

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES #88

John Jay College of Criminal Justice

March 25, 1993

Time 3:15 PM

Room 630 T

Present (24): Michael Blitz, James Bowen, Dorothy Bracey, Orlanda Brugnola, James Cohen, Edward Davenport, Migdalia DeJesus-Torres de Garcia, Henry DeLuca, Lotte Feinberg, Robert Fletcher, Elisabeth Gitter, Robert Orappone, Karen Kaplowitz, John Kleinig, Tom Litwack, James Malone, Jill Norgren, Pat O'Hara, Dagoberto Orrantia, John Pittman, Rick Richardson, Edward Shaughnessy, Chris Suggs, Agnes Wieschenberg

Absent (15): Peter DeForest, Vincent Del Castillo, Robert DeLucia, Jannette Domingo, Lou Guinta, Melinda Guttman, Dan Juda, Lawrence Kobilinsky, Gavin Lewis, Rubie Malone, Lydia Rosner, Douglas Salane, Martin Wallenstein, Carl Wiedemann, Bessie Wright

AGENDA

1. Announcements from the Chair
2. Approval of Minutes #87 of the March 10 meeting
3. Response to the Report of the Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Academic Program Planning: Proposed endorsement of the University Faculty Senate's March 16 resolution and report
4. Proposed revised resolution on the funding of new degree programs and of current degree programs at John Jay
5. First reading of a proposed amendment of the Faculty Senate Constitution
6. Proposal from the Calendar Committee for the 1993-94 academic calendar
7. Report on affirmative action
8. Discussion of Curriculum Committee proposals to the College Council for changing the associate degree program
9. Report of the Adjunct Issues Committee

1. Announcements from the Chair [Attachment A]

The Senate was directed to the written announcements [Attachment A]. Senator Dorothy Bracey was applauded for having been selected by the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences, in a national competition, to be the next editor of the Journal of Criminal Justice Education, which will, as a result, be housed at John Jay. Senator Bracey said that she felt that her candidacy was unique because of the letter from the Faculty Senate reporting the Senate's unanimous endorsement of her candidacy.

The announcement that Kitty Lunn, a student in the Thematic Studies Program and in the CUNY/BA program, has won the Belle Zeller scholarship was also greeted with applause. Benator Gitter said that both Ms. Lunn and another John Jay student who was a finalist, as well as last year's winner, have remarked to her their surprise that none of the faculty on the selection committee who interviewed them were from John Jay. Benator Gitter said that not only does this put John Jay students at a disadvantage but there is the larger issue of the importance of a notable John Jay faculty presence in University-wide activities and she asked whether John Jay faculty have ever been judges for the Belle Zeller Scholarship and how the judges are selected. President Kaplowitz said that the Belle Zeller Scholarship, which has existed for slightly more than ten years, has never had a John Jay faculty member as a judge as far as she knows, but that she would call the Professional Staff Congress to check whether this is, in fact, true and also to ascertain how the judges are chosen.

Benator Jill Norgren was commended for the tremendously successful standing-room only talk by novelist Gloria Naylor on March 23, the culmination of Women's History Month, which also included the awarding of prizes for student poems and essays.

Senator Shaughnessy announced that in addition to the memorial meeting for Professor Olga Bcarpetta at the New School on April 15, reported in the Announcements, at which he will be speaking on the College's behalf as will others, a memorial service is being held at Fordham University on the afternoon of March 31. Professor Bcarpetta, a member of the Sociology Department, died on December 8.

It was announced that (Acting) Security Director Brian Murphy will be meeting with the Benate at its next meeting on April 13. Senator Larry Kobilinsky had suggested that the Senate's executive committee invite Mr. Murphy and had proposed this as an agenda item because of break-ins of faculty offices and so that the Senate could ask about security issues having to do with crimes on the campus and about the dissemination of information about such occurrences.

It was reported, for informational purposes, that an electrical power surge in North Hall destroyed the computer of Benate Vice President Michael Blitz and wiped out electricity in the five faculty offices contiguous to his and that a similar electrical malfunction occurred in an administrator's office on the fourth floor of North Hall. Senator Norgren suggested that a phonemail message from the administration should be sent to alert faculty to the danger apparently posed to computing and other electrical equipment in North Hall. Senator Norgren said that this is the same issue as the need for phonemail messages about crimes that occur on campus. She noted that quite a number of faculty have their own computer in their office and that it is bad enough to lose work and to have a college computer ruined, as has Vice President Blitz, but to have one's own computer at risk and to not know that there is, in fact, a risk is not fair treatment of the faculty. She said that the administration should send a message so that people may take informed action. Asked the cause of the electrical problem, it was reported that the electricians said that the North Hall wiring is old and that, therefore, the problem could reoccur in other parts of the building. Senator Gitter expressed great scepticism, noting that most buildings do not need to be rewired after 20 years or even after 100 years. President Kaplowitz said that both the electrical and security

issues and the importance of timely disclosure to the College community are issues that the Senate's executive committee would raise with President Lynch when they next meet with him on March 29. Benator Norgren Questioned why the administration does not use the phonemail to inform the College community about such issues as safety and security. President Kaplowitz suggested that if the meeting with President Lynch, which the three vice presidents attend, does not result in a message to the faculty about the electrical wiring problem, she would transmit such a message through phonemail, although it is, she said, more appropriate for such a message to be sent by the administration. Benator Shaughnessy urged President Kaplowitz not to send a phonemail message, explaining that she should not do the administration's work. Benator Norgren noted, however, that the ones who are potentially at risk by the lack of such a message are the faculty. Senator Feinberg suggested that if such a phonemail message is sent, it be prefaced with the phrase: "In the absence of a message from the administration, the Faculty Senate wishes to inform you that" This course of action was agreed to by the Senate.

Senator Suggs noted that a report about the criminal justice doctoral program, which he wrote as the chair of the Senate's committee on academic affairs and that had been appended to the agenda of the previous Senate meeting, had not been officially received by the Senate at that last meeting because of loss of a quorum and he suggested that the report be appended to the minutes of the current meeting, for informational purposes, unless there is an objection. Senator Suggs explained that the report is a review of the status of the criminal justice doctoral program and that if the Senate wishes to discuss any issues raised by the report, such a discussion will be placed on the agenda of a future Senate meeting. He noted that Senators Lotte Feinberg, John Kleinig, Tom Litwack, James Malone, and Pat O'Hara, all of whom participated in the meeting with Professor Tony Simpson, the executive officer of the doctoral program, had reviewed and approved the report. There was no objection raised to appending the report to the minutes [Attachment B].

Senator Litwack said that although we are not going to discuss the committee's report on the doctoral program today, he wants to make a crucial point for the record (although, he added, there might be some dispute about the numbers): even though we have heretofore been concerned that the doctoral program drains resources from the College, in fact the reality turns out to be exactly the opposite: the doctoral program actually subsidizes the College in the amount of more than \$100,000 a year, to the great detriment of the doctoral program. And therefore, Senator Litwack explained, it is not that the doctoral program drains the College's resources but the exact opposite, the College drains the doctoral program's resources, and the question that the Benate may have to look at some day is whether the College should continue to drain resources that were intended by CUNY to go to the doctoral program to be used in ways that we do not know about. Senator Suggs added that at the conclusion of the report, the committee suggests that although the criminal justice doctoral program is not really within the purview of the Faculty Senate, because it is a CUNY program and not a John Jay program, the Faculty Senate might want to study what the money allocated but not distributed to the criminal justice doctoral program has been used for at John Jay College. [The committee's report appears as Attachment B]

Senator Norgren distributed information about the hours of

the Women's Center (extension 8184/ Room 1110 I) and asked that Senators help disseminate this information. She said that one of the ways she sees the Center being helpful to the faculty, separate from being helpful to the students, is that it provides a resource for faculty whose students come to them for help and advice. She noted that many of us have had a student come to us after having been raped, for example, and in addition to the other resources available there is now the Women's Center about which we can inform our students. She said that just the previous day a student spoke to her about the problems of being both a single parent and a college student and asked if there is a support group at the College where she can speak to other such students. Senator Norgren said that she was able to direct her student to the Women's Center where such a group, if it does not already exist, can be started.

2. Approval of Minutes #87 of the March 10 meeting

By a motion duly made and seconded, Minutes X87 of the March 10 meeting were approved.

3. Response to the Report of the Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Academic Program Planning: Proposed endorsement of the University Faculty Senate's March 16 resolution and report [Attachment C]

President Kaplowitz noted that the College Council was scheduled to discuss and vote on the recommendations of the Chancellor's Advisory Committee on March 17 but that the College Council failed to achieve a quorum and, therefore, no action was taken by the College Council. She said that at that Council meeting she reported that the Faculty Senate would be considering this issue today. She explained that each college is to report its response to the Chancellor's Advisory Committee Report by March 31 and that the report is to be from each college president to Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Richard Freeland.

She also reviewed the consensus by the Faculty Senate in February that the proposed University Faculty Senate (UFS) resolution, which had been seen in a draft version, was superior to the responses of the other colleges and organizations and that rather than duplicating the work of the UFS the Senate should consider endorsing the UFS position. The Senate, therefore, decided to wait until the UFS took action, in order to see the final form of the position adopted by the UFS. The UFS did take action on March 16 when it approved an amended version of the proposed resolution and explanatory statement, without dissent. President Kaplowitz said that she has never seen such solidarity on the part of the UFS; the entire discussion and vote of this resolution, the only item on the agenda, took 15 minutes. She noted that the UFS is a 120-member body and that, in fact, a backup meeting had been scheduled for the following week in case the UFS needed more time to deliberate beyond 11 PM, which is as late as a quorum is generally maintainable. Instead, the entire discussion and vote took 15 minutes. One person spoke against the resolution but also spoke against the Chancellor's Advisory Committee Report; then three people spoke in support of the resolution; no one else stood at any of the microphones to speak and so the question was called; the vote on calling the question

was unanimous: and then ~~the~~ resolution and report were approved with no negative votes and with five abstentions. Everyone on the UFS was quite simply stunned by the resoluteness and solidarity reflected by the course of events. ~~She~~ said that a very clear, unambiguous political signal was the message that the UFS delegates obviously wished to convey.

Vice President Blitz moved that the Faculty Senate endorse the March 16 resolution and explanatory report of the University Faculty Senate [Attachment C] and adopt it as its own response to the Report of the Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Academic Program Planning. Senator Gitter seconded the motion.

Senator Kleinig criticized the UFS resolution, saying he thinks it is very poor document. He said he can see the political reasons for endorsing it but that he is unhappy about its sweeping remarks. He said that he does not agree that the Chancellor's Advisory Committee Report offers "no academic vision for the University": the Report does, he said, offer an academic vision for the University, one which many people find very offensive, but that is a different point. He said that although he can see how one can construe remarks in the Report as favoring centralization, he does not, in fact, think the Report proposes centralization. He said that claiming that certain recommendations are "arbitrary and capricious" is inaccurate: the recommendations may not be well founded at times but that, again, is not the same thing and such a characterization is unwarranted. The Report is characterized as presupposing that the University is a "fully integrated system" but the Report does not, in his opinion, presuppose that. He said that it seems to him that the resolution includes many remarks that are not well founded. He said that he sees the decision to endorse the resolution as a political decision, which he understands.

Senator Davenport spoke in favor of the motion, saying that it is a political decision but that on the merits of the individual items he disagrees with Senate Kleinig about the UFS resolution. He said that, if anything, the UFS resolution, in terms of the individual items, is not strong enough. He said that the document issued by the executive officers of the Graduate School [copies of which had been distributed to the Benate members] is much stronger and more critical of the Report than the UFS resolution. He noted that the concern about centralization is largely based on the procedure whereby colleges are relegated to the second-level review.

Senator Kleinig said that he believes that the Report presents the second-level review as a stronger form of review than that suggested in the Report's documentation that follows the text, which is presented as though it is making suggestions to a central body as to whether programs and majors are justified for retention. He said his own view is that the Report is not a good one, as he stated in his written commentary that he had provided for the Senate [Attachment D]. He said that his only concern is aligning himself with what seems to be an overly politicized resolution

Senator Suggs said that although he agrees with Senator Kleinig's points, he feels that we should, in fact, endorse the UFS resolution. He said that the UFS resolution is not the best one possible because of the second resolved clause: he said that the "academic planning and evaluation processes" alluded to in that clause simply do not exist at many of the campuses. Faculty

and students have problems because of the lack of these structures and yet the UFS is invoking these processes to assert the right of faculty to determine curriculum. He added that the determination of the curriculum is, of course, the faculty's right but the UFS is invoking principles not observed by the University.

Senator Malone said that whether we move toward a more centralized University system or whether we do not, we must hold fast to the faculty's right to determine the curriculum and, therefore, he supports the resolution.

Senator Bracey said she would like to see us move closer to the model of a University and what she finds so disappointing about the Chancellor's Advisory Report is that insofar as it does this at all it does it in the worst possible way and that it had had the opportunity to do it in the best possible way. And, therefore, she said, whereas she does not agree with every 'whereas' and 'resolved' in the resolution, she really agrees with the tenor of the resolution and, therefore, supports it.

Senator Litwack said that those who attended the caucus of College Council faculty representatives immediately prior to the Council meeting on March 17 know that he opposed the UFS resolution very strongly at that time when the group debated whether to present the UFS resolution for endorsement by the College Council. There being no quorum at the College Council, no action was taken and, in fact, no motion was made. He said he now feels more ambivalent about the UFS resolution, in part because it is the Faculty Senate that is considering endorsing it rather than the College Council and, in part, because of all the position papers issued by various colleges and constituencies that have been distributed to Senate members by the Senate's executive committee. He said that the more statements about the Chancellor's Advisory Committee Report he reads, the more awful the Report is revealed to be.

Senator Litwack said that apart from the questions of language which Senator Kleinig raised, which he is sympathetic to and in fact raised at that previous discussion, his concern is the fact that we also have on our agenda today a resolution calling for a massive redistribution of resources within CUNY toward John Jay. Frankly, he said, he is not so sure that such a redistribution can be accomplished under the current college and system-wide evaluation and academic planning processes: such a redistribution certainly has not occurred to date. And so he is not sure he wants to agree with the second UFS resolved clause because it suggests that the current evaluation and academic planning processes are adequate for making academic decisions and dividing resources within CUNY and we at John Jay feel that this is not true. He said the Chancellor's Advisory Report does raise the legitimate issue that we do have finite resources and sometimes the way those resources are used have to be looked at not solely by the individual colleges because those individual colleges that have more than their share of the resources will not want to give any of it up. And so it may require some centralized mechanism to question that distribution and to change it and we may be in some ways opposing, by supporting the UFS resolution, what we ourselves are proposing in the other resolution that is on today's agenda.

President Kaplowitz said that the Chancellor's Advisory Report is not calling for a redistribution of the University resources. Senator Litwack said that the language of the Report

leaves this open because it says that resources may or may not be redistributed. President Raplowits said that the Report is advisory and that what 80th Street is saying, explicitly, is that each college will continue to have the budget it currently has. She explained that colleges are being reassured that they will not be penalized and need not fear being penalized by having their budget cut if they eliminate academic programs. Instead, the money a college saves by eliminating academic programs will be available for use by the college to strengthen its remaining programs. She said that, in fact, if we oppose the Chancellor's Advisory Report recommendations, we are opposing the principle that the allocation of resources should remain as it is now.

Benator Litwack said that he is concerned, however, that if we endorse the UFS resolution, our endorsement might be misunderstood to be an endorsement of the allocation practices that currently exist. President Raplowits said that if the Faculty Senate endorses the UFS resolution and also endorses its own resolution about the funding of John Jay's academic programs, which is the next item on today's agenda, both documents will be transmitted to President Lynch as the Senate's response to the Chancellor's Advisory Report and we will ask President Lynch to report both resolutions as being part of John Jay's response to the Report. She said that the two documents are, in fact, responses to the issues raised by the Chancellor's Advisory Report: both have to do with funding of academic programs, areas of academic excellence, the mission of the colleges, and programs that are specific to each college's mission. ours can be a two-part response: one having to do with University-wide issues and the other having to do with the specifics of John Jay.

President Kaplowitz added that at the March 17 College Council meeting, which never took place because of lack of a quorum, President Lynch said that in the absence of a position by the College Council he would report his sense of the College's response to the Chancellor's Advisory Committee Report. She said that Benator Litwack had said to President Lynch that President Lynch cannot characterize any response but his own since there has been no action and, in fact, there has not even been discussion. President Kaplowitz said that it was at that point that she stated that the Faculty Senate would be meeting today and that we have on our agenda action items on this matter. She said that President Lynch offered to come to the Senate to discuss this with us but that after the meeting it was discovered that he would be out of the country this week. She added that the Senate's executive officers will inform President Lynch of the Senate's action, if any, when they next meet with him on March 29.

Senator Litwack said he agrees that the Faculty Senate has to come out against the Chancellor's Advisory Report today: he said he has no ambivalence about that whatsoever. He said that he offered a possible alternative resolution at the pre-College Council caucus but that he is not now sure that adopting it would be better than endorsing and adopting the UFS resolution but he would present his resolution for consideration by the Senate because it both addresses John Jay's concerns and condemns the Advisory Report: "While recognizing that the Report of the Chancellor's Advisory Committee raises important fiscal and academic issues facing the City University of New York, the John Jay College Faculty Senate resolves that the Report also places at serious risk essential needs of CUNY students and essential academic values and, therefore, should not be adopted by the City University of New York." Benator Litwack said that he is not

presenting this as a substitute motion but rather as suggested language for the Senate's consideration.

Professor Haig Bohigian (Mathematics) said he sees no conflict between the original motion and Senator Litwack's version and that both could be adopted. He added that in all his years on the University Faculty Senate, since 1968, he has never seen the UFS act with such uniformity by its membership. He said that it was a remarkable statement that the UFS was making by taking such swift and uniform action. He noted that that does not mean that the UFS resolution is a great resolution. He added that if anything has united the faculty of this University, it is the Chancellor's Advisory Report.

President Kaplowitz said we could pass both resolutions, with Senator Litwack's resolution concluding with a phrase stating that the Faculty Senate, therefore, endorses and adopts the UFS resolution. She said that because our Faculty Senate had been in favor of adopting the UFS resolution as far back as February, no resolution or statement had been developed and she said she is concerned that if Senator Litwack's resolution is our sole response it would give the inaccurate impression that we had not studied or thought about this important issue. By signing onto the UFS resolution, we would be saying that we identify with and see ourselves as part of the faculty of CUNY and that we are cognizant of the position of and, indeed, agree with the position taken by the organization that speaks for the entire faculty of the City University.

Senator Richardson called the question. The motion to call the question carried. The motion to endorse the UFS resolution and report and to adopt it as the Faculty Senate's position carried with 3 negative votes and 4 abstentions.

President Kaplowitz said that this would be transmitted to President Lynch to be included as part of John Jay's response to the Report, due March 31, and that a copy of his response would be requested and would be distributed to the Faculty Senate.

4. Proposed revised resolution on the funding of new degree programs and of current degree programs at John Jay [Attachment E]

It was noted that this item is a revision of the resolution that the Senate had deliberated upon at its last meeting and that the "resolved" clause was entirely rewritten by Senator Litwack on the basis of the Senate's discussion. Senator Cohen moved the resolution and Senator Bracey seconded it.

Senator Cohen suggested that the term formula be changed because although he knows about a formula that determines the adjunct budget he does not know that there is, in fact, a formula that determines the rest of the budget. It was agreed that the word formula would be changed to the term "practices."

Senator Kleinig asked why John Jay is underfunded. It was explained that it is the result of history and that Baruch is also severely underfunded. Hunter is also underfunded although to a lesser degree. Senator Grappone suggested that language about the importance of resources for academic support services be included and this was agreed to.

Senator Orrantia asked to have added to the list of possible new programs a baccalaureate in legal translation in court interpretation, explaining that this is a program that has been planned and developed by the Foreign Languages Department over a period of several years and that it is directly related to the mission of the College and would be of great benefit to our students. This addition was agreed to.

Senator Shaughnessy said that he did not think the resolution should contain a litany of possible new programs because the faculty has not had full consultation about these new programs. Senator Gitter and Senator DeJesus-Torres de Garcia said that the programs listed in the resolution are all in the planning stage and had been worked on and developed by various faculty groups and by various departments.

Asked about the source of the analysis showing that John Jay would have 100 additional lines and \$4 million more each year if John Jay were funded according to the same allocation practices as are, for example, Lehman, CCNY, Brooklyn, and Queens, President Kaplowitz explained that this analysis was conducted by Budget Director Robert Sermier and that President Lynch wrote to Vice Chancellor for Budget and Finance Richard Rothbard using these numbers and asked for a more equitable allocation of resources. Although the Chancellory did not grant this request, the analysis and the numbers were not disputed by 80th Street.

Senator Litwack suggested that the list of possible new programs should begin with "an expanded and much needed ESL program." He said our students need an ESL program more than the other programs. He said that this is something we must have, not something it would be nice to have and, therefore, we should list it first. President Kaplowitz said that a great many of the members of the English Department do not think that we should have an expanded ESL program here at all: an ESL program is incredibly expensive and can not be done well unless incredible amounts of money are devoted to it. She explained that many think there should be fully funded ESL centers at several colleges of the University where all ESL students would study until they fully develop their English reading and writing skzlls. she said President Lynch had suggested that ESL be included and that the Executive Committee apprised him of the other point of view about ESL and that because this is a list of possible programs ESL was included but placed at the end of the list. Senator Litwack withdrew his suggestion. Other improvements in the language were suggested and accepted.

The resolution, as amended, was approved with no negative votes and with two abstentions [Attachment E].

5. First reading of a proposed amendment of the Faculty Senate Constitution

A first reading of a proposed amendment to the Faculty senate Constitution adding two at-large executive officers to the Senate's executive committee was moved and seconded. The amendment was proposed by the executive committee because the demands on the executive committee warrant an increase from its current size of four members to six members. The first reading passed by unanimous vote. The second reading will be on April 13.

6. Proposal from the Calendar Committee for the 1993-94 academic calendar: Senator Del Castillo

It was explained that although senator Del Castillo attended the Calendar committee meeting as the Senate's representative, he cannot be present today and so Dean Frank McHugh and Registrar Don Gray briefed President Kaplowitz and Vice President Blitz. The Senate's recommendations about: academic calendar issues will be reported to Senator Del Castillo, who will report; them at the next Calendar Committee on March 29.

The calendar being proposed by the Calendar Committee has 8 classes beginning on September 1, 1993, and final exams ending before the winter holiday and no Friday make-up days. The Senate approved this proposed calendar by unanimous vote.

The Calendar Committee also proposed that book money be distributed on the first and second days of class and that late registration take place during the second week of class, on September 7 and 8. It was explained that the reason for this proposal is that there is insufficient financial aid and bursar office staff for both activities to be done at the same time.

President Kaplowitz said that the Faculty Senate last year recommended that late registration take place as early as possible because students entering class several classes late have tremendous difficulty catching up and this affects all the students and the way the course is taught. And so last semester and this semester late registration took place on the second and third days of the semester. She added that faculty can put books required for their course, certainly those required for the first two weeks of class, on Library reserve.

Senator Gitter said that although this makes sense in theory, the reality is that the Library cannot always obtain reserve books in time for the first day of class. She said that she has had that problem and that without assigned texts students are at a complete loss. Senator Gitter made a strong plea for having the distribution of book checks as early as possible because students are humiliated when they go to the bookstore and do not have the money for \$40 texts.

Senator Litwack said he thought that the purpose of late registration is so that students can attend class and determine if they want or need to change the course and that we need to schedule late registration late enough for them to do this. He said that the dates proposed are good because they are after Labor Day and many students are on vacation until Labor Day, about which they have no choice. Senator Norgren said that making late registration later in order to give students a shopping period is not a good idea since our students need the entire fourteen weeks of the semester to overcome their lack of academic preparation.

A motion to provide book checks on the first two days of class and to have late registration on September 7 and 8 was approved. At the same time, Senate members asked that the administration be apprised of the Senate's recommendation that a way be found for these two essential needs of the students, late registration and book check distribution, be provided to students as early in the semester as is possible.

President Kaplowitz noted that another issue will have to be discussed by the Senate shortly if the computerised registration

test scheduled for April is successful, in which case computerized registration will begin in September. Since faculty will not be needed to hand out course cards (which would no longer exist) the role of faculty at registration has to be determined. She said that in anticipation of computerised registration, registration is expanded from five to seven days (since down time and other possible problems have to be anticipated and factored in). Entering freshmen, who are group registered, will register on August 18 and upper freshmen will be registered on August 19 and on that day HEOs will do registration. Registration for all other students will be for six days, from Monday, August 23, through Monday, August 30. The role of faculty during registration is being envisioned as advisory and administrative: deciding course overalls (unless departments make a general no-exception policy about this): deciding about course equivalencies and substitute courses: and deciding about waivers of prerequisites since more than a third of the courses will be described in the new catalog as having a prerequisite that may be waived by the section instructor, but section instructors will rarely be available at registration for consultation, especially because half our course sections are taught by adjunct faculty.

7. Report on affirmative action: Senator Cohen

Senator Cohen said that he is prepared to make the report requested by the Senate at its previous meeting, but he suggested that in light of the imminent loss of a quorum he postpone making the report until the next Senate meeting. This was agreed to.

8. Discussion of Curriculum Committee proposals to the College Council for changing the associate degree program

Senator Feinberg drew the Senate's attention to the statement appended to the agenda that was issued by the Department of Public Management about the recommendation in the Chancellor's Advisory Committee Report that the associate degree program in public administration and management be eliminated, Senator Gitter said that she had not been able to understand this document and asked that this be discussed at the next Senate meeting on April 13, which is a day before the April 14 College Council meeting when this item is to be presented for action by the Council, Senator Feinberg agreed to explain the document and her department's reasons for it when the Senate discusses this on April 13.

9. Report of the Adjunct Issues Committee: Senator Richardson

Senator Richardson distributed copies of his Committee's report on the survey of adjunct faculty for discussion at the next senate meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 5 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Edward Davenport
Recording Secretary

Announcements from the chair

Professor Dorothy Bracey awarded editorship of ACJS journal

The editorship of the Journal of Criminal Justice Education, which is published by the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences (ACJS), has been awarded to Professor Dorothy Bracey (Anthropology) after a national competition. The Journal will be housed at John Jay, and virtually all of the publishing costs will be borne by ACJS. At its December 11, 1992, meeting, the Faculty Senate unanimously approved a motion endorsing Professor Bracey's candidacy for the editorship.

John Jay student wins Belle Zeller scholarship for 1993-94

Kitty Lunn learned on March 22 that she has been awarded a Belle Zeller Scholarship for 993-94 academic year. She is one of 10 Belle Zeller Scholars selected. Ms. Lunn is a CUNY/BA student studying theater and law and is also a student in John Jay's Thematic Studies Program. This year John Jay student Rian Keating is a Belle Zeller Scholar and he, too, is a CUNY/BA and a TSP student. Last spring, at the Faculty Senate's request, Ms. Lunn testified at the College Council about the problems of access for people with disabilities at John Jay that she faces as a person who uses a wheelchair.

Prizes awarded to student Poets and essayists

As part of John Jay's celebration of Women's History Month, prizes were awarded to three student poets and to three student essayists on March 24. Each winner received a plaque and a check for one hundred dollars. The submissions were judged by English Department faculty who did not know the identity of the author nor anything about the author: each poem and essay was identified only by the author's social security number.

The poetry contest winners were Laura Farrington, Marsha Wilson, and Jeannie Yip. The judges of the poetry contest were Professors Michael Blitz, Lee Jenkins, and Chris Suggs.

The essay contest winners were Kelly K. Oi, George Reynolds, and Elizabeth Schupp. The essay contest judges were Professors Ed Davenport, Marnie Tabb, and Marie Umeh.

The awards were given at the conclusion of a talk by novelist Gloria Naylor to a standing room only crowd in Room 1311 North. Following the event, Naylor signed books at a reception sponsored by Student Council. The event was organized by the Women's Studies Committee which is chaired by Professor Jill Norgren (Government).

Memorial meetins for Olga Scarpetta set for April 15

A memorial meeting in memory of Professor Olga Scarpetta, who died on December 8, will be held at the New School on Thursday, April 15 at 7:45 PM in Graduate Faculty Room 242. New School Professor Paul Shapiro is organizing the event. Members of the John Jay community are invited.

Senate to meet with Security Director on April 13

Acting Security Director Brian Murphy has accepted an invitation from the executive committee to meet with the Faculty Senate at its April 13 meeting. The discussion will be about the security situation at John Jay and was suggested by a member of the Senate, Professor Lawrence Kobilinsky (Science).

Electrical problems in North Hall

A row of six faculty offices on the first floor of North Hall and an administration office on the fourth floor of North Hall lost electrical power as the result of electrical surges. The computer and the printer in Professor Michael Blitz's office (the only office of the seven with a computer) were destroyed by the surge: the surge protector was not sufficiently powerful to protect the equipment (and, in fact, only a \$300 dollar protector could have prevented the damage according to Buildings & Grounds personnel).

80th Street issues Publication on CPI

The CUNY Central Administration issued a 57-page publication of Post-Conference Documents from the November 6, 1992 CPI conference, entitled "The College Preparatory Initiative: What It Is and What It Is Not." What emerges from this publication is that the way CPI is envisioned as motivating students to take college preparatory courses in high school is by virtue of the fact that students without the required number of CPI units will not be eligible for direct admission to the senior colleges. Students without the required number of CPI units will continue to be admitted to the community colleges. Prior to 1996, students in the CUNY community colleges will be able to transfer to the senior colleges only if they have completed all the English CPI units and at least one mathematics unit. After 1996, community college students will be able to transfer to a senior college only if they have all the English and Mathematics CPI units.

March 11 College Council meeting

The meeting was devoted to the Curriculum Committee's proposal for John Jay's implementation of the College Preparatory Initiative (CPI). After a lengthy discussion, at which many students and many faculty spoke against the implementation proposal, the proposal was approved by the 58-member Council by a vote of 15 to 11 with 2 abstentions.

March 17 special College Council meeting

Because the recommendations from the Curriculum Committee with reference to the Report of the Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Academic Program Planning were not acted on by the College Council at its regular March 11 meeting, and because a response to the Report's recommendations is due at 80th Street by March 31, a special meeting of the College Council was scheduled for March 17. The College Council did not have a quorum and, therefore, did not discuss the recommendations and did not vote on them. President Lynch said that his written statement to 80th Street due by March 31 would report that no quorum had been obtained and that, therefore, there was no action. He said that he would say what he expects will be the decision of the John Jay community but Professor Litwack said that President Lynch could only report his own opinion about the recommendations and could not characterize anyone else's since no discussion, much less action, has taken place. Professor Kaplowitz reported that the Faculty Senate has an action item about this issue on the agenda of its March 25 meeting and that any action the Faculty Senate takes would be reported to President Lynch. The College Council members disbanded at 4:00 PM, after waiting unsuccessfully for 45 minutes for a quorum.

Honorary degree candidates for May 27 commencement

The awarding of honorary degrees to Clyde Collins Snow and Ephraim Isaac was approved by the Board of Trustees on March 22. The Board of Trustees also gave informal approval to the awarding of a degree to F.A.O. Schwarz, Jr., who has agreed to accept the degree on May 27 and whose name will be presented to the Board for formal approval. Nina Totenberg has also been informally approved but has not yet said whether she will be able to attend the May 27 event. If she responds affirmatively by April 16, her name will also be sent for formal Board approval.

March 16 University Faculty Senate meeting

Professor Picken, UFS chair, reported that the Board of Trustees March 15 public hearing was marked by a protest of about 100 students in opposition to the Report of the Chancellor's Advisory Committee. Five students spoke against the report, which was not on the agenda of the Board's March 22 meeting: they signed up to speak to the issue of the Chancellor's report, which is on the agenda of every meeting.

CUNY is seeking restoration of \$38.4 million to its budget in response to the Governor's executive budget proposal.

The fourth joint CUNY and public schools CPI conference was held March 12 at John Jay. The final session will be in June. University Dean Ron Berkman is meeting with the Council of Faculty Governance Leaders on March 26 to discuss CPI at the request of the Council.

Professor Picken met with Assemblyman Ed Sullivan, chair of the Higher Education Committee, who plans to hold a series of hearings on both CPI and the Chancellor's Advisory Committee Report. Assemblyman Sullivan will speak at the first UFS fall 1993 meeting in September.

The single action agenda item was a resolution on the Report of the Chancellor's Advisory Committee. The resolution was developed in the following way: the UFS executive committee held a hearing in January at which UFS delegates commented on the Report. A draft resolution and commentary was then developed by the executive committee based on that testimony and the UFS met as a committee of the whole in February to comment on the draft documents. Based on those comments, the documents were amended. In case the UFS needed additional meeting time, a special extra meeting was scheduled for the subsequent week.

The amended resolution and explanation, which calls on the Chancellor to put aside the recommendations contained in the Chancellor's Advisory Committee Report, was moved by Professor Sandi Cooper (CSI) on behalf of the Executive Committee of the UFS (a 120-member body). One person spoke against the resolution while also criticizing the Advisory Committee Report and the process. Three delegates spoke in support of the resolution. The question was called. The motion to call the question passed by unanimous vote. The resolution and commentary were approved with no negative votes and with five abstentions and, therefore, passed without dissent. [The text of the resolution and commentary are appended to the Minutes as Attachment C.]

The University Faculty Senate resolution and commentary are being transmitted to Chancellor Reynolds, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Richard Freeland, and to the Board of Trustees.

March 17 President's Cabinet

President Lynch reported about responses to the Chancellor's Advisory Committee Report to date and asked about other CUNY responses. Professor Kaplowitz reported that the previous night the University Faculty Senate approved a resolution, without dissent, calling upon the Chancellor to set aside the recommendations of the Advisory Committee Report.

It was reported that Baruch is now requiring the showing of ID cards for entrance to its buildings. The Human Dignity course will be given in Guatemala the following week and in Peru and Bolivia in the summer. Discussions are taking place about the suitability of the course for Turkey.

The previous week John Jay received its first allotment of freshman admissions and will receive a second allotment two weeks later. We are 140 students ahead of last year's first allotment. The commitment to keep a balance of 25 percent of freshmen admitted to the associate degree program and 75 percent to the baccalaureate program was reaffirmed.

Vice President Witherspoon announced that Student Council elections will be on May 5 and May 6 and that nominating petitions are being circulated and must be submitted by April 1. The petitions are available at Vice President Witherspoon's office from 9-5 and from Dean Smit's office from 5-9 PM. Vice President Witherspoon expressed his hope that faculty announce this in their classrooms. Vice

President Witherspoon also spoke about LEX and the funding of the student newspaper. He praised the work of Professor Blitz, the faculty advisor of LEX.

Dean McHugh reported that the Calendar Committee has met and that John Jay's planned 1993-94 academic calendar is due at 80th Street by the end of March. The proposed calendar has classes starting September 1 and exams ending before the winter break, with no Friday make-up classes. On-line registration will be tested in April at which time it will be decided whether it will be used in September. If the decision is to use it in September, the system will again be tested by using it for summer school registration. If there is on-line registration, registration will be spread over seven days. The development of computerized prerequisite checking is proceeding as scheduled.

External Relations Director Judith Bronfman reported about Roosevelt Hospital's wish to change the address of the hospital. It was agreed that the hospital would be asked to provide street lighting on 59 Street and on 10 Avenue.

The Police Cadet students will take the Human Dignity course during the week of April 5.

Board of Trustees March 22 meeting

Board Chairman James Murphy announced that Augusta Kappner, acting president of CCNY and president of BMCC, has been nominated by President Clinton to be assistant secretary of education for adult and vocational education. The search process for the CCNY president is nearing conclusion: the previous week 10 candidates were interviewed. Both the men's basketball team and the women's basketball team of Hunter College won the CUNY championships.

Chancellor Reynolds reported that Fall 1993 admission of freshmen applications is up 4.7 percent (mostly to the senior colleges). Those applicants represent a 14 percent increase in the number of applicants who have a high school average of 85 or higher and a 12 percent increase of applicants with a high school average of 80-85 percent. Unlike CUNY, the private colleges and SUNY show a decline in the number of

March 22 Board of Trustees meeting (cont)

applicants.

A detailed and lengthy slide presentation about student financial aid was given. (Details are available.) The Board approved a B.S. in biotechnology at York and an advanced certificate in bilingual education at Baruch. The Board approved the awarding of honorary degrees by John Jay to Clyde Collins Snow and to Ephraim Isaac.

Trustee William Howard spoke about the Board of Trustees public hearing the previous week and concerns expressed by students that the Chancellor's Advisory Committee Report is an attack on students of color.

Recommendation for amending proposed Charter amendment

In November the Faculty Senate proposed an amendment to the College's Charter with regard to the Judicial Committee so as to bring the Charter into conformity with the changes mandated at every campus by the Board of Trustees the previous year. At the February College Council meeting, the HEO representatives objected to the proposed amendment because at John Jay the Judicial Committee adjudicates not only student disciplinary charges but also challenges to membership on the College Council. The HEO representatives said that the revised Judicial Committee would not be sufficiently inclusive for the latter purpose. The Faculty Senate's proposed Charter amendment was tabled until the April Council meeting and a subcommittee of the College Council executive committee was formed to propose a solution. The Faculty Senate's executive committee has proposed the following solution which it transmitted to the faculty members on the Council's Executive Committee: instead of a single committee, there should be two committees, one that adjudicates student disciplinary charges and this should be named the Adjudication Committee (to avoid confusion with the student Judicial Board) and a second committee, to be called the Membership Committee, whose sole purpose would be to adjudicate written challenges to the legality of a person's membership on the College Council. The Membership Committee would be comprised of three faculty, elected by the Faculty Senate, two students chosen by a method determined by the students, and one HEO, chosen according to a method to be determined by the HEOs. No administrators would be on the committee because all administrators who serve on the College Council do so as statutory members: none is elected and therefore there would never be a challenge to any administrator's membership. The faculty members on the College Council executive committee subcommittee are: Ed Davenport, Tom Litwack, James Malone, Martin Wallenstein.

March 16 Council of Chairs

The Council of Chairs deliberated about the recommendations that a task force of chairs (and a representative of the Faculty Senate) have developed about the procedures and criteria used in the Personnel process. The recommendations will be presented to the College Personnel & Budget Committee and upon adoption will be distributed to the faculty.

The Calendar Committee proposal was reviewed. A motion to begin classes after Labor Day and to end classes before Christmas but to schedule final exams after Christmas failed by one vote. Therefore the Calendar Committee proposal was endorsed.

ATTACHMENT B

REPORT OF THE ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE OF THE JOHN JAY COLLEGE
FACULTY SENATE : MEETING WITH PROFESSOR TONY SIMPSON, EXECUTIVE
OFFICER, PHD PROGRAM IN CRIMINAL JUSTICE, FEBRUARY 8, 1993

ATTENDING: Professors Lotte Feinberg, John Kleinig, Tom Litwack,
Jim Malone, Pat O'Hara, Tony Simpson, and Chris Suggs

The meeting was called to provide the Senate with a basis for understanding the mechanisms through which the doctoral program in Criminal Justice is driven and the nature of the formal and informal relationships between the program and the College.

Professor Simpson provided the committee with a breakdown of current faculty and executive officer allocations for doctoral programs throughout the University, including those allocated to John Jay. These allocations change with enrollment and lag actual enrollment conditions somewhat. The College's allocations add up to **8.04** faculty FTEs and one executive officer FTE. The figure of 8.04 includes an allotment of **3.61** faculty FTEs for the Criminal Justice doctoral program. The executive officer's line and a line for an administrative assistant are not counted against the **8.04** total. The balance of the allocation is distributed for faculty serving other doctoral programs. These allocations are other than the 100 "lines" housed at the Graduate Center itself, none of which is held by John Jay faculty or is allocated to the doctoral program in Criminal Justice.

Using the **3.61** FTEs, Professor Simpson schedules 10 courses per semester. Some courses (one per semester on average) are taught by non-College faculty. Thus, on average, **18** courses (54 credits) or the equivalent of 2.5 FTEs are taught by John Jay faculty per year in the Criminal Justice doctoral program, leaving one **(1)** "line" of resource to be distributed somewhere within the College. Since, in fact, these allocations are framed as by name lines (e.g., Professor X is carried on a line at the Graduate School for accounting purposes, although she need not be, in fact, the faculty member teaching in the program) and thus the full salary of a named professor is "covered" by the Graduate School but not lost as an item in John Jay's budget, the College "profits" by an amount equal to the salary of a senior professor less the cost of adjunct replacements for the faculty member teaching in the program in any given year. This can amount to as much as \$51,000 (\$72,000-\$21,000).

It is not the case, however, Prof. Simpson reported to the committee, that the balance of one FTE in available funds or services is allotted to the program by the College, to whom the original allocation is distributed. Rather, that "line" or its equivalent in funds is managed by the College administration, not by the doctoral program, and is largely reallocated elsewhere .

Further discussion of the question of faculty participation and availability made clear that while the relationship between the program and the College is a "formal" one in only the most limited of senses, it is, in fact, reasonably close, perhaps symbiotic, in an informal sense. For example, the Provost has agreed to provide adjunct money to departments from which faculty are drawn for teaching service in the program, yet some departments still are very hesitant to allow faculty such leave. More participation will most likely depend on informal relationships within the College than on formal agreements.

No great increase is foreseen in the demand for faculty, since the program has plans for entrance requirements and academic "tightening" which, while raising the quality of participants, will in the short run probably tend to reduce to some extent the size of the student body. Nevertheless, much is needed in the way of support for the existing faculty and for the program itself, including "rewards" for committee work and mentoring that exist in other programs but which are unavailable here. Consequently, while the one line withheld by the College might not necessarily go to provide more faculty in any given semester, Professor Simpson argues that the resources it represents could and ought to be used to provide support and service that is now absent from the program.

Professor Simpson also pointed out that there is no formal relationship between the PhD and MA programs in criminal justice. For the most part, he observed, the thirty credits of the Master's degree program are not easily transferrable to the doctoral program. He fears that many, if not most, MA students do not know that, in general, Master's degree students are limited to 15 transferable credits, from John Jay or elsewhere. The question of the desirability of closer ties between the two programs is a complex one. The tenor of our discussion was that each served a different purpose and a different constituency and that current requirements for completing the Master's degree were not the same as those for entering the doctoral program. There also appeared to be political questions surrounding the issue, having to do in the main with the formal versus the informal status of the doctoral program within John Jay's administrative hierarchy.

It appeared by discussion's end that the Senate's functional interest was of necessity circumscribed by the fact that the real business of the program is carried on for the most part within the orbit of graduate school concerns and practices. Insofar as there are College issues associated with the program, we identified the following points for further discussion, given the will of the Senate:

- 1) How can the College help secure two lines in residence for the program at the Graduate Center?
- 2) How can the College begin to serve its own students through more effective direct recruitment to the doctoral program from the undergraduate programs?
- 3) How can the College provide sufficient support for faculty participating in the program?

The question of a full "pass-through" of 3.61 lines to the program may not be an issue that falls within the Senate's purview, although it might be of interest to the Senate to be able to account for the money available to the College from the Graduate School but not expended by the College on doctoral program staffing or support.

For the committee

Chris Suggs
Senator, English

**Resolution of the University Faculty Senate of The City University of New York on the
Report of the Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Academic Program Planning**

March 16, 1993

- Whereas: Chancellor W. AM Reynolds charged an Advisory Committee of presidents and Distinguished Professors with preparing a report which offers an academic planning blueprint for the University, and
- Whereas: The Committee's report recommends actions that, if adopted, would fundamentally reshape many of the colleges of the City University, and
- Whereas: Chancellor Reynolds has stated that the report is "...not a document to cut. It is not a document to save dollars" (UFS plenary session, December 8, 1992), it must therefore be evaluated on its academic merit, and
- Whereas: The report offers no academic vision for the University and no compelling rationale, academic or fiscal, for these particular recommendations, and
- Whereas: The report presupposes that the University is a fully integrated system when, in the absence of system-wide tenure, appointments, articulation, and academic infrastructure elements (such as registration and counseling), it demonstrably is not, and
- Whereas: The report enumerates the presumed advantages of system-wide academic planning while ignoring the clear disadvantages of centralization, and
- Whereas: The report relies on data that are insufficient to support the conclusions drawn with the result that its recommendations are arbitrary and capricious, and
- whereas: Access to a liberal arts curriculum, which has long been identified as the best lifetime preparation for the workplace, for opportunities for career advancement, and for citizenship, is diminished in the report's recommendations for growth in perceived direct-employment offerings, and
- Whereas: The adoption of the report's recommendations would have a disproportionately negative impact on selected institutions which serve primarily minority student bodies, and
- Whereas: The University Faculty Senate is on record as calling for greater cooperation and coordination in areas such as articulation and transfer of students, consortial research undertakings, and opportunities for international study, and
- Whereas: It is appropriate for a community of scholars to undertake academic program review and the faculties and governance structures at the colleges are thus empowered, and
- Whereas: With the exception of the Graduate School and University Center, the University

Resolution on the Report of the Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Academic Program Planning

has not fostered consortial arrangements including the sharing of faculty, now therefore be it

Resolved: That the UFS calls upon the Chancellor **to** set aside the specific recommendations included in **the** Report of the Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Academic Program Planning and **to** present only actions recommended **by** duly-constituted faculty governance organizations at the colleges, and **be** it further

Resolved: That the University recognize the academic planning and evaluation processes that now exist **at** the colleges and system wide and support those procedures, and be it further

Resolved: That the University foster the development of discipline-based University councils **as** a vehicle for providing **a** system-wide perspective **on** academic offerings, and **be** it further

Resolved: That opportunities for the collaboration of faculty among colleges **be** promoted **and** the issues of joint faculty appointments and sharing of faculty among colleges **be** studied in detail.

Adopted without dissent **by** the 208th Plenary Session

EXPLANATION

Introduction

The Report of the Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Academic Program Planning has opened a debate on the governance structure, purpose, and mission of the City University, its component colleges and their educational offerings, and the role of faculty in shaping curricula. Fundamental to this debate is the definition of the appropriate balance between the colleges and the chancellor in determining educational policy and academic support services. In participating in this debate, the University Faculty Senate is cognizant of its Bylaw responsibility "...for the formulation of policy relating to the academic status, role, rights, and freedoms of the faculty, university level educational and instructional matters, and research and scholarly activities of university-wide import. The powers and duties of the university faculty senate shall not extend to areas or interests which fall exclusively within the domain of the faculty councils of the constituent units of the university." (Section 8.14) We also acknowledge the Bylaw responsibility of the faculty of the colleges "...for the formulation of policy relating to... curriculum, awarding of college credit, granting of degrees." (Section 8.6)

In January, 1992, when the composition of the committee was announced, University Senators actively questioned its composition. In plenary session, University Senators suggested that the appointment of Distinguished Professors as representatives of the faculty to a committee largely concerned with undergraduate teaching at the disparate institutions composing CUNY did not appear designed to include those colleagues most familiar with academic offerings and governance procedures throughout the University. We believe that some of the defects of the report stem from the rejection of this counsel.

The second portion of the report contains specific recommendations affecting individual offerings at the colleges. Some of the recommendations are for new academic offerings while others call for consolidation or elimination of departments or programs. Most recommendations are directed at offerings in the four-year liberal arts colleges. As the University Senate, we offer no comment on any of the specific cases. The appropriate venue for discussion of these matters is the elected faculty governance body of the affected college(s). We note, also, that any recommendations from a college for the abolition, consolidation, or merger of existing departments must come before the Board of Trustees of the University through the Committee on Academic Policy, Program, and Research and be subject to the public hearing process.

The Report and its Recommendations

The recommendations contained in the report and the process used to derive those recommendations have received wide discussion, and all colleges are submitting detailed responses which critique the document. Among the major criticisms voiced by faculty throughout the University are:

- The report contains no academic vision of what a college education should be or a specific academic vision for the City University;
- The report offers no justification as to why the types of recommendations offered are needed at this time;

- The report takes no cognizance of the missions of the colleges and the fact that the academic offerings of the colleges derive from their missions;
- The report uncritically presumes the virtues of centralized systems and centralized academic planning without taking into account the histories of the individual colleges and the advantages to students and faculty of their academic independence;
- The report ignores the regular processes of academic planning that are undertaken at the colleges including, among others, accreditation and departmental reviews;
- The report, while undercutting college academic planning, advances no definition of the appropriate role for the Central Office;
- The report is reductionist in that it treats a college as the sum of its offerings;
- The report assumes the interchangeability of offerings from college to college and assumes that students and faculty can simply be moved from one to another;
- The report's recommendations, if implemented, would undercut the liberal arts mission of some of the senior colleges;
- The report fails to aggregate and assess the impact of all proposed actions on individual colleges and therefore does not acknowledge or defend the critical redefinitions of the missions of selected colleges that would flow from the recommendations;
- The report, in all too many cases, appears to deny opportunities for study in the liberal arts and sciences to minority students who would be tracked into increasingly vocational institutions;
- The report assumes that the colleges of the City University are physically proximate in a way which would permit easy movement by students and faculty;
- The report is silent on crucial issues concerning faculty, especially as regards tenure, joint appointments, mandated participation in programs at other institutions, etc.

While the report acknowledges some of these shortcomings, it in sum offers three rationales for its recommendations: they are based on data, they represent opportunities for improved access, and they support academic excellence. The University Faculty Senate believes that the recommendations, and the process used to derive them, fail on all three counts.

Use of "Data." The report presents "data" which are offered as a justification for the proposed recommendations. Yet at almost any level, the "data" are not real. Errors abound. For example, advanced instruction in foreign languages is often accomplished through tutorials rather than through scheduled classes. This is not recognized in the report. Another example: The contribution of the classics department to the Brooklyn College Core Curriculum is not listed as a departmental activity, yet every student at the college takes the course staffed by the department.

At another level, the question of which "data" should **be** used **arises**. Why such a short-term horizon? Why majors and graduates and not, for example, contributions to general education or grants and **contracts** received? Why not the scholarly reputation of the department? Why not the results of departmental or college reviews? Reliance on the number of majors, the number of sections offered, and the number of faculty represents the most **mechanical** analysis (if analysis is the appropriate term) of the quality or value of a department or program.

At another level, the "data" criteria utilized **are** simplistic. For example, the **report** conflates access for development of knowledge and thinking **skills** with **access** for superior achievement. While it is anticipated that a number of CUNY graduates will **become** leaders in their fields, Nobel Prize winners, and Distinguished Professors, it is understood that the overwhelming majority will attain a variety of levels of competence well short of such eminence. **Access** to the study of history, philosophy, literature, the **fine arts**, foreign languages, and the **natural** and behavioral sciences is for most of our students the cultural inheritance which enables them to find their **bearings** in a bewildering world and **to** make contact with **the** fullest range of human **experiences**. This cultural inheritance helps students make more informed decisions throughout their lives in their various capacities **as** citizens, producers, **parents**, consumers, creators, **etc.** **This** fundamental contribution of **liberal arts** education toward a functioning, democratic society is not appropriately analyzed by numbers alone. By conceiving of educating **students** who **take** **courses** for one or more semesters but do not complete degree requirements **as** a faulty **use** of resources, the report exposes its vision of colleges **as** primarily licensing institutions rather than **as** channels of culture.

The report admits that its own data may be arbitrary and even erroneous. It then ignores its own crucial admission and **proceeds** to propose a **series** of drastic transmutations of **the** colleges. This suggests that the authors of the report were perhaps less interested in a coherent and **serious** review process than in preparing the opening gesture for a University-wide **reallocation** of resources. While University decisionmakers may believe that they **can** decide academic policy issues **on** a "factual" or "data-supported" basis, this is an illusion. Ultimately an academic judgment must be made, and there is **no** substitute for the deliberative process of college academic review.

Improved Access. The report maintains that it is important for students to have **access** to programs but then proceeds to recommend that a great many offerings be consolidated. There is an obvious **lapse** in logic here. The difficulty is compounded by the reality that New York City is not a University community, a single town such **as** Amherst, New Haven, or New Brunswick, where access to courses at various locations **can be managed** by shuttle bus. Transportation in The City of New York is often unreliable and time consuming. **This** is critical since many of the report's recommendations **are** predicated on students being enrolled in courses in more than one college during the same semester. This is **a** far different circumstance **than** the student who, due to **a** particular interest, chooses a college in order to take a particular major **on** a full-time basis.

The very **use** of the word "**access**" in the report is unclear. It is often impossible **to** tell whether the "**access**" under discussion is to a program or is geographic. But **on** either **score**, the report fails to demonstrate that the proposed recommendations would contribute **to** the University's commitment to reasonable access.

In another way, too, the report has very troubling implications for **access**. For many of

our students, college is an opportunity to evaluate different interests and constantly review career choices. Students who after two years still do not know what they want to major in are to be prized, not punished. But the report clearly offers as a model the student who has a defined employment interest and follows that program through to completion. The report appears to discourage the idea that students might, after taking an introductory course, develop an interest and possibly wish to change major. After all, the advanced courses in that new area of interest might not be available at that college.

This possible lack of advanced courses in some of the liberal arts and sciences is especially troubling in light of the College Preparatory Initiative. If the CPI is successful, students should be coming to college with better preparation and with wider academic interests. Yet the report's recommendations could well narrow the range of courses available after the high schools have whetted students' appetites.

Contributing to Academic Excellence. Many of the report's recommendations, if adopted, would undercut the academic excellence and character of the colleges. For the most part, the recommended consolidations and eliminations are directed at traditional liberal arts and sciences departments. In fact, the report does not acknowledge the centrality of certain liberal arts disciplines to liberal arts colleges. The fact that a discipline has few majors does not mean there is no interest in the discipline nor that it fails to inspire students or that it is not critical to the cumculum of the institution. Nor are advanced courses in the liberal arts restricted only to majors in the field. We can point to numerous courses where the audience for advanced electives transcends declared majors.

Within the City University we do have experience with the impact of downgrading of liberal arts programs. When liberal arts majors were abolished at John Jay College, those departments lost the intellectual stimulation that comes from students and faculty participating in upper-division courses. Rather than contributing to academic excellence, such an initiative undercuts it.

The major guarantor of the excellence of the academic offerings of the City University is the quality of the faculty. Yet the report is distressingly silent on the anticipated or desired impacts of the recommendations on the faculty. While the report posits a greater flexibility of faculty appointment and has recommendations based on faculty being assigned teaching programs at more than one institution, the mechanics of how this is to be accomplished are not discussed. Under Alternative Recommendations (below) some specific ways in which this unaddressed agenda can be pursued are offered.

There is one clear way in which the report's recommendations would affect the faculty, and that impact can only be viewed as negative. The concept of limiting advanced courses in liberal arts and sciences departments would clearly work to diminish excellence. Recruiting for institutions where faculty are assured of spending their careers teaching only introductory courses is, at best, difficult. In the recruiting environment that we know will exist in the next ten years, we will need to offer superior opportunities for new faculty, not truncated versions of traditional academic programs. The University needs to be examining ways of insuring that faculty have opportunities for professional development, not undertaking actions which limit that development.

Alternative Recommendations

Given that we **are** unable to accept the basic premise of the report, is there anything that **can be** offered in support of the need for greater attention to academic planning in the University? The answer is an emphatic yes. In making the following recommendations, we **start** with **two** essential principles which undergird our proposals. First, faculty must **be the** primary group involved in academic planning. Second, in almost all **cases**, academic planning must **take** place at the college level. With these principles in mind, we offer the following recommendations.

We **accept** the report's position that the colleges **need to** develop new curricula in response to changes in the disciplines, changes in the student body, and changes in the needs of the city and state. We applaud the **stated** willingness of the chancellor **to** encourage new curricular offerings and to **seek** needed support.

The **report** recognizes the centrality of faculty to the academic planning process. It **realizes** that only **on the** campuses **can serious** programmatic planning occur. The Chancellor's panel should have concerned itself with ways to improve that process. We **have** **three** specific recommendations offered to support the academic planning process at the colleges and system wide.

- In **spring 1992**, the chancellor prepared a proposal which called on all colleges to engage in regular review of all academic programs. This review **entailed** **departmental** or program self study and external review (many colleges already **utilii** such reviews). **This** proposal **was** reviewed by standing committees of the University **Faculty** Senate which made a variety of recommendations for improvement. The proposal has not yet moved to the next level for possible approval and implementation. We **recommend** that the proposal **be** revived. The self study followed by external review **process** makes the **best use** of the knowledge of the faculty in the affected department and offers the best way for a department or program to place its activities in the context of **the** discipline and college, have that view critiqued **by an** external **team**, and have the college community then consider how the offering fits within the mission of the **institution** and determine what **resources** are needed **to** assure the ability of the department or program to meet the **stated** goals established for it by the college. All existing offerings of the colleges should **be** subject **to** this **type** of review on a regular basis.
- There is **an** important role for self study and external review in the evaluation of newly **adopted** programs. We believe that new offerings should not wait **ten** years for such review. Therefore, we propose that **all** new academic **majors** or programs approved by the college and University **be** subject to a 'sunset' provision which would **require** external review in **five years** from the **date** of implementation. Based on **the** results of that review, a recertification of the offering by the college cumcuh **committee** and the **appropriate** University committees would **be** called for in order for the major or program to continue. After this recertification, the major or program would fall **into the** normal college review cycle.
- New offerings in the process of development offer **the** greatest opportunity for system-wide consideration. Where we **can** anticipate the need for new cumcuh, such majors or programs might **be** targeted **to** appropriate colleges. We believe that **an appropriate** venue

for such discussions would **be** University-wide, discipline-based councils. Were such councils in place, they could then be **asked** to consider where new majors **or** programs need to **be** developed and where they might fit within the academic offerings of the University. **An** example of such a council that is already in existence is the council of the chairs of the foreign language departments. That council may **be** the best faculty body for considering where new language offerings will **be needed** and where the greatest potential for support lies. We recommend that the University **undertake** to encourage such councils by discipline and **ask** them to provide a University-wide perspective on the development of new academic offerings.

In thinking about the future programmatic needs of the University, **we** should recognize the powerful allure that incentives **can** provide. The Report offers one such incentive: **A** college that gives up a program gets to keep the resources. **Yet** there is no discussion of how offerings moved **to** a new campus will be funded at their new home. It is hard to imagine any college eagerly seeking to absorb programs and faculty without explicit **assurances** that the required funding will **be** forthcoming.

- We recommend that where a college agrees to accept a major or program **from** another institution, earmarked funding **be** provided **to** support that offering.
- Continuing along this same line, where a college is asked by a discipline council to consider adopting a new major or program, a commitment of **earmarked** funding on the **part** of the University administration must **be** a **part** of such discussions.
- Finally, there **are** models of inter-college cooperation that now exist such **as** the teacher education program involving Queensborough, LaGuardia, and Queens. We recommend that incentives and earmarked funding **be** provided where colleges choose to collaborate in offering joint or directly articulated programs.

We **also** concur with the report in its attempt to increase faculty development and provide additional opportunities for faculty advancement. There **are** many problems **to be** worked out before many of the report's recommendations could **be** implemented, but we encourage broad discussion of the issues.

- While the University does not have the advantages that would come from system-wide appointment and tenure, the creative deployment of the faculty **can** assist in meeting short-term programmatic **needs** throughout the system. We concur in the Report's call for greater **use** of faculty at different colleges where need **arises**. Faculty exchange for those colleagues already on staff holds great potential when the arrangement is made through the departments and with the full concurrence of the participants. Of even greater value long term would **be** joint faculty appointments which would allow colleges not now offering full majors at least the possibility of recruiting outstanding faculty. Such potential appointees could teach advanced **courses** at other colleges or have **access** to facilities that may not **be** available at a given institution. Given the complexity of the **issues** involved in faculty appointments and determining teaching programs, the University Faculty Senate calls for **an** in-depth study of questions of system-wide tenure, joint appointments, and the sharing of faculty among colleges.

- Departments are not the only opportunity that exist in the system for creative utilization of faculty. Centers and Institutes can be used to involve faculty in undertakings which go beyond a single campus, can provide access to equipment or resources not readily available in all colleges in the system, provide an unusual opportunity for the professional development of the faculty, and represent a way in which individual faculty can develop liaisons with colleges and colleagues in the system other than their own. We urge greater use of approved Centers and Institutes and that all new proposals for such structures include plans for involving greater numbers of faculty from other colleges in the system. This could be considered as one part of a new University commitment to the professional development of its greatest resource, its faculty. It could extend to a commitment to diverse teaching experiences for all faculty (e.g., faculty who teach service courses at special mission colleges should have the opportunity to teach advanced electives in their field and possibly graduate courses). A faculty which is engaged in a variety of activities at a variety of institutions over time is more likely to be of assistance in furthering the academic goals of the University in addition to supporting the department in which they are formally housed.

NOTES ON THE GOLDSTEIN REPORT

Many of the existing criticism of the Goldstein report fail to take account of its own caveats. The Committee makes it very clear that it is "**sensitive**" to many of the concerns that are so vehemently expressed in the formalized rejections of it (pp. 5ff). For that reason, I think they are going to be seen as assertions of political muscle rather than reasoned responses. What the Committee makes absolutely clear is that they are proposing a two level review, the first of which they have themselves undertaken. They indicate with reasonable clarity what they have and haven't taken into account. All of this is found in the Introduction. It is their view that most of the concerns that others have expressed are properly considered at the second level - a review process that takes place at a college and departmental level, as is indeed demanded by many of the subsequent responses to it. I see no problem with a review of the kind they have undertaken - even though I think it may have been misguided in important respects. Since it is simply proposing a second level review of a number of programs, I see no problem with there being what is essentially an external first level review. I think there is as much to be said for such reviews as there is for Middle States reviews: they force Colleges and programs to look at themselves when they would not otherwise do so. I do not see why that is not a good thing.

I will admit that there may be more sinister motivations behind the whole project, but I think that if that is so we do not frustrate them by rejecting the report out of hand.

Even so, I think there are some serious problems with what the Committee has undertaken and proposed.

- (1) The idea of a unified university system (**p. 3**) may be a very good one in theory. If one were constructing a university system from scratch, one might well keep some control over unnecessary or wasteful fragmentation. But it's another thing to try to unify an existing system - not just because it's politically difficult, but because the dislocation that may be brought about may well outweigh the supposed virtues of unification. It's like the dream of universal communism. If there is to be some move toward unification, the virtues of unification need much more argument than the Report provides.
- (2) The committee confuses short- and long-range perspectives. **As** it notes, the mandate was to respond to "the present budget exigencies" (p. 2). The committee, however, takes it that its task is to produce a plan for the 21st century (**p. 4**). Are we to presume that the present budget crunch will last for that long - that better times will never come? Alternatively, if the State's budgetary problems remain, are we to presume that CUNY shouldn't be pressing for and shouldn't/couldn't succeed in getting a larger piece of the cake? Further, unfortunately, a Report of this kind might be used by the State as a reason for not alleviating the present situation: why throw extra money at a system that

can make internal cuts?

- (3) In my view, although the Report takes off from the current budgetary crisis - as though that justified it - its major focus is on unification. Many of the initiatives it suggests -e.g. in the areas of telecommunications, university-wide computerized enrollment - are very expensive .
- (4) The major arguments for the widest possible dispersal of undergraduate majors are two:

(i) As Chris Suggs noted, many students don't have a strong idea what they want to major in until they have tried out various things; many don't pick their college on the basis of the majors it offers. To expect a student who, at Lehman, becomes sufficiently interested in philosophy to want to major in it, to transfer to, say, Hunter, might be quite unreasonable. Sometimes transfers are necessary, but, given the difficulties they are likely to cause students, we should minimize the need for that. John Jay, unlike some other Colleges, can manage its specialism in part because it is particularly well situated with regard to public transport.

(ii) I don't think that if, say, majors in philosophy are concentrated at Hunter, Brooklyn and Queens, the existing faculty will have to travel from College to College to fulfill their teaching requirements (as Orlanda suggested). Fewer adjuncts will be hired, and existing faculty will be kept fully occupied in their original colleges. The problem will be one of demoralization - the demoralization already experienced by many faculty in community colleges where they are fully occupied with service and/or core courses and no opportunity to teach anything that connects with or even furthers their own research interests. Just as there is already - unfortunately - a college caste system (how many community College faculty are there on the doctoral faculty?) a further caste system will be developed. Philosophers teaching at Colleges with majors in philosophy will be viewed more highly than those teaching at other colleges. Less compellingly, but not implausibly, there is something of a breach of contract involved: people come to colleges with certain expectations - sometimes promises - about what they'll be able to teach. Can we just ignore those implicit commitments? The demoralization in those places that lose faculty may well be deepened by the fact that it will be harder to get good faculty applicants in the future - unless of course one takes the cynical view that the future is going to be so bad that there will be lots of bright beggars out there. The committee tries to address this problem by talking about joint or visiting appointments. But as those who also teach in the doctoral programs at the Graduate Center know, it's not a good arrangement. You can't move offices very easily, and in one of the locations one functions as though one were an adjunct.

John Kleinig

Resolution of the John Jay Faculty Senate
on the Funding of Academic Programs

March 25, 1993

Whereas, the inequitable funding whereby CUNY allocates resources unfairly discriminates against John Jay and diminishes and undermines John Jay's ability to provide the education and academic support our students need and deserve, and

Whereas, If John Jay were funded equitably, John Jay would have an additional 100 lines and would receive an additional \$4 million a year (on an annual budget of \$27 million), and

Whereas, 49 percent of our course sections are taught by adjunct faculty and insufficient numbers of courses and insufficient numbers of sections are offered at the levels needed by our students, and

Whereas, there are insufficient faculty to provide adequate numbers of courses and of course sections for many of our academic degree programs, almost all of which are unique within the City University, and

Whereas, there are many additional programs and majors that are related to John Jay's unique mission that John Jay could offer if in addition to the resources needed to offer our current programs and majors we were to receive additional funding, therefore be it

Resolved, That the John Jay Faculty Senate calls upon the CUNY Chancellor and the Chancellory and the CUNY Board of Trustees to fund John Jay according to the resource allocation practices by which most of the senior colleges of CUNY are funded so that John Jay can maintain and improve the quality of its present academic programs and of its academic support services and also so that John Jay can develop such new programs as a baccalaureate and a master's in dispute resolution, a baccalaureate in forensic social work, a baccalaureate in criminal justice and the humanities, a baccalaureate in international criminal justice, a baccalaureate in legal translation in court interpretation, and an expanded ESL program, conditional on the affirmative action of the relevant academic departments and of the appropriate governance bodies of John Jay College of Criminal Justice.