

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES #92

John Jay College of Criminal Justice

May 20, 1993

Time 3:00 PM

Room 630 T

Present (31): Arvind Agarwal, Michael Blitz, James Bowen, Orlanda Brugnola, Edward Davenport, Jane Davenport, Peter DeForest, Kojo Dei, Migdalia DeJesus-Torres de Garcia, Vincent Del Castillo, Robert DeLucia, Lotte Feinberg, P.J. Gibson, Elisabeth Gitter, Robert Grappone, Lou Guinta, Lee Jenkins, Karen Kaplowitz, Andrew Karmen, Gavin Lewis, Tom Litwack, Barry Luby, James Malone, Peter Manuel, Rick Richardson, Peter Shenkin, Chris Suggs, Martin Wallenstein, Agnes Wieschenberg, Davidson Umeh, Bessie Wright

Absent (7): Janice Bockmeyer, David Brandt, Jannette Domingo, Melinda Guttman, Laurence Holder, Jill Norgren, Bruce Pierce

AGENDA

1. Announcements from the chair
2. Approval of Minutes #91 of the May 7 meeting
3. Guest: President Lynch
4. Election of Faculty Senate Executive Committee
5. Guest: Mr. Robert Hernandez, Student Council President Elect
6. Election to College committees
7. Report on the Faculty Senate survey of Administrative Offices
8. Proposed Charter amendment
9. Proposal for a Senate/Chairs Committee on Phase II Planning
10. New Business

1. Announcements from the chair [Attachment A]

The first meeting of the 1993-94 Senate was called to order. The members were introduced and the new members were welcomed. The Senate was directed to the written announcements [Attachment A].

President Kaplowitz reported that earlier that afternoon President Lynch asked to come to the Faculty Senate and that he would be arriving at 3:30.

She announced the results of the Senate's choice, through a secret mail ballot, of faculty to recommend to President Lynch for appointment to the search committee for Dean of Graduate Studies. She reported that in the interim since the last Senate meeting, President Lynch allocated two additional seats to the Council of Chairs, which had elected Professors Ned Benton, Harold Sullivan, and T. Kenneth Moran to the committee, and that the Council of Chairs also elected Professors Catherine Rovira and Sydney Samuel.

The three faculty nominated and elected by the Senate for the search committee are Professors Tom Litwack (Psychology), Pat O'Hara (Public Management), and Bruce Pierce (Law, Police Science). President Kaplowitz reported that the Senate's Executive Committee is recommending that the Senate forward the names of these three faculty plus the candidate who received the fourth highest number of votes: Professor Elizabeth Crespo (Puerto Rican Studies). Senator Malone noted that President Lynch had been concerned, as had the Senate, that the search committee have a diverse membership and, he explained, the recommendation to send the name of all four faculty members is being made in the interests of such diversity. This recommendation was approved by unanimous vote.

President Kaplowitz recounted that at the previous Senate meeting the Senate took two actions with regard to the Mayor's elimination of the entire funding for the CUNY/NYPD Police Cadet Program: first, the Senate approved by unanimous vote a resolution calling on city officials to restore the program's funding and this resolution was sent to every legislator. The second action was that the Senate directed President Kaplowitz to try to place this issue on the agenda of the May 11 meeting of the University Faculty Senate in the hope that the UFS, which represents all the CUNY faculty, would endorse it. She reported that a version of the John Jay Senate's resolution was placed on the UFS agenda and that the resolution was adopted by unanimous vote of the University Faculty Senate. She added that Chancellor Reynolds commented at the beginning of her report to the UFS that she was very pleased to see this on the UFS agenda. Copies of the UFS resolution were distributed [Attachment B].

Two documents from Vice President Roger Witherspoon were also distributed, one a memorandum (which the Faculty Senate was cc'd) stating that students who fight on campus will be summarily dismissed and will then be brought up on disciplinary charges [see Attachment A]. The second document from Vice President Witherspoon is a recommended policy about minor children on campus and in classrooms [Attachment C]. Senators were invited to report their reactions to the recommended policy and the reactions of their constituents either to the Senate's executive officers or directly to the Office of Vice President Witherspoon. Also distributed was a memorandum from Provost Wilson to the Council of Chairs about faculty responsibility at registration: the memorandum states that the PSC contract will, of course, be honored and, therefore, faculty who work registration in August (during annual leave) will be compensated if they also work registration in January.

Senator Feinberg invited the senators to a reception on May 26, hosted by the graduate (MPA) faculty of the Public Management Department, honoring MPA students inducted into Pi Alpha alpha, the national honor society for public affairs and administration. Also being honored are former faculty members Ellen Rosen and Peter Albin, who retired last year. The keynote speaker will be Alair Townsend, formerly deputy mayor for budget and currently the publisher of "Crain's New York Business."

2. Approval of Minutes #91 of the May 7 meeting

Upon a motion duly made and carried, Minutes #91 of the all-day Friday, May 7, meeting were approved, conditional on the guests and outgoing Senators being given an opportunity to review the minutes for possible errors.

3. Guest: President Gerald W. Lynch

President Lynch was welcomed, as were Dean James Curran and Dean Mary Rothlein. President Kaplowitz explained that this is the first meeting of the new Senate. President Lynch congratulated the new and returning Senators and said that he is looking forward to working with the Senate next year. He said he had wanted to meet with the Senate today upon learning that President Kaplowitz had asked Dean Curran to brief the Senate about the status of the funding for the CUNY/NYPD Police Cadet Program because he had wanted to personally brief the Faculty Senate on this situation.

Saying that the efforts to restore funding are moving well, President Lynch described the support of the City Council as tremendous. At a breakfast that morning with the City Council there was tremendous support for the program: the Chancellor spoke very strongly for it, Speaker Vallone spoke in support of it, and Priscilla Wooten, head of the City Council's Education Committee, was very supportive. He thanked the faculty for the letters that they sent to legislators.

The President reported that we are coordinating our efforts with the firm of Harold Rubenstein, who represents CUNY, and that Mr. Rubenstein had the very good idea of taking a Polaroid picture of each Cadet and then having each Cadet send the photograph with a handwritten letter to the Mayor and to the Speaker, which was done. The Cadets have really been devastated, President Lynch said, as the faculty undoubtedly know. The Cadets had been admitted to the Police Department contingent upon completion of the program: they had already passed the Police entrance exam, as well as the background check, and the psychological check. Also, they were making \$100 a week, which also would be cut off at the end of June. President Lynch said it really is unbelievable that the funding for the entire program has been cut and what makes it especially unbelievable is that the Cadets are 67 percent African-American and Hispanic: 47 percent Hispanic and 20 percent African-American and so it has been the best program for recruiting minorities in the history of the New York City Police Department. And in addition, the Cadets all must be residents of New York City, which is another victory for the Mayor in that Phil Caruso [president of the Police Benevolent Association] agreed to this residency requirement for the Police Cadets and the New York State Legislature also was willing to agree to it. And so the whole situation is bizarre.

President Lynch remarked that President Kaplowitz had in front of her copies of a letter addressed to Mayor Dinkins which had been signed by 15 State Senators, including some Republicans, including Frank Padavan (chair of the Senate Oversight Committee for Safe Streets/Safe City), and Roy Goodman. President Kaplowitz, who then distributed copies of the letter, explained that she had waited until this briefing to distribute the letter because the letter is best understood in the context of the briefing. President Lynch thanked her for providing copies of the letter to the Senate and noted that the letter very strongly tells the Mayor that cutting the Cadet program is a very big mistake. The reason the State Senate is important, he added, is that it is predominantly Republican and the fact that they are supporting the program is the first significant victory we have had. He said that it shows, too, that the letters and support from the faculty have helped because the legislators were knowledgeable about the program and about the funding issue.

Reporting that there will be a press conference the following week, President Lynch asked Professor Kaplowitz to attend. He said that he had just spoken to Patrick V. Murphy in Washington, who agreed to speak to Phil Michael, the City's Budget Director, who was his deputy commissioner for trials when he was with the Police Department.

President Lynch also reported that Jay Hershenson [CUNY's Vice Chancellor for Public Relations] has suggested that there should be an auditing check of the entire \$1.8 billion Safe Streets/Safe City budget: the reason is that if by now the Safe Streets/Safe City project was supposed to have spent, let's say, \$1 billion but has not yet been able to spend it, we could say that part of the money not spent could be used for the Cadet Program because the \$3.5 million funding for the Police Cadet program comes out of that \$1.8 billion. He explained that the Safe Streets/Safe City program is probably significantly behind its spending cycle because it has been slow in implementing the civilianization part of the program.

President Lynch noted that the Mayor has told him that he knows that the CUNY Cadet Program has a lot of minorities but the Mayor added that we will get minorities into the Police Department in other ways. But, President Lynch pointed out, the CUNY Cadets are a group of 125 selected, accepted, young people, who have been taught special skills and perspectives by such people as Professor Wallenstein, who he sees here and who has praised the Cadets: the Cadets have learned CPR, Spanish, Creole or Russian (which is taught to those Cadets who already know Spanish) and so it will be the best trained police group in the City. And they will all have their Associate Degree. So to cut the funding makes no sense.

President Lynch recounted that when he headed the most recent search committee for the police commissioner, the Mayor emphasized over and over again the need for recruiting more African-Americans and Hispanics, particularly African-American males, into the Police Department. Yet the CUNY Cadet Program is the program that is actually doing it. He said that he is SURE the Faculty Senate feels his frustration.

Saying that he would like President Kaplowitz and perhaps a few other people from the Senate's Executive Committee to join him at the press conference, President Lynch added that he has asked the head of the Guardians Association (the organization of African-American police officers), the head of the Hispanic police organization, Walter Alicea, and Pat Braxton, the head of the Policewomen's Association, to be there, as well as Shelley Silver, chair of the Assembly Oversight Committee and Frank Padavan, chair of the Senate Oversight Committee.

There is also a legal issue involved, President Lynch noted, because the issue is whether the Mayor, having asked for funding for police officers, and having hired them, can then turn around and fire them. The Mayor says "no layoffs" but he is laying off these Cadets as well as the 150 who are in the pipeline who have been approved, prepared, and are ready to begin on July 1 and who will also be dropped, although they are not yet on the payroll.

Fortunately, President Lynch said, the Chancellor sees this as her program. She is very, very connected to it. She spoke forcefully about it this morning to the City Council, and at the Council of Presidents this afternoon, and she is on her way to see Assemblyman Saul Weprin, the Speaker of the Assembly.

President Kaplowitz recounted that when she presented a version of the John Jay Faculty Senate's May 7 Resolution calling for a full restoration of the funding of the Cadet Program at the University Faculty Senate on May 11, several faculty from other CUNY colleges where Police Cadet students attend spoke in support of the program and in support of the Resolution and senators were lined up to speak in support of the Resolution until someone, indicating that there was no need to hear more because everyone was in support, called the question, and the UFS approved the Resolution by unanimous vote. She also noted that earlier in that meeting, when Chancellor Reynolds began her report to the UFS, she began by saying how very pleased she was to see that the UFS is taking up the issue and has a Resolution on its agenda. President Kaplowitz recounted that when she asked the Chancellor a question about another aspect of the CUNY budget, she prefaced her question by saying that she was pleased to have heard the Chancellor's comments about the CUNY Cadet agenda item because John Jay's Faculty Senate had unanimously approved a similar resolution. She added that Chancellor Reynolds described the Police Cadet Program as wonderful, said the funding elimination came out of the blue, and said that the program was cut because people in the City administration felt it would be an easy program for the City Council to restore the funding of because it was so popular with the City Council and she characterized this as cynical machination.

President Kaplowitz said that she is also pleased to report, to both the Senate and to President Lynch, that at that May 11 UFS meeting she was elected to the executive committee of the University Faculty Senate and noted that the UFS executive committee is meeting with Chancellor Reynolds in a few days, on May 25. She added that as a member of the UFS Executive Committee she has been asked to represent the University Faculty Senate on the CUNY Construction Fund as well as on the Board of Trustees Committee on Student Affairs (as the alternate faculty member). President Lynch congratulated her and said that her participation on these bodies is very important. She noted that the CUNY Construction Fund should be very interesting since the other members are the director of the State Budget Office and members of the State Legislature: this is where the money for capital projects for CUNY is actually dealt with. She said she had just been appointed the previous day to both committees and was pleased to be reporting it.

President Lynch congratulated her and said that he is very grateful to the University Faculty Senate for its Resolution supporting the Police Cadet Program and said that he is also very grateful to John Jay's Faculty Senate for unanimously approving its Resolution and for then bringing it to the UFS.

Noting that the CUNY/NYPD Cadet Program is 12 years in the making and represents the thinking and work of a lot of good people, including Dean Curran and Phil Caruso, President Lynch said that having taken all this time to launch the program, it is hard to conceive of it being shut down. He noted that the education of the Cadets includes meetings with such groups as the Gay and Lesbian Alliance, so that the Cadets will be prepared for the culturally diverse city. So he said he continues to believe we will succeed. He said he will continue to work on this and hopes that the Faculty Senate will continue to also. President Lynch said that legislators really pay attention to letters from the public and that letters not on College stationery that have one's home address are the best: one can identify oneself as a faculty

member at the College but letters with a home address are most effective. President Lynch offered to answer questions and then thanked the Senate for its work and for making room on its agenda for him today.

4. Election of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee

Nominations were opened for the position of President. Karen Kaplowitz was nominated. There being no further nominations, a motion to close nominations carried. It was proposed that the election be by acclamation. President Kaplowitz said that the election should be by secret written ballot. Senator Wallenstein said that if the Democratic Party can nominate its candidate for president of the United States by acclamation, the Senate should be able to conduct its voting by acclamation. Senator Umeh said there is clearly support for President Kaplowitz to be reelected and so he asked why a ballot is needed. Senator DeJesus-Torres de Garcia said if we really want to give our support to President Kaplowitz then we should give our support through the message of a secret ballot. She said she deserves a secret ballot by virtue of her excellent contributions to the Senate and her excellent contributions to the College. Senator Lewis said that since the Faculty Senate supports President Kaplowitz, if a secret ballot is for some reason important to her and if for some reason she feels insecure about the Senate's support, we should do what she has asked.

President Kaplowitz thanked Senator Lewis for his statement, saying that it made her realize that she must explain her reason more fully since she does not, in fact, feel insecure about the Senate's support: she said she has been told by a number of people that some members of the College administration have claimed that her election in the past has not really reflected the will of the Senate because the election was not by secret ballot and that were it by secret ballot she would not have had the Senate's support. She said that if those administrators are correct, then she and the Faculty Senate should know this but that if, in fact, the administration is wrong, then the administration should know that it is wrong and it would then not be able to make such assertions. A secret ballot is the only way to determine this. She said that the Senate should make it clear that whoever it elects to a leadership position has been elected freely and without coercion. She added that her effectiveness in representing the Senate in dealing with the administration and with those who are told this by members of the administration is what is at issue. She added that she would withdraw her name from nomination if the election is not by secret ballot.

Senator DeJesus-Torres de Garcia said that she entirely agrees with President Kaplowitz's depiction and analysis of the situation and said that we should vote by secret ballot for this reason. She added that President Kaplowitz has her total support and that is why she urges the Senate to vote by secret ballot.

Secretary Davenport said that the Senate should remember that we might not always be as fortunate as we now are in enjoying a feeling of solidarity and in having candidates whom we could support. Democratic procedures are invented, he said, to enable the electorate to get rid of bad leaders. Procedures which safeguard the democratic process ought to be embraced when we have good leaders because it is terribly awkward to do so when we have

someone in office whom we want to throw out. He said now is the time to establish the procedure of a secret ballot so that it is in place for the future. The Senate agreed to a secret ballot.

Ballots were distributed and senators were given four choices to write on the ballot: the name of the nominee; the name of another senator (as a write-in); the word "no"; or the word "abstain." Ballots were counted by two senators who announced that every ballot contained the name of the nominee, Karen Kaplowitz: there were no write-ins, no negative votes, and no abstentions. President Kaplowitz said she was tremendously moved by the vote and felt very honored. She thanked her colleagues.

Michael Blitz was nominated for Vice President. Nominations were closed. A secret ballot was conducted and he was unanimously reelected.

Edward Davenport was unanimously reelected as Recording Secretary by secret ballot.

James Malone was unanimously reelected as Corresponding Secretary by secret ballot.

Nominations for the two at-large positions on the Executive Committee were open. Orlanda Brugnola, Lee Jenkins, and Agnes Wieschenberg were nominated. A secret ballot was conducted and Senators Orlanda Brugnola and Lee Jenkins were elected.

President Kaplowitz noted that the Senate is indebted to Secretary Davenport for his wonderful service this past year as Recording Secretary and for his willingness to continue in that capacity. She noted that he set the high standard which has since been maintained when he served as the very first Recording Secretary of the Senate in 1986-87. The Senate applauded him (and insisted that this be reported in the minutes). President Kaplowitz also praised Vice President Blitz and Secretary Malone, saying it was a wonderful executive committee this past year and added that she looks forward to continuing working with them and with the new members, Senators Brugnola and Jenkins.

5. Guest: Mr. Robert Hernandez, Student Council President Elect

President-elect of the Student Council Robert Hernandez was welcomed and congratulated on his election: he was elected on May 6 and will take the oath of office on June 1, at which time he will assume his position as head of the student government, which represents all 8600 undergraduate and graduate students. President Kaplowitz explained that the Senate's Executive Committee had invited Mr. Hernandez so that he could meet the Senate and the Senate could meet him and so that the two organizations could establish early on a good working relationship.

Mr. Hernandez said he was very pleased to have been invited and to have the opportunity of speaking with the Senate. He said that he wants to create a greater line of communication between faculty and students. He said there are many things about which the students need to inform the faculty. One of the most important goals for the College, he said, is to increase the diversity of the faculty and he called this one of the most crucial issues for the College. He said that he does not mean to imply that the faculty is not comprised of wonderful teachers

because, in fact, he has had really wonderful faculty throughout his career at John Jay: in fact, he is graduating next week and will begin his master's program in the fall here, which, he said, demonstrates how much he enjoys being at John Jay. Nonetheless, he said, we have to increase the University of the faculty and we have to break down the barriers that exist between faculty and students. It is most important to break down those barriers because the dialogue between students and teachers is something that: is extremely beneficial to the entire John Jay community.

Mr. Hernandez said that he wishes to applaud the work of the Faculty Senate in trying to restore the funding of the CUNY Police Cadet Program and in trying to keep the program alive. He said that this is one of the projects he has been devoting himself to even before he was elected to office. He thanked the Senate on behalf of the students for devoting its energies to this issue and he praised the Senate's Resolution on this issue.

President Kaplowitz told Mr. Hernandez that she and her colleagues on the Senate look forward to working with him and with the other members of the Student Council. Mr. Hernandez thanked the Senate for inviting him but excused himself to take a final examination. He was thanked for coming and was wished great success in his work as president of the student government.

6. Elections to Collese committees

a. Faculty panel for the Collese Judicial Committee

The College Judicial Committee is a faculty and student committee which adjudicates disciplinary charges brought against students, charges such as Vice President Witherspoon discusses in his memorandum about fighting on campus. The configuration of the Judicial Committee is mandated by the Board of Trustees Bylaws: the rotating chairs are faculty who are appointed by the President of the College; the Faculty Senate elects the six-member faculty panel (who are not necessarily members of the Senate) from which two faculty members for each disciplinary hearing are chosen by lot; a six-member student panel is elected by the student body.

It was noted that only one disciplinary charge was brought against a student during the past academic year and that was for allegedly defrauding the Federal government of several thousand dollars by accepting financial aid for which only full-time students are eligible although the student was attending on a part-time basis.

The current members of the faculty panel, whom the Senate elected last May, are all willing to serve again, if elected. They are: Professors Jane Bowers (English); Betsy Hegeman (Anthropology); Zelma Henriques (Law and Police Science); Richard Koehler (Law and Police Science); Barry Latzer (Government); and Timothy Stevens (English). The floor was opened for further nominations. There being none, Senator Gitter moved that the slate be reelected and the motion carried.

The Senate also voted to recommend that President Lynch reappoint the three rotating chairs of the Judicial Committee: Debra Baskin (Law and Police Science); James Malone (Counseling & Student Life); and Dagoberto Orrantia (Foreign Languages).

b. Committee on Cultural Pluralism and Diversity

The Charter requires the Senate to elect six faculty (who are not necessarily members of the Senate) to this College committee, which is comprised also of students, HEOs, and administrators. Five of the faculty elected by the Senate last year are available and are willing to serve if reelected: Vincent Del Castillo (Law and Police Science); James Malone (Counseling & Student Life); Carmen Solis (SEEK); Chuck Strozier (History/Center for the Study of Human Survival); and Maria Volpe (Sociology). Professor Laurence Holder (SEEK) has asked to be nominated and his name was placed in nomination.

Senator Suggs asked what mechanism was used to solicit nominations. President Kaplowitz explained that the Senate minutes had earlier in the year reported that these elections would take place. Furthermore, the Senate Constitution charges the Executive Committee with nominating Senators for College committees.

The floor was opened for further nominations. There being none, a motion to reelect the slate was made and carried.

c. Committee on Honorary Dearees

The Senate nominates candidates for the Committee on Honorary Degrees but the entire full-time faculty votes for the members of the Committee. The term of office is three years. Four people will continue to serve next year: Jane Bowers (English); Jannette Domingo (African-American Studies); Daniel Gasman (History); and Robert Panzarella (Law and Police Science), who is the committee's elected chair.

Three faculty have just completed their 3-year term and so their seats are vacant. Only tenured faculty who hold the rank of associate professor OR above are eligible to serve ON this Committee, which recommends to the Faculty Senate candidates for an honorary degree. Those candidates who are approved by the Senate are then recommended to the President of the College for his approval and then to the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees for their approval.

Five faculty have accepted nomination: Erica Abeel (Foreign Languages & Literature); Peter DeForest (science); Barry Latzer (Government); Maria Rodriguez (Speech & Theater/SEEK); and David Sternberg (Sociology).

The floor was opened for further nominations. The Senate agreed that further nominations could be made through August and that the Executive Committee would ascertain whether faculty nominated would accept nomination. The election will be held at the beginning of September so that the Committee on Honorary Degrees can begin its work early. [Ed. Professor Jose Arcaya (Psychology) was subsequently nominated and his name was placed on the ballot.]

- d. Town Hall Planning Committee: 2 seats
- e. Academic Calendar Committee: 1 seat
- f. Comprehensive Plannina Committee: 5 seats

The Senate decided to conduct these elections in September.

A question was asked about the Comprehensive Planning Committee. It was explained that the Committee is chaired by Dean for Planning and Development Mary Rothlein and that the Senate has five seats on the 25-member committee. Last year the Senate representatives were Lou Guinta, Karen Kaplowitz, Jim Malone, and Chris Suggs, all of whom are on this next year's Senate and are eligible for reelection, and Lydia Rosner, who is NOT on the new Faculty Senate. Senator Suggs explained that the Middle States self-study process led to a recognition that we need to do Long range planning in terms of the physical plant, the composition of the faculty, the size of the student body, etc. Senator Suggs noted that this is a new committee, having just been formed in December, that only three meetings have been held, and that the committee is still trying to define how to do long range planning. The Office of Dean Rothlein is planning a day-long workshop retreat for the committee in the fall with an outside consultant so the committee can formulate a planning process because, he explained, it is somewhat stymied as to how to go about long range planning.

Senator Richardson noted that the Senate has a number of its own standing committees, President Kaplowitz explained that Senators would be sent a committee sign-up form in September. Senator Richardson moved that the Senate establish a Senate affirmative action committee, He said there are pressing reasons for this, including the Middle States visiting team recommendation to improve the diversity of the faculty. The motion was seconded.

Senator Gitter said she does not understand what powers or role this committee would have nor what its relationship would be to the department PLB committees. Senator Richardson said that although the College endorses the goal of diversifying its faculty it seems not to act on that endorsement and that the faculty should take the lead in aggressively lobbying for improved affirmative action as well as investigating situations that call for investigation. He said there should be a Senate committee to which faculty can report problems and go for guidance.

Senator Feinberg said she is opposed to the formation of such a committee, because there are already places for faculty to go to seek redress and because the Senate ought not to second guess departments because doing so is both inappropriate and might cause unnecessary problems down the line. She said she shares Senator Richardson's concerns but does not think that his motion would provide a solution. Senator Feinberg also noted that Farris Forsythe, the Affirmative Action Officer, meets with departments and works with department PLB Committees.

Senator Agarwal agreed with Senator Feinberg and added that he had been a member of the College's Affirmative Action Committee, which is chaired by Farris Forsythe, and that his experience is that the function of the College's Affirmative Action Committee is to do exactly what Senator Richardson is proposing that a Senate committee do. Whenever any department engages in a search, the Affirmative Action Committee gets copies of the vitae of candidates and studies the process by which the department conducted its search and made its hiring decisions. Therefore, if the purpose of the motion is to create a committee that does this, that committee already exists. Senator Richardson said that there is no reason for there not to be two committees devoted to such an important issue.

President Kaplowitz suggested that we approach this matter in two ways. First, she said, we should consider inviting Farris Forsythe to a Senate meeting so we can discuss affirmative action issues with her. Second, she recommended that if after reviewing the comments made today, Senator Richardson still wishes to propose such a Senate committee, he should submit the proposal in writing as an agenda item in the fall and that this written proposal should define the purpose of the committee, what its functions would be, and how it would fit in at the College in light of the fact that there is a College Affirmative Action Committee as well as department PCB Committees. She said in that way we would be voting on specific language: she noted that a year ago Senator Richardson submitted in writing an agenda item proposing the creation of a Senate adjunct issues committee and the Senate voted to create such a committee, which has since conducted a valuable survey of the adjunct faculty. She suggested that Senators who support the idea of a Senate affirmative action committee could work with Senator Richardson in preparing the written proposal.

Senator Suggs moved to table the issue of a Senate affirmative action committee until the first meeting in September. The motion was seconded and carried. Senator Gitter asked that the text of the charge to the proposed committee be included with the agenda. Senator Richardson agreed to submit a written proposal for the agenda of the first meeting in September.

7. Report on the Faculty Senate survey of Administrative Offices
[Attachment D]

President Kaplowitz explained that a year ago the Senate's Evaluation Committee had surveyed the faculty about administrative offices. Professor Robert McCrie, who was a member of the Senate at the time, chaired the committee and the other members were Senators Brugnola, Wieschenberg, and the late Olga Scarpetta. She explained that Professor McCrie, who is on sabbatical leave, asked her to present the Report to the Senate.

The Report of the Survey [Attachment D] consists of both statistical information and narrative comments: the narrative is a summary, provided by Secretary Edward Davenport, of the discursive comments but the full text of the written comments will be sent to the heads of the Offices surveyed and to the supervisor of each of those people just as we and our department chairs see the comments written by students when evaluating the faculty: this was decided by the Senate earlier in the year. A motion to adopt the Report and to publish it as an attachment to the Senate minutes carried.

8. Proposed Charter amendment: Senator Suggs

Senator Suggs explained that the problem we have run into at the College Council in many cases is that matters of academic import come before the Council for a vote only a day or two after the members of the Council have seen them either because the agenda is not sent out sufficiently prior to the Council meeting or because the matters have come to the attention of the Council at a very late date. The situation is complicated also by the fact that College Council representatives need time to consult with members of their departments, whom they represent, or with the

Senate (in the case of those who are elected by the Senate), and there is also time needed for communication between the Curriculum Committee and the College Council and the Faculty Senate and sometimes with the Standards Committee and the Graduate Studies Committee. Also, there often has to be consultation with the academic department which is proposing the new major, for example, or with departments that will be affected by a proposal for a new or revised academic policy. Decisions and proposals to the College Council by various committees often have an impact on academic policy and academic policy is the purview of the faculty.

Senator Suggs proposed the following text for addition to the John Jay Charter: Article V. "Section 3. Regular Votes of the College Council. With the exception of those matters detailed in Article V, Section 1 and Section 2, above, all matters coming to a vote before the College Council will be passed by a simple majority at the meeting at which they have been introduced with the exception of items pertaining to matters of academic programs and academic policies and to matters of curriculum other than course proposals and course revisions. These matters shall be proposed and discussed as a first reading at a regular meeting of the College Council and shall be voted upon by the Council only after discussion as a second reading at the next regular meeting of the College Council."

Senator Suggs explained that this proposed Charter amendment is for the purpose of having the College Council adopt a voting procedure whereby every matter that affects academic policy, or academic programs, or a change in curricular programs (excluding course changes or course revisions which we should be able to comprehend in a single reading) come before the College Council in two readings: to be introduced and discussed first at one meeting of the College Council and then to be brought back at the subsequent College Council meeting for a second reading, at which time another discussion would take place and a vote would be taken. That would give members of the Council (and of the Senate) the chance to confer with their constituents.

The proposed Charter amendment is good for the faculty, Senator Suggs said, but it would also be good for the HEO representatives and for the student representatives and for the other non-faculty representatives, who often have no idea what those issues are about when they see them for the first time a few days before a Council meeting. This procedure, he said, might also force some committees to get their work done prior to the last meeting of the semester when we are usually flooded with an avalanche of major curricular proposals with very little chance to discuss them. Senator Suggs noted that this voting procedure would give us the better portion of an academic month to consider and consult about proposals before we vote on them.

Senator Suggs explained that in order to have this voting procedure in place and be a mandatory procedure henceforth, we have to have a Charter amendment because we do not have Bylaws for the College Council or for the College. The reason he is proposing that the amendment be in Section V of the Charter is that there really is no other place in the Charter where it would fit.

President Kaplowitz said that if the Senate agrees with this proposed voting procedure and endorses it, the Charter amendment proposal would be sent to the College Council as a proposal from the Senate to be placed on the College Council's September meeting for a first reading and on the October agenda for a second reading (all proposed Charter amendments require two readings).

A motion to adopt the proposal and to submit it as a College Council agenda item proposed by the Senate was made and carried by unanimous vote.

9. Proposal to create a Faculty Senate/Council of Chairs Committee on Phase II Planning

It was explained that the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate and the Executive Committee of the College of Chairs are proposing that the two organizations form a joint committee to plan for Phase II, which is the building that will replace North Hall and that will be contiguous to T Building. The purpose of the joint committee would be to survey the faculty about what it wants and what it does not want the new building to have and to look like. President Kaplowitz noted that this was not done before T Building was built and those who have offices there and who teach there have very strong opinions about the building, some very positive, of course, but some very negative.

This joint committee would survey both the North Hall and T Building faculty: the North hall faculty would be asked what it would like to have in Phase II and the T Building faculty would be asked what experiential knowledge they could share with us as to which aspects of T Building should be emulated and which should not be repeated. The committee could also review the departmental proposals for Phase II which were solicited and submitted by the department chairs in 1988. Since then, of course, the needs of departments may have changed dramatically.

President Kaplowitz reported that the previous day the Council of Chairs endorsed the proposal of the joint committee and agreed that the Chair of the Council of Chairs and the President of the Senate should be statutory members and that each group should choose three additional members (if the Senate decides to participate). The Chairs selected Professors Sandy Berger (Science), Ned Benton (Public Management), and Jannette Domingo (African-American Studies).

Senator Malone moved the endorsement of the Senate's participation in a joint Chairs/Senate committee. The motion passed by unanimous vote. It was agreed that the three Senate seats would be filled at the first meeting in September.

10. New business

Professor Haig Bohigian, chapter chair of the Professional Staff Congress, asked to brief the Senate about two matters. The first is the affirmative action survey instrument that was sent to all faculty by the CUNY Central Office. He said there had been a number of complaints about it and that the union had taken this up with CUNY and that the current recommendation of the PSC is that it is up to each faculty member to decide whether or not to fill out the questionnaire. The union's suggestion to CUNY had been to accept the completed surveys without the label (which includes one's name, address and social security number) but that the label is unacceptable. The response of 80th Street was that they are not going to keep files containing information about individual faculty members and that they need the labels simply to keep track of who submits the form and who does not. The union rejected this

answer, he said. The counter to that is that technically, by law, 80th Street can fill out the forms on their own for any faculty member who does not send in a completed form. So the PSC is advising each person to make an individual decision.

With respect to the contract payment bill: the payment bill now has a Senate number and an Assembly number. Professor Bohigian described the political machinations that are causing the delay but said that there is no question about the retroactive monies being paid: it is just a question of the monies being paid in a timely way. A complicating factor is that State law mandates that if all the payments have not been paid by September 20 they revert back to the State. He said he is sure that will not happen.

Senator Guinta, saying he was personally offended by the affirmative action questionnaire, asked why the PSC did not ask CUNY to withdraw the questionnaire. Professor Bohigian said that the PSC cannot tell management what to do: 80th Street's job is to manage CUNY and 80th Street felt that this was the best way to proceed. The PSC protested but the PSC cannot force CUNY to withdraw the form. By the same token, the PSC, being a responsible organization, cannot tell faculty not to fill out the questionnaire. So the position is that faculty should do what they wish. Senator Guinta asked whether the PSC pointed out how offended many faculty were by the form and Professor Bohigian said the PSC absolutely had done so. Professor Bohigian said that 80th Street noted that they are required by law to get this information and that they thought they would be able to avoid offending faculty by adopting the same terminology and categories that were used on the United States census form.

Senator Brugnola asked a question about the quality of the PSC's representation of adjunct faculty. President Kaplowitz explained that the Faculty Senate is not the appropriate place to take up union issues. Rather, she said, union issues should be taken up at PSC chapter meetings, which are held every month. Professor Bohigian agreed. President Kaplowitz noted that that is different from the Senate receiving a brief status report from Professor Bohigian in his capacity as the PSC chapter chair about matters relevant to the faculty, and she thanked him for apprising the Senate about both the affirmative action survey and the contract payment bill.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Edward Davenport
Recording Secretary

Announcements from the chair

May 11 University Faculty Senate meeting

Chancellor Reynolds reported to the UFS and said that she is pleased to see a resolution on the CUNY/NYPD Police Cadet Program on the UFS agenda for action later in the meeting. Chancellor Reynolds said that the cut in the Cadet Program came out of the blue and that the thinking behind the cut is that this program is such a favorite of the City Council that it would be one that would be easily restored. She called this kind of machination very cynical. The Chancellor said that because the Legislature approved the NYPD/CUNY Police Cadet Program as part of the Safe City/Safe Streets Program, CUNY is approaching this funding cut as a legal issue. She called the Cadet Program a real source of future leadership for the Police Department and therefore, she said, she is happy that this resolution is on the agenda. The Chancellor also spoke briefly about the budget, noting her concern about the City budget, which becomes effective in the summer of 1994. She also reported that she has asked the college presidents to summarize what campus life is like for their students.

Professor Kaplowitz asked the Chancellor about the funding of the associate degree Programs at John Jay and at NYCTech noting that although it is good news that funding for the associate degree programs at John Jay and at NYCTech is in the Mayor's final budget issued the previous week, once again the State is not funding these programs although the State continues to fund the associate degree programs at the SUNY senior colleges and thus continues this inequitable funding. Professor Kaplowitz asked the Chancellor, who is in the process of developing the CUNY budget request for 1994-95, whether she is again going to request funding from the State for the associate degree programs at JJ and at NYCTech. Chancellor Reynolds indicated that she is not going to again request that the State fund these programs but will instead continue with the arrangement arrived at with the City, which she called a permanent solution, but she also suggested that further information about this should be sought from Vice Chancellor for Budget Richard Rothbard.

The Chancellor answered questions about the decision of CUNY, in conjunction, she explained, with the State Attorney General, to hire Paul, Weiss, Rifkind (a private law firm) to represent CUNY in the discrimination case filed by Italian-American CUNY faculty and which was heard by Judge Constance Baker Motley who recently issued an injunction against CUNY. Chancellor Reynolds also said that CUNY would appeal the successful lawsuit of Professor Leonard Jeffries, the decision about which had been issued that day. When a UFS delegate questioned why the CUNY counsel was so terrible, Chancellor Reynolds said that the Attorney General makes all decisions about the attorney without any input from CUNY.

Professor Picken reported that a briefing of student leaders about the Chancellor's Advisory Report is scheduled at various campuses but that he has pointed out that such a briefing is no substitute for a hearing at which any student can speak. The Board of Trustees public hearing about the June Board agenda will be on Monday, June 21, at 4 PM and to speak one must register by telephone by Friday, June 18, before 4 PM, by calling 794-5555.

Professor Picken reported that he testified at the

May 11 University Faculty Senate meetina (cont)

hearing on the Chancellor's Advisory Report that was held by State Assemblyman Edward C. Sullivan (chair of the Higher Education Committee) on the morning of Thursday, April 29. The chairs of the Faculty Senates of Hunter, CCNY, and Queens testified as did UFS Vice Chair Sandi Cooper and 12 other faculty. On Thursday, May 13, he will testify at the hearings being held by State Senator David Paterson on the funding of CUNY.

Elections were held for the five at-large seats on the, UFS Executive Committee. Nine delegates had been nominated at the previous meeting and had provided nominating statements. The five who were elected were: John Donoghue (NYCTech); Karen Kaplowitz (John Jay); Eleanor Lundeen (CCNY); Susan O'Malley (Kingsborough); and David Speidel (Queens). The four executive officers all are beginning the second year of their two-year term: Chair: Robert Picken (Queens); Vice Chair: Sandi Cooper (CSI); Secretary: Bernard Sohmer (CCNY); Treasurer: Fred Greenbaum (Queensborough)

A resolution calling on all CUNY presidents to make public the expenditures of all college research grant overhead monies was adopted.

A resolution was moved by Professor Kaplowitz urging city officials, including Mayor Dinkins, Speaker Vallone, and the members of the City Council, to restore the funding of the CUNY/NYPD Police Cadet Program. This was a shorter version than John Jay Senate's resolution from which it was drawn: however, in moving the resolution, Professor Kaplowitz explained that the current class is comprised of **67%** students of color, 37% women, are required to be NYC residents, and that an additional 1000 students have been screened for the program. UFS delegates Inez Martinez (Kingsborough), Jack Donoghue (NYCTech), and Mary Omolu (Medgar Evers) spoke in support of the resolution, which was adopted by unanimous vote. [Attachment B]

President Edison O. Jackson, who presides over Medgar Evers College, spoke to the UFS about the programs and accomplishments of his college.

May 12 President's cabinet

Much of the meeting was devoted to the Police Cadet Program. The funding cut was made **by** City's Office of Management & Budget. President Lynch will be testifying before several City Council committees. Dean Curran reported he has had Polaroid photos taken of each Cadet, who then wrote a letter to City Hall with the photograph attached. Professor Kaplowitz reported that the UFS unanimously adopted a resolution (based on the JJ Faculty Senate's resolution) calling on city officials to restore the funding of the program. The new Comptroller, Carl McCall, will be honored by 100 Black Men and 100 Black Women at a reception to be held at John Jay on June 3: a number of years ago Comptroller McCall taught at John Jay for a semester in the Graduate Program. Vice President Witherspoon reported that the Student Council elections have been validated by the student Judicial Board: no candidate contested the elections. **2,000** freshmen students have been allocated to John Jay so far.

May 13 College Council meeting

Student Council President Ronald Quartimon reported that the Student Council unanimously adopted a resolution endorsing the mandatory wearing and showing of John Jay ID cards in any

May 13 Collecre Council meeting (cont)

manner or form required by the College.

An amended calendar of Council meetings was distributed. A proposal was approved to provisionally adopt the calendar (because no one had seen the amended calendar) and that the calendar be finalized by June 30.

Ballots were cast for the College Council committees. President Lynch announced that the Faculty Senate is electing members for the graduate dean search committee: the Council agenda had stated that the Council's faculty members would elect search committee members but this had been changed.

The faculty members approved a tentative list of June and September graduates. The Council ratified the recommendations of the Honors, Prizes, and Awards Committee to grant the following awards at commencement: the Leonard E. Reisman Award to Jeffrey Cilione; Scholarship & Service Awards: Alethia Matheson and Ronald Quartimon; Service Awards: Jacqueline Amedee, Herman Rivera, Barbara Sabater, and Howard Vargas. (The members of the Committee on Undergraduate Honors, Prizes, Scholarships & Awards are: VP Roger Witherspoon, Dean Hank Smit, Professors Rubie Malone, Nick McNickel, Jill Norgren, and four students: Robert Hernandez, Lisa John, Tonya McCaw, Dove Ben Okpaire.)

The Council approved new course proposals recommended by the Curriculum Committee and the addition of two courses to the recently revised Police Science major. The Council also approved the prerequisite changes proposed by academic departments and approved by the Curriculum Committee.

Although the ten recommendations having to do with the associate degree programs were reported as not needing action by the College Council, a motion was unanimously adopted by the College Council to ratify recommendations #2 through #10, with the relevant departments and persons to report back to the College Council at the November Council meeting about actions required by these recommendations.

One of the recommendations, which became College policy by the Council's action, is to admit **75%** of the entering freshman into the baccalaureate program and **25%** into the associate degree program (previously the allocation had been 50% into each).

The first recommendation, to terminate the associate degree program in government and public administration, was deleted by action of the Curriculum Committee which voted to send the issue back to the two departments which jointly offer the degree (Department of Government and the Department of Public Management) to further study the degree and the implications of terminating it.

The Council's executive committee was unable to fulfill its charge to propose a course of action when College Council members are excessively absent. Dean McHugh had issued a document in April reporting that 5 Council members had missed 3 meetings; 6 members had missed 4 meetings; and 3 members had missed 5 meetings thus far: this is despite the fact that only 6 regularly scheduled meetings had been held this year so far.

Dean McHugh's April 19 memorandum to President Lynch noted that in October 1991 the Council approved a resolution requiring that a member who had missed three meetings be asked to attend or be replaced by a member of his or her constituency. Noting that this approach is not working, Dean McHugh asked that the Council's executive committee develop

May 13 College Council meeting (cont)

an approach to this problem. The Council approved a motion directing the executive committee to present possible courses of action in September and to solicit possible solutions from members of the Council

May 19 Council of Chairs meeting

Registrar Gray briefed the chairs about computerized registration. The test during the one-day summer school registration will involve 1400 students, which is the same number who will register each day in the fall.

Professor Crozier reported that the Council of Chairs were given two more seats to fill on the search committee and the Chairs elected Professor Catherine Rovira (Foreign Languages & Lit) and Professor Sydney Samuel (Mathematics).

Professor Crozier was reelected the Chair of the Council of Chairs, by acclamation. Professor David Goddard was reelected Deputy Chair, by acclamation. The other three members elected to the Chairs executive committee are Professors Ned Benton, Catherine Rovira, and Harold Sullivan.

Professor Crozier reported that both he and Professor Kaplowitz have decided to place on the agenda of their respective organizations a proposal for a Phase II Planning Committee. The Council chose Professors Ned Benton (Public Management), Sandy Berger (Science), and Jannette Domingo (African-American Studies) to serve on the committee.

VP Witherspoon issues policy about fighting on campus

On May 17, Vice President for Student Development Roger Witherspoon issued a memorandum addressed to the John Jay College Community. The memorandum is cc'd to President Lynch, to the Faculty Senate, to the Student Council, and to Club Presidents. The memo reports that a fight took place near the conclusion of an '**End of the Year Party**' on May 13 and states that the "individuals responsible for this incident have been identified and are being called in for immediate disciplinary action. If the Faculty/Student Judicial Committee hears this case I will ask that all of the individuals involved be suspended from the College for at least a semester. In addition, in the future, I have instructed all of the Deans in Student Development to immediately suspend any students involved in a fight on campus. This suspension will last seven school days and will lead to a disciplinary hearing." The memorandum ends with the following sentence, which is underlined, and is in caps and bold type: "**Fighting on campus will not be tolerated!**"

Resolution of the University Faculty Senate
of The City University of New York
on the CUNY/NYPD Police Cadet Program

May 11, 1993

- Whereas: The CUNY/NYPD Cadet Corps is **an** innovative program designed and implemented jointly by The City University of New York and the New York Police Department to produce college-educated police officers who are reflective and representative of the people of the City of New York whom they serve, and
- Whereas: The CUNY Cadets, having been recruited by CUNY and screened for police service by the NYPD, are all full-time students enrolled in Associate Degree programs at 10 CUNY Colleges in all five boroughs, these colleges being John Jay College of Criminal Justice, **Medgar** Evers College, The College of Staten Island, New York City Technical College, Borough of Manhattan Community College, Bronx Community College, Hostos Community College, Kingsborough Community College, LaGuardia Community College, Queensborough Community College, and the program must therefore **be** viewed **as** a University-wide initiative, and
- Whereas: The CUNY/NYPD Cadet Corps was totally eliminated in the Mayor's Executive Budget announced on **M a y** 3, 1993, whereby the elimination of the \$3.5 million program will mean **the** layoff of the entire class this fall and **the** loss of hundreds of college-educated future police officers, therefore be it
- Resolved: That the University Faculty Senate of The City University of New **York** calls upon city officials, including Mayor David Dinkins, Speaker Peter Vallone, and the members of the City Council, to restore the funding of the CUNY/NYPD Cadet Corps.

Adopted Unanimously by the 210th Plenary Session

**PROPOSED INSTITUTIONAL POLICY ON:
MINOR CHILDREN ON CAMPUS**

We realize that many John Jay students are parents and that parents sometimes have emergencies: the best-made plans to care for the children while parents are in class can come apart, often on short notice. At the same time that we are sympathetic to the parental problems, we are concerned about the safety of children who are left unattended in public areas of the school or who are distracting to instructors and other students in class.

I. **MINOR CHILDREN IN THE CLASSROOM**

A. **Generally**

No guests are permitted in the classroom as seats are limited.

It is the responsibility of faculty to ensure that the classroom environment is conducive to teaching and to learning,

B. **In an Emergency situation**

1. Approval of instructor is required before class begins and outside the classroom setting.
2. No previous incident of classroom disruption
3. Children may be allowed on a one time basis
4. If the child is disruptive or distracting to students or to the professor, the professor shall ask that the child be taken out of the classroom.

11. **MINOR CHILDREN ON CAMPUS**

A, **Generally**

Minor children are not permitted on campus unless for the purpose of attending the Children's Center, or a special event such as the December Holiday Party for Children, or when attending, with their parents/guardian, a social or cultural event designed for families.

B. **In an Emergency Situation**

1. In cases when it is necessary to bring minor children on campus, they must be in the company of their parent/guardian at all times.
2. If children are left unattended, Security is instructed to inquire regarding the parent's whereabouts and take said children to a secure location.
3. Repeated inattention to these College policies may result in disciplinary charges brought against the John Jay student.

JOHN JAY COLLEGE OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE

The City University of New York



**FACULTY SENATE EVALUATION OF
ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES: 1992**

June, 1993

INTRODUCTION

In recent years a few faculty senates, or their equivalents, have undertaken formal evaluations of administrative services. (For a partial bibliography on this issue, see Academe, January-February, **1989**.) Nonetheless, such reviews sponsored by faculty groups must be considered to be uncommon at present.

After earlier discussion, the Faculty Senate of John Jay College decided to undertake this process in the academic year **1988-1989**, and a committee was formed headed by Prof. Robert Panzarella which developed a questionnaire. This form was then forwarded to all department heads for comment. Along the way the questionnaire was revised frequently to reflect suggestions received from administrative department heads, Senate members, and others.

In the academic year **1991-92**, the questionnaire was revised further to put the emphasis on evaluation of services--not administrators per se--though inevitably the distinction could be blurred in the minds of some respondents. The questionnaire was distributed to all full-time and part-time faculty members in late April, **1992**. As chair of the committee, I received all responses and secured them until the committee met to open the sealed envelopes in August. Of 261 full-time faculty members, **98 (37%)** replied. Of **345** part-time faculty members, **56 (16%)** replied.

Additionally, 23 faculty members returned the questionnaires in sealed envelopes, but did not indicate their names and departments on the outer envelope and such responses were not counted. If their responses were included, the total response rate would be **29.2%**. Also, some members of the Committee and I chose not to submit responses in order to emphasize process objectivity. Some faculty members received questionnaires while on leave for the semester and were unable to respond in time. Thus, the response of active present faculty personnel seemed high and likely to be representative of faculty views.

Four persons requested questionnaires which they said they did not receive. All envelopes from respondents received by the Committee were checked to assure active faculty status.

Please note the Guide on the next page before reading the results. The Committee has sought to be impartial in the management of this evaluation process and no value judgments on the implications, if any, are made by the Committee from this evaluation. Toward this objective, the Faculty Senate voted in the spring of **1993** to eliminate all specific comments and summarized them.

Many persons have aided this evaluation to be completed. I particularly acknowledge the early Committees for their work, and the recent Committee members who have given time freely: Philip Bonifacio, Orlanda Brugnola, Agnes Wieschenberg,

and the late Olga Scarpetta who dearly charmed us with her presence. I also wish to thank Faculty Senate President Karen Kaplowitz for her unwavering support; Prof. Robert Panzarella for creating the document; Peter **H.** Barnett who transcribed the responses into a data file; Gail Hauss who wrote the programs to analyze the data, and Prof. Edward **A.** Davenport who efficiently summarized the discursive comments to the various questions.

Robert D. McCrie
Chair
Faculty Senate Committee on
Evaluation of Administrative Services

A GUIDE TO UNDERSTANDING RESPONSES

Faculty members were asked to evaluate services provided by the administration by rating them on a scale of 1 to 7. For each unit the same four questions were asked. Ratings ranged from 1 to 7, with one being the lowest rating, 4 being the mid-point, and 7 being the highest rating.

Respondents were asked to circle the number of their rating for each unit they wished. They were also invited to write in any comments they wished, and attach extended written comments on separate paper. (No extended comments were received.)

If faculty members had minimal or no contact with the unit during the past year, they were asked to omit evaluating it and continue to the next question.

Respondents were also asked to indicate if they were adjuncts or full-time faculty, and if their teaching was mostly in North Hall or the Tenth Avenue Building. Answers were mixed together except for a few questions in which were separated for the two buildings because of different experience.

Guide to Responses. All participants were invited to evaluate services by answering the following questions.

1. How much use or contact have you had with this unit in the past year?
2. How adequate was availability of service (days of the week, hours)?
3. How adequate was the range of services?
4. How was the quality of service (responsiveness, efficiency, etc.)?

Responses indicate Mean (half above and half below) and Number of responses for full-time (FT) and part-time (PT) Faculty members.

Comments from faculty members were summarized and are reported following the numerical scores. However, the original comments, in edited form, have been transmitted directly to the relevant department: manager and to their supervisors.

1. Bookstore

	<u>F/T Mean</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>PT Mean</u>	<u>N</u>
Contact	3.84	92	2.71	48
Service Availability	5.04	84	5.13	38
Range of Services	4.88	82	5.02	40
Quality of Services	4.93	87	5.32	41

There were 7 positive comments and 18 negative comments. The most common positive comment was that the staff was helpful. The most common negative comment was that prices were too high.

2. Faculty Dining Room

	<u>F/T Mean</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>PT Mean</u>	<u>N</u>
Contact	2.94	85	2.20	41
Service Availability	4.38	53	4.11	19
Range of Services	4.09	53	4.05	19
Quality of Services	4.78	55	5.00	17

There were 6 positive comments and 17 negative comments. The most common positive comment was that service was good. The most common negative comment was that the atmosphere was depressing.

3. Student Cafeteria

	<u>F/T Mean</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>PT Mean</u>	<u>N</u>
Contact	4.73	90	3.36	42
Service Availability	5.21	71	5.06	31
Range of Services	4.64	70	4.65	31
Quality of Services	4.76	71	5.14	29

There were 12 positive comments and 27 negative comments. The most common positive comment was that the staff was friendly. The most common negative comments were about the limited menu and the loud noise.

4. Instructional Services: Films, Video

	<u>FT Mean</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>PT Mean</u>	<u>N</u>
Contact	4.14	90	3.00	44
Service Availability	5.57	74	4.80	35
Range of Services	5.32	72	5.20	35
Quality of Services	5.62	76	5.50	34

There were 10 positive comments and 9 negative comments. The most common positive comment was that the staff was helpful. The most common negative comment was that there was inadequate budget for staff and films.

5. Technical Services: Print Shop, Copying

	<u>FT Mean</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>PT Mean</u>	<u>N</u>
Contact	4.04	89	2.68	37
Service Availability	5.29	69	4.09	22
Range of Services	5.50	68	4.55	22
Quality of Services	5.64	72	4.78	23

There were 19 positive comments and 9 negative comments. The most common positive comment was that the staff was helpful. The most common negative comment was that the tight budget restricted hours and the numbers of copies.

6. Services: Mail and Fax

	<u>FT Mean</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>PT Mean</u>	<u>N</u>
Contact	4.20	90	2.23	35
Service Availability	5.35	72	4.50	16
Range of Services	5.31	71	4.75	16
Quality of Services	5.44	72	5.18	17

There were 8 positive comments and 12 negative comments. The most common positive comment was that the staff was helpful. The most common negative comment was that fax service is needed in North Hall and after 5 pm in the T-Building.

7. Telephone Services

	<u>FT Mean</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>PT Mean</u>	<u>N</u>
Contact	4.61	83	2.93	41
Service Availability	5.33	69	5.00	25
Range of Services	5.00	69	5.17	24
Quality of Services	5.12	66	5.30	23

There were 8 positive comments and 17 negative comments. The most common positive comment was that message retrieval works well. The most common negative comment was that faculty must regain access to local information and long distance lines.

8. Security

	<u>FT Mean</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>PT Mean</u>	<u>N</u>
Contact	3.92	92	3.45	44
Service Availability	5.08	77	5.41	39
Range of Services	4.82	74	5.47	36
Quality of Services	4.72	76	5.51	39

There were 6 positive comments and 12 negative comments. The most common positive comment was that most security officers were polite and helpful. The most common negative comment was that the department is overly bureaucratic and the student-officers were not effective in dealing with other students.

9. Office: Payroll Related (W-4's, W-2's, check distribution)

	<u>FT Mean</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>PT Mean</u>	<u>N</u>
Contact	4.85	89	4.12	52
Service Availability	5.18	82	5.22	45
Range of Services	5.44	81	5.51	43
Quality of Services	5.37	84	5.42	45

There were 7 positive comments and 6 negative comments. The most common positive comment was "generally good service." The most common negative comment was about the long lines for paychecks.

10. Business Office: Purchasing/gifts, grants, & program adminst.

	<u>FT Mean</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>PT Mean</u>	<u>N</u>
Contact	2.65	72	1.32	31
Service Availability	4.81	31	4.22	9
Range of Services	4.87	30	4.44	9
Quality of Services	4.39	31	5.00	8

There was 1 positive comment and 9 negative comments. The positive comment was about grant handling. The most common negative comment was about byzantine procedures.

11. Building and Grounds: Cleaning

	<u>FT Mean</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>PT Mean</u>	<u>N</u>
Contact	4.71	90	2.60	40
Service Availability	4.30	77	4.12	24
Range of Services	4.29	78	4.04	25
Quality of Services	4.40	77	4.50	26

There were 6 positive comments and 27 negative comments. The most common positive comment was that cleaning in certain areas was good. The most common negative comment was about filthy lavatories in North Hall.

12. Building & Grounds: Maintenance & Repairs

	<u>FT Mean</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>PT Mean</u>	<u>N</u>
Contact	3.54	83	1.84	32
Service Availability	3.78	59	3.71	14
Range of Services	3.70	56	3.71	14
Quality of Services	2.64	58	4.43	14

There was 1 positive comment and 23 negative comments. The positive comment was that service was good in one specific area. The most common negative comments were about slow response to complaints and about locks and doors in North Hall having remained broken for years.

13. Microcomputer Lab: Near the Bookstore

	<u>FT Mean</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>PT Mean</u>	<u>N</u>
Contact	2.93	76	1.91	33
Service Availability	5.16	44	5.08	12
Range of Services	5.34	44	5.67	12
Quality of Services	5.33	45	5.92	12

There were 9 positive comments and 4 negative comments. The most common positive comment was that it was a "professional tightly run ship." The most common negative comment was about the excessively strict rules.

14. Mainframe Computer Center: on the 2nd floor of North Hall

	<u>FT Mean</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>PT Mean</u>	<u>N</u>
Contact	1.97	65	1.28	29
Service Availability	3.92	25	4.71	7
Range of Services	3.48	25	5.50	6
Quality of Services	3.44	25	5.67	6

There were 2 positive comments and 8 negative comments. The positive comments indicated helpfulness up to a point. The most common negative comment was that it did not provide the services our College needs.

15. Personnel Office: Records, communications, info.

	<u>FT Mean</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>PT Mean</u>	<u>N</u>
Contact	4.21	09	2.29	38
Service Availability	5.35	75	4.77	22
Range of Services	5.41	75	4.86	22
Quality of Services	5.63	75	5.52	21

There were 11 positive comments and 5 negative comments. The most common positive comment was that the office was usually helpful. The most common negative comment was that at times they were not helpful.

16. Office of the Presidents Public Relations

	<u>FT Mean</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>PT Mean</u>	<u>N</u>
Contact	3.57	84	1.91	34
Service Availability	4.75	63	4.07	14
Range of Services	4.49	61	5.14	14
Quality of Services	4.40	63	6.08	13

There were 7 positive comments and 12 negative comments. The most common positive comment was that the office is good at public relations. The most common negative comment was that the office does not place a high priority on supporting good teaching or good teachers.

17. Office of the Provost

	<u>FT Mean</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>PT Mean</u>	<u>N</u>
Contact	3.97	86	1.66	32
Service Availability	5.19	69	4.45	11
Range of Services	5.01	67	5.45	11
Quality of Services	5.01	69	4.91	11

There were 5 positive comments and 7 negative comments. The most common positive comment was that the provost was accessible. The most common negative comment was that the office does not properly support faculty,

18. Office of the VP for Administrative Affairs

	<u>FT Mean</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>PT Mean</u>	<u>N</u>
Contact	3.13	76	1.70	30
Service Availability	3.94	48	4.44	9
Range of Services	3.74	46	4.44	9
Quality of Services	3.60	48	4.62	8

There were 2 positive comments and 15 negative comments. The positive comments indicated that the office was responsive. The most common negative comment was that faculty problems are low on the list of priorities.

19. Office of the VP for Student Development

	<u>FT Mean</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>PT Mean</u>	<u>N</u>
Contact	3.30	77	1.45	31
Service Availability	4.87	45	4.25	8
Range of Services	4.84	44	4.25	8
Quality of Services	4.91	46	5.14	7

There were 2 positive comments and 3 negative comments. The positive comments indicated that the office was good with students. The most common negative comment was that more should be done for evening students.

20. Student Counseling and Referral Services

	<u>FT Mean</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>PT Mean</u>	<u>N</u>
Contact	3.37	78	2.03	32
Service Availability	5.42	45	4.31	16
Range of Services	5.38	42	4.37	16
Quality of Services	5.56	43	5.00	15

There were 8 positive comments and 7 negative comments. The most common positive comment was that the office is good with students. The most common negative comment was that the office is not prepared to deal with academic advisement.

21. Office of the Dean of Undergraduate Studies

	<u>FT Mean</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>PT Mean</u>	<u>N</u>
Contact	3.97	80	1.71	31
Service Availability	4.98	57	4.70	10
Range of Services	4.94	54	4.67	9
Quality of Services	4.92	60	5.00	10

There were 4 positive comments and 9 negative comments. The most common positive comment was that the office was engaged in laudable attempts to raise standards in the undergraduate program. The most common negative comments were that the office was under-staffed and did not develop curriculum.

22. Office of the Dean of Graduate Studies

	<u>FT Mean</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>PT Mean</u>	<u>N</u>
Contact	3.08	71	1.17	29
Service Availability	4.60	35	4.33	6
Range of Services	4.41	34	4.33	6
Quality of Services	4.21	38	5.20	5

There were 4 positive comments and 5 negative comments. The most common positive comment was that the office was courteous. The most common negative comment was that neither the operation of this office nor the graduate program in general were widely understood at the College.

23. Office of the Registrar

	<u>FT Mean</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>PT Mean</u>	<u>N</u>
Contact	4.80	91	2.97	47
Service Availability	5.40	80	5.03	35
Range of Services	4.70	80	5-21	33
Quality of Services	5.69	83	5.08	36

There were 11 positive comments and 6 negative comments. The most common positive comment was that the office does a lot of work and should be a model for the College. The most common negative comment was about the chaos at registration.

24. Office of Funded Research and Institutional Grants

	<u>FT Mean</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>PT Mean</u>	<u>N</u>
Contact	3.44	81	2.03	32
Service Availability	6.02	50	4.77	13
Range of Services	6.08	50	5.00	13
Quality of Services	6.23	53	4.92	13

There were 15 positive comments and 1 negative comment. The most common positive comment was that the office was service-oriented. The only negative comment was that the office did not understand academic research.

Cardiovascular fitness center

There were 8 positive comments and 2 negative comments. The most common positive comment was that the office was well run and helpful. The negative comments indicated that there were insufficient hours.

The Week of...

There were 2 positive comments and 2 negative comments. The positive comments indicated that the information provided was essential. The negative comments indicated that the editing should be better.

Alumni Office

There were 2 positive comments.

Affirmative Action

There was 1 negative comment urging that the office be more active .

Since the completion of the questionnaire, several changes have occurred concerning administrative services. Among these are:

- A fax machine for faculty use has been installed in North Hall;
- The mainframe computer service has a new director, and
- The "chaos" of registration has been eliminated by an on-line system.