

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES #72

John Jay College of Criminal Justice

March 13, 1992

Time: 9:30 AM

Room 630T

Present (27): Arvind Agarwal, Michael Blitz, James Bowen, David Brandt, Orlanda Brugnola, Lily Christ, James Cohen, Migdalia DeJesus-Torres de Garcia, Janice Dunham, Elisabeth Gitter, Lou Guinta, Karen Kaplowitz, Sondra Leftoff, Tom Litwack, Robert McCrie, Jill Norgren, Dagoberto Orrantia, John Pittman, Mary Regan, Lydia Rosner, Douglas Salane, Timothy Stevens, Chuck Stickney, Jerome Storch, Antoinette Trembinska, Martin Wallenstein, Agnes Wieschenberg

Absent (13): Haig Bohigian, Philip Bonifacio, Dorothy Bracey, Luis Cuevas, Jannette Domingo, Robert Fox, Suzanne Iasenza, Rubie Malone, Olga Scarpetta, Edward Shaughnessy, Candice Skrapec, Howard Umansky, Carl Wiedemann

AGENDA

1. Announcements from the Chair
2. Approval of Minutes #71 of the February 19 meeting
3. Budget report and recommendations: Fiscal Advisory Committee: Senator Cohen
4. Proposal on class size and reallocation of sections: Professor Harold Sullivan
5. Discussion of Report by the Faculty Senate/Council of Chairs Committee on the Associate Degree Program
6. Report from the Committee on Evaluation: Senator McCrie
7. Election of three faculty to fill the newly created College Council seats through May.
8. Discussion of March 16 College Council agenda items
9. Proposed resolution on Better Teaching Seminars: Senator Norgren
10. Proposed resolution on recruiting more criminal justice practitioners as students at JJ: Pres. Kaplowitz
11. Proposed resolution on faculty presence during student evaluation of faculty: Senator Trembinska
12. Proposed resolution on notification of dates of student evaluation of faculty : Senator Trembinska
13. Proposed resolution on frequency of student evaluation of faculty: Senator Trembinska
14. Proposed amendment of the Charter regarding P&B membership: Senator Litwack
15. Invited Guest: Ronald Quartimon, vice president of Student Council and vice chair of USS
16. Proposed resolution on faculty involvement in the voter registration drive: Senate Executive Committee
17. Report on the Middle States self-study: Senator Rosner
18. Invited Guest: John Emmons, Chair of the HEO Council
19. Invited Guest: Provost Basil Wilson
20. Reports from committees (written)

[Ed. In order to facilitate the business of the Faculty Senate, the agenda schedule was not followed precisely. However, all reports and actions will be recorded in agenda order.]

1. Announcements from the Chair

The Senate was directed to written announcements [Attachment A.]

Senator Dagoberto Orrantia was welcomed to the Senate as the new representative of the Department of Foreign Languages and Literature, replacing Marcia Yarmus who is on sabbatical leave.

The annual meeting of the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences (ACJB) is taking place in Pittsburgh and, thus, several senators are unable to attend today's Senate meeting because they are attending the ACJB Conference. It was agreed that in the future the Faculty Senate would schedule meetings so as to not conflict with the two major criminal justice conferences (ASC and ACJS).

President Kaplowitz reported that the administration has announced that Computer Center Director Jack Meth, whose appointment is annual because of the nature of his job, has not been reappointed for next year. She also reported that the Auxiliary Enterprises Corporation has voted to allocate \$12,000 of non-tax levy funds, to be matched with \$12,000 dollars of other non-tax levy funds, to hire an evening director of student clubs and student activities. It is not yet clear to whom this person will report. President Lynch is also talking about hiring a dean for the evening programs. Senator Btorch asked whether Dean George Best had not originally been hired to be the evening dean. Senator Norgren responded that, indeed, he had been hired for that purpose. She added that the College needs to ensure that the new hire would not do what the last three people who were hired to work at night did, that is, decide that they do not like working at night after taking the position and after working at it for a short period of time.

Senator Rosner said that we do need more administrators at night. President Kaplowitz agreed and said she had a very disruptive student in a night course this semester. The course meets on the third floor of North Hall and when she convinced the student to go into the corridor with her (because her other students were becoming very upset by this student's disruptive behavior), she walked with him throughout the third floor and was unable to find an administrator nor any way of summoning an administrator. She said that in light of the Senate's Better Teaching Seminar last semester on disruptive student behavior in the classroom and Vice President Witherspoon's subsequent letter to her about this topic, she wanted to report that she subsequently sought the help of Vice President Witherspoon, who had pledged in his letter his commitment to providing assistance in such situations. She said that Vice President Witherspoon had intervened and had been tremendously supportive and effective, doing everything we hope for from the administration. She said wanted to report this not only to publicly recognize Vice President Witherspoon but also to give this information to faculty who are having or who may have similar problems.

Senator Wallenstein said that it is irresponsible for the college to continue to hire administrators when faculty lines and class sizes are at risk. Senator Norgren noted a recent study by the University Faculty Senate of the increase in CUNY administrators that was distributed to the P&B and she recommended that it be distributed to the Senate. She added that the administration is obviously not concerned with the issue and will continue to be unconcerned until its hand is called. She urged the Senate to take up the issue. President Kaplowitz said that the University Faculty Senate (UFS) newsletter reported the analysis by UFS Chair Professor Robert Picken which shows that at CUNY the ratio of administrators to faculty had been 1:18.1 five years ago (in 1986) and is now 1:15.5. Professor Picken reported to the UFS two weeks ago that a dean at NYU, reading the UFS newsletter report, did a hasty analysis of administrator to faculty ratio at NYU and discovered it to be 1:43. Professor Picken's analysis shows that over the past five years at CUNY, enrollment has increased 10 percent, the number of administrators has increased 10 percent, but the number of full-time faculty has decreased 10 percent. President Kaplowitz reported that the UFS is now preparing a chart that will provide the number of full-time faculty, the number of administrators, and the number of FTEs over the last five years for every CUNY college. She said that as soon as the chart is available she will provide it to the Senate. Senator Norgren said it would also be interesting to see what people are doing who had been hired, noting that it is quite possible that their new assignments are completely unconnected to the job for which they were hired.

President Kaplowitz next noted that she had sent copies to the senators of Professor Harold Sullivan's memorandum to Vice President Smith because she had been copied on the memorandum and she invited Professor Sullivan (Government) to report on Vice President Smith's response to him. Professor Sullivan's memorandum had been in response to a memorandum from Miriam Mucchi, who is in charge of telecommunications for the College, prohibiting the receipt of personal faxes and stating that not only would personal faxes not be delivered but that the addressee would not be informed that a fax had been received by the College. Professor Sullivan's memorandum addressed the issue of the violation of privacy implicit in the memo, since the private or business nature of a fax can not be determined unless the fax were read [Attachment B].

Professor Sullivan explained that initially he had spoken to Ms. Mucchi expressing his concern about the issue of privacy and that he then decided to write a memorandum about the matter. In reply, in a memorandum to Professor Sullivan, Vice President Smith asserted that about half of the faxes that are received are junk faxes and that, thus, the administrative staff have to go through each fax, but that they are not interested in their content. Senator Norgren asked whether a cover sheet identifying the recipient by name isn't usually part of a fax transmission and that this would easily distinguish legitimate transmissions from junk mail. Professor Sullivan said that many faxes do have a cover sheet but that when they do not, as was the case with the fax he was sent, his name and title and department appeared on the very first lines of the document, and so it was unnecessary for anyone to read beyond that to determine whether it was a "junk" fax.

Professor Sullivan reported that Vice President Smith's memo to him contains the statement that a new College policy

has just been implemented whereby every fax received will be placed in an inter-office envelope and sent through campus mail. Until now, a phonemail message was left saying that a fax had been received and that the recipient could retrieve the fax by going to the mailroom on the fifth floor of T Building. Professor Sullivan noted that the new system might pose a problem since most faxes are sent for the purpose of quick transmittal and they are often documents whose timeliness is of primary importance. He noted that a fax that arrives on a Thursday might not be received through inter-office mail until the following Tuesday making fax transmission less efficient than first-class mail.

The senators discussed the issues of privacy, the ways College policies are set and communicated, and the need for an additional fax machine in North Hall. President Kaplowitz noted that a fax machine is in the Admissions Office on the fourth floor of North Hall but that no notice is given to the recipient when a fax arrives. Not knowing this, she had given someone that fax number because her classes and office are in North Hall and she knew she would not have time to easily pick up from T Building a fax she was expecting that day. She said that it was only because a faculty colleague by chance came upon the fax and left her a phonemail message that she knew the fax had arrived. Because the colleague put the fax in inter-office mail she did not receive it by the deadline by which she had needed it.

Senator Brandt noted that the whole way that these issues are handled is indicative of the administration's lack of concern for and lack of respect of the faculty and that this is unacceptable. He added that the whole way that perks are handled at the College is unacceptable, but noted that fax transmissions are not perks.

Senator Wallenstein moved a resolution that the College resume the procedure of placing a phonemail message upon the receipt of a fax. Senator Rosner moved to amend the motion to add that an additional fax machine be provided in the North Hall mailroom (or a similar location in North Hall) for transmission and reception of faxes by the faculty. Senator Storch suggested that we include the importance of extensive hours and clearly stated hours because if a fax machine is in a North Hall office that is not usually accessible, having it will create more problems because we will be unable to retrieve our faxes.

Senator Christ noted that two themes keep emerging during the Middle States self-study and that they are both related to this issue: the lack of efficient communication on the campus and the necessity of treating each other with mutual respect. Professor Sullivan pointed out that his memo concerned those more general issues and not just the single issue of his fax. President Kaplowitz noted that the communication issue is an important one because no one could even have known about the policy concerning "private" faxes unless the person had been to the fifth floor of T building to send a fax and noticed the memorandum from Ms. Mucchi sitting next to the fax machine. Senator Orrantia agreed, saying that he would not have known about the policy had Professor Sullivan's memorandum and Ms. Mucchi's memorandum not been sent to him in his capacity as a senator. He added that when he read Ms. Mucchi's memorandum his initial response was concern that not only was someone judging whether a fax is a professional or a private communication but

that someone might dispose of a fax because they could not read it because it was written in a language other than English. He said that as a professor of foreign languages, he receives communications in several languages and someone seeing them might erroneously assume they were private correspondences. Senator Stevens said that as someone who regularly receives communications in Dutch from Amsterdam as part of his scholarly work, he had had the same reaction.

The motion was restated: Resolved that the Faculty Senate requests that fax machines be available in both North Hall and T Building for transmission and reception; that these fax machines be available at clearly stated and extensive hours; that when a fax is received, a phonemail message be placed informing the recipient of the transmission and the location of the fax and that the fax not be placed in inter-office mail unless the recipient specifically makes such a request; and that all fax transmissions be treated as professional communications.

The motion passed by unanimous vote. Professor Sullivan was thanked for bringing this issue to the Senate's attention.

Senator Guinta noted that he is chairing the Middle States self-study committee on the physical plant and that one of his committee's recommendations is that a committee of faculty, administrators, and students be formed to make policy decisions about such matters. Professor Sullivan said he is pleased the Middle States self-study will identify this topic as an important issue but suggested that the College does not need another committee and that such matters could best and most appropriately be handled by the Faculty Senate and the Council of Chairs.

President Kaplowitz next reported that Professor Serena Nanda (Chair, Anthropology Department), has written to her about the Senate's discussion of the College Personnel (P&B) Committee process that appears in Faculty Senate Minutes #69 (December 13, 1991) and that Professor Nanda has asked that her letter be read into the minutes of today's meeting. The Senate's December 13 discussion was about a perception by many members of the Senate and of the general faculty that service no longer counts in the "P" process.

Professor Nanda's February 26, 1992, letter: "I am very distressed by the remarks (attached and underlined) made at the December 1991 Senate meeting. ['College service is no longer being considered by the College Personnel Committee in promotions.. .. Many Senators said that the word throughout the College and directly from many chairs to their faculty is that service no longer counts at the College and that only publishing counts. Faculty are being told that if they have published a book they will get promoted to full professor even without service and that anything short of a book means the promotion is virtually doomed. Junior faculty are being advised to spend their time on research and not on committees or performing other College service' pp.8-9.]

"These statements are totally untrue, inaccurate, and also unhelpful. Because of the confidential nature of the P and B process, it is not possible for me to give details and examples, but I can assure you that no such statement has been made during the process either officially or unofficially.

Indeed, quite the opposite is true: this year, as in the past, the P and B, at all levels, has always considered college service very very important, it is discussed in connection with all candidates, and is looked at carefully both in a candidate's file and during discussions. I really don't know where those who spoke got their information from: it is obviously rumor since only members are present at P and B meetings. I believe it is fair to say, though I must, in this letter, speak only for myself, that the P and B committee views our college as a 'community of scholars and teachers and learners' and that the word 'community' is a very important consideration in our discussions and votes. Service to that community is well argued by all segments of the P and B--chairs, administrators, at-larges, and students.

"My distress also extends for the same reasons to the remarks about what some chairs are reported to have told their faculty. While it may be true (and I only know this for a fact in one case) that some chairs may indeed be advising their candidates as suggested, if it is 'the word throughout the college' I can tell you for myself, that word is incorrect. What is happening, both through the P and B subcommittee of the Chairs, and also in the P and B meetings, is that there is an increasingly more careful attention to all aspects of the criteria for promotion: teaching, scholarship (or its equivalents, i.e., creative work) and service. I would appreciate if you would please read this at the next Senate meeting so that it may be included in the Senate minutes. Thank you for your attention. Sincerely, Serena Nanda, Chair, Department of Anthropology."

Senator Brandt said that this is the same issue as the fax issue, in that faculty are being isolated from processes that have a real impact on their careers. Here is a letter from Professor Nanda, for whom he has real respect, saying that although she could not say what actually happened at the "P" Committee, we should trust her assurances about what did or did not occur. Be said that this is difficult to accept, President Kaplowitz said that an ad hoc subcommittee on the procedures and criteria of the "P" Committee that Professor Nanda is chairing is about to release its report and that the report will be on the agenda of the Faculty Senate for discussion and comment and she suggested that the Senate make a real contribution to the discussion about the policies and procedures of the P&B when that report is released.

2, Approval of Minutes #71 of the February 19 meeting

By a motion duly made and seconded, Minutes #71 were approved. Senator Wieschenberg noted that the Minutes accurately report her remark to Assistant Security Director Isabella Curro about a broken fire door to the stairwell on the fourth floor of North Hall and that she is pleased to report that the door has since been fixed.

3. Budget report and recommendations: Fiscal Advisory Committee: Senator Cohen [Attachment C]

Benator Cohen noted that his Committee had not had an

opportunity to go over the final version of the report [Attachment C] in detail and that there might, therefore, be additional comments by members of the Committee. The other Fiscal Advisory Committee members are Senators Lou Guinta, Suzanne Iasenza, and Tom Litwack.

Senator Guinta wondered whether the faculty wants to accept the idea that it is the faculty's responsibility to search for non-tax levy money, adding that he thinks it might be a good idea. He noted that only a very limited number of faculty are currently involved in generating grant money. He suggested that Jacob Marini, the director of the grants office (Office of Sponsored Programs), would be willing to come to the Senate to discuss the issue. He said that President Lynch is committed to the issue. He noted there are various incentives to faculty for finding grant money as well as benefits to the College as a whole.

Senator Guinta also noted that since we are the only CUNY college in this area and since there is a burgeoning development of the neighborhood, there is tremendous money-making potential in a continuing education program, which would not only bring in money and create a very strong link with the community but which could also give faculty who primarily teach basic courses an opportunity to teach more advanced subjects.

Senator Guinta reported that last year only 26 faculty had acquired grants and that only \$700,000 in grant money had been generated by faculty. He also reported that he had raised the issue of a continuing education program with President Lynch who felt that it would not work but, Senator Guinta added, he had asked a friend who is in the continuing education program at Queens College and she emphatically said that a continuing education program would be highly profitable within five years. President Kaplowitz asked which administrator's responsibility this would fall under. Senator Guinta said that it would initially fall under Dean Mary Rothlein's office, since she is responsible for Planning and Development, but that the President would have to decide who would be responsible for it.

Senator Trsmbinska asked if she had understood correctly that there were only 26 faculty who had generated \$700,000 in research and training grants last year. When assured that those were the figures, Senator Trembinska noted that at one of the luncheons for the Senate given by President Lynch this semester she had raised the issue about whether the faculty should perhaps place greater focus on grant getting activities and was told by President Lynch that hers was a misperception and that faculty were indeed generating a great many grants. She said that President Lynch had offered to check into this and had reported at the Spring Faculty Meeting that it is anticipated that the faculty will bring in \$3 million in grants this year. Senator Guinta responded that her perception is more accurate than that report.

Professor Sullivan asked about the kinds of grants that faculty bring in, noting that while many faculty bring in grants they might not be grants that generate soft funds. Senator Cohen noted that the bulk of the funds come out of training grants. Senator Norgren noted that training grants could support other important College and faculty interests

quite validly. She pointed out that grants offer many faculty incentives and improve faculty life. She also noted that Jacob Marini had helped her develop a grant with extraordinarily low overhead. She suggested that it is not in the best interests of the faculty to be pressured into searching for grants. Instead, she felt, that it would be better for faculty to be informed about the benefits of grants since there is so much hard work involved in preparing grant proposals.

Senator Gitter asked why it is necessarily in the best interest of the College to encourage faculty to secure grants if increased numbers of grants might result in increased released time for faculty at a time that record numbers of adjuncts are teaching and record number of sections are being taught by adjuncts. Senator Salane noted that his grants usually generate little released time but do enable him to hire students.

Senator Blitz said that getting grants, especially training grants, is a tremendous benefit to the College as well as to the faculty. At the same time, he, too, is worried about possible pressure on faculty to acquire grants, and he urged the Senate to pay close attention to the duplication of effort at the college (item #3 of the report).

Senator Rosner recommended that the College explore forcefully the matter of continuing education programs at John Jay and its significant revenue possibilities. She said that this could also be a way of restoring John Jay's good name in the professional community, which she said it is very important that we do.

Senator Rosner also noted that 900 overtally cards had been issued this semester and that this had generated significant funds "on the backs of the faculty" and that perhaps the Faculty Senate should take a position on this. Senator Cohen responded that the administration has been traditionally concerned with increasing the enrollment in order to ensure expansion of the physical plant. Now there are also formulas imposed by 80th Street having to do with FTEs that involve how much money John Jay receives. He noted that his expertise on the matter is expanding and that it behooves us to understand the matter fully.

Senator Agarwal said two issues are involved: one is professional satisfaction and the other the use of grants to supplement the College's budget. He said these are two different issues and purposes and should not be confused.

Senator Litwack noted that we all agree that faculty should neither be pressured nor discouraged to search for grants. He proposed that a certain amount of released time be available for faculty to develop grants. He noted that until recently when the budget situation became bad, Dean of Graduate Studies Barbara Price had given out three hours of released time each semester for research or grant writing.

Senator Litwack next addressed the language of item #3 of the report. He said the language might be misinterpreted to mean that we are urging the firing of administrators. He noted that long ago President Lynch had established the policy of not firing people and that we should not approve

the issue without careful consideration of this. Senator Guinta responded that the Committee had considered this matter, and that he personally feels, and the Committee agrees, that no one should be fired. He said the Committee's recommendation is redeployment, not retrenchment. President Kaplowitz noted that the State Legislature is about to consider another Early Retirement Initiative (ERI) for CUNY, whereby those eligible would be anyone with 15 years of service who is 50 years or older. She said that if ERI goes through, there will undoubtedly be administrators who will take early retirement. A motion was made to add the phrase '@particularly as natural attrition occurs*@to item #3 to prevent any misinterpretation of this recommendation.

Senator Orrantia noted that there had been an effort to offer continuing education courses in the past and that he had recruited students from outside the College, but that there was no clear commitment by the administration that support would be provided to sustain faculty initiatives. Senator Storch noted that the continuing education problem is complex because it is not permissible to use tax levy money to support its development.

President Kaplowitz said that the proposals of the Fiscal Advisory Committee are intended to be matters of general principle, and that the Senate should not try to micro-manage the College. She suggested that we express our concerns and articulate our recommendations and invite the administration to respond and then discuss their response.

Senator Storch said that redeployment of personnel is very important to the viable functioning of the College. Senator Leftoff noted that there is an important issue in evaluating the administration, noting their relative expense vis-a-vis faculty salaries and that faculty must submit to evaluation of its productivity and that the administration does not. President Kaplowitz pointed out that an item on today's agenda addresses that very topic: it is a report by the Senate's Evaluation Committee about an instrument for faculty evaluation of administrative units and staff units.

Senator Norgren moved the adoption of the Fiscal Advisory Committee's report and its recommendations with the suggested modifications, noting that the real issue is how far the faculty is willing to go to make its concerns felt.

The report and its recommendations were adopted with no negative votes and with one abstention. The report will be sent to the members of the College Personnel and Budget Committee, which is chaired by President Lynch.

4. Proposal on class size and reallocation of sections:
Professor Harold Sullivan [Attachment D]

President Kaplowitz noted that the administration's proposal for making the \$1.3 million cut in John Jay's budget includes saving \$400,000 by increasing class size by 2.8 students. She said that last year Professor Sullivan issued a report to the Budget Planning Committee recommending that class size not be increased but that the section allocation to departments be conducted differently. He again this year

issued a report on this subject [Attachment D] and the Senate's Executive Committee has invited Professor Sullivan to report on his study to the Senate.

Professor Sullivan reported that whereas there may be some debate over the validity of various caps on class sizes and their relation to the College's budget, the number of course sections allocated to some departments is unfair given student demand. He noted that the real issue might not be so much increasing cap size but the average class size. He distributed data on fall 1991 enrollment data [Attachment E]. Professor Sullivan noted that the administration has now also adopted the approach of increasing the equality of the teaching load in terms of class size rather than raising caps. He then explained his handout, noting especially that mayors had responsibilities for offering upper-level courses even if they do not fill. By looking through the data one can see which departments are overburdened and underburdened. He explained that it is an analysis of student demand and is thus a type of market analysis.

Senator Orrantia asked about the accuracy of the figures. Professor Sullivan said he excluded "shadow sections" that are never given in the first place (and are only listed in case additional sections have to be added) and he said he also corrected obvious mistakes; he did not count obvious distortions due to registration in internships, etc.

Senator Cohen asked for a clarification of the definition of class cap. Professor Sullivan explained that this is the cap set by the Provost, usually in consultation with the department chair. Senator Brandt said he is impressed by how highly subscribed all the departments are and that he worries about basing an analysis on the Provost's judgment of appropriate caps. Professor Sullivan acknowledged former Provost Sexter's arbitrary attitude toward setting caps, but said that there are still obvious inequities in arbitrarily set caps that differed widely from actual enrollment.

President Kaplowitz said that the significance of Professor Sullivan's work is that it suggests that by reallocating sections class size does not have to be increased. Senator Pittman questioned the wisdom of such arbitrary caps. Professor Sullivan responded that he might have overstated the matter if he had left the impression that the caps were absurdly arbitrary as a rule, but rather that more attention and care to the matter is the point. Senator Wallenstein noted problems with current class size in his basic speech courses and said that any raising of class size would be disastrous. Senator Guinta wondered if the caps are set according to a formula based on attrition. President Kaplowitz said that some administrators propose raising class size on the basis that so many students drop the course by the 10th week but that those of us in the classroom have countered this proposal whenever we hear it with the point that it is because so many classes are so crowded that many students, who need more individual attention, drop courses.

Senator Brugnola asked how day/night classes are factored into this analysis. Professor Sullivan responded that every department had day/night classes. He also noted that there are also obvious misallocations within departments

when a chair allocates too many sections of a particular course. He also noted insufficient sections to address demand as well as excess offerings given obvious demand. Senator Blitz said that if we tried to equalize class size across the college, then all faculty would feel an interest in the issue of increased class size. He wondered what we might do concretely with this data.

Senator Litwack asked how these figures reflect the allocation of sections taught by adjuncts. Professor Sullivan explained that they influenced the allocation of sections taught by both full-time faculty and adjuncts. He said that the system of allocation has changed since the time when Senator Litwack was chair of the Psychology Department: each chair is now told how many sections his or her department can offer and the chair determines how many sections are taught by full-time faculty and how many by adjunct faculty. Senator Litwack suggested that the loss of the criminal justice professional population might bring into question the efficiency of our continuing to offer day/night sections. President Kaplowitz responded that if we have any hope of increasing and retaining our in-service population, we should continue to offer day/night sections. She noted that a related resolution is on today's agenda.

Senator Litwack moved that student demand be given serious consideration by the Provost in allocating sections. Senator Brugnola said that any statement that we could make about this must take into account the importance of offering some courses without regard to class size. Senator Salane worried about the possible consequence which is that the number of upper-level courses offered would be decreased. He also worried about sufficient input into the Provost's process of determining class caps.

Senator Norgren suggested that perhaps chairs should have to justify the number of sections offered based on longitudinal data rather than more impressionistic bases.

The question was called. The motion carried with four opposed and four abstentions.

Senator Gitter suggested that this was an important and informative report but that it really did not require action by the Senate. Professor Sullivan agreed and said that he brought this to the Senate as an information item. The Senate thanked Professor Sullivan for bringing it to the Senate and for meeting with the Senate to discuss it.

5. Faculty Senate/Council of Chairs Committee on the Associate Degree Program Report: Discussion of Possible approaches

President Kaplowitz reported that the Senate's Executive Committee urges delay of this discussion pending a decision by the State and the City as to whether the associate degree program will be funded. The Executive Committee also recommends that the Senate forward the report to the President, the Middle States Committee, the Provost, the Deans, and several committees, particularly the committees on Retention and Academic Standards, and on the Curriculum.

Senator Litwack wondered why we should send it at all if the program might not be funded. President Kaplowitz said that if the program is funded, these groups would already have received the report and, it is to be hoped, studied and discussed it. Since the decision about funding might not happen until August, as was the case last year, it would not be efficient to wait until then, when the College is not in session, to send it. Senator Cohen complimented the report which he termed excellent and commended the committee members: Senators Bowen, Bracey (chair), Cuevas, Gitter and Professors Lutzker, Moran, and Zlotnick. The motion to transmit the report passed unanimously.

6. Election of three faculty to fill the newly created Collese Council seats from now through May.

At its December 13 meeting, the Senate decided to fill the three new faculty seats on the College Council (created by the restructuring of the Council) from among the fifteen at-large members of the Faculty Senate in an election by the Faculty Senate. The Senate elected the following three at-large senators: Orlanda Brugnola, Lou Cuevas, Antoinette Trembinska. Their term of office is from March 16, the date of the next Council meeting, through May.

7. Report from the Committee on Evaluation: Senator McCrie

Vice President Dunham drew the Senate's attention to an article on security in this week's issue of Time magazine quoting and citing Robert McCrie and his affiliation with JJ.

Senator McCrie spoke on behalf of the Senate's Committee on Evaluation. He reported that over the past several years the literature has suggested that the faculty of a college has an obligation to evaluate college services. Therefore, the Faculty Senate's Evaluation Committee has developed a document to evaluate services. Its purpose is not to evaluate individuals. The document was circulated for comment among all the offices and units being evaluated and has received limited comment. The Committee revised the document accordingly and revised it again in response to the Senate's December 13 discussion. The Committee decided that the Committee itself would receive the completed surveys.

Senator McCrie noted that the questionnaire reflects a concern with anonymity but that each respondent would sign an outside envelope to ensure that only one survey is submitted by each member of the faculty who responds. He noted that there is a potential problem with the discursive options on the survey, in that we might be overwhelmed if many respondents give discursive comments, but that is also a potential plus. He noted the complexity of the questionnaire itself. If it goes to all full-time faculty and adjuncts, there is a potential for a huge number of responses. The Committee proposes to issue a booklet that will report on the responses question by question, providing a record of the descriptive responses, grouping together those that are very similar, and also quoting those that are unique.

Senator McCrie said the results would be disseminated to the Faculty Senate and to the units that are evaluated, and other relevant recipients as determined by the Senate. He said that the Office Institutional Research and the Office of Testing had volunteered to help with processing the information. He distributed the questionnaire, noting the changes since the last time the Senate saw the questionnaire in December. He recommended reducing the scale to five gradations rather than seven based on the recommendations of Gail Hauss and Virginia Gardiner.

Senator Norgren asked why the Library is not included as a unit being evaluated. Vice President Dunham explained that last semester the Library issued a questionnaire of its own and reported the results in the Library newsletter. Also, the Middle States committee on the Library conducted a study complemented by a survey distributed to Library users.

Senator Cohen suggested there could be interesting correlations if there is additional identifying information provided by the respondents, such as how long the faculty member has taught at John Jay. Senator Norgren suggested that the option of opting out be provided for each question. Senator Blitz pointed to seeming contradictions between the instructions and the gradations of the evaluating scale. Senator Brandt recommended retaining the seven-range scale because of studies he cited that show its efficacy. President Kaplowitz recommended altering the questionnaire title to reflect its evaluation of units, rather than of staff. Senator Gitter suggested that the term "confidential" in the title be changed to "anonymous."

Senator Cohen asked whether the Committee has made sure that every unit being evaluated has received a draft so that there is no suspicion about our motives in doing this evaluation. President Kaplowitz noted that almost two years ago President Lynch approved a proposal for this evaluation and the list of units to be evaluated and that in the interval the instrument has been sent to all the units being evaluated. Senator Gitter suggested placing an article in "The Week of" explaining the history and process of the evaluation. The questionnaire, with the recommended changes, was endorsed by unanimous vote. Senator McCrie and his committee were thanked. The members of the Evaluation Committee are Philip Bonifacio, Orlanda Brugnola, Robert McCrie (chair), Olga Scarpetta, and Agnes Wieschenberg.

8. Discussion of agenda items of the March 16 College Council meeting

President Kaplowitz reviewed the College Council agenda. The Faculty Senate's proposal to revise the membership of the Council Executive Committee is on the agenda as a first reading. This is the proposal the Senate took to the Board of Trustees. After all constituencies agreed to support it, the HEOs have put a different proposal on the agenda (which would provide for fewer faculty members) as a first reading. The Senate reaffirmed its support of its own Charter amendment. It was noted that a Charter amendment can not pass without the support of the faculty and that Vice Chancellor Bloom had promised to personally place the Senate's proposal on the

Board of Trustees agenda if the College Council does not satisfactorily resolve this issue.

The next item should be a proposal to amend the Charter to remove limits on terms of office. When the student members of the College Council objected to a proposal to remove the limitation on terms of office, they stated that had the proposal come from a small department they would have supported it. Senator DeJesus-Torres de Garcia then submitted a proposal to amend the Charter by deleting limits on terms of service. Even though this was on the agenda in February (and not discussed because there was loss of a quorum), it was removed from the agenda at the Executive Committee meeting because Mr. Quartimon noted that Robert's Rules restricts resubmission of an item to those who voted with the majority. Senator Iasenza is working with Senator DeJesus-Torres de Garcia on a different proposal which Senator Iasenza, who voted with the majority, will submit.

There are two other Charter amendments, one to change the at-large members of P&B from "instructional staff" to "faculty," and one to delete the restrictions on who can speak at a College Council meeting to bring the Charter into conformity with actual practice.

President Kaplowitz reported that at the direction of the Senate she submitted a request for a report on the college's compliance with laws concerning people with disabilities. She asked, at the Senate's direction, that the letter from the Hunter faculty member, distributed by Senator Brugnola, be included with the Council agenda and she also requested that a letter she subsequently received from a John Jay student, Kitty Lunn, be also included. (The senators were sent a copy of Ms. Lunn's letter by President Kaplowitz as soon as she received it. The letter recounts the difficulties that Ms. Lunn, who uses a wheelchair encounters both because there is no women's room in North Hall that is wheelchair accessible and because she has a class in T Building that ends at 10:30 PM, after the Library is closed and, therefore, she cannot get out of T Building since the elevator is inside the Library. The letter reports that at times she has had to crawl up the stairs, at times has had to be carried up the stairs. The letter also reports an injury she sustained when she fell out of her wheelchair because of an inadequate curb cut in front of North Hall.) The Executive Committee of the Council acceded to Vice President Smith's request that the two letters be excluded from the agenda packet because they could embarrass the College.

The Senate agreed that the two letters are important documents which the Council members need and it was decided that copies of the letters would be distributed at the Council meeting for informational purposes. President Kaplowitz said that Ms. Lunn will attend the Council meeting.

Senator Wallenstein said that recently, on one of the coldest days of the year, he observed a student in a wheelchair waiting outside T Building, in front of the electric door, waiting for the electric door to be unlocked. Meanwhile the student sat in the frigid cold, unable to get into the building.

President Kaplowitz said that the electric door has

repeatedly been locked despite her protests and the protests of others and that when she signals her need to use the door, security personnel do not unlock it because she is not visibly disabled. She noted that it is illegal for people to have to declare their physical status and that it is also illegal to deny use of a door to the able bodied. The Supreme Court ruling that separate is never equal pertains to facilities for the disabled and able bodied.

Senator Stickney said that he can attest to the accuracy of Ms. Lunn's letter: he was the person who carried her (and her wheelchair) on the escalator because she could not gain access to the elevator in T Building and, therefore, could not exit the building after his class. Senator Gitter expressed shock concerning the possible liability to Senator Stickney if Ms. Lunn had fallen as well as the terrible indignity for the student. She also wondered why this is such an intractable problem.

Vice President Dunham said that during a planned fire drill no security person came to the Library to assist a student who uses a wheelchair. She stayed with the student because they were not able to use the elevator (a rule whenever there is a fire) and she had no way of carrying the student up the stairs and out of T Building. she said that had there been a fire she and the student would have been trapped there.

President Kaplowitz recounted the Senate's efforts to overcome the administration's inaction. She noted that the Faculty Senate first brought many of these issues to the administration's knowledge with its report on T Building issued by the Senate's Evaluation Committee in Fall 1988. Then the Senate brought the issue to the College Council, held a public hearing, and brought in legal and architectural experts from the Mayor's Office for People with Disabilities. The College Council approved resolutions proposed by the Faculty Senate, calling for reasonable accommodations and the removal of architectural barriers as required by Section 504 of the 1973 Federal Rehabilitation Act.

Senator Blitz suggested adopting a specific, simple list of goals and creatively pursuing ways to ensure their implementation. Senator Rosner noted the urgency of redressing these problems in the light of the City College tragedy. Senator Wallenstein suggested the possibility of the Faculty Senate joining a class action suit to force compliance. Senator Brugnola noted the reticence of many students to make waves concerning the issue and felt that whatever the Faculty Senate does should take their feelings into account. Senator Blitz said that there are more direct ways, perhaps, than a lawsuit, and suggested listing things we are prepared to do. Senator Storch wondered if the College Council would listen to anything other than the threat of a lawsuit. Senator Wallenstein said that it would be accurate to say to the College Council that a substantial number of senators felt that bringing in the press might be necessary. Senator stickney urged the Senate to provide the administration with some options short of defending against a suit. Senator Norgren urged notifying the College Council that the faculty feel a moral obligation to protect their disabled students. Senator Stevens said he strongly believes this issue is a moral one and speculated whether the Faculty

Senate or the College Council would have tolerated such delay if the concerns had involved race or gender.

Senator McCrie responded to Vice President Dunham's experience in the Library with the student in the wheelchair, noting that the College's security force had suffered extremely from budget cuts. Senator Scarpetta noted that the real issue is not the security officer not showing up, but the issue of the potential danger. President Kaplowitz agreed, saying that the architectural barriers are the issue and that the law requires that the disabled not be dependent on the availability or good will of personnel.

Although many senators urged movement on a class action suit or on bringing in the media, it was agreed that this would be discussed at the next Senate meeting, after the Senate hears a report about the actions, if any, taken by the College Council and by the administration.

9. Resolved, That the Faculty Senate's Fall 1992 Better Teaching Seminars include one designed expressly for the P&B Committee and that the topic be non-traditional methods of teaching: Senator Noruren

Senator Norgren outlined faculty involvement in the Faculty Senate's Better Teaching Seminars and spoke about increasing faculty exposure to the non-traditional strategies covered in some seminars. Perhaps more faculty would be interested if they felt that there was some institutional support. She and others believe that a Better Teaching Seminar for members of the P&B would be useful. She noted that President Lynch has expressed his support for the idea.

Senator Norgren explained that on March 3 Professor Dennis Sherman (TSP/History) conducted a Better Teaching Seminar on teaching techniques that are not teacher oriented and that several faculty during the post-exercise discussion had spoken of their apprehension of how an observer would rate such a class. She noted the danger of a performance review of such a non-traditional teaching strategy by someone unfamiliar with the techniques, prompting a potential comment such as "it was clear that there was learning going on, but it was not clear that there was any teaching going on." Senator DeJesus-Torres de Garcia said the operative term is "student-centered learning," and she cited numerous studies demonstrating its efficacy.

Vice President Dunham questioned the wisdom of suggesting to the P&B the activities it should engage in. Senator Norgren suggested that it is entirely appropriate to do so and that it is a way of creating a supportive environment for our faculty colleagues. Senator Christ pointed out that it is appropriate since we are evaluated by our peers and there are other legitimate teaching styles besides lecturing. Senator Wallenstein said it is absolutely the role of the Faculty Senate to express faculty values and that it is the responsibility of the P&B to reflect those faculty concerns. Senator Brugnola wondered about involving the Council of Chairs to ensure maximum participation. It was explained that the P&B consists of all department chairs, three at-large faculty, two students, and the president, the

provost, and the deans of undergraduate and graduate studies.

President Kaplowitz suggested two different seminars, one for the members of the College "P," and one for the members of the department P&Bs because they also base their assessment, in part, on the observation report and often the members of the department P&B are the ones who conduct the observations. Senator Norgren suggested first conducting a Better Teaching Seminar for the entire "P" and then considering whether to repeat it for the departmental committees. Senator Regan suggested involving students who had had such learning experiences. Senator Norgren reminded the Faculty Senate that there are student members on the P&B. Senator Scarpetta suggested that the spirit of the resolution reflect the need for a variety of teaching styles and professional growth and innovation in teaching techniques, as indicated on the Form C.

Senator DeJesus-Torres de Garcia mentioned her experience in the 1970s when one evaluation of her teaching expressed doubts concerning her command of the subject, given her unconventional teaching approach, which was student-centered. President Raplowitz reported that at the Better Teaching Seminar faculty had reported observation reports that stated it was clear that learning was taking place but not that any teaching was going on.

The motion was called, seconded, and passed unanimously.

10. Resolved, That the Faculty Senate requests that the administration of the College develop a strategy for attracting more criminal justice Practitioner students to John Jay and that this strategy be made known to the Faculty Senate by May 1, 1992: President Kaplowitz

President Kaplowitz explained that this resolution is being presented at the request of an ad hoc committee that she and Professor Robert Crozier formed last fall for the purpose of developing strategies to increase the number of John Jay students who are criminal justice practitioners. Among the committee members are Professors Dorothy Bracey, Vincent del Castillo, Richard Koehler, and Charles Lindner, all of whom have been criminal justice practitioners or are key members of criminal justice professional organizations. She referred the Senate to a report she provided as part of the "Announcements from the chair" which appears as Attachment A of Minutes #69 (December 13, 1991). This report shows the number of in-service students, as defined by the administration.

She said that the problem is that some members of the administration have not been very responsive to the ideas and efforts of the ad hoc committee and that the committee has come to realize that the group is perceived as being out of touch with the interests and concerns of the general faculty. The group has been consistently treated as if it was totally unrepresentative of the larger faculty body. She said the committee decided that if the Senate passed this resolution it would be a clear message to the administration that the group is not a fringe contingent, and that the faculty agree with the goals of increasing the number of in-service

students. This would enable the committee to operate more effectively and would, at the same time, result in a request for a strategy from the administration which the committee would work to help actualize.

She said that she and Professor Crozier had met with President Lynch in the Fall and that he had pledged his support and had given the group the go-ahead (which she reported at the Fall faculty meeting) but that there does not seem to be the same commitment by other administrators. She said that one positive note is that a police officer who attends John Jay has since been hired, by the Office of Admissions, on a part-time basis to visit precincts to promote John Jay.

She described a variety of ideas the group has proposed including a revival of the satellite program (but using other college campuses rather than precinct houses), staffed with full-time faculty who would be paid overages: this would be prefaced by a pilot satellite program to determine whether it is viable; a survey of our in-service students to determine why they came to John Jay and what they think we should do to attract more in-service students; a survey of non-John Jay students who are criminal justice practitioners conducted in cooperation with the unions or the agencies.

President Kaplowitz said that the desire to increase the in-service student population is not a code word for increasing the population of white students; she said that it has been suggested to her that that might be how the work of the committee has been perceived. She noted that she and Professor Crozier had been very startled by this suggestion. She said that in doing their research they had learned that one of the arguments that had convinced then Police Commissioner Ben Ward to approved the requirement of a college degree for promotion was that Professor Robert Panzarella, among others, showed him data that demonstrate that those who take most advantage of college incentives are the African-American members of police departments. Furthermore, there are more and more criminal justice practitioners of color, and the corrections personnel, for example, are comprised primarily of people of color.

Senator Christ strongly seconded the proposed resolution. She said that if we keep losing our police officers and other in-service students there is no reason for John Jay's continued existence. She voiced a belief in the importance of reaffirming John Jay's mission to provide a liberal arts education for criminal justice practitioners. She felt strongly that we should actively recruit criminal justice practitioners.

Senator Brugnola voiced support of the proposal, noting the shift toward community-based policing and the potential attractiveness of a liberal arts education at this time. Senator Wallenstein and other senators expressed their support of reviving the satellite program.

Senator Storch suggested the necessity for not only recruiting but for retaining those in-service students we have and addressing the concerns of those students, especially after the instability created by the student strikes. Senator DeJesus-Torres de Garcia said she supports

the resolution but urged the Senate to not be distracted by the issue of the student strikes since the real decline of in-service students occurred across a much longer time period, especially after the loss of the liberal arts majors. Senator Storch said it is important to look at why other colleges are getting the in-service students. He said that this is especially true now that promotions are dependent on college degrees in so many cases. He urged that we address not only ways to recruit but ways to retain the in-service students. He moved to amend the motion to include the phrase "and for retaining those criminal justice students who attend John Jay." The amendment was accepted. The question was called:

Resolved, That the Faculty Senate requests that the administration of the College develop a strategy for attracting more criminal justice practitioner students to John Jay and for retaining those criminal justice practitioner students who attend John Jay, and that this strategy be made known to the Faculty Senate by May 1, 1992.

The motion passed unanimously.

11. Resolved, That the Faculty Senate recommends that there be notification by the Office of the Provost of the change in rules whereby faculty do not have to leave the classroom during student evaluation of faculty and that, furthermore, faculty be urged to remain in the classroom during the process: Senator Trembinska

Senator Trembinska noted that there used to be a requirement that faculty leave the classroom during the process of student evaluation of the faculty. She pointed out that a year ago the Faculty Senate voted to recommend to the Provost that the policy be changed to give faculty the right to remain in the classroom. The Provost accepted the recommendation and, as a result, the rule regarding leaving the classroom has been deleted from the instruction sheet. However few people notice when something is deleted from instructions, especially when so many recite the instructions from memory. Furthermore, students do not know of the rule change and have challenged the right of faculty to remain in the classroom and there is no document to point to that verifies the veracity of those who assert that they may, indeed, remain.

Senator Trembinska recounted her own experience last semester. She heard raucous laughter from an adjacent classroom and went to investigate. There in the corridor was a totally humiliated instructor who could hear the students collaborating in the most disrespectful manner about how to answer the questions and what remarks to write. She introduced herself and learned that the instructor was an adjunct who did not know of the rule change. Senator Trembinska said that she can not describe the gratitude of the adjunct when told that she has the right to be in the classroom. The adjunct immediately returned to the classroom and the collaborative evaluation ceased.

Senator Trembinska strongly recommended that the Senate support an affirmative approach by the Provost of informing

the faculty by letter and also by including a dramatically visible notice in the instruction sheet reporting the new policy. Senator Christ wondered about wording that permitted faculty to make the choice whether to leave or to remain. Senator Storch suggested that faculty should not have such a choice because of the potential student pressure on faculty to leave the classroom.

Senator Litwack asked if there is any rational reason for leaving the room or for requiring faculty to leave the room. President Kaplowitz said that the original reason was the belief that a faculty member's very presence is inherently coercive, even though the process permits students to fill out the form with complete anonymity and, indeed, not fill out the form at all. She said the Senate recommended the policy be changed when members learned of abuses of the process. Since a faculty member's reappointment and promotion are based, in part, on the evaluation by students, the Senate was very concerned. This reliance on student evaluation is particularly relevant to adjuncts since there is no presumption of reappointment for adjuncts and a very negative student evaluation or even a mediocre one can be a very heavy determinant as to whether the adjunct is rehired.

Senator Regan recounted an experience a couple of years ago when an entire group of students gave the identical evaluation of her. Senator Stickney pointed out that when faculty are not present there is an issue of coercion of students by other students to either not fill out the form or to fill it out in certain ways. Senator Orrantia said that this is the first time he has heard about the change in policy, not having been on the Senate previously, and said it is essential for the instructions to state the change in policy and to express a preference for faculty to remain in the classroom. Senator Wallenstein said that despite his colleagues' comments, he is concerned about the coercive nature of the faculty presence. Senator Norgren questioned how the administration can reconcile two contradictory rules: on the one hand, faculty were to leave the room during evaluations and now, presumably, may still do so although they do not have to, and on the other hand, faculty are prohibited from absenting themselves from the classroom when the class is in session. The resolution passed with no negative votes and with one abstention.

12. Resolved, That the Faculty Senate recommends that each semester that student evaluations of faculty are to take place, faculty be notified by the Provost's Office prior to beginning of the semester as to the specific dates on which the process will occur so faculty can plan their curricula:
Senator Trembinska

Senator Trembinska said there are many reasons why faculty should be informed prior to the beginning of the semester when student evaluations will take place. She noted that her department, Mathematics, has required departmental tests on specific days of the semester for certain courses. Other faculty schedule guest lecturers, films, field trips, etc. She called the present procedure rigid and said there is a real need to have early notice of the dates in order to accommodate them on the syllabus. Senator Scarpetta

suggested an amendment whereby students would also know when the evaluation is scheduled so that they can be sure to be present if they want to participate in the process. She suggested that the dates should be included in the official calendar and that the College Calendar Committee could be charged with setting the dates. Senator Trembinska accepted the amendment.

Senator Wieschenberg proposed further amending the resolution to extend the period during which evaluations take place to a week. Senator Orrantia supported the amendment and Benator Trembinska accepted it. The question was called:

Resolved, That the Faculty Senate recommends that each semester that student evaluations of faculty are to take place, faculty and students be notified by the Provost's Office prior to the beginning of the semester as the specific week during which the process will occur so faculty can plan their curricula and that the date be included on the College calendar. Furthermore, an entire week should be scheduled for the evaluation process, with each faculty member to choose the date during that week that best conforms with his or her course syllabus.

The question was called. The motion passed unanimously.

16. Resolved, That the Faculty Senate endorses the University Student Senate (USS) voter registration project, the goal of which is to register 50,000 CUNY students and that, further, the Faculty Senate recommends that faculty permit Mr. Ronald Quartimon (Vice Chair for Legislative Action of the USS and Vice President of John Jay's student Council) and his student government colleaaues to visit their classes to distribute voter registration forms and to make a brief Presentation on voter registration: Faculty Senate Executive Committee

President Kaplowitz noted that Mr. Ronald Quartimon, the Student Council vice president, is the vice chair for legislative action of CUNY's University Student Senate (USS). Mr. Quartimon, who was scheduled to be a guest today of the Senate, asked for her assistance in the USS's voter registration drive. Mr. Quartimon has explained that the USS has chosen this as one of its activities and has set itself a goal of registering 50,000 CUNY students. She said that both she and Senator Blitz had invited Mr. Quartimon to their classes to test the presentation and that it had been appreciated by the students. Mr. Quartimon distributed voter registration forms to those students who requested them and then told the students they could complete the form at their convenience and hand it in to him later at the Student Council Office.

Senator Rosner questioned potential problems about permitting the students to come into the classroom for this purpose. President Raplowitz said that she called the CUNY Legal Office and although the Senate can ask President Lynch to request a formal legal opinion from Vice Chancellor Diaz, the information she was given by one of the lawyers on Vice Chancellor Diaz's staff is that faculty are permitted to invite students to their classroom although they are also, of

course, free to not do so. The key is that the process not be coercive. It is permissible to give out voter registration forms to those students who ask for them. By inviting the students to fill out the form at a later time and to hand it in to Student Council (or to mail it) at a later time there is no coercive element. Voter registration drives are common at other universities.

The motion passed by unanimous vote. [Ed. Mr. Quartimon later arrived as the Senate meeting was ending. He expressed his appreciation that the Senate had endorsed the voter registration drive.]

18. Report on the Middle States self-study: Senator Rosner

Senator Rosner reported as the Senate's representative on the Middle States Steering Committee. She said that all the self-study committees have submitted their reports to the Steering Committee. The Steering Committee members (herself, Professor Moran, Dean Faber, and Dean Rothlein) have divided the reports among themselves and now are examining them for overlaps, inconsistencies, etc. The draft of the report will be ready by August, in time for the faculty's return from summer break. She said there seems to be a good reason to release parts of the report to the Senate, starting with the statistical analyses produced by the Office of Institutional Research as part of the Middle States process and also the Publications Committee report.

She noted that there are two immediate results of the Middle States process. The first is that John Jay has begun to develop a real institutional research capacity as a result of Professor Richard Lovely's efforts to computerize information. She suggested that the Senate consider inviting Institutional Research Director Gail Hauss and Professor Lovely to the Senate to discuss the research process and the College's new research capability.

The second immediate outcome is that the Program and Curriculum Committee has discovered that between 80 and 100 courses listed in the catalog are never actually given. Dean Faber is already beginning the process of asking academic departments to review their course listings.

She also noted that one of the themes that has emerged and that is repeated over and over by the committees is that there is a general openness at the College and a willingness to speak out, but that there is at the same time a sense that nothing results from doing so. She said there is a need for improving the development of consensus concerning resource allocations and priorities, and there is also a need to improve intracollege communication. She said that the academic preparation of our students is another area of great concern: the concerns relate to our desire to move our students out into successful careers and to ensure that our remedial courses are successful. Senator Rosner also reported that an incredible mistrust of the administration has been voiced by significant portions of the faculty and that this needs to be carefully and thoroughly addressed.

President Kaplowitz noted that when the Middle States

self-study report is issued in August, the Senate will have a big project requiring our attention and consideration, since we will want to provide written and oral testimony about the report. Also, the Senate will undoubtedly want to take up many of the issues that the self-study provides analyses of and act on the report's recommendations or propose alternate recommendations. Senator Rosner agreed. She said that at some point the agenda of the Senate should focus on the big issues involved in the report, not the minutiae, and she warned that there could be battles concerning turf which would divert the energies away from taking positive action on recommendations.

Senator Rosner pointed out that we have already received our initial fall allotment of students from 80th Street and that the members of the self-study committees have real concerns related to the incoming students' academic preparedness and how this can relate to the way we fulfill the mission of the College.

18. Invited Guest: John Emmons, Chair of the HEO Council

[Because of a scheduling conflict, Mr. Emmons and Ms. Angela Martin arrived while Provost Wilson was meeting with the Senate. They said they were pleased to have been invited and would be happy to attend a future Senate meeting.]

19. Invited Guest: Provost Basil Wilson

The Senate welcomed Provost Wilson. Asked to comment on the budget situation, he described it as still fluid. He noted that the numbers that we have are still only those proposed by the Governor and that Chancellor Reynolds has pledged to continue to fight for additional sums of money. He noted that John Jay is studying ways that the College might make the required cuts. He explained that the most difficult task ahead for us is the need to reduce the adjunct budget and still accommodate the same number of students. He pointed out that this year we were really fortunate in getting funds to cover additional adjunct sections.

Senator Rosner asked about the possibility of raising the admission requirements by requiring a higher grade point average for entering students. The Provost responded that he opposes such a change. Senator Gitter asked about whether we need to continue to take in students if our funding is being reduced. Provost Wilson explained that our funding depends upon the number of students we admit and that if we cut our enrollment, the funds will be cut. Vice President Dunham asked if there is not a longer-term problem of underfunding. He concurred that is so. In previous times we would expect a decline in enrollment in the spring but for the last two years there had been no decline. He also pointed to an increase in the numbers of students applying to John Jay and mentioned that we might have to cut off admissions at an earlier date in order to ensure that we do not have more students than we had last year.

President Kaplowitz spoke about the excellent decisions of the Student Council to contribute student monies to

support various academic support programs but she said that some of the money has been allocated to buy televisions for the lounges on the second and fifth floors of T Building and the third floor of the North Hall. She questioned the appropriateness of placing televisions in these areas when most of the students are asking for quiet lounges where they can read and study. She said that when she told her students about the planned televisions, they spoke not only of **the need** to not lose the study areas that exist but also of the need to increase the places where students can study without distractions. Senator Orrantia said that the Corporate Board, of which he is a member, had approved this expenditure after discussing the issue of quiet lounges.

Provost Wilson said he, too, is concerned about placing televisions in lounge areas and thereby restricting quiet areas available for studying. He spoke of the hope of developing study space in the North Hall area where the Library used to be situated. Senator Litwack asked why providing a quiet lounge in the former Library space should take so long and questioned whether it could not be done **quickly** albeit in a temporary way. Provost Wilson explained that Vice President Smith had looked into the possibility and found there are prohibitive costs involved in providing adequate air flow. Several senators noted that adequate air flow **does** not exist throughout North Hall and that certainly the Library space should be made available to students. Senator Litwack pointed out that it is a large, open area and that there are already chairs and desks which are being warehoused there and that the space could be quickly set up as a study area. Provost Wilson said he would look into this again.

Senator Wallenstein described the incident involving a student in a wheelchair at the locked electric front door of T Building and spoke about the letters from the John Jay student and the Hunter College faculty member and reported the Senate's concerns. Senator Wallenstein spoke of the Senate's plan to move the issue ahead on the agenda of the College Council meeting. Provost Wilson said that he is concerned about getting to the issue of the composition of the Executive Committee, but that he thought that the matter of access for the disabled could be moved up on the agenda to reflect the Senate's concern. Senator Gitter questioned if anything is more important than the safety issues involved. Senator Wallenstein noted that there are so many concerns about this issue that have been voiced by the Senate over a long period of time and that the College now has a real legal obligation to address those issues before a tragedy occurs. Provost Wilson agreed.

Provost Wilson next expressed his concern that there is an impression that service no longer counts at the P&B Committee. He strongly reiterated his conviction that service does count and explained that teaching, publications, and service are weighted differently depending on each individual's candidacy for the personnel action being considered. President Kaplowitz noted that at least three chairs are reported as having told their faculty that service no longer counts and she also reported about Professor Nanda's letter disputing this, which had been read into the minutes. She reminded the Provost of his plan to hold seminars on the promotion and tenure process. Senator Wieschenberg asked if she had understood correctly that there are differing ways that

service, teaching, and scholarship are balanced, depending upon the individual candidate. Provost Wilson confirmed this, adding that the P&B is democratic and that in his opinion the process is fair.

Senator Gitter asked about the need to sustain our population of in-service students and whether this goal is being pursued aggressively. Provost Wilson responded that there is an administration concern about this and that someone has been hired to help recruit in-service students. He agreed that there is a need for a critical mass of in-service students in order for John Jay to survive. Senator Wallenstein asked about the possibility of reviving the satellite program. Provost Wilson said that there would be a problem getting the necessary Board certification unless the courses are housed at college sites. He also remarked that there is a problem in committing dwindling full-time faculty, in a time of rising adjunct-taught sections, to teach these students. He said that it is important for police officers and other in-service students to study within a formal college setting, noting the growing interest in community policing.

President Kaplowitz reported the Senate's resolutions concerning the process of student evaluation of the faculty. Provost Wilson supported the change in instruction. He also expressed interest in the revival of the College Council committee on student evaluation of the faculty. It was noted that the committee has not been meeting even though during the past two years the Standards Committee and other committees have been suggesting changes in the evaluation form.

President Kaplowitz then reported the Senate's resolution to offer a Better Teaching Seminar for the P&B. Provost Wilson praised the Better Teaching Seminars and said that they have clearly become an institution at the College. He said there is a growing number of faculty who attend and they are drawn from broader circles. He noted that different people attend each seminar, depending on the topic, Vice President Dunham concurred with the Provost's impression. The Senate thanked Provost Wilson for meeting with the Senate.

20. Reaorts from committees [Attachment G]

As chair of the Senate's Committee on Student Concerns, Senator Stickney presented his Notes on the February 25 Town Meeting on "Civility and Mutual Respect."

Upon a motion to adjourn, the meeting ended at 5:00 PM

Respectfully submitted,

Timothy Stevens
Recording Secretary

Announcements from the chair

Board of Trustees February 24 meeting

Chairman Murphy announced that a 1987 graduate of the CUNY Law School has been appointed to the Governor's Office for Gay and Lesbian Affairs.

Chancellor Reynolds said that enrollment is even higher than expected according to phase I data. Enrollment is up by 9.2 percent (7.8 percent increase at the senior colleges and 14.9 percent increase at the community colleges). CUNY is appealing the following aspects of the Governor's Executive Budget with reference to the senior colleges: the \$52.7 million cut to be compensated by a \$500 annual tuition increase; the \$28.4 million lump sum cut; the failure to fund \$13.1 million for the associate degree programs at John Jay and at NYCTech; the failure to grant senior college status to Medgar Evers; the cut in aid to part-time students; the other cuts to student aid; the cut of 50 percent of the PSC/CUNY grants; the failure to fund \$7.5 million to staff new CUNY buildings; the failure to fund \$3 million needed for the Campus Security Initiative; \$12 million not funded for other items; the \$500,000 cut eliminating Schweitzer and Einstein chairs. With reference to the community colleges, CUNY is appealing the decrease in base aid of \$80 per student, totaling \$3.4 million and the cut in aid to part-time students. Also, the Article 7 bills are being challenged which would cut into the authority of CUNY and make it more like a state agency.

The tentative impact statements from the presidents are grim, the Chancellor said: at the senior colleges, 589 full-time positions would have to be eliminated by attrition and layoffs; at the community colleges, 219 full-time positions would have to be cut.

Chancellor Reynolds announced the membership of the special committee engaged in CUNY-wide programmatic review, which will report to the Fiscal Affairs Committee: the nine-member committee will be chaired by Leon Goldstein (president, Kingsborough CC); the other presidents are Ricardo Fernandez (Lehman), Frances Degen Horowitz (the Graduate School), and Charles Meredith (NYCTech); the other members are five distinguished professors: Abraham Ascher (Graduate School, History); Robert Callender (CCNY, Physics); Roy DeCarava (Hunter, Art); N. John Hall (BCC, English); Katherine Harris (Graduate School, Speech and Hearing Science).

The Chancellor reported that Trustee Badillo has recommended that a similar audit as that done by Vice Chancellor Rothbard of CCNY's student activities be done of every campus. That recommendation is being acted on. The audit will look at how student activities and outside activities are booked, etc., at all colleges.

Notice was given of the Board's plan to vote at its March meeting to change the composition of corporate boards at each college so that the students will have one fewer seats than the combined seats of faculty and administrators. (Currently, students have one more seat than the combined faculty and administration seats.) The corporate boards are responsible for dispersal of the student activities fees.

The Board approved Bylaw amendments having to do with disciplinary procedures at each college. The Board's amendments included a compromise amendment introduced by Trustee Robert Picken, the chair of the University Faculty Senate, whereby the faculty's concerns would be addressed.

Board of Trustees meeting (cont.)

The original proposal called for the president of the college to name the chair of the disciplinary committee, who could be an administrator and could be from a different college. The substitute amendment provides for the college president, in consultation with the chair of the appropriate governance body or, if the president is the chair, in consultation with the body's executive committee, to select three members of the instructional staff who would serve as rotating chairs, after being trained by 80th Street about issues of due process. If all three chairs are unable or unwilling to preside over a disciplinary hearing, the chair would be chosen by lot from among the names of the chairs of the other colleges' disciplinary committees. The new disciplinary procedures take precedence over the current procedures and committees of every CUNY college.

The Board also suspended collection of \$.85 each semester from every student activity fee. This money provided approximately \$400,000 as the yearly University Student Senate (USS) budget. The Board also suspended the stipend for the chair and the six vice chairs of the USS beginning July 1.

John Jay's Charter amendments were approved by the Board of Trustees. Trustee Picken reported his gratitude to President Lynch and to Vice Chancellor Bloom for helping resolve the issues he had raised about the proposed amendments to John Jay's Charter.

University Faculty Senate February 25 meeting

UFS Chair Robert Picken reported on the substitute amendment to the Bylaws change involving disciplinary hearings. The substitute amendment had failed at the Student Affairs Committee by a vote of 3 to 3 but because of widespread faculty disapproval of the proposed Bylaw amendment, Trustee Picken and Chancellor Reynolds negotiated the compromise amendment. The Board of Trustees public hearing on February 18 drew 234 speakers, most of whom were faculty in opposition to the proposed Bylaw change. The public hearing was chaotic and there was a small number of disruptive students. After 25 speakers testified, a smoke bomb was detonated and the building was evacuated: it was not known at the time that the device was a smoke bomb. Trustee Picken reported on two clarifications related to the Bylaw change: students may be provided by legal counsel paid for by the college's student government only if such paid legal counsel is made available to every student brought up on disciplinary charges; furthermore, the provision permitting 80th Street administrators to suspend students is limited to University sites (i.e. 80th Street, the 57th Street CUNY Computer Center, etc.).

Professor Picken reported that the information regarding administration/faculty ratios at CUNY now (1:15.5) as compared to 1986 (1:18.1) has drawn widespread response. He reported that an administrator at NYU told him that she did a quick study of NYU, using Professor Picken's definitions, and found a administration to faculty ratio of 1:43.

Vice Chancellor for Legal Affairs Robert Diaz reported on his Office and answered questions. He said that pending an advisory opinion by the State Ethics Board, the CUNY policy restricting use of one's title and college and university affiliation will be limited to those on exempted titles (those not covered by the PSC contract: people on the executive pay plan and HEOs who receive a REM). Vice

university Faculty Senate (cont.)

Chancellor Diaz also promised that his office would issue a ruling as to the indemnification (or liability) of CUNY faculty when engaged in classroom and non-classroom activities (such as advising student clubs).

CUNY equal Protection lawsuit filed on February 26

A broad based coalition of CUNY faculty, staff, and students filed an equal protection class action suit in New York State Supreme Court against the Governor, Legislators, and other New York State officials on February 26. The plaintiffs are the CUNY Coalition of Concerned Faculty and Staff and 49 individual plaintiffs, six of whom are John Jay faculty and students: Professors Migdalia DeJesus-Torres de Garcia (Department of Puerto Rican Studies); Karen Kaplowitz (Department of English); and H. Bruce Pierce (Law and Police Science). Three students who attend John Jay are also plaintiffs: Rian Keating, Vivian Roman, and Evangelina Soto. A copy of the 52-page complaint has been placed on Reserve in John Jay's Library, along with press information and copies of articles that appeared in The New York Times and Newsday.

HEOs elect five to serve on the College Council

The five HEOs elected to the College Council are: John Emmons (Financial Aid Office); Harriet Gorran (Provost's Office); Angela Martin (Business Office); Marie Rosen (Law Enforcement News); Paul Wyatt (Admissions). The first two individuals are the chair and vice chair of the Council of HEOs.

Bramshill Professor joins JJ faculty for spring semester

Christopher Flint, this semester's Bramshill professor, is the 65th person to participate in this John Jay faculty exchange program.

Reception to celebrate 20th anniversary of TSP

A reception to celebrate the 20th anniversary of Thematic Studies will be on May 6, from 5-8 PM, in President Lynch's office. All faculty who have taught in TSP will be honored.

March 4 reception honored Student Council and club officers

On Wednesday, March 4, a reception was held to honor the Student Council members, club officers, and other student leaders. Speeches were made by Student Council president Francis Ngadi, President Lynch, Vice President Witherspoon, Provost Wilson, and Faculty Senate president Karen Kaplowitz. Professor Kaplowitz announced the reception honoring faculty advisors of student clubs and organizations and explained that this was the result of a request by Mr. Ngadi to the Faculty Senate in September that the Senate find a way to honor faculty advisors. She invited all those present to attend the April 9 event. Professor Kaplowitz also announced that Mr. Quartimon, Student Council vice president, is scheduled to speak to the Senate in March about a voter registration drive.

Faculty seminar on Professor Leonard Jeffries at JJ

Under the auspices of Provost Wilson and Professor Charles Strozier of the Center on Violence and Human Survival, a faculty seminar about Professor Leonard Jeffries was held on March 5. Provost Wilson and Professor Jill Norgren (Government) were discussants.

Reception for new City Council member who is JJ graduate

A reception for Antonio Pagan, newly elected member of the City Council, and a graduate of John Jay (MA) is scheduled for Thursday, April 2, at 5:00 PM.

PLB at-large elections are taking place

Eight faculty have accepted nomination to the at-large seats on the College Personnel and Budget Committee: Philip Bonifacio (Counseling); Daniel Gasman (History); Samuel Graff (Mathematics); Lee Jenkins (English); Eli Silverman (Law and Police Science); Martin Wallenstein (Speech & Theater); Agnes Wieschenberg (Mathematics); Maureen Wilson (Foreign Languages).

Student Council contributes fund and announces its

"Educational Blueprint: Investina in Ourselves"

The Student Council has allocated \$18,000 to carry out improvements in the College Mathematics Resource Center, including hiring additional tutors and extending the hours of service. The Writing Center has been given \$8,000 for similar improvements. Electronic bulletin boards will be installed in various locations in North Hall at a cost of \$10,400. Also, \$3,500 has been allocated to provide television sets in the second and fifth floor lounges of T Building and in the third floor lounge in North Hall. A contribution of \$5,000 has been made to the Lloyd George Sealy Library. The Student Emergency Loan Fund has been given \$10,000 by the Student Council: this fund provides for loans of up to \$500 for those students who meet the criteria. And through the funding of the Student Council, every 1992 graduating student will receive the Yearbook free.

Nominations due for At-large Faculty Senate election

Faculty who wish to run for the 13 full-time at-large Senate positions or for the two adjunct at-large seats are invited to submit self-nominating petitions to VP Janice Dunham, chair of the Senate's Election Committee. Faculty may also nominate colleagues.

Book group to meet March 17 and May 6

William Maxwell's So Long, See You Tomorrow will be the topic of the Brown Bag and Book discussion on March 17 at 12:30 in the English Department Conference Room (1281 N). The last session of the semester, on May 6 at 12:30, will be devoted to To Know a Woman, a novel by Amos Oz.

Town Meeting scheduled for March 19

The next Town Meeting will be on Thursday, March 19, at 4:30 PM in the Faculty Dining Room. The topic is "CUNY in budget crisis: leadership strategies" and the moderator is Alumni Director Al Higgins. The April 7 Town Hall meeting is from 3:15 to 5:00 and is on the rights each of us has as a member of the John Jay community. Mr. Higgins will again be the moderator. The last Town Hall meeting of the semester will be an open forum and will take place from 4-6 PM on May 5.

John Jay College of Criminal Justice
The City University of New York

Memorandum

TO: Vice President Smith
FROM: Harold Sullivan *HS*
DATE: February 15, 1992
SUBJ: The New "Fax Policy"

About one week ago I received a call from Technical Services that a fax had arrived for me. When I went over to pick it up, I was politely told by a woman who works there that we could no longer receive "personal" faxes. I was handed a memo dated January 8 and written by Miriam Mucchi. Although I have called Ms. Mucchi to tell her what I thought of her memo, I think it appropriate that I take this matter to higher authority.

Ms. Mucchi's memo and the policy it announces reflect an attitude on the part of some in the administration that is simply unacceptable. If there is a problem with faculty over use of the fax machines, that problem should have been brought to the attention of the faculty, perhaps through the Council of Chairs or the Senate. After appropriate consultation, some mutually satisfactory solution might have been found. Instead, however, we were presented with an edict from an "administrator" who asserts the right to read, retain and presumably discard faculty correspondence (see point number 5 of the Mucchi memo.) *memo is attached.*

Let me be direct. No one has a right to read my correspondence. I recognize that Ms. Mucchi or her agents have to determine to whom a fax is addressed, but after that the content is none of her (or their) business. Now maybe it is true that some in the administration have nothing better to do than to read incoming fax material. If true, I and other members of the Budget Committee would certainly like to be so informed.

Now a few facts about my offending fax. 1) It was addressed to me by name and title. A full address was listed at the start. In sum, no one had to read beyond the top lines to know to whom it was addressed. 2) It was only the third or fourth incoming fax I have ever received while at John Jay. 3) It was the only fax that was not related directly to College business. 4) It concerned a personal business matter needing prompt attention. 5) Because of my duties as Chair and as a faculty member I am on campus every day and

usually for over eight hours, and under these circumstances I sometimes must have some personal communication.

Now I understand that personal use of the fax machine does involve some nominal costs to the College (although the amount involved in "receiving" a fax must be very little indeed.) When I am not at John Jay, my duties force me to call my office and administrative offices frequently. When I am away during the Summer or at other times of annual leave, I run up large phone bills calling the College on College business. I am never reimbursed. I think the College gets the better part of the deal.

If it is to be College policy that administrative staff have the right to read incoming communication, I suggest that faculty have the same opportunity to review administrative communication. Perhaps it would be appropriate for there to be a complete inventory of all fax machines. The faculty should be informed about their precise location, who uses them and for what purposes. A committee of faculty might then be formed to ferret out administrative waste. As a first step that committee should be given direct access to *all* fax machines in the College and the opportunity to read all the faxes addressed to all in high level administrative positions.

Following an extended period of review of each others fax "mail," it might be appropriate to reallocate our "fax resources." Although Ms. Mucchi's memo never explained why changes were necessary in fax protocol, presumably the problem is that the machine in Technical Services is being over used serving the two hundred plus faculty in this College. Maybe a machine that now serves a far more exclusive clientele might be pressed into community service.

One thing that should be quite clear is that the time for imperial decrees from administrators to the faculty is over.

cc.
Prof. Crozier
Prof. Kaplowitz
Ms. Mucchi

JOHN JAY COLLEGE OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE
CAMPUS FACILITIES AND PLANNING

TO: Fax Machine Users

FROM: Miriam S. Mucchi *MSM*

DATE: January 8, 1992

The purpose of this memo is to notify you of some procedural changes regarding the use of the fax machine located in Technical Services - Room 535. These changes will be effective immediately.

1. The fax machine may only be used for College related business.
2. The log sheet must be completed prior to the transmission of all documents.
3. All international faxes, including Canada and area code 809, must be approved by the Chairperson or Department head prior to transmission.
4. All groups which are normally charged for their copier and/or telephone usage will be charged for all faxes sent regardless of their destination.
5. Any fax received that is of a personal nature will not be delivered, nor will you be notified of its receipt.

If you have any questions, please contact me at extension 8400.

MSM:tg

JOHN JAY COLLEGE OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE
The City University of New York

THE FACULTY SENATE
Committee on Fiscal Affairs
Chairperson: Prof. James Cohen

March 13, 1992

PRESENTATION ON BUDGET ISSUES FOR FY 1993

For the third consecutive year, CUNY and John Jay College face budget cuts mandated by the Governor and by the CUNY Central Office. The estimated size of the cut for FY '93 is \$1.3 million, though the budget is not yet approved by the State Legislature and the size of the cut may change considerably after legislative review. The College administration has suggested a short term proposal to meet the estimated cut and their plan merits a Senate response. In addition, President Lynch's long term policies for dealing with budget reductions that began three years ago, and which the President estimates will last until 1995, also merit discussion.

The Administration's proposal is fundamentally a holding action that allows continued, incremental erosion of College faculty and of other than personnel services; i.e., supplies and materials. It has the following major components:

- ** No layoffs. Rely on attrition to generate savings.
- ** Do not replace attrited positions. Freeze all full time faculty and "non-teaching" hires (whether this includes all non-instructional staff and top administration is not clear).
- ** Replace attrited faculty lines, partially, with adjuncts.
- ** Increase class size.
- ** Cut College Assistants.
- ** Generate revenue by renting the theatre.
- ** Cut O.T.P.S.

The Fiscal Affairs Committee strongly recommends that this plan be re-examined, on the following grounds. First, increases in class size will bring many course sections to a ratio of close to 50 students to one instructor. Class size is already unacceptably high and ought not be allowed to increase further. Second, the administration proposal increases the proportion of adjuncts supporting the academic teaching load, to the point where the College could soon have more sections taught by adjuncts than by

full time professors.¹ Third, no initiatives are planned to generate savings in the College administration. Fourth, insufficient attention is paid to existing and new sources of non-tax levy revenue that might be used to offset cuts.

The Fiscal Affairs Committee suggests that the following short and long term actions be considered by the College community in preparation for the likely contingency that the State Legislature will mandate cuts in the CUNY budget:

(1). Begin work immediately to generate additional revenue for the College and its academic programs through increased faculty grants and other community oriented initiatives. Some faculty, but not nearly as many as might, support their academic and professional activities with non-tax levy resources; for example, paying their own phone bills, buying supplies, supporting students and paying for College overhead. Other significant opportunities could also increase non-tax levy resources for the College as a whole. For example, the College should explore vigorously larger, self supporting continuing education programs. In subsequent remarks Senator Guinta will address potential initiatives in the areas of faculty grants and new non-levy revenue generating programs.

(2). Plan and implement policies that generate increased revenue from from the College's institutes and centers,, and/or that reduce the tax levy resources committed to those units. This proposal follows from our recent, detailed report to the Senate on the "deficit" financing of centers and institutes that has persisted for many years.

(3). Consolidate selected administrative units that have overlapping missions and personnel, particularly as natural attrition occurs. It is not this Committee's responsibility to recommend specific organizational changes, but an analysis of administrative units and their personnel indicates that a variety of opportunities exist that would generate savings and increase productivity.

¹ One of the main pieces of data that stands out in an analysis of the organizational development of John Jay College in the past five to ten years is that adjunct lines and sections taught by adjuncts have grown proportionately far more than any other category of either instructional or non-instructional personnel. Full time equivalent adjunct lines increase from 39 to 71.5 between 1987 and 1992. That translates to an increase from 273 to 502 adjunct-taught sections, an 84% increase. Most other categories of personnel, except for buildings and grounds which grows with the opening of "T" Building, stay relatively constant throughout this period.

Looking at John Jay's budget from a long term planning perspective the Fiscal Affairs Committee suggests that the core problem facing the College is that enrollment growth in the 1980's outstripped growth in the academic resources needed to serve that enrollment. This problem has been exacerbated by recent budget cuts. We have a new building, but still lack a solid advisement system for our students. We have almost 50% of our sections taught by adjuncts. We have between 40 and 50 students in many classes and a very high rate of attrition in a student body with significant educational deficiencies.

The administration suggests that, if we just hold together for two or three more years of budget cuts, we'll be alright. The trouble with this "holding action" policy and its merely marginal changes is that it fails to address or to ameliorate the problems created by the past decade of enrollment growth. A new vision and fresh plans are needed to deal with the very difficult educational situation we now face at this College.

From: **Professor** Harold Sullivan

To: The Faculty **Senate**

ATTACHMENT D

John Jay College of Criminal Justice
The City University of New York

Government Department

Memorandum

TO: Basil Wilson

FROM: Harold Sullivan **HS**

DATE: February 20, 1992

SUBJ: Proposals to increase class **size**

In discussions at the Budget Planning Committee the question of increasing class size has come up again as a means of cutting the adjunct budget. I understand that an increase in the *average* class size by about 3 or 4 might bring hundreds of thousands of dollars in savings (by costing many adjuncts their jobs). If such a step becomes unavoidable, I am concerned that it be done in a way that advances equity in the College and not in a way that unfairly increases the burdens of faculty who are already carrying more than their fair share of the work load.

At first glance the simplest (but not the fairest or most efficient) way to increase average class size would appear to be to raise the course caps. Courses with 42 students would go to 45, those with 26 would go to 29 etc.. In departments which already fill all or most of their sections, such a step would indeed raise *their* average enrollments as even more students would register.

Some departments, however, still have many classes that are not filled. In such departments increases in course caps would have no effect. A course with a current cap of 42 but actual enrollment of 25 would probably gain no additional students if its cap were raised. Instead of 17 empty seats, it would have 20 empty seats. Only classes in departments whose classes now fill and for which there remains unsatisfied demand would gain students and would carry the additional burden of even more crowded classes.

No doubt you will be told that relatively low enrollment departments cannot cut their sections because they must run courses for their majors. Many of these courses, however, do not need to be run every semester. Despite gradual increases in our section allocation, the Government

Department is still able to run some courses in our major only every third or fourth semester. If that is good enough for us, it should be good enough for others. Because we are able to run some of our less popular courses only periodically, even these courses now fill. (Excluding the GOV/PAD Internship, 99% of the GOV class seats were taken this semester. If we include the Internship, the figure is 98%)

One final point concerning equity, although I heard last year that you had decided that all 400 level courses would be capped at 26, I believe there are still many courses with caps lower than that. For example, *one* of our courses this semester, GOV 435, still has a cap of 23. In other departments I believe many 400 level courses are still capped at 20. Before you consider raising the cap of our other 400 level sections above the current cap of 26, equity demands that you raise the caps of other departments to the same level as ours. If others' 400 caps are not to be raised, please lower ours.

Before even considering raising average class size, major cuts and restructuring should first be done in administration. But if *average* class size must eventually be raised, the only fair and efficient way to do it is to cut sections in departments which still have substantial numbers of empty seats. Allowing such Departments to run only sections that come close to full capacity would raise average class size across the College and save on adjunct costs in a manner that would advance equity. To raise the caps for all, will only increase the burdens of the already overburdened.

Thanks

cc.
Budget Planning Committee
Dean Faber
Dean McHugh
Rh Serrano

Fall 1991 Enrollment Data by Department,

Revised
10/17/91

Please Note: The statistics below were gathered from the course tallies produced by the Registrar's Office. Adjustments were made to remove from the listing of "maximum seats" courses which were never actually scheduled (such courses are generally listed in the tallies with section numbers of 50 and above.), In addition figures for Independent Study were omitted, and a few minor corrections of course caps were made (For example, GOV/PAD 405, a cross listed day only class, was listed as having a maximum of 42 GOV seats and 42 PAD seats. This was corrected to 21 seats for each department.

DEPT. (Discipline)	Max. Seats	After Regular Registration		After Late Registration	
		No. Seats Taken before 9/5	% Seats taken	No. Seats taken	% Seats taken
AAS					
AAS	342	328	96%	341	100%
SWA	26	17	65%	22	84.6%
ETH123/125	315	312	99%	319	102%
Total AAS	683	657	96%	682	100%
AMP					
ART	536	486	91%	504	94%
MUS	348	287	82%	308	87%
PHI	546	514	94%	516	100%
REL	62	36	58%	41	66%
Total AMP	1492	1323	89%	1369	92%
ANT	777	639	82%	677	87%
CSL					
COM*	1221	1131	93%	1190	97%
CSL	372	303	81%	312	84%
FRC*	182	190	104%	204	112%
Total CSL	1775	1624	92%	1706	96%
* COM & FRC include SEEK sections					
ENG					
ENG	3126	2940	93%	3119	100%
LIT	1196	1018	85%	1048	88%
Total ENG	4322	3958	92%	4167	96%
* ENG includes SEEK sections					

FOR LANG	936	835	91%	899	96%
-----------------	-----	-----	------------	-----	------------

GOV	1519	1359	90%	1441	95%
------------	------	------	------------	------	------------

HIS	1170	970	83%	1040	89%
------------	------	-----	------------	------	------------

LPS (Undergrad)

COR	588	480	82%	541	92%
LAW	1517	1310	86%	1394	92%
PSC	1213	975	80%	1062	88%
SEC	378	175	46%	186	49%

Total LPS	3696	2940	80%	3183	86%
-----------	------	------	------------	------	------------

CRJ(Undergrad)*	556	422	76%	489	88%
------------------------	-----	-----	------------	-----	------------

<i>CRJ Graduate</i>	528	371	70%	417	79%
---------------------	-----	-----	------------	-----	------------

***Please Note:** CRJ classes are listed separately because CRJ classes at both the graduate and undergraduate levels are taught by faculty from many departments.

MAT (incl SEEK)	3726	3132	84%	3284	88%
------------------------	------	------	------------	------	------------

FED	728	769	105%	794	109%
------------	-----	-----	-------------	-----	-------------

PSY (Undergrad)	1933	1616	84%	1703	88%
------------------------	------	------	------------	------	------------

<i>GRAD PSY</i>	340	355	104%	375	110%
-----------------	-----	-----	-------------	-----	-------------

All PSY	2273	1971	87%	2078	91%
----------------	------	------	------------	------	------------

Fall 1991 Enrollment Data by Department

Pub Man.(Undergrad)

ECO	651	442	68%	481	73%
FIS	330	117	35%	140	44%
PAD	754	393	52%	441	58%
Total Undergrad	1735	952	55%	1062	60%
GRAD PAD	488*	380	78%	458**	81%***
All Pub. Man.	2223	1332	60%	1520	66%***

* does not include West Point

** includes West Point. Max Seats for all Grad PA including West Point was 568.

*** includes West Point. The total Max Seats For PM is 2303 (1520/2303 = 66%)

PRS

PRS	309	186	60%	231	75%
ETH 124/125	a73	280	103%	287	106%
Total PRS	582	466	80%	520	89%

SCI

BIO	75	72	96%	74	99%
CHE	135	114	84%	122	90%
NSC	300	318	106%	323	107%
PHY	50	50	100%	39	78%
TOX	15	3	20%	3	20%
Total SC	575	557	97%	561	98%

SEEK

ENG	403	379	94%	414	102%
COM	391	34s	88%	387	99%
SPE	308	316	102%	335	109%
MAT	120	110	92%	115	96%
FRC	182	190	104%	204	112%
Total SEK	1404	1340	95%	1455	104%

SOC

SOC	2420	1914	79%	2063	85%
------------	-------------	-------------	------------	-------------	------------

SPEITHE

SPE (incl. Seek)	1163	1113	96%	1172	101%
DRA	128	140	109%	147	115%
Total SPE/THE	1291	1253	97%	1319	102%

STA

STA	256	217	85%	239	93%
------------	------------	------------	------------	------------	------------

Town Hall Meeting Notes
by Professor Charles Stickney, Chair
Faculty Senate Committee on Student Concerns

"Civility and Mutual Respect"
Moderator: Dean George Best
February 25, 1992

In his opening remarks, President Lynch spoke of love as first of all love of self; one who hates is fixated on the hated person and the hate can consume the person who feels hatred and can lead to disharmony both within the person and in society.

Mr. Ngadi, president of Student Council, said that John Jay students want respect and want to live together as a family in harmony.

The vice president of Lambda reported that his club office has been the target of homophobic graffiti and that Lambda flyers and notices have been torn down. He said gays and lesbians feel attacked by the homophobic elements that exist at John Jay. [He distributed to the Town Hall resource panelists packets of informational material.]

Bob Santiago, a student, said that some professors curse at students and that is not respectful.

Serena Nanda, professor of Anthropology, spoke of the way free speech sometimes conflicts with acceptable civil speech. She also asked the students present to explain what course of action they take when they have complaints about a teacher.

Mr. Ngadi said that name-calling is not free speech and that free speech does not include cursing.

President Lynch said that all speech is protected by the Constitution, but that although speech is protected we should refrain from using hurtful or profane speech.

Davidson Umeh, professor of Physical Education, urged all to use respectful speech.

Reginald Holmes, a student, apologized to Provost Basil Wilson for remarks he made about Dr. Wilson at a recent Town Hall meeting. Mr. Holmes also apologized to all whom he has insulted over the years and apologized for his lack of respect.

Lou Cuevas, professor of Counseling, noted the different backgrounds of our students. He said the professors should be models of respectful behavior and speech, models to be emulated by their students. Many students here have been insulted by students and by faculty, he noted.

Michael Blitz, professor of English, said that civility should extend to beyond the College to our larger society.

Margaret Schulze, director of personnel, commented on the difficulty of speaking truth to power and she recommended that the College have an ombudsperson, which is a safe way to "speak to power." She noted that a proposal to have an ombudsperson had been rejected by students at a public forum a few years ago but that it may be time to propose the idea again.

Mr. Ngadi said there is no need for an ombudsperson because there are now good connections between administrators and students. What we should concentrate on is the way we speak, not on what is being said.

Dena Gardner, a student, said that one of her professors made racist statements in class and that **she** confronted the

teacher after class. She asked what are the other options students have.

George Best, associate dean, said that the faculty/student Judicial Committee is a backup but that it is best to first turn to the Office of Student Development which can help bring about a resolution in the form of an apology or a handshake. A formal complaint must be a written complain. He urged that students try to resolve problems directly with the professor or whoever caused the problem.

Reginald Seabrook, a student, said that students feel intimidated by professors and that they listen to other students who may also know of that professor.

Ron Quarterimon, vice president of Student Council, said that students feel that little weight is given to what they say against a faculty member. He said that when a student complains about a faculty member, the complaints are investigated, rather than believing the student who made the complaint. He said this involves a double standard because faculty complaints against students are believed.

A member of the Lambda Club said that a faculty member, who was once a department chair, makes anti-gay and anti-lesbian statements in class and outside class. He called this professor homophobic and very insulting.

Maribel Nieves, a student, said she asked a professor for help with her writing and that he did not help. She said that when a professor reads students' grades out loud, this is an invasion of privacy and can be very humiliating.

Keith Howard, a student, said there is racism at John Jay.

A student asked President Lynch what specific plans he has for achieving an atmosphere of civility for the student body.

President Lynch spoke about the contagious nature of respect.

Seth Palmer, a non-matriculated student, asked how can students get into courses that are prerequisites when those courses are often closed during the last days of registration. He suggested that a certain number of seats be set aside for students who must take those courses.

President Lynch said that the faculty are studying this.

In his closing remarks, President Lynch said all of us here at John Jay have to respect others. He praised this Town Hall meeting topic as a very important one.

Mr. Ngadi said the Town Meetings are working. We should each look at ourself and work toward being a better person and toward creating a better community.