees to be assigned to a program or to a secondary department, the relationship shall be defined in a Faculty Assignment Letter (FAL), addressed by the Provost to the faculty member, signed by the faculty member, copied to the chair of the home department and the director of the program or the chair of the secondary department. The FAL shall describe the nature and duration of the assignment and the responsibilities and expectations with respect to teaching, service, and participation in program/department committees and activities.

II.F.3. The Chair or a member of the Department Personnel and Budget Committee designated by the chair of the department to which a faculty member is appointed (the home department) must conduct the annual personnel review in accordance with the PSC-CUNY Contract. In gathering information to arrive at his or her assessment of the candidate, the chair or his/her designee shall confer with the program director or secondary department chair. The program director or secondary department chair may not be present at the annual evaluation conference or at the deliberations of the Personnel and Budget Committee of the home department unless he or she is a duly elected or appointed member of that committee. The home department chair presents the faculty member to the Faculty Personnel (FPC). As a statutory member of the FPC, the secondary department chair may contribute to the FPC's discussion of the faculty member. If a program coordinator is an at-large member of the FPC, he or she may contribute to the FPC's discussion of the faculty member.

In addition, the program director or secondary department chair shall meet periodically throughout the appointment period with the faculty member for the purpose of mentoring and guiding him or her.

II.F.4. For members jointly assigned to the SEEK Department, the Board of trustees has provided the following: (Board of Trustees Minutes, 1994, 06-27, 007, D) *“Faculty designated to teach developmental courses and employed in the SEEK Department shall be evaluated by the SEEK Department, but also reviewed separately by the pertinent academic department with the*

Deleted: ing

Deleted: annually

Deleted: and shall keep a written record of these meetings and of the guidance given to the faculty member in each meeting. A copy of this written record shall be given to the faculty member and the home department chair. The written record shall be included in the personnel file with all contractual safeguards and provisions.

academic department report being submitted both to the SEEK Department and to the Dean of Faculty [Provost]. Faculty who are so designated or appointed and employed in an academic department shall be evaluated by the appropriate academic department, but also reviewed, separately, by the SEEK Department, with the SEEK Department report being submitted both to the appropriate academic department and to the dean of faculty [Provost]. . . . The reviews by both the SEEK Department and the academic department shall include reference to teaching effectiveness and sensitivity to the learning patterns of disadvantaged students and reference to the academic content and substance taught.”

Combined Consideration of Reappointment and Promotion

II.D.6. The order of consideration of candidates will be as follows:

- collective consideration of reappointments without any negative votes from Departmental Personnel Committees, as specified in the Tenure Calendar tables above, and provided that any member may call for individual consideration of individual cases;
- individual consideration of all other reappointment candidates; considered by rank;
- individual consideration of tenure candidates; considered by rank;
- individual consideration of candidates for promotion to Associate Professor; and individual consideration of candidates for promotion to Full Professor.

When a candidate is being considered for reappointment and promotion during the same year, both actions will be taken up when reappointment is considered. Separate votes shall be taken on each action, with the reappointment or tenure action being voted on before the promotion action. The applicable standards of review shall be applied for each action.

II.G Nominating Distinguished Professors

(all new language)

II.G.1 Nominations for the position of Distinguished Professor may be proposed by members of the faculty or members of the administration. Nominees may either be external candidates or current members of the John Jay College faculty. Regardless of how nominations originate, they must be vetted and approved by the Personnel and Budget Committee (P & B) of the department to which the Distinguished Professor is to be appointed or in which the nominee currently has an appointment. The P & B, in reviewing the nomination, must apply the rigorous scholarly criteria required by CUNY Bylaws. Nominators, chairs and candidates are encouraged to review the CUNY Bylaws and related documents posted on the CUNY website.

Deleted: Guidelines

Deleted: guidelines

II.G.2 In the case of an external candidate, the nominee must have all of the qualifications necessary for appointment to the positions of full Professor. The Board of Trustees may act to confirm the appointment as a full Professor concurrently with the approval of the designation as a Distinguished Professor.

Deleted: initially be appointed, at the college level, to a faculty line as a

Deleted: While

Deleted: t

Deleted: , the appointment to a professorial line is a necessary precondition.

II.G.3 If the departmental P&B votes in favor, the nomination is forwarded to the Provost who independently makes a judgment about the merit of the nomination and determines whether CUNY will make a Distinguished Professor position available. If the Provost's assessment is positive, and if CUNY advises the Provost that an additional distinguished professorship can be assigned to the college, the Provost will forward a recommendation to the President who will decide whether to bring the nomination to the Faculty Personnel Committee for its review and vote.

II.G.4 The department chair shall solicit at least ten letters of evaluation from widely recognized authorities in the nominee's field, as required by CUNY procedures. The FPC shall review the nomination letter and the candidate's external letters of evaluation, and vote on the nomination.

II.G.5 Should the FPC vote in favor of the nomination, the next stage of the CUNY review process is put into effect. The application is sent to the Office of the Executive Vice-Chancellor and University Provost, including the candidate's current curriculum vitae, external letters of evaluation, letters of recommendation from the John Jay College President and Provost, and documentation of the college's review processes, to enable the university to make an independent determination of the merits of the appointment.

Proposal for Review Committee Structure

Informational Only – Not to be added to the Faculty Personnel Guidelines

The review committee structure needs to be changed to address the change in caseloads for the various committees - particularly the reappointments committee - resulting from a) more faculty members; and b) more years of reappointment reviews. This proposal is to split the reappointment review committee into two committees – Reappointment Review Committee A and Reappointment Review Committee B.

The Faculty Personnel Guidelines state: *II.3.C: The Provost shall fairly distribute workload or reassign workload among existing committees provided that similar personnel actions are considered by the same committee.*

- Thus, the review committee structure is discretionary to the Provost, and this restructuring proposal does not require a revision of the Guidelines.
- This proposed restructuring complies with the II.3.C because it assigns similar cases (based on reappointment year cohorts) to the two reappointment review committees, so it is consistent with the above rule. (For example, all of the third-year reappointments are considered by the same review committee.)

The seven-year reappointment and tenure clock applies to tenure-track faculty members whose tenure-track service at John Jay began in the Fall of 2007 or thereafter and to those whose tenure track service began in Fall 2006 who elected the seven year clock. The following is a summary of the review sequence for the first 7-year cohort.

- F06: initial appointment semester
- S07: reappointment to year 2
- F07: reappointment to year 3
- F08: reappointment to year 4
- F09: reappointment to year 5 (would have been considered by tenure committee under old clock)
- F10: reappointment to year 6 (would have been tenure decision review under the old clock)

Based on the above, it is apparent that in Fall 2009, the Tenure Committee will consider only the cases where the new faculty member chose a 5-year clock. The bulk of the cases would, if no change is made, shift to the Reappointments Committee, resulting in additional workload for that committee.

Under this proposal, a Reappointment B committee is created. This committee will consider cases in two of the years before tenure.¹

Decision Year	Appt. Type	2008-2009	2009-2010 and after
1	Appt to Year 2	Reappointment	Reappointment A
2	Appt to Year 3	Reappointment	Reappointment A
3	Appt to Year 4	Reappointment	Reappointment A
4	Appt to Year 5	Tenure	Reappointment B
5	Tenure (5-year clock)	Tenure	Tenure
5	Appt to Year 6		Tenure (See note 1)
6	Appt to Year 7		Reappointment B
7	Tenure (7-year clock)		Tenure
Any	Promotion	Promotion	Promotion

Since there are more members on the FPC, providing FPC members for the additional committee is feasible.

¹ The Faculty Personnel Guidelines recommended that the Tenure committee consider cases two years before the tenure decision rather than the year immediately before, in order to assess readiness for tenure and to make signaling recommendations in time for improvements to be made. Therefore, this proposal assigns 5th-to-6th cases to the Tenure Committee.

ATTACHMENT F

Department Bylaws Template

Note: Sentences in **BOLD** are required and may not be modified.
Sentences in *ITALICS* are explanatory and are included for the department's consideration.
All other sentences are optional and may be included, deleted or modified.

Article 1: Title and Purpose

This document is the Bylaws of the Department of _____ at John Jay College of Criminal Justice, City University of New York (CUNY). Bylaws are required pursuant to Article II, Section 3 of the College Charter. The purpose of the document is to define the governance, organization and operation of academic departments.

Article 2: Department Chair

The chair of the department shall be the chief executive officer and shall undertake the duties set forth in Section 9.3 of the CUNY Bylaws. He or she shall be tenured, hold professorial rank, and shall be elected by secret ballot for a term of three (3) years by an absolute majority of all full-time faculty of the department eligible to vote, as defined in Article I, Section 3.a.i of the Charter, subject to the approval of the President and the CUNY Board of Trustees.

Elections shall be held in May of the year in which the chairperson's term expires. The new chairperson shall take office as of July 1 of the year in which he or she is elected.

A department may want to specify that there may be one or more deputy chairs, and specify authority, function, and mode of appointment or election.

Article 3: Departmental Committee on Faculty Personnel and Budget

The Departmental Committee on Faculty Personnel and Budget shall be chaired by the chair of the department. In addition, the full-time faculty of the department, as defined in Article I, Section 3.a.i, shall elect four (4) full-time members of the faculty, as defined in Article I, Section 3.a.i of the Charter, each of whom shall serve for one year. At least four (4) of the committee members shall be tenured. If the department has fewer than four (4) tenured faculty members, the committee shall be established as set forth in Article 9.1 of the Bylaws of the CUNY Board of Trustees.

The committee shall vote on all full-time faculty personnel actions.

The committee shall also approve any departmental budget proposals, and approve any expenditure plans for funds allocated to the department including the department's share of grant overhead monies. The Chair shall provide quarterly expenditure reports to the committee and the department.

The committee shall act as the search committee for each faculty search, or may designate a

search committee to make recommendations to the Departmental Committee on Personnel and Budget.

Article 4: Departmental Committees

The department shall elect a Committee on Student Grade Appeals consisting of full-time members of the faculty, as defined in Article I, Section 3.a.i of the Charter.

The department may determine committee membership and structure including qualifications for committee membership.

The department may determine that it will elect the same group to different department committees so that the group is familiar with issues facing the department. For example, the department can elect members of the Departmental Committee on Faculty Personnel and Budget to also serve on the Student Grade Appeals Committee. In the alternative, the department may provide as wide a range as possible of participation for department members.

The department shall elect a Curriculum Committee consisting of full-time members of the faculty, as defined in Article I, Section 3.a.i of the Charter.

The department may determine committee membership and structure including qualifications for committee membership.

The department may conduct elections for committee membership. *(see above)*

A department may want to specify other committees in this section.

Article 5: Departmental Representatives

The department shall elect representatives to college governance committees as provided by the Charter, including representatives to the College Council, the Faculty Senate, and the Committee on Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Standards.

The faculty, by vote at a department meeting, may instruct the department representatives to college committees as to how to vote on an upcoming issue.

Article 6: Undergraduate Program Governance

The Chair shall serve as or appoint a coordinator for each of the undergraduate majors offered by the department. Each coordinator shall serve on the Council of Undergraduate Program Coordinators as defined in Article I, Section 9.j of the Charter.

Article 7: Departmental Policy

Departmental policy shall be established by vote of the full-time faculty, as defined in Article I, Section 3.a.i of the Charter, at a regular department meeting.

Article 8: Meetings, Elections and Voting

The department holds faculty meetings not less than once each semester. **Elections shall be held during a regularly scheduled department meeting in May of each year.**

Each member of the full-time faculty, as defined in Article I, Section 3.a.i of the Charter, shall be allowed one (1) vote in all College and departmental elections.

The department chair shall establish a schedule of meetings and circulate a proposed agenda at least (e.g. 3 to 5) ___ days before the meeting.

Department meetings shall follow Roberts Rules of Order.

Department elections shall follow the College Election Guidelines.

The election of the Chair and of the members of the Committee on Faculty Personnel and Budget shall be by secret ballot, and election shall require a majority of the eligible voting faculty members in the department. If, after ___ ballots (e.g., 3 to 5 ballots), a candidate does not receive the necessary number of votes for the position, the candidate receiving the highest number of votes shall be recommended to the President, who may accept or reject the recommendation. If after ___ (e.g. 3 to 5 ballots) the vote for a position results in a tie, the President of the College may be asked to break the tie.

Candidates for all positions other than chair may be nominated and/or voted for individually or as a slate of candidates.

There shall be action minutes of all department meetings.

The annual evaluation of the Chair by the President and Provost shall be distributed to the faculty upon receipt by the Chair, and shall be placed on the agenda of the next faculty meeting for discussion.

Article 9: Adoption of the Bylaws

These Bylaws may be adopted by an absolute a majority of the of full-time members of the department faculty, as defined in Article I, Section 3.a.i of the Charter, in a noticed meeting where a quorum of the full-time faculty who are eligible to vote is present. **The bylaws must then be submitted to the Executive Committee of the College Council. When the Executive Committee of the College Council approves the bylaws, they shall take effect immediately.**

Amendments to the Bylaws

These Bylaws may be amended by an absolute a majority of the of full-time members of the department faculty, as defined in Article I, Section 3.a.i of the Charter, in a noticed meeting where a quorum of the full-time faculty who are eligible to vote is present. **The amendment**

must then be submitted to the Executive Committee of the College Council. When the Executive Committee of the College Council approves the amendment, it shall then be considered final and shall take effect immediately.