

Faculty Senate Minutes #366

Friday, December 10, 2010

10:00 AM

Room 630 T

Present (47): William Allen, Andrea Balis, Spiros Bakiras, Elton Beckett, Ben Bierman, Marvie Brooks, Erica Burleigh, Elise Champeil, Sergei Cheloukhine, Demi Cheng, Kathleen Collins, Edgardo Diaz Diaz, Virginia Diaz-Mendoza, James DiGiovanna, Jennifer Dysart, DeeDee Falkenbach, Beverly Frazier, Terry Furst, Robert Garot, Jay Gates, Katie Gentile, Lior Gideon, Norman Groner, Maki Haberfeld, Jay Hamilton, Olivera Jokic, Karen Kaplowitz, Tom Litwack, Evan Mandery, Vincent Maiorino, Nivedita Majumdar, Xerxes Malki, Gerald Markowitz, Isabel Martinez, David Munns, Paul Narkunas, Richard Ocejo, Richard Perez, Frank Pezzella, Raul Rubio, Rick Richardson, Richard Schwester, Francis Sheehan, Staci Strobl, Pat Tovar, Monica Varsanyi, Valerie West

Absent (2): Lyell Davies, Roz Myers

Guests: Professors Valerie Allen, Kimora, Margaret Tabb, Director Katherine Killoran

Agenda

- 1. Adoption of the agenda**
- 2. Announcements & Reports**
- 3. Approval of Minutes #365 of the November 23, 2010, meeting**
- 4. Review of the agenda of the December 13 meeting of the College Council:**
 - a. Proposed policy about extra coursework during the semester**
 - b. Proposed Second Chance Policy**
 - c. Proposed Rescission of the required use of APA documentation**
- 5. Community Period: A new proposal**
- 6. Proposed revision to JJ's General Education program: Invited Guest: Professor Amy Green, Chair, Gen Ed Steering Committee**
- 7. Sexual relationships between students and faculty/staff: Proposal to create a Senate committee to make recommendations to the Senate: Executive Committee**

8. **Proposed revision of the Form C for reappointment, tenure, and promotion decisions for full-time faculty**
9. **Discussion JJ's changed procedure for promotion to full professor**
10. **Pilot protocol for peer observation of teaching: for comment by the Senate**
11. **Proposal from the Department of Political Science regarding minimum enrollment for evening, Friday, and weekend courses: Senator Monica Varsanyi**

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

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

3. **Approval of Minutes #365 of the November 23, 2010, meeting.** Approved.

4. **Review and discussion of the agenda of the December 13 meeting of the College Council [Attachment A1, A2, A3]**

The Senate reviewed the proposals on academic standards on the College Council agenda. A asked about academic dishonesty and how the proposed Second Chance Policy will affect students on academic probation because of plagiarism, cheating or any other questionable behaviors that caused them to fail. A Senator asked about policies at other CUNY colleges and was informed that there are virtually no forgiveness policies elsewhere. The Senate approved a motion to move to amend the Second Chance Policy at the College Council so as to render students on academic probation because of plagiarism, cheating or other academic integrity infractions, ineligible for the Second Chance Policy opportunities. The Senate discussed the proposed policy on APA Documentation. A Senator introduced an amendment proposed by the Library faculty whereby the "major" forms of documentation would be assigned and would be explained on the Library's homepage.

5. **Community Period: Consideration and vote on a new proposal** [Attachment B]

The Senate Executive Committee in consultation with VP for Enrollment Management Richard Saulnier has developed a new proposal for a community period. It provides for no classes to be held from Mondays through Fridays from 1:40 PM to 2:40 PM; in addition, during the Fall semester classes offered during the subsequent period from 2:50 PM to 4:05 PM on Mondays and Wednesdays would be taught by only adjunct faculty and during the Spring semester courses offered during the subsequent period from 2:50 PM to 4:05 PM on Tuesdays and

Thursdays would be taught only by adjunct faculty. Furthermore, full-time faculty would be able to request a waiver because of extraordinary circumstances so they could teach during the adjunct-only period and that waiver request would have to be approved by the instructor's chair and by the Provost.

A Senator suggested that this proposed schedule will create a problem for the master's level courses. Another Senator said that the burden of the community hour is being placed on the full-time faculty. A Senator moved that consideration of the community hour proposal be considered separately from the proposal regarding the subsequent class period. A Senator suggested that the College organizations should be able to conduct business within an hour-long meeting time. A Senator suggested that adjuncts are already disconnected from their departments and scheduling them to teach at a time when departments may meet will cause a greater disconnect. Some Senators disagreed, saying that this proposal would increase adjunct involvement in some departments because the departments can meet during the community period and not during the subsequent period. A Senator discussed the negative implications of trying to conduct College business in one hour.

A motion was made to separate consideration of the proposal for a community hour from 1:40-2:40 PM from the proposal that the subsequent 5th period two days a week be taught by adjunct faculty, only, (with a waiver provision for full-time faculty). The motion passed.

A motion to determine which of the two issues to discuss first was made and seconded. 14 voted to discuss the subsequent 5th period first; 12 voted to discuss the issue of the community hour first.

A motion was made and seconded to recommend to President Travis that the 5th period on Mondays/Wednesdays in the Fall and on Tuesdays/Thursdays in the Spring be taught by adjunct faculty only and by any full-time faculty who request a waiver for extraordinary reasons and whose waiver is approved by their department chair and by the provost. The vote was 15 for, 18 against, and 5 abstentions; the motion failed.

A motion was made and seconded to recommend to President Travis that there be a Community Hour every day, from 1:40- 2:40pm, with 10 minutes travel time before and after the Community Hour. The motion was amended to propose that the Community Period be 75 minutes. The motion carried.

6. Proposed revision to JJ's General Education program: Invited Guest: Professor Amy Green, Chair, Gen Ed Steering Committee [Attachment C]

Professor Amy Green and other members of the General Education Steering Committee joined the Senate to discuss the changes that are being proposed. Many of the ideas that made their

way into the final proposal came from the report "Learning Outcome for Undergraduate Education at John Jay," created by a task force commissioned to reform Gen. Ed. The framework was introduced by committee members and the Senate had an opportunity to ask questions and give feedback. Senators recommended that an overlay of requirements be added, whereby students would be required to take a certain number of courses in the humanities, a certain number in the social sciences, and a certain number in the sciences and computation. The point was made by several Senators that most students come to John Jay interested in criminal justice and might very well never take courses in other areas voluntarily. This overlay would address this concern and pattern of behavior while preserving the outcomes-based Gen Ed proposal and the five areas of courses being proposed.

7. Sexual relationships between students and faculty/ staff: Proposal to create a Senate ad hoc committee to study this issue about which there is currently no CUNY or JJ policy and make a report and recommendations to the Faculty Senate: Executive Committee

President Kaplowitz gave a brief introduction of the Executive Committee's proposal to establish an ad hoc committee to look at the issues of sexual relationships and sexual harassment between members of the campus community members. The Senate discussed whether to form an ad hoc committee to look at these issues. Several senators volunteered to serve on the committee. The members are Senators David Munns, Staci Strobl, Francis Sheehan, and Karen Kaplowitz.

8. Proposed revision of the Form C for reappointment, tenure, and promotion decisions for full-time faculty

The Provost appointed a task force to look at the Form C and the Senate discussed a proposal to revise the Form C, which is used for reappointment, tenure or promotion. The Form C with the proposed revisions was reviewed by the Senate. The Senate shared comments and concerns about possible revisions. President Kaplowitz requested that comments be e-mailed to her directly so that she can keep a record of what the concerns are. She will report them to the College's Faculty Personnel Committee (FPC) when it takes up these proposals in the spring; they are to be voted on by the FPC but not by any other body.

Most of the objections were focused on the proposed addition to the Form C whereby candidates would be required to provide evidence of the quality of the journals in which their articles are published and also information about the number of times each of their journal articles is cited to demonstrate the impact factor of their publications. One Senator noted that some journals are important to a specific specialization in the field but are less prominent (in terms of impact factor) to the umbrella discipline. More specifically, it is possible that someone could be working in a unique field within, say, criminal justice, and thus will not publish in the leading journal of "Criminal Justice Behavior" or "Criminology" but in other highly important journals with a lower general impact factor. Furthermore, citation data are very odd; they are

very difficult to capture, and document; and there is no actual validity to them. In addition, sometimes people cite works just to show the flaws of an article or of a study or how inferior the study was. Often acceptance to high impact journals is a long process that can take even years and a scholar may prefer to publish two to three manuscripts during that period rather than wait for just one article that ultimately may not be published. The Senator said that personally he believes that a candidate who can demonstrate engagement and academic productivity (writing academic articles, books, reports) should not be measured by measurements that have very little validity, and may run the risk of incorrectly portraying the candidate.

He added that each and every faculty member who wants to receive tenure and promotion, or just promotion, will do his or her very best to present a strong case in front of the P&B and will make an attempt to document achievements in the self evaluation section. We do not need additional impediments as proposed in the new Form C draft revisions.

Another Senator said that her problem is with the directive requiring the candidate to provide information as to the quality of the academic journal. These determinations are often hotly contested within disciplines. What one considers a top journal in the field varies considerably by theoretical perspective and by geography. The providing of a journal description to the FPC may actually make the personnel process divisive if the reader of the Form C disagrees with the characterization of the journal. For example, in criminology, the top journals Americans tend to tout (quantitative) would not be the same English-language journals that people in Europe would hold as the best (qualitative work). In fact, John Jay's Distinguished Professor Jock Young has recently pointed out that there are at least two criminologies operating at the same time and articles published in one camp's journals would be flat-out rejected in the others' and vice versa. In particular, rejection rates and citation counts are also problematic, as it is not clear they measure a person's success given their particular specialization. Some topics or perspectives or methodologies aren't considered in the mainstream of a field even though the work in these areas is excellent and moves the field forward. She said she recently deliberately published in a "lower-tier" journal because she knows its editors are working hard to make sure historical criminology/criminal justice gets published and she had a historical article. In terms of rejection rate and citation, perhaps the numbers would look bad for her, she said, but given the methods she used and the people she wanted to reach, she published in the right place.

Another Senator said she does not think the standards effectively represent interdisciplinary fields, where the journals are necessarily smaller and may, therefore, have less "impact" in the ways that are being measured here. Additionally, the measurements being used to define a journal's impact are based on the mainstream journals of the major fields. This proposed requirement will work against scholars doing cutting edge work in their field, as the most innovative and creative work is, by definition, transgressive and not in the mainstream journals (i.e. CUNY Distinguished Professor Michelle Fine: of her most recent articles listed on the CUNY Graduate Center website, four-fifths are in more esoteric, potentially lower impact journals.

Would these not count for her?. If we adopt these narrow guidelines John Jay will end up as a college of intellectual mediocrity where only those doing tried and true research flourish. Radical and innovative research will be seen as risky and potentially hazardous to tenure/promotion. One possible alternative, she said, could be if a journal's impact is also measured by the composition of its editorial board. After all, they would be the reviewers of papers. This would enable esoteric, smaller or/and interdisciplinary journals to be included as legitimate sites for publication. She also asked about invited papers to either journals or conferences? These are not peer reviewed yet to be an invited speaker or to be invited to write a paper or commentary for a journal is a sign of professional status and respect. For her area of psychoanalysis, cultural theory and in some gender studies journals, invited speaking and commentaries are a significant sign of professional recognition, as important as peer reviewed papers and presentations.

Another Senator said that it seems that the proposed revisions may be to pass on the responsibility of providing information pertaining to the "quality" through "objective criteria," of publications onto the candidate. This is a reasonable expectation. Candidates should provide as much pertinent information about the quality and caliber of the publications that publish their work. It seems that the consensus brought up by various senators pertains to the seemingly unyielding focus of providing "objective criteria." For many senators, the inclusion of the need for "objective criteria" data is an unfair expectation, given that it is not the norm in many disciplines. It should be known that many fields and subfields (including disciplines in humanities and social sciences, multi-disciplinary, and inter-disciplinary research areas) do not have this type of information readily available. Furthermore, many well-established journals do not maintain such data.

Another Senator said that to the extent the reorganization of Form C is a way of raising research standards at the college, it's unwarranted. Requiring candidates to describe the prominence of the journal they are publishing in, its acceptance rate, the number of times the candidate's article is cited, etc., is clearly an attempt at raising the quality of research. Raising standards is in and of itself a laudable goal. However, more stringent tenure requirements will not further that goal. With a heavy teaching load and considerable service expectations, untenured faculty already work very hard at maintaining a balance and focus on their own research. Pushing them harder will only push them into the market. Institutions with much higher ranking than ours require less for tenure. For a college like John Jay to have a very high bar for tenure will also make it a lot less attractive to potential job candidates. If we are indeed serious about raising standards, then we need to be more supportive towards our faculty and struggle for better work conditions. If there is any data on institutions with comparable teaching load that have enhanced their research profiles simply by raising tenure requirements, then that needs to be publicized. If such data are unavailable, then this approach needs to be rethought. Furthermore, the Senator said she has heard discussions around this issue and some of the popular ideas need to be refuted. Apparently, the thinking is that with 24 hours of release time our untenured faculty have the same work conditions as fellow colleagues in Research 1 institutions and therefore it is fair to demand the same amount of productivity from them; this is not really true. At a typical Research 1 institution, faculty

come in with a 2-2 load, a reduced load for the first year or two and a paid semester off, usually in their third year. That's 20 courses in the first 6 years as opposed to 34 at John Jay. Additionally, Research 1 institutions are able to offer much more support for travel, equipment, etc and have superior libraries and labs. And because research (rather than teaching) is prioritized in such institutions not only in the first 5 years but throughout people's academic career, it creates a very different culture, one much more conducive for intellectual production. The release time from 8 courses in 5 years does not even begin to compare. So expecting the same level of productivity is simply unfair.

Finally, it is understood, I imagine, that our contract specifically regulates that contractual release time should not be tied to increased research expectations. In a sense the proposed reorganization of our Form C is a violation of the spirit, if not the letter, of the contract.

Another Senator noted that it appears that more journals, (at least in his area) are requiring a fee for publication of peer reviewed articles. He said that in March of 2010, he went online and came across the "Open Addiction" Journal. After receiving a letter of acceptance of the article, an invoice for \$800 was emailed to him for the publication of the article. He declined the offer to have the article published. He discovered that the practice of fee for publication is becoming common in his area of drug research and, perhaps, others. For example, the online journal "Addiction Research" also requires a fee. This practice should be known by the College FPC and the Administration for obvious reasons

Another Senator criticized the proposed requirement that all references to human research work on the Form C would have to include the John Jay IRB number, saying that this is a very problematic issue. He said that while he understands the importance of the IRB and its need to maintain ethical conduct in research, and also the need to protect the interests of the college community, he finds this requirement to be out of context for the Form C, and for personnel action considerations and requirements. IRB should be a completely separate process, he said, adding that he discussed this with several of his colleagues some of whom are already at the rank of full professor, and they all agree that this should not be a requirement. Every project that involves human subjects or requires a waiver of the IRB needs to be brought before the JJ IRB and if one is applying for a grant, as he has done, NIH and NIH will require an applicant to submit a statement of the IRB procedures. He does not think or believe it is for the College P&B to discuss such important issue (unless someone has been found guilty of violating human research rules).

9. Discussion about JJ's changed procedure for promotion to full professor [Attachment D]

The Senate voted to propose an amendment to the College's Charter of Governance whereby the process of promotion to full professor would resume the path that has been in place at John Jay for the past 40 years; that is, like all other personnel actions, a consideration of a candidacy for promotion to full professor would begin with a vote by the departmental P&B Committee.

10. Pilot protocol for peer observation of teaching for Senate comment. Postponed.

President Kaplowitz said that subsequent to sending out the agenda, she learned that during the spring semester, three academic departments will be piloting the English Department's protocol for peer observation of teaching. The three volunteered to do so. So instead of discussing the English Department's protocol at today's meeting, she proposed that this item be postponed until the Senate's all-day meeting in May when Senators from those departments can report their experiences, as can Senate members from the English Department, and the entire Senate can review the protocol and ask questions and comment as well. This was agreed to.

11. Proposal from the Department of Political Science regarding minimum enrollment for evening, Friday, and weekend courses: Senator Monica Varsanyi [Attachment E]

The Senate voted to direct President Kaplowitz to communicate to the Provost the Senate's view that courses offered during the evening, on Fridays and on weekends be permitted to run with fewer students than are required by the Class Size Police.

The meeting was adjourned at 4 pm.

Submitted by
Virginia Diaz-Mendoza
Recording Secretary

ATTACHMENT A1

To: Undergraduate Curriculum & Academic Standards Committee

From: Academic Standards Committee

Date: November 19, 2010

Re: Proposed Policy Regarding Extra Work During the Semester

Current Policy:

There is no policy regarding the acceptance by faculty of additional/extra credit/supplemental work by students during the semester to improve their grade.

Proposed Policy:

Any extra-credit course work opportunities during the semester for a student to improve her/his grade must be made available to all students at the same time. Furthermore, there is no obligation on the part of any instructor to offer extra credit work in any course. The term "extra credit work" refers to optional work that may be assigned by the instructor to all students in addition to the required work for the course that all students must complete. It is distinguished from substitute assignments or substitute work that may be assigned by the instructor to individual students, such as make-up assignments to accommodate emergencies or to accommodate the special circumstances of individual students.

Rationale:

Many students complain that some students are given the opportunity to do extra work to raise their final grade but that this opportunity has not been afforded to them. This proposed policy is sound fairness policy. Fairness requires that the opportunity afforded to any student(s) enrolled in a course to do extra-credit work to improve their grade must be afforded to all the students enrolled in that course and at the same time so that all students have the same opportunities to demonstrate skills and competence and to improve their course grade. At the same time, instructors have the discretion to respond to individual students' special situations by designing substitute assignments for their students. For example, if a faculty member assigns his/her students to write about the comments made by a guest lecturer or about a presentation made in class, and a student is absent from that day's class, the faculty member may choose to give that student a substitute assignment. This is distinguished from extra-credit work which a student has the option of doing in addition to the semester's assigned work.

Referred back to Committee by the College Council. Revised text approved by UCASC on November 19, 2010.

ATTACHMENT A2

To: Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee

From: Academic Standards Subcommittee

Re: Proposed Second Chance Policy

Date: November 19, 2010

Background:

We have a significant number of students who have difficulty adjusting to the rigors of college during their first year or so at John Jay. Many of these students are dismissed from the College due to poor academic performance. These students often then go to a community college to build up their skills and get more experience at the college level. Many have successful community college records and look to return to John Jay College, which in many cases is their College of first choice. Sadly, we then advise these students to go elsewhere because their prior academic record at John Jay College makes it too difficult for them to succeed. This is because the grades they earned at John Jay, before transferring elsewhere, are calculated in their GPA when they return to John Jay, although the grades they received at the community college do not.

Transfer credit grades are not calculated in a student's GPA when s/he transfers to our College. While many colleges accept transfer credits, no CUNY college accepts the grades that students received while enrolled at another college.

This means that if the student left John Jay with, for example, a 1.30 GPA and earned 30 credits at a community college with, for example, a 3.50 GPA, when s/he returns to John Jay the student begins her/his studies anew with that same 1.30 GPA. The result of this is that the student restarts at John Jay on academic probation and rarely can move out of academic probation.

The inauguration of the Justice Academy Program at the CUNY community colleges, also known as the 2+2 programs, makes this issue an especially important and immediate one. Students are transferring to our partner CUNY community colleges schools to rebuild their academic records. Unfortunately, even when they successfully complete their Associate Degree as a part of our joint CUNY Justice Academy Program and they look to return to John Jay, we advise them to go elsewhere to complete their Baccalaureate Degree because of the situation described above.

In acknowledging the fact that our former students are attracted to the CUNY Justice Academy Program and that they are, for all practical purposes, prevented from returning to John Jay College after completing their associate degrees, the following proposal is offered.

Proposal:

This proposed Second Chance Policy is as follows: Students who leave John Jay College either on academic probation or as the result of an academic dismissal who then transfer to a Justice Academy Program at a CUNY community college and complete at least 30 credits, earn a GPA of at least 2.50, and receive an Associate Degree from a CUNY Justice Academy Partner will have the grades of their prior coursework at John Jay College treated as if it were transfer credit just as is the coursework that is being transferred from the Justice Academy community college. These students would, therefore, begin their second career at John Jay College with a clear GPA slate, that is, with a GPA of 0.00.

Explanation:

This proposed policy allows the College to give these students a second chance at John Jay after they have demonstrated the ability to succeed academically by graduating from a Justice Academy degree program with at least a 2.5 GPA. The proposal also relieves our partner community colleges from the difficult policing function of preventing our students from enrolling in the Justice Academy Programs.

All other students who wish to transfer to John Jay from a CUNY Justice Academy Partner program may do so with an Associate Degree after having earned a 2.00 GPA; we are proposing the requirement of a 2.50 GPA as part of this Second Chance Policy to better ensure that such students can now succeed at John Jay when they return to our College.

This Second Chance Policy will also assist students described in this policy with their financial aid status.

After reviewing various issues and various policies at other CUNY Colleges, the Academic Standards Committee recommends that the Second Chance Policy should be restricted to the CUNY Justice Academy programs, also known as our 2+2 programs. One big factor is that the curriculum and the courses, including the syllabi, at the CUNY Justice Academy programs have been designed in close collaboration with John Jay faculty and have been approved by John Jay's Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee, by John Jay's College Council, by the CUNY Board of Trustees, and by the NYS Regents.

The second big factor in recommending that the Second Chance Policy should be restricted to the CUNY Justice Academy programs is that John Jay is the only CUNY college that offers majors in the disciplines that the Justice Academy Program majors are offered in; this means that students who graduate from the Justice Academy have only one college, John Jay, among all the CUNY senior colleges that they can attend because if they attend any other CUNY senior college they must change their major. On the other hand, those students who leave John Jay and attend a community college and receive an associate degree in other majors have the choice of ten other CUNY senior colleges at which they can study without changing their major. For these reasons, this Second Chance Policy is designed for Justice Academy students only.

ATTACHMENT A3

To: The Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee

From: The Academic Standards Subcommittee

Date: November 19, 2010

Re: Proposal on Rescission of the College's Policy on APA Documentation

Background:

In the early 1980s, after John Jay lost all its humanities majors (including English, history, American Studies, and many others) the Curriculum Committee proposed to the College Council and the College Council then adopted a policy whereby only one method of documentation shall be taught and shall be required and accepted by faculty and that was the American Psychological Association (APA) method. (Only Science faculty and only students in Science courses were exempted from this policy.)

The reasoning at the time this policy was established was that all John Jay majors were social science majors (except for Forensic Science) and such a policy simplified the teaching and learning of documentation. Now, of course, we have many liberal arts and humanities majors. Furthermore, while some faculty members still abide by this policy, others do not even know of its existence, and yet others know about this policy but choose to ignore it.

In May 2010, the Faculty Senate discussed this situation and voted by an overwhelmingly positive majority to recommend to UCASC that the current policy be rescinded. This recommendation was referred to the Undergraduate Standards Subcommittee at that time, which supported the Faculty Senate's position and forwarded the proposal to UCASC.

Proposal:

It is the Academic Standards Subcommittee's unanimous recommendation that UCASC should propose to the College Council that the current policy, which requires that only the APA method be taught and be accepted by faculty, be rescinded. Furthermore, the Subcommittee proposes that each faculty member who requires that students submit papers or other assignments with documentation include on her/his course syllabus the name of the method of documentation being required for the course; if the instructor will accept specific multiple methods or all methods, that information shall likewise be included on the syllabus. Such decisions shall be entirely within the discretion of each member of the faculty. The Academic Standards Subcommittee also recommends that the Library continue to include and, if possible, expand on its homepage guidelines for each of the major methods of documentation so that

students can have easy access to such guidelines. Such a Library homepage already exists at http://guides.lib.ijay.cuny.edu/citing_sources.

Rationale:

With students now majoring in a variety of disciplines and because various methods of documentation are inappropriate to certain disciplines but are appropriate to others, faculty members should be free to teach the documentation method appropriate to their discipline and students should be taught such documentation methods. Furthermore, all students would benefit by receiving clear information at the beginning of each course about the method of documentation that will be required for that course as well as access to guidelines on a College website with information about that method. It is the position of the Academic Standards Subcommittee that if a College policy exists, it should either be widely disseminated and adhered to or it should be rescinded.

Approved by UCASC on November 19, 2010

ATTACHMENT B

Community Hour Proposal Faculty Senate 12/10/2010

Fall Semester Schedule

Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
1st Period 8:00-9:15				
2nd Period 9:25-10:40				
3rd Period 10:50-12:05				
4th Period 12:15-1:30				
5th Period 2:50-4:05				
6th Period 4:15-5:30				
7th Period 5:40-6:55				
8th Period 7:05-8:20				
9th Period 8:30-9:45				

Spring Semester Schedule

Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
1st Period 8:00-9:15				
2nd Period 9:25-10:40				
3rd Period 10:50-12:05				
4th Period 12:15-1:30				
5th Period 2:50-4:05				
6th Period 4:15-5:30				
7th Period 5:40-6:55				
8th Period 7:05-8:20				
9th Period 8:30-9:45				

Shaded area indicates periods when full-time faculty will not be scheduled. The days alternate each fall and spring semester. The grid will be evaluated after 2-3 years and changes can be made if necessary.

Education for Justice: the General Education Curriculum of John Jay College of Criminal Justice - 44-69 credits

<p>Reasoning & Communication 18-24credits</p> <p><i>Essential Knowledge: familiarity with</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •mathematical skills •at least one language other than English <p><i>Reasoning, Analysis and Critical Thinking:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •formulate questions •distinguish between evaluative and factual statements •gather & analyze data using quantitative & qualitative methods •sort, prioritize, and structure evidence •solve problems through evidence-based inquiry •apply informal and formal logic in problem-solving, analysis, and developing arguments <p><i>Communication:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •listen effectively •express oneself clearly in forms of written and spoken English •target an audience •work collaboratively •maintain self-awareness and critical distance •use technologies to construct and disseminate knowledge •use common academic and workplace software <p><i>Research and Information Literacy:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •understand how information is generated and organized •conduct effective Internet and database searches •comprehend and discuss complex materials •critically evaluate information •understand plagiarism, cite sources •use information effectively and responsibly 	<p>The Justice Core 9 credits*</p> <p>Themes:</p> <p>100 - Justice and the Individual [FYS] 200 - Struggles for Justice and Equality in the United States 300- Justice in a Global Context 400 -Capstone in the major</p> <p><i>Essential Knowledge: familiarity with</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •issues and institutions of justice •the history, cultures, social, political, and economic institutions of the U.S. •global interdependence <p><i>Reasoning, Analysis & Critical Thinking</i> <i>Communication</i> <i>Research and Information Literacy</i></p> <p><i>Ethical practice:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •articulate the ethical dimensions of personal, academic, social, economic, and political choices •use cross-cultural knowledge •communicate and collaborate with people of diverse age, class, ethnicity, gender, nationality, race, religion, and sexuality <p><i>Civic engagement:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •develop the habits of introspection, personal and civic responsibility, and communication •be informed and responsible citizens of the world <p><i>Intellectual maturity:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ persist in the face of obstacles; ▪ navigate ambiguity and disagreement •cultivate self-understanding •cultivate curiosity and embrace learning as a life-long process <p><i>*Credits in the core may be applied to requirements in other clusters.</i></p>	<p>The Creative Dimension 6-9 credits</p> <p><i>Essential Knowledge: familiarity with</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •formative ideas and works in the arts and humanities •artistic work as a form of inquiry, problem solving, and pleasure <p><i>Reasoning, Analysis and Critical Thinking</i> • <i>Communication</i> <i>Research and Information Literacy</i> <i>Creativity</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •understand the role of creativity in all fields of inquiry and expression •develop their own creativity <p><i>Intellectual Maturity</i></p> <hr/> <p>Learning from the Past 6-9 credits</p> <p><i>Essential Knowledge: familiarity with</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •formative ideas and works in the arts, humanities, mathematics, natural sciences, and social sciences •U.S. and world history •global interdependence <p><i>Reasoning, Analysis and Critical Thinking</i> • <i>Communication</i> <i>Research and Information Literacy</i> <i>Intellectual Maturity</i></p> <hr/> <p>The Natural and Physical World 7-8 credits</p> <p><i>Essential Knowledge: familiarity with</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •formative ideas and works in mathematics & science •science and scientific reasoning <p><i>Reasoning, Analysis and Critical Thinking</i></p> <hr/> <p>Self, Culture, and Society 7-10 credits</p> <p><i>Essential Knowledge: familiarity with</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •formative ideas and works in the humanities and social sciences •the history, cultures, social, political, and economic institutions of the U.S. •global interdependence •habits and choices that create and maintain wellness <p><i>Reasoning, Analysis and Critical Thinking</i> • <i>Communication</i> <i>Research and Information Literacy</i> <i>Personal Development and Social Responsibility</i></p>
--	---	---

WHAT DOES THE DRAFT GENERAL EDUCATION PROPOSAL DIAGRAM MEAN?

The draft proposal diagram depicts how the new general education curriculum will be organized. The architecture is built on the *Learning Outcomes for Undergraduate Education at John Jay College* adopted by the College Council in 2009. (See <http://inside.jjay.cuny.edu/apps/generaled/docs/Learning%20Outcomes%20for%20Undergraduate%20Education.pdf>). Credit ranges for each of the curricular areas and for the overall program are also proposed.

There are six boxes on the diagram. Each represents a cluster of learning outcomes:

Reasoning and Communication

The Justice Core

The Creative Dimension

Learning from the Past

The Natural and Physical World

Self, Culture, and Society

In the next phase of curriculum development, teams of disciplinary experts will scaffold the outcomes in the clusters, and a wide variety of disciplines will develop courses to address them. Students will practice those abilities at increasing levels of sophistication across the curriculum.

The **Reasoning and Communications** cluster the highest number of credits because it contains multiple essential academic competencies, including written and oral communication, math, reasoning, and foreign language.

The signature element of the program is in the center box. **The Justice Core** includes three seminars (one each at the 100, 200, and 300 levels) and a capstone in the major. This cluster follows three best practices in General Education:

1. The core provides a common experience for ALL students.
2. Core themes are related to the mission of the college.
3. The sequence scaffolds and integrates what students are learning in other courses.

100-level core courses will focus on the theme of justice and the individual and include first-year seminar skills (basics for college success). Special versions of the 200- and 300-level core courses may be designed to assist the transition of incoming transfer students. The major capstone (many majors already require one) will demonstrate and assess

The four clusters in the right-hand column - **The Creative Dimension, Learning from the Past, The Natural and Physical World, and Self, Culture, and Society** - ensure that students experience the full breadth of the liberal arts and sciences.

WHAT'S NEXT?

Between now and February 14, 2011 all faculty members are asked to provide feedback on the draft design. Feedback can be given in several ways:

- _ at the General Education Steering Committee web-site, <http://inside.jjay.cuny.edu/apps/generaled/email.html>
- _ during open forums on December 8, 2010, and February 3, 2011 and at Faculty Development Day on January 27;
- _ at meetings of standing committees, including the Undergraduate Curriculum and Standards Committee the Faculty Senate, Council of Chairs, Provost's Advisory Council, Council of Major and Program Coordinators;
- _ through meetings between members of the General Education Steering Committee and individual departments.

After February 14, 2011, the closing date for feedback, the Steering Committee will revise the model and a formal proposal will be sent to UCASC for review. After UCASC's approval, the proposal will be sent to College Council.

After a design for general education has been approved by the College's governance bodies, the course development phase of the process will be begin and continue through academic year 2011-12.

- _ A time table for implementation will be established.
- _ Faculty from diverse disciplines will meet to scaffold outcomes within and across the clusters and determine the number of credits required in each area. The outcomes scaffolds will be given to departments to use for course development. Workshops for faculty will be offered on designing outcomes-based courses.
- _ A faculty director of general education will be established, along with a general education oversight committee. UCASC will form a General Education Curriculum Development Subcommittee to review course proposals and ensure the integrity and coherence of the new model.

The Steering Committee looks forward to the campus-wide conversation about a new general education program and thanks you in advance for your participation.

ATTACHMENT D

Discussion about JJ's changed procedure for promotion to full professor and what action, if any, the Senate wishes to take

Background: *Because of an arbitration decision** involving a faculty member at Lehman College, John Jay's longstanding procedure for promotion of a faculty member to full professor has just been changed. Until now, at John Jay a candidate for full professor was considered by her/his department P&B, which voted by secret ballot on the merits of this promotion and the results of this vote were then forwarded to the Review Committee of the College Faculty Personnel Committee and then to the full membership of the Faculty Personnel Committee (along with the Review Committee's vote). The candidate could choose to have the promotion go forward even if the department's vote was split or negative or the candidate could choose to withdraw his/her candidacy for promotion if the department's vote was split or negative. In other words, our procedure for promotion to full professor was exactly the same as our continued procedure for promotion to associate professor. But because of the arbitration decision, it has been determined that at John Jay, promotion to full professor may **not** be considered by the Department P&B at all and may be considered by **only** the College Faculty Personnel Committee (and its appropriate Review Committee).*

The reason for this exists in Section 9.8 of the CUNY Bylaws and the fact that John Jay's Charter does not explicitly describe what has been our historical practice. See both below:

John Jay Charter. Article I. Section 9.e. Committee on Faculty Personnel:

There shall be a Committee on Faculty Personnel which shall review from the departments and other appropriate units of the College all recommendations for appointments to the instructional staff in the following ranks: Distinguished Professor, Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, Instructor, Distinguished Lecturer, Lecturer, Chief College Laboratory Technician, Senior College Laboratory Technician, and College Laboratory Technician, and make recommendations to the President. It shall also receive recommendations for promotions and reappointments with or without tenure, together with compensation, in the aforementioned ranks of the instructional staff and shall recommend to the President actions on these matters. It may also recommend to the President special salary increments. The President shall consider such recommendations in making his or her recommendations on such matters to the CUNY Board of Trustees.

Board of Trustees Bylaws: Section 9.8. Promotions:

a. PLAN NO. ONE. Promotions of tenured instructors to the rank of assistant professor shall be recommended to the college committee on faculty personnel and budget by the chairperson of the department only after an affirmative vote of a majority of all members of the department

*** Please email Karen Kaplowitz if you would like to receive a copy of the arbitration decision*

ATTACHMENT D – p. 2

who have professorial rank. Promotions to the rank of associate professor shall be recommended only after an affirmative vote of a majority of all associate professors and professors in the department. In departments where every professorial rank is not represented, recommendations for promotion shall be initiated by the committee on appointments of the department. This plan shall not apply in the case of promotion to a professorship.

PLAN NO. TWO. All promotions in the instructional staff, except promotion to professor, shall be recommended to the college committee on faculty personnel and budget by the chairperson of the department only after a majority affirmative vote of the departmental committee on personnel and budget; provided, however, that no member of such committee shall vote on his/her own promotion.

A minority of any departmental committee on personnel and budget or any committee under plan no. one of this section shall have the power to submit a minority recommendation to the college committee on faculty personnel and budget.

Promotion to the rank of professor shall be recommended by the faculty committee on personnel and budget only after an affirmative vote of a majority of all associate professors and professors on the committee. The president, however, shall have the power to make an independent recommendation for promotion in any rank to the board, after consultation with the appropriate departmental committee and with the faculty committee on personnel and budget. In all instances no final action of departmental committees with regard to promotions shall be taken without consultation with the president.

Please note:

CUNY Board of Trustees Bylaws: Section 8.14. College Governance Plans:

The provisions in duly adopted college governance plans shall supersede any inconsistent provisions contained in this article.

Therefore, if we at John Jay wish to continue our past practice, we would have to amend our Charter to specifically state that promotions to full professor must be considered by the department P&B. If the Board of Trustees approves our amendment, then our Charter supercedes the CUNY Bylaws. There is a chance that the Board would do so because it has granted this right to another college and because our procedure is detailed in our Personnel Process Guidelines, which were fully vetted by CUNY's Office of Legal Affairs: see below:

Please note JJ's Personnel Process Guidelines, which were vetted by CUNY's Office of Legal Affairs:

John Jay Personnel Process Guidelines

III. THE PERSONNEL PROCESS: COMMITTEES

B. Department Personnel Committees

1. For full-time faculty members in professorial titles, and for full-time lecturers, instructors, and college laboratory technicians, reappointment, tenure, appointment, appointment with a Certificate of Continuous Employment, and promotion are considered by a series of committees. Since the committees - beginning with Department Personnel Committees - meet in early September, the candidate should start organizing his/her material the previous Spring. Promotion candidates are required to have their complete file in the Provost's Office by June 1; reappointment and tenure candidates by September 1. The procedures for obtaining outside letters of evaluation have a separate timetable. (See Section II of this document.)

2. Department Personnel Committees meet in early September (usually in the Provost's Conference Room) to vote on a candidate's reappointment, certification, tenure, or promotion, based on a review and discussion of the candidate's file. The CUNY Bylaws require that no faculty member who does not hold the rank of associate professor or professor shall vote on any promotion to full professor. Each member of the Department Personnel Committee is obligated to review the entire official file of the candidate. The official file is in the Provost's Office.

3. The department Chair will notify the candidate of the decision of the Department Personnel Committee as soon as possible after the vote is officially recorded. The Department vote becomes incorporated into the candidate's file for the next committee level, the Review Committee. It is therefore imperative that Department Personnel Committees meet according to schedule so that the business of the Review Committee will not be held up.

C. College Wide Personnel Review Committees

Following action by departmental Personnel Committees, candidates' files are subject to review by College Wide Personnel Review Committees.

1. Review Committees are subcommittees of the College Personnel Committee. Subject to (3) below, there shall be three Review Committees: a Reappointments Review Committee, a Tenure Review Committee, and a Promotions and Waivers Review Committee.

Therefore, the first decision for the Faculty Senate is whether we want to follow our past practice or whether we want follow the practice now being required of us.

ATTACHMENT E

To: The Faculty Senate

From: Department of Political Science

Date: December 3, 2010

Proposal

The Political Science Department proposes that the course cancellation policy be amended: specifically, that the enrollment “floor” for evening, Friday, and weekend classes be lowered to 8 students.

Rationale

The administration has encouraged John Jay faculty to offer a larger number of evening, Friday, and weekend classes, both due to scheduling and space constraints, as well as perceived student demand. Increasingly, however, these sections do not “make” and are cancelled at the last minute. When this happens, both students and faculty (full-time, as well as adjunct) are negatively impacted.

- Students, who often have demanding work and personal schedules, are forced at the last minute to rework their class schedule, and sometimes are not able to do so (i.e. a student who needs a T/R schedule, and cannot take a M/W class), thus causing a potential delay in progress to degree.
- Full-time faculty are either required to prepare a new course at the last minute (in Political Science, this is normally POL 101), or if a junior faculty, forced to use a PSC-CUNY pre-tenure course release, though it may not be ideal to do so during the semester in question.
- Adjunct faculty who are slated to teach POL 101 are released from teaching at the last minute, a situation that is likely to be financially precarious.

Therefore, while the administration is encouraging the faculty to offer evening, Friday, and weekend classes, the risk of doing so lies squarely on the shoulders of the students who wish to take these courses, and the faculty who teach them (not the administration). Lowering the enrollment floor on evening and Friday sections would increase the probability that courses would “run” and decrease the risk for students and faculty alike.