

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES #89

John Jay College of Criminal Justice

April 13, 1993

Time 3:15 PM

Room 630 T

Present (32): Michael Blitz, James Bowen, Dorothy Bracey, Orlanda Brugnola, James Cohen, Edward Davenport, Peter DeForest, Migdalia DeJesus-Torres de Garcia, Vincent Del Castillo, Robert DeLucia, Lotte Feinberg, Robert Fletcher, Elisabeth Gitter, Lou Guinta, Dan Juda, Karen Kaplowitz, Lawrence Kobilinsky, Gavin Lewis, Tom Litwack, Barry Luby, James Malone, Rubie Malone, Jill Norgren, Pat O'Hara, Dagoberto Orrantia, Rick Richardson, Douglas Salane, Chris Suggo, Martin Wallenstein, Carl Wiedemann, Agnes Wieschenberg, Bessie Wright

Absent (7): Henry DeLuca, Jannette Domingo, Robert Grappone, Melinda Guttman, John Kleinig, John Pittman, Edward Shaughnessy

AGENDA

1. Announcements from the Chair
2. Approval of Minutes #88 of the March 25 meeting
3. Report on affirmative action
4. Second reading of a proposed amendment of the Faculty Senate Constitution
5. President Lynch's October 31 report to 80th Street about John Jay's response to the Report of the Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Academic Program Planning
6. Discussion of Curriculum Committee proposals to the College Council for changing the associate degree program and for eliminating an associate degree program
7. Discussion of the written report of the Middle States Site Visit and John Jay's response to the Middle States Commission
8. Report from the Senate's Adjunct Issues Committee
9. Smoking policies and practices and proposed mandatory showing/wearing of ID cards
10. Invited Guest: (Acting) Security Director Brian Murphy
11. Discussion of the April 14 College Council agenda

1. Announcements from the Chair [Attachment A]

The Senate was directed to written announcements [Attachment A]. A new member of the Senate was welcomed, Professor Barry Luby (Foreign Languages and Literature), serving as an at-large representative by virtue of last spring's election: he is replacing at-large representative Lydia Rosner, who is on leave.

2. Approval of Minutes #88 of the March 25 meeting

By a motion duly made and seconded, Minutes #88 of the March 25 meeting were approved.

3. Affirmative action report: Senator Cohen

Senator Cohen was asked to report on the information he ascertained on behalf of the Senate about affirmative action and the kinds and amount of support provided by the administration and the Affirmative Action Committee. Senator Cohen said that he spoke to Farris Forsythe, the Affirmative Action Officer, and to the Provost and that, having consulted with President Kaplowitz, he then asked a representative of each department that is conducting a search to ask his or her chair if sufficient support is being given for the search and what other kinds of support the department would like to receive in the future: both he and President Kaplowitz felt that information from only the administration and not from the department chairs as well would not be an inclusive and balanced report. Senator Cohen suggested that after he makes his report, the department representatives briefly report on what they learned from their chairs.

Senator Cohen reported that the membership of the College's Affirmative Action Committee includes two statutory members: Farris Forsythe and Diane Dwyer of the Personnel Office; George Eid is the co-chair; the other members are Professors Frederik Rusch (English), Olga Scarpetta (Sociology) [who died on December 8 and has not been replaced], Mary Stanulis (Science), Tom Fisher (SEEK); Jacob Marini; Elsa Evans (the non-instructional staff representative); and students Jeffrey Cilione and David Hadley (chosen by the Student Council). Senator Cohen said that he had a long telephone conversation with Ms. Forsythe who explained that she meets with each department P&B that has a line to fill: she attempts to go with one or two other members of the Affirmative Action Committee to the department P&B or to entire department meetings.

Ms. Forsythe assesses each department's compliance with affirmative action guidelines, using utilization review data that have been developed to provide a set of standards: she compares the composition of faculties within any given department to the composition of available faculty in that geographic area as well as nationally; the geographic and national data determine whether the department has too few or enough or more than enough faculty members from any given racial and ethnic groups. Explaining that he saw her data when Ms. Forsythe came to the Public Management Department, Senator Cohen said that utilization review data are available to faculty of each department.

If department compliance is not adequate or if Ms. Forsythe determines there has not been sufficient outreach, the search is reopened or she requires that the search be reopened in order to get adequate outreach in terms of the pool of candidates. Senator Cohen said that neither Ms. Forsythe nor the Affirmative Action Committee provides much technical assistance to departments in terms of recruitment.

At the end of the process of meeting with all the departments, a report is filed with the Central Office at 80th Street. This is done not only for the faculty but for all

categories of personnel employed by the College. Senator Cohen distributed data provided by Ms. Forsythe that show that as of 1991, out of 235 full-time faculty, 34% are women, and 21.3% are in underrepresented groups. Most of the faculty at John Jay who are members of underrepresented groups are from three departments: African-American Studies, Puerto Rican Studies, and SEEK.

Provost Wilson advertised the faculty lines for which searches are being conducted in four publications: "The Chronicle of Higher Education," "The New York Times Week in Review," "Black Issues in Higher Education," and "Hispanic Outlook in Higher Education." As is true in other areas, Senator Cohen reported, the faculty and others in the College have done a lot of work in this area: work has been done by members of the Affirmative Action Committee and by others and numerous positive initiatives have been proposed over the years which for one reason or another have not got off the ground but, he added, he is presenting only a surface study.

Some of the proposals were developed by Ms. Forsythe, by Professor Rusch, and by Jay Sexter when he was Provost. These include the following: that there be College-wide searches as well as departmental searches so that the College as an organizational unit can take more of an initiative to locate potential candidates: that departments share information with each other both about sources of information and about actual candidates: this year, for example, there are candidates for the Public Management line who have also submitted their vita to the Government Department and to the Law and Police Science Department but that was really the result of serendipity, he explained, and not through organized sharing of information; there is an old proposal that the College establish a target date, a goal, some five years in the future, to achieve a certain number of hirings of members of underrepresented groups.

Two major initiatives that have been proposed are to have a faculty exchange program with traditionally black and Latino colleges, as a way to build ties, build recruitment bases, do networking, all the kinds of spinoffs that could result. The second, which was proposed by Jay Sexter, was the establishment of a minority fellowship for ABDs who would not teach a full load, they would teach six credits a semester, but would receive a salary in the low assistant professor range, and they would be mentored and supported in their teaching: upon completing their doctorate they would be assured of a tenure-track position but in return would have to commit themselves to spend at least a year or two teaching at the College. President Kaplowitz suggested that the second half of the report, the assessments and suggestions of the department chairs, be given at the next Senate meeting because of the press of time. Senator Cohen concurred.

4. Second reading of proposed amendment of the Faculty Senate Constitution [Attachment B]

The proposed amendment calls for adding two at-large officers to the Senate's Executive Committee so that the Executive Committee would have six members. The amendment was approved by unanimous vote. As the result of this affirmative vote of at least two-thirds of the Senators present and voting at the second reading, the amendment to the Senate Constitution was adopted [Attachment B] .

5. President Lynch's October 31 report to 80th Street about John Jay's response to the Report of the Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Academic Program Planning

The president of each College was required to respond to the Report of the Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Academic Program Planning by March 31, in the form of a report to Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Richard Freeland, as to the process and decisions of the College. President Kaplowitz noted that she wrote to President Lynch reporting the Faculty Senate's two resolutions, the resolution about the funding of John Jay's current and potential academic programs and the adoption and endorsement of the University Faculty Senate resolution, for his information and for inclusion in the required report. Not having received a copy of President Lynch's report, she said that, as agreed to at the previous Senate meeting, she also sent the documents to Vice Chancellor Freeland.

President Kaplowitz explained that this agenda item was to be a discussion of President Lynch's report on behalf of the College but since we do not have his report we obviously cannot discuss it. She noted that President Lynch had been out of the country and had just returned and that his staff had said that they could not locate the document but that President Lynch would be back at the campus at 3 PM. She said she would follow up on this and that a discussion of the President's report would be on the next Senate agenda.

Senator Litwack suggested that if we do not get a copy of the President's report today, since this item is also on the agenda of the next day's College Council meeting for discussion, a motion should be made to move the item from the end of the Council agenda to the beginning of new business. President Kaplowitz supported this suggestion and noted that it was Senator Litwack who had been instrumental in putting this on the College Council agenda, as a member of the Council's executive committee, and that the executive committee had supported the addition of this item.

[Ed. During the course of the Senate meeting, a member of President Lynch's staff arrived with a copy of the 17-page document in question, which she gave to President Kaplowitz.]

6. Discussion of Curriculum Committee proposals to the College Council for changing the associate degree program and for eliminating an associate degree program [Attachments C & D]

The Senate was referred to two agenda attachments: one, a February 22, 1993, document from the Department of Public Management in response to the recommendation in the Report of the Chancellor's Advisory Committee to eliminate the associate degree in government and public administration at John Jay and transfer it to Medgar Evers [Attachment C]; and two, the Curriculum Committee's recommendations to the College Council about the associate degree program, including a recommendation that the associate degree programs in police science, corrections, and security management be retained but that the associate degree in government and public administration be eliminated [Attachment D].

The associate degree in government and public administration is the joint responsibility of two departments: the Department of

Government and the Department of Public Management. Both departments voted on the recommendation in the Advisory Report: the Government Department unanimously voted to eliminate the program but the Department of Public Management took a different position, which the department representatives were invited to explain as was Professor Ned Benton, chair of the Department of Public Management.

Senator Feinberg, a member of the Department of Public Management, drew the Senate's attention to item #4 of the Public Management Department's document [Attachment C], which reported to the Curriculum committee the Department's determination that the program should be "discontinued in its current form" but (and she added that this is a large and an important caveat) that "further review is necessary to determine whether the program should be terminated altogether or whether it should be revised and refocused consistent with a CUNY-wide strategy for associate degree programs related to public service."

Senator Feinberg explained that it was the thinking of her department that further study of the program and the implications of terminating it is needed in light of several facts: there is a large number of students who sign up for this degree, some place between the high 400s and the low 500s; and uniform service police students need two years of college to qualify for promotion to sergeant and, although many in-service students major in law and police science, many are interested in public administration. So that simply eliminating the program would be potentially harmful to those students. And therefore, she explained, her department was hoping to do an assessment to see what the legitimate needs of the students are and what would be appropriate courses for a two-year degree as opposed to a baccalaureate degree.

Senator Suggs asked how many of those degrees have been granted. Senator Feinberg said that one of the problems is that there is very little information about associate degree students: who they are, what they do, what their academic needs and interests are. She said that it may turn out that the program should be eliminated but she said until we study the possible consequences of such an action we should not take it.

Senator O'Hara, also a member of the Department of Public Management, said that a lot of the concerns that came out of the New Programs subcommittee of the Curriculum Committee (which was charged with studying the associate degree programs and making recommendations) about all the associate degree programs, such as the difficulty of determining and tracking the number of people who graduate, the difficulty of determining how many switch over to baccalaureate degrees, are the same issues that apply to the associate in government and public administration.

Senator O'Hara said that the Curriculum Committee had got out ahead of where the Department of Public Management was on this issue. He explained that he had informed the New Programs subcommittee of the Curriculum Committee that the Department of Public Management, of which he is a member, is certainly dissatisfied with the associate degree program as it is presently constituted and thinks that it is worthy of review. But the faculty of the Public Management Department clearly does not want to throw the baby out with the bath water, as the document that Senator Feinberg read makes clear. He said that the Department stands by Item #4 of its resolution and does not stand by the recommendation of the Curriculum Committee.

Professor Ned Benton said that another consideration involves thinking of this issue in a CUNY-wide perspective. He explained that each of his Department's programs has attempted to reach out to other CUNY campuses to improve the diversity, the depth, and the richness of the offerings that are available to our students. At the master's level several agreements have been reached with Hunter whereby students at both colleges can take concentrations at either college. Now this is also being developed with Baruch.

Professor Benton said that the range of associate degree programs at CUNY is another issue. There are three CUNY associate degree programs in public administration: at Hostos, Medgar Evers, and John Jay. The program at Hostos is oriented toward medical and office management: at Medgar Evers it is a business program with a public sector concentration (as is Baruch's baccalaureate program): John Jay's is a very operationally oriented public management program. The distinction is that for students interested in a business orientation, with a link to Baruch, then the Medgar Evers program is for them: students interested in an office and health oriented focus should attend Hostos: if, on the other hand, students are interested in operational management (where people do things such as sanitation, transportation, the whole range of uniform agencies, housing), then our associate program has that: we have courses in productivity, operations management, etc. Professor Benton said that when we look at it in a CUNY-wide perspective, there may be a role for our program and it may serve students in CUNY, consistent with the collaborative spirit of the Chancellor's Advisory Report.

Senator Del Castillo said that it may be that adults just entering college may find the associate degree program a short-term achievable goal and if once in the college they decide to go on for a baccalaureate degree program, that should not work against the program and, if anything, it should be in its favor.

Senator Gitter said she is confused and asked whether these arguments had been made to the Curriculum Committee and if they were made were they not persuasive or were they not made because the Curriculum Committee moved too quickly? She said that the Senate need not get into the details of the merits of the proposal but rather we should understand the process.

Professor Benton said that it is clearly stated in the Department of Public Management's resolution, passed on February 22, that the Department's faculty are unanimously dissatisfied with the program as it exists but that the faculty feel that more study is needed before any change is made. Senator Gitter asked whether this argument was made at the Curriculum Committee.

President Kaplowitz said that she had also been confused and that she had, therefore, reviewed the minutes of the Curriculum Committee and although the minutes are very detailed, they report only actions and, therefore, it is not possible to ascertain the arguments made for or against a motion. But the minutes did reveal (in the attendance list) that the representative of the Public Management Department was absent from that particular Curriculum Committee meeting. She said that in light of all the concerns that had been conveyed to her and her own concerns about the matter, she had spoken with the two chairs, Professor Harold Sullivan and Professor Benton. In addition she and Professor Bohigian consulted with each other and Professor Bohigian spoke with Professor Benton. She said that she then consulted with Provost Wilson who yesterday said that in light of the concerns

raised, he would support a motion at tomorrow's College Council meeting to send the recommendation to eliminate the associate degree in government and public administration to a task force comprised of members of both departments. She said that she then spoke again with the chairs of the two departments, who both expressed their preference to have the issue sent back to their two departments for further study and then, based on what each department decides, a taskforce can be convened, if necessary, to recommend a way of implementing the two departments' decisions and this recommendation would ultimately be transmitted to the Curriculum Committee and then to the College Council.

It was agreed that the faculty members on the College Council would support a motion at the next day's College Council to send the issue back to the two departments.

The other recommendations of the Curriculum Committee with regard to the associate degree program [Attachment D] were then discussed. Senator Suggs said he is sympathetic to the problems of departments responsible for associate degree programs but every year he gets more confused because the rhetoric moves us into the realm of mythology because we never get any hard and fast figures. Everyone claims that the associate degree programs are useful but no one ever seems to graduate from them. What is problematic, he said, is that no one wants to give up programs for which they have been historically responsible. We take in 500 students and grant three degrees. He asked Senator Bracey whether in the research she did as chair of the Faculty Senate/Council of Chairs Joint Ad Hoc Committee on the Associate Degree she was able to determine why it is so difficult to track the data for all this.

Senator Bracey said that it is not that it is difficult to do, it is just that it is not done. She explained that there is nothing that tags a student as an associate degree student, or nothing that did, and therefore no information about them was attainable.

Senator Gitter said that we are talking about a world that has already changed: we have already changed the admissions criteria, and we are in the process of making other changes which is what the Curriculum Committee document contains. She said we have agreed to send the specific recommendation about the government and public administration program back to the two departments and the Curriculum Committee is recommending improving the other associate programs and she said that we should support these recommendations. Senator Bracey agreed.

Professor Bohigian said that he and President Kaplowitz had had several extended conversations about the associate degree program in government and public administration. He said that they had put a lot of energy into this issue and he is pleased to see it progress so smoothly. The previous day he wrote to the two departments [he distributed copies of his memorandum] because he was very concerned that the recommendation in the Report of the Chancellor's committee, which he said he calls the Chancellor's consolidation report, was being treated as an issue relevant only to the two departments and not as a College-wide issue with College-wide implications. The number of students in the John Jay program in 1991 was 556 and the number at Medgar Evers, the proposed beneficiary college, was only 77. He said that the 556 students in our associate degree program are taking courses in every one of our other disciplines and, therefore, this is a issue for the entire College.

Professor Bohigian pointed out that the State has been playing around with the funding of our associate degree programs and if we eliminate one such program this would play directly into the State's hands. He added it is extremely naive to think that a senior college, upon dropping an associate degree program, would win State approval of a new associate degree program: the way to go is to revise the program internally and do it operationally. He said that approximately half or more of the students in the program are in-service students, according to Senator Feinberg's data, and this is also an important consideration. He said he respects senator Suggs' arguments and would agree with him if this were a University where all decisions were handled strictly on an academic basis with no other considerations. But, he said, unfortunately throughout the country and particularly in New York State, things are decided politically and, without any other clout, it is a numbers game. It is, unfortunately, not just an academic issue. He said that he would be very hesitant to give up the associate degree programs, no matter how poorly they are constituted. He added that to his knowledge from the University Faculty Senate and from the PSC, and he said that he believes President Kaplowitz will confirm this, no other CUNY college is conforming in any way to the recommendations in the Chancellor's Advisory Committee Report. He said that if we want to please the Chancellor there are other ways than supporting recommendations in the Advisory Committee Report: for example, Professor Benton is working on an articulation program with Hostos and with Medgar Evers to improve our program and this is in keeping with the Chancellor's wish to improve articulation between the senior and community colleges.

Senator Norgren said that in response to Senator Suggs' assertion that no one is ever willing to give up a program, she would like to state that her department, Government, had a meeting to discuss the recommendation in the Chancellor's Report and voted to eliminate the associate degree in government and public administration. She said that her department had not explored some of the issues and implications that Senator Feinberg has wisely raised here today and, therefore, perhaps her department was not wise to take the position it did take. But the action of her department does suggest that there is a willingness to close programs and what does seem to be clear is that we do not have the information to make informed decisions. She said the larger questions involve really the role of the associate degree programs here, the funding of those programs, and what that means for the College. She said today's discussion is important because it has been a discussion about the relation between a department's decision and how that decision could effect the larger College community. She said that all that being true, it is also true that her department had been willing to close a program.

Senator O'Hara said that aside from the recommendation of the Curriculum Committee to end the associate degree in government and public administration, the other recommendations of the Curriculum Committee are really to make the associate degree students more identifiable, more accountable, more verifiable and, therefore, are very good recommendations. He added that he would like to thank his colleagues: a lot of people did react positively to the recommendation to eliminate the program and reacted in the absence, as he has just learned now, of his department's representative on the Curriculum Committee. He said that as a faculty member of the Public Management Department, he and his colleagues are very appreciative to all our colleagues who alerted us to the implications of taking action without further study.

Professor Bohigian said that President Kaplowitz should be especially thanked because she provided a lot of the information that went into the memorandum he wrote to the two departments.

President Kaplowitz thanked Professor Bohigian for coming to today's meeting to participate in this discussion and thanked him also for his memorandum. She pointed out that one of the things that this issue demonstrates is that it is crucial to have sufficient time to consult with one's colleagues between the time of receiving a College Council agenda and having to cast a vote. She said that because we did not get to this item at the College Council's March 11 meeting, there has been time to consult and to consider the issue, which had been forwarded by the Curriculum Committee on March 5, only six days before the Council meeting.

She said that Senator Suggs' suggestion in December that all College Council agenda items about academic issues should be required to receive two readings before a vote (the way a Charter amendment must) gains great support from this experience in that two readings would have ensured time to consult. She suggested that the Senate propose this as a Charter amendment next year. The Senate concurred. She also noted that at the following day's College Council, an agenda item is the approval of next year's calendar of meetings: the executive committee dates (for setting the agenda) would mean that members would receive the agenda only a day or two before each Council meeting. Thus the proposed calendar of meetings should be amended because otherwise once again there would not be time for consultation or discussion.

Senator Suggs said he wanted to call our attention to Item #2 of the Curriculum Committee document [Attachment D]. He asked whether the Academic Standards Committee has the power to make decisions about students transferring from the associate to the baccalaureate program. He said he understands that the CUNY Bylaws give the faculty the right to make such academic decisions but that it was his understanding that the Registrar had until now always made decisions regarding the qualifications for transfer. President Kaplowitz said that this recommendation is for the purpose of returning this academic responsibility to the faculty. She noted that several administrators sit on the Academic Standards Committee, namely Dean Faber, Dean McHugh, and VP Witherspoon, but that in addition there are 22 faculty (and several students) and so the vast majority of members are faculty. Senator Suggs asked whether the Academic Standards Committee is the correct committee.

Senator Suggs also asked about Item #7, having to do with the College Preparatory Initiative (CPI). President Kaplowitz explained that the Board of Trustees has approved a resolution which states that students may not transfer from a community college to a senior college unless they have taken all English CPI units and at least one mathematics CPI unit and that starting in 1996, such transfers will be permitted only for students who have completed all English and mathematics CPI units. She said that we should add this at the College Council so that the Council's document reflects this Board policy. Senator Suggs asked whether the Middle States site visit report speaks to the issue of associate degree programs and specifically whether the team's report recommends that the associate degrees be terminal degrees. President Kaplowitz suggested that this could best be addressed by going on to the next agenda item and, if it is wished, returning to the current item. This was agreed to.

7. Discussion of the written report of the Middle States Site Visit and John Jay's response to the Middle States Commission

On March 3, the Middle States visiting team gave an oral report of its findings, which was taped by the College although the chair of the visiting team, Dr. Ronald Watts, said that the final report might be different from the oral report and that the oral report was, therefore, not to be considered the final version. Both President Lynch and Dean Rothlein asked that no transcripts be made of the oral report and this request was honored by the Senate's officers.

On March 29, at a meeting of the Senate's executive officers with President Lynch and the vice presidents, President Lynch noted that the site visit report had arrived and that it was to be returned to Dr. Watts, the team chair, with corrections of any errors of fact, errors of ambiguity, or unnecessary abrasiveness. Asked for a copy of the report, President Lynch explained that it is his understanding that he is not permitted to show the draft report to anyone, although he did say that he had shown it to Dean Rothlein and to Provost Wilson. President Kaplowitz said that she had understood the procedures and policy of Middle States to be somewhat different, and wanting to check the accuracy or inaccuracy of her understanding, she called Middle States and was told that there is no restriction upon the President: he may show the draft version of the report to whomever he wishes or he may show it to no one: it is solely within the President's discretion. The corrections, if any, are not to be sent to the Middle States Commission but rather to the chair of the visiting team. Upon receiving suggested changes, the chair of the team prepares the final version of the report, which he then sends to both the Middle States Commission and to the President of the College.

After receiving this final, corrected version, the College has two weeks to send an institutional response about the site visit report and about any substantive issues raised in the report and this institutional response is to be sent directly to the Middle States Commission. President Kaplowitz said that on April 2, when she learned that the corrected, final, report had arrived at the College and that the institutional response is due April 14, she called Dean Rothlein (President Lynch was out of town) and asked for copies of the report for the Faculty Senate, explaining that the Senate is scheduled to meet on April 13 and would devote part of its meeting to helping develop the institutional response. Dean Rothlein explained that although the report had been sent to the print shop it had not yet been duplicated and she offered, in the meantime, to provide copies of the report to President Kaplowitz as well as to Professor Crozier and Professor Goddard.

On Friday, April 9, Dean Rothlein called to explain that 500 copies were being printed for the entire College community but were not yet ready and that, furthermore, it had been decided that everyone would receive the report at the same time, with no one to receive a copy before anyone else. When President Kaplowitz noted that copies of the report are needed so that the institutional response could be written, and that upon receiving a copy she would make copies for the Faculty Senate in time for the Senate's April 13 meeting, Dean Rothlein said that unfortunately she doubted that the 500 copies of the report would be printed by the time of the Senate's April 13 meeting and she further explained that President Lynch had decided to write the institutional response on behalf of the College and that he planned to thank the Middle States Commission, to praise the visiting team, to praise

the report, and to express the College's resolve to improve.

President Kaplowitz said that, again, her understanding of the Middle States procedures and policy was somewhat different from what was being described. To check the accuracy or inaccuracy of her understanding, she called the Middle States Commission, on Friday, April 9, and the Commission faxed her a document that states that the institutional response is not to be a presidential response but rather is to "involve as wide a constituency as possible."

President Kaplowitz read from the 1990 document, entitled "Collegiality and Public Communication in the Accrediting Process," which she was faxed on April 9, in which the Middle States Commission articulates its procedures and policy:

"Institutional Response to Visiting Team Reports: The self-study process is based on collegiality, which makes possible the honest institutional self-appraisal that leads to improvement. The institutional response to the team report is an integral part of this process. Just as constituent groups should receive copies of the team report, so too should they receive or have access to the formal institutional response. In addition, the institutional response should not be construed as a 'Presidential Response,' the sole product of the president and senior administrators. Reacting to the team report and helping to frame the response is, in fact, a further extension of the self-study/evaluation process and should involve as wide a constituency as possible, especially those who participated in producing the self-study."

President Kaplowitz explained that as soon as she received and read the fax of the four-page Middle States Commission document, she called Dean Rothlein's office and left a message and has left additional messages since then, but unfortunately Dean Rothlein has not yet called.

President Kaplowitz also read from a Middle States (draft) document called "The Middle States Design for Excellence Handbook for Institutional Self-Study," which she received two years earlier from Dean Rothlein when the self-study process at John Jay began: "Institutional Response and Commission Action: The chair of the visiting team will submit the team's evaluation report to the institution for fact finding soon after the visit. The final version will then be sent to the president of the institution's administration for distribution to faculty, students, and staff and to the Middle States Commission Office as well. The institution should respond by sending a brief letter to the Commission acknowledging receipt of the report and responding to any part of the document or process it chooses. This response becomes part of the official record and is submitted with the evaluation team's report to the Commission which decides upon the accreditation. Institutions are apprised of the accreditation outcome by means of an action letter which should be made widely available to faculty, students, and staff."

Thus, when the Commission votes in June, the vote will be on the basis of not only our self-study and the team visit report but also on our institutional response to the report.

Noting that neither she nor anyone else on the faculty has seen the written report which, almost two weeks later, is still being photocopied, President Kaplowitz added that Professor T. Kenneth Moran, the chairs' representative on the Middle States Steering Committee, has not yet seen the report either. Professor Moran has offered to come to today's Senate meeting if we wish, he is in his office and available, but he also said that she could quote him as saying that it would be unfortunate if this dialogue were to stop at the very end of the process and that, furthermore, doing so would violate everything he had been assured and would violate everything that he knows Middle States represents.

President Kaplowitz said that the course of action being proposed by the Faculty Senate's Executive Committee, subject to endorsement by the Senate, is to ask President Lynch to request that the Middle States Commission grant an extension of the April 14 deadline for the institutional response, in light of the fact that we have been on Spring break from April 2 through April 11. If he has already sent a response, we would ask him to write to the Middle States Commission saying that there will be a second response from the faculty and that absent that the Senate, perhaps in conjunction with the Council of Chairs, will send a response nonetheless. (President Kaplowitz said that she consulted with Professor Crozier today, as did Professor Moran, and that the two support this course of action.) She said we may agree with the President's response completely, and most probably will, but we do not know whether we do because we have not yet read the report.

President Kaplowitz said that this is why she cannot answer Senator Suggs' question about what the team said about the associate degree program, although she did transcribe that part of the oral report because of this agenda item and she asked whether she should read her transcription. Senator Guinta advised against doing so, saying that we really need to see the final, corrected, version of the report because anything else is not authentic. The Senate concurred.

Senator Norgren supported the proposed course of action but opposed our suggesting that the reason an extension should be given is because we had been on Spring break. She said it somehow suggests we are at fault. There were a number of ways we could have gotten copies. She said that undoubtedly President Kaplowitz would have gotten copies to the Senate members if she had been provided with them or she would have provided advice to the administration about the best way of getting copies to the Senate. Senator Norgren said that President Lynch should be asked to request an extension because the College community has not yet read the report.

Senator Litwack said if President Lynch does not convey this request to Middle States, we should write to Middle States to report that President Lynch's response is not the institutional response because we have simply not yet seen the report. The Senate concurred, without dissent, on this course of action.

6. Discussion of Curriculum Committee proposals to the Collegen Council for changing the associate degree program and for eliminating an associate degree program [continued from p. 9]

Senator Suggs said the we are at a historic moment in the

life of the college and after this moment we may no longer have a chance to rationalize what is a historical anomaly: the presence of associate degree programs on a senior college campus. He said that, except for the fear of loss of lines, there seems not to be any cogent argument for the associate degree programs. He said that to move associate degree programs to colleges that are designed to have them is not to deny students access and is not to vitiate programs. He suggested that we should not be making decisions about the associate degree program until we see what the Middle States visiting team's recommendations are.

Senator Richardson said that we seem to treat this as if there are substantive differences between the associate degree and the baccalaureate programs. For the students, there is no real difference. We do not offer specific courses for one program as opposed to the other. The only difference is that for entering students the associate degree program may seem more attainable.

President Kaplowitz recommended that we move on from discussing the associate degree program, but Senator Litwack noted that this important issue will be coming up for a vote tomorrow at the College Council and so it is important to discuss it now. Senator Gitter noted that there had been widely advertised College-wide hearings at which everyone had had a chance to speak.

Senator Norgren asked if it is not true that the core requirements for the associate degree are different from those for the baccalaureate degree and, therefore, it is not a case of starting in one program and continuing in the other. Senator O'Hara agreed. He also said that all the recommendations from the Curriculum Committee are general principles which the Curriculum Committee and other committees and departments are to study next fall: none of the recommendations (except for the one about eliminating the associate in government and public administration) is a proposal for changes of policy or curriculum changes. The document simply describes the next step in the process of studying the associate degree program with the goal of improving it but any proposals for improvements will have to be voted on later.

Senator DeLucia said he applauds the new position of the Department of Public Management. He said he really feels for students coming out of high school. They want to work in the criminal justice system, not necessarily in the uniform services. They think of police, corrections, and security as uniform law enforcement work. For them, the government and public management program is very appealing. Also there are a number of students who want the bachelor's degree but do not have the necessary high school average and so high school counselors recommend that they apply for the associate degree. But he said that for many students there is a stigma attached to the associate degree. He said that the first thing he is asked by students is how they can get into the baccalaureate program because they understand that the associate degree does not lead to jobs. Because there is no formal mechanism, the students simply act as baccalaureate students and take the courses needed for a baccalaureate degree.

8. Report from the Senate's Adjunct Issues Committee: Senator Richardson [Attachment E]

Senator Richardson said that this is the first attempt to study our adjunct faculty. He characterized the 38 percent

response rate to the survey conducted by the Senate as quite respectable.

It was suggested that data from the Provost's Office be included in the report to provide a portrait of the adjunct population so that the portrait of the survey respondents could be compared to this.

Among the recommendations of the Senate's Adjunct Issues Committee, based on the results of the survey, is that the Council of Chairs be asked to devote a meeting to the issues delineated in the report. It was asked whether it is the place of the Senate to make such a request. Senator Norgren said that she knows that the Chairs already discuss adjunct issues on a regular basis. She pointed out that the chairs are our elected representatives and that it is appropriate to convey not only information but also requests to those we have elected.

Senator Gitter moved that we adopt the report for distribution, including the recommendations, with the changes suggested, and this was approved. Senator Richardson acknowledged the work of the members of his committee: Senators Orlanda Brugnola, Robert DeLucia, Robert Grappone, Jill Norgren, and the late Olga Scarpetta [Attachment E].

9. Smoking policies and practices and proposed mandatory showing/wearing of ID cards

Because Security Director Brian Murphy had already arrived, this item was only briefly noted. A letter from Professor Timothy Stroup had been appended to the agenda: in his letter to President Lynch, which was cc'd to President Kaplowitz, Professor Stroup asked that the NYC smoking regulations, which are currently being violated by the College, be enforced. President Lynch has asked the Senate's Executive Committee to ask the Senate whether John Jay should become a smoke-free College and whether the wearing and showing of a John Jay ID card should be mandatory. He is also asking the Student Council's opinion. It was agreed that both issues would be placed on the next Senate agenda.

10. Invited Guest: (Acting) Security Director Brian Murphy

(Acting) Security Director Brian Murphy was welcomed. Senator Orrantia asked Mr. Murphy why the locks in North Hall had not been repaired in the three years since the last building takeover. He noted that the office of his chairperson (Foreign Languages and Literature) was broken into three days earlier, on Friday, April 9. Mr. Murphy said the problem is money. He said that he had submitted a request immediately after the takeover for money to repair the 750 locks damaged in North Hall, but he was told that the \$35,000 necessary for this repair was not available. He said that the locks should be replaced because of wear and tear, entirely separate from the glue that was put in them. As for the office of the Foreign Languages Department chair, the person who broke into the office evidently had the key to the office, which brings up issues of key control.

Mr. Murphy said that he has to have the cooperation of the department chairs: keys must be returned by people who leave,

adjuncts and others, which is not now happening. He added that the top lock is the important one: he said that using only the bottom lock means you are vulnerable because the bottom lock can very easily be opened with a plastic credit card. Senator Orrantia described the problem of the B&G cleaning staff who have access to the offices and who lock the broken bottom locks from inside and, as a result, it is impossible for him to enter his office. Senator DeForest noted the related problem of cleaning staff who leave the top locks of office doors unlocked. Mr. Murphy explained that often all the top locks in a corridor are opened at the same time for the cleaning staff and then are improperly left unlocked when the cleaning staff leave.

Senator Norgren asked how we can be helpful: she said she assumes two locks are better than one. Mr. Murphy said two locks are always better than one. He said the money was used for good purposes, for adjuncts, and other academic needs. Senator Norgren also asked whether phonemail could be used to both quell rumors and to provide information. She said that she assumes this raises the issue of secrecy for the purpose of apprehending a criminal.

Mr. Murphy said that he chose to be secretive about recent burglaries in North Hall because he believed that the burglar could be arrested and he just has been. He said that there is concern that spreading information about minor incidents could spread panic and inaccurate rumors. The incident of the man with a gun in the fourth floor men's room in North Hall, for example, grew into all sorts of rumors. He said that perhaps a phonemail message might have quelled the rumors but because a Town Hall meeting was coming up it was decided that the issue would be dealt with there. Mr. Murphy said that certainly if there were any physical assault it would be reported to the College community immediately: there would never be any attempt to cover up physical assault. He said that a phonemail message about a minor incident makes everyone think it is anything but minor.

Senator Wallenstein asked Mr. Murphy his opinion about requiring people to show their ID when entering the college. Mr. Murphy said that it is a great idea and at the same time he dreads the thought of having to implement it. He said he met this afternoon with Provost Wilson, VP Smith, VP Witherspoon, and Dean Best. He said ID checking is inevitable and that we are just about the only CUNY college that does not do this. He said that there will be resistance to it. He is suggesting that we start slowly by having everyone wear their ID (chains and clips will be provided) and eventually we will start requiring IDs for entry into the buildings. He said he can document the incidents in the past year committed by outsiders. We are plagued by locker break-ins and he is convinced this is the work of outsiders who could be stopped by an ID check. Mr. Murphy said we are having a lot of domestic violence on campus: husbands and boyfriends and wives and girlfriends who are not students come onto the campus and have a confrontation with John Jay students. He said that with an ID check we could stop this.

Mr. Murphy said he is 100 percent for ID checking but if the College is not totally for this, it will not work. He said that at today's meeting he recommended a committee to work on the implementation and that he plans to ask Professor Kaplowits to serve on the committee or to recommend someone to represent the Senate. He said he was pleased to hear the Student Council president, Ron Quartimon, come out in favor of the IDs. He also said he thought our students would accept ID checking because ID

checks already exist on most campuses and students will have seen this elsewhere.

Senator Wallenstein asked whether Mr. Murphy can document that most incidents are by outsiders. Mr. Murphy said absolutely and that most arrests are also of outsiders. He said that the burglar who Professor Norgren referred to was a John Jay student a year and a half ago but is not one now and an ID check would have shown that. He said there are cases of people who live in the buildings: Professor Fletcher can verify that a man was living on top of the sauna baths for six months and this man committed an awful lot of burglaries of lockers. Another lived in the mechanical room of B&G.

President Kaplowitz asked how we would deal with the hundreds of visitors who come into our buildings every day: the people trained by Dean Curran, by the Criminal Justice Center, the neighborhood people who use our gym on weekends, and the public who is allowed to use the Library. Mr. Murphy said that Professor Lutzker is changing her opinion about having the Library open to the entire public: the Library has been getting killed with book larcenies and other kinds of larcenies. He added that there are temporary ID cards that can be given to visitors that expire after 24 hours. Or attendees to conferences can be required to be issued invitations which they will have to show. Or people attending training sessions can be listed on a letter from the training center and each person's name can be checked off as they arrive at the Security Desk. There are lots of security measures that can be adopted and that is why we need a committee.

Senator Kobilinsky said he had served on a security committee six years ago which had recommended ID checking at the doors and this had been tried but it had failed. Everything being described now was used then, including expiring 24-hour ID cards. He said he is feeling a sense of *deja vu*. But everything failed. He urged that we look into the reasons for this failure before we try to implement ID checking again. He also said that he still does not have an understanding of the extent of crime going on at the College. A student this morning told him her coat had been stolen. He said if he had not known the student he would not have known about it. How much crime is occurring here?

Mr. Murphy said that a lot of crime goes unreported. He said he'll see five or six lockers broken into and only one student will come in and report that his locker had been broken into to. The Library is plagued with larcenies. He said students study, their minds are focused on their work, and someone will steal their jacket or their books or whatever is left on the seat or table when the student gets up to get a book. But, he said, he believes this is also done by outsiders. Mr. Murphy said that the mistake six years ago was the immediate implementation of ID checking at the doors rather than the gradual approach of first having everyone wear their IDs for several months and then requiring IDs for entrance to the buildings, which is what he is proposing.

Senator Feinberg asked about the physical structure of the two buildings that allows people to enter without passing the security desk. Mr. Murphy said there is a problem of logistics but that stanchions would be used to funnel people into increasingly narrower areas, so that they must pass the security desk. He said that with sufficient money, a system can be purchased whereby turnstiles and computerized ID cards are used,

such as at Police Headquarters. He said that because such a system is costly, we would use stanchions and would have a computer printout of all students so that anyone without an ID card could be checked against the printout upon showing any other piece of identification.

Senator Brugnola noted that the current sign-in system for weekends seems easy to misuse. When she signs in she sees that other people have signed in as Mickey Mouse or in entirely illegible handwriting. Mr. Murphy agreed that we would need better and more extensive training of the security staff: we would need to teach the students who are employed as security officers how to be verbally assertive, how to challenge people, that they must do more than just sit there. He said that if the security officers do not do their job, the ID checking will not work.

Senator DeForest asked how much the turnstile computerized ID system would cost. Mr. Murphy said he does not know but that the former security director, James Scully, had looked into it and that he would find out from him. He acknowledged that the physical layout of the buildings will be a logistical problem.

Mr. Murphy asked President Kaplowitz what her thoughts about this are. President Kaplowitz said she first wanted to report what President Lynch had said to the Executive Committee. She said one cannot help but sympathize with President Lynch's stated wish to improve security before something terrible happens rather than improve it as a response to a terrible event, which President Lynch had explained is what happened at Baruch, where a woman was raped and it was then that more stringent security was introduced. She pointed out that President Lynch is a member of Chancellor Fernandez's school security taskforce which is recommending that security systems be introduced in the public schools although they are not in place at John Jay: the taskforce, whose report was released two days ago, is recommending mandatory ID checks at the door. She noted the irony if anything terrible does happen here: we are the college of criminal justice, offering majors in security, for example, and we do not have a security system in place that addresses these issues. In addition to issues of safety, there is a public relations and a credibility issue that is very compelling. Also President Lynch talked about the opportunistic situation, whereby people who are just walking by, coming out of the hospital for example, see people walk unchecked into our buildings and then they enter out of curiosity or out of maliciousness.

Senator Wallenstein said that most people will show their ID and will support this but those who oppose it will probably draw the most attention. He said he thought that the faculty would support this. President Kaplowitz said that Student Council president Ron Quartimon said at the last Town Meeting that during the past few months students have been telling him they do not feel safe at John Jay and that he had never heard such comments during the previous years. He said it is for this reason he is supporting mandatory ID checks and would ask the Student Council to endorse such a policy. She said she does if he has, in fact, brought this issue to the Student Council nor does she know what position, if any, the Student Council has taken.

President Kaplowitz said that while she is extremely sympathetic to the concerns articulated by President Lynch, she is also very concerned that the College not make the mistake of establishing rules which we do not then enforce because such that

results in the further breaking of rules and creates a real disrespect not only for us as faculty and as administrators but for the academic activities that take place at the College. She said that she agrees with Senator Kobilinsky that we **need** to know why the system failed so completely six years ago.

Senator Litwack said he realizes that the cost issue is a real one but that given who we are, we should be a model for everyone else and if it costs money, then the money for a top security system ought to be available for our College. He said that means money for new locks, money for a turnstile computerized ID system, and for whatever else is necessary.

Mr. Murphy was thanked and he, in turn, thanked the Senate for inviting him.

11. Discussion of the April 14 Collecre Council agenda

[See pp. 4-9 and pp. 13-14.]

The meeting was adjourned at 5:20 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Edward Davenport
Recording Secretary

Announcements from the chair

Senate officers meet with President Lynch

On March 29, Senate officers Kaplowitz, Blitz, and Davenport met with President Lynch, Provost Wilson, Vice President Witherspoon, and Vice President Smith. President Lynch raised concerns about the safety and health of the members of the college community. He asked that the Senate discuss the feasibility of a smoke-free campus, of ID card checks to enter the buildings, and he spoke about the administration's decision to determine whether we should resume recycling. He explained that Professor Stroup's letter about the College's violation of the smoking laws raised the question of whether we should build special smoking rooms or whether we should adopt a no-smoking policy at the College. As for the ID cards, he spoke about his wish to have security measures in place without the impetus of a terrible event, such as the recent rape at Baruch. As for recycling, he said that the College's efforts to recycle had been undermined by the garbage collectors who throw all our recycled garbage into the same truck.

The executive officers presented President Lynch with copies of the Faculty Senate's positions about the Report of the Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Academic Programming Planning.

Upon being asked when the written report of the site visit is expected, President Lynch said that it had been received and that a response about errors, ambiguities, and unnecessary abrasiveness is due the following day.

March 29 Town Hall meeting

The March Town Hall meeting on "Safety, Security, and Health" was facilitated by Jeff Cilione, a student studying dispute resolution who is also chair of the student Judiciary Board. This is the first time a student has facilitated a Town Hall meeting. Student Council president Ronald Quartimon said that during the last several months he has heard from numerous students who have told him that they do not feel safe at the College. He said that this is something he had not heard in the past. In light of these comments, he announced that he will propose to the Student Council that the Student Council endorse a resolution calling for the mandatory wearing of John Jay ID cards and the mandatory checking of ID cards to enter the college's buildings.

March 26 Council of Faculty Governance Leaders

The Council of Faculty Governance Leaders, which is comprised of the chairs of the campus faculty senates and the executive committee of the University Faculty Senate, met on March 26 with University Dean Ron Berkman to discuss the College Preparatory Initiative.

The Faculty Governance Council then discussed the Report of the Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Academic Program Planning and agreed that the University Faculty Senate would request a delegate from each campus to report on the second level review process at her or his campus. The report is to include a summary of the second level review decisions, an analysis as to whether or not the process respected the elected faculty governance procedures, and whether or not the final campus report from the College's president reflected faculty determinations.

Board of Trustees schedule for Chancellor's Advisory Report

The Report of the Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Academic Program Planning and/or proposed actions will be presented to the Board of Trustees by Vice Chancellor Freeland at its June 28 meeting. The Board Committee on Academic Policy will deliberate about these proposals at its Monday, June 7, meeting, at 5:00 PM at 80th Street. Faculty may attend as observers. The public Board of Trustees meeting for comment by the public about the June Board of Trustees agenda will be on Monday, June 21, at 4:00, at 80th Street. To speak on June 21, it is necessary to telephone the Office of the Secretary of the Board of Trustees (794-5555) before 4:00 PM on Friday, June 18, and state one's name and affiliation and the agenda item one wishes to speak to. Speakers are permitted three minutes and may submit a written statement, which may be longer than the spoken statement. The written statements as well as a transcript of the spoken statements are transmitted to all the trustees. People may attend the public hearing as observers without having signed up to speak. People who have not signed up to speak by 4:00 on the previous Friday may not do so.

Dr. Barbara Price to resign as dean of graduate studies

Dean of Graduate Studies Barbara Price has announced her intention to step down as dean effective September 1994. She will begin a sabbatical leave the previous semester, in February 1994. Upon her return to the College after the sabbatical leave, she will rejoin the Department of Law, Police Science, and Criminal Justice Administration as a member of the faculty. A search committee is to be named.

\$10 million allocated for purchase of land for Phase II

The NYS Legislature and the Governor have approved an allocation of \$10 million for the purchase of land contiguous to T Building for a future building to replace North Hall.

Mayor's proposed budget funds JJ & NYCTech associate programs

The Mayor's preliminary budget includes \$13.1 million for John Jay's and NYCTech's associate degree programs. The borough presidents and the City Council have requested that the Mayor's proposed reduction of \$2 million for CUNY be rescinded. The Mayor's Executive Budget is due April 26.

Dean Faber issues report on proficiency test appeals

As required by the College Council, Dean Eli Faber issued a report to the Standards Committee on the CUNY proficiency examination appeals for the Spring 1993 semester: first extension (for students who have exceeded 60 credits): 90 students were granted a first extension: first and last extension (students who have exceeded 60 credits and will reach 85 credits this semester): 77 students: last extension (students have already had one extension): 55 students: not permitted to register (students have had two extensions or have exceeded 96 credits): 47 students (N.B. the 96 credit limit at John Jay is to be replaced by a 85 credit limit as of Fall 1993).

Coalition of Concerned CUNY Faculty and Staff meets April 22

A meeting of the Coalition of Concerned CUNY Faculty and Staff will meet at 6:30 PM in Room 1400 of the Graduate Center on Thursday, April 22, to discuss the Chancellor's Advisory Committee report and to discuss possible strategies.

Second reading of a proposal to amend the Faculty Senate Constitution

N.B. The proposed amendment of the Faculty Senate Constitution is the addition of the underlined material. To be adopted, a proposed amendment must receive an affirmative vote of two-thirds of those present and voting at two consecutive, regular Senate meetings.

ARTICLE IV: OFFICERS OF THE JOHN JAY COLLEGE FACULTY SENATE

The officers of the John Jay College Faculty Senate shall be as follows:

1. President. The President shall preside at all meetings. In the event that a President is unable to complete a term, the Senate shall determine by vote that the office is vacant and thereupon the Vice President shall succeed automatically to the office of President.

2. Vice President. The Vice President shall assume the duties of the President in presiding over the Senate when the President is not present or when the President yields in order to participate in discussion on a motion. If the Vice President is unable to complete a term or succeeds to the office of the President, the Senate shall elect a new Vice President.

3. Recording Secretary(ies). The Recording Secretary(ies) shall record and transmit the minutes of all meetings of the Faculty Senate to the Corresponding Secretary for distribution.

4. Corresponding Secretary. The Corresponding Secretary shall distribute minutes of Senate meetings, forward official correspondence of the President and of Senate committees, receive copies of official committee reports from committee secretaries, and maintain archives of minutes, committee records and correspondence.

5. Officers-At-Large. Two (2) Officers-At-Large shall assist the other executive officers in the execution of their responsibilities.

All officers shall be elected in May after the new Senators have been elected and the Senate has been convened. Their terms of office shall be for 1 year.

ARTICLE V: EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The Executive Committee shall consist of the officers of the Senate. The Executive Committee shall determine when meetings of the Senate are to be held in accordance with Article VI. The Executive Committee shall receive agenda items from members of the faculty and shall establish the priority of agenda items. The Executive Committee may recommend limiting discussion, subject to approval by a vote of the Senate. The agenda may be revised at any time upon a motion from the floor and an affirmative vote at a meeting of the Senate.

EXPLANATION: A six-member executive committee would better ensure the availability of a sufficient number of members to attend executive committee meetings, to set the agenda, etc.

John Jay College of Criminal Justice

The City University of New York

445 West 59th

New York, NY 10019

(212) 237-S070

The Department of Public Management

Economics, ~~Fire~~ Science, and Public Administration

**Response of the Faculty
of the Department of Public Management
to the
Report of the Chancellor's Advisory Committee
on Academic Program Planning**

Whereas, the Advisory Committee on Academic Program Planning recommended that "Consideration should be given to strengthening master's degree programs at Baruch and John Jay,"

Whereas, the Advisory Committee recommended that the baccalaureate majors in Public Administration at Baruch and at Medgar Evers Colleges be strengthened, but failed to note, in either the analysis or the recommendations, the baccalaureate major at John Jay College;

Whereas, the Advisory Committee recommended that the associate degree programs at Hostos and Medgar Evers Colleges be strengthened, and that the associate degree program in Government and Public Administration be designated for further review.

Therefore, the faculty of the Department of Public Management recommend the following responses by John Jay College and the City University of New York to the Advisory Committee recommendations.

1. City University of New York, and Baruch College and John Jay College of Criminal Justice, should strengthen the MPA programs by continuing to support the self-study process that is preliminary to re-accreditation of both programs by the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration, including priority implementation of the recommendations forthcoming in the self-study process.
2. To foster the quality and diversity of the Master of Public Administration programs and related master's programs within CUNY, while avoiding program duplication and inefficiency, our faculty will strive to coordinate courses and programs in a manner consistent with the following program concept:

John Jay College of Criminal Justice offers a policy and management program related to John Jay's programs in criminal justice, public safety, and public service. The program develops students for civil service careers in government services, especially in uniformed services, international and military organizations, and in agencies with inspection and oversight missions.

3. The Advisory Committee failed to note, in either the analysis or the recommendations relating to baccalaureate programs in Public Administration, the new major in Public Administration approved by the Board of Trustees and the State Department of Education during 1992. Presumably, this oversight occurred because the Committee focused in existing programs. We recommend that a process of faculty consultation take place, similar to the consultation between MPA program faculties, to strengthen the baccalaureate programs in Public Administration at Baruch College, Medgar Evers College, and John Jay College. Such consultations should include faculties in Public Administration and related fields across CUNY.

4. The faculty agree that the associate degree program in Government and Public Administration should be discontinued in its current form. However, further review is necessary to determine whether the program should be terminated altogether, or whether it should be revised and refocused consistent with a CUNY-wide strategy for associate degree programs related to public service. Such a strategy should be developed through consultation with representatives of the faculties in public administration and related fields across CUNY, and should build on the findings and recommendations of the JJCCJ Curriculum Committee concerning associate degree programs at John Jay College.

5. The faculty recommend that consideration be given, in close consultation with the New York City Fire Department, to development of an associate degree program in Fire Science.

Adopted by the faculty, February 22, 1993.

ATTACHMENT D

RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING

THE ASSOCIATE DEGREE PROGRAMS

To reform and strengthen the associate degree programs, the College Curriculum Committee recommends the following:

1. That the College retain the associate degree programs in Corrections, Police Science, and Security Management; but that it eliminate the program in Government & Public Administration

2. That the Undergraduate Academic Standards Committee evaluate the current procedure allowing students to transfer from associate to baccalaureate status upon completion of 12 credits with a 2.0 average; and that it consult during its deliberations with the Undergraduate Admissions Committee

3. That approximately 25% of the students admitted in any entering freshman class be associate students and approximately 75% be baccalaureate students

4. That the Department of Law and Police Science consider establishing 15-18 credit associate degree specializations in Police Science, Corrections, and Security Management; that those specializations not contain 300- or 400-level courses; and that the recommendations for those specializations be formulated by the end of the Fall 1993 semester

5. That the Department of Law and Police Science consider the inclusion of some career-specific requirement(s) in these degree programs, with options such as internships, computer literacy, foreign languages, writing courses, and accounting; and that these be formulated by the end of the Fall 1993 semester and accompany the recommendations for the specializations

6. That, in the course of their deliberations, the Department of Law and Police Science examine similar associate degree programs elsewhere, as well as explore agency needs

7. That the College Curriculum Committee reduce the General Education Requirements for the associate degree programs (with attention to CPI requirements); and that its proposal for the General Education Requirements be formulated by the end of the Fall 1993 semester

8. That the College Curriculum Committee and the College Council approve the three revised degree programs in Spring 1994

9. That special attention be paid to creating an advisement program for associate students; and that they be advised therein to apply for the associate degree

10. And that the Registrar, the Dean for Admissions and Registration, the Provost, and the Dean of Undergraduate Studies examine ways to assure that associate students with 50 credits and above, who have filed applications for the associate degree, be permitted to register early enough for the courses that they need in order to graduate

ADJUNCT FACULTY SURVEY RESULTS

A survey of adjunct faculty was conducted during December 1992/January 1993. A questionnaire was sent to each adjunct faculty member via inter-office mail. In all, 354 questionnaires were sent, and 133 surveys were returned, for a response rate of 38%

The survey breaks down into three basic sections: demographic information, close ended statements for which the respondent indicated their strength of agreement, and an open comments section.

Section SummariesDemographics:

Of the 133 survey respondents, 54% were male and 46% female. This group is slightly overrepresented by females when compared to the current adjunct faculty population of 61% males and 39% females (Middle States Report, 1993). 94% of the group hold graduate degrees with just under 1/3 holding doctorates. Of the remaining two thirds, 37% are actively engaged in the pursuit of a doctoral degree. Of the part-time faculty surveyed, 35% hold full-time jobs in other professions. Only 27% of the group teach part-time at another college. Despite the poor fiscal situation at CUNY and other universities, fully 3/4 of the adjunct respondents aspire to full-time college teaching careers. As of Fall '92, 66 % of those surveyed have been teaching at John Jay four or more consecutive semesters, with a modality of 27% having taught here 10 or more semesters. Adjunct faculty respondents are generous with their time to students by donating an average of two unpaid hours of counseling or office hours per week.

Close Ended Statements:

Office space is adequate for 60% of those adjuncts surveyed, but just under half "sometimes" to "always" have trouble accessing departmental facilities. Adjuncts feel that their class assignments are scheduled fairly, are sure of the evaluation procedures of their work in the classroom, but are unsure of the criteria and policies used for re-appointment. Most are aware of what to do should illness preclude holding class. Departmental complaints seem to be responded to adequately. There does not seem to be a problem, among those surveyed, with sexual harassment from either students or faculty/staff with over 90% reporting "rarely" to "never". While 44% of the group feel that there is rarely or never a lack of team spirit among departmental faculty, 46% disagree. This split is rather even, which might suggest a variance between departments. The same kind of split exists in the area of collegial support and mentoring. Most respondents have no trouble handling students who act out in class, but 56% at least sometimes don't know where to refer students in crisis. A sizeable 37% of the part-time professional instructional staff surveyed are "usually" or "always" required to hold unpaid office hours. This may be reflected in the fact that 36% of adjuncts report that they are unsure of their contractual job rights and obligations.

RESULTS

N=133 Response Rate 38%

Sex: Male 54% Female 46%

Highest Degree Obtained: BA/BS 6% Masters 63% Doctorate 31%

Are you a Doctoral Student: Yes 37% No 63%

Do you currently hold a full-time position in a profession other than teaching?
Yes 25% No 75%

Are you retired from teaching or other full-time profession?
Yes 6% No 94%

Do you currently hold an adjunct teaching position at another college?
Yes 27% No 73%

Do you intend to pursue a full-time career in college level teaching?
Yes 75% No 25%

Counting this semester, how many semesters have you taught at John Jay?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10+ Semesters
13% 14% 7% 6% 8% 7% 7% 4% 9% 27%

Approximately how much unpaid time do you spend per week counseling students ?
None 10%, <1 Hr. 29%, <2 Hrs. 36%, 3 Hrs. 13%, 4 Hrs. 2%, >5 Hrs. 10%

For the following items, please circle whether you:
Never (N), Rarely (R), Sometimes (S), Usually (U), or Always (A), AGREE with following statements.

	<u>N</u>	<u>R</u>	<u>S</u>	<u>U</u>	<u>A</u>
1. My office space is adequate for my needs.	10%	9%	13%	33%	35%
2. I have trouble accessing departmental facilities (copy machines, computers, mail, office keys, clerical, etc).	25%	28%	25%	15%	6%
3. I am sure of the rules concerning the scheduling of departmental observation and evaluation of my work.	4%	10%	17%	37%	33%
4. I have trouble handling inappropriate classroom behavior.	36%	40%	19%	3%	2%
5. I am sure where to direct students for remedial help.	8%	10%	27%	33%	21%
6. I am unsure where to get help for students in crisis.	20%	26%	33%	13%	8%
7. I am required to post and maintain regular office hours, for which I'm not paid.	46%	11%	6%	17%	22%
8. I am sure of the procedure if illness precludes meeting class.	5%	9%	12%	24%	50%
9. I find collegial support and mentoring to be inadequate.	21%	28%	23%	18%	10%
10. I have experienced sexual harassment from faculty/staff member(s).	95%	3%	1%	1%	-
11. I have experienced sexual harassment from students.	85%	8%	6%	1%	-
12. My complaints to the department are adequately responded to.	4%	5%	16%	41%	34%
13. I am unsure as to the criteria and policies for re-appointment.	19%	20%	27%	20%	14%
14. I feel class section assignments are done fairly.	4%	2%	13%	54%	27%
15. I feel there is a lack of team spirit among departmental faculty.	20%	24%	24%	24%	8%
16. I am sure what my contractual job rights and obligations are.	12%	24%	22%	28%	14%

Open Ended Comments:

Open ended responses by adjunct faculty tended to express four basic needs/concerns, and can be categorized as follows:

Category 1. Need for Information

Adjuncts consistently expressed a need for specific information regarding:

1. Contractual and job requisites/rights.
2. Available college support services.

With respect to contractual requisites and rights, a substantial number of adjuncts requested clarification regarding reappointment procedures, office hour policies, and guidelines pertaining to course limitations and grading. The need of information pertaining to available college services and resources was also consistently expressed. Specifically, adjuncts requested information about available copy, mail and fax services, computer access, room acquisition, phone usage, and secretarial support.

Sample Comments:

"I don't want to lose my seniority and benefits if I take a semester off. I'm not sure how this works".

"I'm unclear about office hours, unclear about how schedules are determined and unclear about whether an adjunct can ever be assured of a job".

"As adjuncts we do not have any knowledge of our contractual obligations. Salary information is not available. I don't know how many semesters of continuous teaching I have to put in to receive a pay step increase. I get different answers when I ask".

"I have no office. I am unable, teaching at night, to use a computer or get phone mail".

"As an adjunct after five PM there is no way I can get mail, supplies, access to a copy machine".

Category 2. Need for Affiliation and Validation

Issues concerning a need for respect, inclusion and support was a common theme which emerged.

Sample Comments:

"Part time faculty are often talked about as if they are less qualified to teach than full-time faculty. This second rate/class attitude needs to be addressed".

"It has been my perception that as an adjunct, I am not treated with the same respect and professionalism within the department as full-time staff".

"There is a general tendency to treat adjuncts as stepchildren, isolated and left to fend for themselves. I find this discouraging and unnecessary".

"Adjunct involvement in departmental functions is encouraged on paper, however actual adjunct involvement is resisted. Adjuncts are often not informed about departmental matters and often find out important information by accident".

Category 3. Need for Improved Contract

Adjunct faculty commonly expressed dissatisfaction with their salaries and benefits, particularly those pertaining to health care.

Sample Comments :

"Adjunct reps should demand and publicize the inequality of equal pay for equal work -- that our salaries are 1/3 - 1/2 of other faculty. Expose the PSC as a craft union that helps to create a two tier pay system".

"Greater parity should exist between the salary of adjuncts and full-time staff. The present difference is unconscionable and unexplainable".

"Health insurance should be provided during the first semester of teaching and be transferable for one college to another".

"Adjuncts should be permitted to teach more than two courses".

Category 4. Expressed Comments of Job Satisfaction

There were several members of the adjunct faculty who used this forum to also comment favorably about their experiences at John Jay.

Sample Comments:

"I believe the adjuncts at John Jay, and especially in my department are more fortunate than at other institutions. I get pretty well supported with office space, clerical help, and advice/support from colleagues. I taught at a prestigious private university here in N.Y.C. where this was definitely not the case".

"I have been extremely pleased with the warmth and friendliness of faculty members in my department".

"My relation with other members of the department is very good. I have been treated fairly and professionally by all of them".

"I should note that John Jay is the best place that I have ever adjuncted. Little things like "the week of" allow adjuncts to feel connected. As does the phone and office the department gives me access to (both unheard of at for adjuncts at other schools)".

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Day and evening access to mail and photocopy rooms for all adjunct faculty.
2. If this is not possible (we should know why!): establishment of an adjunct resources center in each building to include photocopying machines; mail room; telephones; fax service, etc., which would be open Monday through Thursday, 5 p.m. to 9 p.m.
3. Mandatory orientation for all new adjunct faculty. This would necessitate the establishment of a college fund to pay the required (union contract) hourly rate of those attending. This orientation session would run two hours and would cover everything from evaluation and reappointment procedures to general information about the college and classroom procedures.
4. Development of a pamphlet for adjuncts that would spell out college services, contractual obligations and college requirements (policy on office hours, reappointment procedures, qualifications for medical benefits, presence in classroom during teaching hours and examinations, grading policies, use of library, etc.); college governance (opportunity to be student club advisor, Faculty Senate representative, etc.); access to recreational facilities.
5. Request that all departments include adjunct faculty on departmental lists that are submitted for the college telephone directory each fall, and assign shared phone lines for adjuncts not presently assigned phones.
6. Request the council of chairs devote one of its meeting (perhaps mid-October) each year to adjunct faculty issues. The provost and undergraduate dean should be present. At some point in this meeting, adjunct representatives (from the Faculty Senate and other interested adjuncts) would join the meeting to present and discuss issues and concerns of adjunct faculty. This meeting would provide opportunity for an exchange of information, and help to inform department chairs on ways they can reach out to orient adjunct faculty and to get information to them.

Respectfully submitted,

Faculty Senate Adjunct Issues Committee :

Orlanda Brugnola

Robert DeLucia

Robert Grappone

Jill Norgren

Rick Richardson, Chair