

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES #82

John Jay College of Criminal Justice

November 11, 1992

Time 3:15 PM

Room 630 T

Present (28): Michael Blitz, Dorothy Brace, David Brandt, Orlanda Brugnola, James Cohen, Edward Davenport, Migdalia DeJesus-Torres de Garcia, Peter DeForest, Vincent Del Castillo, Robert DeLucia, Lotte Feinberg, Robert Fletcher, Elisabeth Gitter, Robert Grappone, Lou Guinta, Dan Juda, Karen Kaplowitz, Gavin Lewis, Tom Litwack, James Malone, Jill Norgren, John Pittman, Rick Richardson, Lydia Rosner, Edward Shaughnessy, Chris Suggs, Martin Wallenstein, Agnes Wieschenberg

Absent (10): James Bowen, Henry DeLuca, Jannette Domingo, John Kleinig, Lawrence Kobilinsky, Rubie Malone, Dagoberto Orrantia, Douglas Salane, Olga Scarpetta, Antoinette Trembinska

AGENDA

1. Announcements from the Chair
2. Approval of Minutes #81 of the October 27 meeting
3. Approval of the calendar of Spring 1993 Senate meetings
4. Proposed Charter amendment: Judicial Committee
5. Election to fill a vacant seat ON the College Council  
(or allocation of the seat to an academic department)
6. Proposal from the Ad Hoc Committee on Recruiting and Retaining In-Service Students
7. Discussion of a survey of adjuncts: Senator Rick Richardson, chair, Senate Committee on Adjunct Issues
8. Proposed resolution: Resolved, That the Faculty Senate shall develop and conduct a survey of John Jay faculty
9. Guests: Dean of Graduate Studies Barbara Price and members of the Graduate Studies Committee
10. New Business

1. Announcements from the Chair

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

President Kaplowitz announced that Senator Olga Scarpetta has taken a medical leave from the College until February. She said

she is pleased to report that Senator Scarpetta has not resigned her seat on the Faculty Senate nor has she resigned from the Senate's Executive Committee. When she returns in February, she will resume her duties as Recording Secretary. In the meantime, Corresponding Secretary Edward Davenport will take the minutes in the interim. Senator Davenport was thanked for taking on this additional responsibility.

President Kaplowitz also reported that Ronald Quartimon, the president of John Jay's Student Council, was elected chair of the University Student Senate on November 8 and is, therefore, a voting member of the CUNY Board of Trustees. He is the first John Jay student elected chair of the USS. She noted that Mr. Quartimon received a real mandate: he was elected by 17 votes (14 votes are required) on the first ballot (an almost unheard of event for USS); the other two candidates each received seven votes and four votes. A very large and diverse group of John Jay students attended the election at York College in support of Mr. Quartimon. Senator Norgren suggested that the Faculty Senate send a letter of congratulations. The Senate endorsed this proposal.

Questions were asked about the memorandum sent by the Senate's Executive Committee to President Lynch in response to President Lynch's decision to meet with only the Executive Officers of the Senate and not with a delegation of Senators as had been agreed to. President Kaplowitz explained that the Senate's Executive Committee is concerned about scheduling problems, given that both the President of the College and the members of the faculty have numerous commitments. Senator James Malone said that it is the Senate's right to decide who among its members should represent the Senate and noted that the Senate had unanimously voted to empower the Executive Committee and those Senators it selects to serve as a delegation to resolve governance issues and to represent the Senate. The Senate then reaffirmed its commitment to this policy.

President Kaplowitz reported that one meeting of a Senate delegation has taken place with President Lynch and that was on October 29. She and Vice President Michael Blitz attended, with Senators James Malone, Rick Richardson, and Agnes Wieschenberg. She said that the meeting was very collegial and cordial although not substantive: several issues were raised, each of which President Lynch deferred until the next meeting, which he suggested be held on November 12. He suggested biweekly meetings, with the date set at each meeting, because of his fluid schedule. President Lynch said he would request the letter from 80th Street, as he had promised to do in September. However, in the interim, President Lynch has cancelled the November 12 meeting, because of a schedule conflict, and has rescheduled it for the morning of November 23.

The items the delegation raised, which are to be discussed at the next meeting, include the Senate's position that it is the appropriate faculty body to elect the faculty panel for the Corporate Board and the for Auxiliary Services Board, and the Senate's request for information about non-tax-levy revenues, requested in May and reiterated in September. She said that President Lynch said he did not recall the latter item but promised to review the request for the next meeting, which has been rescheduled for two weeks later. Thus the first two "biweekly" meetings will be (at least) a month apart. She noted that the establishment of Senate delegations was in response to President Lynch's request that communications from the Senate not

be in the form of formal written resolutions.

Senator **Guinta** suggested that the rapport between the Senate and the administration would be easier to obtain and maintain if we had the same Senate members attend all the meetings. President **Kaplowitz** said that the administration delegation varies from meeting to meeting. Indeed, there have been two meetings this semester: at the first there were eight administrators and at the second there were four. Only President **Lynch** and **Patricia Maull** were present at both. Six of the administrators who attended the first meeting (on Friday, September 25) did not attend the October 19 meeting. Two who attended the October 19 meeting, Vice President **Witherspoon** and Vice President **Smith**, were not at the previous meeting.

Senator **James Malone** said that the Senate should decide its own delegation and the Senate concurred. A member of the Senate delegation to the September 25 meeting pointed out that the seven Senators who attended and who thought they were meeting with only President **Lynch** discovered when they arrived in President **Lynch's** office that there were eight administrators attending this meeting. He said that the (almost) equal number of Senators was an important element in the success of the meeting.

Senator **Litwack** said that there is another practical need for a flexible Senate delegation, which is that certain Senators are especially knowledgeable about certain issues. Senator **Litwack** pointed out that Senator **Wallenstein's** knowledge of law and his skill at legal reasoning played a crucial role at the September 25 meeting, the purpose of which was the resolution of the issue of faculty representation on the college Council.

Senator **Malone** said he did not think President **Lynch's** decision had to do with rapport; rather, as President **Lynch** conveyed in his message, he is concerned with continuity. But, Senator **Malone** added, the Executive Committee's memorandum rightly states that continuity will be served as long as the president of the College and the president of the Senate are in attendance. Senator **Litwack** concurred, saying that rapport is nice but ultimately there can be no rapport if there are no meetings. Senator **Malone** said there is an even more fundamental issue: the President has the right to decide who among his administrators will attend each meeting and the Senate's executive committee must have the right to decide who among the Senate will accompany them to meetings.

Senator **Cohen** said that it had been in the context of the President's seemingly more open and accessible stance, and the meeting with him that had been scheduled for October 29, that the Senate removed from the October 15 agenda a resolution to file a Freedom of Information request for information about the non tax levy monies. The item was to be returned to the agenda by the Executive Committee if and when the Executive Committee felt that it was appropriate to do so. He asked whether in light of the events being discussed, the Senate's Executive Committee thinks the FOIA request resolution should be returned to the agenda, adding that he thinks it should be returned. Senator **Rosner** said the tabled item on the Freedom of Information request should be put back on the agenda. President **Kaplowitz** noted that the meeting with President **Lynch** is the morning of our next Senate meeting. If the Senate wishes, we could put the FOIA request resolution on the agenda of that November 23 meeting and if the meeting with President **Lynch** that morning results in our receiving

the information, we can remove the resolution once again. Otherwise, it will be on the agenda. The Senate concurred with this course of action. President Kaplowitz reported, in this context, that the previous day, the Budget Planning Committee (BPC) unanimously agreed that the Faculty Senate, if it is still willing, and to the extent it is willing, should focus on non tax levy monies, and the BPC would continue to focus on tax levy monies. In this way, both important budget areas would be addressed and there would not be an overlap. She said that the BPC was unequivocal in expressing support for the Senate for taking on this issue.

Senator Suggs referred to an attachment to the agenda: a statement by Professor Tony Simpson, the Executive Officer of the Ph.D. program, commenting on an article in the June 1992 issue of The Journal of Criminal Justice Education, in which JJ's doctoral program is rated 14th out of 23 doctoral programs overall and in one category, 21st out of 23. Senator Suggs suggested that the Senate invite Professor Simpson to our next meeting to discuss this issue. President Kaplowitz noted that Professor Simpson has been asked by President Lynch to write a longer commentary for submission to the Journal and said that she would ask him for a copy of that document when it is completed.

2. Approval of Minutes #81 of the October 27 meeting

By a motion duly made and carried, Minutes #81 of the October 27, 1992, meeting were approved.

3. Approval of calendar of Spring 1993 Senate meetings

The scheduling conflict identified at the previous Senate meeting was resolved. By a motion duly made and carried the following schedule of Senate meetings was approved (with all meetings at 3:15 PM except the Friday meeting, which will begin at 9:30 AM):

Thursday, February 4  
Wednesday, February 24  
Wednesday, March 10  
Thursday, March 25

Tuesday, April 13  
Wednesday, April 28  
Friday, May 7

The date of the first meeting of the 1993-1994 Senate was approved for Thursday, May 20, at 3:00 PM. This meeting, which is during Final Exam Week, is after the completion of the election of at-large representatives to the Senate and also after the department elections have taken place.

The Senate also approved an extra, back-up Senate meeting for Tuesday, December 22, at 3:00 PM. (This is during Final Exam Week.) This meeting has been scheduled in response to President Lynch's concern that a conflict might arise preventing him from attending the Senate's meeting on Friday, December 11. Should President Lynch be able to attend on December 11, the December 22 will be cancelled.

4. Proposed Charter amendment: Judicial Committee (Student Disciplinary Committee) [Attachment B]

A change in the proposed Charter amendment was explained. The last paragraph has been expanded to comport with the Charter and also with the agreement developed with President Lynch on September 25 and which is part of the Memorandum of Understanding signed by President Lynch.

By a motion made and carried, the proposed Charter amendment [Attachment B] was adopted by the Senate by unanimous vote for transmittal to the College Council for action by that body. It was noted that although the deadline for College Council agenda items was two days earlier, the Council Executive Committee does not meet until the following day and that the Committee would be asked to put this item on the November Council agenda for a "first reading."

It was noted that the Executive Committee of the College Council that will meet on November 12 is still last year's committee. President Lynch did respond to the Senate's memorandum about the illegality of administrators nominating faculty members by announcing at the October 28 College Council meeting that the faculty nominations would be redone and would take place from the floor of the Council and that only faculty members could nominate faculty to run for the Executive Committee positions. The ballots were to be mailed out and the new committee was to be in place by November 12. But no ballots were mailed out by the Secretary of the Council. Instead, ballots will be distributed at the November College Council meeting and will be collected at that meeting. The new committee, therefore, will not be in place until December.

Senator Litwack said that the method used at the October 28 College Council meeting to nominate faculty members of the Executive Committee of the College Council was not in accord with the College's Charter of Governance. While the restriction that only faculty may nominate faculty was honored, the Charter specifies that only the members of the Executive Committee may nominate and does not permit nominations by others from the floor. Therefore, taking nominations from the floor is violative of the Charter.

Senator Litwack said that although we should not challenge this year's procedures, we should send a letter to President Lynch making it very clear that while we are not challenging that decision for this year it is, in fact, violative of the Charter and that in the future nominees for faculty members on the Committee can come only from faculty members on the Executive Committee. It was agreed that a letter would be sent.

President Kaplowitz said that another issue has emerged from the last College Council meeting. As charged by the Senate, the Senate's Executive Committee had apprised Dean Faber of the Senate's concerns about the proposed Police Science major and Senators had raised these concerns at the College Council. After the College Council meeting, the Curriculum Committee met and some members raised concerns about the fact that the Senate was discussing the work of the Curriculum Committee. And so the Curriculum Committee voted to charge its executive committee to meet with the Senate's executive committee to ascertain why the Senate is discussing these matters. A member of the Curriculum Committee, she was told, had said that the College Council is supposed to be a rubber stamp! And so a meeting is to take place

between these two executive committees. The Senate will receive a report about this.

5. Election to fill a vacant seat on the College Council (or allocation of the seat to an academic department)

Because Senator Scarpetta has taken a medical leave until February, she has resigned her seat on the College Council (but not her seat on the Faculty Senate). She had been elected to the College Council by the Faculty Senate as one of the Senate's at-large representatives. A phonemail message had been sent to all senators not on the College Council inviting them to stand for election to this seat. None accepted the invitation.

The floor was then opened for nominations or self-nominations to this seat. There being none, the seat was declared vacant and the Senate determined that according to the College's Charter and the Senate's Constitution, the seat is to be allocated as a second seat to the largest department (after English, Mathematics, and Law & Police Science, all of which have two seats). Therefore, the seat is allocated to the Department of Public Management. Senator Feinberg said that she would convey this information to her department. President Kaplowitz added that she had alerted Professor Ned Benton, chair of the Public Management Department, to the likelihood of this happening when no one responded to the phonemail message about the open seat.

President Kaplowitz said that it may be time for the College to think about returning to a divisional structure, rather than a departmental structure. She noted that with the shrinking of the full-time faculty it is virtually impossible for departments to be adequately represented. She said we are just spreading ourselves too thin. Senator Norgren said this is especially true with the interdisciplinary nature of so many of the majors, which is at odds with the departmental structure. Senator James Malone said another very important issue is the support given to departments: small and large departments are treated similarly in terms of support staff and other forms of support, even though the size of departments can vary enormously. Senator Suggs said colleagues at colleges throughout the country are telling him that downsizing is taking the form at their institutions of combining and merging departments. Senator Wallenstein expressed a cautionary note: although there are many interdisciplinary majors, academic disciplines define what they do.

60 Proposal from the Ad Hoc Committee on Recruiting and Retaining In-Service Students [Attachment C]

President Kaplowitz explained that the proposal [Attachment C] is from an ad hoc committee of faculty and administrators that was formed in response to the declining population of in-service students. (She reported that the committee has a new member: Alumni President Seymour Jones.) A survey was conducted by the committee during fall 1992 registration and more than half of those who completed the survey identified day/night courses as the best aspect of John Jay. The most serious problem identified was the lack of sufficient day/night courses. The proposal is for the Senate to endorse compliance with a 1967 College Council policy:

"No course shall be offered on a day-only or evening-only basis unless there is at least one corresponding parallel course offered day-night or unless prior approval has been obtained from the Dean of Faculty."

Senator Gitter asked the purpose of the Senate taking a position on this issue. She asked whether the chairs do not already follow this policy. President Kaplowitz noted, for illustrative purposes and not to single out any particular departments, that not a single day/night section of Statistics 250 or of Research Methods 325 is being offered this semester even though these courses are needed for so many majors. Senator Gitter said that the Chairs schedule courses and if the Chairs do not schedule day/night courses this should be between the Chairs and the Provost. President Kaplowitz said that since this policy is not being honored, the Senate is being asked to recommend that the policy be honored. If Chairs are not scheduling day/night courses it may be because there is a sense that there is no faculty will to teach such sections: if the Senate endorses the policy, we are saying there is a faculty will. Of course, there may not be such a will. But if we do endorse it, we are being asked to convey this to the Provost who would convey it to the chairs. She said that it may be that a better sequence should be followed.

Senator Wallenstein questioned whether the Senate is the appropriate forum for discussion of this policy. Senator Suggs said he does think the Senate is the proper forum. He noted that one of the original reasons for the existence of the Senate was to give a voice to the faculty where the voice of the faculty might be somewhat different from the voice of the individual departments. He said that the problem with the College Council at that time had been that departmental members only voted the way the department wanted them to vote and that if the College Council was a rubber stamp that was the reason why. Inasmuch as this relates to the viability of the College as a practitioner-oriented college, to one degree or another, it is a faculty issue, he said. Faculty could say to departments: we are enthusiastic about the Senate's recommendation and we recommend to the Council of Chairs that they offer day/night sections. He added that this is one of the occasions where the faculty can speak as a faculty. Senator James Malone agreed that the Faculty Senate is the appropriate forum. He asked whether the policy is still on the books. The reply is that it is still on the books but is not adhered to.

Senator Litwack said he thinks this is legitimate Faculty Senate business but added that he wants to speak out strongly against the policy as it is written. He said that at the very least we should not approve or reapprove this policy without getting input from the Chairs. Furthermore, this policy was adopted many years ago when we had many more students who needed day/night courses than need them now. Another problem, he said, is that in many ways day/night courses are not efficient: sixty students come in the day and 20 at night, which means real overcrowding in the day sessions. Third, it may reduce the resources need we to have for day classes. Fourth, it is difficult to get adjuncts to teach day/night classes. In addition, when we used to offer almost all day/night courses, faculty organized their lives to accommodate that schedule but since then many faculty members have organized their lives somewhat differently because they have not been teaching day/night schedules. Senator Litwack said that as a principle, we have to offer enough day/night courses to meet the needs of the professional student. But the proposal as presented would be

harmful to the College.

Senator Rosner agreed. She said the day classes wind up very crowded and the evening courses have very few students. Students register for the evening section of courses that are quickly closed out and then attend the day class. She said that if the in-service students need the courses we should mount them but for the proposal to call for a section of every course to be given day/night at a time when the College's resources are declining and the adjuncts are picking up so much of the load is not realistic.

Senator Norgren asked whether we have surveys that are reliable. She said her evening sections of day/night courses are filled and that when she observes adjuncts their night courses are elbow to elbow. She added that it is not just criminal justice practitioners we should consider: many of our students work and we should provide sufficient numbers of sections for them. Often they are our most interested students. She said that just because our in-service student population has declined, our population of good evening students has not declined.

Senator Rosner said that she was speaking to the issue of parallel courses, not to the issue of night classes. Senator Norgren said that although some evening students on occasion do attend during the day, Senator Rosner's point is an important one: it may be that we need to look at whether we offer sufficient night-only classes and we may have to offer more. The other issue is that we were hired with one condition of employment and some of us wish not to teach at night. That is something we have to discuss forthrightly but first she would like to see the data about enrollment in night classes.

Senator Bracey said that the committee did not have the data but she did not think it would be difficult to get. Senator Bracey said the committee does have the data of the survey done of students who receive tuition waiver: these are the in-service students. She said that she does not particularly like to teach late night courses and she could understand why other faculty might feel the same, but she said that the students had expressed a desire for day/night classes and it is important to decide what kind of a college we are and what message we are sending students about the kind of college we are going to be. She asked whether we are we a college that addresses itself to the needs of in-service students. She reported that the committee will be conducting another survey, one of the police population in general, those practitioners who do not attend John Jay. Asked whether the survey addressed night rather than day/night classes, Senator Bracey explained that the survey asked open questions and that no suggested answers were provided: the students volunteered that day/night courses is the best thing about John Jay, not night courses. They were not given an option: they volunteered day/night courses as the best thing about John Jay.

Senator Bracey noted that we do not know what the demand for day/night classes really is because many students may quit8 possibly have voted with their feet by not coming to John Jay or by not going anyplace at all. But if students need day/night courses there is a good chance that those students are not attending John Jay because we are not meeting that need. The more often that happens, the more often that in-service students talk about the difficulty of getting day/night courses at registration, the less hospitable John Jay seems to those students. The other question is whether we care about how we appear to those students.



Because the issue is not one of filling OUR classrooms: clearly we are able to do that. We are talking, she said, about a particular group of students.

Senator Bracey explained that if criminal justice practitioner students do not matter to us, then we do not have to offer day/night classes: but if we want to send a signal that in-service students are important to us, she said that she thinks there is no better way for us to do it.

Upon the arrival of Dean Price and members of the Graduate studies committee, Senator Wallenstein moved to table this item. Senator Norgren asked that when this is put back on the agenda that we have data about the empty seats in the evening classes: not how many register for evening classes but how many attend at night. Senator Buggs suggested that we survey by walking around the corridors and looking in classrooms. Senator Norgren agreed, adding that we could each survey the members of our departments.

9. Guests: Dean of Graduate Studies Barbara Price and members of the Graduate Studies Committee

Dean Barbara Price and her colleagues on the Graduate Studies Committee were welcomed: Professors Ned Benton (Public Management), Robert Bonn (Sociology), William Heffernan (Law & Police Science), James Wulach (Psychology), and Dean McHugh.

President Kaplowitz explained that Dean Price had called the Senate's executive committee and had asked, on behalf of the Graduate Studies Committee, to be invited to the Senate to discuss the master's program especially in light of the issues raised by the Middle States self-study. The executive committee had extended the requested invitation. President Kaplowitz then invited Dean Price to make a statement about the program and the issues. Dean Price said that she did not have a statement to make. She thanked the Benate for inviting her committee and said that she and her committee members have come to answer the Senate's questions. President Kaplowitz said that the Benate does not have questions about the graduate program: indeed, the Senate's ten priorities for the College, requested by Middle States, make no reference to the graduate program. She added that in contrast, the Council of Chairs named the governance and the standards of the master's program as one of its four priorities for the College and in light of this she asked why the Graduate Studies Committee had asked to be invited to the Faculty Benate and not to the Council of Chairs.

Dean Price said that the Graduate Studies Committee felt that the graduate program did not receive the attention it should have in the Middle States self-study report. She added that the program is not as well known as she and her colleagues would like and, therefore, they thought they could be of service by answering questions. Professor Ned Benton (Public Management) said that the committee had decided to reach out to the faculty through the Faculty Senate.

Professor Harold Sullivan (Chair, Government) said that he certainly has questions about the master's program and that the Council of Chairs had indeed raised many issues. He said that at the undergraduate level, governance at the College is very broad: for example, majors are open to discussion and to criticism by

people from all the other departments. In the graduate program it is different, he said. There the dominant departments at the College control the graduate programs in all departments. He cited as an example the fact that criminal justice is an interdisciplinary program and on the undergraduate level the Government Department plays a very active role in the major. But on the graduate level the Government Department does not play a role in the governance of the master's program in criminal justice even though government faculty teach courses included in the program. At this College, he said, governance participation is very broad. He cited as an example the fact that the previous week he had been asked to defend his department's new major before the Curriculum Committee of the whole College. Every one on the committee has a right, as it should, he said, to question the major, indeed all majors and all courses. On the graduate level, however, the programs are governed solely by the Graduate Studies Committee. The difference is dramatic, he said, between the undergraduate program, whose governance is inclusive, and the graduate program, whose governance is exclusive. He asked who the members of the Graduate Studies Committee are and why those individuals are members.

Dean Price said that the College Charter mandates the membership of the Graduate studies Committee. The members, as required by the Charter, are herself (as chair); the dean for admissions and registration; the vice president for student development; each of the coordinators of each master's program (although the Charter does not specify how many coordinators of each program there shall be); two students; the BA/MA coordinator; and a representative of the Library, without vote.

Professor Sullivan asked who chooses the coordinators of the programs. Dean Price replied that the President appoints them. She advises, to some extent, but he appoints them. She said some programs have two co-coordinators. She cited forensic science, which though a small program, chooses to have two co-coordinators. She said this is the result of history plus the Charter.

Professor Sullivan proposed a possible change in the governance structure that would address many of the issues that have been raised about the master's program: the problem of lack of participation of much of the College; the fact that, in a sense, the Committee has come to the Senate to let the College know what it does because the College by and large does not know. He said he would argue that the Graduate Studies Committee should be broadened substantially: the membership should be the program coordinators; the chairs (or their designees) of departments whose faculty teach in the master's programs should also serve on the committee (unless there is already a department representative in the person of a program coordinator); and there should be at least three other at-large members from departments that do not participate, so that the College as a whole has a role in looking at how these programs operate, in judging how these programs operate, and who could report to the College: these at-large representatives could be chosen by the Faculty Senate and the Council of Chairs together or separately.

Professor Sullivan said that this proposal could ultimately build support for the program and could result in greater participation in the program. The curriculum would be reviewed more thoroughly. Professor Sullivan noted that he had originally recommended to the Middle States committee that curriculum matters should go to the Curriculum Committee: but Dean Faber does not

support this. Nonetheless, a substantial broadening and a more inclusive and representative governance structure would benefit the program. He proffered the proposal for the Senate's consideration. President Kaplowitz suggested that Professor Sullivan might wish to submit a proposed Charter amendment since the charter would have to be amended for these changes to take place. He said he would consider doing so.

Senator Gitter asked why the Graduate Studies Committee has come to the Senate. She said that the graduate courses, in general, are characterized by small classes taught by full-time faculty while the undergraduate courses, especially those for freshmen and sophomores, such as English 101 courses, are overcrowded and the overwhelming majority are taught by adjunct faculty. Some adjuncts, she said, are doing a wonderful job but many adjuncts are not experienced teachers: there are no resources to train them, there are no resources to mentor them. Senator Gitter protested being asked to listen to squabbling about how the riches of the graduate program are to be divided. She protested this presentation, saying that our energies are better used dealing with more urgent educational matters. She said it angers her to have to listen to a dispute over the allocation of generous graduate program resources.

Senator Norgren said she very much understands what Senator Gitter is saying. She said there is an ongoing and fundamental question having to do with the resources of the College. She said that one question, which we may not want to get into today, is the extent to which the graduate program enhances the reputation of the College. She said that the issue Professor Sullivan is raising is an important governance issue: the Curriculum Committee has broad authority over the undergraduate program but there does not appear to be the same or equivalent involvement or oversight by faculty in terms of the graduate curriculum.

Senator Norgren said that if there were a larger participation there might be a larger opportunity to discuss the allocation of resources and to talk about the graduate program and to participate as faculty. She asked Dean Price how many of our 210 faculty regularly teach in the program. She added that she has the technical right to teach in the program but has never done so. Dean Price said that we give approximately 132 courses each year. Approximately 40 or 50 faculty teach in the graduate program, including adjuncts. Dean Price said that Senator Gitter should realize that adjuncts also teach in the graduate program.

Senator Gitter responded that that is not the point. She said obviously there are many values to having a graduate program. But she said she was suggesting that using public time for what seems, to an outsider, to be a kind of power struggle seems unseemly.

Senator Norgren asked what is the rationale for the governance configuration. Dean Price said she does not know since she was not at John Jay when the Charter provision was written. She said the Graduate Studies Committee is seen as the curriculum committee for the graduate program: the Graduate Studies Committee establishes teaching standards, and establishes who can teach in the program in terms of publications and in terms of excellence of teaching. Even English and Mathematics courses are offered, despite the special mission of the graduate program. The courses offered are based on the needs of the program and the standards set by the Committee, she said.

Professor William Heffernan (Co-coordinator, Criminal Justice) said the Committee is composed of those who are actively involved in the administration of the program. As for curriculum matters and the selection of faculty who will teach in the program, the Committee tends to defer to the person who is involved in the actual administration of the program.

Senator Norgren said that that does not address her question. She said that as a political scientist she can speak to a proposal from the Anthropology Department, if she is on the Curriculum Committee, and asked why it is different for the graduate program, Professor Heffernan said that the graduate coordinators are the experts and they can best make these decisions. He suggested that the model to be emulated should be that of the graduate program and not that of the undergraduate program. He said that the administrators of the graduate program are best able to judge these issues and he questioned why Senator Norgren is assuming that the undergraduate governance structure is the better of the two.

Professor Sullivan said that the reason he is raising these issues is because this really is a governance issue and the Senate has rightly always been interested in such matters. He said it is also an issue of resources. Unless there is wider participation and oversight, there can never be a more equitable allocation of resources (if they are now inequitable, which we do not know because almost none of us has a role or a voice in these matters). At the moment, we do not know enough. This is not how we should be running the College, he said. On the undergraduate level, when a department proposes a program or a major, the entire College has the right to scrutinize and question. That is not true on the graduate level. He said that he does not agree that only the experts have that right, as Professor Heffernan suggests.

Senator Feinberg said that in the case of the master's in Public Administration, there is an outside agency, NASPAA [National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administrators] which is comparable to Middle States, which accredits the master's program in public administration. That is one reason for the difference in the governance structure.

Senator Guinta said that Dean Price had commented that the graduate program had not received the attention it should have in the Middle States self-study report. He asked what aspects were omitted. Dean Price said the main issue is that Middle States did not pay much attention to the program. The report complained about the program's racial and ethnic representation when, in fact, we have probably the highest number of minority students in a graduate criminal justice program in the United States. The tone and the brief amount of space devoted to the program are what she and the other members of the Committee object to, she said, adding that it was this to which she attempted to respond in her memorandum to the Middle States Steering Committee, a copy of which she sent to the President of the Faculty Senate who provided copies to the Senate.

Senator Guinta said that having been on the Middle States Committee, he thinks the graduate program escaped the wrath of Middle States and, indeed, in light of the very harsh questions raised about retention and graduation rates, remediation, and the allocation of resources, but not about the graduate program, many of us at the College think that the graduate program is treated as a sacred cow not only by Middle States but in general by the College. Therefore, he said, he is surprised that Dean Price and

the graduate coordinators aren't pleased by the comparatively good press the program received.

Dean Price said that **virtually** none of the master's programs except criminal justice was cited in the self-study and the comments about that program were negative. The master's programs subjected themselves to a **self-assessment**, using a nationally structured set of questions scored by ETS, which was done independently and that kind of positive activity was not mentioned in the report.

Professor **James** Wulach (Coordinator, Forensic Psychology) said the graduate program is feeling the effects of the budget **crisis just** like everyone else. He said his program has increased **class size** by an average of 27% this **semester** and during the last several years the forensic psychology program has been losing professors, making the program **more** and more dependent on adjunct faculty. He said the forensic psychology program is really a national program because people attend from all over the country. John Jay's is the only master's program in forensic psychology in the country. Students can now come into the program only if they have a 3.0 GPA and that will be the standard from now on. Professor Wulach said that all the master's programs were lumped together in the Middle States report without differentiating between the programs and he said that he thought that was unfortunate.

Senator Bracey said she wanted to understand what we are discussing. She said she understands that the graduate coordinators and Dean Price feel that they were slighted by the Middle States report but many groups have felt slighted by the self-study and she wondered whether Dean Price or the graduate coordinators have any specific proposal which they want the Senate to consider. She said that if there were a motion put forward to eliminate the graduate programs she doubted that such a motion would pass. She explained that usually the Senate tries to have a resolution or a proposal about which the Senate deliberates and votes. She said that if the Graduate Studies Committee has a proposal that it would like the Senate to consider, the Senate would be pleased to entertain it and to discuss it fully. Dean Price said they do not have any specific proposal. Dean Price explained that she and the other members of the Committee asked to come to the Senate to learn what the concerns of the members of the Senate are and what suggestions the Senate has and to hear from the Senate. She said they want to make the graduate program better known.

President Kaplowitz said that the Graduate Studies Committee's wish to meet with the Senate and the Senate's responsiveness to the suggestion bespeaks respect by each body for the other. She said the fact that the Senate has not heretofore taken up issues having to do with the graduate program may be an indication of general approbation or of lack of knowledge about the program, but if the latter was the reason that is already **chan/ed** as a result of this meeting. She invited the Graduate Studies Committee to submit any proposals it would like the Senate to consider and suggested that Professor Sullivan may wish to submit his proposal for amending the governance structure.

Professor Benton said that when the Committee perceives they need someone to teach in the program, the Committee members try to find people. He said he found someone to teach in the MPA program who is in a different department than his. But, he added, if

faculty members are interested in teaching in the program, they should speak to the graduate coordinators. He said by speaking to each other we may be able to accomplish much. Another member of the Committee noted that the Committee's meetings are open. President Kaplowitz suggested that the dates, times and location of meetings be published so that those interested can attend. Dean Price invited President Kaplowitz to the next day's meeting of the Committee. She also offered to put her on the Graduate Study Committee's mailing list so she will receive the minutes.

Senator Juda said he liked the informal airing of an issue such as this one, since the information was all new to him. He said we miss a lot when we just focus on a proposal. He said that the feelings and the impressions expressed were very interesting.

President Kaplowitz thanked Dean Price and the members of the Committee. She said that important issues had been raised and important information had been provided. Dean Price thanked the Senate as did the other members of the Committee.

7. Approval of a survey of adjuncts: Senator Rick Richardson, chair. Senate Committee on Adjunct Issues

Senator Richardson moved that the Senate approve the adjunct survey that his committee developed. In response to a request for more time to examine and discuss the survey, Senator Richardson accepted a friendly amendment that proposed changes be sent to him by November 16 and that the Executive Committee be charged with approving the final instrument. The motion, as amended, carried by unanimous vote.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Edward Davenport  
Interim Recording Secretary

## Announcements from the chair

### JJ's delegation to UFS Conference on Faculty Governance set

On December 4 a day-long conference on faculty governance is being sponsored by the University Faculty Senate. In addition to each college's UFS delegates, eight faculty from each CUNY college will attend. (Thus a total of 250 faculty are being invited.) The eight attending from JJ (in addition to John Jay's UFS delegates) are Professors Michael Blitz, Edward Davenport, Betsy Gitter, James Malone, Rick Richardson, Lydia Rosner, Chris Suggs, and Martin Wallenstein.

### Alumni Association has new president

Seymour Jones (B.S. 1978) is the new president of John Jay's Alumni Association, succeeding Angelo Pisani, after having served as vice president for a number of years. A member of the New York City Police Department, Captain Jones is assigned to the Police Academy. Mr. Jones, who was a member of the Provost Search Committee in 1990-91, is a doctoral candidate in criminal justice at SUNY Albany, where he spent last year completing his course work.

### Police cadet inauguration at City Hall November 6

At City Hall on November 6, 136 police cadets were sworn in at a ceremony attended by Mayor Dinkins, Commissioner Kelly, Chancellor Reynolds, and the presidents of the 11 CUNY colleges participating in the program. John Jay has the single largest number of police cadet students (55).

### Satellite videoconference at JJ on ADA and cj agencies

The first videoconference at John Jay, sponsored by the Office of Special Programs, was on the subject of the Americans with Disabilities Act and the Criminal Justice Agencies. John Jay was one of 11 satellite-receiving sites (the only one in New York City). Members of various agencies attended and asked questions through a telephone pickup,

### EO of Ph.D. program responds to article critical of program

Professor Tony Simpson, the Executive Officer of the Ph.D. program in Criminal Justice, has supplied the Faculty Senate with a copy of a statement he wrote for John Jay colleagues in response to an article in the Summer 1992 issue of The Journal of Criminal Justice Education which ranks 23 criminal justice doctoral programs in the country. John Jay's program received an overall ranking of 14 (out of 23 programs) and in one category ranked 21 out of 23. [Copies of the statement have been distributed to members of the Faculty Senate.]

### English Department responds to Middle States report

The English Department adopted a statement developed by the Department's Composition Committee and written by Professor Ben Hellinger in response to the Middle States self-study report about remediation. The English Department voted to distribute the document throughout the College and asked that it be distributed to the Faculty Senate. [Copies of the statement have been distributed to members of the Senate.]

### Provost selects faculty for peer review of research awards

Provost Wilson has chosen two members of the faculty to join him in selecting the ten recipients of the \$1,000 research awards he has created. The two faculty are Professor Dorothy Bracey (Anthropology) and Professor Peter DeForest (Forensic Science), both members of the Faculty Senate.

**Provost selects faculty to develop teaching award process**

Provost Wilson has asked Professors Charles Bahn (Psychology), Betsy Gitter (English/TSP), and Shirley Schnitzer (English) to recommend criteria and procedures for an annual award honoring outstanding teaching.

**JJ student honored at Belle Zeller Scholarship dinner**

Rian Keating was one of 12 CUNY students awarded a Belle Zeller Scholarship at an awards ceremony on November 5. Mr. Keating is the first John Jay student to win the Belle Zeller Scholarship since Rick Richardson won in 1988. (Rick Richardson, a doctoral candidate at Fordham, is an adjunct member of the Sociology Department and an adjunct representative on the Senate and on the College Council.)

Mr. Keating was sponsored by Professor Carol Groneman (TSP/History) and Professor Timothy Stevens (English). A full-time student who holds a full-time job, Mr. Keating has a 4.0 GPA and plans to be a special education teacher of the hearing impaired. Under the auspices of the John Jay Players, Mr. Keating wrote and produced a play about a family's response to AIDS. He has been a volunteer crisis intervention worker at Gay Men's Health Care for four years. Mr. Keating is also one of the named plaintiffs in the faculty/student CUNY equal protection lawsuit against New York State.

This year's Belle Zeller Scholarship award dinner at the Grand Hyatt was also the occasion for honoring United States Representative Jose E. Serrano, who was presented with the "Friend of CUNY Award." Attending the event from John Jay, in addition to Mr. Keating and his sponsors Professors Groneman and Stevens, were President Lynch, Professors Haig Bohigian, Robert Crozier, and Karen Kaplowitz, Provost Basil Wilson, Deans Eli Faber and Mary Rothlein, External Affairs Director Judith Bronfman, and PR Director Julia Bryant.

The deadline to apply for next year's Belle Zeller Scholarships is December 7. To be eligible, a student must have a 3.75 GPA and must be sponsored by two faculty. More information is available from Pat Sinatra.

**JJ alumnus elected to NYS legislature**

Scott Stringer, a John Jay alumnus (B.A. 1986) was elected to the State Assembly from the 67th District: John Jay is located in the 67th District. Assemblyman Stringer succeeds Jerrold Nadler, who was elected to the 8th Congressional seat held by the late Ted Weiss. Assemblyman Stringer joins two other John Jay graduates in the NYS Assembly: Alton Waldon and Larry Seabrook. Assemblyman Seabrook is teaching an African-American Studies course at John Jay this semester.

**Open meetings on CPI and Associate degree programs announced**

Professor Chuck Stickney (TSP/English), chair of the New Programs subcommittee of the Curriculum Committee has announced three open meetings on the College Preparatory Initiative and on the Associate Degree programs: November 3, November 16, and November 23 at 3:15 in Room 610T.

**President' Cabinet: November 4**

The ISITAP program on "Human Dignity," which JJ has taught in Panama and Honduras and will teach in other Latin and South American countries, has been given jurisdiction by the Justice Department for Russia and all of Eastern Europe. The decision to invest John Jay money to participate in this



President's Cabinet: November 4 (cont)

program was characterized by President Lynch as a risk worth having taken, especially since John Jay is about to break even financially.

Various legislative bills involving training and education grants were summarized by President Lynch, who suggested that John Jay aggressively seek these funds: the grants are for programs in intensive training in critical languages; adult illiteracy; ESL; sexual offenses prevention training.

The possibility of recruiting JJ students from among soldiers who are leaving the military was mentioned.

CUNY's sexual harassment policy is being revised by the Central Administration at 80th Street.

Receptions are planned for Representative Jerrold Nadler (8th District) and for NYS Assemblyman Scott Stringer (67th District), who is a John Jay alumnus and Mr. Nadler's successor. John Jay is located in the 8th Congressional District and in the 67th State Assembly District.

A reception for NYPD Commissioner Kelly is set for November 24.

The CCP (Creating Career Pathways) is a proposed change in NYS law being supported by Lieutenant Governor Stan Lundine. President Lynch reported that SUNY and CUNY are opposing the proposal, which is a form of tracking, similar to the German system, and is the opposite of the Chancellor's College Preparatory Initiative (CPI) which is predicated on the necessity of all high school students receiving a college preparatory curriculum.

College Council: October 28

President Lynch reported that the Faculty Senate had challenged the right of administrators to nominate faculty to the College Council executive committee and he said that after reviewing the Charter he concurred. He suggested that the Charter requirement that faculty members on the Executive Committee nominate faculty be broadened for this occasion so that this year's executive committee could be formed in an expeditious manner: he suggested that nominations be made from the floor for faculty members but that only faculty would be permitted to make nominations. The ballots will be mailed out to Council members so that a new executive committee could be in place by November 12, when the executive committee is scheduled to next meet. Seven faculty were nominated, all of whom had already agreed to stand for election, for the six faculty seats.

Ballots were distributed for four empty seats on the student panel of the Judicial Committee (the student disciplinary committee). Five names were on the ballot. No information about the five candidates was provided, despite a request, on the grounds that information could not be objectively given.

The Council approved recommendations from the Graduate Studies Committee for a new course in ethical issues in forensic psychology and also approved new admissions requirements for the master's program in forensic psychology: a minimum 3.0 undergraduate GPA will be required except in exceptional cases if GRE scores, interviews, essays, and letters of recommendation demonstrate a student's ability to complete graduate work.

The proposed revision of the Police Science major was discussed. The issues raised at the Senate on October 27 were presented. In response to Professor Richardson's

October 28 Collecre Council (cont)

proposal that courses on alcoholism and drug abuse be added, Dean Faber reported that the Curriculum Committee had agreed in May that all academic departments would have until, March 1993 to propose additional courses for the Police Studies major which the Curriculum Committee was bound to consider and he asked that the Council members refrain from a "feeding frenzy" at today's meeting. Professor Kaplowitz reported that departments were seemingly not informed about this provision for proposing additional courses and she suggested that a statement about this should have been included in the College Council packet from the Curriculum Committee. Professors Bracey, Brandt, and Suggs articulated various concerns, especially the overlapping of the three proposed tracks of the Police Science major. Several members of the police science faculty attended the meeting in addition to Professor T. Kenneth Moran, department chair. Dean Faber noted that the proposed revision of the major has taken three years and that the 29-member Curriculum Committee (approved the major by a vote of 10-3-2. Professor Suggs spoke about his concern that 80th Street might not approve the proposed revision and he offered to work with Professor Moran and Dean Faber. The offer was accepted. Professor Kaplowitz suggested that had the Senate received the College Council packet earlier, there would have been more time for consultation with Professor Moran and other members of the Law and Police Science Department. She also said that the faculty are sensitive to the tremendous amount of work that went into the major, a fact the Senate had had no knowledge of until now, and that on the one hand the faculty representatives want to be responsible Council members and; not just a rubber stamp and on the other hand they want to be supportive of the work of their colleagues and, in this particular case, the wishes of the Law and Police Science Department. The motion to approve the major carried, with an agreement that the packet will not be sent to 80th Street until departments have an opportunity to propose additional courses and until the overlapping tracks are reviewed.

Council of Chairs: October 14

Professor Crozier reported that the funding for the associate degree program for 1993-94 is not yet in the budget. He also reported that the administration's decision as to when to advertise for 1993-94 faculty lines may not be made until late November.

The Council of Chairs unanimously approved a proposal that student evaluations of adjunct faculty be conducted every semester so that department chairs can make more fully informed reappointment decisions.

The Council of Chairs then met with the Middle States Steering Committee and presented the Council of Chairs' top priorities for the College, as requested by the Middle States Steering Committee, which it defined as John Jay's main "problem areas" :

- "- Increasing adjunct dependence and the decline in full-time faculty.
- Admissions and retention, and issues of overall enrollment size.
- Undergraduate academic advising
- Governance of the Graduate Program and its admission standards (of both faculty and students)"

Council of Chairs: November 4

Professor Robert Crozier reported that Dean Price has invited him to attend the Graduate Studies Committee, in light of the Council of Chairs' stated concerns about the graduate program. Professor Kaplowitz reported that Dean Price conveyed a request to her from the Graduate Studies Committee to be invited to the Senate to discuss these issues and that members of the Graduate Studies Committee and Dean Price will attend the Faculty Senate on November 11. She invited the chairs interested in this topic to attend.

The Chairs and Provost Wilson discussed the requests for faculty lines that the chairs of 16 departments have submitted. The total requests add up to requests for more than 30 lines and yet no more than 15 lines can be hoped for. The various criteria for a department being allocated a line were reviewed, most especially adjunct reliance and the need to offer courses required in a major.

Provost Wilson reported that earlier in the day at a meeting of the CUNY Academic Council (provosts, deans of faculty, etc) the promise of the replacement of 20 percent of faculty lines lost to early retirement was put into question because the many new initiatives being embarked upon by CUNY (upon the request of the Chancellor and approval of the Board of Trustees in October) might absorb the funds for those promised lines. He said that JJ will not advertise for positions until the P&B process is completed. He also spoke about the fact that JJ has fallen behind in the field of criminal justice and said that will be a factor in line allocations.

Professor Jannette Domingo reported on a \$140,000 grant from the Ronald McNair Post-Baccalaureate Fellowship (from the Department of Education) for faculty to mentor juniors or seniors in research skills. Twenty students with a GPA of at least 2.8 will be chosen to work with five faculty who are engaged in research. Faculty mentors will be paid on an overload basis and students will receive independent study credits and a summer stipend. She invited faculty to recommend students or to indicate their interest in being mentors. Inquiries should be directed to Professor John Cooper.

Computerized reuistration committee: November 3

The Committee on Computerized Registration discussed the proposal of Computer Center Acting Director Peter Barnett's proposal for prerequisite checking, which involves the purchase of special hardware. It was reported that funds for the purchase of the hardware are available from the T Building Furniture and Equipment budget. It was also reported that President Lynch supports the proposal. Registrar Donald Gray raised operational issues (staffing, etc). Other possible approaches to Dr. Barnett's proposal were suggested by Professors Ned Benton and Peter Shenkin. The committee approved a motion to adopt, in principle, the proposal developed by Dr. Barnett for prerequisite checking and to charge a subcommittee to suggest ways to solve operational problems identified by Registrar Gray and to report back at the next meeting on December 1. Attending the meeting were Frank McHugh, Donald Gray, Peter Barnett, Betsy Gitter and Karen Kaplowitz (Faculty Senate), Ned Benton and Sydney Samuel (Council of Chairs), and Peter Shenkin (Mathematics). Vice President Smith and Provost Wilson arrived shortly before the meeting ended.

To: Faculty Senate  
Re: Proposed Charter amendment: Judicial Committee

Proposed amendment: proposed deletions are bracketed; proposed additions are underlined:

Article I. Section 10. Council committees.

e. Judicial Committee

[A] The Judicial Committee shall have among its functions, and shall be composed as, a student disciplinary committee chosen in accordance with the Bylaws of the CUNY Board of Trustees. When functioning as a student disciplinary committee, the committee shall use and be subject to the procedures required by Section 15.5 of the Bylaws of the Board Of Trustees, as amended February 24, 1992. The Judicial Committee shall consist of the following five members: [two members of the instructional staff nominated by the Executive Committee and elected by the College Council; two students nominated by the Student Council and elected by the College Council, and a law member who shall be a qualified attorney who may or may not be a member of the faculty, chosen by the other four members. The committee shall select its own chairperson.] ~~two faculty members and two student members and a chairperson, who shall be a member of the instructional staff. A quorum shall consist of the chair and any two members.~~

The president shall select in consultation with the Executive Committee of the Colleeae Council three (3) members of the instructional staff of the Colleeae to receive training and to serve in rotation as chair of the Judicial Committee. The chairperson shall preside at all meetings of the Judicial Committee and shall decide and make all rulings for the Committee. She/he shall not be a voting member of the Committee but shall vote in the event of a tie.

The two faculty members shall be selected by lot from a panel of six faculty elected annually by the Faculty Senate from among the persons having faculty rank or faculty status. The two student members shall be selected by lot from a Panel of six students elected annually in an election in which all students registered at the Colleeae shall be eligible to vote. No individuals on the panel shall serve for more than two consecutive years. [The Judicial Committee shall have primary jurisdiction in all matters of student discipline not handled administratively. Matters of discipline may be handled administratively only with the consent of the person involved.] ~~The Judicial Committee shall adjudicate such charaes as may be brought against a student by an administrator, a member of the faculty, a member of the staff, or a student. When functioning as a student disciplinary committee, [T]the committee shall use the procedures required by the Bylaws of the Board of Trustees.~~

The Judicial Committee shall function as an adjudication committee as described in Article I, Section 4.e. Of the John Jay Charter, upon the receipt of a challenae in writing from an appropriate member of the Colleeae community challenging the right of another member of his or her constituency to serve on the College Council. When functioning as such an adjudication committee, the procedures of the Judicial Committee shall be aoverned by Robert's Rules of Order, Revised.

Proposed amendment, with proposed deletions removed and proposed additions included:

Article I. Section 10. Council Committees.

e. Judicial Committee

The Judicial Committee shall have among its functions, and shall be composed as, a student disciplinary committee chosen in accordance with the Bylaws of the CUNY Board of Trustees. When functioning as student disciplinary committee, the committee shall use and be subject to the procedures required by Section 15.5 of the Bylaws of the Board of Trustees, as amended February 24, 1992. The Judicial Committee shall consist of the following five members: two faculty members and two student members and a chairperson, who shall be a member of the instructional staff. A quorum shall consist of the chair and any two members.

The president shall select in consultation with the Executive Committee of the College Council three (3) members of the instructional staff of the College to receive training and to serve in rotation as chair of the Judicial Committee. The chairperson shall preside at all meetings of the Judicial Committee and shall decide and make all rulings for the Committee. She/he shall not be a voting member of the Committee but shall vote in the event of a tie.

The two faculty members shall be selected by lot from a panel of six faculty elected annually by the Faculty Senate from among the persons having faculty rank or faculty status. The two student members shall be selected by lot from a panel of six students elected annually in an election in which all students registered at the College shall be eligible to vote. No individuals on the panel shall serve for more than two consecutive years. The Judicial Committee shall adjudicate such charges as may be brought against a student by an administrator, a member of the faculty, a member of the staff, or a student. When functioning as a student disciplinary committee, the committee shall use the procedures required by the Bylaws of the Board of Trustees.

The Judicial Committee shall function as an adjudication committee as described in Article I, Section 4.e. of the John Jay Charter, upon the receipt of a challenge in writing from an appropriate member of the College community challenging the right of another member of his or her constituency to serve on the College Council. When functioning as such an adjudication committee, the procedures of the Judicial Committee shall be governed by Robert's Rules of Order, Revised.

**EXPLANATION:** On February 24, 1992, the CUNY Board of Trustees amended Bylaw 15.5, to change the structure, membership, and procedures of every CUNY college's committee on student discipline. The changes went into effect at all CUNY colleges on February 24, 1992. John Jay's Charter of Governance does not reflect these changes and, therefore, is misleading to those who read the Charter and to those who rely on the Charter for information about the Judicial Committee and its procedures. Please see the amended Bylaw 15.5, which is attached.

**ATTACHMENT C**

To: The Faculty Senate

From: Ad Hoc Committee on Recruiting and Retaining  
In-Service Students  
Dorothy Bracey  
James Curran  
Vincent Del Castillo  
Zelma Henriques  
Karen Kaplowitz  
Richard Koehler  
Charles Lindner  
Frank McHugh

Date: October 29, 1992

We wish to draw the Faculty Senate's attention to the following policy which was adopted by John Jay's College Council on December 15, 1967:

"No course shall be offered on a day-only or evening-only basis unless there is at least one corresponding parallel course offered day-night or unless prior approval has been obtained from the Dean of Faculty."

We are calling upon the College to comply with this policy, which remains the operative policy, never having been reversed or modified by the College Council. In light of the change in programs (the elimination of liberal arts majors) in the interim since the policy was adopted, we recommend that the Provost grant waivers for those courses that might otherwise not have a sufficient enrollment for a day-night (i.e. two-section) offering. We do urge, however, that some liberal arts courses (i.e. courses not directly related to the mission of the College or its majors) in each discipline be offered on a day-night basis.

We are requesting that the Faculty Senate consider adopting a resolution that calls upon the College to comply with the College Council policy. Should the Senate do so, we suggest that the Senate forward its recommendation to the Provost for transmittal to the chairs of the academic departments [who are responsible for scheduling courses].

**EXPLANATION:**

Our committee has been working for more than a year to develop ways to recruit more criminal justice practitioner (in-service) students and to increase the retention of those in-service students who do attend John Jay.

During Fall 1992 registration, we surveyed the tuition-waiver students (undergraduate in-service students) by using an anonymous open-ended survey. The survey was clearly and specifically addressed to them: It began, "Dear Police Officer, Corrections Officer, Court Officer, and

Firefighter." The survey asked two open-ended questions: what works best for you at the College; what at the College does not work for you (what is a problem, or what do we not provide that we should).

Of the 167 respondents, 93 said that for them the best aspect about John Jay is the day/night schedule of courses. (The second best [35 respondents] is the quality of the faculty and the third best is a tie [14 respondents] between the tuition waiver program and the specialized mission of the College.)

As for what they criticized, the most frequently cited negative aspect of the College is an insufficient number of day/night sections (48 respondents). (The second highest complaint [33 respondents] was the decreased amount of tuition waiver available.)

Our committee believes that if the day/night course schedule is what is making the difference between keeping or losing the in-service students, whom the Faculty Senate and others on the faculty believe are critical to our survival and viability as a College, then John Jay must be responsive to this.

We are asking the Senate to consider our request not only because of the survey results but because our own review of course offerings indicates that day/night courses are not being offered in sufficient numbers and sometimes not at all.

We are asking the Faculty Senate to take this action in light of the Senate's October 27 vote identifying the increased recruitment and retention of in-service students as one of its recommended top ten priorities for John Jay. We also note with appreciation that the Faculty Senate unanimously endorsed a resolution from our committee last spring, recommending that the administration develop strategies for recruiting and retaining criminal justice practitioner students.