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Budget and Planning Committee Meeting

September 20, 2010

Notes

I. President Travis gave an overview of the financial situation at the college that has been adversely impacted by the college not meeting its enrollment target and NYS budget reductions.

II. Senior Vice President Robert Pignatello provided some additional detail on the actions taken to reduce spending in FY 2010 that resulted in a year end surplus. Those actions included hiring pauses, not filling faculty and staff vacancies, increasing use of other college funds to offset tax levy costs and reduced OTPS expenditures.

III. SVP Pignatello then gave the attached presentation that included additional information on the Budget Review Exercise and results, the impact of the reductions implemented, and developments since May 2010 when the committee last met. He also presented data on Full time faculty strength, instructional spending at John Jay College, annual enrollment projections, changes in enrollment at John Jay as compared to other CUNY colleges. Lastly the presentation provided the financial plan projection for FY 2011 and a proposed action plan to overcome the projected $3.9 million shortfall. The committee discussed the data and action plan.

IV. A draft of a memo from President Travis to the College Community regarding the financial picture at the college was shared with the committee and the committee provided feedback and suggested edits. The President committed to consult with the FPS on any full time hiring decisions.
Budget and Planning Committee Meeting

February 17, 2011

Notes

I. President Travis gave an update on the NYS Budget situation and the uncertainties regarding the FY 2012 state budget. The NYS budget recognizes the 5% tuition increase ($40 million for CUNY) approved by the CUNY BOT. The president expressed thanks to the students for their willingness to bear the increase. The college will model some contingency plans in the event of additional NYS reductions to CUNY. Over the next 2 months we will assess the impact of the reductions and establish priorities if we have any ability to make investments.

II. SVP Pignatello then gave the attached presentation that included a status report on the various actions proposed to balance the FY 2011 budget and whether or not we achieved them. He also provided an update on the Post financial plan developments including our success in engaging the University for additional resources. CUNY increased our allocations by $1.2 million. We have maintained a hiring pause. There has been no clear guidance on replacement of ERI. Lastly the presentation provided the financial plan projection as of the 2nd Quarter of FY 2011 and a proposed financial planning process for FY 2012 that includes consultation with the FPS (financial planning subcommittee) and SPS (strategic planning subcommittee) as a joint committee.

III. An overview of the new building budget request was discussed. We are awaiting feedback from the University as to how much funding will be provided.

IV. Associate Provost Llama provided an update on the Master Plan and Middle states review. He spoke about the need to align our Budget and Planning activities to Middle States standards and timeline to connect subcommittee activities to the relevant dates.

Master Plan Impellementation. The master plan was approved on October. The President and Vice-Presidents met and developed strategies to implement the master plan. The strategies are now being mapped to the next 4 years so we can monitor and be responsive to changing circumstances and unforeseen opportunities. Although the goals and objectives are fixed, the strategies may change. We will work on costing out and prioritizing the strategies over the next few months.

Middle States: 6 working groups have been established. The Steering committee and working groups are preparing for the self-study which is a set of research questions which focus on Middle states standards and issues at John Jay. The design documents to be completed at the end of March.

Other Discussion
There were some questions regarding why John Jay has not had a robust summer program. The feeling is that some faculty may perceive that students cannot learn in a shortened session. Others pointed out there is a significant body of research that refutes that notion. Previously the college policy restricted the number of courses a student could take in the summer. The Year Round College Task Force report recommended revising those restrictions as well as several other measures to increase of summer enrollment and make better use of our facilities.

The committee also discussed on-line learning and the desire to enhance this program through technology fee funding.
Budget and Planning Committee Meeting

May 18, 2011

Notes

I. Sr VP Pignatello gave an update on FY 2011 financial situation, the status of the new building and a review of developments since the Committee last met in February.

II. SVP Pignatello then gave the attached presentation that included an update on the CUNY policy on personnel actions during the hiring pause. All exemptions from the pause must be approved by the University. We then discussed the 3rd Quarter Financial Plan projection and a preliminary estimate for FY 2012 and FY 2013. There are a number of uncertainties including the potential budget reductions and any change in the NYS tuition policy.

III. The college will receive $5.7 million to operate the new building. Target opening is late summer/early fall 2011.
The College Council held its first meeting of the 2010-2011 academic year on Thursday, September 23, 2010. The meeting was called to order at 3:40 p.m. and the following members were present: Spiros Bakiras, Elton Beckett, Ben Bierman, Jane Bowers, Marvie Brooks, Elise Champeil, Sergei Cheloukhine, Shu-Yuan Cheng, Kathleen Collins, Elizabeth Cyran, Lyell Davies, Virginia Diaz, James DiGiovanna, Jannette Domingo, Jennifer Dysart, Beverly Frazier, Terry Furst, Robert Garot, Katie Gentile, Lior Gideon, Norman Groner, Maki Haberfeld, Jay Hamilton, Chad Benito Infante, Berenecea Johnson Eanes, Olivera Jokic, Karen Kaplowitz, Mehak Kapoor, Maxine Kerr, Nilsa Lam, Anne Lopes, Sylvia Lopez, Vincent Maiorino, Xerxes Malki, David Munns, Joseph Onwu, Robert Pignatello, Carina Quintian, Rick Richardson, Raul Rubio, Richard Saulnier, Michael Scaduto, Francis Sheehan, Davinder Paul Singh, Staci Strobl, Christopher Sui, Courtney Taylor, Pat Tovar, Jeremy Travis, Michelle Tsang, Fritz Umbach, Monica Varsanyi, Valerie West, and Anastasia Williams.


Alternates Present: Nancy Marshall

I. Adoption of the Agenda
It was moved to adopt the agenda as presented. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

II. Minutes of the May 13, 2010 College Council Meeting
It was moved to accept the minutes as presented. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

III. Approval of Members of the College Council
It was moved to adopt the members with the following additions:

Committee on Student Interest
Andrene Clay
Committee on Faculty Personnel
Akuba Chinebuah
IV. Report from the Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee (attachments B1 – B14)

It was moved to adopt the item marked “B1. Proposal for a 2+2/Joint Degree Program with Kingsborough Community College for an A.S. in Science for Forensic Science/B.S. in Forensic Science.” The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the proposal marked “B2. Proposal for a New Minor in Film Studies.” The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the new course proposal marked “B3. PAD 3XX Fraud, Waste, Abuse and Corruption in Public Organizations.” The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the new course proposal marked “B4. PAD 3XX Decisions in Crises” The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the new course proposal marked “B5. SOC 3XX Gangs and Transnationalism”. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

It was moved to adopt course revision proposal marked “B6. PAD 241 Computer Applications in Public Administration”. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

It was moved to adopt course revision proposal marked “B7. PAD 340 Planning”. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

It was moved to adopt course revision proposal marked “B8. PAD 346 Administration of Personnel Resources”. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

It was moved to adopt course revision proposal marked “B9. SPE 209 Dialect, Accent and Voice for the Professional”. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

It was moved to adopt course revision proposal marked “B10. MUS 102 Music Skills.” The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the proposal marked “B11. Policy on Courses Repeated after Failing Three Times”. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the proposal marked “B12. Policy on Credit limits for Students Coming off Academic Probation”. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.
It was moved to send the proposal marked “B13. Policy on Extra Work and Grade Appeals & Changes” back to Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the proposal marked “B14. Policy on Electronic Withdrawal from Courses” as amended below:

*In order to minimize the loss of laboratory keys and equipment, the Registrar will provide the Science Department with a Stop Code for students who withdraw without returning keys and equipment. The Science Department will manage this process through use of the code and special access to SIMS.*

For the Faculty Issue:

*The faculty member is automatically notified through their John Jay College email when students withdraw from their courses. The W grade will be applied to the student’s record when it is received electronically. This timing is important in order to be in compliance with Federal Department of Education regulations. The faculty member may reverse this grade by filing a Faculty Report of Alleged Violation of Academic Integrity. In this case a PEN grade will be assigned. The faculty member and the student may also request that the Registrar rescind the resignation within one week of the filing of the form.*

The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

V:  Report from the Committee on Graduate Studies (attachments C1-C3)

It was moved to adopt the new course proposal marked “C1. FOS 761: Forensic Anthropology: Osteological & Genetic Identification.” The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the new course proposal marked “C2. CRJ 735: Prosecuting Crime.” The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the proposal for a course revision proposal marked “C3. A change in the course description for FOS 730: Molecular Biology for Forensic Scientists.” The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.
It was moved to adopt the proposal marked “C4. CRJ 710: Issues in Criminal Justice I – to be renamed CRJ 710: Issues in Criminal Justice—Theory and Courts.” The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the proposal marked “C5. CRJ 711: Issues in Criminal Justice II – to be renamed CRJ 711: Issues in Criminal Justice – Policing and Corrections.” The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

It was moved to adopt a new policy marked “C6. A resolution to change the diploma awarded to students in the Master’s program to include all Master of Arts and Master of Science degree programs.” The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

VI: 2009-2010 College Council Committee Record
The 2009-2010 College Council Committee Record was distributed to the College Council.

VII: College Council Calendar 2010-2011
The College Council Calendar 2010-2011 was distributed to the College Council.

VIII: New Business

The College Council approved the following charge to the Student Evaluation of the Faculty Committee:

The Student Evaluation of the Faculty Committee shall gather and review examples of student evaluation instruments of undergraduate, graduate, and online courses from colleges known to be especially effective in the evaluation of faculty by students. The Committee shall consult with individuals who have expertise in pedagogy and assessment, beyond their own expertise. The Committee shall solicit suggested changes and improvements in the John Jay instrument and shall develop a proposed revision. This proposed revision shall be shared with the College community for comment and ultimate transmittal to the College Council for action at the March meeting of the College Council.

The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:16 p.m.
The College Council held its second meeting of the 2010-2011 academic year on Thursday, October 14, 2010. The meeting was called to order at 3:40 p.m. and the following members were present: Spiros Bakiras, Andrea Balis, Elton Beckett, Ben Bierman, Jane Bowers, Elise Champeil, Serguei Cheloukhine, Shu-Yuan Cheng, Kathleen Collins, Elizabeth Cyran, Lyell Davies, Virginia Diaz, James DiGiovanna, Jannette Domingo, Beverly Frazier, Terry Furst, Robert Garot, Jay-Paul Gates, Katie Gentile, Lior Gideon, Norman Groner, Maki Haberfeld, Jay Hamilton, Chad Benito Infante, Clement James, Jr., Berenicea Johnson Eanes, Karen Kaplowitz, Maxine Kerr, Nilsa Lam, Ajibade Longe, Anne Lopes, Sylvia Lopez, Vincent Maiorino, Evan Mandery, Shavonne McKiever, David Munns, Joseph Onwu, Robert Pignatello, Carina Quintian, Rick Richardson, Raul Rubio, Richard Saulnier, Michael Scaduto, Richard Schweste, Francis Sheehan, Staci Strobl, Christopher Sui, Courtney Taylor, Karen Terry, Jeremy Travis, Michelle Tsang, Fritz Umbach, Monica Varsanyi, and Anastasia Williams.

Absent were: Marvie Brooks, Brian Costa, Jennifer Dysart, Olivera Jokic, Mehak Kapoor, Xerxes Malki, Isabel Martinez, Paul Narkunas, Richard Ocejo, Richard Perez, Frank Pezella, Davinder Paul Singh, Pat Tovar, Valerie West,

Alternates Present: Dee Dee Falkenbach

I. Adoption of the Agenda
It was moved to adopt the agenda as presented. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

II. Minutes of the September 23, 2010 College Council Meeting
It was moved to accept the minutes as presented. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

III. Report from the Committee on Graduate Studies (attachment B1)
It was moved and seconded to adopt the item marked “B1: A Proposal for a new program: MA/JD in Psychology and Law.” with the following amendments:

On page 11 of the proposal (page 17 in the College Council document), under “Governance of the Program”, second paragraph, 4 th line, the sentence that reads:
“The Director will receive three credits of release time per academic year to administer the program.” is to be deleted from the proposal.

The second amendment is in the same section and page, first paragraph, after the second sentence insert the following:

"At John Jay, they must be approved by the College's and University's governance processes, including the Graduate Studies Committee, the College Council, the College President, and the CUNY Board of Trustees, as appropriate."

The amendments were accepted and the motion was approved unanimously.

IV. Proposal from the Faculty Senate on the Honorary Degree Committee Composition (attachment C)

It was moved to adopt the proposal marked “C: John Jay College Procedure for Awarding Honorary Degrees.” The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

V. Master Plan (attachment D)

It was moved to adopt the proposal marked “D. Master Plan: John Jay @ 50.” The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:40 p.m.
JOHN JAY COLLEGE OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE

The City University of New York

MINUTES OF THE COLLEGE COUNCIL

Thursday, November 11, 2010

The College Council held its Third meeting of the 2010-2011 academic year on Thursday, November 11, 2010. The meeting was called to order at 3:40 p.m. and the following members were present: Spiros Bakiras, Andrea Balis, Elton Beckett, Jane Bowers, Marvie Brooks, Elise Champeil, Serguei Cheloukhine, Shu-Yuan Cheng, Kathleen Collins, Elizabeth Cyran, Lyell Davies, Jannette Domingo, Jennifer Dysart, Terry Furst, Robert Garot, Jay-Paul Gates, Katie Gentile, Lior Gideon, Maki Haberfeld, Jay Hamilton, Olivera Jokic, Karen Kaplowitz, Nilsa Lam, Anne Lopes, Vincent Maiorino, Xerxes Malki, Shavonne McKiever, David Munns, Paul Narkunas, Joseph Onwu, Carina Quintian, Rick Richardson, Raul Rubio, Richard Saulnier, Michael Scaduto, Richard Schwester, Staci Strobl, Christopher Sui, Courtney Taylor, Pat Tovar, Jeremy Travis, Michelle Tsang, Fritz Umbach, Monica Varsanyi, and Anastasia Williams.

Absent were: Ben Bierman, Brian Costa, Virginia Diaz, James DiGiovanna, Beverly Frazier, Norman Groner, Chad Benito Infante, Clement James, Jr., Berenecea Johnson Eanes, Mehak Kapoor, Maxine Kerr, Ajibade Longe, Sylvia Lopez, Evan Mandery, Isabel Martinez, Richard Ocejo, Richard Perez, Frank Pezella, Robert Pignatello, Francis Sheehan, Davinder Paul Singh, Karen Terry, Valerie West,

Alternates Present: Nancy Marshall

I. Adoption of the Agenda
It was moved to adopt the agenda with an amendment. The item marked “VII. Attachment D. Proposed Statement on the Purposes of the Student Evaluation of the Faculty Instrument” should be labeled under item V. “New Business”. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

II. Minutes of the October 14, 2010 College Council Meeting
It was moved to accept the minutes as presented. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

III. Report from the Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee
(attachments B1 – B8)
It was moved to adopt the proposal marked “B1. Undergraduate Admissions Standards Proposal 2011-12.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.
It was moved to adopt the proposal marked “B2. Forensic Science Transfer Student Admissions Standards 2011-12.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the new course proposal marked “B3. PHI 3XX Philosophical Modernity.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the new course proposal marked “B4. PHI 4XX Senior Seminar in Ethics.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the new course proposal marked “B5. ACC 4XX Digital Forensics for the Fraud Examiner.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the course revisions marked B6 and B7 as a package:

The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to accept items marked B6 and B7. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the course revision marked “B8. Course Revision: ENG 233 Journalism.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

IV. Report from the Committee on Graduate Studies (attachment C1 – C2)

It was moved to adopt the new course proposal marked “C1. FCM 7XX: Foundations for Digital Forensics and Security.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the new course proposal marked “C2. PMT 7XX: Advanced Fire Protection Systems.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

V. Report from the Faculty Senate (attachment D) - Professor Kaplowitz

It was moved to adopt the proposal marked “D. Proposed Statement on the Purposes of the Student Evaluation of the Faculty Instrument.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:40 p.m.
I. Adoption of the Agenda
It was moved to adopt the agenda as presented. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

II. Minutes of the November 11, 2010 College Council Meeting
It was moved to accept the minutes with an amendment stating that Joseph Onwu was present at the November 11 College Council meeting. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

III. Report from the Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee (attachments B1 – B4)
It was moved to adopt the proposal marked “B1. Proposal on Extra Work during the Semester.”

The motion was seconded and passed.

In Favor: 40  
Opposed: 0  
Abstentions: 4

It was moved to adopt the proposal marked “B2. Proposal to Establish a Second Chance Policy.” as amended to read as follows under “Proposal”, first sentence:

“...Students who leave John Jay College either on academic probation or as the result of an academic dismissal, for reasons other than academic dishonesty, who then transfer to a Justice Academy Program...”

The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the proposal marked “B3. Proposal on the Rescission of the College’s Policy on the APA Style of Documentation.” as amended to read as follows under “Proposal”, fourth and fifth sentences:

“The Academic Standards Subcommittee recommends that faculty adopt a style that is recognized by their discipline(s). The subcommittee also recommends that the Library continue to include and, if possible, expand on its homepage guidelines for each of the major methods of documentation so that students can have easy access to such guidelines.”

The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the new course proposal marked “B4. SOC 2XX Political Imprisonment.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

IV. Report from the Committee on Graduate Studies(attachment C1 – C4)

It was moved to adopt the proposal marked “C1. Amended version of the MPA proposal.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the proposal marked “C2. A proposal for a new Advanced Certificate in Crime Prevention and Analysis.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.
It was moved to adopt the new course proposal marked “C3. CRJ 7XX: Seminar in Crime Prevention and Analysis.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the new course proposal marked “C4. FCM 7XX: Foundation for Digital Forensics and Security II.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

V. New Business

It was moved to adopt the Draft Time Line from the Student Evaluation of Faculty Committee as presented. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:40 p.m.
The College Council held its fifth meeting of the 2010-2011 academic year on Thursday, February 24, 2011. The meeting was called to order at 3:45 p.m. and the following members were present: Spiros Bakiras, Elton Beckett, Ben Bierman, Jane Bowers, Elise Champeil, Serguei Cheloukhine, Shu-Yuan Cheng, Lyell Davies, James DiGiovanna, Jannette Domingo, Jennifer Dysart, Beverly Frazier, Terry Furst, Robert Garot, Jay-Paul Gates, Katie Gentile, Lior Gideon, Norman Groner, Maki Haberfeld, Jay Hamilton, Karen Kaplowitz, Anne Lopes, Sylvia Lopez, Evan Mandery, Sara McDougall, Shavonne McKiever, Richard Ocejo, Joseph Onwu, Robert Pignatello, Carina Quintian, Raul Rubio, Richard Saulnier, Michael Scaduto, Richard Schwester, Francis Sheehan, Pat Tovar, and Jeremy Travis.

Absent were: Andrea Balis, Kathleen Collins, Brian Costa, Elizabeth Cyran, Virginia Diaz, Chad Benito Infante, Clement James, Jr., Berenecia Johnson Eanes, Olivera Jokic, Mehak Kapoor, Nilsa Lam, Vincent Maiorino, Xerxes Malki, Isabel Martinez, Paul Narkunas, Richard Perez, Frank Pezella, Rick Richardson, Davinder Paul Singh, Staci Strobl, Christopher Sui, Courtney Taylor, Karen Terry, Michelle Tsang, Monica Varsanyi, and Valerie West.

Alternates Present: Nancy Marshall

Guests Present: Akeel Uddin, and Lisa Marie Williams

I. Adoption of the Agenda
   It was moved to adopt the agenda as presented. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

II. Minutes of the December 13, 2010 College Council Meeting
   It was moved to accept the minutes as presented. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

III. Memberships (attachment B)
   It was moved to accept the nominees to each committee as presented. The Senate nominees are as follows:

   Faculty elections Committee: Prof. Ekaterina Korobkova (Science)
Undergraduate Admissions & Recruitment Committee: Prof. Maria Kiriakova (Library)

The following faculty were elected to fill seats in the College Council. Their names were read during College Council:

- Prof. Veronica Hendrick (English) will replace Prof. Marvie Brooks, who took early retirement

- Prof. Sara McDougall (History) will replace David Munns who is on sabbatical

The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

IV. Report from the Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee (attachments C1 – C16)

It was moved to adopt the proposal marked “C1. Proposal to revise the B.A. in Forensic Psychology.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the proposal marked “C2. Resolution on the Honors Program. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the proposal marked “C4. Proposal on the Eligibility of Transfer Students for Graduation Awards, etc.,” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the proposal marked “C3. Proposal to revise the College’s Incomplete Grade Policy.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the new course proposal marked “C5. SOC 2XX: Sociology of Human Rights.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the new course proposal marked “C6. PSY 3XX: Brain and Behavior.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the new course proposal marked “C7. PSY 3XX: Perception.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the new course proposal marked “C8. PHI 3XX: Existentialism.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the new course proposal marked “C9. PHI 3XX: Classic Chinese Philosophy.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.
It was moved to adopt the new course proposal marked “C10. ENG2XX: Journalism in the 21st Century.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the new course proposal marked “C11. AJJ2XX: Introduction to Community-based Approaches to Justice.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the new course proposal marked “C12. PAD 3XX: Public Policy Analysis.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the new course proposal marked “C13. CJB 1XX: Dimensions of Justice.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the course revision marked “C14. MUS 202: Compositional Techniques.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the course revision marked “C15. COR 101: Institutional Treatment of the Offender.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the course revision marked “C16. ENG/ANT 328: Forensic Linguistics.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

V. Report from the Committee on Graduate Studies (attachment D1)

It was moved to adopt the proposal marked “D1. Proposal to Change the admissions requirements for the Forensic Computing Program.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

VI. Proposal from the Faculty Senate to Amend the John Jay Charter of Governance (attachment E)

First reading of proposed amendment was presented to College Council. It was agreed to send the proposal to the Faculty Personnel Committee for review and feedback.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:49 p.m.

Absent were: Alain Berrouet, Shu-Yuan Cheng, Brian Costa, Ugooma Daniel, Beverly Frazier, Tyler Garvey, Katie Gentile, Chad Benito Infante, Clement James, Jr., Olivera Jokic, Mehak Kapoor, Nilsa Lam, Jerry Markowitz, Isabel Martinez, Paul Narkunas, Richard Perez, Frank Pezella, Rick Richardson, Raul Rubio, Davinder Paul Singh, Christopher Sui, Courtney Taylor, Michelle Tsang, Valerie West, and Lisa-Marie Williams.

Alternates Present: Nancy Marshall

I. Adoption of the Agenda
It was moved to remove item B15” Policy on Extra Work Assigned After Final Grades are Submitted” from the agenda. The motion to remove item B15 was seconded and approved unanimously. The motion to approve the new agenda was seconded and approved unanimously.

II. Minutes of the February 24, 2011 College Council Meeting
It was moved to accept the minutes as presented. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

III. Second Reading and Vote on Charter Amendment Proposed by the Faculty Staff
It was moved to accept the second reading on the Charter Amendment as presented. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.
IV. Report from the Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee (attachments B1 - B15)

It was moved to adopt the item marked “B1. 2+2/Joint Degree with Borough of Manhattan Community College for an A.S. in Accounting for Forensic Accounting and a B.S. in Economics (Forensic Financial Analysis Specialization).” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the new course proposal marked “B2. ENG 3XX: Intermediate News Writing and Reporting.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the new course proposal marked “B3. SOC 2XX: Sport in Global Perspective” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the new course proposal marked “B4. POL 3XX: Government & Politics in the Middle East and North Africa.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the course revisions marked B5 – B13 as a package:

B5. PSY101: General Psychology I
B6. PSY 200: General Psychology II
B7. PSY 221: Social Psychology
B8. PSY 231: Child Psychology
B9. PSY 242: Abnormal Psychology
B10: PSY 311: Experimental Psychology
B11: PSY/LAW 370: Psychology and the Law
B12: PSY 378-379: Field Work in Psychology
B13: PSY 421: Forensic Social & Experimental Psychology

The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to accept items marked B5 – B13. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to revise the item marked “B14. Proposal to Revise the Latin Honors Standards.” To reflect that under the revised proposal, Magna Cum Laude is to be a 3.75 cum GPA, and not a 3.7 cum GPA as written. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.
V. **Report from the Committee on Graduate Studies (attachments C1 – C5)**

It was moved to withdraw the following new course items:

- **C1. CRJ 7XX:** Investigation of violent Crime
- **C2. CRJ 7XX:** Counter-Terrorism Policy for Law enforcement
- **C3. CRJ 7XX:** Public health Issues in Criminal Justice: An Epidemiological Approach

These items have been sent back to the Committee on Graduate Studies for a resubmission in a format that provides similar information to the Undergraduate Studies format. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the proposal marked item C4. “A Proposal for a New Advanced Certificate Program in the Forensic Computing Program titled ‘The Computer Science for Digital Forensics Bridge Program.’” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the proposal marked item C5. “A Resolution to Change the Prerequisites for the Completion of the Master or Arts in Criminal Justice.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:35 p.m.
The College Council held its seventh meeting of the 2010-2011 academic year on Wednesday, April 13, 2011. The meeting was called to order at 3:45 p.m. and the following members were present: Spiros Bakiras, Andrea Balis, Elton Beckett, Ben Bierman, Jane Bowers, Serguei Cheloukhine, Shu-Yuan Cheng, Kathleen Collins, Elizabeth Cyran, James DiGiovanna, Jannette Domingo, Beverly Frazier, Terry Furst, Robert Garot, Tyler Garvey, Lior Gideon, Norman Groner, Maki Haberfeld, Jay Hamilton, Berenecea Johnson Eanes, Karen Kaplowitz, Nilsa Lam, Anne Lopes, Sylvia Lopez, Vincent Maiorino, Xerxes Malki, Evan Mandery, Jerry Markowitz, Sara McDougall, Shavonne McKiever, Richard Ocejo, Joseph Onwu, Robert Pignatello, Carina Quintian, Rick Richardson, Richard Saulnier, Michael Scaduto, Richard Schwester, Francis Sheehan, Staci Strobl, Karen Terry, Pat Tovar, Jeremy Travis, Monica Varsanyi, and Valerie West.

Absent were: Alain Berrouet, Elise Champeil, Brian Costa, Ugooma Daniel, Lyell Davies, Virginia Diaz, Jennifer Dysart, Jay-Paul Gates, Katie Gentile, Veronica Hendrick, Chad Benito Infante, Clement James, Jr., Olivera Jokic, Mehak Kapoor, Isabel Martinez, Paul Narkunas, Richard Perez, Frank Pezella, Raul Rubio, Davinder Paul Singh, Christopher Sui, Courtney Taylor, Michelle Tsang, and Lisa-Marie Williams.

I. **Adoption of the Agenda**
It was moved to adopt the agenda as presented. The motion to approve the new agenda was seconded and approved unanimously.

II. **Minutes of the March 24, 2011 College Council Meeting**
It was moved to accept the minutes as presented. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

III. **Report from the Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee (attachments B1 – B6)**
It was moved to adopt the proposal marked “B1. Proposal for B.A. in Law and Society.” The motion was seconded and passed.

   In Favor: 41   Opposed: 0   Abstentions: 4

It was moved to adopt the proposal marked “B2. Proposal to revise the B.A. in Criminal Justice.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the proposal marked “B3. Proposal to Revise the B.S. in Fire Society.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the new course proposal marked “B4. ENG 3XX (336): Digital Journalism.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the new course proposal marked “B5. PHI 3XX (377): Reality, Truth and Being: Metaphysics.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the new course proposal marked “B6. ART (125): Graphic Art.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

IV. Report of the MPA-IG Online Program
Provost Bowers reported on this item.

V. Graduation Award Recipients
It was moved to adopt the Committee on Honors, Prizes and Awards decision to bestow Graduation Awards to the recipients listed. The motion was seconded and passed.

   In Favor: 43   Opposed: 0   Abstentions: 2

The meeting was adjourned at 4:55 p.m.
The College Council held its eighth meeting of the 2010-2011 academic year on Monday, May 16, 2011. The meeting was called to order at 3:45 p.m. and the following members were present: Andrea Balis, Elton Beckett, Ben Bierman, Jane Bowers, Elise Champeil, Serguei Cheloukhine, Shu-Yuan Cheng, Kathleen Collins, Elizabeth Cyran, Lyell Davies, Virginia Diaz, James DiGiovanna, Jannette Domingo, Jennifer Dysart, Beverly Frazier, Terry Furst, Robert Garot, Tyler Garvey, Katie Gentile, Lior Gideon, Norman Groner, Maki Haberfeld, Jay Hamilton, Bereneecia Johnson Eanes, Karen Kaplowitz, Nilsa Lam, Anne Lopes, Sylvia Lopez, Vincent Maiorino, Xerxes Malki, Sara McDougall, Richard Ocejo, Joseph Onwu, Robert Pignatello, Carina Quintian, Rick Richardson, Raul Rubio, Richard Saulnier, Michael Scaduto, Francis Sheehan, Pat Tovar, Jeremy Travis, Monica Varsanyi, Valerie West, and Lisa-Marie Williams.

Absent were: Spiros Bakiras, Alain Berrouet, Brian Costa, Ugooma Daniel, Jay-Paul Gates, Veronica Hendrick, Chad Benito Infante, Clement James, Jr., Olivera Jokic, Mehak Kapoor, Evan Mandery, Jerry Markowitz, Isabel Martinez, Shavonne McKiever, Paul Narkunas, Richard Perez, Frank Pezella, Richard Schwester, Davinder Paul Singh, Staci Strobl, Christopher Sui, Courtney Taylor, Karen Terry, and Michelle Tsang.

I. Adoption of the Agenda
   It was moved to adopt the agenda as presented. The motion to approve the new agenda was seconded and approved unanimously.

II. Minutes of the April 13, 2011 College Council Meeting
    It was moved to accept the minutes as presented. The motion was seconded and passed.

    In Favor: 43    Opposed: 0    Abstentions: 2

III. Certification of Graduates
     It was moved to accept the certification of Graduates as presented. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

IV. Report from the Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee (attachments B1 – B6)
It was moved to adopt the new course proposal marked “B1. CJBS 1XX (101): Introduction to the American Criminal Justice System.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the new course proposal marked “B2. PED 3XX (300): Community programs for health, Wellness & Physical Activity”. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the new course proposal marked “B3. POL 2XX (234): Introduction to Public Policy”. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the new course proposal marked “B4. CJBA 2ZZ (230): Understanding Criminal Behavior”. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the new course proposal marked “B5. CJBA 3XX (362): Historical Perspectives on Violent Crime in the United States”. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the proposal marked “B6. Proposal for a New Model of General Education at John Jay- ‘Education for Justice’”. The motion was seconded and passed.

In Favor: 44
Opposed: 1
Abstentions: 0

V. Two Proposed Resolutions Regarding the Proposed Revision of John Jay’s General Education Curriculum (attachment B.7)

Resolution 5.1, Annual Report, was seconded and approved unanimously.
Resolution 5.2 was seconded and approved unanimously.

VI. Report from the Committee on Graduate Studies (attachments C1 – C11)

It was moved to adopt the new course proposal marked “C1. ICJ 780: Internship Course.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the new course proposal marked “C2. ICJ 791: Thesis I” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the new course proposal marked “C3. ICJ 792: Thesis II” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the new course proposal marked “C4. ICJ 793: Comprehensive Exam Review.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the new course proposal marked “C5. CRJ 7XX: Counter-Terrorism Policy for Law Enforcement.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the new course proposal marked “C6. CRJ 7XX: Gangs in American Society.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.
It was moved to adopt the new course proposal marked “C7. CRJ 7XX: ProSeminar on Terrorism Studies.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the new course proposal marked “C8. CRJ 7XX: Public Health Issues in Criminal Justice: An Epidemiological Approach.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to amend item (6) of the proposal marked “C9. A Proposal for a New Advanced Certificate in Terrorism Studies”, to read as follows:

“Faculty members hold regular office hours to confer with students...
faculty members will provide regular guidance to students.”

The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the new course proposal marked “C10. A Proposal for a Change in the Forensic Computing Program.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the new course proposal marked “C11. A Resolution Regarding Program Registration.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

VII. Request for Name Change by the African American Studies Department
It was moved to change the name of the Department of African American Studies to The Department of Africana Studies. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

VIII. Proposal To Create a College Campus-Wide Assessment Committee
It was moved to create a college campus-wide assessment committee. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

IX. Proposed College Council Agenda
The College Council Calendar for the 2011-2012 academic year was presented to the College Council for their review.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:55 p.m.
Meeting Minutes: Student Evaluation of Faculty (SEOF) Committee

October 22, 2010

Keith Markus, Joshua Clegg, Yi Lu, James Llana, Alexander Long

Keith updated the members of the committee on some history of the revision process of the SEOF instrument. The current instrument was last revised 10 years ago. The dropboxes were also instituted 10 years.

Keith volunteered to set up a BlackBoard Organization for the SEOF Committee to provide a centralized location for documents produced by the committee.

The committee discussed the charge presented to them by the Faculty Senate which instructed the committee to gather data on the current instrument, consult with experts and stakeholders in the SEOF process, solicit suggested changes of the current SEOF instrument, and present revisions to the College Council.

The committee discussed whether it would be revising the SEOF process or the SEOF instrument. The committee concluded that it would first work on revising the instrument and address the process at a later time, if at all. To begin the revision process, the committee agreed to begin with formal research that would gather data empirically.

Questions the committee raised were:

1. Does every question on the instrument factor into the promotion process?
2. Is the instrument an evaluation of the instructor or the course? Does the Charter specify this?
3. What does faculty want feedback on? What they do well? What they need to improve on?
4. Does the instrument evaluate teaching processes or learning processes?
5. What does the committee hope to measure?
6. Have specific complaints come from faculty and students regarding the current instrument?
7. Does Student Government have a position on the SEOF process?
8. What concerns are there about the current instrument?
9. What should be in the next instrument?
10. What should the committee be trying to assess?

The committee proposed to invite members of the college to participate as stakeholders in the revision process of the current SEOF instrument. Those invited would include faculty (adjunct, tenure-track, tenured) students, and department chairs and college P members.

The committee then drafted a timeline mapping out target dates and tasks for the revision process.

The meeting began at 3 p.m. and adjourned at 5 p.m.
Meeting Minutes: Student Evaluation of Faculty (SEOF) Committee

November 19, 2010

Keith Markus, Joshua Clegg, Yi Lu, James Llana, Alexander Long

In order to begin collecting empirical data, the committee discussed producing an online survey of the current SEOF instrument to be distributed to all members of the College. The committee agreed that the survey should have both qualitative and quantitative elements in the survey.

The committee then drafted a timeline with target dates and tasks. The first draft of this timeline is as follows:

1. collect data from survey, Dec. 2010
2. form an advisory board of stakeholders, Dec. 2010
3. analyze data from survey, Feb. 2011
4. create a blueprint of revised SEOF instrument, March, 2011
5. run pilot of revised SEOF instrument, April/May 2011
6. modify revised SEOF instrument, Sept. 2011
7. introduce revised SEOF instrument to Faculty Senate, Oct. 2011
8. fully implement revised SEOF instrument, Nov. 2011

The committee acknowledged that this timeline was rather ambitious, and understood that extensions and delays in the process might be likely.

The meeting began at 3 p.m. and adjourned at 4:30 p.m.
Meeting Minutes: Student Evaluation of Faculty (SEOF) Committee

February 15, 2011

Keith Markus, Joshua Clegg, Yi Lu, Alexander Long

The committee discussed finalizing edits to the survey designed to:

1. clarify the survey’s purpose
2. encourage the College’s involvement in the survey
3. emphasize the deadline of the survey
4. inform the College what the SEOF Committee intends to do with the results

The meeting began at 3 p.m. and adjourned at 4 p.m.
Meeting Minutes: Student Evaluation of Faculty (SEOF) Committee

March 16, 2011

Keith Markus, Joshua Clegg, Yi Lu, James Llana, Alexander Long

The committee discussed identifying members of the College to serve as an advisory board of stakeholders as the committee moved forward in the process of revising the SEOF instrument. After discussing this Karen Kaplowitz, it was agreed that the committee would identify a group of five to seven members of the College. Those invited were Meghan Duffy, Pat O’Hara, Marlon Daniels, Harold Sullivan, and Terry Furst. The committee also agreed that inviting students via Student Government would be vital to the process. The committee discussed what would be expected of the stakeholders, which it identified as including:

1. serving as a sounding board for concerns about the current instrument
2. serving as a sounding board for revisions of the current instrument
3. providing prompt feedback

The committee finalized revisions to the survey and decided to submit it to the Provost’s Office, which would then distribute it to the College.

The committee then discussed what it would do with the data collected from the survey. The committee agreed to analyze the data quantitatively and qualitatively, and then compose an executive summary of its findings.

The meeting began at 3 p.m. and adjourned at 4:30 p.m.
Meeting Minutes: Student Evaluation of Faculty (SEOF) Committee

April 27, 2011

Keith Markus, Joshua Clegg, Yi Lu, Alexander Long

The committee discussed the qualitative and quantitative analyses from the SEOF survey. The committee then agreed to write an executive summary of its findings and post it on Inside John Jay.

The meeting began at 1 p.m. and adjourned at 2 p.m.
Meeting Minutes: Student Evaluation of Faculty (SEOF) Committee

May 25, 2011

Keith Markus, Joshua Clegg, Alexander Long

The committee discussed revisions of the Executive Summary of the committee’s analyses of the survey of the current SEOF instrument.

The committee was updated on responses from those invited to serve as stakeholders. Of the five members invited two responded positively and three have yet to respond.

The committee agreed to contact Kevin Nesbitt regarding the possibility of having a two-sided evaluation form should the new instrument have bubble items on both sides.

The meeting began at 4 p.m. and adjourned at 5:30 p.m.
PRESENT:       Dean Jannette Domingo, Dean Wayne Edwards, Professors Rosemary Barberet, Warren Benton, William Heffernan, Thomas Kubic, Marilyn Rubin, Robert Till, and James Wulach.

NOT PRESENT: Vice President Richard Saulnier, Dean Larry Sullivan, Professors Diana Falkenbach, Richard Lovely, Chitra Raghavan, and Student Representatives Clement James and Jean-Ivan Noel.

ALSO PRESENT: Carmen Solis, Faculty Associate to the Dean.

AGENDA ITEMS:

The meeting began at 12:30 p.m.

1. The Dean’s Announcements

   a. The Dean informed the committee members that the Office of Professional Studies has been officially merged with the Office of Graduate Studies. The new office is the Office of Graduate and Professional Studies (OGPS). The members of the Professional Studies staff are located in Suite 603 in the BMW building.

   b. Dr. Carmen Solis was introduced as the new Faculty Associate to the Dean. She joined OGPS on August 26th. Dr. Solis has been part of John Jay for many years and was most recently a counselor in the SEEK Department. She continues to teach in the
NYPD and has conducted workshops on behalf of the college abroad. She will be responsible for the student service areas of the Dean’s portfolio.

c. Summer School: The number of registered students for summer 2009 was circulated. The Dean urged other program directors to follow the example of the MPA program and survey the students in their respective programs to ensure that summer courses offered are those for which the students have a preference.

d. Online Education: The goal of the college is to have all graduate programs available online in five years. There is a need for an examination of the curriculum that will be made available. The question of availability of resources was also an important question.

2. MINUTES OF THE MEETING

The minutes of the meetings for May 12, 2010 were deferred for approval at the next meeting.

3. New Graduate Faculty

The committee members voted unanimously to submit the following graduate faculty members to the Provost for approval:

Criminal Justice Graduate Faculty: Sung-Suk Violet Yu Delene Bromirski Michael Maxfield

4. Early registration, advisement and graduate orientation

The discussion of early registration, advisement and graduate orientation was deferred to the next meeting.

5. A Proposal for a New Graduate Program: The MA-JD in Psychology and Law

A proposal for a new graduate program, the MA-JD in Psychology and Law was presented by the Dr. James Wulach, program director for the Forensic Mental Health Counseling Program. Professor Wulach explained that the new program required students in the MA degree program in Forensic Psychology to complete 128 credits to obtain both degrees. For this joint program, New York Law School (NYLS) will accept up to 12 credits from John Jay’s Forensic Psychology Master’s program towards the NYLS JD and John Jay College will accept up to 12 credits from the
NYLS’s JD program toward the John Jay Master’s Forensic Psychology Degree program. Students will be able to obtain both degrees in four years.

After some discussion, the members voted unanimously that the proposal for the MA-JD in Psychology and Law should be submitted for consideration at the next college council meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Janice Carrington, Administrative Director
Office of Graduate and Professional Studies
AGENDA ITEMS:

The meeting began at 12:30 p.m.

1. The Dean’s Announcements

   a. The Dean informed the committee members that the bylaws had been returned by the Assistant Vice President, the Office of Legal Counsel. The amended bylaws should be ratified by bylaws by respective program faculties, reported to the Committee on Graduate Studies and then forwarded to the Executive Committee of the College Council. The errors cited must be corrected and substantive changes addressed. Her other comments should be considered, but responsive changes were not required.
b. Members were informed that the deadline date for submission of all thesis submissions had been extended from December 1st to December 2nd, 2010.

c. November 1st was the date set for Winter Registration. November 17th is the scheduled date for students to drop courses.

d. A Summer School survey was being prepared in response to a request from the Task Force on Year Round College. Students would be asked to indicate the courses they would be most interested in registering for in the summer. Members felt that there should be additional resources available for students during these sessions.

e. Dr. Carmen Solis informed that committee members that a new system was being developed to advise students who were either already on probation or were deemed in danger of falling into that category. A system has been set up on blackboard to allow students on probation to access “Skills Clinics” to help them develop writing and statistics skills which they may be lacking.

2. MINUTES OF THE MEETING

The minutes of the meetings for May 12, 2010 and September 13, 2010 were unanimously approved.

3. Early registration, advisement and graduate orientation

The Dean informed the committee members that the Vice President for Student Development, Berenecea Eanes and Vice President Saulnier in his capacity as Vice President for Enrollment Management would address their concerns about the new process for registration, advisement and orientation. She then invited members to voice their concerns. Some program directors expressed their dissatisfaction with the organization of the current advisement day and orientation days for graduate students.

Members did not feel that there was a need for advisement after students had completed the registration process. In addition, the second meeting date for advisement did not work. Another program director questioned VP Saulnier’s assertion that these events addressed retention. The social event at the end of the orientation day integrated well into the rest of the program and was a good welcome to the college.

The Vice Presidents explained their separate responsibilities. However, this was a learning experience and there were plans to make the next experience a more cohesive one. It was agreed that the discussion of early registration, advisement and graduate orientation would continue.
4. New Courses

The committee members unanimously agreed to approve the following courses for submission to the College Council:

FCM 7XX: Foundations for Digital Forensic and Security 1

PMT 7XX: Advanced Fire Protection Systems

The meeting was adjourned at 2:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Janice Carrington, Administrative Director
Office of Graduate and Professional Studies
COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE STUDIES

Minutes of the Meeting
November 10, 2010


Not Present: Student Representatives Clement James and Ian Stuart.

Also Present: Carmen Solis, Faculty Associate to the Dean; Linda Mitchell, Graduate Career Advisor.

AGENDA ITEMS:

The meeting began at 12:30 p.m.

1. The Dean’s Announcements

   a. The Dean informed the committee members that the bylaws for the Forensic Computing program would be tabled for the next meeting. She reminded the program directors that they need to make all the changes mandated by the legal counsel.

   b. Members were reminded that the next CGS meeting would be on December 2\textsuperscript{nd}, 2010. This is a change from the original meeting date of December 9\textsuperscript{th}.
c. The Dean announced seminars were scheduled for Friday, December 3rd and Tuesday, December 7th. Linda Mitchell explained that the first seminar was intended to draw those students interested in internships in human Rights, the EEOC and the Waterfront Commission. Carmen Solis explained that Seymour Jones, the speaker on December 7th, would address the audience on his area of expertise, Homeland Security and the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center (FLETC).

d. The Dean explained that in light of the elimination of all college assistants at the level of the programs, the Office of Graduate and Professional Studies was attempting to make arrangements for graduate students who had work study hours to be assigned to assist the program directors.

e. After a lengthy discussion the members agreed that the following motion should be accepted. There was one .

   “Resolved that the Committee on Graduate Studies urgently request from the Provost, the budget allocations for all programs directors.”

f. A second motion was also accepted by the committee members as follows:

   “Resolved, that the Committee on Graduate Studies expresses its deep concern about the short-term and long-term effects of the elimination of College Assistants for MA Programs. The decision to eliminate them is devastating and counterproductive to the successful administration of the MA Programs at John Jay College. The college assistants are heavily involved in providing regular feedback to hundreds of potential Program applicants, current students, and graduates of the Programs.”

The Dean agreed to invite the Provost to speak to the Committee about the Program Budget allocation process and elimination of the college assistants.

2. MINUTES OF THE MEETING

The minutes of the meetings for October 12, 2010 were unanimously approved.

3. A New Advanced Certificate in the Criminal Justice Program

After some discussion the new Advanced Certificate in Crime Prevention and Analysis was approved for submission to the College Council with the condition that the course CRJ 716 be included as a perquisite for CRJ 739.
4. New Courses

The committee members unanimously agreed to approve the following courses for submission to the College Council:

FCM 7XX: Foundations for Digital Forensic and Security I

CRJ 7XX: Seminar in Crime Prevention and Analysis

5. Other Business

Professor Robert Till advised the committee that a decision had been made to nullify the examination of four students who had taken the PMT Comprehensive examination on Friday October 22, 2010. The action was taken in consultation with the Chair, Protection Management Department, and in response to complaints implying that students who took the afternoon examination had been given an unfair advantage. The affected students will be able to retake the examination on November 17th, 2010.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Janice Carrington, Administrative Director
Office of Graduate and Professional Studies
COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE STUDIES

Minutes of the Meeting
December 2, 2010


Not Present:  Vice President Richard Saulnier, Professors and Student Representatives Clement James and Ian Stuart.

Also Present: Carmen Solis, Faculty Associate to the Dean; Linda Mitchell, Graduate Career Advisor; Dean Lopes, Undergraduate Studies.

AGENDA ITEMS:

The meeting began at 12:30 p.m.

1. The Dean’s Announcements

a. The Dean reminded the committee members that the last day of classes was December 13th. She also reminded members that the first graduate career symposium was scheduled for Friday, December 3rd. The second symposium would take place on Tuesday, December 7th, 2010. A list of the dates of the CGS meetings for the Spring 2011 semester was circulated.
b. Members were asked to submit their summer schedules via CSS by the due date - Monday, December 6th.

c. The sub committees for the Middle States review had been formed. A steering committee had been set up to work on the self study which was due for Fall 2012. The site visit was scheduled for 2013.

d. The Dean announced that MA program bylaws had been received from the following programs:

Forensic Computing
Forensic Mental Health Counseling
International Crime and Justice
Protection Management

All outstanding bylaws should be sent to the Office of Graduate and Professional Studies before the end of the semester.

2. MINUTES OF THE MEETING

The minutes of the meetings for November 10, 2010 were unanimously approved.

3. New Graduate Faculty

The committee members voted unanimously to submit the following graduate faculty members to the Provost for approval:

Criminal Justice Faculty: Frank S. Pezzella
Forensic Computing Faculty: Patricia A. O’Connor

4. A motion to change the admissions requirements for the FCM program was unanimously approved

5. The motion to increase the equivalency credits for the FCM program was withdrawn.

6. New Courses

The committee members unanimously agreed to approve the following 1 credit courses for submission to the College Council:

FCM 7XX, FCM 7XY, FCM 7XZ: Cooperative Education
7. A Proposal for the separation of the MPA program into two distinct programs:

After some discussion, the committee voted unanimously that the proposal to separate the MPA program into two distinct programs should be submitted to College Council.

8. The Budget Discussion

The Dean stated that she would consult with the Office of the Provost to reschedule another meeting for the budget discussion.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Janice Carrington, Administrative Director
Office of Graduate and Professional Studies

Not Present: Vice President Richard Saulnier, Professors Marilyn Rubin and Robert Till and Student Representatives Clement James and Ian Stuart.

Also Present: Carmen Solis, Faculty Associate to the Dean; Linda Mitchell, Graduate Career Advisor; Dean Lopes, Undergraduate Studies.

AGENDA ITEMS:

The meeting began at 12:30 p.m.

1. The Dean’s Announcements

   a. The Dean reminded the committee members that all summer schedules should have been finalized. If any changes were required, program directors should email the office of Graduate and Professional Studies as soon as possible.
   
   b. The fall schedules were due on February 22nd. The questions posed by the Program Directors were answered in a handout which was distributed to all
committee members. The Dean advised members to forward any additional questions to Vice President Saulnier.

c. Attendance Rosters were due by February 24th. Members were reminded that it was very important for faculty to submit these rosters on time to avoid financial implications for our students.

d. Reminders were given for the following important events:
   Graduate Open House – March 15th, 2011
   Commencement and graduation ceremony: June 3rd, 2011 – this year commencement will take place at the Jacob Javits Center.

e. Members were also reminded that the dates of the Committee meetings for the remainder of the Spring, 2011 semester were: March 8th, April 6th, and May 2nd, 2011.

2. MINUTES OF THE MEETING

The minutes of the meetings for December 2, 2010 were unanimously approved.

3. A report on Distance Learning

Dean Lopes, the Chair of the Distance Learning Task Force, provided a report on the readiness of the graduate programs and graduate certificate programs to go online.
She stated that the cost to the college was one of the concerns of the Task Force. Several revenue generating proposals were being considered. The impact on learning and teaching, the development of a curriculum for online programs were also some of the issues which were of concern to the Task Force.
Dean Lopes invited committee members to submit any ideas or recommendations for the final report of the Task Force.

4. New Courses

The committee members unanimously agreed to approve the following courses for submission to the College Council:

Criminal Justice: CRJ 7XX – Investigation of Violent Crime
   CRJ 7XX – Terrorism Policy for Law Enforcement
   CRJ 7XX – Public Health Issues in Criminal Justice: An Epidemiological Approach
5. A Proposal for an Advanced Certificate in the Forensic Computing Program

After some discussion, the committee voted unanimously that the proposal for an advanced certificate in Computer Science for the Digital Forensics Bridge Program in the Forensic Computing Master’s Program should be submitted for the consideration of the College Council.

6. Motion to Change the prerequisites for the completion of the Master of Arts in Criminal Justice

The Committee voted unanimously to submit for the consideration of the College Council the proposal to change the prerequisites for the completion of the MA in Criminal Justice.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Janice Carrington, Administrative Director
Office of Graduate and Professional Studies
COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE STUDIES
Minutes of the Meeting
March 8, 2011

Present: Dean Jannette Domingo, Vice President Richard Saulnier, Deans Larry Sullivan and Wayne Edwards, Professors Rosemary Barberet, Warren Benton, Diana Falkenbach, William Heffernan, Richard Lovely, Chitra Raghavan, Robert Till, Margaret Wallace, and James Wulach.

Not Present: Professor Marilyn Rubin (on sabbatical) and Student Representatives Clement James and Alain Berrouet.

Also Present: Jane Bowers, Provost; Carmen Solis, Faculty Associate to the Dean; Linda Mitchell, Graduate Career Advisor; Jeffrey Aikens, an MPA graduate student.

AGENDA ITEMS:

The meeting began at 12:30 p.m.

1. The Dean’s Announcements
   The Dean announced that the Office of Graduate and Professional Studies would be sponsoring two events in March – the Graduate Career and Internship Expo 2011 on March 24th and the lecture by Professor Charles Ogletree, author of *The Presumption of Guilt: The Arrest of Henry Louis Gates Jr. and Race, Class and Crime in America* on March 31st.
2. **MINUTES OF THE MEETING**
   The minutes of the meeting for February 10, 2011 were unanimously approved.

3. **Differential tuition increase for the MPA programs.**
   The Dean and Provost described a 15% differential tuition that the College was considering in order to provide additional funding to the MPA program. The differential tuition would also be imposed by the other CUNY MPA programs at Baruch and City College. The Dean explained that because tuition must be the same for all like programs in CUNY (e.g., all of CUNY’s MA programs) at John Jay, a differential tuition would only be possible for the MPA program. Benefits to the MPA program were discussed. However, Committee members were also concerned about possible losses of revenue to the College as a whole if MPA enrollment declined as a result of the higher differential tuition.

   The Provost had to leave the meeting before the discussion concluded. The Dean indicated that she would convey the Committee’s concerns to the Provost.

4. **New Courses**
   The committee members unanimously approved the following courses for submission to the College Council:

   Criminal Justice:  CRJ 7XX – Gangs in American Society
   ICJ 7XX – Comprehensive Review

5. **A Proposal to change the course proposal form**
   After some discussion, the committee agreed that the New Course Proposal form should be revised in keeping with requirements for Middle States. The Dean will present a new form to the next CGS meeting.

   The meeting was adjourned at 2:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Janice Carrington, Administrative Director
Office of Graduate and Professional Studies
COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE STUDIES
Minutes of the Meeting
April 6, 2011

Present: Dean Jannette Domingo, Vice President Richard Saulnier, Dean Larry Sullivan, Professors Rosemary Barberet, Warren Benton, Diana Falkenbach, William Heffernan, Richard Lovely, Chitra Raghavan, Margaret Wallace, and James Wulach.

Not Present: Dean Wayne Edwards, Professor Marilyn Rubin (on sabbatical) and Robert Till, Student Representatives Clement James and Alain Berrouet.

Also Present: Carmen Solis, Faculty Associate to the Dean; Linda Mitchell, Graduate Career Advisor; Paul Wyatt, Director of Student Relations.

AGENDA ITEMS:

The meeting began at 12:30 p.m.

1. The Dean’s Announcements
   The Dean distributed a list of her announcements to the committee members. Members were reminded that the last day for students to withdraw without academic penalty was April 11th, 2011.
   Spring break was scheduled for April 17th to 26th, 2011.
   Graduate Orientation for the fall semester was scheduled for August 24th, 2011.
A listing of the Graduate Academic Advisement Sessions for incoming students was also distributed.

2. MINUTES OF THE MEETING
The minutes of the meeting for March 8th, 2011 were unanimously approved.

3. Dual BA/MA degree in Forensic Mental Health Counseling.
After some discussion, the committee unanimously approved the new dual BA/MA degree in Forensic Mental Health Counseling for the consideration of the College Council.

The committee members unanimously approved the new advanced certificate in Applied Digital Forensic Science for submission to the College Council.

5. Forensic Computing Motion to Increase External Credit
A motion to increase the external credits allowed by the Forensic Computing program from 3 to 6 credits was unanimously approved by the committee members for submission to College Council.

6. A Report on the National Online MPA – IG program
The Program Director, Ned Benton, gave an overview of the report on the first year (2009-2010) National MPA – IG online program. He stated that for the coming year students from Senegal and China would be entering the program. The Senegalese contingent would come to the United States to participate in a preparatory course load to ensure a proficiency level in the English language.

7. Reports on Differential tuition increase for the MPA programs
The Dean described the consultations between the administration and the MPA directors, faculty and students that had occurred with respect to differential tuition since it was discussed at the March CGS meeting. She stated that the MPA students had responded vigorously to surveys for the proposal. While most students were not in favor of the differential tuition increase, they did value most of the various services to which the funds might be allocated. She noted that the Administration’s proposal and the MPA faculty proposal differed in respect to the governance, the inclusion of other budget issues, and the concern was expressed that the tuition increase was being applied to the
program with the most diverse population. Concern was also expressed that the increase would negatively affect enrollment if students drop out or reduce the number of courses for which they would register.

The Dean advised committee members that they will be kept informed of developments with respect to this proposed differential tuition increase for the MPA program.

There was no further business; the meeting was adjourned at 2:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Janice Carrington, Administrative Director
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Not Present: Professor Marilyn Rubin (on sabbatical) and Diana Falkenbach, Student Representatives Clement James and Alain Berrouet.

Also Present: Carmen Solis, Faculty Associate to the Dean; Linda Mitchell, Graduate Career Advisor.

AGENDA ITEMS:

The meeting began at 12:30 p.m.

1. The Dean’s Announcements
   The Dean distributed a list of her announcements to the committee members.
   - The last day of classes was May 18th, 2011.
   - Departmental awards ceremony would take place on May 18th at 3:30 p.m., in the 4th floor gymnasium.
   - The President’s Open Forum was scheduled for May 11th, 2011 in Room 630T at 9:30 a.m.
The graduate student focus group was scheduled for Mary 12th in Room 620T at 4:00 p.m. Program Directors were encouraged to submit the names of graduate students to Anila Duro or Linda Mitchell.

The Graduation Ceremony was scheduled for Friday, June 3rd, 2011 at the Jacob Javits Center, 655 West 34th Street. The first ceremony would begin at 10:30 a.m. and second at 3:30 p.m.

Graduate Orientation for the fall semester was scheduled for August 24th, 2011.

The first day of classes for the fall semester is August 26th, 2011.

2. MINUTES OF THE MEETING

The minutes of the meeting for April 6th, 2011 were unanimously approved.

3. New Courses

The committee members approved the following courses for submission to the College Council:

a. International Crime and Justice:
   - ICJ 780 Internship Course
   - ICJ 791 Thesis I
   - ICJ 792 Thesis II

b. Criminal Justice: CRJ 7XX Pro-seminar in Terrorism Studies

The Committee members also approved the following course in the MPA program on an experimental basis:

   PAD 818 Ethics and Compliance for Auditors

4. New Advanced Certificate

The committee members unanimously approved the new advanced certificate in Terrorism for submission to the College Council.

5. Proposal to change the Master of Science in Forensic Computing

The committee unanimously approved the changes to the Forensic Computing program for submission to the College Council.
6. Discussion of the Advisement Plan

The Dean invited, Dr. Carmen Solis, the Faculty Associate to present to the committee the report of the Advisement Planning Committee. Dr. Solis explained that the document that had been circulated outlined the section which pertained only to graduate students. She stated that the administration intended to fund the employment of one peer advisor for each program.

7. Discussion of Cross-Program Registration

After some discussion, members agreed unanimously to submit to the College Council the resolution that students in the Master’s degree programs at John Jay College of Criminal Justice may not register for courses outside their own program with the exception of courses already listed in the curriculum of their specific program of study or by permission of their Program Director.

There was no further business; the meeting was adjourned at 2:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Janice Carrington, Administrative Manager
Office of Graduate and Professional Studies
To:  Vice President Berenecea Johnson-Eanes

From: John Leebens, Assistant to the Vice President

Date:  February 23, 2011

Re: Honors, Prizes, and Awards Committee Meeting Minutes (February 18, 2011)

Meeting was called to order by Michael Scaduto at 10:30AM

Present:

Jana Arsovska, Sociology
Gloria Proni, Science
John Leebens, Student Development
Michael Scaduto, Scholarship Coordinator
Berenecea Eanes, Vice President for Student Development

Overview

- Michael Scaduto welcomed the group and provided an overview of the voting procedure with a list of awards the Honors, Prizes, and Awards Committee would be voting on.
- A description of each graduation award was provided for reference by Mike.
- The deadline for submission is set currently for March 14th, 2011.
- After consultation, it was agreed by the committee and the Provost’s Office to incorporate the Faculty Service to Students Award into the Honors, Prizes, and Awards Committee.
- The deadline for submission of Faculty Service to Students materials is March 25th.
- The meeting for March 29th was confirmed by those in attendance.

Meeting was adjourned at 11:15 AM by Vice President Eanes.

Respectfully submitted:

John Leebens, Assistant to the Vice President
Meeting was called to order at 4:00pm.

Quorum was established

Attendees’ Present:

- Dean Edwards
- Paul Wyatt (guest)
- Rima Douglas
- Lorraine Moller
- Melinda Powers
- Stephen Barnes
- Melissa Fleck

Absentees’

- Dan Palumbo
- Andrene Clay
- Ishmael Hall
- Tiaesha M. Pelt
- Yanira N. Robinson

Welcome & Introduction

Community Hour

- John Jay College of Criminal Justice is one of three CUNY institutions that do not have this system in place.
  - Prospective Date of Implementation: Fall 2011

The Agenda and Previous Challenges

- Student Engagement:
  - Empowerment of the student body to have a voice
  - Open lines of communication for student concerns
  - It is imperative that students are contributing their interests for the mission of the Student Interest Committee to be fulfilled

Secretary for Committee

- Melissa Fleck
  - Will be abroad for meetings after 12.7.10 meeting.
    - Would be able to set up a virtual meeting via laptop computer during meeting times.
Committee of Student Interests
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Student Activity Fee

- Increasing the Student Activity Fee
  - It has not been increased since 1988, remaining at a low $48.75/semester
  - It has been attempted to campaign to increase 3 times for the past 8 years without success
  - Students have a vote
    - 1500 students to put in a ballot
    - November elections and platforms
  - Lehman College increased their SAF after 19 years, but did not promote campus wide

- What budgets come from this fee
  - Grid comparing all fees from all CUNY institutions will be supplied at next meeting from Dean Edwards
  - OSA spreadsheet of where the money is distributed to will be supplied at next meeting by Rima Douglass

- Health Services at John Jay College
  - Financed by the VP’s budget
    - Interest in hiring a nurse practitioner
  - Looking to transfer financing for this to SAF

- Johan Jay is the lowest 4 year institution of Senior Schools for SAF

- This institution is in transition, and it is time to consider what John Jay’s image is in comparison to other CUNY institution

- Athletics Department
  - No assistance for student campaign due to the fact that they allocate a large percentage of SAF as of right now.
  - The visual of Athletics is present; it is other student organizations that are not fully represented campus-wide that are in need of these funds.

- What student development wants to implement for the student body that they are unable to do
  - Concerts
  - Key Note Speakers
  - Events

- The pool at John Jay being closed by NYC Board of Health
  - The pump that cleans the pool was broken, and there are no funds to replace the equipment.

- The gym at John Jay
  - The divider is stuck and will not pull up into the ceiling; remains this way at half court
  - This does not attract athletes to apply due to the poor conditions
  - Students may not even consider John Jay due to its reputation for this reason.

- The new building:
Committee of Student Interests
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- Will fill the demand of having an esthetically pleasing institution; however there are no funds to do anything with it.
- With the change of climate, community hour and increased SAF this will give an opportunity for the entire culture of John Jay to become more unified
- Students will make more time to participate in OSA and will become exposed to the organizations on campus

Student Concerns:

- **Graduate Students and SAF**
  - Graduate students pay $100/ITSS fee as well as a SAF-both of which are not utilized by this population due to the fact that they have evening classes and day jobs;
    - all of these activities are during normal business hours;
    - the computer laboratory and library not being available after 10pm Monday-Thursday and 6pm Friday-Saturday and 5pm Sunday
    - *This is a tough sale*

- **Library Hours**
  - Students want longer hours:
    - Midterm and Final week
    - Weekends
  - Can we fund these extended hours by offering more work-study?
  - Can we close the library during less-traffic hours?
  - Can we close the computer lab earlier and keep the library open later?
  - If students cannot study in the evening after their night classes, they are less likely to participate in OSA, because they dedicate these activities during open hours of the library, so after their class they are left without adequate study facilities. It’s a deterrent.
  - **Larry Sullivan: Chief Librarian** will be invited to the next meeting to discuss this issue

- **Student Identification Information**
  - Having to provide your last 4 numbers of your social security number frequently on campus
    - Writing Center
    - Counseling Center
    - Student Clubs
      - First 5 when executives sign up
      - Last 4 for every single event
        - Giving entire social security number to OSA
      - Deterring students from joining organizations
      - Posing a identity theft threat
      - Executives do not want the responsibility of having these numbers in their possession
Committee of Student Interests
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- Can we use the same number we use for our library cards? If the library has a number associated with our names, why can we not use this?
- Can we use birthdays and last name to identify students?
  - As a criminal justice institution, we should be modeling behavior for the real world and this practice is not acceptable to ensure identity protection
    - Computer has been stolen in the past and students were notified that their personal identification was released
    - Recycling paper: student was given a list of social security numbers on the back of a form given by the financial aid department and returned it on good merit, thankfully.

*Meeting called to order 4:45pm*
Meeting was called to order at 3:30pm.

Quorum was established

Attendees’ Present:

- Dean Edwards
- Paul Wyatt (guest)
- Lorraine Moller
- Melinda Powers
- Stephen Barnes
- Melissa Fleck

Absentees’

- Dan Palumbo
- Rima Douglas
- Andrene Clay
- Ishmael Hall
- Tiaesha M. Pelt
- Yanira N. Robinson

AGENDA:

1. Community Hour
2. Student Activity Referendum
3. Agenda Items
4. New Business
   a. Next Meeting Date: Thursday December 9th 2010 at 3:30pm

Book Sale: Introduction to fundraiser by Melissa

New Building Forum: December 2nd @ 2pm by Dean Edwards

Community Hour: Moving forward with Community Hour; TBA

Student Activity Referendum: Short 500 signatures to put this on the ballet

- Community hour may help with this advancement next year
- Not holding this as a primary issue during elections so it doesn’t go on a platform
- John Jay Players Club: Use to be well established, however has been inactive (Moller)
  o Theater=cash cow; theater arts department only gets 1 week for a semester
    ▪ Black box will be shared with community body: students to promote a worthy cause.
    ▪ Gorilla Theater: dramatizing an interesting issue
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- Contact information to share this information with student body
  - Tuition increase: Not going to help with the SAF increase
  - SAF: Cost Analysis (Fleck)
    - Concerns with how SAF is being spent
      - Binders...binders...and more binders! Student leaders have a binder and a stack of papers that are given to us at every meeting; can we eliminate this cost and put the information on PDF or on JAY STOP to save this cost?
        - I.e.: At the Leadership retreat we each got a binder...which has to cost at least $5 per person; with 30 people that’s $150 that could have been saved.
    - Sign-ups for events on campus that clubs sponsor:
      - Huge binder at least 5 inches thick of every student on campus where they have to initial next to their name when they get a ticket.
        - Can we make this an excel spreadsheet and avoid this paper trail? Each binder must at least costs OSA $10 and when we multiply that by 10-15 events per year, concluding that there
        - These binders just go in the drawer and are accessible to anyone who walks into the office (Barnes)
        - Social Security numbers on these forms...?
          - Refer to Rima Douglas
      - Promoting events: posters that are made to promote an event are $100/each and there are at least 5 or 6 that I have seen: with this $600 more students would be able to participate in these activities, especially when we are running into a problem where the same 15-20 students are going on these trips and those are the same students signing the referendum; we need to target the student body as a whole and having more opportunities to participate, which will bring more to the college opposed to posters that don’t need to promote anything because the people who go to these events know before the poster hits the print shop...
        - Sign up for events: there are held at 9am and the spots are filled before 9:15. This excludes graduate students and afternoon students...the same population who are expected to not be on the petition due to the lack of opportunity to utilize the SAF.
  - Suggestions: Put information on a flash drive as is done in Student Development (Wayatt)
    - Caution of action to SIMS
    - OSA: Event sign up requires ENTIRE social security number
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- Anyone can access this information
- What are the student’s thoughts? (addressed to Melissa Fleck and Stephen Barnes from Dean)
  - We need it because it is clear that the student body is not engaged as a community because we do not have the funds. (Barnes)
  - Cost Analysis: Can we find out where each penny goes from the SAF to determine how much waste there is on paper supplies, print shop orders, etc. to determine how much more money we can save? Why aren’t there reports of financial expenditures at John Jay? Students aren’t going to give the college more money if they feel funds are inadequately being spent at the current SAF; someone has to be held accountable. (Fleck)
- Can we promote this in a different way? (Moller)
  - What if proposal went for a 10%-20% increase for fall 2011 and a 30% increase for the following year...gradual increase?
  - Problem: This student body cannot vote for future student body...because there are different students (Dean)
  - What if we have 3 different fees? Since 1988 this has been going on...
    - What if we asked for 20%, 30%...offering options so it appears it is inevitable that we need an increase, but the choice is up to the student body. Maybe it can be packaged in such a way that people can see how a higher amount will bring them more advantages.
    - A more powerful way to put this out; give students the opportunity to feel like they are making a choice
- The feeling that the $98 was too high...looking to raise it to $75
- Jay Jay Players to hand out these flyers (Powers)
  - Yes, step one is visibility (Moller)
- Having some type of budget sheet that shows what EXACTLY is being spent on what...account for EVERY PENNY to recover from this issue (Fleck)

Cafeteria: Food service survey (new item on agenda)

- Length, Time, Effectiveness (Fleck)
- Abbreviated Version in cafeteria? (Moller)
- Students don’t eat in cafeteria, quality and price (Barnes)
- Survey asked these questions....(Wayatt)
- Captivating audience in the One Stop Area: can we get students to fill out survey while they wait? (Moller)
- Incentive to fill out survey: giving a prize from a raffle (Powers)
- Offering some type of food? Healthy items to encourage healthy eating (Powers)
- Why is the food so bad? We have enough culture in the MBJ team...how are these items coming out tasting so bad? (Fleck)
- Student Run Café and its initiatives (Fleck)
  - Conscious consumption:
Conscious consumption card: 10 cents per purchase goes to a scholarship for students and after 10 stamps on the card you can submit it into the raffle for it to be pulled at the end of each semester

Not only encouraging conscious consumption in regards to healthy eating, but also understanding the importance of working with suppliers that are dedicated to Human Rights in the workplace: ie. Global compact

- Realizing how small steps towards sustainable efforts can have a large effect on society; raising awareness; educating.
  - Not just a good cup of coffee...

Concerns on OSA allocating funds to certain clubs (Fleck)

- Why are some clubs that are considered more leisure receiving more financial incentives from SAF than for those who are working with minimal budgets and doing most of the non-profit, social justice, social movement activities?
- We talk about SAF and clubs because there are a lot of behaviors that aren’t acceptable on campus, and the student body knows about it: if they think these funds are going towards ‘party clubs’ they will have no desire to give them more as these are not only the most popular clubs, but they are also the clubs that have the most money, giving them the most publicity therefore making the entire reputation for OSA and SAF to students to have a negative connotation.

- There should be a quota for these types of things in order to receive a specific amount of money vs what you contribute to the John Jay community (Powers)
- Has advisement changed in the past two years? I recall eliminating food from the budget I advised. (Moller)
- Why do students have to use MBJ for food for events? (Fleck)
  - They do not, there is a way we work this out: speak to Rima (Dean)

Meeting Adjourned at 4:30pm
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Thursday, May 12, 2011
Present: Laura Dradowski; Jerrell Robinson; Stephen Barnes; Oscarina Diaz; Ismail Etienne; Jonathan Hamilton; Lewquay Williams; Dean Edwards
Not Present: Lorraine Moller; Melinda Powers; Norhan Basuni

Last meeting of the semester

I. Senior Class Gift
   • The senior class gift will be the legacy project-raised a decent amount of money, looking for more contributions from graduating students.
   • Funds from legacy project will go towards scholarships.

II. Graduate salute-
   o Cap and gown distribution taking place in the gym instead of the MPR.
   o Refreshments including popcorn, hot dogs cotton candy will be given.
   o DJ will be present. Photographer for graduation photos will be there from Thornton studios
   o Photo booth, giveaways, mascot
   o Distribution of senior cruise tickets. It will be a festive environment

Stephen and Norhan are the first King and Queen of John Jay College.

III. Campus Life in the New Building-
   o Think-tank- new set up with community hour, jaywalk (size of Bryant Park).
   o Changing the way we socialize and interact with each other. Tailored for those who will be coming back to John Jay next semester.
   o How will it impact campus life?
   o Athletics will not be moving, will remain in T building.
   o The move will start with Student Development and Enrollment Management in August.
   o The Science lab will be the last to leave North Hall because of equipment.
   o New CUNY Community College at the North Hall site? New dorms? It will be the main campus for the new community college.
   o The demographics of BMCC is overflowed with students from Washington heights- it will make more sense to build a community college at this site tailored for these students.
- Justice Academy: one of the feeder programs. John Jay will be more for transfer or feeder programs than for incoming freshmen students.
- New men’s volleyball team this fall. Practice begins January 4th. Intramural date: May 17th from 3-5p in the main gym. Season runs from January until late March or April.
- CUNY sponsors needed for sports to be included in colleges.
- Looking into other sites for residence halls.

IV. **Social Security** - Topic was not included in agenda. Contact Professor Adam Wandt.

V. **Student Activities Programming Board** - not discussed (Jerrell was called in for something urgent)

VI. **Student Life Handbook** - concern about no sufficient student input

- Stephen Barnes motioned to adjourn.
- Lewquay Williams seconded the motion.

**The meeting was adjourned at 4:09 pm.**
Anne Lopes
Dean, Undergraduate Studies
John Jay College of Criminal Justice
alopes@jay.cuny.edu

Council of Academic Program/Major Coordinators
Minutes
September 14, 2010

Present Bettina Carbonell, Angela Crossman, Rick Culp, Maria Dagostino, Lior Gideon, Jay Hamilton, Elizabeth Hegeman, Shaobai Kan, Anne Lopes, Virginia Moreno, Allison Pease, Peter Romaniuk, Jon Shane, Andrew Sidman, Staci Strobl, Robert Tiff, Gregory Umbach.

Guests Amy Green, Sumaya Villanueva

1. Welcome and introduction of Council Members and Guests.

Dr. Amy Green (Chair of the General Education Steering Committee) gave an update on the General Education reform. The Steering Committee is working to develop a model for governance review based on the feedback it has received thus far. It hopes to complete this phase of the process by November 10th. Dr. Green will return to talk about the proposal, which she hopes will be approved by College Council by May 2011 at the latest. All are asked to continue to participate by sending feedback through the web-site or directly to Dr. Green.

Dr. Sumaya Villanueva (the Academic Advisement Director) is developing advisement tools in hard copy and online formats so that students can conduct effective degree planning. She wants students to think more comprehensively about: not only their electives but other meaningful experiences on campus. Dr. Villanueva and Louise Freymann, her staff member, will reach out to all major coordinators for participation in this process.

1. Announcements:
   a) Budget news is worse than last year. 21% CUE cut (will lead to a very bare bones undergraduate experience).
   b) Good news: we remediated over 300 conditional students in the summer with a 92% pass rate (the highest we’ve ever had). These entering students are better prepared and faculty will see a difference in classrooms.
2. Coordinator and Major Advisor Proposal Updates

The proposal is taking longer than it was supposed to because President Travis and Provost Bowers requested a comprehensive advisement plan.

Compensation for major advisors is estimated based on one course release per 400 students enrolled in the major. In majors where full-time faculty are not interested in acting as a major advisor, adjunct faculty could provide the function.

It is possible that we will phase the plan in based on resources with the three largest majors having advisors in place first.

3. Using Data to Improve Major

Committee to focus on two major tasks over the course of the year: 1) how data can be used to assess and improve the major, and 2) assessment of majors. Coordinators who complete the assessment will receive a $500.00 stipend.

Major Enrollments

Enrollment data suggests that we have a smaller entering class. The high school graduate population will begin to decline next year. Retention is therefore increasingly more critical. The dean will bring the latest retention report to be discussed during the next meeting. A request was made for the dean to send top five reasons for attrition in the Law Police Science majors.

Identified retention issues were:

- Finance
- Work
- Weak bond with institution (students get lost)
- Lack of student engagement with faculty outside of the classroom

Student Experience Survey

Students report that they cannot always register for courses that they need. As we will begin to work on scheduling an invitation will be sent out to Kathy Killoran and VP Saunier to meet with committee.

4. Middle State Standards and the Major
In 2 years, we will be deeply engaged in accreditation. Dean asked committee to read pages 40-46 of distributed "Standards for Accreditation" article for a taste of things to come. The article will be discussed.

5. Assessment Continued

Virginia Moreno handed out a guide to major assessment planning that she developed for the committee.

Steps 4 and 5 of guide will be our focus this fall: How do we know that students learn? How do we do the assessment? What evidence do we need to show?

As everyone was asked to recollect, major coordinators mapped courses to program learning outcomes last spring.

Now we are at the next step. Progress toward specific outcomes needs to evidenced and areas to improve curriculum need to be identified. The extent of progress students are making toward mastering outcomes should be assessed through assignments and tests in the courses to which a specific outcomes or outcomes map.

For next time, all coordinators were asked to collect and bring in assessments that map to the outcomes. We will review them.

Put another way, major coordinators were asked to bring the assessments that faculty teaching in the major use in their classes. The assessments should be specified on the syllabus and should map to the program (and course level) learning outcomes. Black assessments are fine. Question prompts for assignments, tests, essay questions etc...all work as long as they map to outcomes.

Virginia also will work with Jay Hamilton and Angela Crossman to bring back an example for the committee.
1. Announcements

- Anne introduced Dean Auld, Director of Student learning, Assessment and Academic Programs to the committee. Dan will be an additional resource for faculty on assessment.
- Jim Liana will oversee assessment in the major now that he is on board. He will join the committee at meetings with Virginia and take the lead on the assessment of the major initiative.

2. Assessment work coordination. Follow-up from last meeting.
   - Jim and Virginia will be working closely with major coordinators and chairs to make assessment a non-onerous process.

3. Using data to improve the major continued

   - The committee reviewed data concerning the characteristics of the entering class (see attached). The implications for the major were discussed.
     - Skill level upon entry and realistic yet high expectations mastery were identified.
     - Preparedness level explains retention rates to some degree.
     - More information about what students skill levels upon entry really mean would be useful.
     - Some majors incorporate critical skill development in reading and writing in the major.
     - Work in reading is also important.
     - Expectations for student preparation and assignment completion are also important.
     - Want to be sure expectations are high enough to stimulate performance and mastery.
     - Building skills into the major is important so that students are able to acquire the skills necessary to graduate. General education is insufficient to this given students level of preparedness and what we know about learning skills and the need for continual opportunities to practice and improve.
     - Math skill development was also identified.
- Students need to practice summarizing to demonstrate that they understood what they read. There many techniques for this.
- For future discussion: the committee will review the instrument on student evaluation of the major.

4. Assessment

- Virginia discussed draft model for the assessment of student learning distributed last time.
- The sample assessment rubric for the capstone and how it could be adapted was described.
- The full assessment process for the capstone was discussed.
- The role of chairs in enlisting departmental participation was identified. Jim will meet with chairs to discuss their role and support of coordinators.
- The collection of syllabi was also discussed.

5. Next step in assessment

- Continue collection of assignments.
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1) Introduction of Jim Liana as Associate provost for Institutional Effectiveness. He will be joining us in our work. He is a co-chair of the Middle States Steering Committee and responsible for the oversight of our self-study process. He also works on strategic planning.

Middle States Jim talked about the importance of Middle States standards and about Standard 14, which is about student learning and assessment, which is directly related to the work of the committee. (A copy of the standard was included in the week’s packet). Jim talked about the need for assessment and the fact that we can decide how to do it. We will want to develop best practices for assessment on our campus. We can do this in very cost effective ways. Middle States does not want to burden us; it wants us to look at what we have and to use multiple measures. The goal of assessment is the continuous improvement of the major.

Jim reviewed the importance of learning goals and the fact that all syllabi will need to include learning outcomes that may to the programs goals. How majors are assessed will depend on what tools are at hand. One will the assessment of the capstone as previously discussed. Exams, survey data and other information sources will provide further information about the majors.

Middle States want to see everyone buy into assessment and understand it. It also wants a sustainable process.

The self-study will be designed in the Spring 2011 and conducted over the next academic year in preparation for Middle States’ visit in spring 2013.

Middle States can visit and report that all is well or that some areas require improvements. It can ask for monitoring letters—John Jay has had two such
citations in the past. The two areas that were particularly poor were student learning outcomes assessment and General Education. Because we have a past record, Middle States will pay particular attention to these areas.

Middle States reviewers will be interested in the extent to which we are achieving our mission. When they visit they will talk to everyone.

2) Using data to improve the major continued

Anne shared data on our student profile and asked everyone to consider the implications of the data for curriculum in their work with faculty. She also said that we would discuss it more with regard to the implications for our majors at our next meeting.

3) Overview of full process of assessment review

Virginia reviewed the program assessment process. She described the assessment loop and stated that we will need to show that we use data to make improvements in our majors. (See handout). By the time Middle States comes, the college needs to have completed a full-assessment loop.

She then described the assessment toolbox (exams, multiple choice tests, lab reports, essays, alumni survey, etc). She iterated the principles of good assessment.

Virginia described rubrics and how to use them for assessment. The handouts describe how rubrics can be developed. Using a rubric to assess capstone projects will be important.

The discussion will continue next time.

4) The role of the major coordinator in the assessment of the major was discussed. Numerous major coordinators were concerned about the work involved in conducting on-going assessment of the capstone. The lack of support staff and help and inadequate compensation were issues that were raised. The work is not recognized or valued. This is a problem for untenured faculty especially.

Anne suggested that there are ways to do this are not so onerous. Administrators need to look at how it can be done. She promised to address this with the Provost.

5) Virginia’s PowerPoint presentation will be sent to all coordinators via email.
1. Announcements

- Anne introduced Dean Auld, Director of Student learning, Assessment and Academic Programs to the committee. Dan will be an additional resource for faculty on assessment.

- Jim Liana will oversee assessment in the major now that he is on board. He will join the committee at meetings with Virginia and take the lead on the assessment of the major initiative.

2. Assessment work coordination. Follow-up from last meeting.

- Jim and Virginia will be working closely with major coordinators and chairs to make assessment a non-onerous process.

3. Using data to improve the major continued

- The committee reviewed data concerning the characteristics of the entering class (see attached). The implications for the major were discussed.
  - Skill level upon entry and realistic yet high expectations mastery were identified.
  - Preparedness level explains retention rates to some degree.
  - More information about what students skill levels upon entry really mean would be useful.
  - Some majors incorporate critical skill development in reading and writing in the major.
  - Work in reading is also important.
  - Expectations for student preparation and assignment completion are also important.
  - Want to be sure expectations are high enough to stimulate performance and mastery.
  - Building skills into the major is important so that students are able to acquire the skills necessary to graduate. General education is insufficient to this given students level of preparedness and what we know about learning skills and the need for continual opportunities to practice and improve.
  - Math skill development was also identified.
4. Assessment

- Virginia discussed draft model for the assessment of student learning distributed last time.
- The sample assessment rubric for the capstone and how it could be adapted was described.
- The full assessment process for the capstone was discussed.
- The role of chairs in enlisting departmental participation was identified. Jim will meet with chairs to discuss their role and support of coordinators.
- The collection of syllabi was also discussed.

5. Next step in assessment

- Continue collection of assignments.

Coordinator of Majors Meeting
02-01-2011; Room 531T

Assessment Portion of the meeting only:

- Virginia acknowledged that faculty are really engaging in assessment.
- Several faculty volunteered to share their departmental assessment plans/experience thus far:
  - English Department put together a rubric, and changed their goals as a direct result of developing the rubric. This is acceptable and serves as an example of the assessment loop.
  - Political Science developed rubrics, and were challenged to define what they really meant by their learning goals. They found it difficult to assess and measure broad goals, i.e. write effectively. Understand that the broad goals need to be defined further.
  - Some faculty debate in the Global History department regarding whether or not to provide the rubrics to students. Concern about the “Hawthorne Effect”; a temporary improvement in performance by students because they know they are being assessed/studied. Much of the current literature is very much in favor of sharing the rubrics down the line; rubrics help students to understand why professors are asking them to do certain things. Students can learn to score themselves when using rubrics; it gives them a way to begin to assess their own work over time. Unintentional learning, however immeasurable, also happens and can be great over time.
  - Psychology department has concerns regarding the Psych 101 exam questions and how they are being presented to students.
- Virginia reviewed the next 2 steps in the assessment process (a 7-step template being used as a guide, and steps 1-3 have already been completed), and stressed that you DO NOT have to use one rubric for everything. If anyone has questions about the process/development of rubrics, feel free to contact her for assistance.
- It was stated that for any given goal you have multiple ways of assessing that goal. There are a variety of inventory assessment tools, i.e. exams, research papers, surveys. However, you do not have to assess all of the goals at once. Any goal may be assessed over time. The assessment plan identifies the what, how, who and when.
- Jim expressed practical concerns: we need to get some assessment data (by the end of the semester if possible) for the capstone courses, and that faculty work on developing rubrics. It is important for faculty to own the process; create your own format or use the default rubric (SUNY 4-point standard). If the default rubric is used, you must then figure out what constitutes ‘meeting expectations.’
- A request was made for a rubric model; Virginia will provide that to all.
- Assessment Cycle: Virginia distributed and reviewed an example of a simple assessment plan.
  - How do you develop the assessment planning cycle? The recommendation is to create short-term followed by long-term.
  - The assessment plan serves as a mini contract between you and your clients.
• It will be very important for all departments to submit their plans to the College Council, because they are a very important committee on campus.
• It is important that the language be clear; identify what is supposed to be accomplished.
• Do not include TOO FEW items, and do not include TOO MANY items.
• Assessment is a shared exercise that documents, for the world to see, that you have consulted with your colleagues and developed program goals. It is a way of creating discussion around the major; which is critical to student success.
• Non-teaching units will also develop their own assessment plans.
• A situation was cited involving two faculty members grading the same exam differently. If this happens, perhaps the rubrics are too vague; feel free to rewrite them. This is also a great opportunity to utilize ‘norming sessions’ amongst the faculty, to ensure that faculty are on the same page regarding the rubrics.
• Q. How do we respond to the thought that assessment is an infringement upon our rights to teach freely?
• A. The canned Middle States response is as follows:
  ▪ You are FREE to determine HOW to teach;
  ▪ You are NOT FREE to determine WHAT to teach.
  ▪ The assessment component relies on the overall department.
Council of Major Coordinators Meeting
Minutes
March 1, 2011

Present: Jim Liana, Peter Romaniuk, Bettina Carbonell, Robert McCrie, Harold Sullivan, Andrew Sidman, Maria D’Agostino, Lior Gideon, Jay Hamilton, Jon Shane, Maki Haberfeld, Doug Thompkins, Shu-Yuan Cheng, Angela Crossman, Daniel Auld, Allison Pease, Virginia Moreno, Robert Till, Nikisha Williams (guest), Meghan Duffy (guest)

1. Announcements
   - Jim was chair of the meeting, as Anne was unavailable.

2. Discussion of Major Survey and the Use of Data - Nikisha Williams
   - Nikisha began with a brief overview of how the survey is conducted. Every three years, the students are surveyed, and the survey currently being looked at was given to sophomore, junior, and senior students in the Fall 2009 semester. A copy was given to the council members, but it can also be found online via inside John Jay in the OIRA section.
   - Nikisha then opened the floor to questions, many of which centered around major-specific questions or sections. The issue with adding major-specific questions is that it could cause even less students to respond to the survey.
   - There were also queries about the fact that so few students had responded, however Nikisha noted that while "n" (being the number of respondents) was low, the spread of respondents across the majors was representative of the percentage of students in the majors (i.e. if 20% of the student population are Criminal Justice majors, roughly 20% of respondents were also Criminal Justice majors).
   - Jim then presented the idea that the council members should suggest what they would like to have on a "dream" evaluation. Again, the suggestions tended toward a section for each major within the survey, which was stated as not doable.
     - However, Shu-Yuan presented the option that there be a small, customized popout for students of specific majors within the survey. Nikisha said that as long as the list of questions was reasonable (5 or 6 questions at most), this could potentially be accommodated.
     - It was also noted that the OIRA can help instruct individual majors on how to go about analyzing their own survey data if they have any.
● If any majors want the initial survey data re-worked from the raw data, they can request this as well, (e.g. information by gender and major or other specifics), although they cannot be given the raw data in order to protect student anonymity.

3. Faculty Development and Outcomes Assessment - Meghan Duffy
   ● Meghan came to the meeting in order to discuss what her department, the Center for the Advancement of Teaching, does for faculty members. They work with faculty and staff via workshops for faculty improvement. To demonstrate, Meghan had the members answer 3 questions:
     ○ Who are your students?
     ○ What do you want your students to know and be able to do?
     ○ What is the evidence that they have reached those goals?

   ● The point of these questions was to get faculty thinking about backward design, which is essentially thinking like an assessor when planning a course.

   ● Meghan is available in the Center in room 333T or via email at mduffy@jay.cuny.edu.

4. Assessment - Jim and Virginia
   ● Virginia opened discussion by asking how far the council members were from assessing and if they were facing any challenges thus far.
     ○ Lior said that he will begin assessment on Monday according to the rubric provided, but that he is still unsure of how exactly to proceed.
     ○ Virginia said that the goal is to identify who you are, what you do, and how well you are doing it via multiple assessment measures such as papers, essays, etc.

     ○ Lior also wanted to know how to set up the rubric, since a template was given.
     ○ Virginia said that the template can be used, but that the most important thing was that the rubric, however formatted, be meaningful to the major and to any others reading it.

     ○ Allison wanted to know how often conversation should occur between the coordinators and Virginia.

     ○ Virginia wants to have the 7 assessment steps (given in a previous meeting) to be documented, either in one giant document or many smaller documents.

   ● The overall goal is for most programs to have assessed all of their goals with the exception of a few programs (such as newer ones), which needs to be done now in preparation for 100% compliance with Middle States in Spring 2013.

   ● Lior also expressed that there are major overhauls happening within his major and that looking into the future of the programs before the overhauls are finished is difficult to do.

   ○ Virginia suggested that the assessment could then focus on why the changes themselves need to be made, so that people who are not directly attached to the major can see the necessity of the changes.
• Maki expressed the concern that there is some confusion about who is doing the assessing of courses.
  ○ Jim and Virginia both emphasized that the instructors should assess their own courses, with at most 2 readers assessing a series of courses, in order to ensure that the assessment remains standardized.
• There was also a difficulty voiced by both Angela and Doug, in that their capstone courses tend to reflect specializations and do not always have similar items to be assessed over different sections.
  ○ Virginia suggested that the courses all agree upon one similar rubric to be applied for one semester in order to assess them at least once.
• Virginia asked who has been working on or completed their rubric and assessment, and most have at least started working.
• To conclude the discussion on assessment, Virginia offered up some tips:
  ○ A 5-year cycle is recommended usually for assessments and should be kept in mind for the future, but the goal is to assess all levels within the next 18 months.
  ○ A narrative should always be included with measures.
  ○ Multiple measures (at least 2) should be used for each goal, and one must be a direct assessment.
    ○ Doug expressed concern that the list of goals and objectives for his major might be cumbersome to assess at once, and Virginia suggested that if they can be assessed at once, that would be fine, but the goal is not to overburden coordinators. Jim suggested that the list of goals and objectives be whittled down with Virginia's assistance.
  ○ Try to link survey items with specific goals for the program.
  ○ Everything within this assessment should also be utilized with the review of the programs themselves.
Council of Major Coordinators Meeting
Minutes
April 5, 2011

Present: Anne Lopes, Jim Llana, Virginia Moreno, Bettina Carbonell, Allison Pease, Jay Hamilton, Andrew Sidman, Robert Till, Dan Auld, Angela Crossman, Betsey Hegeman, Staci Strobl, Lior Gideon, Ric Curtis, Doug Thompkins, Shu-Yuan Cheng

1. Announcements
   a. General Education Steering Committee Proposal
      o The new General Education proposal is currently up for debate in UCASC. Anne will be sending out the document and a tabular presentation for the council’s review. Any questions about the proposal can be directed to Amy Greene.
         1) Implications for Majors
            o The new General Education outcomes should be integrated with and looked for in the capstone courses for each major.
   b. Other
      o The group was given a review of the Fall 2010 Grade Distribution Report to look over for next meeting’s discussion of the findings. The full report can be found on the OIRA website (http://owl.cuny.edu:7778/portal/page/portal/oira/OIRA_HOME).

2. Assessment - Virginia and Jim
   • Virginia and Jim both encouraged any members who have not yet submitted drafts for their assessments to submit them to Virginia so that she can assist early on with any corrections that may need to be made.
   • Robert asked if it would be appropriate to give the same rubric to two different professors using two different assessment tools (e.g. essay versus midterm test), and Virginia said to make sure to keep in mind the appropriate timing for an assessment according to what a student should have learned halfway through a course versus at the end of a course, for example. The timing should be decided upon by each department individually.
      o Bettina asked how much extra work went into grading both with the new rubric as well as a professor’s normal system, and Robert said that many professors said that the extra work was minimal, and sometimes helped to improve their own grading systems.
- Virginia reminded everyone that no assessment or rubric is perfect, which is why more than one is needed, to reduce the limitations of only one assessment style. Given this structure, a task and a rubric with which to measure it is only one measure and at least one more is needed, be it an indirect measure such as a survey or another direct measure.

- Virginia and Jim emphasized the idea that when results are received, the focus should be on what those results are telling you as far as whether standards and expectations are being met or not. The interest lies in the percentage that are reaching each level of performance.

- Staci asked whether there was a rule of thumb for how many students to assess when one needs to select a sample size due to a large number of students. All members are encouraged to ask Virginia if they are unsure about the sample size.
  - Bettina, who had already selected her sample, noted that due to the length of the theses in her department, (30-35 pages each), the practical solution was to use papers that were in electronic format and therefore easier to distribute to the graders. They ended up choosing one section of twelve students, which, though small, gave a representative sample of the group as a whole.
    - Virginia asked whether this process helped refine the rubric, and Bettina noted that this made it clearer just how subjective grading can be. Virginia suggested that one way to refine might be to look at all papers together and decide as a group which ones reach the minimum to meet expectations, in order to give a focal point from which to branch outward.

- Jim reminded everyone that they should keep some samples from each level on the rubrics to demonstrate a practical utilization of the rubric.

- Virginia reminded the group that, regardless of the scale being used, the level that meets department standards must be indicated.
  a. Presentation by Allison Pease - Gender Studies and English Rubric
     Presentation
      - Anne will be distributing the English document on a later date, but Allison overviewed it briefly for the group. Allison decided on a rubric, selected three faculty, and as the papers were scored, a professor noted that the rubric could greatly improve teaching methods overall.
      - Allison also discussed the Gender Studies rubric for GEN 101. While evaluating with the rubric, Allison and the grader she chose discovered that the students were demonstrating that they were reaching the goals for the class, but that the rubric was not showing this. Since, the rubric has been revised, including different assignments and a vocabulary test, and the revisions were made more helpful, according to Allison, by a document found on Blackboard from Michigan. Allison also found that
odd-numbered scales were unhelpful, as everyone seemed to gravitate
toward the center number more often than not.
- Virginia and Jim emphasized that learning goals, assessment, and grading
must all be linked. This includes things such as defining how elements of
a paper demonstrate the learning goals and operationalization of the
rubric to specify items that correspond with which level of performance
in terms of learning goals (e.g. meets expectations, does not meet
expectations, exceeds expectations, etc.).

b. Presentation by Andrew Sidman - Political Science
- Andrew started by encouraging everyone emphatically to send drafts to
Virginia, as the feedback he was given was the way he managed to
lengthen and put detail into his assessment plan. He also improved the
rubric as he was looking at papers, trimming and adding items where
necessary. Andrew allowed in his rubric to include individualization for
different professors and classes, as well. Overall, Andrew stressed again
that feedback was imperative in developing the level of specificity that he
reached. Andrew also noted that he found a significant issue with the
writing abilities of students.
  - Jay asked how Middle States might interpret this writing deficit,
and Anne noted that this has actually been mentioned as a
nationwide issue, so Middle States will likely be unsurprised.
  - Jay also questioned whether the implicit belief that students will
score lower on writing will cause graders to unconsciously rate
students lower on writing, and Virginia said that this is a case for
needing specificity in the rubrics, so that assessing can be as
objective as possible.
  - Jim reminded the group that what matters is what is done with
the knowledge that writing abilities are deficient, and Anne
mentioned that this is a case for the encouragement of practicing
writing early on and offering better feedback to students.
  - Virginia also stated that if one finds that her or his students are
not reaching appropriate writing levels when they arrive in class,
the department should be consulted as to how to get them to
these goals in time for upper-level coursework.
  - Virginia and Jim advise members to continue working on drafts and turn drafts in
to Virginia for help earlier rather than later, as well as to keep in mind detail to
assist with usability and a multi-year plan.
  - Virginia noted that she will be calling on another member to attend the Grad
Center conference as Andrew did, which he said was very worth going to in
order to learn what others are doing successfully in assessment.
Council of Academic Program/Major Coordinators
May 3, 2011

Minutes

Present: Bettina Carbonell, Shu-Yuan Cheng, Angela Crossman, Maria Dagostino, Lior Gideon, Jay Hamilton, Betsy Hegeman, Jim Liana, Robert McCrie, Virginia Moreno, Allison Pease, Peter Romaniuk, Jon Shane, Andrew Sidman, Staci Strobl, Robert Till, Fritz Umbach

1. Announcements
   a. Advisement pilot
      • The College is implementing a (3-phase) comprehensive advisement plan
         o 2 weeks a year when faculty and designated major advisors will counsel students.
         o Phase 1 will be piloted during the Fall 2011 semester in the Forensic Science and Forensic psychology departments (to have a sense of possible problems before expanding to other departments)
      • Dean Lopes thanked the committee for their help in developing the advisement plan for the College.
   b. Online Courses
      • Two task forces finished their work
         o Online and Year-Round
         o Dean Lopes asked committee members to read the reports because of their implication for the majors.
   c. Year Round College
      • Led by Associate Provost Liana, the year-round report would like for students to think of John Jay as a year round college.
      • The report also discusses retention, scheduling and summer schedule
      • Benefits of a year round college are not only great for current students but are also revenue generating.
      • The college will hire a director as early as fall
      • Fritz says the faculty contract has been a stumbling block to the year round option
      • Jim recommends the creation of a robust program for faculty development
         o This year round option will not change faculty contracts, but will involve possibly a revenue sharing incentive for departments offering courses during the summer
      • Both reports focus on very critical issues: Faculty Development and assessment
      • Anne is gravely concerned with compliance issue because she does not believe that we are prepared to offer Online Undergraduate Program (students will not be able to take more than 50% of courses.)

2. Update on retention Efforts College-wide
Below is Dean Lopes' update on the college-wide retention issues that she reported to ESM
   • UGS is beginning a Latina/o Retention Study Group (will be College-wide initiative by fall)
• Integrating SEEK program with UGS (10% of our students are SEEK) and the resources are there for students
• UGS is also doing a lot around remediation
  o We accept students who are not skills certified and send them to Summer Academy which had spectacular results last year
• Piloting early start program for those students less skilled so they have a less heavy load during fall
• Multiple orientations rather than one large one if funding is permitted
• Hired one transfer advisor
• Academic Advising tools will be converted to web tools next year
• Advisement will begin in the fall
• Early Intervention programs (Finding out how a student is doing by week 4 so students can go for help if needed)
• Faculty will be able to use tutor-track
• There are lots of graduate initiatives as well

Dean Lopes believes that retention starts with faculty engagement and advisors; and she thanked the coordinators for their efforts this term on retention.

3. Next Month’s Assessment: Getting the Data
   a. Questions, concerns
   • Jim suggests gathering data in capstones and express the need to have that task started
     o Asks if there are any problems?
     o Evidence of dramatic progress
   • Virginia thanks those who reached out to her (and expressed that she will not be able to provide input to those who delay in sharing design for collecting data, drafts, rubrics, plans, etc)
   • How many goals will be assessed by fall 2012?
   • Completed chart will indicate Middle State compliance
     o Learning goals/collating data
     o Analyzing data
     o Documented use of findings (via e-mail from departmental chairs to faculty)
   • Virginia talked about the difference between goal vs objective
     o Goal is a broader term while objective is more specific
   • Jim says to focus on the end of semester assessments for next month
   • Fritz says that History is in the process of assessing exams results
     o So far results are that students’ writing is sub-par
     o Faculty feels anxious that they will be punished for those results even though students should have learned those skills elsewhere
   • Virginia says to be candid and that Middle States will be surprised if we say that students have no English problems
   • Jay expects to find similar results with other departments if we put together our actions based on assessment
   • The English department accessed and discovered writing to be an issue so they are:
     o Talking to the writing center
     o Giving out 10 workshops on structuring arguments for literature papers this month alone
- Using writing fellow (to work in certain sections of their curriculum)
- Fritz believe that students do not know they have problems since they have a false sense of adequacy
- Anne suggest giving them feedback frequently
- Angela: Grade inflation issue
  - Pressure for adjuncts; they need support from administration
  - Where is institutional support for honest grading?
- Anne: Complex issue if 50% of class fails that is a problem the course is trying to do too much for where students are
  - That students fail is ok
  - Take into account student profile (1000 SAT, 82 SAT average)
  - Courses need to be pitched to where the students are so they can be taught
- Jim: need to have expectations that students can reach
- Fritz: History has 2 faculty members who are easy graders and their enrollments are always up
- Virginia: Change our reference; dialogue should be about:
  - Extent to which students met learning objectives instead of focus on grades
  - Expectations for department/program (As a program need to develop a rubric to assess something; whatever assignment is, it needs to include basic element.)
- Fritz: Should we send all 600 graded reports?
- Virginia: No, you should instead select a random sample of papers representing performance from each different level.
- Stad: I did 5 year plan but only half on my goals will be addressed/assessed by 2012
  - We will not be ready by Fall 2012 unless we have help
- Jim: We will need to have separate discussion outside of this meeting with Maki, Anne, Jim, Virginia
- Anne asked: When I met with chairs some of them do not what is happening in assessment, how can we bridge that gap?
  - Coordinator Group Meeting with the chairs? Resounding Yes!
  - Have to impress upon the chairs the role of major coordinators and assessment support
  - First meeting in Fall will try to have chairs and also Provost
- Everybody collecting data this month! Please send copy of rubrics to Virginia before you do scoring
The Interim Executive Committee of the College Council held its first meeting of the 2010-2011 academic year on Thursday, September 2, 2010. The meeting was called to order at 3:35pm and the following members were present: Andrea Balis, Elton Beckett, Jane Bowers, Karen Kaplowitz, Maxine Kerr, Sylvia Lopez, Joseph Onwu, Carina Quintian, Francis Sheehan, and Jeremy Travis.

Absent were: Berenecea Johnson Eanes and Robert Pignatello

I. Adoption of the Agenda for the Executive Committee
It was moved the agenda be adopted with two amendments. First, it was recommended to insert the word “for” in the item marked VI. for it to read “Election of Secretary for Executive Committee of the College Council and for the College Council”; second is the addition of agenda item marked IX. titled “Bylaws”. The motion was seconded with the amendments and approved unanimously.

II. Minutes of the May 3, 2010 Executive Committee Meeting
It was moved to adopt the minutes as presented. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

III. Minutes of the May 25, 2010 Executive Committee Special Meeting
It was moved to adopt the minutes as presented. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously

IV. Adoption of the Agenda for the September 23, 2010 College Council
It was moved to adopt the agenda as amended. The word “Committees” was added to item III for it to read: “Approval of Members of the College Council Committees (separate attachment)”. The motion was seconded as amended and approved unanimously.

V. Nominations to College Council and its committees
It was moved to nominate the following faculty, staff, and students to the Executive Committee of the College Council:

Seven (7) members of the full-time faculty as defined in Article I, Section 3.a.i
1. Francis Sheehan Science
2. Karen Kaplowitz English
Two (2) higher education officer
1. Sylvia Lopez  
   Financial Aid
2. Michael Scaduto  
   Scholarships

Three (3) students
1. Maxine Kerr  
   Vice President of the Student Council
2. Anastasia Williams  
   Treasurer of the Student Council
3. Joseph Onwu  
   President of the Student Council

The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

VI. Election of Secretary for Executive Committee of the College Council and for the College Council
It was moved to nominate Mayra Nieves for the position of secretary. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

VII. Final Report on 2009-2010 College Council activity
A report on all College Council Committees was given to the members of the Interim Executive Committee of the College Council. It was recommended that the report be shared with the College Council.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:50pm
The Executive Committee of the College Council held its second meeting of the 2010-2011 academic year on Tuesday, October 5, 2010. The meeting was called to order at 3:32pm and the following members were present: Andrea Balis, Elton Beckett, Jane Bowers, James DiGiovanna, Jennifer Dysart, Robert Garot, Berenecea Johnson-Eanes, Karen Kaplowitz, Maxine Kerr, Sylvia Lopez, Joseph Onwu, Michael Scaduto, Jeremy Travis, and Anastasia Williams.

Absent were: Robert Pignatello and Francis Sheehan

Guest: Counsel Maldonado

I. Adoption of the Agenda for the Executive Committee
   It was moved the agenda be adopted as presented. The motion was and approved unanimously.

II. Minutes of the September 2, 2010 Interim Executive Committee Meeting
   It was moved to adopt the minutes with an amendment; correcting the spelling of the name of James DiGiovanni to James DiGiovanna. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

III. Adoption of the Agenda for the October 14, 2010 College Council
   It was moved to adopt the agenda as amended. Item V “Proposal from the Faculty Senate (attachment D)” will now be labeled as item IV “Proposal from the Faculty Senate on the Honorary Degree Committee Composition (attachment C). Item IV “Master Plan (attachment C)” will now be labeled as Item V “Master Plan (attachment D)” . The motion was seconded as amended and approved unanimously.

IV. Report from Counsel Maldonado on Charter Questions and Department Bylaws.

1. Effective September 1 Dean Lopes is chairing the Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee but according to our charter the Provost chairs this
committee. Does this mean the provost’s absence is counted? Do we change the charter? What do we do until then in terms of counting attendance towards quorum?

Response to question 1: Article I, Section 1(xi) of the College Council Bylaws authorizes the President to name the Dean of Undergraduate Studies as the chair of the committee and to appoint another administrator to replace the Provost on the committee. Article I, Section 1(xi) states that:

Administrative members of committees shall be those named, or those holding equivalent positions and functions, as determined by the President.

2. James Llana is chairing the Strategic Planning Subcommittee of the Budget and Planning Committee and his title is associate provost for institutional effectiveness BUT the charter reads lists the chair as being the associate provost for strategic planning. Jim is the person doing the job it’s just that the title for the position was changed from the time the charter was written to the time the person was actually hired. Do we change the charter to reflect this new title? What is involved?

Response to question 2: College Council Bylaws Article I, Section 1(xi) authorizes the President to appoint the Associate Provost for Institutional Effectiveness as the chair of the Strategic Planning Subcommittee. See above.

3. The charter requires each committee meet and submit its minutes, agenda and attendance to the college council however, there are some committees, because of the nature of their work, that aren’t required to do so (personnel and budget, judicial committee) and yet still there are others that don’t register votes or items because they are consultative in nature (provosts advisory council, financial planning subcommittee, strategic planning subcommittee). Can we make this distinction? Does it need charter change?

Response to question 3: Bylaws Article I, Section 1(vii) specifically requires that all College Council Committees keep minutes of their meetings, “including attendance.” In addition, Article XV, Section 48 of Robert’s Rules of Order requires that minutes include the following information:

- Kind of meeting (regular or special)
- Name of the assembly
- Date, time, and place of the meeting
- Name of regular chair or substitute
- Whether minutes of previous meeting were approved
- Time meeting was adjourned
Even if a committee does not put a motion to a vote, it should maintain minutes with the information required above. The confidential proceedings of the Personnel Committee and Judicial Committee should not be included in the minutes forwarded to the Secretary. These committees, however, should also forward the information listed above.

4. What is the status of the undergraduate bylaws? I informed them that all departments submitted bylaws and you reviewed them and returned them with edits. Have you received any since then?

Response to question 4: All of the departments submitted draft bylaws at the end of last semester. I reviewed the submissions and notified each chair of the changes recommended by the ECCC. Eight departments resubmitted the bylaws with the requested changes. The rest are pending.

5. Graduate bylaws – I have not received any, have you?

Response to question 5: All of the Graduate Programs submitted draft bylaws. I reviewed the submissions and notified the Dean of Graduate Programs of the changes recommended by the ECCC.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:20pm
The Executive Committee of the College Council held its third meeting of the 2010-2011 academic year on Wednesday, October 27, 2010. The meeting was called to order at 3:31pm and the following members were present: Andrea Balis, Elton Beckett, Jane Bowers, James DiGiovanna, Robert Garot, Berenecea Johnson-Eanes, Karen Kaplowitz, Maxine Kerr, Sylvia Lopez, Michael Scaduto, Francis Sheehan and Anastasia Williams.

Absent were: Jeremy Travis, Robert Pignatello, Jennifer Dysart, and Joseph Onwu

I. Adoption of the Agenda for the Executive Committee
   It was moved that the agenda be adopted as amended with the addition of the report on bylaws by Counsel Maldonado. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

II. Minutes of the October 5, 2010 Interim Executive Committee Meeting
    It was moved to adopt the minutes with an amendment. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

III. Adoption of the Agenda for the November 11, 2010 College Council
    It was moved to adopt the agenda as amended to include The Statement of Purpose” from the Faculty Senate as Attachment “D”. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:45pm
The Executive Committee of the College Council held its fourth meeting of the 2010-2011 academic year on Thursday, December 2, 2010. The meeting was called to order at 3:38pm and the following members were present: Jane Bowers, James DiGiovananna, Jennifer Dysart, Robert Garot, Karen Kaplowitz, Maxine Kerr, Sylvia Lopez, Joseph Onwu, Robert Pignatello, Michael Scaduto, Francis Sheehan, Jeremy Travis, and Anastasia Williams.

Absent were: Andrea Balis, Elton Beckett, and Berenecea Johnson-Eanes

I. Adoption of the Agenda for the Executive Committee
   It was moved that the agenda be adopted as presented. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

II. Minutes of the October 27, 2010 Executive Committee Meeting
   It was moved to adopt the minutes as presented. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

III. Adoption of the Agenda for the December 13, 2010 College Council
   It was moved to adopt the agenda for the December 13, 2010 College Council with the following amendment: that the item marked V. “Request from Professor Hoffman (attachments D1 and D2)” be handled by Associate Provost James Llana. The motion was seconded as amended and approved unanimously.

IV. Department Bylaws
   The Executive committee of the College Council agreed to invite Counsel Maldonado to its next meeting, scheduled for February 8, 2011, to discuss department bylaws in a detailed fashion.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:11pm
John Jay College of Criminal Justice
The City University of New York
The Executive Committee of the College Council

Minutes of the Executive Committee of the College Council

Tuesday, February 8, 2011

The Executive Committee of the College Council held its fifth meeting of the 2010-2011 academic year on Tuesday, February 8, 2011. The meeting was called to order at 3:40pm and the following members were present: Andrea Balis, Elton Beckett, Jane Bowers, James DiGiovanna, Jennifer Dysart, Robert Garot, Karen Kaplowitz, Sylvia Lopez, Joseph Onwu, Robert Pignatello, Michael Scaduto, and Jeremy Travis.

Absent were: Bereneecia Johnson-Eanes, and Francis Sheehan

I. Adoption of the Agenda for the Executive Committee
   It was moved to adopt the agenda with the addition of the following additions:

   1. Official Communication of College Council
   2. Memberships

   It was moved to add to the agenda of the executive Committee of the College Council. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

II. Minutes of the December 2, 2010 Executive Committee Meeting
   It was moved to adopt the minutes as presented. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

III. Adoption of the Agenda for the February 24, 2011 College Council
   It was moved to adopt the agenda for the February 24 College Council with the following addition of “Membership Elections” as item III. It was moved to add Membership Elections to the agenda. The motion was seconded as amended and approved unanimously.

IV. Department Bylaws
   The new deadline for Graduate Program Bylaws is April 4, 2011. The Executive Committee of the College Council authorize the Chair to communicate with the chairs of the academic departments who are not in compliance. Counsel Maldonado will report back on Graduate Program Bylaws at the next Executive Committee of the College Council. Approval of Bylaws will occur at the March 9, 2011 Executive Committee of the College Council.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30pm.
The Executive Committee of the College Council held its sixth meeting of the 2010-2011 academic year on Wednesday, March 9, 2011. The meeting was called to order at 3:43pm and the following members were present: Elton Beckett, Jane Bowers, James DiGiovanna, Jennifer Dysart, Robert Garot, Karen Kaplowitz, Sylvia Lopez, Joseph Onwu, Robert Pignatello, Michael Scaduto, and Jeremy Travis.

Absent were: Andrea Balis, Berenecea Johnson-Eanes, and Francis Sheehan

I. Adoption of the Agenda for the Executive Committee
   It was moved to adopt the agenda as presented. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

II. Minutes of the February 8, 2011 Executive Committee Meeting
   It was moved to adopt the minutes as presented. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

III. Adoption of the Agenda for the March 24, 2011 College Council
   It was moved to adopt the agenda for the March 24 College Council with the following amendment: that the item marked V. “Second Reading and Vote on Charter Amendment Proposed by the Faculty Senate” be labeled as item III. The motion was seconded as amended and approved unanimously.

IV. Department Bylaws
   It was the sense of the Executive Committee of the College Council to defer departmental bylaws to the April 4, 2011 Executive Committee of the College Council to allow the members of the Executive Committee of the College Council ample time to thoroughly review the bylaws. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

V. Report of the MPA-IG Online Program
   It was moved to have this item removed from the agenda of the March 9, 2011 Executive Committee of the College Council and be placed on the April 13, 2011 College Council as an agenda item. It was agreed that Provost Bowers will report on this item. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:35pm.
The Executive Committee of the College Council held its seventh meeting of the 2010-2011 academic year on Tuesday, April 5, 2011. The meeting was called to order at 3:40pm and the following members were present: Elton Beckett, Jane Bowers, Berenecea Johnson-Eanes, James DiGiovanna, Jennifer Dysart, Robert Garot, Tyler Garvey, Karen Kaplowitz, Sylvia Lopez, Joseph Onwu, Michael Scaduto, and Jeremy Travis.

Absent were: Andrea Balis, Elizabeth Cyran, Robert Pignatello, and Francis Sheehan

I. Adoption of the Agenda for the Executive Committee
   It was moved to adopt the agenda as presented. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

II. Minutes of the March 9, 2011 Executive Committee Meeting
   It was moved to adopt the minutes as presented. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

III. Adoption of the Agenda for the April 13, 2011 College Council
   It was moved to adopt the agenda as presented. The motion was seconded as amended and approved unanimously.

IV. Department Bylaws
   Due to pressing obligations, Counsel Maldonado could not be present to give the report on departmental bylaws. It was moved that all bylaws be formatted uniformly using Provost Bowers guidelines, and that counsel give a report at the next Executive Committee of the College Council. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:15pm.
The Executive Committee of the College Council held its eighth meeting of the 2010-2011 academic year on Wednesday, May 9, 2011. The meeting was called to order at 3:40pm and the following members were present: Elton Beckett, Jane Bowers, Berenecea Johnson-Eanes, James DiGiovanna, Jennifer Dysart, Robert Garot, Tyler Garvey, Karen Kaplowitz, Sylvia Lopez, Robert Pignatello, Joseph Onwu, Michael Scaduto, and Francis Sheehan. Absent were: Andrea Balis, Elizabeth Cyran, and Jeremy Travis.

I. Adoption of the Agenda for the Executive Committee
   It was moved to adopt the agenda as presented. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

II. Minutes of the April 5, 2011 Executive Committee Meeting
    It was moved to adopt the minutes as presented. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

III. Adoption of the Agenda for the May 16, 2011 College Council
    It was moved to amend the agenda by replacing item VIII “Proposal To Create a College Campus-Wide Assessment Committee” with a new version in memo format; and to make current item V “Report from the Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee” item IV, and to make current item IV “Two Proposed Resolutions Regarding the Proposed Revision of John Jay’s General Education Curriculum” item V. The motion was seconded as amended and approved unanimously.

IV. Department Bylaws
    Counsel Maldonado reported on all bylaws submitted to date, except Communication and Theater arts. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:15pm.
Financial Planning Subcommittee Meeting
August 17, 2010 corrected Sept 2, 2010
Minutes

Meeting commenced at approximately 4:05, Agenda and Handouts: attached

1. SVP Pignatello provided an overview of the documents distributed, the University Allocation and the impact on the college. The college base allocation was reduced by 2.5% or $2 million. In addition we must set aside 1.25% or $1 million as a contingency fund. The total reduction of $3 million may leave the college with a shortfall of $2.2 million.

2. The committee discussed a strategy of submitting a preliminary financial plan that was not balanced and requesting support from the University.

3. Ned Benton requested a crosswalk between the FY 10 year end Allocation and the FY 11 Allocation.

4. Provost Bowers requested that the financial plan projection for full time salaries be broken down by Faculty and other.

5. It was agreed that the Academic Group within the Committee (Provost, Ben, Ned, Tom, Karen and other faculty) would review proposals that would impact the adjunct expenditures including: teaching capacity, release time potentially owed to the college, class size and class limits.

6. Summer enrollment was discussed. Ned suggested that enrollment could be increased if the college instituted a revenue sharing model where a portion of the summer revenue would be returned to the department for investment. Rob and Jane suggested that the idea be considered only after the current gap is closed. In general there was support for a reasonable investment in resources to assist in managing the summer program. Marketing is needed. The provost agreed to look into what other CUNY schools do to attract students in the summer. There needs to be a college survey of students

7. There was a discussion about enrollment and specifically projections for FY 12 and FY 13 graduate enrollment. There is an expectation that applications for graduate programs will decline because of the new requirement (effective Fall 2010) that students take the GRE. We agreed to bring up the matter with VP Saulnier. It was agreed that we need to market and advertise our graduate programs.

8. The faculty expressed concern that the Budget Allocation Review Process had stopped. SVP Pignatello reaffirmed the college's commitment to continue the process. A report on Centers and Institutes is being prepared and will be shared with the subcommittee after the President’s review. The position review results will be shared and discussed at the next meeting.
9. There was a lengthy discussion on the purpose of the committee. SR VP Pignatello stated it was agreed the purpose of the committee is to make recommendations. The committee needs to have the opportunity to provide input before final decisions are made.

10. It was agreed to meet again in 2 weeks. SVP Pignatello’s assistant will set up the meeting.

Meeting ended at 6:10 pm
Financial Planning Subcommittee Meeting
September 1, 2010

Meeting Notes


- **Review of Minutes from 8/17/10 Meeting**
  Minutes were reviewed. Item #9 should be revised to reflect that “Rob stated the purpose of the committee is to make recommendations.

- **Update on Financial Plan Projection**
  The following were distributed and discussed:
  - Revised Financial Plan Projection
  - Impact of Enrollment Shortfall - VP Saulnier explained that the University pushed the college to grow, however they had problems with their registration process and a potential pool of students were closed out. After some discussion it was agreed we should be more conservative in our estimate of the % of students in Spring vs Fall.
  - Crosswalk FY 10 – FY 11 Allocation
  - PS Projection
    It was suggested that we analyze "hard attrition" (ie faculty who left but were on the July payroll for summer pay.

- **Preliminary Results of Position Review**
  There was a long discussion about the “bucket exercise” that the college undertook in the Spring of 2010. Members of the committee felt they should be making recommendations regarding buckets. The exercise yielded mixed results because in some cases a function is a high priority but the person performing that function is not suited for it. It was agreed that each VP should provide a report on what positions were eliminated.

  This item was on the agenda and discussed generally. There was general consensus that in order to increase winter and summer enrollment, we should survey students to see what courses they want to take. Also it was agreed we should implement controls on non teaching adjunct expenditures and review for potential savings. NTA appointments are generally related to tutoring and student service additional assignments. There was further consensus that we should focus on recruitment for graduate programs and we need to look at how we market and advertise for these and all programs.
Pause Exception Review (as of 8/20/10)

The President has completed a review of recent “paused position exceptions” previously grant but not yet filled. The review has resulted in certain exceptions being allowed to proceed onward and others being temporarily delayed in order to recognize cost savings. These decisions are summarized below:

Student Development:
1. Authorization to fill one full time College Office Assistant. This position will be hired at a university hiring pool in the Spring 2011. Until such time permission is granted to use the funding for this position to increase VP Eanes’ college assistant budget for Fall semester staffing.
2. Authorization to appoint Rima Douglass to Interim Director of Student Activities (Acting Full HEO @ $68,803).
3. Delay search for Director of Student Activities with expectation search will resume in early Spring 2011 with an anticipated July 2011 appointment.

Enrollment Management:
1. Authorization to appoint Title IV Coordinator for Financial Aid Office.
2. Authorization to hire College Office Assistant for One Stop Services at university hiring pool on 8/25.
3. Delay hiring of one College Office Assistant in Admissions Office until March 2011.
4. Delay hiring Federal Work Study Coordinator until March 2011 or beyond.

Academic Affairs:
1. Authorization to appoint Associate to Dean for Undergraduate Studies.
2. Authorization to appoint Substitute Director of Research Operations (at salary not to exceed $75k).
3. Authorization to convert full time college assistant position to Assistant to Director of Math Resource Center (Asst. to Heo at salary of $36,965) which must be funded via UG Studies college assistant budget.
4. Delay search for Director of Graduate and Professional Studies until later in Fall semester with an anticipated February 2011 appointment.
5. Delay search for Director of Prisoner Re-entry Institute to March 2011.

Marketing and Development:
1. Authorization to appoint Executive Assistant to VP position.

Finance and Administration: Pignatello:
1. Authorization to proceed with conversion of two full time college assistant positions in theater services and one full time college assistant conversion in the Office of Business Services.
2. Authorization to appoint HR Benefits Manager.
3. Authorization to appoint Stationary Engineer.
4. Authorization to make temporary salary adjustments for Anne Goon, Susan Jeffries and Lisa Curro while serving in interim positions.
5. Authorization to make counter offer to keep critical staff member in DOIT (cost of $9k).
7. Delay search for Director of Security until later in Fall semester with anticipated appointment January 2011.
Financial Planning Subcommittee Meeting

September 15, 2010

Meeting Notes


- **FY 2011 Financial Plan**
  The DRAFT Financial Plan projection using enrollment data from 9/10/2011 was distributed. The plan incorporates the University allocation reductions of 2.5% and an additional 1.25% encumbrance as protection against the continued uncertainties in the State’s economic condition. In addition the most recent enrollment data indicates that we fell short of our enrollment target for Fall 2010. The combined impact is that we are projecting a $3.9 million deficit. All agreed we must take action to prevent this. Proposals include suggestions for OTPS, CA, and Adjunct savings as well as not replacing Early Retirement participants and delaying the hiring of positions that had been exempted from the hiring pause. In addition we will look to increase spring, winter and summer enrollment and rely on non-tax levy support. The proposals need to be researched to ensure viability.

- **Draft Memo from the President regarding the Financial Picture at the College**
  The President requested that a draft of a memo he is planning to send to the College Community be shared with the Committee for input. The Committee reviewed the memo and suggested that language be added to say “We have developed a plan that does not envision any layoffs in Full time faculty and staff” or similar language. Other minor edits were suggested and agreed to by the Committee.

- **Other Business**
  The committee requested a list of changes between the 8/3 year end projection and the 9/10/2010 projections
Financial Planning Subcommittee Meeting

October 14, 2010

Meeting Notes


- Sr VP Pignatello briefed the committee on the budget consultation process with HEO's, the Exec Committee of the PSC, Labor Management committee. He has been providing overviews of the dire budget situation, the cuts we face and the actions that were taken in the financial plan to address potential shortfalls. A balanced financial plan was submitted as required to the University on October 6. The Plan was drafted after consultation with this committee and others and includes the recommendations and planned actions previously discussed.

- **Review of Financial Plan Submission**
  The Update on the FY 2011 Financial Plan Submission document was distributed and discussed. The Financial Plan incorporates an action plan (previously vetted by the FPS) to close a projected budget gap of $3.7 million. The action plan includes: spending reductions (15% OTPS and 15% College assistant reductions and projected savings from the Early Retirement Incentive offered by the University, delaying hires and more efficient scheduling); revenue increases associated with increased enrollment from transfers in the spring semester, winter session and summer session; and offsets from non-tax levy sources such as the Auxiliary Services Corp, Research Foundation, IFR and philanthropic support. There was a discussion regarding the accruals from vacancies and whether they can be retained by the department. The discussion will be continued.

- **College Assistant and OTPS Reductions and Impact**
  It was reported that the Vice Presidents were required to submit proposals to meet the 15% reduction in OTPS and College assistant spending. It is expected those reductions will have service impacts.

- **Update on Searches**
  - **Substitutes** – A chart of current administrative substitutes was distributed. The staff who are on the list are all in their last allowable appointment term. The university will not allow an additional semester appointment. It was agreed that these positions should be searched.
  - **CA Conversions** – There was a consensus to support the conversion of College Assistants who work full time hours to full time titles. These positions must be posted and searched. It was agreed the college should proceed with the posting of approximately 13 positions to be funded by the college assistant funding and a minimal additional investment by the College.
• **Reclassifications** - The university is not processing reclassifications at this time.

• **New Business**
  The committee requested a report on Adjunct expenditures and the New Building Budget Request. It was agreed these would be distributed.

  It was suggested that the College pursue additional revenue initiatives including course fees and material fees. It was agreed we would pursue this.

  The College Assistant Task Force Report was distributed.
Financial Planning Subcommittee Meeting

November 8, 2010

Notes


- **Update on Budget and Election Results:**
  
  Sr VP Pignatello gave an update on the latest NYS Budget news. It appears the University will receive a $14 million mid year budget cut in FY 2011 and potentially an additional $100 million cut in FY 2012. The University will seek tuition increases to offset some of these reductions (1% would offset the $14 million mid yr and 7% increase would offset 56 million of 100 million). The Chancellor has stated he is “unalterably opposed to Retrenchment”. Matt Sapienza confirmed the University’s intent to help John Jay with our current year budget issues. The new building request was submitted to the University and they are reviewing it.

- **Review of College Assistant and OTPS Reductions and Impact**
  
  The Summary of Proposed VP reductions was distributed and discussed. The service impacts of the College Assistant Reductions are likely to be seen in the reduction of services in: the library; peer advisement; tutoring, reading and math labs; administrative services such as bursar, print shop and copy center services, Human Resources, help desk, accounting, payroll; enrollment management services including admissions, one stop, registrar, financial aid and testing; and student services – counseling, health office, and career services. It was requested that the college provide advance notice to faculty and students of reduced service hours.

- **FY 2011 1st Quarter Expenditure Report**
  
  The 1st Quarter Financial Plan projection and report was disseminated and discussed. Current projections indicate that the college will be within its financial plan if planned revenue and enrollment assumptions materialize.

- **Searches - Director of Seek**
  
  The committee approved the posting and hiring of this position as all agreed it is an important priority for the college.

- **New Business**
  
  There was a general discussion regarding the architecture of the Budget and Planning Committee and the subcommittees for Strategic Planning and Financial Planning. It was suggested that since the membership of the 2 subcommittees is almost identical and that financial planning must be aligned with and informed by strategic priorities, the 2 subcommittees should meet jointly. There was general agreement to this suggestion.
Financial Planning Subcommittee Meeting  

December 16, 2010

Minutes

Attendees


Guests:  VP Saulnier, Assoc Provost Llana, VP Hoexter

I. Presentation on Marketing by VP Hoexter: VP Hoexter provided an overview of the marketing materials that have been developed by her office and enrollment management. Samples of documents were viewed by attendees. Key points of the discussion of our marketing efforts and results included:

- the need to improve the website for graduate programs.
- concern over coordination of efforts between Enrollment Management, Marketing and the Provost’s offices as they relate to Graduate Programs. In this academic year, a significant increase in enrollment in one program was offset by decreases in 2 other programs.
- Questions regarding who we send marketing materials to; VP Saulnier reported that we rely on Graduate Program Directors to provide a list of feeder institutions and send information to their institutions, career officers and advisors. It was suggested we should advertise in the Chief and SUNY newspapers.
- The need for measures to assess the effectiveness of our marketing efforts.
- Prof Kucharski suggested there are ways to improve search engine optimization to ensure our program names appear in searches.
- The need to make investments to protect revenue and enrollment.

II. FY 2011 Budget Update

- 11/30 Budget ESM Report Highlights: The College received $800k in additional funding from the University as a result of various presentations and discussions with the University regarding the College’s financial situation. Overall we are projecting a
year end surplus but there are serious concerns regarding the State Budget for FY 2012 and our projections include optimistic enrollment projections for Spring 2011.

- **ERI Analysis** – The latest list of ERI applicants was reviewed and there was a discussion about the impact of the retirements and the need to build back and replace critical positions (such as the Director of Institutional Research)

### III. Searches/Exemptions to the Pause

- **Director of Counseling (HEO)**
- **Director of Student Activities (HEO)**
- **Director of Public Safety/Risk Management (Classified Managerial)**
- **Academic Advisor for Transfer Students (HEA)**
- **Chair, Protection Management Department (Faculty)**

All exemptions to the hiring pause were approved by the committee following extensive discussion and requests for additional information regarding the Director of Public Safety and the Chair of Protection Management.

Ned Benton suggested that there should be a similar review process for part time positions and otps expenses. This may not be practical because these allocations are made to the departments and college assistant expenditures are impacted by both the number of positions and the number of hours each employee works. The College is committed to ensuring that part time staff do not work full time hours and therefore as there is transition of staff working a greater number of hours, we may replace them with more part time staff working fewer hours.

### IV. New Building Budget Request

- **New Building Budget Request**- was distributed. Request has been submitted to the University and was included in the NYS Budget request. The University has not been informed of the status of the request.

### V. FY 2012 Financial Planning Cycle

- **FY 2012 Financial Planning Cycle** to be discussed in the next meeting. All agreed that we need to start the process earlier.
JOINT Strategic Planning Subcommittee (SPS) & Financial Planning Subcommittee (FPS) Meeting Notes

Date: February 2, 2011
Time: 2:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.
Location: Room 610T

Attendees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jane Bowers</th>
<th>Francis Sheehan</th>
<th>Anna Maria Singh (A)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>James Llana</td>
<td>Harold Sullivan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Pignatello</td>
<td>Thomas Kucharski (A)</td>
<td>Virginia Moreno*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Kaplowitz</td>
<td>Ned Benton</td>
<td>Ben Rohdin*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay Hamilton</td>
<td>Carina Quintian</td>
<td>Inez Brown*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Non-voting Staff member.  (A) = Absent

Guests:
- None

- Attempt to approve minutes from 12/01 meeting; action postponed to give members another opportunity to review them. The minutes will be resent closer to March 2nd; Karen Kaplowitz requested a hard copy via interoffice mail.
- Preliminary discussion of strategies:
  - “Cultural competency” – Discussion of what is really meant by this.
  - Words? Intention? Ideas behind some of the strategies?
  - Believe VP Eanes defines ‘culturally competent’ as having sensitivity to others.
  - Some feel it is a powerful statement.
  - How do we operationalize this? Are there behavioral measures/indicators for this?
  - Perhaps the next level of planning (action steps) would provide further insight.
  - Example cited: LGBT
  - Would like to delete last ½ of Goal 1 Objective 1 Strategy 2. (Karen)
  - Separating this from Gen Ed would not be a good idea. (Jane)
  - VP Eanes intends to develop learning outcomes; creating an alignment between academic and non-academic.
  - Concern that majority of people reading this may not know what ‘cultural competency’ actually means.
  - What is the timeline for development of the action steps? Target dates for completion; multi-year plan for the programs that extend beyond a set time frame.
  - Feel cultural competency requires more time, money and energy than cultural awareness. “Competency” is purposely stronger than “awareness.”
  - Concern about how we accomplish something like this? It does not necessarily have to be the curriculum; it can be accomplished via non-academic activities. I.e. President has an initiative in the spring ‘Understanding Islam.’
Evaluation will not be based on whether or not we did them. The question becomes, “What was the degree of accomplishment?”

- In general we are expected to allocate resources we were need the Master Plan (MP) document to show the manner in which we did this; that we were able to make priority statements; should be reflected in the language of the document.
- The timetable was pegged to the MP. Example cited: faculty hiring.
- Aspirational/planning document
  - Ultimately what gets done is what we can fund, not what is written in the document. The resource allocation decisions will be guided and not mandated by the MP.
- We really do need a process for prioritizing.
- Add a strategy for the appropriate goal that speaks about FT faculty teaching in the classroom.
- Concern that there are no actions that address the things we are no longer going to do - i.e. reduce, enabling shifting of resources.
- This document needs to reflect some judgment regarding prioritizing and resources. There are words that we could use (i.e. consider vs. commit; consistent with the addition of faculty). Everything now appears as a command level commitment. The use of the word ‘DEVELOP’ appears too fuzzy throughout the document.
- The document does not map backwards. For example: Faculty Hiring Plan.
- Points President Travis will address:
  - MP implementation
  - Role of governance structures
  - MS (schedule; interaction for developing next year’s budget)
  - Budget update
- How do we think about linking the budget (FPS) and planning (SPS)? What is the proper format? Does this warrant a change to the charter? Middle States will want them to be linked.

Budget Schedule:
AY 07/01; Budget approved by state 04/01; Budget approved by Governor 02/01

- John Jay College should be in a position by 04/01 to have a pretty good idea of where we are/what we would like to do with our budget. We currently have a better handle on our budget than ever before, to make preliminary decisions; an added advantage of having the MP in place. Urgency to make decisions because of budget cuts. We must have conversations about how to react to those types of changes. Rob and Pat currently going through an exercise.
- There are approximately 48 administrative vacancies; including ERI’s; ~ 19 faculty; excluding ERI’s; ~50 total including ERI’s, etc… The committees should take shock of these vacancies and determine the priority in terms of hiring. Jane is working on identifying what is “critical” regarding faculty hiring.

- FPS and SPS should be brought in earlier than in the past. Considerations will be laid out for comment and feedback - far away from budget. It will be just to determine a sense of what’s
important. Hiring is dependent on what the final allocation is (from CUNY), but we should be ready to go when the allocation is made. Have a consensus ready to activate.

- Looking at strategies and agreeing what we can do. Having a multi-year implementation plan; some associated costs; Jim is working on this. We are way down on our ERI.
- Rob’s report on budget.
  - Report on government’s budget re: CUNY: There will be an $83 million cut to CUNY senior colleges.
  - Tuition is the big ‘X’ factor; 5% spring tuition increase will result in $40 million against the $83 million gap; revenue is recognized, but it will be used to cover mid-year cuts from this year. There may be some $ remaining but it is not hopeful.
  - The Governor is not supporting a tuition increase right now.
  - Considering our request regarding the new building.
  - The ERI replacement policy will be different; some flexibility will be granted.
  - A 4% cut (greater than $3 million) for JJC; pretty deep cuts again.
  - A surplus of $1.6 million this year could help for next year.
- Richard will have spring enrollment numbers next week.
- There will be a discussion regarding “personal touches” the College could do to “woo” potential students.
- Q. What is the Enrollment Plan?
  - Increase the % of students who have returned. We did not do good with entering freshmen. We want to be within 100 FTE’s of the estimate. (Richard)
- Q. Did our ratio of enrollments change?
  - EM is working on ways to reach out to students to increase the yield. Enrollment data will be finalized in approximately three weeks.
  - Required reserve is 1% – 3% of the floor; we are encouraged to keep more. Surpluses might help mitigate the cuts that come.
  - There have been no searches authorized until the budget is finalized.
  - Question posed was “What is left to cut?” Some feel there are still some things chairs could do to help, i.e. banking release time.
  - There will be another joint committee meeting on March 02, 2011. Perhaps we could use this time slot to follow up on budget review. The President recommended alternate meetings of the FPS and SPS. An intervening meeting to discuss strategies.
  - February 15, is the target date set by Jim; excluding costing.
  - There will be a Budget Office meeting with each of the VPs regarding $/spending plan; engage in discussion to cost out.
Master Plan Terms to Be Defined and/or Clarified

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MP Goal Objective, Strategy</th>
<th>Word(s)/Phrase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Goal 1 Objective 5</td>
<td>clique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Goal 1 Objective 5</td>
<td>cultural competency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Goal 1 Objective 2</td>
<td>Office of Career…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Goal 1 Objective 5</td>
<td>honor code – This should also apply to faculty and staff somewhere in the document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Goal 1 Objective 4, 3</td>
<td>formalize…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Goal 1 Objective 6, 5</td>
<td>ambiguity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Throughout the MP</td>
<td>Use the word “develop” and in most places there is no timeline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Goal 1 Objective 2, 6</td>
<td>There are two possible meanings as it is written. <em>(The latter?)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Throughout the MP</td>
<td>Departments and programs never seem to be addressed specifically.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Goal 4 Objective 1, 2</td>
<td>decision matrix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Goal 4 Objective 3</td>
<td>Is it just about “arts” projects?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Goal 4 Objective 2, 1</td>
<td>What is the departmental advisory board?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Goal 4 Objective 4, 2</td>
<td>Assess or actually participate? Seems ambiguous.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Goal 4 Objective 4, 3</td>
<td>What do we <em>(offer)</em>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Goal 5 Objective 2</td>
<td>Should this document reflect more of what our priorities are via the words we choose?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Goal 5 Objective 2, 2</td>
<td>What do we literally do here?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Goal 5 Objective 1</td>
<td>Question about faculty hiring plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Goal 5 Objective 3, 1</td>
<td>Identify priorities that need to be stretched out. Should we identify other initiatives that require a timeline? Come up with a language that defines our priorities. We need a clear level of articulation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Strategy in response to Karen’s previous comments re FT faculty in the classroom. Place in the teaching OBJ.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Review ALL the strategies and see which objectives they impact; should not be just a 1-to-1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Goal 5 Objective 4, 1</td>
<td>Elaborate wording; what do we mean? There are other ways to expand diversity; REWRITE recommended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Goal 5 Objective 4, 3</td>
<td>conversion rates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
23. Goal 5 Objective 5, 4  Enhance…or do we mean communicate?
24. Goal 5 Objective 8, 1  Risk Management?
25. Goal 3 Objective 3, 1  Should not be endorsing a document; level of specificity is not in line with the document. Don’t we just want to establish standards?
26. Goal 1 Objective 2, 4  ‘Quality.’ This seems too narrow as is; we want to provide competent advice.
27. Goals 5 Objective 2, 6  Should it be limited to planning? Shouldn’t it also be integrated into management. We really don’t have an ALL-FUNDS approach to management.

Additional comments about the MP:

- We should be able to look at the document both ways:
  - Goals → Strategies → Actions
  - Actions → Strategies → Goals
- **NEXT STEP**: Implementation Plan – this could be used to identify/determine alternate purposes.
- Concern that we are not identifying any things that will save the College money. One way to do this would be to commit to an annual process; concept of a zero-based review. This recommendation could be added to the strategy about prioritizing: Goal 5, Objective 2.
BPC Planning Subcommittees Meeting
Feb. 28, 2011
Minutes


Rob opened the meeting with a review of the agenda and some observations about the budget, noting that we’re engaged in shaping a financial plan earlier than in the past. Hopefully, we’ll have a state budget and a College financial plan in April some time. Rob and Pat have been meeting with the VP’s to determine what adjustments need to be made—including spending on OTPS and college assistants. OTPS cuts are not anticipated, but savings there may be realized anyway. The VP’s are assigning costs to the Master Plan strategies, but it will be several weeks before that is completed. Pat continues to work on the financial plan in anticipation of about a 4% cut for next year.

Rob and Pat reviewed several documents with the subcommittees, including the latest version of the financial plan (“FY 2011 Financial Plan 2nd Quarter Final Expenditure and Projection Analysis”), which shows an end-of-year balance of about $2.7 million, which may not be enough to offset anticipated cuts. The assumptions behind the plan are conservative. Other documents presented were a “Faculty Vacancy Chart” showing 55 vacant positions (with 9 exemptions from “pause”) and an “Administrative Vacancies by Funding Source” chart, which shows a total of 71 vacant positions (with 13 exemptions from “pause”). A third document, the “John Jay College FY2010 Tax Levy OTPS Weekly Summary” attracted very little discussion.

There was a long discussion of how to proceed with the proposed prioritizing of Master Plan objectives. There were some who preferred to see cost and other detailed information on the strategies before the discussion, since without them it might be difficult to understand how funds and activities might be sequenced and how strategies connected with one another. Others thought that starting with the broader objectives, without being constrained by costs of the strategies, made more sense. There were many variations and combinations of these two broad positions. There was general agreement around the idea that the College is working at some level in all areas of the Master Plan; the issue is where to place an extra emphasis when we’re anticipating very limited discretionary funding. The discussion was ultimately resolved by a decision to have members lay out their top ideas for funding at the next meeting. Once there is a consensus on a few major initiatives--and perhaps we’ll arrive there in stages, paring down a larger list of ideas under each goal-- we will have to consider in detail the means of supporting those initiatives.

The first order of business at the next meeting will be to discuss the suggestions made by the Council of Chairs on Master Plan strategies, with the idea of making a recommendation to the President.
JOINT
Strategic Planning Subcommittee (SPS) & Financial Planning Subcommittee (FPS)
Meeting Notes

Date: March 2, 2011
Time: 2:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.
Location: Room 610T

Attendees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Representative</th>
<th>Absent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jane Bowers</td>
<td>Francis Sheehan</td>
<td>Anna Maria Singh (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Llana</td>
<td>Harold Sullivan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Pignantello</td>
<td>Thomas Kucharski (A)</td>
<td>Virginia Moreno*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Kaplowitz</td>
<td>Ned Benton</td>
<td>Ben Rohdin*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat Ketterer</td>
<td>Carina Quintian</td>
<td>Inez Brown*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay Hamilton</td>
<td>Richard Saulnier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Non-voting Staff member.  (A) = Absent

Guests:

- None

- Attempt to approve minutes from 02/28 meeting; action postponed to give members another opportunity to review them. Karen Kaplowitz requested a hard copy.

- Discussion of the Master Plan (MP) strategies/goals/objectives. As agreed at the previous meeting, the subcommittees took up the suggestions forwarded from the Council of Chairs concerning the strategies attached to the MP. Jim pointed out that if recommendations are made, they will be made to the President. The floor was opened up to suggestions regarding the best way to proceed.

- Since he presided over the Council of Chairs when the recommendations were made, Ned began the discussion by stating that some of the items have less urgency than others, and that some look more like goals than strategies.

- Jane thought that there were some revisions based on discussions in the joint FPS/SPS meetings, but Jim responded that was not the case.

- Ned stated that some of the concerns regarding some of the terminology in the MP were addressed by Jim’s response in an earlier memo, but of concern was how these definitions would be incorporated into the MP? Via appendix, glossary, etc…?

- In response to a broad request to change the document, Jim stated that it did not belong to “us” but to the President and the VPs. The subcommittees can certainly make recommendations for changes, however. As Ned pointed out, this was a major concern for the Chairs who feel alienated by the process that produced the document. The Chairs’ vote not to approve the strategies underscored their absence from any meaningful participation in the process. Discussion resumed about the specific MP concerns.
• The word ‘honor code’ was changed to ‘honor pledge’ by VP Eanes, and it refers to something that students will do during orientation. VP Eanes confirmed that it is not a code of conduct, but a pledge about civility and respect.

• It was recommended that someone/Jim go through the strategies and decide what should be a strategy or goal. Jim did not think this was a good idea due to the size of the undertaking and the work already put into the document. It was determined (general consensus) that **Ned and Karen will provide two lists of specific problems in an effort to resolve/address the concerns.**

• Ned led the group through the specific points in the memo from the Council of Chairs. The group agreed to adopt most of them in one form or another, but there was no agreement on a 75% floor for faculty hiring (as a proportion of positions “…planned, funded or filled…”) or on a “target of 60% coverage of course sections with full-time faculty.”

• Jim proposed that he meet with Ned and Karen to work out the language for each strategy to reflect the discussion. Then the subcommittees could at the next meeting discuss and vote on a document for recommendation to the President.

• With time running out, it was clear that consideration of budget priorities would have to wait until the next meeting. Since the Executive Staff will begin shaping the financial plan on March 21, it will be important to have that meeting before then, so Jim will soon propose several times. He also urged that we come to that meeting with just a few, large and important ideas for consideration.
Joint FPS-SPS
Meeting Notes

Date: Monday, March 14, 2011
Time: 9:30-11:00 a.m.
Location: Room 531T

Attendees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Jay Hamilton</th>
<th>Carina Quintian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>James Llana</td>
<td>Francis Sheehan (ABS)</td>
<td>Anna Maria Singh (ABS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Pignatello</td>
<td>Harold Sullivan</td>
<td>Virginia Moreno*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Kaplowitz</td>
<td>Thomas Kucharski</td>
<td>Ben Rohdin*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat Ketterer</td>
<td>Warren (Ned) Benton</td>
<td>Inez Brown*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(ABS) = Absent  * Non-voting Staff member.

Guests:
- Richard Saulnier

Move to adopt minutes of November 2, 2010
February 28, 2011 – minutes accepted (no opposes)
March 2, 2011 – minutes accepted (no opposes)

I. Financial Report (Rob)
- Crunching numbers to try and project numbers for 2012.
- Believe there will be a state budget on April 1st.
- One-time help from CUNY this year (~ $1 million of assistance) will not be repeated next year.
- Modeled on Early Retirement Savings Plan

BROAD PARAMETERS for next year...
- Issues regarding standards; SEEK Enrollment.
- We are looking at flat rates.
- Absorbing cut which looks like it will be about 4%.
- Not sure how mid-year cut will be handled – the impact ~ $736K.
- $1.7 - $2 million deficit for next year; assuming 15% reduced rate for OTPS and CAs.
  Have not factored in any significant hires.
- ~ $2.6 million year-end balance; could be a little more based on OTPS expenditures.
- We must make investments in the area of strategic investments.
  - Marketing; out-of-state students (carry higher tuition that JJC gets to keep);
    recruitment of transfer students; year-round college (more students in the summer).
- Hearing good things about the new building funds.
- Rob will confirm some assumptions with Matt Sapienza, Associate Vice Chancellor for Budget and Finance, prior to putting out a written document.
- Projected 10% increase in summer enrollment.
- Useful to look at assumptions for positions.
- 109 vacant FT faculty and staff positions – with no new hires.
- New chair hired for SEEK, and searching for chair for Protection Management.
II. Suggestions from the Council of Chairs

- Jim met with Karen and Ned to draft particular language; the plan is to discuss and send as recommendations to the President.
- 2nd suggestion: Goal 2 Obj 5 – leave out ‘centers.’
  - There is no OBJ/STRATEGY placing priority on revenue generation. This should be explicitly stated somewhere.
  - Probably Goal 5; wherever there is an appropriate location.
  - Goal 5 Obj 2? This is done after you get the money.
  - This is a core function revenue generating goal that should stand alone.
  - Proposal: Add a strategy that states revising revenue through techniques such as ENROLLMENT MGMT. Goal 5 Obj 2 or a stand-alone strategy.
    - The #1 strategy should be acquiring the resources
    - Prioritize activities and investments that all generate revenue.
    - The goal should be broad enough to encompass various activities.
- Resources allocated to support assessment.
  - Reword Goal 5 Obj 2; should contain some reference to assessment.
  - Internal capacity to handle assessment.
  - Wherever we think it will be the most prominent place MS might look at it.
  - Jim and Virginia will discuss; group agrees in principle that it should be added.
- Motion to forward recommendations to the President as strategies, with completion of one outstanding item.

III. Recommendations to President on Funding Initiatives Linked to Master Plan.

- Today’s end product will be a short list of products we are recommending.
  1. Faculty hiring (particularly to replace those lost).
  2. General umbrella of raising NET REVENUE. Doing things that generate revenue that can be invested.
  3. Staff hires and faculty compensation; Academic Advisement (Jane)
  4. Words of advice: We have to be careful about when we make revenue commitments, because it is dependent on ENROLLMENT.
  5. There are so many interdependencies, in order to raise revenue we have to evaluate:
    - ENROLLMENT MGMT
    - STAFF
    - FACULTY LINES

- There were (58) staff positions lost over the last several years, in some critical operational areas of the college. There is financial stress on the college; we cannot ignore the impact of the staff position losses on the staff that remain. There needs to be a balance.
- FT faculty contribute in many ways other than just the classroom; i.e. retention.
- Once we enhance revenues, then we can discuss faculty and staff hires. We need to get really serious about how we are going to generate money.
- There is a problem adding assessment to faculty responsibility – there are two questions we should ask:
  a. If we can’t hire anyone and we can’t spend any money, what are our top priorities?
Identify what we can do on the MP that doesn’t cost. We must be aware of the limits on faculty and staff.

b. If we had $1 million to spend, what are our top 3 priorities?

- Funding is needed to support assessment and faculty incentives.
- There are some things we cannot afford to do, but there are some things that we can’t afford not to do. We need to make some investments that will bring in money in 2012.
- What initiatives could be undertaken because they will generate NET REVENUE next year? This list would be really useful for our budgeting exercise. This must happen immediately.
- Vice Presidents are working on this, but it will not be complete prior to the next ESM meeting on the 21st.
- We must identity LOW COST; NO COST.
- There are some items that we label ‘NO COST’ that actually do cost. Some things have a negative effect on staff.
- Perhaps certain strategies can be partially addressed/completed in an effort to be more realistic and mindful of constraints; perhaps reassignment of duties. Managing of resources and prioritizing is critical. This is very subjective territory.
- It would be useful to present some high level recommendations at the ESM meeting next Monday; concern that we will lose our voice if we do not take advantage of this priority.
- What about retention? This is revenue generating as well. It is less expensive to retain students than to recruit new ones.
- Anne is currently assessing the impact of advisement on retention.
  - We have increased retention, especially during the first year.
  - It would be good if we could come up with some rather broad principles to present to the ESM. We can get this to the Vice Presidents; this might influence their discussion. It is important to note that the process does not end on March, 21st.
  - Recommend that there be ‘no more initiatives for a while.’ There is a point at which there are not enough resources to complete these initiatives. Faculty morale is being negatively impacted. i.e., should Distance Learning be a priority since it will not generate revenue for some period of time?
- Believe we have a strong enough infrastructure to support Distance Learning.
- One key criterion to retaining students is satisfied faculty. Decrease in faculty morale is a concern for retention.
- Jim will generate some language for recommendations on 1) suggestions from Council of Chairs and on 2) development of financial plan for 2012. He will circulate it to the wider body for approval via email and then, if approved, he will forward the recommendations to the President.
**Joint FPS-SPS**

**Meeting Notes**

**Date:** Wednesday, March 30, 2011

**Time:** 2:00-3:30 pm

**Location:** Room 610T

**Attendees:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jane Bowers</th>
<th>Jay Hamilton</th>
<th>Carina Quintian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>James Llana</td>
<td>Francis Sheehan</td>
<td>Anna Maria Singh (ABS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Pignatello (ABS)</td>
<td>Harold Sullivan</td>
<td>Virginia Moreno*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Kaplowitz</td>
<td>Thomas Kucharski (ABS)</td>
<td>Ben Rohdin*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat Ketterer</td>
<td>Warren (Ned) Benton</td>
<td>Inez Brown*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**(ABS)= Absent  * Non-voting Staff member.**

1. **Approval of Minutes for March 14, 2011.** Jane proposed several changes to the minutes, which were approved as amended.

2. **Discussion of Differential Tuition.** After noting that the discussion today is preliminary, Jim opened the floor to discussion. We began with Jane’s summary of the administration position. She stated the basic facts of the proposal for a 15% tuition increase for the MPA degree across City College, Baruch College, and John Jay, the three schools that offer the degree. Stable enrollment would mean about $600,000 in additional revenue, which would have to be devoted to the MPA program. Even with the increase, the program would be relatively cheap. In response to the question “Why the MPA,” she noted that Baruch approached us two years ago with such a request, but that we are paying attention now because the budget situation is acute. She reviewed the points on page three of the administration proposal. She acknowledged the possibility of an adverse impact on enrollment, but noted the compensation for students who demonstrate unmet need through a FAFSA form. After two years, that allowance may be reviewed and the money devoted to other purposes within the MPA program. The DT policy will be assessed annually. There has been a lot of consultation with faculty and students concerning the issue, but ultimately it is an administrative decision. The plan is to submit a joint resolution to the Board of Trustees in June, which
will spell out all the provisions of the policy, including how the additional income would be spent.

Karen asked if the aid to students would be limited only to continuing students and Jane responded, no, that we don’t want to impact incoming students either. However, for students entering in the spring semester it is not necessarily a given, but we do want to be fair to students coming in the fall who have already planned on the current tuition.

Ned offered a summary of the PA Department position, as outlined in a memo from him and Jay. The PA Department has consistently opposed a tuition increase in the past, but the Department recently approved a resolution in support of an increase with the understanding that the administration not pick and choose among its components. The main concern is that students will go elsewhere when confronted with the proposed increase; they know how to avoid paying the extra tuition by enrolling in our own related courses or taking online courses at another school (for transfer) and delaying formal entry into the MPA program, thereby not gaining any advantages that would accrue to registered MPA students and not having the benefit of what the MPA now offers its students. There will be a problem for retention and graduation, and the committee needs to be aware of the financial risk. Ned has identified risks for loss of revenue and assigned values to them. Contingencies should be created to cover those losses, which will in effect be cuts to other programs at the college; as with any cuts, they should be identified and prioritized.

One specific problem is the uncertainty about the continuity of financial aid; Ned went on to outline four areas of concern, two of which are linked directly to the DT while the other two are related to the general budget situation.

1) He noted the relative high conversion rate recently; there was a jump from 62% to 77%. This high conversion rate is quite “valuable” because it translates into revenue. The concern is that this year any announcement of a tuition increase would be coming at decision time for students thinking of entering our MPA program. Ned believes that the news about the tuition hike will reduce the conversion rate and cost perhaps $100,000 in lost revenue.

2) Current students may take fewer courses in the face of a tuition increase, something supported by the PA Department’s survey of MPA students. Students who don’t file a FAFSA form won’t be protected by the commitment to cover unmet need. And Ned is worried by military personnel who don’t file a FAFSA, but who will see their out-of-pocket expense increase by 65%. So Ned recommends a contingency of $135,000 for students who take fewer courses.
3) The next concern is that there will be perhaps 75 more graduates of the program than in recent years (because of an increase in enrollment a few years ago), thereby quickly depleting a source of revenue in the pipeline.

4) Lastly, Ned presented enrollment figures from the graduate programs that show a dramatic admissions reduction in the Criminal Justice Master’s program with a related loss of $338,000 in revenue. It’s not likely that growth elsewhere will compensate for this, especially in light of potential decreases in MPA revenue. All in all, Ned is predicting a drop of $927,000 in graduate program revenue, as indicated on the page of figures that he distributed to the subcommittees. Conclusion: it’s a bad year to risk revenue loss by imposing a tuition increase.

Richard challenged Ned’s numbers and assumptions for several reasons: 1) We’re taking in better students across the board, and it’s accepted everywhere that better-prepared students have less risk of attrition. 2) Based on the turnout at our Graduate Open House, we may have hit the bottom with CJMA enrollments. 3) Students won’t turn to cheaper alternatives, if they have not done so already. 4) Our grad students know it’s easy to complete a FAFSA form, and they will do so if it affords them some protection against any increase. 5) CUNY imposes tuition increases all the time without providing advance notice to incoming students, and there is apparently no adverse effect.

Ned asked Richard for his assessment of contingencies for things that could go wrong, and Richard responded that he would have to think about it, since it’s a difficult thing to analyze with confidence.

In the context of a brief discussion concerning the ability of a program to spring back from enrollment losses, Jane challenged Ned’s assumption that retention rates can’t show much improvement quickly by comparing the JJ MPA graduation rate with that of Baruch, which is about 20 percentage points higher. There is clearly room for us to improve, and we know that students who are better supported are more easily retained.

Richard concluded that Ned was presenting a worst case scenario. Richard acknowledged that graduate enrollment would be down next year but that compensation would come in the form of higher transfer enrollment.

Jay initiated a discussion of the advantages of Baruch in terms of its ability to compensate for any lost students due to higher tuition. If they fall short, they can make a small adjustment in admission standards to make up the loss, since they have relatively large demand.
Karen suggested that the tuition increase be 5% a year over three years, to cushion the impact. With the small increment, we would get about $200,000 the first year and shouldn’t have to worry about covering students’ unmet needs. Ned thought this a good idea. Jane said she would “take it back.”

3. **PMP Discussion.** Jim concluded the meeting by noting that he distributed the 1) PMP report from CUNY for 2009-2010 (as a sample) and 2) projected CUNY targets and goals for 2011-12. The subcommittees will need to consult on the JJ targets and goals once they have been proposed by the Divisions, and that will remain for a future discussion.
Joint SPS-FPS Meeting
April 14, 2011
4:00 pm – 5:50 pm
Room 610T

Minutes for SPS meeting held __________, 2011 were approved by the joint committee.

The meeting began with Rob discussing how beneficial and important is has been for the SPS and FPS to hold joint meetings. It is an opportunity to better align planning and resources—a more deliberate approach. Lessons have been learned from a tumultuous year, and this joint effort was an opportunity to bring together planning, prioritization and resource planning.

Discussion continued with an emphasis on the improved college-wide consultation process; information is more abundantly and more frequently.

Rob stated that there have been actions taken toward achieving the College’s financial goals; achieving the goals is however, dependent on University allocation and state budget. There is some concern regarding tuition increases and the potential revenue from a tuition increase; the University is not in favor of a tuition increase for 2012. At the CUNY and state levels, there will be a larger discussion of tuition policy.

As reported by Rob, the Executive Staff was asked to look at investment decisions and Master Plan (MP) priorities; the question put forth to the ESM was, “If we had to make investment by areas, where would they be?” There is a $1.8 million deficit projected for next year. It was determined that new investments will be required in order to increase revenue next year.

(For the following discussion, reference handouts distributed by Pat.) Pat led a discussion about the financial/budget projections. Mid-year there is a base reduction of $800,000 that carries into next year. There have been ultra-conservative projections with regard to turnover, and a flat-lining of expenses for adjuncts, OTPS and college assistants.

As per Richard, for financial planning purposes, a flat enrollment model was used for next year’s projections. It is important to note that the projections are based on assumptions about the future; educated guesses were used every step of the way for the projections. There is a modest change in retention rate built into the table. There is some concern about the freshmen numbers because of the changes in CUNY math requirements; the passing range was changed from 35 to 40—this is crucial for our students. The College does not know what the net effect will be. The SEEK population is also projected to be smaller.

Rob reported that there were 10 non-reappointments. The College has set $250K savings target against salary levels and assessment of priorities. A question was posed regarding whether or not the savings targets were for staff or faculty projections; the response was that the targeted reductions would be for administrative/staff positions and not faculty. There is no commitment to replace anyone that leaves.
There will be a significant reduction in the total base budget allocation for FY 2013. Total financial expenditures will be fairly flat for 2013; the College had Early Retirement Initiative (ERI) for ⅔ of this year, which it won’t have next year. The year-end balance includes spring tuition increase – more than the value of the cut. It also includes mid-year cut, which is permanent (NET).

There will be a task force established to review Continuing Education; there are local and University aspects to this item.

Ben recommended modeling a reduction of the JJ grad student stipends. There are a number of other items that the College could do to reduce costs and shift costs to the Graduate Center.

Rob stated that some of the budget projections need to be fleshed out a little more, and that the College is looking at other ways to save money. I.e. taking advantage of large classrooms – there has been a lot of debate about class size; decrease in enrollment/flat line projection for next year/more efficient schedule. The class size issue can still be addressed – belief that 2% is realistic. The current enrollment projections DO NOT include summer enrollment. The focus is on net profit as opposed to an expense reduction.

Brief discussion about non-teaching adjuncts (NTA); the College will not advocate a percentage decrease in CA positions.

Richard discussed the College’s ideas/plans to increase the number of out-of-state students – focus on New Jersey. Offering a NJ waiver or scholarship (in the form of a partial tuition waiver of 25-30%) as a way to encourage students to come to JJC; this would not be a generic offering, as certain criteria would have to be met. The College is currently working on a proposal, which would also require CUNY Board approval.

- A 33% change in price point could still yield considerable revenue from NJ residents.
- Approximately 15 out of 20 NJ community colleges have students who attend JJC; tuition would be slightly less than attending Rutgers for normal full-time students; tuition would be much part-time students.
- There is currently a 5 - 30% acceptance of NJ students, and a 5% yield.

It was recommended that the dollars be invested and that existing funds be used more strategically.

New Jersey presents additional opportunities to increase the number of students who attend JJC; there are an extensive number of counties and townships that require their law enforcement personnel to take basic training.

JJC has the highest number one choice rate in the University; however we can do things to increase the actual yield rate (the # accepted vs. the # enrolled); i.e. Phone-A-Thon - is a personal phone call from a JJC employee; increasing the speed at which transfer credits are evaluated. All of these are measurable.

Spring Enrollment Initiative
Ben posed a concern regarding whether or not the ½% was coming from admissions or ______. He does not believe that the College actually achieved anything this year, and that the College should spend a little more time evaluating what the numbers should be. Rob responded by stating that the rate from fall to spring was 94.73; the goal was a 2% increase, and the College achieved 1%. The goal will be changed to ½% for next year. Pat will go back and look at the numbers again.

Jane commented that for every % increase in retention rates, you increase revenue. She will put forward a budget and see what happens. The **Year Round College Task Force** made recommendations that would increase enrollment and retention:

- Invest $259K
- Hire a director; this could help to shape revenue outcomes for 2013
- Spend money on marketing
- The recommendations DO NOT distinguish undergraduate from graduate students.

The **JJ Online Task Force** made recommendations that would increase enrollment and retention:

- Online instruction and programs
- Invest money for promotions; funds will come out of the tech fee ($200K) and will not have an impact on the tax levy budget
- There will be no revenue for 2012; online will build long-term revenue potential.

Pat and Rob stated that every FTE would result in approximately $6K, resulting in a total of approximately ½ million dollars. These projections ARE NOT built into next year’s projections, and further vetting of the numbers is needed if these numbers will be included in the College’s financial plan.

FYI: Currently there are no lab fees.

Dean Domingo and Jane met with the Faculty Senate (FS) and recommended a proposal of a 3-year phase-in of 5% per year. Baruch, City College and JJC met with CUNY’s budget team, and CUNY stated that the proposal was a “non-starter.” The University is going forward with the plan for 15% tuition increase in the MPA program. A working group, consisting of MPA faculty, dean and students, will be established to work out the details such as:

- Communicate to continuing students
- Develop financial aid policies and processes
- An oversight committee
- The position the College may be able to afford to hire next year.

The proposal will be presented to the Faculty Senate on June 6th, 2011, and to the CUNY Board of Trustees on June 27th, 2011.

A question was posed regarding whether or not the College should model some lower numbers to address Richard’s concern that this will be a cost (loss) for next year.

Richard stated that prediction scenarios could be pretty complex; a change in Criminal Justice is straightforward and simple to model, and in this case we don’t know what to predict. Ned’s projection
is a loss of graduate revenue of approximately $200K. Pat responded by stating that we could change the numbers, but someone has to commit to a number. Whatever revenue is raised will go to the program. It is important to understand that the projections are a working document. Overall FTE numbers will be adjusted; revenue will be adjusted accordingly.

Tom expressed that the current JJC policy regarding non-degree students seems somewhat “cold.” Currently, non-matriculated students are not allowed in the master’s program. There are huge numbers of non-degree populations at other CUNY colleges. JJC could adjust the current policy and have a select way of admitting students. There is some resistance among some members of the Graduate Studies Committee – concern about caliber of students admitted. It was recommended that the current policy be modified because there is a large amount of potential revenue. The College should think about ways to increase enrollment for Master’s degree programs; the focus seems to be on matriculation agreements with community colleges.

Richard stated that someone is currently working on revamping the Forensic Computing program in an effort to increase enrollment for this graduate program.

Rob stated that he expects a DRAFT of the College’s plan before the semester ends.
SPS-FPS Meeting
Meeting Notes

Date: Wednesday, May 4, 2011
Time: 2:00 p.m.
Location: Room 610T

Attendees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Warren (Ned) Benton</th>
<th>Thomas Kucharski</th>
<th>Richard Saulnier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jane Bowers (A)</td>
<td>James Llana</td>
<td>Francis Sheehan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inez Brown (Recorder)</td>
<td>Virginia Moreno</td>
<td>Anna Maria Singh (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay Hamilton</td>
<td>Robert Pignatello (A)</td>
<td>Harold Sullivan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Kaplowitz</td>
<td>Carina Quintian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat Ketterer</td>
<td>Ben Rohdin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(A) = Absent

Guests:
- None

Jim: Discussion about Assessment
- Interested in creating a culture of assessment across the campus, and this committee can help us do that. The proposed type of assessment committee exists on most college campuses.
- Concern that faculty is being picked pretty thin.
- Isn’t that the purpose of the SPS?
- Should be attached to UCAST and Graduate Studies Committee. They make a lot of determination regarding that.
- Who serves on the committee? Concern it will be people who are not necessarily the “DOERS”; they will be creating work.
- Concern regarding how this committee is chosen.
- People likely to be tapped are those who have done a great assessment job to date.

Carina
- HEO should be selected by the HEO Council and not the Provost.
- If it is going to be this much work, perhaps we should spend a bit more time researching the best committee structure.
- Doesn’t feel FS is the body to select committee members. Charter requires to nominate all members appointed by the College Council.
- These types of committees are not supposed to be program or department based; they should be college based.
- The reporting structure should be clearer.

Virginia
- Recommendation is not to imbed the Assessment Committee into any committee. H should be an independent committee, but not have independent authority to assign/delegate work.

Ned
- Council of Undergraduate Major Program Coordinators has done great work re: assessment.

Jay
There is some urgency, in that we need to have this committee up and running before MS insists. Would be good to have it done by September.

**Ned**
- Could we just assemble a WG under the SPS to do this?

**Ben**
- This committee needs to be resourced; but not by buying faculty out of the classroom.

**Karen**
- Should be at least 5 HEOs; chaired by an administrator, i.e., Jim.

**Key Question**
- Do we think there should be a free-standing committee?

**Challenge**
- How do we get from here to there?

**Stipulation**
- Be developed in stages with the opportunity to make changes.
Strategic Planning Subcommittee (SPS)
Meeting Notes

Date: Wednesday, September 1, 2010
Time: 2:00 p.m.
Location: Room 610T

Attendees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jane Bowers</td>
<td>Francis Sheehan</td>
<td>Student TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Llana</td>
<td>Harold Sullivan</td>
<td>Gail Hauss*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Pignatello</td>
<td>Carlton Jama Adams (A)</td>
<td>Virginia Moreno*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Kaplowitz</td>
<td>Ned Benton</td>
<td>Ben Rohdin*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay Hamilton</td>
<td>Carina Quintian</td>
<td>Inez Brown*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Non-voting Staff member.  (A) = Absent

Guests:

- VP Richard Saulnier    Enrollment Management
- James Llana (Jim) introduced himself as the new chair of the SPS.

Agenda Item #1: Approve Minutes from May mtg

- Following the distribution of the minutes from May’s meeting, the floor was opened for comments/concerns; there were none. The minutes were approved.

Agenda Item #2: Role of the SPS

- There needs to be a common understanding of the role of the SPS. As per the charter, the SPS is to provide guidance to the President. There is a concern that the SPS has been more of a talking committee; we need to be a little more formal than we have been in the past, in accordance with charter guidelines. Formal recommendations should be made to the President. A question posed to the SPS was, “What shape should the guidance take?”
- Jane agrees that the SPS spent a lot of time talking, and that could leave the committee with a feeling that it was not a productive as it could have been.
- It was recommended that any issues/activities at the college that the SPS would like to weigh in on be formally documented. The SPS should press the issue whether or not the majority lends support. It should not put forth only the ideas supported by the majority.
- When a written recommendation is produced, all major positions should be represented so that the President can see the range of views for a specific concern/item.
- Q. How often should guidance be issued?
- A. As issues are deliberated and/or dealt with across the campus. Many feel that we cannot prescribe a guidance timetable.
- A concern was raised regarding how the SPS agenda gets established; viewpoint expressed that there should be some input/consensus around the agenda items.
- Forming the agenda via suggestions from the SPS members and the administration would be a good approach. Jim could solicit input from appropriate parties, create a DRAFT agenda based on that input, distribute to members for feedback, and then formulate an agenda.
- Ultimately it should be the chair’s discretion to determine what items are actually placed on the agenda.
Agenda Item #3: Connecting SPS & Financial Planning Subcommittees

- Middle States recognized a problem with the lack of integration between the SPS and the Financial Planning Subcommittee (FPS). The SPS needs to think more formally about a connection between the two.

- Distribution of MS publication *Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education*. Jim highlighted the section of the handout that discussed Institutional Planning and Resource Allocation. JJC will be obliged to address all the elements; we will have to convince MS that we meet/are working on all the criteria set forth. It is important that we connect the two Budget and Planning subcommittees, because MS will be looking over our shoulders very carefully. The stakes are high.

**SPS and FPS Membership**

- Q. How might we establish a formal connection?
  - A. Although not in the charter, Jim Llana will informally be part of the FPS; the existing committee membership overlap could be useful.
    - One difference in current membership between both committees is that Jama Adams sits on the SPS only, and Tom Kucharski sits on the FPS only.
    - Richard Saulnier has been invited to participate in the FPS.

- Question arose as to why there are two separate subcommittees of the larger Budget and Planning (B&P) Committee. The thought is that if 2 committees did not exist, then the FPS would always take precedence.

- Should we be concerned that the two distinct subcommittees have virtually the same membership?
  - The larger B&P committee seems to meet exclusively over budget issues; more engaged in the financials than in any strategic planning. They may be happy to exist as is, and be removed from the SPS processes and discussions. Several disagreed with this thought and believe that the FPS needs to know. Concern that external parties may see the disconnection between the subcommittees as a flaw.

- There seems to be a bit of work to do regarding establishing a formal connection.

- The SPS matters should in fact be discussed at the larger B&P; recommendations should be put forth prior to the larger B&P meetings.

- The B&P committee meets less regularly than either of the subcommittees. The SPS may want to recommend that the B&P meet more regularly; we could put together a formal recommendation.

- It was expressed that planning should be driving the budget and not the other way around.

- Since there is only a 2 member difference, what would be the harm in making Tom a member of the SPS? It really is not that simple; the separate committees were established for specific reasons. There is in fact another difference; although students sit on the larger B&P, there is no student representation on the FPS. This was a matter of privacy, and a need to secure personal information of faculty.

- Shouldn’t we be concerned about true checks and balances? If you really want this, then you want different people to sit on the two subcommittees.

- There should be some realignment of what the two subcommittees are talking about. The connection between the two could be linking resources and priorities - assigning costs to plans.

- Question was posed regarding whether or not MS would flag the two subcommittees with such similar membership. Belief is that MS is more interested in what happens. A possible solution to the subcommittee concern could simply be a question of changing the conversation versus a change in structure.
The *Bucket Exercise* was an attempt to prioritize. However, we have struggled with what to do with the resulting document that was charged by the B&P. It would be useful to have a joint meeting on certain agenda items.

It was noted that the concrete goals laid out in the Master Plan (MP) will make the work of the FPS much easier. It should simplify how we develop our financial plan(s).

Q. Why not invite Tom Kucharski to participate in the SPS?

A. There are other voices at the college (i.e. VP Student Development/Eanes) that are not represented on the SPS either.

A. There should be an open invitation to invite all members of the FPS to the SPS.

**Perez Law Discussion**

- Discussion regarding whether or not the Perez Law regarding subcommittees is applicable in this situation.
- We are operating at JJC as though it is an open meeting.
- Thought that perhaps the SPS could be open and then closed (invoke executive session) when necessary. This will not work because there are restrictive rules regarding executive session.
- If a quorum is reached (from the larger committee) then you are subject to the Open Meetings Law. If guests are invited, then the SPS will be subjected to this law.

Idea: chairs of the SPS and FPS could meet to plan the SPS agendas in an effort to coordinate the two subcommittees.

**Agenda Item #4: SPS Agenda for Fall 2010**

Q. Was the SPS involved in the Master Plan (MP) process?

A. No, but SPS members were on the MP Advisory Committee (MPAC).

There will be an MPAC meeting on September 29th, at which time Keeling will present the MP – including the feedback compiled from the website. There will be some final decisions made and then MPAC will vote and send the MP to the College Council (CC).

The MP is expected to go to the CC for review and approval on October 14th.

It is important that we not ignore the MP once it is rolled out. SPS will have a passive role in monitoring the MP, but a more active role in scanning the environment. This is an opportunity for the SPS to think more actively about the future. We need to be more engaged in the assessment process.

Q. When will the VPs’ actions be available? The SPS decided last semester that it would review those actions and offer recommendations/feedback.

A. VPs are done with strategic priorities, but they must individually meet with the President to review. Once that process is complete, the strategic priorities should be available to the SPS.

Recommendation was made that those documents be on the September 29th, agenda of the SPS. The plan is to circulate the documents prior to the meeting, so that they can be discussed at the meeting. The SPS must figure out how we are going to see the consequences of the plans put forth.

The SPS should review all of the planning grids then determine what it needs to ask for.

Broadly speaking, the SPS should determine if the college is moving in the direction that it says it is.

Q. How are we going to handle the “lower level” issues/concerns? (i.e. space, schedule and demand model) Thought is that the SPS should focus on broad directions and underlying principles.

A. We should make a recommendation regarding where the “lower level” issues/concerns should be discussed.
A. Are space discussions appropriate for this committee?
A. College Charter specifically names the SPS as being responsible for space, so the discussion remains here, but in strategic dimensions.

**PMP Items**
- The SPS would like to receive in advance, and review, the PMP data book. Gail distributes this data book, and is awaiting final data from CUNY. After she receives it, she will distribute to the SPS. The SPS should review and discuss the impact(s).
- Formulation of the PMP was done in silos; it should be more group oriented/consultative. The SPS does not see the PMP prior to submission to CUNY; SPS should be part of the process.

**Miscellaneous Items**
- Q. Are there any other broad issues that the SPS should be concerned with?
- A. The SPS never does Outcomes Assessment (OA).
  - We need to do OA, and it is something the SPS should be talking about doing.
  - We need a Comprehensive Assessment Plan; can use some of the indicators in the PMP.
  - Concern that OIR data resources are underutilized, and that we do not link what we aspire to do with where we are.
  - Data is used to guide what we do, but it is not used in a formal structure.
  - There are five different planning conversations taking place on campus, but there is a great disconnect between them all.
  - We don’t talk enough about how to interpret the data we do have. We need to force a better understanding of what the data is telling us. There should be a formal process to help the college community interpret and make better informed decisions.
  - There are several units of the college that use OIR regularly, but not all. The new director of Career Services actually requested a presentation; this was great.
  - This concern could be an agenda item for the next meeting.

**Agenda Item #5 Middle States (MS) Working Groups (WGs):**
- Denoting faculty on the MS WG lists: WG#1 – Demi Cheng; WG #2 - #12; WG#3 - #12.
- On WG#5, Hodges is an adjunct. Jane is aware of that. There was concern regarding whether or not he would be available to participate on a WG. Jane will follow up with Jama. Jim recalled an email about this person; he will check his email from Jama.
- Angela Crossman is reconsidering serving as chair of WG#3; Jane will follow up.
- On WG#5, Hodges is an adjunct. Jane is aware of that. There was concern regarding whether or not he would be available to participate on a WG. Jane will follow up with Jama. Jim recalled an email about this person; he will check his email from Jama.
- Jane explained that each WG has 5 faculty members; more than the number of administrators sitting on any given WG. Reminder that there is one student on every WG.
- The goal was to have one more faculty member than administrator on each WG.
- Recruiting faculty members to sit on WGs has been a challenge. Jane is happy to add one more faculty member per WG, but she cannot do the recruiting. She would like to leave that to the members of the SPS; asking all SPS members to recruit their colleagues.

- The deadline to submit additional faculty names is Wednesday, September 29th, 2010.
Strategic Planning Subcommittee (SPS)
Meeting Notes

Date: Wednesday, September 29, 2010
Time: 2:00 p.m.
Location: Room 610T

Attendees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jane Bowers</th>
<th>Francis Sheehan (A)</th>
<th>Anna Maria Singh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>James Llana</td>
<td>Harold Sullivan</td>
<td>Gail Hauss*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Pignatello</td>
<td>Thomas Kucharski (A)</td>
<td>Virginia Moreno*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Kaplowitz</td>
<td>Ned Benton</td>
<td>Ben Rohdin* (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay Hamilton</td>
<td>Carina Quintian (A)</td>
<td>Inez Brown*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Non-voting Staff member. (A) = Absent

Guests:

- VP Richard Saulnier Enrollment Management

- Anna Maria Singh was introduced as the student representative who sits on the SPS; she is a junior majoring in Criminal Justice, who also serves as the co-chair of the Committee on Clubs.

**Agenda Item #1: Approval of Minutes from September 1st, meeting**

- Meeting opened with request for SPS to approve the minutes of the meeting held on 09/01/10.
- There were no changes/edits recommended to the minutes.
- A move was made to adopt the minutes;
- The move was seconded.
- There were no objections and the minutes were considered satisfactory and accepted.

**Agenda Item #2: Presentation on PMP**

- SPS was informed that it would be involved in the PMP cycle this academic year; this will be the 11th cycle of the PMP.
- Jim Llana shared the CUNY PMP PowerPoint presentation available on the CUNY website. [http://www.cuny.edu/about/administration/chancellor/performance-goals.html](http://www.cuny.edu/about/administration/chancellor/performance-goals.html)
- The PMP is a way of addressing Middle States (MS) standard #7.
- There was interest in looking at the University’s PMP. Gail has the current University 2009-2010 Year End Performance Management Report, but is not allowed to post it on the internet/intranet. It is important to note that there are caveats in the report; most faculty instruction items (%FT faculty teaching, mean teaching hours) are incorrect, and will not be refreshed until next year. However, the JJC data book has corrected values for John Jay only. The data cannot be compared to other colleges because we do not have access to their corrected data.
- Gail will send the aforementioned document to the SPS members.
- Discussion regarding the use of the PMP measures.
  - The President’s salary is impacted by the PMP report; this component was incorporated into the PMP process in 2008-2009.
  - Colleges are placed in one of five quintiles; JJ has ping-ponged, and is currently in the first quintile.
If you look at [www.cuny.edu/pmp](http://www.cuny.edu/pmp) you may view every campus’ PMP report – NOT THE DATA.

- Review of CUNY’s PMP Assessment Cycle diagram.

  - There are new items on the CUNY 2010-2011 Targets-Objectives.
  - One purpose of the PMP is to ‘Foster a Culture of Evidence.’ JJC needs to become an institution that operates on evidence.
  - In the past, it seems as though JJ added more than targets to the PMP, i.e. activities, programs. We are going to try and streamline this for next year’s submission.
  - The PMP document we produce actually contains a lot of context information. Technically we are not accountable for context information, but we have been ‘nailed’ in the past for context items.
  - CUNY’s push to raise grants and contracts contradicts its goal to improve upon the indicator that measures FT faculty in the classroom.
  - There is a lot of data available behind the CUNY login → CPE; PMP Data book (JJC and CUNY’s); Enrollment projections, etc… However, access to that data is restricted to executive staff and OIR directors.
  - A motion was made to ask the Provost to ask CUNY to provide the JJC SPS with access to CUNY’s OIR/PMP website. The motion was seconded; question called; no opposes; the motion carries.
  - Jim will work with Ned to draft a formal memo from the SPS to the Provost (Jane).

**Agenda Item #3: Information Resources**

- Gail Hauss provided an overview.
- There is a wealth of information available on the JJC Office of Institutional Research (OIR) website; you must access via the JJC intranet (Inside John Jay) because much of the data is not available to the general public. The OIR reports are organized by topic; there are sections related to the academic departments, and a separate section for masters’ level students.
- OIR encourages the college community to view the OIR website; if you cannot locate something, you may contact Gail Hauss (OIR) for further assistance.
- Go to “Quick Facts” to see what is current with regard to data facts.
- The public IR page has links related to OIR.
FYI: The Chronicle of Higher Education has put up a nice page that shows the ratings of doctoral programs; this is the first time Public Administration and Public Policy programs have been included. The metrics are interesting and can perhaps be used to compare the JJC program. Forensic Psychology is not included although other sub-programs are; not sure why.

OIR has posted the new faculty survey.

Q. How does OIR feel about posting surveys done by other departments on the OIR website?

A. Absolutely. Send Gail the survey and results, and she will have it posted.

Q. Could you explain seat utilization?

A. Course utilization looks at how many students are available in a course vs. the number of students enrolled in a course. The college strives to make the max seat utilization possible; this is contingent on an efficient schedule.

CUNY conducts the Student Experience Survey every two years on even numbered years; JJC conducts this survey on the CUNY off-years and typically excludes freshmen. The next online JJC Student Experience Survey will launch in spring 2011. The number of respondents for the last student survey was 262; 4,000 students CUNY-wide responded to the survey.

Q. At what point do we say responses are valid/invalid?

A. We often get tripped up on response rate, but we (CUNY and JJC) weight the data response bias. Usually gender and ethnicity; the size of the college also matters because 200 students at York is different from 200 students at JJC even though the sample size is identical. The university’s analysis is representative of the population.

The online survey responses confirm the CUNY responses. There was concern expressed about self-selection; Gail assured that CUNY uses a random selection of 1,000 students from each college, and they weight when and where appropriate.

Agenda Item #4: The Financial Picture at the College

The President’s memo was circulated on 09/21/10, discussed proposals for blanket budget cuts and revenue generation; all VPs are expected to make a 15% reduction in OTPS and College Assistants (CA) – those financial proposals are due 10/15/10.

Concern was expressed that we are almost at the end of the 1st quarter, so we are realistically looking at a 20% cut over the next 3 quarters. It is endlessly annoying that we don’t hear from the University regarding what they are/are not going to do. We hear an awful lot of conceptual discussion about what we are going to do, but very little else.

We are in a very fluid state and are being asked to balance the budget. Financial plans must be submitted to the University by 10/06/10; CUNY doesn’t really care about the specifics of cuts (i.e. OTPS).

Q. Does the SPS want to recommend/discuss the proposed cuts?

The Financial Planning Subcommittee (FPS) will review the proposed OTPS and CA cuts; this is an opportunity for governance to have a role in the process and offer input regarding what to preserve, and what to cut. It is difficult to see what the impact of the cuts will be.

The college is currently implementing the following in an effort to cut back:

- Did not appoint CAs past 12/31/10.
- Enrollment Management will reduce the number of CAs and office hours. The goal last year was to preserve student services at the current level, but cuts will impact student services this year because there are not a lot of choices.

There is a concern that if we are going to revise the spring schedule, we need to know; the chairs need some guidance.

Retention Rates
It is difficult at this point to assess cuts because the proposals have yet to be developed, but we can make suggestions on the revenue side; specifically with regard to retention.

This community could really have an impact regarding Fall to Spring retention rates.

Q. What is it that faculty/chairs are supposed to do?
A. Working to a metric target is partly what this committee is about. If we could ask particular college groups, “What could we be doing?” then we could identify the opportunity pockets. It would be great if we had an early warning system, but until we get there…Jane has been having conversations with administrators, faculty and chairs about how to implement a process. The goal is to have a set of referrals, even though we don’t quite have enough of those people to refer to.

Idea: We could do a Survey Monkey poll to find out the intentions of students who are enrolled but not registered for the following semester; an intervention could be done at that time. It would be great if we could identify certain populations. The challenge regarding what to do with the students who need intervention remains.

The MPA program is going to issue a survey to students regarding advisement, then attempt to resolve the issues. Thinking about doing a January non-credit MPA qualifying exam workshop; this is a much cheaper alternative to a formal course and could impact retention.

A more urgent matter is that clear advice and instructions need to be given to faculty. Jane was charged by President Travis to get the faculty to rally around “how” they can support retention goals; Jim volunteered to assist in this effort.

FYI: Anne Lopes (Undergraduate Dean) suggested a REGITHON; call students who are not registered and inquire/encourage.

FYI: At Brooklyn College, each faculty member was told that they have to advise 50 students.

Jim will send an email notification about a meeting to continue the discussion of ideas to support retention efforts.

Agenda Item #5 Misc.
As you may have noted, the SPS agenda is different from what was discussed at the last SPS. We were supposed to review and discuss the VPs’ strategic action plans; President Travis informed Jim that he was still reviewing them. Once the Master Plan (MP) is approved, President Travis is looking forward to developing a 5-year plan that looks at reaching the MP goals. He would like the SPS involved reviewing the 5-year plan.

The VPs’ priorities are action plans that contain MP objectives, hence keyed to the MP. In an effort to bring them all together, the plan is very hierarchical. When we see the VPs’ priorities, the VP objectives will be clearly visible.

Concern was expressed about the process. As explained to Jim, President Travis will develop the goals/objectives/plans, and the SPS would review them and respond accordingly.
Strategic Planning Subcommittee (SPS)
Meeting Minutes

Date: Wednesday, October 27, 2010
Time: 2:00 p.m.
Location: Room 610T

Attendees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jane Bowers</td>
<td>Francis Sheehan</td>
<td>Anna Maria Singh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Llana</td>
<td>Harold Sullivan</td>
<td>Gail Hauss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Pignatello</td>
<td>Thomas Kucharski</td>
<td>Virginia Moreno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Kaplowitz</td>
<td>Ned Benton</td>
<td>Ben Rohdin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay Hamilton</td>
<td>Carina Quintian</td>
<td>Inez Brown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Non-voting Staff member.  (A) = Absent

Guests:
- VP Richard Saulnier  Enrollment Management

---

Action Items

**Agenda Item #1: Approval of Minutes from**
- Meeting opened with request for SPS to approve the minutes of the meeting held on 09/29/10.
- There were no changes edits recommended to the minutes.
- A move was made to adopt the minutes;
- The move was seconded.
- There were no objections and the minutes were considered satisfactory and accepted.

**Agenda Item #2: Student Evaluations of Faculty**
- Richard Saulnier had previously made a recommendation to temporarily dispense with student evaluations of faculty for the next two spring semesters, and the SPS was asked to discuss the proposal. Implementation of this idea would save the college approximately $18,000 per year; paper alone costs $10,000.
- This was presented to the Senate Executive Committee and placed on the agenda for the Senate meeting being held tomorrow. Junior faculty members felt strongly about evaluations not being skipped; issues corrected from one semester to the next would not be reflected.
- The College Council Committee is responsible for the methods, process, etc… utilized in the student evaluation of faculty. The SPS would be usurping their authority.
- The 1st priority of the Master Plan is Student Success. The 2nd priority of the MP is Excellent Teaching. To suspend evaluations would be hypocritical. After some discussion, there was virtually no support for the proposal in Committee.
- Richard is officially withdrawing this request, and Karen will inform the Faculty Senate that this item does not need to be discussed at the meeting tomorrow.
- Jane would like to put the following item on a future agenda: Consideration to move toward online evaluation of faculty.

**Agenda Item #3: Increasing Spring Enrollment**
- The SPS sub-group met on 10/06/10 to share ideas for increased spring enrollment. The one significant idea that is still thriving is a survey of students in the spring semester. Although
the summer schedule is due out in November, the survey will not be done until March. The schedule will be adjusted based on survey feedback.

- Ned will create a survey for Department Chairs, to determine what courses can/cannot be taught in the summer. The surveys (1 for undergraduates and 1 for graduates) will be circulated in November; the purpose is to identify which courses are possible for the summer. The survey will be sent to SPS members, and they may offer feedback.

- When the survey is implemented (centrally, not by departments), students will be able to select which disciplines they are in, and see just the courses pertaining to that discipline or curriculum area, Gen Ed for example.

- There was concern expressed regarding the response rate, but some pointed out that the survey will be attractive to students thinking about summer school.

- As opposed to informing the students via their JJC email addresses, a recommendation was made to also place the survey on the Jay Stop web page.

**Agenda Item #4: Access to CUNY PMP Information**

- Jane requested permission from David Crook on Monday, October 25 concerning committee access to restricted PMP data; no feedback yet. **Request was made that this be kept on the SPS agenda.**

- Request was made to receive some type of gentle reminder regarding action items discussed in the SPS meetings.

**Agenda Item #5 Middle States Issue**

- It is important for the college to have a plan; particularly at times of stress, one needs a good plan.

- Next semester the Working Groups (WGs) will be framing “research questions” about all the Middle States standards; there needs to be a discussion soon on Standard 2 (Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal) since one workgroup will be charged with framing questions about our planning process and ultimately assessing it for the Middle States Self Study.

- One member argued that JJC has a tough time with planning. While there wasn’t much disagreement, the Provost cited an important counter-example: the decision to eliminate the Associate degree programs used a sound planning process based on resources and goals.

- Addressing the budget in the context of planning has to be a priority for Institutional Effectiveness. And we need to understand the inter-relationships of different budgets across the college, and it is important to have a process to deal with resource conflicts versus responding ad-hoc. A great question that the college must answer for Middle States is, “What does the process look like?”

- Pages 5-6 of the handout (Middle States narrative on Standard 2) seem to speak to the JJC challenges.

- External factors make planning difficult: how do we go about implementing a college plan when the budget is not determined until August, and there are mid-year changes, etc…? The University also has other plans that do not relate to JJC, but impact us directly.

- Perhaps the college should consider adjusting its budget/planning cycle. There is nothing preventing areas of the college from doing that now; this can happen at the VP level.

- The college needs to invest in growing revenue; when are we going to have that conversation?

- Our systems for planning are really weak, and given the current state, it makes it even more difficult to address.
It seems as though there are two distinct but related issues here: **Resource Planning** and **Middle States**.

- Since every CUNY school is in the same situation, why not look at their MS Standard 2 (*Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal*) and see how they presented themselves to MS.
  - They all have to deal with uncertainties.
  - The budget has been so poor for so long, that it is hard to establish any reserves.
- The expectation is that there will be another $80 million cut to CUNY which translates to about a $3 million cut to JJC. We should plan the budget based on that, but we really do not have that option. The planning is always the last thing we do; it takes time to sit back and figure out how to fix it.
- Why not make a formal recommendation to the President that priority has to be given to recruitment of students, and toward marketing efforts? We need a clearer context for this; postpone until the next SPS meeting. **Everyone is asked to consider ideas/proposals around this idea, and present for discussion at the next meeting.**
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Action Items

**Agenda Item #1: Approval of Minutes from**
- Meeting opened with request for SPS to approve the minutes of the meeting held on 10/27/10.
- There were no changes/edits recommended to the minutes.
- A move was made to adopt the minutes;
- The move was seconded.
- There were no objections and the minutes were considered satisfactory and accepted.

**Agenda Item #2: Discussion of Planning and Resource Allocation**
- Using the Middle States (MS) guidelines gives us a way of focusing concretely on planning.
- It would be a good idea if we came up with one or two guidelines for steering the planning process.
- President Travis is anticipating attending a joint FPS/SPS meeting in January, to present and review Master Plan (MP) strategies developed in consultation with the VPs; they are being presented to the SPS for consultation. Jim will work on scheduling an exact date.  
- There was concern expressed about the consultation process and strategies being ‘delivered’ to the SPS. What about the college governance committees? Jim stated that he does not know what President Travis’ intentions are, and that the SPS could express its concerns now as opposed to waiting until the January meeting.
- With regard to taking the strategies to various campus constituencies, Jane observed that the strategies are just the means by which the goals are operationalized. While college-wide consultation was necessary for the Master Plan, the strategies would come to the SPS without the expectation that campus constituencies would specifically approve them. Some argued, however, that the goals and strategies for achieving them cannot be cleanly separated.
- A suggestion was made to read the plans for this year and set up a process for offering planning recommendation for next year.
- The SPS should talk about a timeline for next year; fix some target dates for doing things on this committee. A recommendation was made that a timeline be constructed for this year.
- A reasonable time to plan would be in the spring of the previous year; by the end of April. The SPS could be working on it by March. Some decisions are made even earlier, and discussions could realistically begin before March. It would be great to establish a “normal”...
cycle; there are some items that we just will not know (i.e. Compact), but we can make preliminary decisions.

- Whatever the activities are in the planning process, we should be able to calendar them and establish decision points – decisions that have already been made. There are external factors that we know we will not be able to do anything about, i.e. CUNY’s calendar is very simple – wait until the state budget is done.

- Q. What should we be doing?
  - A. We need to layer certain kinds of decisions; constructing a plan for adjunct budget, faculty hiring, etc… Enrollment is a layer; we need the most up-to-date information to determine what goal(s) we need to reach.

- Develop a financial plan in April; the working version could be adjusted as necessary. The plan could have “What if…” scenarios…
  - **If we miss enrollment by x%, what do we do?**
  - **If our budget is cut by x%, what adjustments do we need to make?**

- An enrollment plan of courses could lay out different levels of anticipated revenue. We could disaggregate and set targets for what we need to get to in order to generate revenue, and approach different outcomes with different resources, etc…

- We should also be formalizing our checkpoints for assessments during these early discussions.

- Examples of data that are needed in order to move forward are: inventory of positions, turnover rate. We must develop a plan that helps us to be more intentional about the personnel budget.

- In support of the MP, it would be a good idea to influence the decisions in all of the other entities that generate revenue (i.e. Tech Fee, Research Foundation (RF), Student Fee, Aux Services Corporation). It will be a challenge the first year because the cycles are different. The Aux and RF have cycles that begin in September. Question arose regarding how realistic it is to get the respective entities to change their cycle. Rob sits on the Foundation and Aux.

- We must make more of an effort to invest in revenue producing opportunities such as summer enrollment, online courses and fundraising.

- What are the steps along the way in order to make this happen by April? This is really complicated; hence benchmarks are needed along the way so that we can look at the elements.

- It was proposed that we do ** calendaring for our current process**, a table with different tracks, before we can determine which ones need to be changed. A **sub-committee was established to complete this task**: Richard, Ned and Ben. The proposed calendar will be presented at the joint SPS-FPS meeting in January. The purpose is to create a framework for the systematic and predictable consideration of planning initiatives in the context of the budget.

**Agenda Item #3: Consideration of Subcommittee Recommendation to President Travis**

- It is the sense of the SPS that we convey to President Travis that we would appreciate receiving the MP strategies document at least one week prior to the joint SPS-FPS meeting in January. The SPS would also like to propose that the joint meeting be held as early in January as practical. Those representing other constituencies intend to report back to their respective groups for comment, then report to the SPS in February or when practical.

- The Sub-Committee voted in favor of sending the “sense of the meeting” recommendation to the President. Jim will transmit it after clarification of wording with Karen.

**Agenda Item #4: New Business**

- --
JOHN JAY COLLEGE OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE
The City University of New York
UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM & ACADEMIC STANDARDS
COMMITTEE

Minutes of September 24, 2010

The Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee held its meeting on
Friday, September 24th, at 9:30 am in Room 610T. Dean Anne Lopes, UCASC Chair,
called the meeting to order.

Present: Amy Adamczyk, C. Jama Adams, Simon Baatz, Bettina Carbonell, Clara
Castro-Ponce, Diana Friedland, Lior Gideon, Victor Herbert, Chad Infante, Kathy
Killoran, Ben Lapidus, Susan Larkin, Kyoo Lee, Michael Leippe, MaryAnn McClure,
Alandra Mitchell, Virginia Moreno, Lisandro Perez, Judy-Lynne Peters, Michaels Puls,
Peter Romaniuk, Richard Saulnier, Ellen Sexton, David Shapiro, Ed Snajdr, Monika Son,
Christopher Sui, Hung En Sung, Dana Tarantino.


Guests: Vielka Holness, Karen Kaplowitz, John Pittman, Kate Szur, Sumaya Villanueva.

Administrative Announcements

Dean Anne Lopes called the meeting to order at 9:30 am and welcomed the group. She
explained that this would be her first year as chair, although she was a member last year.
She emphasized that the work of the committee is critical to the undergraduate mission of
the college. She also underscored that this committee has the opportunity to think about
new areas of knowledge and skills for our students and can drive John Jay to become a
cutting-edge institution.

Dean Lopes said that it is important to rationalize the committee’s work and think about
the big issues in curriculum. She observed last year that the UCASC was more reactive
to what was coming forward, not necessarily steering the development of curriculum.
She hopes to open up some space for the big issues going forward. She stated that we
will try to develop clear criteria for evaluating proposals and provide written feedback,
especially with regard to the review of program proposals. She also said some feedback
forms will be created not to bureaucratize the process but to make it easier for everyone
to know what the criteria are and what feedback has emerged from the subcommittees.

Dean Lopes said that this will be a landmark year for us and the College. We will
consider and hopefully approve a new general education curriculum, which will be the
first time it has been re-imagined in thirty-five years. It will be transformative for both
students and faculty. So, the UCASC will play a crucial role, and you have an
opportunity to help us transform the college for our students and for the future. That is
very exciting and an extremely important role and responsibility. We look forward to
that discussion of our general education curriculum and the opportunity to revitalize it.

Dean Lopes explained that the UCASC has a very large agenda this year including two
proposals for new programs, five program revisions, forty-nine new course proposals and
twenty-seven course revisions, in addition to other policy issues. The policy and
standards issues around internships and online learning will be examined. She
recognized that John Jay does have challenges. CUNY would like us to slow down a bit
the pace at which we are developing new programs. The new Vice Chancellor expects us
to present compelling arguments for why we need a particular program that include data
from student interest surveys for the new majors, cost analyses, and how well a major
will prepare students for careers.

Dean Lopes had all the members and guests introduce themselves. Kathy Killoran
explained how she populated the UCASC subcommittees: Academic Standards,
Programs, Program Review, Courses, and Educational Partnerships. Dean Lopes
described the subcommittees and their functions and reviewed some basic organizational
processes. She explained that due to the large volume of new course proposals, two
Courses Subcommittees have been formed and she will look at other ways to expedite the
workload.

Dean Lopes talked about the Principles, Policies and Procedures (3P) Subcommittee. She
said that last year she thought that the 3P was supposed to talk about the ‘big’ curricular
issues, but she was disappointed to discover that it talked more about the internal
processes of the UCASC.

Prof. Adams pointed out that the ‘big issues’ do not lend themselves to a large group
discussion and thought there should be space for a more philosophical discussions about
curriculum. He said that there should be questioning of some fundamental principles; for
example, the place of culture, race and ethnicity in the curriculum. The 3P can discuss
these issues and bring back some guidelines. He suggested that the subcommittee adds
another P – for philosophy (4Ps). Dean Lopes said we need to look at the big issues so
we will populate the subcommittee.

Prof. Adams pointed out an error with his email address in the membership list. Kathy
Killoran said she will correct it.

Approval of the Minutes of May 14, 2010

A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of May 14th.

Several changes were noted. On page 18, line 46, the word “description” should be
removed, on page 4, line 36, an error to the UCASC abbreviation needs correction. On
page 13, line 46 should read, “courses be developed in conjunction ….”
Prof. Carbonell made a correction on page 21, line 8 regarding double majors. She said she was incorrectly quoted. She asked that the wording be adjusted to “student members of the College Council expressed concern that permission would have to be gotten from two departments.”

The minutes of May 14th were accepted with the above changes by a vote of 13 in favor and 13 abstentions.

Election of Vice Chairperson

Dean Lopes called for nominations for the Vice Chair position. Prof. Larkin nominated Prof. Sexton.

She was voted in unanimously with all members present in favor (27).

Representatives to Committees

Vice President Saulnier was not sure he would be convening the Scheduling Committee this year, so the item was tabled indefinitely.

Dean Lopes explained that the Criminal Justice BA/BS Advisory Committee was developed in response to the split in responsibility for the B.A. and the B.S. degrees. The purpose of the Advisory Committee is to examine the new curriculum and give opportunities for the previously participating departments to give feedback. Representatives of the Departments of Law & Police Science, Political Science, Sociology, and Criminal Justice are also on the Advisory Committee, and it is chaired by the Dean of Undergraduate Studies.

Prof. Kaplowitz added that the UCASC representative can not be from any of the participating departments. Prof. Adams asked how frequently the committee meets. Dean Lopes said that last year it met infrequently. However, she anticipates it will meet more this year, about two meetings per semester. Prof. Judy Lynne-Peters of the Public Management Department volunteered. She was officially nominated by Prof. Adams and elected unanimously with 27 votes in favor.

New Business

Academic Standards Subcommittee

Proposal for Double Majors (1st reading)

Dean Lopes summarized the two readings rule for the committee. Prof. Kaplowitz relayed the memberships of the Academic Standards Subcommittee from last year. She
explained that this proposal was on the May agenda for a “pre-reading” so the
subcommittee could get a sense of the UCASC members’ feelings about the proposal.

Prof. Kaplowitz explained that John Jay is the only senior college in CUNY which does
not permit students to double major. She guessed the reason was that so many of our
majors were closely related since they all had to be mission-related. She said since now
we have more variety in majors, there is again an interest in allowing students to double
major. She explained that a few years ago there was a double major proposal that was
voted down by the College Council.

Prof. Kaplowitz said that this is a completely new proposal from the one previously
defeated. It allows students to major in two areas without getting permission. However,
students need to complete both majors completely. If there are overlapping courses in
both majors, students can only use them for one of the majors; an additional course must
be taken for the other. This proposal does not allow any double dipping.

Prof. Larkin asked whether this provision was unduly disenfranchising for students. She
wondered whether that is how the other colleges handle double dipping. Dean Lopes said
that it is a complex and important issue. For example, if both programs have a required
introductory course in common, she wondered what the student would be required to do.

Prof. Adams was not sure whether we have enough majors to allow for just any
combinations to work. He wondered if there are programs that students should not be
allowed to combine. He also wondered who is to say that the elective course in a major
they take actually represents the most important essence of the discipline or major. He
expressed concern that the curriculum would be diluted.

A committee member said that the policy should strike a balance between protecting
students from themselves and giving opportunities to suitable students. The member
wondered whether we want students who struggle academically to be able to tackle two
majors since the proposed policy does not prohibit any student from double majoring.

Prof. Lapidus said if overlapping courses are replaced by electives, he was concerned that
it would become a race for the credits rather than the quality of the course of study. He
also pointed out that upper-level electives are not necessarily offered on a regular basis
which could cause problems for students.

Kathy Killoran also suggested that language be added to emphasize the necessity of
getting regular advisement by consulting with the major coordinators when attempting to
double major. She also thought that there could be some double dipping especially when
core courses overlap.

Prof. Carbonell agreed that an advising component is needed in the proposal. She also
suggested that students should do an interim transcript review with the major
coordinators. The students who double major must be more thoughtful and deliberate in
their program planning so that the double major is meaningful and makes sense.
Prof. Romaniuk wondered how well the majors are articulated with each other. He said it may be impossible to combine certain majors. In principle, he expressed support for the idea.

Sumaya Villanueva echoed what the faculty have said about advisement. In her experience, many students express interest in double majoring but when core requirements are the same between programs, double dipping becomes an issue. In some majors, the electives are not offered frequently or the courses have become inactive. She wondered what students would do in the case where courses are not really viable. She stated that we still have some clean up to do with the majors. Also, the major coordinators are not always involved with deciding which courses are offered.

Prof. Leippe said it was hard to see the downside of allowing double dipping and that he would be surprised if this prohibition is common elsewhere. He said that if students were opposed to the idea of consulting with department chairs, they must have perceived it to be unfair. He wondered what would happen if a student were to complete the requirements of both degrees with overlapping courses. He questioned if we would prohibit them from earning two majors. He was also concerned that if students take double majors and need to take additional courses, they would not have room in their schedules to take courses in other disciplines. By not allowing double dipping, we limit students from taking other general education and liberal arts courses (electives).

Vice President Saulnier said that the last time this was proposed, the students were concerned with getting permission. VP Saulnier also expressed concerned that if students applied for graduation and they met the requirements for both majors, it would be a terrible problem to deny them the double major because they did not have permission to do it. On the other hand, we have distinct numbers of credits for earning a degree in each major; how many credits would we allow students to overlap? There are lots of degree programs at John Jay that overlap. He avowed that we need to maintain the integrity of our degree programs.

Prof. Shapiro asked if we lose students because we do not have double majors. Students see double majoring as making themselves more marketable. It would seem to be a marketing issue for us as well; we could be losing some students. He went on to express the value he placed on the broadening of his own undergraduate course.

Prof. Kaplowitz said that what students opposed last time was the permission to attempt two majors; the students felt they may be discriminated against. That is different from putting an advising process in place. The fairness issue was really what students were opposed to. Prof. Gideon asked about the basis upon which students thought they would be discriminated against. Prof. Kaplowitz responded that the fear was that faculty would favor some students over others and discriminate against others on issues other than their academic merits.

Prof. Lapidus said he is having a tough time understanding VP Saulnier’s logic in requiring a certain number of credits and that the discussion should be about the quality
of the degree. If students take the entire course of study for each major, they still complete each program.

VP Saulnier said that thirty-six credits in one program and eighteen in another is a major and a minor, not two majors. Prof. Adams wondered what the NY State Board of Education had to say about this.

Dean Lopes said other institutions allow students to major in two distinct areas. For example, a professional-oriented major can be combined with a liberal arts major; that is what many institutions do.

Prof. Gideon was disturbed that there was no GPA limit included in the proposal. He was concerned that students would bite off more than they can chew. He also asked when students would have to decide and declare a double major (when they enter?, at the end of the freshman year?). He would also like to see which majors could be combinable.

Virginia Moreno was concerned about academic progress and academic program planning. If students decide to double major in their sophomore or junior year, they may deplete their allotted amount of financial aid, life may intervene and they may need to stop out. She was concerned that by attempting a double major, students would delay earning their degrees. She said it may work with a certain population of our students, but may not work for other populations. She expressed her feeling that most students need to prioritize academic planning to complete their degrees with one major. She also pointed out that the College would need departmental advisement in the majors and students who attempt a double major should be required to get advisement.

Prof. Son asked what the practical value of having a double major was. She acknowledged that students express interest in doing so, but she is unsure they really understand what a double major would mean and what the process would entail. She said our students have practical needs and one of them is to be able to get a job when they graduate. Many of our students have a lot on their plates; she wondered when they would graduate. She said the typical time to degree is now six years and she often advises students to get a degree and then pursue a master’s degree. She wondered if that would be better than a double major. She encouraged the subcommittee to think about the practical issues. Prof. Sexton suggested that the UCASC identify a list of majors that we see as distinct from one another.

Chad Infante, a student member, explained that he is a CUNY BA student and is doing a double major. The double major is gearing him towards his goal. A lot of students do not know what they want to do, so it is important to have an advising process so students are able to flesh out, firstly, if they can handle the course load of two majors and secondly, if the programs are what they want to take in the long run. However, he said, there is also a need for a double major. He is double majoring because his interest was in two distinct areas, philosophy and literature. He wanted to tie them together and later realized that they combined very well together. He said that doing a double major can give students greater access to pursuing opportunities after college. He agreed that we
need to say what majors can be combined and which cannot. That would help clear up a lot of the fogginess about double dipping and make the process easier.

Prof. Herbert said that we are an undergraduate committee but that at the graduate level it is not unusual to get a second master’s. As much as he supports comments about advisement, which he thinks is critical, we have to avoid being paternalistic. There are many students who are capable of making this decision and with good advisement will do fine.

Vielka Holness pointed out that law schools look favorably on students who earn double majors. They feel that the course work can have more substance than general electives as students would take more 300 and 400-level courses. Prof. Perez acknowledged that while double majoring is not for every student, choice is good and he supports the principle.

Prof. Adamczyk said it makes her uncomfortable that we do not offer the same opportunities as our peer institutions in CUNY. She supports the need for advisement.

Prof. Adams is uncomfortable when words like paternalistic are used. He said we need a practical basis on which to make these decisions. The committee needs to keep in mind that our students are the youngest in the University, the lowest socio-economically, they work the most and we have very little in terms of advisement structures. He urged the committee to make sure we have the needed structures in place. If students want to declare a double major, then they must see an advisor who must sign off. This signature would not be a stopping point, but simply be an acknowledgement that students have been made aware of the challenges of earning a double major. He stated we need to provide informed autonomy.

Prof. Son said she did not mean to say that some students should not be allowed to double major; they should. But if we give students the opportunity to double major, it becomes the College’s responsibility to have the personnel to advise these students. She also urged that the language be very clear.

Prof. Kaplowitz said that the Academic Standards Subcommittee has a lot to think about and that they will submit a revised proposal. They will also pursue the idea of which majors can or cannot be paired together. Dean Lopes said that the Academic Advisement Center has been tasked with creating more information on choosing majors and minors and combining the two. She also has some general ideas about how the Subcommittee can go forward with the feedback. Prof. Kaplowitz thanked the committee for a thorough discussion.

**Forgiveness Policy (1st reading)**

Prof. Kaplowitz provided some context for the proposed Forgiveness policy. This issue is coming to the fore because shortly we will start to receive the CUNY Justice Academy students from our joint degrees with the community colleges. VP Saulnier said that we
have some students who come to John Jay and do not perform well academically. They can end up on probation or dismissed from the College. Many of these students go to CUNY community colleges, which is what we encourage them to do, but really want to return to John Jay. They may become part of our joint degree programs. Our policy on students who have been dismissed and return is that they begin with the GPA they left us with. This group then is immediately on probation because we do not have a forgiveness policy.

VP Saulnier said the Justice Academy gives us the unique opportunity to pilot a change in the policy. The Forgiveness Policy being proposed says that when students from the Justice Academy come back to John Jay with their associate’s degrees, we will treat all of their credits as transfer credits so students can begin with a clean slate. No academic penalty would be imposed on going elsewhere and doing well. The credit a student earned when they were here the first time count, but the grades would not. So the student who went off and experienced academic success at another institution can now transfer back to John Jay as if they were transferring their whole transcript. Prof. Kaplowitz interjected that it is sometimes very difficult to get off probation since they would have earned at least sixty credits. She also pointed out the Academic Standards Subcommittee would evaluate the policy after two years and may consider expanding the policy to other populations. To transfer back to John Jay in the Justice Academy students would have to earn an associate’s degree with at least a 2.0 GPA, however for the Forgiveness Policy we are saying they have to earn at least a 2.5 GPA to be eligible. She also reminded the committee that the curriculum in the Justice Academy has been developed in conjunction with our faculty.

Chad Infante asked why this policy would only be applicable to Justice Academy students. Prof. Kaplowitz explained that we are experimenting with this group. The Subcommittee may come back with a modification to the policy: it may be too lenient or too stringent in choosing the 2.5 GPA. She said that this is a good control group because they are taking our program.

Prof. Gideon said that he has seen a positive correlation between the year the student is in and their grades. The first year their grades are not that high, the second year they improve their grades, the third year they improve even more, the fourth year they are our top students. He said it has to do with their maturity, socialization to the institution, and other factors. We cannot punish them again after we dismiss them and they return after experiencing much better success and they are more mature. The College should not close the door in their faces. Prof. Gideon expressed the thought that we need to give second chances especially when it comes to education and also need to judge people according to their merit and not who they are. He said we can monitor the results of this policy and make adjustments in the future, if necessary.

Prof. Perez asked why we would not extend the policy to all transfer students. VP Saulnier responded that we approved the curriculum the students take in these programs so we know what they are taking and all the credits will transfer back here. Prof. Perez
asked if we accept transfer students from other institutions or programs. VPS Saulnier said that we absolutely do, but this seemed like a really good kicking off point.

Sumaya Villanueva relayed a prior discussion with David Barnet who is our Director of Educational Partnerships regarding this cohort of students. He was concerned that dismissed JJ students would enter the Justice Academy. On the other hand, what is the difference between a Justice Academy student and another community college student who has earned a two-year degree, and transferred back?

VP Saulnier explained that John Jay took that stand on dismissed students because they would have to start here with the poor GPA they left with due to an absence of just such a policy as this. He thinks we would change that position if this policy is approved.

Vielka Holness wondered if students who come back to JJ would be eligible for accolades such as the Dean’s List with their new GPAs.

Prof. Perez urged the Subcommittee to extend the forgiveness policy to all transfer students with an associate’s degree and at least a 2.5 GPA. Dean Lopes said there are good reasons to do that, and making a policy open to only one group can be questionable. She asked the Subcommittee to think about it further.

The Committee took a short break.

Courses Subcommittee

PHI 3XX Philosophical Modernity (1st reading)

Prof. Sexton gave a brief overview about the Courses Subcommittee’s process for looking at courses. She pointed out which questions on the lengthy form the subcommittee pays close attention to: the course title, description, prerequisites, learning objectives, program of study as well as the class calendar in the syllabus. These give a fairly good indication of what the course is about.

Prof. Sexton said that we have three new courses today for first readings. She called on the proposer, Prof. Pittman, to summarize the PHI 3XX Philosophical Modernity course. He explained that this is one of six required courses and is crucial to the design of the proposed philosophy major. It provides an advanced introduction to the basic problems of philosophy as developed by the end of the 18th century. Kant established the agenda for the contemporary philosophical research that has taken place in the two centuries since his death. This course gears students for intense work in philosophical research and is paired with other courses that critique philosophical modernity from a variety of perspectives.

Christopher Sui asked how this course was different from PHI 326 Topics in Modern Thought. Prof. Pittman explained that PHI 326 is a topics course so when taught, it will
focus on a particular topic within modern philosophy chosen by the instructor. This semester it focuses on existentialism.

Prof. Adams asked Prof. Pittman to explain what is ‘not covered’ in this course. Prof. Pittman said the way that we conceive of this course and within the broader structure of the proposed major is that it will be a kind of basic instruction to the development within western European early modern society of the basic framework of questioning in place at the end of the Napoleonic Wars. After this course, students will be required to take another course which extends and criticizes that basic framework of knowledge. We have a course in African Philosophy, are running an experimental course this semester on Latin American Philosophy, and have submitted course proposals for Existentialism and Classical Chinese Philosophy. He explained that what we try to do in each of these critique courses is to contextualize why philosophy focuses on Western Europe. That is all spelled out in the course description.

Prof. Adams asked if any courses are planned that will look at religious philosophy in relation to modernity. Prof. Pittman said that the modernity course will discuss the reformation and schisms caused by religion. In addition, the department has a course on the philosophy of religion that addresses some of those issues.

Prof. Adamczyzk asked why the course is being pitched when the major does not yet exist. Prof. Pittman explained that last year the UCASC unanimously approved the proposal for the major and it has now been submitted to 80th Street. Dean Lopes said the College is going everything possible to support it. Kathy Killoran explained the expectation from the University that courses for new majors be moving toward approval at the same time the proposal is moving through governance.

Prof. Gideon asked if the course prerequisites were all mandatory courses. Prof. Pittman answered in the affirmative. Prof. Gideon cautioned the Philosophy Department about creating bottlenecks for students. Prof. Pittman said this is a closely articulated course of study. It can be difficult to get students to realize that but as part of the major proposal the whole department agreed to have mandatory advisement. He said they will keep track of the prerequisites and if they become a bottleneck will consider revisiting the issue.

Prof. Carbonell pointed out some tidying up that needs to be done on the syllabus. The number ‘10’ has to be removed and she suggested providing the complete list (or full citations) of the required reading materials. She also suggested moving the class calendar to the rear of the proposal and moving the policies up. Prof. Castro-Ponce suggested making it more visually appealing.

Prof. Herbert said the cell phone policy on the last page of the syllabus seems a bit draconian. Prof. Pittman said that it is a vexing problem and that there has been little discussion or guidance from the College. He said that cell phones ringing only need to happen a few times before students get the point early in the semester. The committee was reminded that we vote on the course proposal itself, not the actual syllabus.
Different faculty may implement the course differently so syllabi provided are merely sample syllabi.

Prof. Lapidus said that every faculty member should have the right to decide on his or her course policies. He explained that in his class, if a cell phone rings, students must sing something or accept the alternative, a hard question on the next exam for the entire class. Dean Lopes noted that it is good to give colleagues feedback on their policies though.

**PHI 4XX Senior Seminar: Ethics (1st reading)**

Prof. Sexton called on Prof. Pittman again to introduce the course. He explained that this is one of the capstone courses, required of all philosophy majors as seniors. It has some of the 300-level courses as prerequisites. He said the department is planning on developing several of these senior seminar courses. This one is the first, and that it focuses on ethics. He explained that the proposed major has sort of an ethical focus and pulls together the themes introduced to students in the first three years. It will be the place where students get into a fairly high level of philosophical research. Each time it is taught, it will have a theme or topic chosen by instructor that may vary somewhat from one implementation to another.

Chad Infante asked if there is a thesis requirement attached to the course. Prof. Pittman said not formally but pointed to the writing assignments planned. He said students could choose to do two shorter writing assignments or one long one. He said the faculty felt it might make more sense to give students two passes at shorter papers – it is reasonable to give instructor the option to decide.

Prof. Carbonell pointed out that there is no mention of practical or applied ethics in the course description, though it is mentioned elsewhere in the proposal. She wondered if the students engage in some application of theories or schools of thought.

Prof. Pittman said that it is an ethical theory course, not on how those are theories are applied. However, he said it may be possible to offer it as an implementation of applied ethics. But in general, he said, the course is not viewed as one that would spend a lot of time talking about applied issues in ethics. Prof. Carbonell pointed to the first performance objective on page four and said she was not sure how that fits into the overall vision for the course.

Prof. Lee further explained the senior seminar’s relationship to applied ethics. She said the PHI 210 Ethical Theory does what Prof. Carbonell is describing. It gets students to think about their real life experiences; they look at their own ethical assumptions and get an essential flavor of ethical theory. They often use media to get them to think about it. At the 400-level, this course gets them into shape to think on a more sophisticated level. When it comes to the writing assignments, students may be able to write about applications of the theories they have learned about, but the course is not oriented toward applied ethics. Prof. Carbonell pointed out that the syllabus mentions applied areas such as environmental ethics.
Prof. Sexton explained that there were some technical issues that needed to be worked out or the UCASC would have seen it last spring. She said that Prof. Shapiro was here to represent the course. He introduced the course as a 200-level course designed to use computer techniques to investigate fraud. The course does not focus so much on the technology itself but on sifting through the huge amount of data that can be gathered. During this course students will learn about and write about as well as design approaches to managing huge amounts of data. This is challenging as it is usual to have way more data than can be useful. It examines software and metadata techniques.

Christopher Sui asked whether this course would help students to qualify for the fraud examiner examination. Prof. Shapiro explained that it is not a required course but a complementary course. It does, however, cover the necessary techniques students need to be familiar with to succeed on the fraud examiner examination and utilizes a text that is edited by the author of the examination.

Prof. Gideon said that it seemed crucial for such a course to have lab hours. Prof. Shapiro said he would explore that point with Prof. LaSalle, the proposer of the course. He said the course was initially planned to require a lab but that became a practical problem and they found some ways to do without it. He said the textbook used comes with a compact disc that provides data sets from which faculty ask students to analyze. He continued that it may not be the ideal situation, but it will provide an adequate experience for students. But, Prof. Shapiro said the point was well-taken. Dean Lopes suggested exploring online applications that could be used to simulate a laboratory environment.

Prof. Adams recognized that this course focuses very much on data and techniques, he questioned whether a university should have such narrowly-defined courses.

Dean Lopes responded that there are professionally-oriented areas of study that have courses like this where they are knowledge-based. In accounting or computer science, for instance, where the knowledge base is very technical, there is a place for that in curriculum but the curriculum should be looked at as a whole. Issues that would naturally come up within a major would not necessarily come up in each course. Prof. Adams suggested that it would be helpful to have question 9b, the performance objectives, highlight ethics a bit more.

Prof. Shapiro explained that this course looks at fourteen case studies in nine different industries and, in each, the legal and economic issues must be examined. Students study how fraud was determined in these cases. While the issues Prof. Adams is concerned with are relevant, he is not sure how much they can be addressed in a 200-level course.
Prof. Gideon suggested that the course should have a 100-level mathematics prerequisite. Prof. Carbonell chimed in saying her comments hinge on the prerequisites too. She noted that ENG 101 and one computer literacy course are the only prerequisites. She was concerned that students may not come to the course with a lot of critical thinking skills, she wondered if this should be a 300-level course. Prof. Shapiro explained that there are three other 300-level forensic accounting courses that are required and several 300-level options in the elective areas so they wish to have this course at the 200-level.

Prof. Sexton had a final comment regarding library resources. She reminded members that the Sealy library has the only research-level collection in the university and the collection is concentrated on criminal justice and related areas. Especially in hard fiscal times, the library may not have the funds to collect extensively to support courses outside our core mission area of criminal justice. She suggested that, when preparing new courses, faculty carefully check on what is available across CUNY especially now that students can request books to be delivered to John Jay within a few days.

Dean Lopes adjourned the meeting at 12:10 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Katherine Killoran, Executive Academic Director of Undergraduate Studies
The Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee held its meeting on Friday, October 15th, at 9:30 am in Room 610T. Dean Anne Lopes, UCASC Chair, called the meeting to order.


**Absent:** Provost Jane Bowers, Michael Leippe, Dana Tarantino.

**Guests:** David Barnet, Alexa Capeloto, Vielka Holness, Karen Kaplowitz, Kate Szur, Lucia Trimbur, Sumaya Villanueva.

### Administrative Announcements

Dean Lopes reported that the Policy on Extra Credits and Grade Appeals was defeated at the College Council. She explained that the students raised concern about the exclusion of faculty offering extra credit assignments. Dean Lopes suggested that the policy proposal be separated into two proposals. The first dealing with the prohibition of students submitting extra work, after their grades have been submitted, to improve such grades and secondly, prohibiting faculty from offering extra credit work to individual students without making the same opportunities available to everyone in the class. Dean Lopes referred this item back to the Academic Standards Subcommittee.

Dean Lopes reported that the Master plan was unanimously approved at the College Council yesterday. She reminded the group of the five basic tenets of the Master Plan: student success, teaching, research and scholarship, strategic partnerships, and institutional effectiveness. She said that obviously student success and teaching are very important considerations for the UCASC. She explained that as part of the Master Plan, the college is adopting the slogan, “Student Success = Our Success.” There will be a marketing campaign and water bottles and buttons will be distributed and there will be a press conference announcing the new Master Plan on Monday. She urged everyone to attend. She emphasized again how incredibly important issues of retention and student
achievement are for the UCASC and the College and she said she is looking forward to working with everyone on it.

Approval of the minutes of September 24, 2010

A motion was made and seconded to accept the minutes of the UCASC meeting of September 24th.

There were several changes requested. Prof. Sexton asked that the phrase “outside our core mission area of criminal justice” be added to the sentence ending on line 10. This better represents her statement. Virginia Moreno also requested that a sentence be added that points out that departmental academic advisement will be required for students who are attempting a double major.

The committee voted unanimously to approve the minutes with the above changes with twenty-five votes in favor.

Election of 2 UCASC members to Honors Program Faculty Advisory Committee

Dean Lopes requested nominations for two representatives to the Honors Program Faculty Advisory Committee. She explained that faculty of the English and Interdisciplinary Studies Program have already been elected or appointed to the committee so the UCASC must nominate faculty from other disciplines.

Prof. Adams asked Dean Lopes to explain what the advisory committee will do. She said it will help shape the new Honors Program going forward, aid and advise the director (who is currently Prof. Matteson of the English Department), and helps with other kinds of activities such as fund raising, the curriculum, and the development of co-curricular activities using the resources of the city. Dean Lopes explained that the former Steering Committee has been retired, a new director is in place and this advisory committee will now be the faculty body working on the program.

Prof. Carbonell nominated Prof. Kyoo Lee from the Philosophy Department and it was seconded by Prof. Adams. Prof. Kaplowitz explained that the Advisory Committee is populated by the Faculty Senate (elects two representatives), the Council of Chairs (one member) and the UCASC (two 2 representatives). The Honors Program proposal specified that faculty come from a variety of disciplines. Prof. Sexton nominated Prof. Romaniuk from the Political Science Department, he accepted the nomination as did Prof. Lee.

A motion was made and seconded to elect Prof. Lee and Prof. Romaniuk to the Honors Program Advisory Committee. They were elected unanimously with 26 votes in favor.
Old Business

New Course: PHI 3XX Philosophical Modernity

A motion was made and seconded to approve the new course, PHI 3XX Philosophical Modernity.

Prof. Lee summarized the changes to the proposal based on feedback at the last UCASC meeting. The changes included clarifying prerequisites, clarifying the assessment section on the syllabus, adding the primary sources to the reading list on syllabus and adjusting the cell phone policy.

Prof. Peters asked if students had to complete all of the prerequisites. Prof. Lee said they did. She explained that all the philosophy prerequisites are required courses in the core of the proposed major.

The new course, PHI 3XX Philosophical Modernity was approved unanimously with 26 votes in favor.

New Course: PHI 4XX Senior Seminar in Ethics

Prof. Lee again summarized the changes. She pointed out several places where they clarified the place of applied ethics and how it will or will not be incorporated into the course. The syllabus remains essentially the same but the learning objectives were changed slightly. The last bullet point was reworded to incorporate practical knowledge without focusing on it explicitly in the course.

Prof. Adams asked about the topics that were included on pages three and nine of the proposal and pointed out that there was no mention of race or ethnicity. Prof. Lee said that this is a theory course but examples were helpful for students. She selected feminism, etc. but another faculty member could certainly choose other examples. This list of examples does not exclude race and ethnicity and in fact these issues are central to the issues discussed in class. Prof. Adams suggested that it would be politically prudent to include mention of race and ethnicity explicitly especially at a school with a majority of students of color.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the new course, PHI 4XX Senior Seminar in Ethics. It was approved unanimously with 26 votes in favor.

New Course: ACC 2XX Digital Forensics for the Fraud Examiner

Prof. Shapiro pointed out the cover memo which highlights the issues addressed since last reading. He said that minimal mathematical knowledge is needed to succeed in the course so no math was added to the prerequisites. He said it was oriented to be more of a
logical in approach to the kinds of data that can be utilized, how that data can be
organized, and how it is analyzed rather than actual calculations.

As for the ethical issues, Prof. Shapiro said the course definitely addresses issues of
privacy throughout the semester. He acknowledged that, ideally, a lab would have been
nice to have but access to the materials online can suffice. The students can learn a lot
about how a fraud examiner analyzes data. He said the skill is very attractive to have for
the job market.

Prof. Sexton reported that the library now subscribes to the journal that the faculty of
forensic accounting recommended both in print and electronically.

Alandra Mitchell asked if students would be required to use the compact disc that
comes with the textbook for the course. Prof. Shapiro said that students would be at a
disadvantage if they did not acquire the compact disc. He said the it is included with the
textbook for free. Chad Infante suggested adding that information to the syllabus.

Prof. Friedland questioned whether students needed math or computer skills when they
are out in the real world in this field. Prof. Shapiro said of course they do, but they need
basic math and computer literacy. They need to understand the basic math but they use
software to analyze the data. Prof. Friedland said upon reading the title of course one
would assume the content of course would address more math and computer content.
Prof. Shapiro said that math is implicated in everything we do, it is implied. Dean Lopes
said perhaps one issue is the course title; she suggested adding “introduction to” to the
course title.

Prof. Sexton pointed out that the course has not been offered yet, and once it runs, the
faculty always can come back and add prerequisites. She expressed the feeling that they
will not need more math skills. Kathy Killoran added that all students take college
algebra and an applied quantitative course as part of their general education program.
We put incoming freshman into math courses when they arrive so they should have
completed math by the time they are ready to take this course.

Prof. Adams said something was nagging at him that was missing from the course but he
couldn’t tease it out. He said our students do not come in computer literate and they
often have shallow knowledge. He said it seems that there is a rigor or way of thinking
that does not come across in the course. Prof. Shapiro said that would be difficult for him
to address without being stated. He gave several examples of how students interact with
the data in the course. He said students look at a system and what data it does collect and
what it does not. Prof. Adams asked if students would have an understanding of how a
database is put together. Prof. Shapiro said they should. He explained that digital
forensic software organizes data that is not necessarily organized by companies and gave
the example of employee emails.
Prof. Herbert tried to explain using a different example. He said he agreed with Prof. Adams that a higher level of computer knowledge was necessary but not for a course at the 200-level. He would not hold the course back for this issue.

Prof. Sexton suggested a friendly amendment to the proposal and suggested adding an additional learning objective regarding computer knowledge and databases. Prof. Shapiro said he would accept the friendly amendment. Prof. Romaniuk shared Prof. Adam’s point but felt that students would acquire the necessary knowledge throughout the course.

Prof. Kaplowitz pointed out language on the syllabus that said “grammar is not as important as content in the course assignments.” As an English professor she could not let that go. She asked if that could be reworded to emphasize the importance of content without diminishing the importance of good writing. Prof. Shapiro said that would be changed especially since we are trying to enhance our writing across the curriculum.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the new course, ACC 2XX Digital Forensics for the Fraud Examiner. The proposal was approved with 25 votes in favor and 1 abstention.

New Business

Academic Standards Subcommittee

Undergraduate Admissions Standards Report and Proposal 2011-12

Prof. Kaplowitz explained that in order for John Jay to revise the freshman admission policies, the change has to reach CUNY by December 1st of this year. She said that every year the admissions standards must be approved by the College Council before then. In order to make that deadline, the UCASC must vote on this proposal at this meeting. She reminded the Committee that several years ago the College Council voted to phase out associate degrees and raise academic standards each year through the Standards Subcommittee, UCASC and the College Council.

Prof. Kaplowitz asked VP Saulnier to explain the proposal which raises the high school academic average for admission from 79 to 80. VP Saulnier distributed some data based on the Fall 2010 entering class and summarized what we achieved in bringing in our first “all baccalaureate” class. He said it was a huge accomplishment for the College and was proud that we doubled the number of baccalaureate students coming to the College from 2009.

VP Saulnier explained how the admission standards work in conjunction with the College’s budget. It is a delicate balancing act that has to be well thought out although the figures are only our best estimates. CUNY has not allowed the enrollment targets for the College to shrink as we go through this transitional process. He explained that in 2009 we had a freshman class of 2,800. This fall our target was 2,000 but our transfer
admissions target was higher. By necessity, we need to admit some students who are slightly below our admission standard. The Director of Admissions gets to look at students that just barely fall below our standards with two goals in mind. We want to accept the best qualified students but also make our budget targets. It is a very complex issue.

He also explained that in the world of recruitment an increase of one point in high school average to 80 makes a big difference in marketing the College to more qualified students. He said the recruiters report great excitement by prospective students that we have phased out our associate degrees; they project that students will be as excited about the 80 average.

VP Saulnier said we are trending positively but we still need to continue to accept students below our accepted standards to meet enrollment and budget targets. The students who we accept that are below the 80 average will all be skills certified and we will try to be as selective as possible. He explained that we use the high school academic average which includes all the courses we would want coming from high school, it omits classes such as physical education, drivers education, shop, etc.

Prof. Kaplowitz said the proposal from the Standards Subcommittee keeps the SAT score required for admission static (at least 900 verbal & math combined). She said the best predictor of academic success for John Jay has been identified as the high school academic average. She also reminded the committee that it had approved a Standards Subcommittee proposal to establish a Faculty Admissions Committee that looks at all the students who appeal their non-acceptance to the College. She relayed that it has been functioning and approved 19 of the 24 students who appealed last year pointing out that we have systems in place to pay attention to those who apply but are under this proposed average.

Prof. Adams asked if students from different quality high schools universally perform as well. VP Saulnier said yes and he is stunned by that data too. Prof. Adams asked if we break down the GPA by the high school attended. Dean Lopes said there is a fair amount of research that says high school success impacts the first year success in college; it also shows less impact as students proceed from the first year of college to the second year. She pointed out that the general education program is critical in preparing students for success.

Prof. Herbert asked if we weighted AP courses and the like. VP Saulnier said CUNY does not do this; they look at students who demonstrate skills certification by their Regents scores or SAT score then our Admissions Office staff look at their records to make decisions if they fall below the standards. He said that is the sort of thing they would take into consideration.

Prof. Herbert then asked about the GED for admissions. VP Saulnier said that we do accept students with a certain score on the GED exam. The increase of the high school average would impact the necessary score to gain admission.
Prof. Shapiro said he generally likes to know the median as well as the mean. Virginia Moreno asked if we expect students admitted at the lower range of the cohort to have lower retention. VP Saulnier said they looked at this question. He said for students between a 75 and 76 average, the difference was much higher than expected. He said as we approve an average of 80, we will also bump up the average that students have which do not have to go to the appeals committee. Virginia Moreno asked if we should consider providing additional support for these populations.

Dean Lopes added that we are providing additional support to those populations as best as we can afford. Kate Szur also added that we have existing courses that we direct students into that have additional support built into them.

A motion was made and seconded to raise the college academic average for the fall 2011 freshman class from 79 to 80.

Prof. Adams asked if we could get an annual report on students who are admitted below that standard.

VP Saulnier said it is an area that we are enormously interested in and this year for the first time, we will have a group to examine. He agreed to track students and bring a report to the UCASC next fall. Dean Lopes said Undergraduate Studies is looking at targeted interventions for very specific populations to aid their skills development.

Prof. Herbert asked if VP Saulnier would like to add to his motion regarding the willingness of the Admissions Office to look at students with high school averages below 80% in order to meet budget demands. VP Saulnier said it is part of their regular practice in enrollment management to do so; it is not necessary to add such language to the proposal. VP Saulnier said we are maturing as a college incrementally over a period of years, but even Baruch looks at students who fall just below their admission standard. Prof. Adams suggested added a word to modify “admissions standard” since we do admit students below the advertised standard. VP Saulnier said he would accept the phrase “stated admissions standard” instead.

A motion was made and seconded to waive the 2\textsuperscript{nd} reading of the proposal. It was approved with 25 votes in favor and 1 abstention.

A motion was then made and seconded to raise the College’s stated high school academic average for fall 2011 class to 80%. The motion was unanimously approved with 26 votes in favor.

Required GPA in Science & Math for Transfer Forensic Science Students

Prof. Kaplowitz explained that this item would also require a waiver of two reading rule for the same reasons articulated above. She explained the CUNY Justice Academy to the committee which are educational partnerships (joint degrees) we established with all the
CUNY community colleges. She commended David Barnet for his brilliance in creating these proposals. She explained that several of the community colleges have chosen to have these joint degrees in forensic science. As part of the requirements, the joint degrees in forensic science require students to have at least a 2.5 GPA in their science and math courses to qualify to continue their studies at John Jay so they will be successful in earning their degrees. At that time, Prof. Kaplowitz said that President Travis assured our partners that John Jay would have the same standard.

We are soon to start receiving these CUNY Justice Academy students after earning their associates degrees. The Standards Subcommittee thought it time to propose our admission standard for transfer students to the forensic science major.

Prof. Kaplowitz explained that the proposal requires all students who transfer into our forensic science major have at least the same standard as the partnership students. There should be equity among the transfer students so they are all adequately prepared to succeed in the program.

Prof. Friedland explained that she and her department have number of problems with this proposal. She said that the proposal makes some assumptions about homogeneity of the students who transfer in. The proposal does not leave room to examine if the students are all taking the same science courses or if, for example, they took one general education science course and received a poor grade. There is much variety among students who transfer to the program and how many credits they have earned before transferring. Prof. Friedland explained the standards that we use internally to determine if students should be on probation or dismissed from the FOS major. They have two intervention points: approximately after the freshman year and again after the sophomore year. This allows students to amass a good amount of credits and grades upon which to make decisions. This proposal does not seem to allow a process like that.

Prof. Adams asked if it is legal for a major to specify that students must have a 2.5 GPA. He wondered why we do not do that for all majors. He suggested that standards should be similar across the board. Dean Lopes explained that a department can establish an entrance requirement for a major, it is a standard practice.

VP Saulnier added that it is typically done for high demand, high cost majors. He said it is quite common but less so for humanities and social science programs. He said they are usually small and competitive and CUNY does this more than you may think.

Prof. Friedland said her department wants these students to succeed as well and explained that she personally tracks the performance of our native students. She said they have the tools and ways to monitor their performance.

Prof. Kaplowitz said the Standards Subcommittee has an alternate proposal which considers the concerns of the Chair of the Science Department and of Prof. Friedland. She distributed the alternative proposal. She explained that there was a proposal from the Standards Subcommittee last spring regarding this matter and the Science Department
asked that it not be sent forward, that such a proposal should come from the department itself. However, the department has not brought anything forward. She explained that John Jay is expecting 40-50 students next year from the Justice Academy and we would like to have this standard in place before then. Prof. Kaplowitz read the new proposal aloud. The language in this proposal, she explained, allows the Science Department an opportunity to individually examine the transcripts of students who have less than 15 credits in science/math and lower than a 2.5 GPA. Prof. Kaplowitz suggested that this proposal be moved.

Prof. Friedland asked why only less than 15 credits. She pointed out that our internal standard specifies 21 credits. VP Saulnier said that was the specific suggestion of the Science Department Chair, Prof. Carpi. Prof. Friedland said she would argue that the number of credits needs to be equivalent to our standard practice for the native FOS students.

Prof. Carbonell asked for clarification of the language in first paragraph, she wondered if the word “major” should be used in both cases. It was agreed that it would make the language more consistent.

Prof. Adams expressed his discomfort with CUNY’s timetable for admission standards. He said this reeks of needing a second reading. He suggested doing what we can to work the language out, and then circulating it electronically and then voting on it that way. Prof. Kaplowitz said it is not permissible under the open meetings law to vote electronically. Prof. Romaniuk asked if we can vote on it pending language clarification. Prf. Kaplowitz said yes.

Prof. Friedland asked what the mechanism would be for students to automatically be referred to the department by the Admissions Office. She requested that we specify that only science courses transferable to the major be used. VP Saulnier said we can get the University to do the broad brush, but the requirements requested by Prof. Carpi would mean additional work by the Admissions Office staff. They would need to calculate the science/math GPA.

Prof. Sexton asked what happens currently to FOS majors who are dismissed from the major. Prof. Friedland said they usually stay at John Jay and transfer to other majors.

Prof. Kaplowitz said when students transfer in with grades of D or C, for example, they do not have the knowledge to succeed and they are using up their financial aid funds. She expressed her concern about these students.

A motion was made and seconded to suspend the two reading rule. That motion was defeated with 1 vote in favor, 19 opposed, and 5 abstentions.

VP Saulnier asked what the major objections were. Prof. Friedland said if the threshold number of credits were increased from 15 to 21, and if a step-wise scale was used to evaluate transfer students (1st year – 2.0 GPA with at least 21 credits of science/math; 2nd
yr – 2.5 GPA with at least 44 credits) and the provision of referring students who fell below these limits to the Science Department for review was included, her department would be amenable.

VP Saulnier said he could accept the 21 credit threshold and then these students would become part of the cohort that is regularly monitored. He said that if the students who have less than a 2.5 GPA with at least 21 credits of science and math were referred to the department, they could determine who should be admitted so a secondary limit would not be needed. The standard would then be a 2.5 GPA across the board.

Dean Lopes said since this is a different proposal, the committee can vote again to suspend the two reading rule.

Again a motion was made and seconded to suspend the two reading rule for this proposal. This time it passed unanimously with 25 votes in favor.

A motion was then made and seconded to approve the Proposal Regarding Required GPA in Science and Math for Transfer Forensic Science Students. It was unanimously approved with 25 votes in favor.

Educational Partnerships

Letter of Intent for a 2+2/Dual Joint Degree with Queensborough Community College for an A.S. in Accounting for Forensic Accounting/B.S. in Economics (Forensic Financial Analysis track)

David Barnet introduced the Letter of Intent (LOI). He emphasized that this was a letter of intent and not a proposal so there is time to adjust the curriculum if we desire. He explained that the UCASC does not approve the letter of intent but we vote to endorse it. This is actually a Queens Borough Community College document signaling its plan to establish a joint degree with John Jay. Mr. Barnet further explained that this is the third version of the partnership in Accounting for Forensic Accounting. He said it is essentially the same as those that UCASC endorsed earlier.

Prof. Herbert said that it is clear there are some differences from the others. He pointed out that QBCC chose to have students take foreign language at their campus and to lower the number of credits toward the major.

Christopher Infante asked what the differences are between this and the other Justice Academy partnerships. David Barnet answered that this is essentially the same, it is just with another campus. Kathy Killoran pointed out that differences in the general education requirements across the community colleges must be worked into the joint degree programs.

Prof. Romaniuk pointed out that GOV 101 should be changed to POL 101.
Courses Subcommittee (1st readings)

New Course: SOC 2XX Political Imprisonment

Prof. Sexton introduced Prof. Lucia Trimbur to give an overview of the course. She said she has run the class experimentally twice and it has worked very well.

Prof. Perez had three points to address with the proposal. First he questioned the inclusion of the word “political” in the course title, and said he is not sure he sees that articulated in the course description – as opposed to other forms of imprisonment. He expressed the feeling that the course description does not distinguish that or articulate it well. His second point was about the use of case studies. He suggested that Prof. Trimbur may not want to freeze that method permanently into the course description. His third point was the omission of an important case dealing with the imprisonment of Puerto Rican Nationalists.

Prof. Adams acknowledged that this is a wonderful course – “the state is not always your friend” – the word “political” doesn’t always capture it. He suggested that it would be helpful to see more grounding in the theoretical framework as a lens to look at these case studies. He said it doesn’t come across in the proposal as strongly as it needs to.

Prof. Romaniuk pointed out that this course will become part of the International Criminal Justice major and he had received very positive feedback from student who took the course. He also said that as a political scientist, he did not have the same reaction to the word “political” that some others had.

Prof. Carbonell questioned the answer to the information literacy question and asked Prof. Trimbur to explain. She said this is a “close reading” course, the students do not do outside research so it is not necessary to use outside resources. She said there is a tremendous amount of reading in the course.

A committee member asked about the use of the word interdisciplinary in the syllabus description. Would Prof. Trimbur say the course is interdisciplinary or would the faculty have the option to teach it interdisciplinarily?

Dean Lopes said that different typologies are good; we do not necessarily want students to look at issues in the same ways. She said the course uses a historical as well as a political perspective. The course seems to be appropriate at the 200-level. She reviewed that there was theory in week one but subsequently it is not explicit.

Prof. Lee like the Politics of Imprisonment as the title, she referred for instance to Angela Davis, and she expressed the feeling that the course does capture the issue of “political imprisonment” which includes the whole political aspect of imprisonment itself.

Course Revision Proposals
Dean Lopes explained to the committee that the Courses Subcommittee has an inordinate amount of work this year. As a way to expedite the process she proposed putting the course revisions directly onto the UCASC agenda after review by Kathy Killoran and/or Prof. Sexton. Prof. Adams has a problem with this change in procedure, he insisted that a group has to agree that proposals do involve a minor revision, he objects to this change in procedure.

Prof. Sexton explained that in the past revisions have gone to the courses subcommittee and we spend a lot of time on them. Prof. Adams said the subcommittees do not have to get bogged down on this. VP Saulnier suggested that we can rely on the expertise of two experienced members of UCASC.

Prof. Sexton explained that the revisions are seen at UCASC twice, she said it is not an efficient use of subcommittee resources. Prof. Peters suggested that each Courses Subcommittee decide how they want to handle the revisions.

A committee member asked if we had considered having the subcommittees make the final decisions on revisions and not have them come to UCASC at all? This met with disapproval generally. Dean Lopes concluded then that each subcommittee can decide how they will handle course revisions and they will come to the full UCASC for vote.

Course revisions: LIT 300 Text and Context and LIT 305 Foundations of Literature and Law

Prof. Carbonell summarized the changes to LIT 300 and LIT 305. Both revisions involve the same change to the prerequisites. She explained that when students began taking the new English major, a bottleneck started to happen around the requirement that students take at least one “historical topics” course before taking the two courses above. The department examined the performance of the students in the courses, and has decided to adjust the prerequisites for these two courses by dropping the “historical topics” course. Students performed as well without the prerequisite as they did when they had the prerequisite. LIT 260, the prior required course in the core of the major, will continue to be the prerequisite.

Dean Lopes asked if we could dispense with the second reading.

A motion was made and seconded to waive the second reading. It was unanimously approved with 23 votes in favor.

A motion was made to take these course revisions as a block and the committee generally agreed.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the changes to the LIT 300 Text and Context and LIT 305 Foundations of Literature and Law courses and was approved unanimously with 23 votes in favor.
Course revision: ENG 233 Journalism

Prof. Capeloto was present to explain the changes being requested for this course based on the newly approved Journalism Minor. She explained that this course is the first course in the minor and provides an introduction to news writing. She explained that the course title is being changed, the description enhanced and updated, a lab hour is being added and the credits are being increased to four. The course involves students working on stories for potential publication in the student newspaper in the lab portion.

Chad Infante asked if the lab hour would take place in the student newsroom. Prof. Capeloto answered in the affirmative; it would be structured into the course.

Prof. Adams asked where the course addresses the new electronic mediums of communication such as blogs and Twitter. Prof. Capeloto explained that the minor has another course that focuses on digital journalism.

A motion was made and seconded to suspend the second reading of this course revision. The motion was approved unanimously with 24 votes in favor.

A motion was then made to approve the changes to ENG 233 Journalism that were specified. It was approved with 23 votes in favor and one abstention.

Course revision: SOC 201 Urban Sociology: the Study of City Life

Prof. Adamczyk summarized the changes being requested to the course which include a change in the title and an updating of the course description to reflect current times. She said the course will be looking at the Western city in a more global context.

Prof. Adams asked to have that statement clarified as he is not sure that comes across in the course description being proposed. Prof. Romaniuk suggested that the course title could actually be “The Global City.” Others agreed that the focus of the course needs to be clarified. Is this course about Western cities examined in a global context or a course on global cities? They suggested a look at the syllabus would be helpful. Kathy Killoran said one was submitted and could be supplied for the second reading.

A comment was made and agreed to by several members that a course that looks at global cities would be exciting.

A motion was made and seconded to adjourn. It was unanimously acclaimed. The meeting concluded at 12:20 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Katherine Killoran
Executive Academic Director of Undergraduate Studies
The Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee held its meeting on Friday, November 19th, at 9:35 am in Room 610T. Dean Anne Lopes, UCASC Chair, called the meeting to order.


Guests: Jana Arsovska, David Barnet, Alexa Capeloto, Jillian Grose-Fifer, Vielka Holness, Karen Kaplowitz, John Matteson, Richard Ocejo, Staci Strobl, Kate Szur, Sumaya Villanueva.

Administrative Announcements

Dean Anne Lopes reported that all UCASC proposals from last month passed College Council, including the Undergraduate Admissions proposals, three new courses (PHI 3XX Philosophical Modernity, PHI 4XX Senior Seminar in Ethics, ACC Digital Forensics for the Fraud Examiner), and course revisions to LIT 300, LIT 305 and ENG 233.

Dean Lopes announced that the Middle States process for the review of John Jay will be launched at the end of this month. She reminded the group of the extreme importance of Middle States accreditation. The college is currently organizing teams to develop the self-study that will begin next term. During the last Middle States review, two areas of concern arose – General Education and Outcomes Assessment – and the college has been working on these two areas since then.

A steering committee has been developing a draft model for General Education that will be put forward to the faculty this week for feedback. The draft model has already been presented to student government, and the students were excited by it. The steering committee will continue to gather feedback until February, after which a final model will be developed. On the subject of revisions to the General Education model, Prof. Jama
Adams encouraged the committee to emphasize to fellow professors that the faculty must come up with creative answers to questions that will be raised during the General Education reform process. He asked everyone to remember that a change in the status quo is inevitable, and it will be necessary for the faculty to engage in the conversation to steer that change. Dean Lopes agreed with this sentiment, noting that the General Education model must come from the faculty. The model should be embraced by those who will be teaching it. Next month, Prof. Amy Green and other members of that committee will formally present the model to the UCASC.

Dean Lopes announced that Faculty Development Day will be on January 26. This date was corrected after the end of the UCASC meeting in an e-mail message, which confirmed that the correct date for Faculty Development Day will be on January 27.

Faculty Development Day is now shared between the Faculty Senate and the Provost's Office. Prof. Karen Kaplowitz and Asst. Provost Jim Llana are planning the workshops for the day. Prof. Kaplowitz is eager to hear any ideas the committee may have about the day's events.

Approval of the minutes of October 15, 2010

A motion was made and seconded to consider the minutes of the UCASC meeting of October 15th.

Prof. Romaniuk asked that the word “course” be changed to “major” on page 5, line 9. Prof. Peters asked that the name “Christopher Infante” be corrected to “Chad Infante” on page 10, line 39.

The committee voted unanimously to approve the minutes with the above changes with 20 votes in favor.

Old Business

Educational Partnerships

Letter of Intent for a 2+2/Dual Joint Degree with Queensborough Community College for an A.S. in Accounting for Forensic Accounting/B.S. in Economics (Forensic Financial Analysis track)

David Barnet presented a second reading of the Letter of Intent (LOI) with revisions based on the last UCASC meeting. David Barnet noted that there is no formal governance role for John Jay in the LOI process, but the letter is presented to the UCASC for inspection and endorsement. In response to the UCASC's feedback, the subcommittee has added LIT 230 and LIT 233 to the course requirements and revised GOV 101 to read POL 101. He said there is still an opportunity to communicate changes back to Queensborough.
Prof. Adams asked where students get exposure to ethics and diversity. David Barnet said that those areas are engaged on a course level basis, and the courses at Queensborough and John Jay have been scrutinized by the subcommittee.

*A motion was made and seconded to endorse the Joint Degree with Queensborough Community College in Accounting for Forensic Accounting/Economics. The Letter of Intent was endorsed with 19 votes in favor and one abstention.*

**Academic Standards (2nd Readings)**

**Forgiveness Policy (now changed to Second Chance Policy)**

Prof. Kaplowitz brought forward the second reading, explaining that the policy has been renamed to change the tone of the name to a more positive one. She summarized the memo, which proposes allowing students who are dismissed from John Jay for poor academic performance to return to John Jay with 0.0 GPA if they have successfully completed an Associate Degree in one of our joint Justice Academy Programs with at least a 2.5 GPA rather than returning to the poor GPA that caused them to leave John Jay in the first place. Currently, without this policy, many returning students cannot get out of academic probation because transfer grades are wiped out when they re-enroll at John Jay, and they are returned to their original low GPA. This makes it difficult for students whose first choice is John Jay College to return to John Jay after improving their standing at community colleges and works against the mission of the Justice Academy Programs, which were designed to maintain access to John Jay’s programs. It also works against the advice we give to students who are dismissed to transfer to community colleges to rebuild their academic records.

Prof. Kaplowitz noted that in the first reading of this proposal, members of this committee thought the offer should be extended to all community colleges. The subcommittee did research that idea, and found that there are almost no Second Chance Policies at CUNY schools to begin with, and the proposed policy is already particularly generous. The subcommittee felt that we should only offer this policy for the 2+2 programs because our faculty have been involved in the design and oversight of those programs, and the syllabi have been examined, so it can be assumed that students have met certain standards appropriate to reentry at John Jay.

*A motion was made and seconded to discuss the Second Chance Policy.*

Prof. Adams commended the committee on its work, but said that he is still not clear on why the population of students who enroll at John Jay from junior colleges should be split into groups who receive separate treatment. V.P. Richard Saulnier answered that the question was raised when JJ dismissed students became part of Justice Academy programs (since 2008), and John Jay's answer to that question was to encourage community college students in such a position not to enroll at John Jay so they could experience greater success elsewhere, where they would start with a clean 0.0 GPA.
However, John Jay has an extraordinarily high percentage of students for whom John Jay College is the first choice. For those students who want to come back, the Justice Academy should be a natural conduit to allow them to come back. Since this is a new program and there is nothing similar to it within CUNY, the subcommittee wanted to focus it on our partnerships.

Prof. Michael Puls noted that it is an issue of consistency, pointing out the rationale used for the subsequent proposal to be discussed - that a professor cannot offer extra credit to a few students without offering it to the whole class. Prof. Kaplowitz answered that many students who go to a Justice Academy can only come back to John Jay because of the discipline studied. The policy is not meant to discriminate against other students, it's meant to acknowledge that if John Jay is the only school a student can return to because of the specific major or program, then that student should receive a second chance. Prof. Judy-Lynne Peters said that if the student is studying a discipline unique to John Jay and the Justice Academy, then the student needs to be able to come back. However, if that student is studying English or something else, that path back to John Jay is not available, and this is problematic.

Prof. Victor Herbert said that while the policy is not a perfect solution, it does seem like a good first step. He noted that the CUNY policy overall does appear to be punitive, and asked that this be looked at in a separate discussion. Prof. Amy Adamczyk noted that the subcommittee plans to keep a close eye on how this proposal plays out over the next few years, emphasizing that this is a first effort to address an acknowledged problem.

Prof. Adams reiterated that the proposal seems needlessly exclusive, and said that John Jay should grab any opportunity it can to influence how students think about justice, whether they're in English or other disciplines.

David Barnet said that there is a 2.5 GPA requirement for math and science courses already, and does not want this to be confused when this new policy is communicated to students.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the Second Chance Policy. It was approved with 16 votes in favor and four abstentions.

Prof. Adams moved that this policy go on the agenda to be reviewed in a year.

Extra Work during the Semester

Prof. Kaplowitz explained that the policy on Grade Changes and Extra Credit approved last year by UCASC but defeated at the College Council has been rewritten and broken into two separate proposals. This is the first part to be addressed. The proposal has been adjusted to to address the issue of our student’s special circumstances (such as missing an assignment) and giving them a chance to make up the work missed by doing a substitute
assignment. The change addresses concerns from the first reading that the extra credit policy restricts a professor's ability to be flexible.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the extra wording in the proposed policy regarding Extra Work during the Semester.

Christopher Sui asked what the rationale is behind offering extra credit to individual students. Prof. Adams said that we receive constant appeals from students when they are failing, and it helps to have a policy in place. Prof. Adams asked that the agenda note that this should policy also should be reviewed in a year.

Prof. David Shapiro asked why we make substitute work discretionary when it seemed as though substitute work should be of the same nature as extra credit. Prof. Adams felt that this distinction was built into the motion. Dean Lopes asked if language regarding substitute work should be added to the wording of the policy. Prof. Kaplowitz said that substitute work is for individual circumstances and so cannot be codified. She cited an example of a professor who created an assignment for a student who was called to Afghanistan during the last two weeks of the semester. Prof. Kaplowitz emphasized that the language of the policy needs to be flexible to address the idiosyncratic needs of each situation.

Prof. Ben Lapidus asked if this policy goes into the syllabus and student bulletin. He doesn't offer extra credit in his class. Prof. Kaplowitz suggested adding a sentence to the proposal to read, “There is no obligation on the part of any instructor to offer extra credit course work in any course.”

A motion was made and seconded to approve the proposed policy regarding Extra Work During the Semester with the new wording. It was approved unanimously with 20 votes in favor.

Dean Lopes asked the group to discuss the point Prof. Shapiro raised about substitute work. Prof. Shapiro said that by allowing substitute work to be discretionary, there is a risk of abuse. Professors have a great deal of flexibility to adapt to students with genuine emergencies, but they also may extend that flexibility to students who find the elements of basic work too difficult or burdensome. With this in mind, Dean Lopes clarified that substitute work is indeed a separate issue from extra work and should be referred to the Standards Subcommittee for discussion.

Courses (2nd readings)

New Course: SOC 2XX Political Imprisonment

Prof. Adamczyk presented the new Sociology course in Prof. Lucia Trimbur's absence. She summarized the revisions Prof. Trimbur made to the proposal based on feedback from the first reading, including a theoretical overview and rewording of the course.
description so that it does not set in stone the exact case studies that will be studied in the course.

Prof. Adams asked if the inclusion of the term “health quarantine” fit under the umbrella of political confinement. Dean Lopes said that health quarantines are extremely political actions and mentioned a few examples of the United States government using health scares to move against homosexuals or prostitutes.

Prof. Ellen Sexton pointed out a typo on page 11, in the item next to the date October 13, 18, “bierarchies” should be corrected to “hierarchies.”

Prof. Lapidus said that we should serve the Latina/o communities in our courses. His students have had connections to regimes as victims and as perpetrators. He asked if there is a way to include something from this region of the world in the course that would speak to the personal experience of students at our institution. Dean Lopes agreed and pointed out that 45% of John Jay students are Hispanic. Prof. Adamczyk said that Prof. Trimbur had heard these concerns in the last meeting, and was taking them into consideration, as referenced in Prof. Trimbur's memo about her revisions to the proposal. Prof. Trimbur did not provide specific case studies in the course description because she wanted to leave flexibility for the individual professor teaching the course.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the new course, SOC 2XX Political Imprisonment. The new course, SOC 2XX Political Imprisonment was approved unanimously with 20 votes in favor.

Course revision: SOC 201 Urban Sociology: the Study of City Life

Prof. Richard Ocejo introduced the course proposal with revisions based on the feedback from the first reading about the range and focus of the course. The department curriculum committee determined that the course would be about Western cities within a global context, but with an open description that allows individual professors to address developing cities at their own discretion. The language of the course proposal has been altered to confirm that focus and allow for the distinction.

Prof. Sexton asked where question number five on the proposal form was, and Kathy Killoran noted that a page was missing from the packets distributed to the committee. It was a printing error, not an omission in the proposal.

Dean Lopes pointed out that learning outcomes need to be included on the syllabus right up front, after the description, especially with the upcoming Middle States review.
Prof. Adams thought certain language (page 2, 8a) still locked the course into studying mostly Western cities and felt this should be made clear in the title if it was the case. Prof. Ocejo felt that including the adjective “Western” in the title would limit the scope of the course and eliminate the openness in the description that does allow a professor to bring a variety of cities into the discussion at his or her own discretion.

Prof. Leippe said that the revision seems to change the course substantially from the original, and asked if this is genuinely a revision or a new course. He asked how much material from the study of urban life would make it into this new course, and said that it seems to be jettisoning old material from the curriculum. Prof. Ocejo said he based the revision on how he teaches the course.

Chad Infante said that he is not sure how many students read the course description when they sign up for a course, so Prof. Adams has a point about the title. Based on the current title, Chad would not expect to study only Western cities.

A motion was made and seconded to approve SOC 201.

Prof. Sexton proposed adding a friendly amendment to the course, and the discussion over the need for the word “Western” in the title was revisited.

A motion was made and seconded to withdraw the motion to vote. The motion to withdraw the motion to vote for SOC 201 at this time was approved with 18 votes in favor and two opposed.

Prof. Adams said the simplest thing for the students would be to include the word in the title, but Prof. Ocejo felt that including the word “Western” in the title would cut off the opportunity for individual professors to include developing cities in the course. Prof. Carbonell felt that the revised course description really does put Western cities first. Prof. Kyoo Lee suggested recasting the question by finding a more inclusive term than “western” or “developing,” and suggested using the world “metropolis” or “metropolitan” that would eliminate the links between terms like “developed” or “undeveloped” and geography, allowing the class to keep a global scope if the professor desired.

Prof. Dana Tarantino asked if there is a course on Non-Western cities. Prof. Ocejo responded that there was not. Prof. Peter Romaniuk suggested recasting the language as “Western and Non-Western cities at all/different stages of development.” Prof. Ocejo said he would rethink the course and bring it back. Prof. Adams said if the intent of the professor was to examine Western cities, it is not a problem but if this is the only course on cities that the department offers, it may want to reconsider what they really want.
New Business

The agenda was adjusted to consider the standards proposals before the Honors Program resolution since Prof. Kaplowitz had to attend another meeting. There were no objections.

Academic Standards Subcommittee (1st readings)

Proposal on Rescission of the College’s Policy on APA Documentation

Prof. Kaplowitz reported that since the 1980s, the college has had a policy that only the American Psychological Association (APA) method of documentation may be taught and accepted by John Jay faculty. The policy is out of date now that John Jay has humanities and other liberal arts programs again. Often, professors are unaware of the policy or ignore it on purpose. The Faculty Senate discussed this last spring and felt that either we should not have a policy, or if we do, it should be enforced. In May, the Faculty Senate voted to recommend to UCASC that the current policy requiring college-wide use of the APA method be rescinded. The Academic Standards Subcommittee recommends that professors use a method appropriate to their discipline, listing that method on the syllabus. The subcommittee also recommends that the Library carry links to all appropriate methods.

Prof. Sexton raised concern about how many guidelines the students will need to know. She felt that students will come to the library too concerned about the mechanical details of each method without understanding why the method matters. Prof. Carbonell agreed.

Prof. John Matteson said that he was delighted with the proposal but wondered how it would be dealt with in courses that do writing across the curriculum or are taught interdisciplinarily. He hoped that faculty would not cal for a different method for each subject within one course, and asked how a syllabus for this sort of course should address this hybrid question. Prof. Kaplowitz said that the syllabus should address that explicitly, and the change in policy is simply to put this at professor's discretion where it was not before.

Prof. Adams noted that the discretion is important especially since there are six or seven frequently used ones.

Kathy Killoran said that she supports this proposal in spirit, but emphasized that it is necessary to educate students on why the method matters. She asked if John Jay could encourage faculty to use one of the major documentation styles. Prof. Peters also worried about students working in various classes across departments who may learn the mechanics of various methods by rote without understanding the importance of citation.

Prof. Herbert raised the concern that this puts a burden on the professor to understand methods outside of his or her own discipline.
Christopher Sui said that from a student perspective, there is very real confusion when learning APA upon entering the college and then entering a major such as Justice Studies and having to learn MLA. Students need a clear understanding by the second term of the freshman year which style is required by major. Alandra Mitchell pointed out that if faculty have their own discretion, she could be forced to learn a different style for every class.

Dean Lopes said that at other institutions, students learn one style in a comp course, and are exposed to other styles there. She said that hopefully in the new General Education model, there would be scaffolding around skills like this that are appropriate to an undergraduate degree.

Prof. Sexton asked if there should be departmental policies for style. Prof. Herbert pointed out that this would be a vote against the proposal, which encourages rescinding policy altogether to leave the choice to individual professors, not departments. Prof. Peters said she would go to her department and recommend that a particular format be adopted at the departmental level.

**Proposal to Revise the College’s Incomplete Grades Policy**

Prof. Kaplowitz explained that this is a revised version of a proposal that was met with opposition at the Faculty Senate last semester and withdrawn. The Standards Committee has rewritten this proposal with enough changes to make it a first reading. She explained the underlined portions of the proposal, which were added as a result of faculty concerns that the former proposal was placing unrealistic requirements on professors. Several requirements of student actions were removed from the proposal, giving more discretion to the professor as to when to offer an incomplete grade, allowing the professor to select “I” from a drop-down menu. The proposal still requires a professor to fill out a box when submitting online grades and to contact the chair in writing with information about which assignments are missing and how they may be made up.

Prof. Adams agreed with the spirit of this proposal but was bothered by the legalization of certain expectations in paragraph three, which uses the term “must,” binding professors into certain actions. He also disagrees with the timeline that requires the Incomplete grade to be resolved by the third week of the following semester.

Prof. Leippe agreed, observing that the proposal seems to create a lot of busy work for the professor. He pointed out that the proposal doesn't take into account practical considerations of the way professors weigh grades. He did not see why the drop-down menu online was necessary. He asked how professors with sections as large as 150 students would manage this amount of clerical work.

Dean Lopes suggest that the Standards Subcommittee think further about the wording of this proposal.
Kathy Killoran reminded the group that this proposal comes forward in response to an observed student need. Students are often confused about how to make up incomplete grades, and with adjunct turnover and retiring professors, sometimes there is no clear process to clear up those Incompletes. Sumaya Villanueva agreed with Kathy Killoran, stating that she sees many students in Academic Advisement who have trouble negotiating this messy process. Professors give students Incompletes to be helpful, students are unaware, and they end up with Fs anyway.

Prof. Adams said that this should be dealt with at the departmental level, rather than by creating more steps in the online grading system.

Chad Infante asked what is wrong with the current policy. Prof. Kaplowitz explained that the current policy does not delineate when professors should fail students and when they should give Incompletes for unfinished work. Also, there is no channel for communicating what is required to complete an Incomplete. She said that students tend to wait until the deadline, and by that time they are unable to do the work. The proposed change would shorten the timeline, but would also allow the professor the option to extend that deadline. She emphasized that the shorter timeline is meant to be student-friendly, and that providing too much time can be a disincentive to completion, causing students’ INCs to change to Fs and putting them into academic probation.

Dean Lopes said that further questions can be addressed to herself and to Prof. Kaplowitz.

**Eligibility Requirements of Transfer Students for Graduation Awards, etc.**

Prof. Kaplowitz explained that currently only grades earned at John Jay are counted towards graduation awards, Latin honors, and so forth. Students who come to John Jay mid-career do not have grades from other institutions counted, whereas students who spend a whole career at John Jay see all of their grades counted toward graduation honors. It is commonly understood that first year students have a more difficult time than juniors or seniors because they just beginning to adjust to college demands, so a student who enters John Jay as a freshman is at a disadvantage when it comes to awards at graduation. As a result, our valedictorian and salutatorian are almost always transfer students. These honors should be for an entire academic career. The proposal would leave transfer grades out of a student’s regular GPA, but would calculate a student’s cumulative GPA based on their entire academic history when identifying students for the specified academic awards. The proposal levels the playing field and consequently communicates more accurately to employers when students achieve these honors.

Prof. Shapiro wanted to know how this affects the Second Chance Policy discussed earlier in the meeting. Prof. Kaplowitz said that the record is never expunged.
Prof. Leippe said that his experience is the opposite of what's observed in the proposal. To him, the more typical situation is that students receive higher grades at their community colleges then they do when they get to John Jay. He raised concern that the proposal might cause a number of students to graduate with Latin honors who never would have earned those honors if they hadn't started at a community college where they got higher grades. Prof. Kaplowitz said that students may have trouble when they get to John Jay because they are now in higher level courses, whereas they were in General Education courses at the community college.

V.P. Saulnier said that in the last five or six years, only one of our homegrown students was valedictorian or salutatorian. He said that only 58 credits are needed to qualify for Latin honors and emphasized that the current requirement is very unbalanced. He said that there is a survey underway to see how other CUNY schools count transfer students' grades, and he'll have more information for the committee at the next meeting.

**Honors Program**

**Request to Extend Resolution to Amend the Curricular Plan for the Honors Program**

Prof. Matteson began with a brief mention of new courses the Honors Program will be presenting to the UCASC at a future meeting, and then introduced his request that last year's resolution to amend the honors curriculum be extended to 2012. He reminded the UCASC that the program had to be modified to include students majoring in forensic science. He explained that revising the current honors curriculum would be fruitless given the pending revisions of the General Education program and the likely admission of John Jay’s Honors Program to the CUNY Honors College, which will have its own curricular specifications that the John Jay Honors Program will need to adopt at that time.

Prof. Adams asked if the Honors Program intends to grow and change to include sciences and social sciences. Dean Lopes pointed out that one of the new courses to be presented to the committee soon is an Anthropology course. Prof. Adams expressed concern about the continued extension. Dean Lopes emphasized the importance of waiting until we have joined the CUNY Honors Program, because once that happens; CUNY will pay for the program Honors Program. She also reiterated that John Jay is in the midst of General Education reform, which means that any changes made to the honors program now will have to be revisited as soon as that reform is rolled out. Prof. Adams was concerned that the honors program has never presented a clear curriculum to UCASC and is operating without scrutiny.

Prof. Lapidus agreed with both points, that changes to the honors program depend on changes to the General Education curriculum, and also that the deadline cannot continue to be extended indefinitely. Prof. Lapidus proposed that if the resolution is extended today, it must be made clear that it cannot be extended further after another year. Prof. Matteson made the point that the Honors Program was presented with a four-year
mandate that is being addressed in a careful and deliberate manner, and the extensions do not reflect a lack of commitment. Prof. Carbonell noted that the amendment to the Honors Program was approved last year for very urgent and practical reasons. She had no critiques of the program, but she wanted to echo Prof. Lapidus's feeling that after next year there cannot be any more extensions.

Dean Lopes clarified that the timeline might be less than a year or more than a year, but that it depends upon the resolution of the general education curriculum and admission to the CUNY Honors College.

Prof. Adams proposed a friendly amendment that this should come up for an update in May and in December. Dean Lopes agreed and stated that further feedback could be directed to herself and Prof. Matteson.

Courses Subcommittee (1st Readings)

Course revision: MUS 202 Compositional Techniques

Prof. Sexton explained that this is a change in the title of the course from “Compositional Techniques” to “Songwriting” to make the substance of the course more transparent to students. The course description has grammatical changes.

Prof. Adams asked about the scope of terms like “basic harmony techniques,” questioning whether the course takes a specifically Western approach to composition without acknowledging that specificity of scope in the description. Prof. Sexton clarified that the revision in question is a change to the title. Prof. Tarantino asked if this committee examines the content of a course when a title change is brought forward. Dean Lopes confirmed that the course content has already been reviewed and the committee should only give feedback on the title change.

Prof. Lapidus explained the background for the change in course title. It's a workshop-driven class whose scope depends greatly on what the students bring into the room, and the new title is meant to be more straightforward to reflect that. Students can bring any musical tradition to their work.

Prof. Tarantino asked if the new title might lead students to think it's a lyric-writing class. Prof. Lapidus said the prerequisite requires Music 102, which means students will have to have a music foundation to enroll. Prof. Adams said that the formal understanding of music required to take the class does not take certain cultures into account, stating that the title change presents a larger issue than a simple word change. Prof. Lapidus said that there are many ways to teach this class, and students bring their varying backgrounds into the classroom, citing past examples such as Senegalese Praise Singing techniques and North African Popular Song in student work. He said that if a student wants to work in a particular genre, then the class allows for that.
Dean Lopes said that further feedback should focus on the title change and can be relayed to Prof. Lapidus.

**New Course: SOC 2XX Sociology of Human Rights**

Prof. Sexton introduced Prof. Jana Arsovska to give an overview of the course, explaining that there is a preexisting POL 320 course but the professors have talked, and the courses are quite different, and even complementary. A number of departments want to adopt this course proposal as part of their majors and minors. Prof. Arsovska also explained that John Jay only has one course that focuses on gross violations of human rights at the moment, so the college is lacking in more sociological courses on human rights. This course would be a needed addition to the curriculum.

Chad Infante said that the course assumes universal human rights, which is a Western concept. He asked how the course would study human rights in a global context without villainizing Non-Western cultures. Prof. Arsovska replied that this is exactly what the course would examine, since it would be a discussion of the very basic definition of fundamental human rights with cultural perspectives that would let students contribute their own perspectives.

Prof. Carbonell agreed that this is a very important course. She encouraged Prof. Arsovska to work on the course description to clarify discipline terms that students outside the field might not fully understand.

Prof. Adams added to the question of cultural perspectives in the course, expressing that many cultures feel that they are not heard on the subject of human rights. He noted that it would be important for a class like this to hear from people on the ground in these countries. For example, Saudi women have very clear voices on the subject, and these voices need to be privileged more in a discussion about global human rights. He also had questions about the language concerning assignments in the proposal, noting that the course does have a considerable content demand, but there is also a need for student critique of the understood material. Prof. Adamczyk in responding to another question about basic principles of sociology, pointed out that SOC 101 is a prerequisite for this class, so some of the basic concepts are addressed there. Dean Lopes also pointed out that they are addressed in the first two weeks of the course while examining the course calendar.

**New Course: PSY 3XX Brain and Behavior**

Kathy Killoran introduced Prof. Jillian Grose-Fifer to summarize the proposal. Prof. Grose-Fifer explained that the Psychology Department does not have any courses that look at the biological bases for behavior at the moment. The new course would address basic physiology and how it relates to behavior.
Prof. Adams was concerned that course proposals are coming in before the revised psychology major is presented, and a clear picture of the direction of psychology at John Jay is unavailable. He felt that the course presents a narrow view of the topic, teaching a classical understanding of the underlying physiology without covering culture. Prof. Leippe clarified that these course proposals are independent of the revision of the psychology major. He said that this is a basic course offered in psychology departments across the country.

Prof. Sexton commended the Psychology Department for bringing this course forward, and noted that it was shocking that it was not already included in John Jay's offerings. Prof. Adams pointed out an item on page two that states that the course evolved out of the Psychology Department's revision of the major in order to satisfy national standards.

Prof. Grose-Fifer responded that any undergraduate institution would be expected to have this class and it is a significant problem that John Jay doesn't yet offer it. Prof. Adams said that the appeal to the national standard is unconvincing when the national standard in a discipline has a long history of ignoring culture.

**New Course: PSY 3XX Perception**

Kathy Killoran introduced Prof. Grose-Fifer to give an overview of the course. Kathy Killoran noted that the subcommittee did have a discussion about cultural content, and Prof. Grose-Fifer added a sentence at the end of the course description regarding culture in response to the subcommittee's feedback and already had a learning objective addressing it.

Prof. Grose-Fifer summarized this as a course that follows on from the prior course and is about how the brain interprets sensory information. She acknowledged that the course does have a very Western point of view due to the available research, but new research is emerging now that can be incorporated into the course and throughout the curriculum. For example, the traditional model for studying language was developed by study of monolingual, often English, speakers. Now, there is a better idea about what happens in bilingual or multilingual speakers, which better represents the workings of language in brains across the globe. The field is moving in this direction, Prof. Grose-Fifer said.

**New Course: ENG 2XX Journalism in the 21st Century**

Prof. Sexton introduced Prof. Alexa Capeloto and her course on journalism but said it is really a media literacy course. She noted that the Communications and Theatre Arts Department has another course taught by Lyell Davies that is complementary to this one. Prof. Sexton expressed that she is excited by this course, feeling that it is important for students to learn how to think about the information they are exposed to every day.
Prof. Capeloto explained that this is the first of the courses designed to be included in the new Journalism Minor that was approved by the College Council in April. Countering the traditional how-to approach of journalism courses, this course would take a more analytical look at the industry necessary for this point in history. The course approaches student experiences both as potential producers of journalism and as consumers of journalism, examining how they should process information in this day and age.

Prof. Romaniuk asked whether the statement in the course description being part of the Journalism Minor was appropriate. Prof. Capeloto said she could move it to the rationale.

Prof. Adams wanted to know if the course was a study of journalism in democracies. He asked how the course would engage students in discussion of a place like China that is not a democracy. He questioned the language that begins “in the industrial age” and asked for clarification in the course description of what parts of the world this course would engage.

Prof. Capeloto said that one cannot have a conversation about press in a democracy without talking about what press is like without a democracy. The class looks at the Worldwide Press Freedom Index, discussing the top of the list, the bottom, the middle and why countries received those ratings. The class discusses how libel law varies from country to country. She said that the focus of the course is intended to be the U.S. media but she thought Prof. Adams comments were fair. Prof. Adams asked that the language in the course description be narrowed and specified.

New Course: PHI 3XX Existentialism

Prof. Sexton introduced Prof. Lee to present the new course in Prof. John Pittman's place. Prof. Lee reminded the committee of the structure of the proposed Philosophy Major and explained that this course has been created to complement the Philosophical Modernity course approved at the last meeting. This course will serve as a critique course; it will bring attention to the sociopolitical aspect of philosophy in addition to the usual focus on individuals and freedom. She noted that there is a typo on page 2 - “wordly” should be “worldly.”

Prof. Adams asked for a definition of the word “throwness.” Prof. Lee explained that this is a term invented by Heidegger to express how one finds oneself thrown into a situation. It's something that one projects and something that happens to a person, a notion that universalist philosophy has not quite recognized, so the Philosophy Department wanted to highlight it here. Where standard and established ways of approaching philosophy examine the individual using oneself as a mirror, this course seeks to contextualize the question of the individual.

No further comments were made. Dean Lopes said that feedback may be directed to Prof. Pittman.
New Course: PHI 3XX Ancient Chinese Philosophy

Prof. Sexton asked if the title is meant to be “Ancient” or “Classical.” Prof. Lee indicated that “classical” should be used.

Prof. Lee introduced the new course, explaining that the department wants to use this course as a critical response to Western paradigms. By studying philosophy from a different paradigm, period, language, students can gain a new point of view on the dominant philosophy perspective. She emphasized that it is key that this course should be placed within the philosophy curriculum, rather than added to it. Also, the course would introduce original languages and texts as a way of helping students familiarize themselves with other traditions rather than relying solely on translations. Prof. Adams commended the Philosophy Department for inclusiveness, especially in regards to the point about placing the course within the department's core rather than adding-it-on.

A motion was made and seconded to adjourn. It was unanimously acclaimed. The meeting concluded at 12:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah Hammond, Scribe
Katherine Killoran, Executive Academic Director of Undergraduate Studies
Minutes of December 10, 2010

The Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee held its meeting on Friday, December 10th, at 9:33 am in Room 610T. Dean Anne Lopes, UCASC Chair, called the meeting to order.

Present: Amy Adamczyk, C. Jama Adams, Bettina Carbonell, Clara Castro-Ponce, Sarah Hammond, Victor Herbert, Chad Infante, Kathy Killoran, Ben Lapidus, Susan Larkin, Kyoo Lee, Michael Leippe, MaryAnn McClure, Alandra Mitchell, Virginia Moreno, Judy-Lynne Peters, Michael Puls, Peter Romaniuk, Ellen Sexton, David Shapiro, Monika Son, Christopher Sui, Hung-En Sung, Dana Tarantino.


Guests: Valerie Allen, Jana Arsovska, Andrea Balis, Alexa Capeloto, Anthony Carpi, Angela Crossman, Jillian Grose-Fifer, Elizabeth Hegeman, William Heffernan, Peter Mameli, Kate Szur, Margaret Tabb.

Administrative Announcements

Dean Anne Lopes began by noting that a Faculty Senate meeting was being held on the same morning and thanked the members with dual responsibilities at UCASC and the Senate for attending both meetings.

Dean Lopes reported on the college’s delegation to the Middle States conference earlier in the week. Hearing presentations by colleges who have not done well in the accreditation process reinforced to her the importance of the Middle States call for a culture of self-examination. The Federal Department of Education is setting ever tighter guidelines for Title 4 funding, and Middle States has matched those guidelines with greater and greater emphasis on outcomes assessment. Progress is not enough. To move forward, a college must have evidence, both on the institutional level and on the course level. John Jay has been taking crucial steps to meet these standards, including the curriculum mapping that departments have been doing. Dean Lopes encouraged the committee to address questions about the conference to Virginia Moreno and Associate Provost Jim Llana. She urged departments to do everything they can for this process, stressing how critical it is for John Jay as an institution.
Dean Lopes distributed a list of people who have worked on the General Education Reform Steering Committee, and commended that group for their remarkable collaboration, asking UCASC to thank these people in person for doing the work of the institution to establish the best General Education program possible for the students.

Chad Infante announced that the John Jay Debate Society will be hosting a nationwide tournament on campus on January 29th and 30th. This is the first time John Jay will host the tournament. He asked for Faculty support and invited everyone to attend.

Dean Lopes introduced a memo from President Jeremy Travis announcing that Provost Jane Bowers is leaving the UCASC committee and will be replaced by Dean Lopes as chair, with Kathy Killoran joining the committee as a member. Professor Jama Adams asked if Provost Bowers would be ex-officio, and Dean Lopes confirmed that she would not. Dean Lopes noted that Kathy Killoran has been organizing the nuts and bolts of the work of this committee, and she will now be a voting member. Dean Lopes was proud that Kathy Killoran's work for the committee is being recognized.

Approval of the minutes of November 19, 2010

A motion was made and seconded to consider the minutes of the UCASC meeting of November 19th.

Professor Ben Lapidus asked that a correction be made to the examples he cited on page, changing the term “Senagalese” to “Senegambian,” and clarifying that his examples of subjects that can be taught in the Songwriting class were hypothetical, not real past examples.

The committee voted unanimously to approve the minutes with the above changes with 20 votes in favor.

New Business

The agenda was adjusted to consider the Criminal Justice BA course early because Professor William Heffernan would have to leave the meeting early to administer the Criminal Justice M.A. Comprehensive Exam. There were no objections.

Courses Subcommittee

New Course: CJBA 1XX Dimensions of Justice (1st reading)

Professor Ellen Sexton introduced the course as one of the first coming through for the new proposed BA in Criminal Justice. As a point on form, she noted that the document presented used an old template, so the description was under question four and the
objectives could be found on the second page. She said that the Courses Subcommittee likes the course, finding it wonderfully placed at the freshman level.

Prof. Heffernan explained that this course is intended to be the second course in the core sequence for the new Criminal Justice BA. The major would begin with a year-long course that provides an overview of criminal justice issues, CRJ 1XX, Major Problems in Criminal Justice I & II, and Dimensions in Justice would follow up as a second-semester freshman course with justice reasoning as its prime concern. The secondary concern of the course would involve readings on justice from Aristotle and Aeschylus to the modern era, but he stressed that the course is not meant to be a history course. The focus of the course will be to acquaint students with justice and reasoning and the ongoing discussion in our society about justice.

Professor Amy Adamczyk expressed concern from the Sociology Department that they already offer justice-related courses very similar to the proposed course. Some Sociology professors had objections to the title, and Prof. Adamczyk suggested changing the name to “Philosophy of Justice” or “Classical Interpretations of Justice.” She asked if Prof. Heffernan had already spoken to anybody in Sociology. Prof. Heffernan responded that he had spoken with Professor Bettina Carbonell in English about potential overlap but had not contacted any Sociology professors. On the point about the title, he said that “classical” would not be appropriate, as the course will be very much about modern debates on justice, and “philosophy” would not accurately capture the mid-range content of the course either. He felt that the course fundamentally differed from Sociology and hoped that a look at the course description would reveal that.

Dean Lopes clarified a point of order that the purpose of the first reading is to invite feedback but not to debate.

Professor David Shapiro pointed out the concept of procedural justice on Page 3, Paragraph D, and asked if the intent is to discuss more than just procedural justice but to discuss substantive justice as well. Prof. Heffernan confirmed that this is the intent of the course.

Prof. Carbonell pointed out that there are no prerequisites on the proposal and Prof. Heffernan said that he should have included them. Kathy Killoran said that he needs to include CJBA1XX and the title of the first course (Major Problems in Criminal Justice I).

Prof. Adams complimented the course, then expressed concern about the steep vocabulary and conceptual curve, wondering if the course is appropriate for freshman. Prof. Heffernan said that the idea is to teach the course with thought experiments, so that the students become acquainted with the material through examples. He said the course would be modeled after Plato, who introduced concepts by beginning with stories.

Prof. Adams asked that the attendance and makeup policy could be amended to include “reasonable excuses” because not all of the John Jay population has easy access to doctors' notes.
Prof. Adamczyk reiterated her question about the title, clarifying that the current title is a problem for the Sociology Department even if it best describes the material in the course. Prof. Adams added to that point that he was not sure how the current title is justified by the description.

Prof. Victor Herbert raised concern about mentioning the *Merchant of Venice* in the course description because of the controversial nature of that text.

Dean Lopes felt that the course would be a good candidate for writing-intensive certification. If it met those guidelines, it could have a smaller class size. She complimented the outcomes, but said that outcomes 5 and 6 are not quite outcomes and could be restated. She also asked about the calculation of the final grade, which does not include attendance. She encouraged adding attendance to the percentage of the final grade.

Professor Peter Romaniuk returned to the question about *The Merchant of Venice*, suggesting that quoting a particular text is not customary in the course description because it ties the professor into teaching that text with the course every time.

Prof. Maryann McClure said that there is a tremendous amount of overlap between this course and courses in the Philosophy Department. She pointed to a quote in the description about “knowing, being, and doing” which are primary basic philosophical divisions. Prof. Adams responded that as General Education reform happens, disciplinary overlap is going to become more commonplace. The acknowledged boundaries between departments are eroding and he suggested to the committee that the college needs a way to manage the conversations that will be coming about overlap across disciplines. Dean Lopes agreed, noting that a student's grasp of a concept or theory is a career-long interpretive process that does not end after the completion of one course. Dean Lopes thought that this kind of question may need to be addressed at the level of a degree plan rather than a singular course.

Prof. Carbonell suggested reaching out to other departments by bringing guest lecturers into the course, especially because of the course's use of primary texts. Dean Lopes said that theory courses in general will involve several disciplines at the same time, and the college wants to authorize faculty to be interpreters of the text, understanding that there are different approaches.

Prof. Adamczyk said that a necessary component of this kind of interdisciplinary discourse is for the conversation to come to the departments before course proposals come to the committee.

Dean Lopes said that further feedback can be directed to Prof. Heffernan.
The agenda was adjusted to consider the COR 101 Institutional Treatment course because Professor Lior Gideon will also be attending the Faculty Senate meeting. There were no objections.

**Course Revision: COR 101 Institutional Treatment**

Prof. Gideon explained that this is a title change to capture the actual course goals, in compliance with the recommendation from the major evaluation in 2002. The new title would be “Introduction to Corrections.” Everything practical about the course will remain the same, but the new title will better express to Middle States and to students what the course actually does, which is to study of the prisons, alternatives to incarceration, and so forth. Similarly, the language of the description has been modified to better capture the workings of the course, but the substance of the course remains the same.

Prof. Romaniuk pointed to page two, paragraph six, to say that the rationale could be written more effectively. He was also confused by the wording of paragraph seven. Prof. Gideon asked that the better phrasing be e-mailed to him.

**Old Business**

**Programs**

**Honors Program**

Dean Lopes introduced the proposal. The proposal has been adjusted to include language about giving updates to UCASC in fall and spring, beginning in Spring 2011.

Professor Adams said that it is very difficult to get a sense of what the Honors Program is when the information comes into the committee piecemeal. The appeal is to see everything at once.

Dean Lopes answered that the Honors Program is working diligently under time constraints. There are experimental courses and other changes that preclude showing a full curriculum at once. It has only been a short time since the launch of this program, and she expressed confidence in the director, who has been tasked with creating a program under less than ideal conditions. The program cannot explicitly say more until the new General Education plan is in place.

Prof. Carbonell asked that new language be reworded to better articulate what the nature of the updates will be. Dean Lopes said that it's very hard to know what the updates will be since it depends on the changes to General Education. Prof. Carbonell asked for something more specific to articulate what kind of information the updates may be about, such as co-curricular or other categories of change. Dean Lopes said she would add “co-curricular requirements” and “curriculum” to the new sentence.
A motion was made and seconded to approve the Honors Program extension. The Honors Program Extension was approved unanimously with 20 votes in favor.

Courses

Course Revision: MUS 202 Compositional Techniques

Professor Ben Lapidus said that no changes had been made to this course revision since the first reading.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the course revision to MUS 202 Compositional Techniques.

The course revision to MUS 202 Compositional Techniques was approved unanimously with 20 votes in favor.

New Course: SOC 2XX Sociology of Human Rights

Professor Jana Arsovska summarized her changes to the course description. A sentence was edited to clarify how human rights would be studied in this course. To address questions of geographical scope, Prof. Arsovska also added a line allowing the course to invite guest speakers or include literature from Africa, Islamic Cultures, Japan, and so forth.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the new course, SOC 2XX Sociology of Human Rights. The new course, SOC 2XX Sociology of Human Rights was approved unanimously with 21 votes in favor.

New Course: PSY 3XX Brain and Behavior

Professor Jillian Grose-Fifer summarized the changes to the course based on feedback from the last UCASC meeting. To be more explicit about sources that address culture's link to behavior, Prof. Grose-Fifer added a bibliography into the syllabus and changed the rationale for the course in the proposal form, clarifying why the department feels that it is important to study physiology.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the new course, PSY 3XX Brain and Behavior.

The new course, PSY 3XX Brain and Behavior was approved unanimously with 21 votes in favor.
New Course: PSY 3XX Perception

Prof. Grose-Fifer again summarized changes to the course based on the committee's feedback. Her changes were similar to the above course, including more explicit references to the multicultural ramifications of the course and the influence of experience in shaping perception.

_A motion was made and seconded to approve the new course, PSY 3XX Perception. The new course, PSY 3XX Perception was approved unanimously with 21 votes in favor._

New Course: PHI 3XX Existentialism

Professor Kyoo Lee thanked the committee for the encouraging feedback and questions. She pointed out the correction of a typo on page two.

_A motion was made and seconded to approve the new course, PHI 3XX Existentialism. The new course, PHI 3XX Existentialism was approved unanimously with 21 votes in favor._

New Course: PHI 3XX Classical Chinese Philosophy

Prof. Lee confirmed that the title of the course will be “Classical Chinese Philosophy,” and that the word “ancient” had been removed from the course proposal.

_A motion was made and seconded to approve the new course, PHI 3XX Classical Chinese Philosophy._

Prof. Carbonell suggested that the abbreviated title might incorporate the term “classical” somehow, perhaps by shortening “Philosophical” to “phil” or “philo.” Kathy Killoran said that this could be worked out.

_The new course, PHI 3XX Classical Chinese Philosophy was approved unanimously with 21 votes in favor._

New Course: ENG 2XX Journalism in the 21st Century

Professor Alexa Capeloto explained the changes to the course proposal, including correction of a misplaced clause about the minor, which has been removed. She also added language representing the fact that the course takes a worldwide perspective at times, though the focus is on the United States.

_A motion was made and seconded to approve the new course, ENG 2XX Journalism in the 21st Century. The new course, ENG 2XX Journalism in the 21st Century was approved unanimously with 21 votes in favor._
Standards

APA Documentation (2nd reading)

Kathy Killoran distributed the proposal for APA documentation that had been left out of
the packet distributed to UCASC members prior to the meeting. Dean Lopes introduced
the proposal, which comes to UCASC from the Faculty Senate, noting that changes had
been made on page two. Professor Sexton asked if Professor Kaplowitz needed to be
present. Dean Lopes said that she could represent the Standards Subcommittee in
Professor Kaplowitz’s place.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the APA documentation proposal.

Professor Sexton spoke for the library, expressing concern that the change in policy
leaves students responsible for learning an endless number of styles as requirements vary
from course to course. She asked that the college provide a recommendation for a few
particular styles. Professor Tarantino agreed. Professor Adams felt that the suggestion to
issue a recommendation would be impractical given that every field has its own particular
needs.

Professor Herbert asked if this change could be phased in over time. Dean Lopes
responded that the college would work with faculty to roll this out and that a particular
style would be introduced in composition courses. Professor Herbert said that the
proposal does not include this information. Kathy Killoran noted that a student’s training
is dependent on the bulletin under which they enter the college, and any changes to the
policy on documentation would only be reflected in the next bulletin. Dean Lopes said
that this will need to be clarified for faculty.

Professor Carbonell suggested that the library could create a brief handout that compares
various styles. If students have an understanding of the component parts of a citation,
they would quickly be able to rearrange things. Professor Sexton agreed that a handout
could be created, but reiterated her earlier concern from the library that with unlimited
styles available to students, the system gets complicated quite quickly because there are
so many formats of information a method might cite. Dean Lopes said that there are some
very clear guides to styles that are good for undergraduates in their first term. The college
can work across the curriculum, coordinating first-year experience, the library and
composition courses in a coordinated effort to reinforce education on the use of methods.

Kate Szur asked if emphasis could be shifted from the concrete details of various
methods to the bigger issue of empowering students early on to make choices between
methods. Once students understand, they can go to the library or the Writing Center for
help with the details. Professor Adams then acknowledged that this change will cause a
lot of new traffic in the library, and the committee should be cognizant of that burden.

Professor Herbert recommended Diana Hacker’s “A Writer’s Reference,” which is
currently excerpted in the library’s APA document.
Professory Sexton asked if the Writing Center had been consulted on the new proposal. Dean Lopes said that they had not. Professor Sexton asked if the Writing Center has the ability to give workshops on every style. Dean Lopes said that it should be possible.

Professor Adams said that it would be helpful to have data from the library that shows how much of the student population is using each method as we implement this change. Professor Sexton said that kind of data would not be available. Kathy Killoran said that even anecdotal accounts would be useful as this moves forward.

Dean Lopes summarized that the proposal needs some concrete amendments. Kathy Killoran said the language of the proposal could include a recommendation that the faculty adopt one of the major styles. Professor Sexton proposed a friendly amendment to add a sentence like “Major styles such as APA, MLA, and CSE are encouraged.”

As a matter of procedure, Professor Adams asked if friendly amendments are allowed with the proposer absent. Dean Lopes said that members of the Standards Committee are present. Professor Larkin supported the friendly amendment, adding that the clearer the proposal is for faculty and students, the easier it would be to follow. Professor Carbonell said that if the overall intention is to empower students, then the college needs to give them experience and education in major styles rather than hybrid styles because hybrid styles are not likely to be used repeatedly.

Dean Lopes adjusted the wording of the friendly amendment to “major styles recognized by their disciplines.” In defense of hybrid methods, Professor Lapidus said that there are disciplines that deal with nontraditional sources like oral traditions or recordings. In those cases, the major methods do have shortcomings. Professor Carbonell said that MLA attempts to speak to every possible source. Professor Adams said that the college does not want either a straightjacket requiring three major styles or a policy that says “anything goes,” and said the proposal should allow for hybrid possibilities.

Dean Lopes said the amendment was going to be a recommendation, not a requirement. Professor Clara Castro-Ponce said that the recommendation could be tailored depending on what the students decide to major in. Dean Lopes clarified that the faculty member selects the method for a course, not the student. If a student changes his or her major, the student will have to learn a new citation style. Professor Sexton said that she has anecdotal evidence from the reference desk of students who have had their grades reduced because of incorrect citation style. Dean Lopes said that the whole depth of this issue cannot be addressed in this meeting, but at minimum, the college’s expectations about students and citation style need to be clear. Professor Adams suggested that this change be brought up for follow up in Fall 2011 to see how it is going. Kathy Killoran suggested giving it a full year before revisiting to allow for a more robust sample. Professor Sexton suggested a friendly amendment that would read “We recommend that faculty adopt a major style recognized by their discipline.”

The proposal on APA Documentation was approved unanimously with 20 votes in favor.
NEW BUSINESS

Self-Study - BA in Forensic PSY

Professor Larkin introduced the program review of the Forensic Psychology major, noting that the document had been revised to streamline the narrative and to make a stronger case for revision of the major. The subcommittee was impressed with the revisions from the department and recommended this proposal’s acceptance.

Dean Lopes opened the floor to discussion.

Professor Adams raised a procedural point, noting that the committee was not given very much time to read this eighty-page document. He asked that the committee receive documents of this length a month or two in advance of discussion. Dean Lopes agreed that the timeline was not ideal and should not be customary, but in this case the department had requested that this be expedited. Professor Adams requested that UCASC not suspend the second reading for this material. Professor Carbonell asked for a clarification on procedure, wondering what UCASC’s relationship to a self-study is. Kathy Killoran answered that UCASC’s responsibility is to review the self-study, discuss it, and vote to adopt it, consenting that the proposal is fit to be seen by outside reviewers.

Dean Lopes’ general feedback for the proposal included interest in the fact that it has taken some time for the self-study to occur. She thought some of the issues raised in the self-study were quite interesting. For example, the 2002 self-study brought up the department’s approach to ethics, and Dean Lopes was curious about the decision-making process that led the department to teach ethics across the curriculum rather than as a freestanding course.

Professor Lapidus asked if actual student feedback could be represented more explicitly in outcomes assessment. He was curious about long-term information about the trajectories of alumni from these programs. Kathy Killoran responded that the college does institutional surveys of alumni at the two-year and five-year mark, but the response rate tends to be very low. She felt that it would be onerous to expect the department to do their own surveys of alumni. Virginia Moreno, however, responded that the ownership of the collection of this data needs to be on the program itself. Institutional surveys cannot address the specific concerns in the detailed ways that would be meaningful to particular programs. Dean Lopes agreed with Professor Lapidus that there are things the department can do to assess themselves more.

Professor Romaniuk wished to commend the department on the self-study and also on the department’s proposal to revise the BA in Psychology. He felt that the case was well-made in both documents.

Professor Crossman explained that the department is currently working on gathering explicitly student-focused feedback. Those steps include surveying majors about what
courses they would like to take in the summer as well as working with Blackboard to
survey and communicate with students.

Professor Shapiro requested that the document be e-mailed out to the committee. He also
asked that a table of contents accompany future documents of this size as well as an
executive summary. Dean Lopes said that the committee can certainly ask for a table of
contents in the future. Professor Leippe said that the categories of the report correspond
to the table of contents in the standard form that is provided to all departments as they
approach self-studies. Regarding the question of student input, Professor Leippe
suggested that the college might want to rethink the timeline of the self-study process.
For example, he suggested a three-year program in which the first-year could be devoted
to the department’s examination of “what questions do we want to ask, what do we want
to know about ourselves,” and a follow-up survey of the students. Virginia Moreno
responded that currently, the college’s approach to assessment is very
compartmentalized, but the college is working to change that. What the department now
has from the self-study is a guide for the next five years.

Dean Lopes commended the department for an excellent self-study. She is excited about
the changes that are planned.

**New Course: PAD3XX Policy Analysis**

Kathy Killoran introduced this course created for the Public Administration major. The
Courses Subcommittee II had asked Professor Mameli to distinguish how this course is
public policy as it applies to public administrators, and he has done so. Political Science
had particular interest in how this course would be taught, and the two departments are
talking.

Professor Mameli explained that the course is the result of a 2008 Self-Study/site visit
team recommendation. The Public Management Department decided to focus on
analytical techniques and measures, to prepare students to go out and get real-world jobs
or prepare them for the MPA program. The course has an interdisciplinary flavor, with
readings from Economics, History, and Law, because that is the nature of the work.

Professor Romaniuk addressed the Political Science Department’s point of view on
possible overlap. He said the discussion between the departments about this course has
been long but collegial, and his department is glad that Professor Mameli has taken the
course in a direction that focuses on analytical techniques. Ultimately, the two
departments fail to agree one hundred percent on where the public policy divide is
between Public Management and Political Science. The Political Science Department
instructed Professor Romaniuk to abstain from the vote but not to oppose the course. The
Political Science Department is planning a public policy course concurrently, but it is still
in the departmental curriculum committee at this point. Professor Romaniuk thanked the
Public Management department for dealing with this issue that could have been more
contentious in a collegial fashion.
Professor Adams didn’t understand the abstention. After six months of discussion, he wondered why there is still not support. Professor Romaniuk responded that the Political Science Department has no desire to obstruct the course, but after examining the way public policy is taught in the proposal, and he was instructed to abstain.

Professor Sexton asked why there are no assignments listed on the syllabus. Professor Mameli didn’t realize that that was required but said he can put a list together.

Professor Leippe was confused by item four on the syllabus and the way it arranged five categories, and he noted the wording “students are also responsible for completing 3-5 page papers.”

Professor Adams asked why the course double penalizes for participation and attendance.

Dean Lopes wondered if the title of the course could be recast along the lines of “Public Policy Analysis for Public Managers,” in order to make clear to students that it is not intended for Political Science majors. This was her suggestion to the chair, and she would make it again. Professor Peters said that she had brought this point up with the chair and he flatly refused. Professor Mameli said that the conversation with the chair could continue.

Professor Gideon asked if the Criminal Justice BA has something similar to this, and wondered if the courses would be cross-listed. Dean Lopes replied that there is a Criminal Justice Policy course, but it’s clearly not public policy analysis, and the fields are quite separate.

Professor Adams had questions about how much reading is appropriate in a three hundred level course, and asked that the syllabus list the reading assignments with chapter titles and page numbers, as well as any web-based readings. He noted that all departments, including his own, are struggling with the question of how much reading a two hundred level course should require as compared with a three hundred level course. He also asked that the proposal speak to how the course will manage the tension between knowledge of content and analysis of it. Professor Mameli answered that there are multiple points of interpretation of student ability built into the course, including specific testing, PowerPoint projects, and papers.

Dean Lopes said that further comments can be e-mailed to Professor Mameli.

**New Course: AAS 2XX Introduction to Community-Based Approaches to Justice**

Kathy Killoran introduced the new course proposal, noting that the courses subcommittee had asked for clarification in the course description, which has been done.
Professor Adams thought the course's interest in how justice works inside of communities was refreshing. He appreciated that the course brings attention to a neglected area of justice studies, which usually focus on justice at the institutional level.

Professor Shapiro asked why the rationale needed to be several paragraphs, commenting that the course did not seem unusual enough to merit such a lengthy description. Professor Adams addressed this question, first noting that he was not speaking for Professor Nembhard, but only to his own experience. He said that both historically and at John Jay, there is a sense that when Africana curricular issues are presented, a stronger, longer, more detailed rationale is required. Dean Lopes expressed her regret for this observation. Professor Adam then agreed that the rationale in this proposal is a bit long. Professor Romaniuk added to this sentiment, singling out item 9d, which reflects the learning objectives of the department rather than the course, and could be rewritten to be more direct.

Professor Sexton asked if the course description needed to include some reference to Africana stories or African diasporas, given that those terms appeared in the rationale and knowledge objectives. Professor Adams responded that his department takes the position that since they are interdisciplinary, they may use Africana material to illustrate a point, but it's not cumulative.

Professor Lapidus asked about the scope of the course. The course objectives end with a sentence about connecting African studies to Justice, but the syllabus shows that the course does not intend to include communities beyond the United States. Professor Lapidus said that these same issues play out in the Caribbean or Latin America. Professor Lapidus felt that if it is to be based on the United States experience, that the title should reflect it. He also had a second question about whether the syllabus could be more specific about the examples that may be used in the section on race, crime, and profiling.

Professor Romaniuk wished to know how much consultation had been done about majors and minors of other programs. He said that he had shared the proposal with Professor Bockmeyer in the Urban Studies major, but encouraged Professor Nembhard to follow up.

Professor Carbonell suggested that the required readings be listed up front so that students understand that this is not a textbook-based course. Dean Lopes said that additional feedback could be e-mailed to Professor Nembhard.

Programs Subcommittee

Proposal to Revise B.A. in Psychology.

Kathy Killoran introduced Professor Romaniuk, who was representing the Programs Subcommittee in place of Professor Baatz.
Professor Romaniuk brought the proposal forward, explaining that the committee had reviewed the proposed changes twice, with substantial feedback for the department. The committee was pleased with the department's adjustment of the proposal, and felt that the case for the revision of the major was well-articulated and ready to be presented to UCASC.

Professor Shapiro had a question about procedure. Given that the self-study and the revision of the major have come from the Psychology Department at the same time, he asked if it would be appropriate to review the Self-Study before reviewing this proposal. Dean Lopes responded that staggering these two proposals would have been ideal, but the simultaneous examination could not be avoided in this case.

Kathy Killoran noted that the new courses recorded in this proposal have been submitted and are starting to work their way through the courses subcommittees. Also, revisions to courses will come before the subcommittee in February. Then she listed the various program proposals that will be coming before UCASC in the course of this year – a new Law and Society major, the Fire Science major revision – explaining that the heavy load of these proposals means that some must be reviewed at the beginning of the year if they are all to pass through UCASC in time to make it into the bulletin for next year.

Professor Adams acknowledged that there is a tension between getting quality discussions and getting the proposals through the system but stressed that attention be paid to the permanence of these approvals. “Once we put these things into the curriculum,” he said, “if they're not for life, they're certainly for a long half-life.” He thought it would be useful for future years' timelines to be visited with departments in May.

Kathy Killoran said that the timeline on the major revision has been standard, having been submitted last March, but that she does take his comment on the Self-Study, because it was a dense and long document. It could be emailed to committee members a bit sooner.

Professor Adams said that his concern is larger than the Psychology Department’s documents on the table, but rather the whole process. Dean Lopes agreed that the schedule needs to be looked at.

Professor Carbonell asked that UCASC members make a point of reading both the Self Study and this proposal before the January meeting and send comments directly to the Psychology Department so that the version presented to UCASC in January could contain responses to the comments. Dean Lopes added that comments should be e-mailed to Angela Crossman by January 10. Professor Adams asked that the Psychology Department generate a document that states which feedback was taken and addressed.

Professor Leippe wished to clarify that the proposed new major was not a product of the current Self-Study. He explained that the new major was being discussed and planned
for a number of years, independently of the Self-Study. Thusly, it should not be essential
to have the Self-Study in order to discuss the proposed new major.

Kathy Killoran said that comments on the proposal to revise the major should also be sent
by January 10.

Proposed Model for New General Education

Dean Lopes introduced the steering committee who would be presenting the new draft of
the General Education curriculum. Dean Lopes explained that since this is a pre-reading,
UCASC would not be looking at the present proposal as a governance body. In this
meeting, UCASC is being introduced to a draft document, which is not necessarily the
same draft that will go through governance. She then brought the committee forward,
applauding them for creating an effective process for curriculum work as well as a
 generating a spectacular new General Education model.

Professor Amy Green introduced the members of the task force who were in the room
and recapped the history of this General Education revision. In 2006, when Provost
Bowers returned to the college as Dean of Undergraduate Studies, she was told by 80th
Street that John Jay was behind the other CUNY schools and the nation on General
Education reform. John Jay hasn't looked at General Education since 1975, so this
revision is long overdue. Professor Green explained that a number of documents related
to the evolving plan and the process for reform can be found on the General Education
website, which also includes a link to a feedback form, so thoughts can be e-mailed
directly to the steering committee. This is the beginning of a three month process, and the
committee is currently gathering feedback on the draft document. A first reading will
come before UCASC after the steering committee's February meeting.

She then drew attention to a diagram, in which Learning Outcomes are presented as the
cornerstone of the new model, and she asked Professor Valerie Allen to speak to what it
means to be an outcome-based curriculum. Professor Allen explained that historically,
the title of a course determines content, and the content then determines the learning
objectives. This leads to outcomes that simply address course content. The disadvantage
of letting content dictate education is that separate domains of content get splintered and
fragmented, and various knowledge bases may not speak to each other. The goal of the
new learning objectives is to enable the college to see the commonalities among
departments, courses, and disciplines. With the objectives in the foreground, those goals
will drive pedagogy and assessment procedures. Content is included, but will no longer
determine the entire framework of a course.

Professor Crossman then spoke to UCASC about the way the learning objectives have
been grouped into learning clusters that seem to make inherent sense. She noted that
though the clusters look as though they represent disciplines and skilled areas, strictly
speaking, they do not. There are some natural affinities – a history course may be taught
in “learning from the past,” for example, but other courses like History of Oppression in
the Twentieth Century or a course on Music as Historical Commentary would fit just as well.

Looking at the document, Professor Green explained that the credit ranges listed are misleading. Though the document says that 44-69 total credits will be needed, those decisions haven't been made yet, and she is looking for feedback on these designations.

Professor Balis relayed the fundamental principle from the General Education Boot Camp, that a General Education program should have a sense of coherence and that it should be connected to the mission of the institution. It should not be something that only applies to students' freshman year courses. The justice core is set at the 100, 200, and 300-level, and meant to be a common experience for all students, though it will be taught differently depending on the department.

Professor Green explained that this document is only a framework. The next step is for faculty to scaffold the outcomes, then to build courses. The committee imagines that there will be a full-time faculty director of General Education and a separate subcommittee that will accept courses into the General Education curriculum. Professor Adams asked if faculty will be in the majority in all of these committees. Dean Lopes replied that this would be so. Professor Balis added that the curriculum will then undergo constant assessment.

With the draft of the curriculum model presented, the floor opened to discussion.

Professor Lapidus asked how courses would be designated into the various Learning Outcomes, given that some courses encompass multiple areas and may qualify for more than one category. He asked who would make those designations and how. Professor Allen said it would be a departmental designation. Professor Lapidus asked if the course would have the cluster designation next to it. Professor Green said that it would.

Kathy Killoran said that there will be a curricular process for general education courses similar to the intensive scrutiny of a new course in UCASC, and if someone wants to submit for more than one cluster, they will have to indicate as much. Both sets of learning outcomes would then be used to evaluate that course.

Chad Infante asked how the enrollment process would actually work for the student, wondering how much latitude the student would have to decide into which cluster a course fits. Professor Green said that hopefully the requirement would be designated beforehand by the committee. Professor Adams said that in some cases a course may satisfy various clusters, but in other cases it might not, and so various bodies are going to have to look at this.

Professor Carbonell said that the plan right now is very intricate and clearly is going to require a lot of advising. She wanted to note the impact on advising as well as the impact on departments and on majors. How would this new plan work with existing pre-requisites for courses and disciplines? As coordinator of a major now, she felt a strong
need to see some sort of hypothetical plan of study about how a student would move
through four years or so. She asked for a document like the one generated for the
proposal of a new major in order to help pull this General Education idea into focus.

Professor Green said the Steering Committee envisions the new curriculum to be vertical,
supporting students from the day they get to John Jay until the day they leave. Pre-
requisites may be prior courses or abilities, as opposed to discipline-based pre-requisites.

Professor Tarantino asked if the committee has planned for the learning curve the faculty
will have as they settle into this. She suggested including IT in the conversation,
wondering if a web component could be built that might help students plan their courses.

Kathy Killoran said that John Jay uses a system called DegreeWorks for advising, and
agreed that it would be a good idea to bring the DegreeWorks people in sooner rather
than later.

Professor Sexton asked about the Justice core 400-level course, a capstone to the major.
Professor Green said that most majors already have a capstone experience, and the
Steering Committee would like to see that capstone projects, papers, or theses also be
looked at in terms of General Education outcomes.

Professor Lapidus worried that this could turn into a race for credits at the end of a
student's academic career. Dean Lopes responded that there is already an effort underway
to plan more coherent degree-planning. Also, this General Education model provides an
opportunity for richer planning from the beginning, allowing more options for the student
within the Learning Clusters as opposed to presenting very specific course requirements.
She emphasized that from a degree-planning perspective, scaffolding is important.
Critical thinking skills exist differently at 100-level than at 400-level, and this plan
should give students multiple points in the curriculum to demonstrate these skills.

Professor Balis also answered that the new model is deliberately built to counteract the
rush for specific knowledge that is learned and then abandoned. That is why 300-level
courses are built into the program, to keep that mission-driven focus all the way through.
Additionally, this would give transfer students a way to interact with the program.

Professor Crossman added that attention is being paid to the scheduling, and how that
supports scaffolding, with the understanding that students often have to take classes
whenever they are available.

Professor Green said that the plan intends to enforce that 200-level courses will have to
be taken between forty and sixty credits.

Chad Infante asked how this would affect transfer students. Professor Greene responded
that the new model would be more flexible to adapt to transfer students histories than the
current model.
Dean Lopes shared feedback from 80th Street, where CUNY is thrilled about the work that John Jay is doing on General Education, especially in light of the clusters and abilities. The Vice Chancellor issued an invitation to this committee to present this work at the CUNY General Education Conference.

Professor Green said that one aim of CUNY is to build a university-wide framework, so that transferring becomes smoother whether one is coming into CUNY or transferring within CUNY.

Professor Herbert had a question about the phrase “one language under than English,” and asked if a more inclusive phrase is possible. Professor Green noted that that part of the document is not up for revision, having already been voted on by College governance, but that this could be taken into consideration as the committee moves forward. Professor Castro-Ponce suggested changing the phrase to “world language.”

Chad Infante asked how this affects students who are trying to get into courses like math 104 by taking exams. Kathy Killoran answered that since we are now a senior college, all students must be skills-certified to start. However, there is more time to allow students from programs like SEEK and non-native, English speakers to move through their courses to become skill-certified within a period of time. Those vehicles are already in place and would stay the same with the new model.

Dean Lopes encouraged the committee to send more feedback through the response link on the General Education website, emphasizing that the more feedback they have, the better.

A motion was made and seconded to adjourn.

It was unanimously acclaimed. The meeting concluded at 12:36 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah Hammond, Scribe
The Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee held its meeting on Friday, January 28th, at 9:36am in Room 610T. Dean Anne Lopes, UCASC Chair, called the meeting to order.


Absent: Victor Herbert, Ben Lapidus, Susan Larkin, Mary Ann McClure, Virginia Moreno, Lisandro Perez, Richard Saulnier.

Guests: William Heffernan, Vielka Holness, Karen Kaplowitz, Cheuk Lee, Peter Mameli, Lucia Trimbur, Shonna Trinch.

Administrative Announcements

Dean Anne Lopes introduced Cheuk Lee who was attending a UCASC meeting for the first time since becoming the new Interim Registrar. Cheuk Lee invited the committee to come to him with questions any time, and said that he looks forward to attending future meetings to better understand faculty concerns and activities.

Dean Lopes took a moment to recognize Diana Friedland, who had passed away earlier in the week, and whose memorial had been held the night before the meeting. Dean Lopes asked Kathy Killoran to speak further about Professor Friedland's impact on John Jay College. Kathy Killoran worked with Professor Friedland on the UCASC committee for many years and became close during that time. She spoke of Professor Friedland's enthusiasm, leadership, and excellent record of service to the college. Kathy Killoran cited Jane Bowers' remark from the memorial, that Professor Friedland was the “epitome of the teacher-scholar,” a brilliant researcher, teacher, and mentor. Kathy Killoran recalled that Professor Friedland “exuded palpable excitement whenever she was going to work in the lab – usually on Fridays.” Kathy Killoran concluded by telling the committee that the Science Department and Professor Friedland's family are establishing a scholarship for a science student in her name.
Chad Infante announced that John Jay would be hosting its first national debate tournament that weekend, and he would appreciate faculty support during the weekend.

**Approval of the minutes of December 10, 2010**

A motion was made and seconded to consider the minutes of the UCASC meeting of December 10.

Professor Lior Gideon noted that he was present at the last meeting, so his name will be moved from the absent list to the present list.

Professor Ellen Sexton noted that page 8, line 32 was incorrect, pointing out that she said that the library already has handouts about different bibliographic styles.

*The committee voted unanimously to approve the minutes with the above changes with 19 votes in favor.*

**Old Business**

Programs (2nd Readings)

Program Review – Self Study – B.A. in Forensic Psychology

A motion was made and seconded to accept the Self Study for the B.A. in Forensic Psychology.

Dean Lopes opened the floor for discussion. There were no comments or questions.

*The Self-Study for the B.A. in Forensic Psychology was accepted unanimously with 18 votes in favor.*

Proposal to Revise the B.A. in Forensic Psychology

A motion was made and seconded to accept the Proposal to Revise the B.A. in Forensic Psychology.

Dean Lopes opened the floor for discussion, but there were no comments or questions.

The Proposal to Revise the B.A. in Forensic Psychology was accepted unanimously with 19 votes in favor.
Courses

New Course: AAS 2XX Introduction to Community-Based Approaches to Justice

Dean Lopes opened the floor for discussion by introducing a cover note from Professor Jessica Gordon-Nembhard, who created the course. Professor Jama Adams noted that Professor Gordon-Nembhard could not get into the city for the meeting because of the heavy snow.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the new course, AAS 2XX Introduction to Community-Based Approaches to Justice.

With the floor open to discussion, Kathy Killoran asked that the course description be reworded to eliminate the first person point of view. She asked that “we will use” on page two change to “will be used.”

Professor Sexton noted that one question was answered incorrectly on page 10. Item 16, regarding consultations should be answered “yes” instead of “no,” to reflect the fact that Professor Gordon-Nembhard has consulted with others about the course.

The new course, AAS 2XX Introduction to Community-Based Approaches to Justice, was approved unanimously with 19 votes in favor.

New Course: PAD 3XX Public Policy Analysis

A motion was made and seconded to approve the new course, PAD 3XX Public Policy Analysis.

Dean Lopes opened the floor for discussion. There were no comments or questions.

The new course, PAD 3XX Public Policy Analysis, was approved unanimously with 19 votes in favor.

New Course: CJBA 1XX Dimensions of Justice

A motion was made and seconded to approve the new course, CJBA 1XX Dimensions of Justice.

Dean Lopes opened the floor for discussion. There were no comments or questions.

The new course, CJBA 1XX Dimensions of Justice, was approved with 19 votes in favor.
Course Revision: COR 101 Institutional Treatment of the Offender

A motion was made and seconded to approve the new course, COR 101 Institutional Treatment of the Offender.

Dean Lopes opened the floor for discussion. There were no comments or questions.

The new course, COR 101 Institutional Treatment of the Offender, was approved with 20 votes in favor.

At this point in the meeting, the itinerary was adjusted. Due to the swiftness of approvals for the new courses, the meeting had run ahead of schedule and needed to wait for the arrival of guests involved with items on the rest of the agenda. Rather than proceeding to the second reading of the Proposal to Revise the College's Incomplete Grade Policy, Dean Lopes and Professor Adams introduced an item that was not on the agenda.

Professor Adams reminded the committee about the mission of the Principles, Policies, and Procedures Subcommittee (PPP), which is in need of more participants. This committee articulates policy decisions on issues that may have been understood informally but never codified, such as how cross-listed courses are shared between departments or what the college's position on lateness and attendance might be. Dean Lopes agreed that the PPP needs membership and called for UCASC committee members to think about who might like to serve or who could be recruited. Professor Adams added that the meetings do not take place every week, and they never last more than an hour.

The itinerary was shifted at this point to move ahead to first readings from the Courses Subcommittee, with plans to move back to Old Business later in the morning.

New Business

Courses Subcommittee (1st Readings)

Course Revision: ENG/ANT 328 Forensic Linguistics

Professor Sexton introduced the proposal to revise the prerequisite for the Forensic Linguistics course.

Professor Shonna Trinch explained the history of changes in the course that have led to this revision. It's been a popular course that students like because it interfaces well with Psychology and Criminal Justice. The departments then added a prerequisite, ENG 228 Introduction to Language. However, the college is limited in terms of faculty to teach the courses so they could only be offered once a year. Since ENG 228 never got much enrollment, only a small number of students would have the prerequisite to take the subsequent course, ANT/ENG 328. As a result of this enrollment problem, they would now like to drop the ANT/ENG 228 prerequisite.
Professor Adams asked how the course addresses the potentially subversive nature of language. He brought up the courts' regular misinterpretations of black English as an example. Professor Trinch said that the course definitely explores dialectical language and the ways language is racialized and genderized, with a critical eye toward language as the last place where people can publicly discriminate against other people. She asked Professor Adams if his question was more particular than that. He asked if the course goes into implications for advocacy. Professor Trinch said that the course goes into the discrepancies in the varying uses of English, how speakers are held accountable for things they did not actually say, and so forth.

Professor Carbonell pointed out that with the removal of the prerequisite, all of the prerequisites for this 300-level course will now be 100-level, and she wondered if students would have a sufficient foundation to fully engage with the material of the course. Professor Trinch responded that the course will be geared more to hook students into linguistics with narrative and oral methods from the field, which are fairly accessible, rather than employing the more science-based approach of phrenology, which would require more formal training. Professor Carbonell said that her concern is more about the jump from 100-level to 300-level than about the distinctions of the material within the field. Professor Trinch agreed and said that this is being addressed.

Professor Adams asked if it would be profitable to have a conversation with Communication and Theatre Arts about the course. Professor Trinch agreed with this sentiment, saying that the idea has been raised to get together a Language Group across the college to work on bringing courses like this together with other language courses, though Communication and Theatre Arts has not been consulted specifically. Professor Tarantino said that Communication and Theatre Arts does have a course in courtroom communication.

A motion was made and seconded to waive the second reading of the course revision, ENG/ANT 328 Forensic Linguistics. The motion to waive the second reading of the course revision, ENG/ANT 328 was approved unanimously with 22 votes in favor.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the course revision, ENG/ANT 328 Forensic Linguistics. The new course, ENG/ANT 328 Forensic Linguistics, was approved unanimously with 22 votes in favor.

Course Revision: POL 3XX Government and Politics in the Middle East

Professor Sexton introduced Professor Peter Romaniuk, who presented the course in Professor Yuksel Sezgin's absence. Professor Sezgin teaches a class at Harvard on Fridays and was unable to attend the meeting.

Professor Romaniuk explained that the course has been developed to add to offerings in international comparative politics in the Political Science Department. The need for study of this region is self-evident, and the department is endeavoring to cover more regions of
the world in terms of comparative politics classes. He said that he would pass any feedback along to Professor Sezgin.

Professor Adams commended the course for reaching for larger world perspectives, but asked about some details in the wording. He asked why the 1914 starting point was pinned down in the description. The syllabus made clear that the course would be addressing the British, colonialism, the Turks, the arbitrary creation of states, and all of the background, but Professor Adams worried that the language in the course proposal did not reflect that when it listed 1914 as the starting point for the material. Professor Leippe asked if that could be rectified by deleting “1914-1945” in the course description. Professor Adams responded that he didn't know the area well enough to understand the full implications of that exact time span, he just wanted attention paid to the fact that the course description creates parameters for future teachers of the course, so the detail of the time span should be worded with intention that makes clear to adjuncts what must be covered.

Professor Edward Snajdr supported the idea of dropping the dates from the description, especially given that this is not a history course. Dean Lopes said that 1914 is an important year. Professor Snajdr said that the nineteenth century is equally important. Professor Carbonell asked for a modifier in the course description like “modern political history” to frame the course's material as a point within a greater timeline rather than the beginning of history.

Professor Tarantino asked about the prerequisite Government 257. Professor Romaniuk answered that GOV 257 is the introduction course to comparative politics and that 300-level courses have regional specialization.

Professor Adams pointed out that Al Jazeera is not available on all cable stations and it would be useful to include a web site in that part of the syllabus.

Kathy Killoran asked for the learning objectives to be rephrased in terms of what students will know and be able to do rather than what the professor will teach them. That will create a more measurable criteria for outcomes assessment. Dean Lopes added that courses usually have three to five learning outcomes, and there are different outcomes addressed in each session or week or module of a course.

Professor Lior Gideon brought up the issue of dates again. He felt that 1914-1945 covers a great deal of material, but is a well-chosen time span, but wondered if it could move a bit past 1945 into the migration to Israel. He suggested adding a few words explaining the substance of these dates, such as “The Ottoman Regime, the British Mandate.” He recommended that the syllabus recommend the Jerusalem Post as reading material. He added that he would be interested to sit in this course, having come from that region himself, to see what is being taught to students and what misinterpretations of the region students bring into the class at the start. Professor Romaniuk responded that Professor Sezgin is Turkish and has done a lot of research on site in the region.
Professor Adams asked for a revision of the phrasing of the attendance policy for a provision of student sickness. He also said that the second reading of the course will be difficult given that Professor Sezgin teaches every Friday. Professor Sexton said that Professor Sezgin has offered to attend by telephone.

Professor David Shapiro brought up the recent news of controversy over a course like this at Brooklyn College, and asked how John Jay would assure that this course is taught without bias. Professor Karen Kaplowitz explained the Brooklyn College controversy. A doctoral student was assigned to teach a course in Palestinian issues, and a city council member objected, having seen the teacher's syllabus. The complaints made their way to the president of Brooklyn College, who promptly removed the adjunct professor from the course, citing the professor's "completely one-sided approach" to Palestinian issues, and stating that the professor did not have sufficient credentials to teach the material. The department then wrote to disagree with the president's decision, and the validity of the administration's swift actions remains in question.

Professor Romaniuk answered that Professor Sezgin has taught this course at a number of institutions, and that the Political Science Department is apprised of the contentious nature of politics. He cautioned against avoiding controversial topics, and pointed out that the college fails its students by sidestepping sensitive subjects. He said that Professor Sezgin has taken great pains to provide balanced perspectives.

Professor Shapiro said that he hoped it was clear that his comments were not meant to attack Professor Sezgin, but the question about the Brooklyn College incident still holds in light of the fact that the course may be taught by adjuncts down the road. Professor Romaniuk answered that Department Chair Harold Sullivan would be sensitive to this when scheduling adjuncts for the course.

Professor Tarantino brought back the rewording of the attendance policy, restating Professor Adams' concern that the policy could be more about doing the work. Dean Lopes clarified the point that the attendance policy should provide room for faculty discretion as well as being fair to the students. She added that attendance policies in general will be discussed in the PPP committee.

Professor Clara Castro-Ponce complimented the idea of the map quiz in the syllabus and suggested a section about the way names in the region have been recorded differently in various texts, cultures, and why, to highlight those discrepancies for students.

Kathy Killoran had a technical point about question 11. The course is listed as fitting two majors, Political Science and International Criminal Justice. For the course to claim the second major, a brief note of permission is required because ICJ is not directly under the Political Science Department's control.

Dean Lopes closed the discussion of the course.

At this point, the meeting returned to Old Business on the itinerary.
Old Business

Standards

Proposal to Revise the College's Incomplete Grade Policy

A motion was made and seconded to accept the Proposal to Revise the College's Incomplete Grade Policy.

The proposal had its first reading at UCASC on November 19.

Kathy Killoran asked about a typo in the last paragraph on the first page, and Dean Lopes confirmed that the abbreviation for an incomplete grade should be “INC” not “IN.”

Professor Michael Leippe asked how the new policy applies to students who miss the final exam. For students who are likely to fail a class unless they can get an A on the final exam, does this policy mean that the professor should assign an INC if the student misses that final exam? Dean Lopes said yes. Professor Adams asked why an INC would be awarded to a student who is failing a class. Dean Lopes replied that if pulling an A on the final exam means the student could pass, then a professor cannot assume the student will fail.

Professor Kaplowitz noted that the first two sentences on page one should be joined by a semi-colon.

Professor Adams raised an objection to the proposal, recognizing that the policy is needed to address adjunct issues, but stating that the unintended effect will be to encourage professors not to give incompletes. Professor Shapiro disagreed, saying that all the policy does is shorten the timeline and make the professor articulate a reason for the Incomplete. He appreciated having a rational basis for the grade. Dean Lopes also responded, noting that it is okay if the policy discourages professors from giving incompletes, and even good. History shows that students who get incompletes tend to drop out at higher rates. If the new policy provides more decisive parameters that may resolve a student's indeterminate status more quickly, that's a good thing. Vice President Johnson-Eanes agreed that too many students are getting lost in the system. She explained that she has seen these students firsthand in her own office, unable to resolve incompletes because the professor who gave the grade had disappeared. Dean Lopes said that one to two percent of grades at John Jay are incompletes, and that percentage is high. Professor Adams asked if there is a way to track the results of the policy to see if that percentage changes.

Professor Gideon recounted an experience last semester in which he gave two students incompletes, one with a deadline and one without. The student who received a deadline met it, but the other student disappeared. Professor Gideon suggested shortening the deadline in the policy even further so that it cannot stretch over a whole semester. Dean Lopes said that this was tried, but the timeline was too short. Professor Kaplowitz said
that actually the proposal had set the deadline at three weeks into the following semester at one point. Kathy Killoran pointed out that some faculty do not answer e-mails over breaks, so she was comfortable with the current timeline on the proposal.

Professor Leippe asked about the “FIN” grade on the proposal. Professor Kaplowitz replied that this grade is the result of a new policy from CUNY. Any incomplete that is not resolved will change to a FIN to show that it was an F resulting from an incomplete rather than an earned F. Professor Leippe asked if the FIN might look better on a record than an F, and wondered if this may tempt students to seek incompletes deliberately, miss an exam on purpose in order to get a FIN instead of a genuine earned F. Karen Kaplowitz replied that the new grade from CUNY was created so that Financial Aid could distinguish between earned and unearned failing grades. When placed side by side, the FIN will be judged more harshly than an F. So the effect will be opposite of Professor Leippe’s concern, discouraging students from seeking a FIN over an F. In the end, the FIN has been created by a CUNY policy and John Jay has approved its use.

*The Proposal to Revise the College's Incomplete Grade Policy was approved unanimously with 22 votes in favor.*

Proposal to Revise Eligibility Requirements of Transfer Students for Graduation Awards

*A motion was made and seconded to consider the Proposal to Revise Eligibility Requirements of Transfer Students for Graduation Awards.*

Karen Kaplowitz summarized the policy, which had its first reading at UCASC on November 19, 2010. The proposal is a move to level the playing field between native John Jay students and transfer students for graduation awards by requiring that all transfer grades count toward the GPA considered for graduation awards.

Professor Adams asked if the grades from other institutions are transparent, wondering what happens if the student comes from a school with a different grade system, especially international students. Dean Lopes answered that there are agencies that specialize in those translations before the grades come into John Jay.

Cheuk Lee added that there is already a tiebreaker in place that means that if two students have the same overall GPA, a native John Jay student will get precedence over a transfer student.

*The Proposal to Revise the Eligibility Requirements of Transfer Students for Graduation Awards was accepted unanimously with 21 votes in favor.*
New Business

Academic Standards Subcommittee (1st readings)

Proposal to Revise Latin Honor Standards

Professor Kaplowitz introduced the proposal. John Jay’s requirements for Latin Honors are much lower than the national norm, and even low among CUNY schools. This hurts John Jay students when they apply for graduate school because it implies that John Jay has low standards. This proposal would raise the GPA requirements to 3.85 for Suma, 3.7 for Magna, and 3.5 for Cum Laude. The national norm is 3.9 for Suma, 3.75 for Magna, and 3.5 for Cum Laude.

Professor Adams asked why the proposal does not raise the GPA requirements immediately to match the national norm. Professor Kaplowitz said that the numbers on the proposal match other CUNY schools. Christopher Sui asked if the plan would be to raise the requirements further after a few years. Professor Kaplowitz confirmed that this would be the case if the committee supports that. Professor Shapiro asked if there is any data as to how this would affect the amount of students receiving honors in each category. Karen Kaplowitz said that an extraordinary amount of students receive honors now. Professor Shapiro said he understands that the data is not available right this moment, but he would be interested in seeing something quantitative in the future.

Chuck Lee did not have hard data available now, but could speak to his experience in the Registrar's office over the past eleven years. He said that very few students get over a 3.8, but a good number do fall between 3.5 and Magna. The largest number of students have between a 3.2 and 3.5, and he estimated a minimum of 100 students in that window would drop off the Latin Honors list with the proposed change.

Professor Tarantino asked why CUNY has not set a standard for all colleges. Karen Kaplowitz answered that first there is not a national standard for Latin Honors, and second, it would go against CUNY’s organizing principles to legislate this for the colleges. For 100 years, CUNY was 17 or 19 independent federated colleges, each developing its own system, and it would go against every sense of faculty voice and governance to impose from the center of administration a rule about something the faculty should decide.

Professor Vielka Holness spoke to her experience at the Pre-Law Institute, where she has been contacted by colleagues from Law Schools to verify that in fact a 3.2 on a transcript does give a John Jay student the right to put Cum Laude on a resume. She said, her colleagues’ response to this information tends to be negative. The standard is bad for students and for John Jay.

Professor Judy-Lynn Peters pointed out that the change would affect the lowest level the most, and the impact on students of such a change would not vary greatly if the requirement was raised all the way to the national standard right now. Professor
Kaplowitz agreed and said that she would support amending the proposal to raise the bar to 3.9 and 3.75. Professor Adams agreed. Dean Lopes said that this suggestion should be brought back to the Standards Committee to discuss.

Professor Leippe asked if John Jay's grading system in general is overly generous with students as the Latin Honors Standards are. Dean Lopes replied that John Jay's grades are in keeping with common standards.

**Policy on Extra Work Assigned After Final Grades Are Submitted 1st reading**

Professor Kaplowitz presented the proposal with a summary of the issue at hand. Presently, to make changes after grades have already been submitted to the Registrar, a professor simply completes a change of grade form, which is signed by the department chair, and then submitted to the Registrar. The change being brought forward with this proposal would be that a grade cannot be adjusted once it has been submitted to the Registrar for any reason except for the discovery of a computational error. The process for correcting grades affected by computational errors would remain the same as the current system with one added step – the Dean of Undergraduate Studies would approve the form in addition to the department chair and the Registrar. Students will not be permitted to submit supplemental work after the grades have been given. The rationale for this proposal is that grades cannot be negotiable. John Jay must protect the integrity of its grading system. There is currently no policy in place to provide parameters to the timeline or nature of grade changes, so this is now being proposed.

Professor Adams asked why the dean needed approval over the change-of-grade. If the policy limits the circumstances for grade changes to computational error, that would seem to eliminate the need for any oversight. Kathy Killoran answered that in her experience, some grade changes are submitted by the same student over a period of years, and it's difficult for anybody to track a student engaged in that behavior. If the requests have to come before the Dean, such behavior is more likely to be noticed. Karen Kaplowitz also answered that the committee's thinking is that not all chairs are asking their faculty why the grades are being changed, given that the form often says “other.” Professor Adams reiterated his point that with the change in policy, there would be no wiggle room for professors, so what is the need for another set of eyes on the form. Karen Kaplowitz answered that currently faculty are feeling pressured to change grades, and are checking “computational error” because of pressure. Professor Adams responded that this change in policy wouldn't change that behavior. Karen Kaplowitz responded that the thinking is that people would not succumb to the pressure if they knew the Dean was looking. Professor Adams objected to this attitude of mistrust. The integrity of grades must lie in the hands of the faculty. He felt that the logic of the proposal does not support the Dean's involvement in the process.

Dean Lopes said there were several thoughts behind the involvement of the Dean. First, chairs will also be signing the grade change form, so someone at another level will be checking. Second, involving the Dean would reinforce the seriousness of the grade
change with the student. Third, the amount of signatures required on the form would
lower the number of grade change requests. She added, though, that she personally did
not feel that it was necessary for the grade change forms to come to her office if the
committee does not favor it.

Professor Carbonell asked for a written clarification in the policy to make clear that the
grade change is not automatic, but that the process begins with a request which then goes
through an approval process before the grade will be changed or not.

Professor Shapiro added to Professor Adams' sentiment that the involvement of the Dean
does not make sense unless the chair and the faculty are going to be subjected to scrutiny.
At the moment, the grade appeal process works, and it seems unnecessary to pile on more
rules.

Professor Adams said that as a chair he sees very few grade-change requests, and they
only come from a particular subset of professors who are not good with math. Dean
Lopes answered that the faculty have asked for this policy because they feel pressure.
Professor Adams asked if the policy is being presented simply to protect weak faculty.

Kathy Killoran suggested that the college not rely on the current appeals process for these
grade changes as some members have suggested. The current appeals process for this
would force an onerous process on the student for what is, in fact, a computational error
made by the professor. If the professor's mistake caused the problem, then the college
should take care of it quickly and efficiently without placing burden of correction on the
student. Currently, the grade appeal system has no timeline and could stretch out past an
additional semester.

Professor Kaplowitz added to that point that the Standards Subcommittee is looking at
the grade appeals process now also. She also said that Vice President Richard Saulnier
supports the proposal on the table because he sees an enormous number of grade changes,
and always for reasons other than computation.

Professor Peters said that what we're not addressing here is student behavior. There is a
culture at John Jay that students believe everything is negotiable. She said that in her own
classes, she is very clear at the beginning, “this is your contract.” When students
approach her at the end of the course with requests, she tells them to read the syllabus and
make an appointment, and then nobody comes to see her. She feels strongly that John Jay
and this committee need to make clear to students, “You work for your grade, and then
you have to live with it.” Any thinking that work can be accomplished after the fact needs
to stop, and if this is accomplished from the get-go, the grade change requests would not
come up so often.

Dean Lopes agreed that a culture shift is necessary, and laying policies like this one down
will help that shift take place. Professor Adams said that this should be on the model
syllabus.
Professor Shapiro returned to Kathy Killoran's mention of the appeals process, asking for clarification on the timeline. He understood that the appeal process has to be commenced within a year. Was it not required to be finished within a year? Kathy Killoran answered that there is no deadline to resolve a grade appeal. Professor Kaplowitz said that the former Standards Committee spent three years trying to change that, but now they are going to try again.

Dean Lopes said that she's never seen students who think they can negotiate their grades at other institutions. The criteria needs to be clear. The culture shift needs to happen.

Courses Subcommittee

New Course: ENG 3XX Intermediate News Reporting (1st reading)

Professor Sexton introduced Professor Devin Harner to present the course.

Professor Harner explained that this course is the third in the Journalism sequence. This course takes students who have learned basic news reporting and moves them into more complicated structures like longer stories, style, collaborative editing, online basics, etc.

Professor Sexton said that these students will be putting together the John Jay newspaper, The Sentinel. Professor Harner said that space considerations in the newsroom prohibit the entire course from taking place in the newsroom, so instead, there is a system that will accommodate students signing up for hour-long work slots. At the end of the course, they will submit a portfolio and self-assessment to the professor.

Professor Adams said that the course should require alternative sources in addition to The New York Times to diversify and bring attention to biases. He also asked that Professor Harner examine the attendance policy, which seems to reward students just for being in class. Professor Adams' rationale was: “Don't give grades for perfect attendance, participation, yes, but simple attendance, no.”

Professor Gideon suggested having at least one lecture on ethics. Professor Harner said that ethics gets covered in the prerequisite courses. Professor Gideon asked why the syllabus talks about plagiarism when it could just reference the plagiarism policy. Professor Harner said that in journalism, there are different ideas about sources, and asked Professor Gideon to clarify his point. Professor Gideon said that it should be placed somewhere other than “notes.”

Dean Lopes addressed Professor Adams' comment that attendance should not be rewarded for its own sake. She said that certain courses, like this one, take professional behavior into account, in which case, the reward for attendance would be justified. For example, if the students are putting together a newspaper, then there are professional practice issues about showing up for work and punctuality that should factor into the grade. She thought there might be a way to write this language into the attendance policy, something about the “need for professional practice” to make the nuance clear. Professor
Tarantino agreed, from the theater perspective, where attendance is crucial. Professor Adams felt that in those cases, what is being rewarded is participation, not attendance. A student could show up and do no work. Professor Tarantino said that it made sense to her to include attendance in the grade for any class tied to a college activity. Professor Harner added that typically there are only two or three students who even meet this high standard, and they are already doing well in the class, so they don't need the boost in grade.

Professor Snajdr brought attention to page 14 of the syllabus, which includes one day to study web-based media. He suggested spending more time on technology. Professor Harner responded that this decision was made with care, and that the department wishes to push traditional writing in this course. He also explained that the following course in the minor concentrates on online reporting. Then he added that students can learn the online stuff, but if they don't have foundational journalism principles mastered, then they'll just have online writing full of typos, spelling issues, bad sources, erratic structure, and so forth.

Professor Adams said that the full text of the plagiarism policy should be in the syllabus, rather than a link that students have to click, because most students will never visit the website to absorb the policy.

Kathy Killoran asked for a few technical adjustments. In the course description, question four needed to be written in third person for inclusion in the bulletin. Also, the learning objectives need to be written from the student's perspective - “what students will know or be able to do” rather than what professors will teach them. She suggested that Professor Harner speak with Professor Alexa Capeloto for tips on that language. Dean Lopes added that Undergraduate Studies could work with him on that language to phrase it better in terms of outcomes assessment.

Dean Lopes said that further feedback could be directed to Professor Harner.

New Course: SOC 2XX Sport in Global Perspective (1st reading)

Kathy Killoran presented the proposal, which had a different title when it came before the Courses Subcommittee. She explained that the subcommittee gave feedback to Professor Lucia Trimbur. They suggested she add SOC 101 as a prerequisite. They also asked that since Professor Trimbur's pedagogical style is all about students’ close reading, she include that element as a performance objective. They also asked her to include full citations for the readings. Then Kathy Killoran introduced Professor Trimbur.

Professor Trimbur explained that she changed the title to reflect the specificity of the course. It is a standard Sociology of Sport class, a course popular at many colleges, but not currently offered at John Jay. Professor Trimbur's own background is in sport, and she writes about the subject. She said that Kathy Killoran had suggested that the course might need to be 300-level, and Professor Trimbur was inclined to agree. Professor Trimbur also said that she plans to pare down the reading list, which includes a number of full books where single chapters would suffice.
Professor Adams agreed that the course looks like a 300-level course because it is very rich in challenging readings. He also asked if outcomes assessment should be included on the syllabus. Kathy Killoran said that the model syllabus calls for including learning objectives, but not outcomes assessment. Professor Adams said that he communicates to his own faculty that there is a certain gestalt one tries to get with the students, and it can not necessarily be measured, but a professor should attempt to come up with criteria for observing how that will be manifested. Dean Lopes agreed that this is true for the professor, but does not need to be communicated to the student. Professor Adams felt that this goal should be transparent in the syllabus. Professor Trimbur thought this sounded like a simple rewording.

Dean Lopes explained that learning objectives and outcomes are essentially the same thing, but each is worded differently. Objectives are worded from the perspective of the student and outcomes are worded from the perspective of the teacher. The basis for the outcomes should be embedded in the syllabus.

Professor Trimbur asked for clarification on what the syllabus requires in addition to learning objectives and possibly learning outcomes. Dean Lopes said that it should spell out what the assessments are.

Professor Sexton asked for more information about the two seven-page papers required in the course.

Professor Lee thought the course looked really interesting and emphasized her enthusiasm, but suggested that the course description could be more specific and concrete. She suggested recasting the first sentence as “This course explores the social and political aspects of sport...” She also noted that the phrasing on the top of page 9 seemed too open. She asked that the material be framed more specifically from the start so that readers would have a better sense of the objectives.

Dean Lopes closed the discussion on this course.

Chad Infante brought two items up that he would like the committee to consider visiting on future agendas. First, he had a concern about the evaluation process for foreign language placement at the college that he wished to bring attention to, but was unsure as to who should address the issue. From the student perspective, the process is inefficient and needs examination. Secondly, he raised that the payment process for late fees on loaning laptops is illogical and cumbersome - they do not accept cash but they only charge five cents per day. Kathy Killoran responded that this would be an accounting problem, because they are not an office that can accept payments. The person to deal with that issue would be the Vice President of Administration. On foreign languages, she said that this past semester a more regularized process for placement was instituted by the Foreign Language Department. The point person for that conversation would be Professor Raul Rubio.
A motion was made and seconded to adjourn.

It was unanimously acclaimed. The meeting concluded at 12:14 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah Hammond, Scribe
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UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM & UNDERGRADUATE STANDARDS COMMITTEE  

Minutes of February 25, 2011  

The Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee held its meeting on Friday, February 25th, at 10:30 a.m. in Room 610T. Dean Anne Lopes, UCASC Chair, called the meeting to order.


Absent: Amy Adamczyk, C. Jama Adams, Berenecea Johnson-Eanes, Chad Infante, Monika Son.


Administrative Announcements

Dean Lopes welcomed everyone and introduced Professor Angelique Corthals, a new UCASC representative from Forensic Science.

Dean Lopes reminded the committee that General Education will come up at the next meeting, so it is important for members to review those materials on the General Education web site soon. She also asked for volunteers to join the Principles, Policies, and Procedures committee (PPP). Professor David Shapiro, Professor Judy-Lynne Peters and Professor Dana Tarantino offered to join Professor Jama Adams and Dean Lopes on the committee. She also announced that all of UCASC’s courses and policy proposals passed at College Council the day before without any questions or problems.

Approval of the minutes of January 28, 2011

A motion was made and seconded to consider the minutes of the UCASC meeting of January 28.
Professor Karen Kaplowitz’s name will be added to the list of guests.

The committee voted unanimously to approve the minutes with the above changes with 20 votes in favor.

Old Business

Academic Standards (2nd Readings)

Proposal to Revise the Latin Honors Standards

Professor Kaplowitz recapped the proposal to increase the minimum required GPAS for Cum Laude, Magna Cum Laude, and Suma Cum Laude. She pointed out that the proposal has been revised in response to feedback from UCASC and others that if a change is to be made, then John Jay may as well adjust the GPA requirements all the way up to the national standard rather than first moving to the CUNY standard, which is lower. So the proposal now intends to raise the GPA requirements for Latin Honors to 3.5 for Cum Laude, 3.7 for Magna Cum Laude, and 3.9 for Suma Cum Laude.

A motion was made and seconded to accept the Proposal to Revise the Latin Honors Standards. The Proposal to Revise the Latin Honors Standards was accepted unanimously with 20 votes in favor.

Vice President Richard Saulnier asked when the effective date of the change will be, and Dean Lopes answered that this proposal will go into effect in Summer of 2012.

Policy on Extra Work Assigned After Final Grades Are Submitted

Professor Kaplowitz summarized the proposed policy, which would provide faculty a firm and clear guideline as to how to respond to students’ requests for changes after final grades have been determined. The policy would allow changes to be made only in the case of computational error, declaring to students that grades are not negotiable.

A motion was made and seconded to accept the Policy on Extra Work Assigned After Final Grades Are Submitted. The Policy on Extra Work Assigned After Final Grades Are Submitted was accepted with 20 votes in favor and 1 opposed.

Courses (2nd Readings)

SOC 3XX Sport in Global Perspective
Professor Lucia Trimbur summarized the new course and pointed out that she had made changes to the proposal after the last UCASC meeting, clarifying the syllabus and strengthening the first two sentences.

Kathy Killoran asked the committee to notice that this course has been listed with a typo in the agenda, and it is in fact a 300-level course, not a 200-level course as listed in the agenda. Also, the ENG pre-requisite will need to be 201 rather than 101, since it is a 3XX course.

Dean Lopes said that the syllabus doesn’t need to include both the learning objectives and learning outcomes. She suggested collapsing those lists down to three to five items.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the new course, SOC 3XX Sport in Global Perspective. The new course, SOC 3XX Sport in Global Perspective, was approved unanimously with 22 votes in favor.

ENG 3XX Intermediate News Writing and Reporting

On the agenda, this course was listed first, but was held pending the arrival of a professor to speak for the course. Professor Alexa Capeloto spoke on behalf of Professor Devin Harner, whose course it is. She noted that he had updated the readings list based on UCASC feedback to bring in some diversity and changed the course description and rationale to explain how the course fits into the journalism minor.

Virginia Moreno asked for a technical revision to the learning objectives, which should have student-centric phrasing such as “by the end of the course, a student should know or learn or be able to…”

A motion was made and seconded to approve the new course, ENG 3XX Intermediate News Writing and Reporting. The new course, ENG 3XX Intermediate News Writing and Reporting, was approved unanimously with 21 votes in favor.

POL 3XX Government and Politics in the Middle East and North Africa

Professor Peter Romaniuk presented the proposal on Professor Yuksel Sezgin’s behalf. Professor Sezgin has sent a memo to the committee since he could not attend the meeting, and Professor Romaniuk recapped the substance of that memo, also adding that the topic of this course had become even more interesting in the news cycle between the first reading of the course and this second reading, given the events in Egypt and the region.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the new course, POL 3XX Government and Politics in the Middle East and North Africa. The new course, POL 3XX
Government and Politics in the Middle East and North Africa, was approved unanimously with 23 votes in favor.

New Business

Programs Subcommittee (1st Readings)

Proposal for a B.A. in Law and Society

Professor Simon Baatz, Chair of Programs Subcommittee, explained that this new B.A. comes from the Political Science Department to replace the current Legal Studies Major. The Legal Studies major has experienced a steady decline in enrollment from 2001 to the present, and the department believes this is due to the lack of clarity in the prior major’s focus. The Law and Society major would study law within a liberal arts context. It would be an interdisciplinary program drawing from many departments. Professor Baatz said that the Programs Subcommittee had felt that the proposal was quite coherently organized and structured, and so they hadn’t asked for very many changes except for a few points on phrasing.

Professor Shapiro asked how it was determined which members would be on the Curriculum Advisory Committee. Professor Jim Cauthen, who represents the proposal, answered that responsibility for the original Legal Studies major was shared between the Law and Police Science, Sociology and Political Science Departments. A few years ago, he explained, the Political Science Department assumed lone responsibility for overseeing the major. The advisory committee was constructed from the departments that originally shared responsibility but, he added, there is no reason they could not have other members from other departments who had courses in the major.

Professor Cauthen then went on to elaborate on the reasons for the new major. The former Legal Studies major felt like a smorgasbord of law-related courses without a focus. This Law and Society major as it is proposed here would endeavor to teach law as an instrument of social change, and that would be the organizing principle used to make all curriculum decisions. Courses will be judged according to that principle, and departments can look to this principle as they develop new courses.

Christopher Sui asked if this major would be appropriate for students who wish to go to law school, given that in his experience, a lot of Law Schools are not looking for students with undergraduate majors that are so focused in law. Professor Cauthen responded that this major is not a pre-law major. The major is structured to comply with ABA standards and includes a number of critical writing courses and so forth. Legal Studies had been losing students because it seemed to be trying to fill multiple roles, as a pre-Law major and preparation for paralegal work. This replacement major has been designed to deal that problem.
Professor Bettina Carbonell asked if the English Department’s Literature and Law course had been considered for the curriculum of the new major, adding that there were several English courses that seem appropriate. Professor Cauthen responded that courses had been considered that seemed to support the organizing principle of the new major. He said if departments would like to suggest courses be added that are appropriate, the Curriculum Advisory Board would consider them.

Dean Lopes praised the new major for its specificity of purpose. “It does not try to be all things to all people, and doesn’t include a laundry list of courses.” She added that there are many majors at John Jay that are unfocused, and that is not good for the college. She thought the organizing principle was a good way to go about centering a major’s focus.

Professor Ellen Sexton asked how students were going to learn how to do legal research. Professor Cauthen responded that there is a Sociology research course and the Political Science department is developing a research methods course. He said he could talk further about it with Prof. Sexton.

Professor Kaplowitz had a technical question about the listed budget, which seemed small at $5,816 for full-time faculty. Kathy Killoran explained that the budget tables are provided by CUNY and account only for added costs on top of resources that we already have to support the major. She explained that expense was identified for the release time that major coordinators earn.

Professor Maryann McClure was concerned that PHI/LAW 310 Ethics of Law is no longer included as a requirement, though it was required for the Legal Studies major.

Professor Kyoo Lee asked about the Foundations Sections that are listed in Part Four of the curriculum (page 16). She thought the foundations that had been designated were essential, but wondered if there might be room for other foundational possibilities like cultural, theological, or ethical. Professor Cauthen responded that ethics in particular is important, and Part Four includes it. He acknowledged that the problem with developing any major is that one has to make choices, so adding any required course means taking other courses out. While developing this major, his committee has been balancing the goals of the major versus breadth. He said that they are open to considering courses that fit within the organizing principle.

Professor Andrew Karmen commended the new major on behalf of the Sociology Department, which looks forward to contributing to the new major.

Proposal to Revise the B.S. in Fire Science

Professor Baatz introduced the revision to this major offered by the Department of Protection Management. The changes to the major have been prompted in part by the Fire and Emergency Services Higher Education (FESHE) program, which is part of FEMA, which in turn is part of the Department of Homeland Security.
Professor Sexton asked about CHEM 104. Professor Robert Till explained that at John Jay, CHEM 103 is what most other students would call CHEM 101 and 102 rolled into one course. Because of this, the new revised major would be dropping CHEM 104, which seems to be an onerous burden on the students. CHEM 103 meets the needs of the major and is useful enough for weeding out students who cannot complete the coursework.

There were no more questions. Dean Lopes announced that members should e-mail Professor Till with additional feedback.

Proposal to Revise the B.A. in Criminal Justice

Professor Baatz introduced the proposal, which would revise the major to be a study of Criminal Justice from a research and policy perspective which would prepare students for work in policy analysis, consulting, or further academic work in graduate school. He enumerated the changes to the major briefly. There's a new required course sequence called Introduction to Major Problems in Criminal Justice I & II, a requirement that students take two research methods courses, a new course on gender, culture, and crime. Prof. Baatz summarized his committee's questions for the Criminal Justice Department. The first question was about the difference between the B.A. and the B.S. degree, and how students know when to switch between them, and the chair had answered that question. The second question was regarding internships and the department said they would work on that. The third question was about international possibilities.

Professor Evan Mandery, who has put a lot of time into this proposal, told the committee that this revision is not an incremental change but a quantum shift which will make a lot of John Jay's students better off. He cautioned against thinking of the change as theory versus practice, but proposed that the change is more about looking at developing skills on one end and equipping students to tackle problems on the other. “I think this is going to position John Jay to be ahead of the curve in the discussion about the evolution of Criminal Justice,” he said. He was proud of the revision of the B.A., which will maintain the focus it had before, but with a much more rigorous curriculum, which will ultimately make a dramatically difference in the marketplace.

Dean Lopes asked him to speak to the difference between the B.A. and the B.S. Professor Mandery said that the Criminal Justice Department has been working with the Law and Police Science Department. Criminal Justice is revising the B.A. and LPS is revising the B.S. He said that there is a basic agreement between the two departments that during the first two years of study, it should be easy for students to move back and forth between the B.A. and the B.S., and they will continue to discuss to work this out. He said there may be a point after which students would not be able to switch easily without taking additional courses. With respect to internships, Professor Mandery said that the Criminal Justice Department is hoping to work closely with John Jay’s Centers in developing them, which would bring a new group of faculty into the major who have not been involved with students previously.
Professor Karmen brought forward concerns from the Sociology Department that this proposal walks some of the same territory as the Criminology major that Sociology offers. He stated that the Sociology Department does not oppose this proposal in any way and wishes to support the new department. He said that his department “wants to affirm our wish to continue to nurture our Criminology major, and that it will continue to be a major focus of our Sociology Department.”

Dena Lopes said that further comments can be e-mailed to Professor Mandery.

Educational Partnerships Subcommittee

Proposal for a 2+2/Joint Degree with Borough of Manhattan Community College for an A.S. in Accounting for Forensic Accounting and B.S. in Economics (Forensic Financial Analysis track).

David Barnett reminded the committee that a Letter of Intent for this partnership has come before the committee twice. He also offered some context. John Jay already has an articulation agreement with BMCC that links their A.A.S. degree in Accounting with John Jay's B.S. in Economics, and there is a fairly healthy flow of students between the schools. This partnership links the A.S. degree in Accounting to our B.S. rather than from the A.A.S., so students have much more liberal arts preparation. John Jay is eager for this proposal to go forward.

Christopher Sui asked if the joint degree program complements what's already at the CUNY Justice Academy. David Barnett confirmed that it is part of the Justice Academy.

Professor Lapidus had a question about the music and art requirements, which are valued at two credits, though he's unaware of anything at John Jay that is only two credits. David Barnett clarified that those parts of the document refer to classes offered at BMCC, and so list credit amounts that correspond with BMCC's offerings. Professor Tarantino also asked about the portion of the document labeled “John Jay equivalents” that calls for two credit electives in music or art, pointing out that John Jay doesn't have two credit courses, and wondering why theater is not listed there, given that John Jay does offer theater courses. David Barnett answered that the “John Jay equivalent” means that the course was taken at BMCC but fits into an area at John Jay, so all of the courses and credit requirements listed rely on offerings at BMCC.

Professor Lapidus asked how changes to Gen Ed will affect this proposal. David Barnett responded that everything will have to be articulated anew after those changes come down. Dean Lopes added that Gen Ed revision will change a lot, but CUNY is also looking for changes in general education at CUNY colleges across the board.

Christopher Sui asked if the program will prepare students for the Fraud Examiner Exam. Professor David Shapiro confirmed that it would.
Professor Leippe asked why a group of particular courses was named in one category. David Barnett answered that this was the result of negotiation between John Jay and BMCC where John Jay had asked them to find an offering that speaks to diversity.

Dean Lopes said that further comments could be e-mailed to David Barnett.

Courses Subcommittee (1st Readings)

New Course: ENG3XX Digital Journalism

Professor Sexton introduced the course, noting that the title has been changed since the course was put on the, from “Online Reporting” to “Digital Journalism.”

Professor Alexa Capeloto explained that this is the final of the four core courses for the journalism minor. The name was changed because “online reporting” did not quite capture the breadth of work students do in the course. In this course, students apply everything they’ve learned about interviewing and writing to the digital world, keying into contemporary forms of communication. This course will make students competitive in the current marketplace.

She also noted that the language in the learning objectives for this course needed adjustment to describe the student learning in the class, rather than the instructor’s goals. Kathy Killoran also asked Prof. Capeloto to include the name of the ENG 3XX course that was specified as a prerequisite for this course for clarity.

At this point, the agenda was adjusted to move past PHI 3XX and return to it later in the meeting when the proposers would be present.

Course Revision: PSY 101 General Psychology I

Kathy Killoran explained that this change comes with a package of changes from Psychology, which are mostly changes to course titles, descriptions or prerequisites as a result of the revision to the major that UCASC approved at the last meeting.

The title for PSY 100 is being changed, since for many years they have been teaching the course as a full Introduction to Psychology rather than dividing it into two courses. They are changing the title to Introduction to Psychology and updating the course description.

Since this made a lot of sense, Dean Lopes asked if the committee would like to go ahead and vote to approve this change and skip a second reading.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the course revision, PSY 101 General Psychology I.
Before the vote, however, Professor Judy Lynn Peters suggested that the entire block of Psychology changes could be voted on together rather than approved one at a time. The committee as a whole agreed with this sentiment, so voting was postponed until Kathy Killoran had recapped the rest of the changes in the Psychology package.

A motion was made and seconded to suspend the second readings of the block of Psychology courses. The motion to suspend the second readings of the block of Psychology courses was approved unanimously with 23 votes in favor.

Course Revision: PSY 200 General Psychology II

Kathy Killoran explained that this course will be called Cognitive Psychology and the description is being revised.

Course Revision: PSY 221 Social Psychology

Kathy Killoran explained that they are changing the description of this course to reflect the material that is being covered.

Course Revision: PSY 231 Child Psychology

Kathy Killoran explained that they are changing the title and description of this course to reflect the fact that it does not focus specifically on children. It will be called Developmental Psychology.

Course Revision: PSY 242 Abnormal Psychology

Kathy Killoran explained that they are adjusting the course description to reflect what is being taught.

Course Revision: PSY 311 Experimental Psychology

Kathy Killoran explained that this is a four credit course, one of the lynchpins of the major, and they have broadened it past Experimental Psychology, and wish to rename it “Research Methods.” There are no changes to the hours, prerequisites, and so forth.

Professor Gideon suggested rephrasing the title as “Research Methods in Psychology,” since the field has its own specific methodology. Kathy Killoran asked if Professor Leippe would agree to the change, and he did.

Course Revision: PSY/LAW 370 Psychology and Law

Kathy Killoran explained that this is cross-listed between Psychology and Law and Police Science. PSY 221 is being added as an alternate prerequisite.

Course Revision: PSY 378-379 Field Work in Psychology
Kathy Killoran explained that they are revising the description to much better describe the experience that students will be getting in the course.

**Course Revision: PSY 421 Forensic Social and Experimental Psychology**

Kathy Killoran explained that PSY 221 Social Psychology is being added as a prerequisite, which makes sense because the other prerequisites are Psychology and Law, and experimental psychology. This adds the appropriate knowledge about social psychology.

Having recapped the changes to all of the Psychology courses, Dean Lopes opened the floor to discussion about the general block of courses. There was no further discussion.

*A motion was made and seconded to approve the course revisions to the block of Psychology courses with one amendment to the title of PSY 311. The revisions to the block of Psychology courses were approved unanimously with 23 votes in favor.*

*At this point the agenda was adjusted to revisit courses that were skipped earlier.*

**New Course: PHI 3XX Reality Truth and Being: Metaphysics**

Professor Kyoo Lee began to present the course in the absence of the proposing professor, who was not present yet because the meeting was moving ahead of schedule. She explained that metaphysics is often called the first philosophy. It is an upper level foundational course that explores the canonical questions such as what is reality, what is truth, and so forth.

At this point, one of the proposers, Professor James DiGiovanna, arrived and proceeded to introduce the course. He explained that metaphysics is one of five essential areas of Philosophy. While the department has good coverage of ethics, aesthetics, logic, and social and political philosophy, they are currently lacking a good metaphysics course, which is why this course is being proposed. He explained that it needs to be at the 300-level because the work will be quite detailed, including contemporary discussion of metaphysics, and students will need to have the background and capacity to read those metaphysical texts. The course will include themes from the Western cannon as well as critiques from Eastern thought, criticisms from feminism and so forth. The course would prepare students for further work in philosophy if they wish to go on.

Kathy Killoran made a request for stylistic changes. The course description needs to be in third person and should not include any contractions. She also asked that the word “Proposed” be added to “Philosophy Major on question 18, since this has not been approved by New York State yet.

Professor Leippe asked for a description of the final exam. He also questioned the viability of an attendance policy that fails a student on three absences, especially with a course that meets twice a week. Professor DiGiovanna answered that actually the policy
in his syllabus would fail a student on four absences, not three, and explained that he got
the policy from the Center for Teaching under the impression that this was John Jay's
policy on absences.

Dean Lopes clarified that there is no college-wide policy on absences, and recommended
rewording the course's stance on absences in case of extenuating circumstances to leave
room for students who may be sick.

Kathy Killoran also clarified that the Center for Teaching makes no policies on
attendance. They can make recommendation, but they cannot set policy.

Professor Victor Herbert though that the syllabus addressed bibliographic styles very
well, but questioned whether the style guides addressed was actually college policy.
Kathy Killoran said that the proposal to broaden the acceptable styles just was approved
at College Council but has not been published anywhere as of yet. Dean Lopes responded
that the model syllabus will be adjusted soon to include new policies like the new policy
on bibliographic style.

Professor Shapiro asked why the course will include so many readings rather than
choosing a few texts with deeper reading. Professor DiGiovanna responded that one hope
of the course is to prepare students for further graduate work in metaphysical studies, so
the course endeavors to give students an understanding of the entire conversation that is
going on in contemporary philosophy rather than of one particular text. He wishes to
impress upon students the living nature of philosophy, which is always a series of
questions in debate. He did say that some of the readings may be trimmed, and if students
show special interest in some areas, those readings may receive more focus.

New Course: ART 1XX Graphic Arts

Professor Cyriaco Lopes introduced the course, which follows up on the drawing course
to develop students as artists. The goal would be to teach art, to teach some basics of
software, and to teach a bit of theory and art history.

Kathy Killoran asked where the class will take place. Professor Lopes answered that it
will be in 1304N, a classroom with the required software. He also said that there is
currently a proposal for a multimedia lab that Art and Music would share with English
and Communications and Theatre Arts, promoting community among the departments.

Vice President Saulnier asked how that room is getting translated into phase 2 and asked
if these classroom lab needs have been taken into account as John Jay moves into the new
building. Professor Lopes responded that nobody knows how to answer this. Dean Lopes
answered that the question has been asked and the college is looking into it with
awareness of the departmental concerns. There are two possible plans and they are being
discussed.
Professor Leippe pointed out a repeated section on page two of the proposal, where the brief rationale from the chair and the general rationale both contain the same paragraph word for word.

Professor Shapiro asked about the grading scheme. Professor Lopes said that he is planning to change the grading scheme, as the courses committee asked him to do, but had forgotten to do so in this document.

Professor Tarantino complimented recommended writing assignments, which require students to share their work on blackboard. She was pleased with the use of blackboard, which is a skill that the college needs to work on. Professor Lopes responded that it seems to create more excitement when students have to share writings with each other than just reporting to the teacher.

Dean Lopes said that further comments can be e-mailed to Professor Lopes.

*Motion was made and seconded to adjourn.*

It was unanimously acclaimed. The meeting concluded at 12:04 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah Hammond, Scribe
The Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee held its meeting on Friday, March 18th, at 9:35 a.m. in Room 610T. Dean Anne Lopes, UCASC Chair, called the meeting to order.


**Absent:** Clara Castro-Ponce, Chad Infante, Alandra Mitchell, Virginia Moreno, Judy-Lynne Peters, Christopher Sui, Hung-En Sung.


**Administrative Announcements**

Dean Lopes began by announcing the historic nature of this meeting, in which the new Gen Ed plan would be read by this committee for the first time. After 35 years of the same Gen Ed, the new model has been long awaited. A number of guests and visitors were present to follow the new Gen Ed proposal's progress through UCASC, and Dean Lopes was excited for the discussion to come.

**Approval of the minutes of February 25, 2011**

_A motion was made and seconded to consider the minutes of the UCASC meeting of February 25th._

The spelling of David Barnet's name will be corrected.

_The committee voted to approve the minutes with the above change with 19 votes in favor and 1 abstention._

**Old Business**

**Programs (2nd Readings)**

**Proposal for a B.A. in Law and Society**
Dean Lopes opened the floor for Peter Romaniuk to bring major forward. Professor Romaniuk then explained that Professor Jim Cauthen had summarized any changes to the proposal in a memo that had been sent to the committee.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the B.A. in Law and Society.

Professor John Pittman brought up a concern that ethics was not given appropriate weight in the design of new major, which has caused unanimous concern among the full time faculty in the Philosophy Department. Prior to the meeting, Professor Pittman did have a conversation with Professor Harold Sullivan about the lack of ethics requirements in the proposed major, and the Philosophy Department also sent an e-mail to Professor Cauthen. Professor Pittman read passages of this e-mail to the committee, expressing the Philosophy Department's objection to a major that can allow a student to graduate with a B.A. in Law and Society without taking a course that is focused in the role of ethical theories and arguments in American legal discourse. He then laid out the details of how ethics is incorporated into the new major's design only as a possible elective – one of six courses that fulfill a broader category designated by the new major.

Professor Pittman continued with a second concern about the process of building the new major, which seemed to have been done without consultation with the Philosophy Department even though the new major is identified as an Interdisciplinary Major. The weight of the major seems to lie in Political Science Courses, although it purports to be interdisciplinary, that aspect of the major is virtually absent.

Professor Sullivan responded to Professor Pittman's points, first addressing the question about the interdisciplinary elements of the major by pointing out a number of courses within the design that do not come from the Political Science department or may be Political Science courses that can be taught by a number of departments.

Professor Sullivan then addressed Professor Pittman's initial concern, noting that everything about the major was chosen deliberately to support its core principle, to study law as an instrument for social change. He pointed out that outside evaluators praised the design for the new majors for its focus. “It's not a supermarket major,” he said. Learning outcomes can be gotten to in multiple ways, and ethics is present in a number of courses aside from those strictly devoted to ethics.

Professor David Shapiro asked Professor Sullivan if a student did not take a Philosophy course on ethics, would that student be able to speak substantively to the law's failure to address ethics meaningfully upon graduating. Professor Sullivan said he couldn't answer that immediately because it would depend on the context of the course. Ethics is a core mission of all courses designed for the major, though not in as focused a way as PHI/LAW 310.

Professor Romaniuk pointed out that the external evaluators had raised no such concerns about whether a student would get to the end with a balanced view of law and society. He also reminded the committee that the current version of this major was deeply flawed, and so the criterion used to restructure the major was changed. This is a genuine replacement, not a revision.

Professor Maryann McClure, who has taught PHI 310 many times, spoke of her experience with students in the course and how directly the course impacts their blended understanding of philosophy and the practice of the law.

Professor Jama Adams spoke about this committee's ongoing interest in ethics. A few years ago, a
subcommittee of this body decided that it was best if ethics was embedded in every course across the curriculum. He noted that there is always a tension in the curriculum between having students understand the intellectual base of a problem, which would get covered in PHI 310, and embedding the discussion throughout the curriculum.

Professor James DiGiovanna returned to the question of interdisciplinarity, noting that there is a benefit for the students to hear about ethics from an expert in the subject who can speak most specifically to the various layers of an issue. He said that this discussion is not a concern over the extinction of a course – 310 will survive – but rather a question of whether students will cover the material with the depth and breadth needed.

Professor Lee elaborated on this point, explaining that the Philosophy professors are aware that they are not the only professors with access to ethics, but they are specifically trained to be sensitive to certain aspects of the world.

Professor Lisandro Perez had a technical correction for the document – that PLJ 322 is now LLS 322.

Professor Pittman said he appreciated that the major has been given a lot of thought and a lot of hard work, and it is a useful and important major that will serve the students. It is not the Philosophy department's desire to stop the major from going forward, but he reiterated his point that the Philosophy Department does still feel that there is not sufficient cross-disciplinary and liberal arts focus to this major, and one symptom of that is that ethics is not given as much attention as it seems as though it should get in a major that is about social change. His department is not insistent that PHI 310 be a requirement, but he does ask that the new major would do well to consider some revision that would give the course somewhat more prominence than it has now.

Professor Sullivan stressed again that because there are multiple sections of PHI 310, it is going to be selected by many students. Then he went on to say that he's seen a lot of majors developed, and often majors lose their way in the process of being created, trying to satisfy too many needs and desires. He said that the new major on the table is not meant to privilege Political Science Department, but does have a focus, and that should be appreciated.

*The committee voted to approve the B.A. in Law and Society with 20 votes in favor and 2 abstentions.*

After the vote, Dean Lopes added two points about process. First, on the issue of consultation, and how much departments need to speak to each other, she felt that should go on the agenda in the next PPP Subcommittee meeting. Secondly, disciplines themselves have become somewhat interdisciplinary in this postmodern world, and the term “interdisciplinary” needs to be clarified by the UCASC committee.

**Proposal to Revise the B.S. in Fire Science**

Professor Robert Till brought the proposal forward, noting that the Science Department had feedback about the Chemistry requirements, and there was brief discussion of modifying the chemistry courses specifically for the Fire Science program. The Science Department will work with Prof. Till to offer specially focused flavors of these courses for the major. Professor Angelique Corthals from the Science Department agreed, explaining that CHE 103 (CHE 101 & 102) can be modified to best fit the needs of the Fire Science students.
Professor Adams asked where ethics is built into the curriculum, as it looked very sharply focused on fire. Professor Till responded that ethics is addressed within the core curriculum, citing an example about sprinklers in a textbook.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the revision to the B.S. in Fire Science. The committee voted unanimously to approve the B.S. in Fire Science with 22 votes in favor.

Proposal to Revise the B.A. in Criminal Justice

Professor Mandery introduced the document. No discussion arose.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the revised B.A. in Criminal Justice. The committee voted unanimously to approve the revised B.A. in Criminal Justice with 22 votes in favor.

Educational Partnership (2nd Readings)

Proposal for a 2+2/Joint Degree with Borough of Manhattan Community College for an A.S. in Accounting for Forensic Accounting and B.S. in Economics (Forensic Financial Analysis Track)

David Barnet brought the document forth, which is being seen by the committee for the third time.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the Proposal for a Joint Degree with BMCC. The committee voted unanimously to approve the Proposal for a Joint Degree with BMCC with 22 votes in favor.

Courses (2nd Readings)

ENG 3XX Digital Journalism

Professor Alexa Capeloto said she had received no further feedback since the last meeting. She changed the wording of the learning objectives and the title of a prerequisite, in response to feedback received at the meeting.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the new course, ENG 3XX Digital Journalism. The committee voted unanimously to approve the new course, ENG 3XX Digital Journalism, with 22 votes in favor.

PHI 3XX Reality Truth and Being: Metaphysics

Professor DiGiovanna explained that the course description was rewritten slightly and the attendance policy was changed.
A motion was made and seconded to approve the new course, PHI 3XX Reality Truth and Being: Metaphysics. The committee voted unanimously to approve the new course, PHI 3XX Reality Truth and Being: Metaphysics, with 22 votes in favor.

**ART 1XX Graphic Arts**

Professor Cyriaco Lopes explained that changes were made to address feedback from the last meeting.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the new course, ART 1XX Graphic Arts. The committee voted unanimously to approve the new course, ART 1XX Graphic Arts, with 22 votes in favor.

**New Business**

**Courses Subcommittee**

At this point, the order of the courses to be discussed was revised due to the presence or absence of various presenters. The following reflects the order in which the courses were discussed rather than the order listed on the agenda.

**POL 2XX Introduction to Public Policy**

Professor Ellen Sexton explained that Professor Jennifer Rutledge could not attend as she teaches on Fridays, but that Professor Romaniuk would introduce the course in her place.

Professor Romaniuk explained that this course is evidence of the organic growth of the Political Science department's curriculum reflecting the terrific new hires added in the past few years. Professor Rutledge was recruited specifically to fill a gap in the department's offerings.

Professor Adams asked how the course addresses public policy in light of catastrophic events, asking where such events such as Hurricane Katrina are addressed. Professor Romaniuk said he would pass the question along to Professor Rutledge.

**CJBA 3XX Historical Perspectives on Violent Crime**

Professor Barry Latzer introduced the course as one he developed from his own research in recent years. He took up the history of crime in the twentieth century when he realized there was a gap in the literature. He felt it would be good to engage the students while he is personally engaged in the material. The idea is straightforward – to discuss in a semi-chronological way the history of crime in the twentieth century up to our own time. Some large topic areas that require intensive focus can't be discussed chronologically, which is why the time periods are not divided up equally in the syllabus.

Professor Sexton pointed out that the form should reflect the fact that Professor Latzer has been in consultation with the History department. She noted that the chair of the History department is interested in approving this course as an elective for the History major.

Professor Adams asked if there could be more analysis in the course of capitalism's effects, given the
300-level of the course. He referred to the experience of immigrant groups who would answer “what constitutes the good life” in terms of material goods, but are blocked from getting jobs. He asked how the course might address the class divide between white collar crime and violent crime, and how that is driven by capitalism as well.

Professor Latzer asked if he should respond, and Dean Lopes clarified the process, that the committee gives feedback and the presenter may clarify a point but does not need to debate. Feedback can be addressed in the second reading.

Professor Adams had a second point regarding assessment. He was concerned that there were only three grades in the syllabus, and suggested that earlier quizzes or some form of feedback be added to the beginning of the course so that students have some sense of what quality of work the professor expects.

Professor Victor Herbert suggested adding contemporary gangs and their impact on urban centers.

Kathy Killoran had a technical correction that the title of CJBA 230 (2XX) needs to be spelled out in the prerequisites because it is a new course, and everybody will not be familiar with it.

**PED 3XX Community Programs for Health, Wellness, and Physical Activity**

Kathy Killoran explained that this course went to Professor Sexton's subcommittee originally, then she continued to work with the department. The course has been created to support the new minor in health and physical fitness. The subcommittee provided a lot of feedback to shape the new course, and the department was very open to the feedback.

Professor Adams asked if there is any psychological dimension to Physical Education, and if so, could that be incorporated into the title. Professor Davidson Umeh said that “wellness” embodies the combination of physical and psychological. Professor Adams then said that the readings don't seem to support any examination of the psychological aspects of physical fitness.

On a technical note, Professor Michael Leippe pointed out that the references do not need to be listed in the schedule since there is also a bibliography attached to the syllabus.

Professor Tarantino asked that the attendance and punctuality expectations be spelled out more clearly.

**CJSBS 1XX Introduction to the American Criminal Justice System**

Kathy Killoran introduced this course as the first intended for the revised B.S. in Criminal Justice. The course is intended to replace CRJ 101, which students from both current majors take. It is a being replaced because they have changed the focus of the course and attack the material a different way. It focuses more on an overview of the CRJ process and how all those components fit together.

Professor Romaniuk pointed out a few typos, and asked that the learning objectives provide more detail. Professor Leippe asked for a more specific description of the term paper assignment.
**CJBA 2XX Understanding Criminal Behavior**

Kathy Killoran introduced Professor Joshua Freilich, explaining that the subcommittee had worked with him to make the class more appropriate for the 200-level. Professor Freilich said that the course is complementary to SOC 203.

Professor Adams thought the list of readings was excellent, but wondered how the course will address the fact that most students will bring less than adequate reading skills to the course. He suggested early quizzes to help with this.

Kathy Killoran asked that the title for prerequisite CJBA 111 (1XX) be spelled out since it is a new course and unfamiliar to many.

**SOC 3XX Evaluation Research**

The presenting professor was not present when this course came up, and Professor Sexton asked a procedural question about whether the presenting professor must be present if no responses are required in the first reading anyway. This initiated a process discussion about the point of first and second readings and the role of the presenters. Dean Lopes agreed that the committee could move forward and discuss the course without the presenter during the first reading. Professor Adams said that it is important for the presenting professor to be in the room because once every now and then, the proposed course is radically different than the norm and the committee needs to hear from the presenter.

Professor Lapidus questioned the purpose of saving responses from the professor until the second reading. If the first reading is intended only for feedback without response, often the issue is still too hot to resolve in the second reading, and then a third reading is needed. Professor Adams said that he felt the proposer needs to be present for all readings, because it is important for that person to hear the thinking of the committee and understand the concerns. He added that multiple readings of a course are fine if needed. He suggested that the committee could prepare proposers to speak to be ready to lay out a richer understanding of their thinking in setting up a course when they first present to the committee.

At this point, Professor Susan Will arrived, and so discussion turned to the course at hand. Professor Sexton introduced the course as a practical, useful one for students that Professor Will has taught before in California. Professor Will picked up the introduction, explaining that the course is one of five advanced methods courses that are part of the revised Criminology major. This particular course has a very practical application, as it prepares students to evaluate programs in nonprofit organizations, government agencies, schools, or almost anywhere. Such evaluation skills would be useful for future program evaluators and for those who may be employed by these agencies. The course is established to unite theory and practice.

Professor Adams asked how the course takes irrational human behavior into account, citing an example of people who wouldn't leave their homes during Hurricane Katrina, asking how program evaluation examines a program’s ability to maneuver with those inconsistencies. Professor Will responded that in actual program evaluation, there would be pre-test and post-test coverage, interviews with the people providing the service and those receiving it, in addition to other efforts to looking at both the implementation of a program and the satisfaction of the participants. Often, she said, it becomes apparent that the person implementing a program is not implementing it as it was envisioned or proposed.
Professor Gideon said that a similar course exists in Corrections (COR 401) and asked if that course could be cross-listed or acknowledged somehow. He questioned the title, as there is no actual evaluation done in this course. Professor Will responded that her ultimate goal with the course is to have students going out to agencies and evaluating them, and she is afraid that adjusting the title at this preliminary moment would create an unnecessary step on the way to achieving the ultimate goal. Professor Gideon also suggested updating the edition of the textbook.

Kathy Killoran noted that the corrections course may still be experimental. Professor Gideon explained that Corrections 401 was not experimental, but it was not offered for a while, and when the course returned the number was changed.

Professor Shapiro asked if the Program Evaluation courses offered in Public Management are only at the graduate level, and Professor Will confirmed that that is the case.

**Academic Standards Subcommittee**

*Model Syllabus*

Dean Lopes presented this, apologizing for the typos. She said a major priority of the Standards Subcommittee is to revise all of John Jay's forms with two goals, to update and to simplify. The model syllabus was altered for those two goals and also to comply with Middle States standards, where learning outcomes are valued most. This syllabus also has a more transparent grading system.

Professor Herbert asked about item fourteen, noting that newly assigned professors or adjuncts may not be aware of college policy for some of these items. He asked if a citation could be included, as it is for plagiarism. Karen Kaplowitz said that there's an e-handbook that spells out college policies available on the internet, and perhaps an URL could be provided in the model syllabus. Kathy Killoran said that that faculty e-handbook was written three years ago, and a number of changes have taken place since then. She said the e-handbook needs to be aligned with current policies before it can be used as a reference.

Professor Kaplowitz noted that the syllabus needs to include a line requiring faculty to state their style requirements in item 15.

Professor Tarantino asked that any extra fees like theatre tickets and so forth be spelled out in number 12. On item 14, she asked that consequences for work handed in late be stated.

Professor Adams asked about learning outcomes. In Middle States language, every learning outcome has a parallel measurable outcome. But some of what education does is not measurable, and he wondered how a syllabus or design might take that into account.

Professor Pittman asked about the relationship between program outcomes and learning outcomes. Is there room for a professor to address learning outcomes in a course that do not officially correspond to programmatic learning outcomes? Dean Lopes responded that a course may have multiple outcomes that are being used to achieve part of one programmatic outcome. Professor Pittman then asked if he was correct in thinking that the course outcomes do not need to be an identical repetition of the program's learning outcome. Dean Lopes confirmed, adding that, in fact, the course learning outcomes should be much more specific.
Kathy Killoran asked that the syllabus require the course description from the bulletin, though faculty can add to it. Also she asked that the ordering of the policies be reconsidered in terms of where each policy would make the most sense – for example, a policy on Incompletes should be listed near the grading section.

On a practical note, Professor Sexton suggested that it be made explicit in the phrasing that this model syllabus is not an example of a syllabus, but a list of things that a syllabus should contain. She also asked that the numbers be removed, because people will copy and paste them, and they are impractical in a complete syllabus.

Professor Adams suggested putting content before the rules, but Dean Lopes said that good practice is for requirements to go first, so students understand how they are being assessed from the beginning.

Professor Michael Puls pointed out a minor typo in the plagiarism policy.

Professor Lapidus asked for a word of welcome early in the syllabus, and asked if there is room for the syllabus to be aesthetically pleasing or have personality to set the tone. Dean Lopes noted that the model syllabus is deliberately third person and personal touches like words of welcome will be left to the individual faculty.

Professor Herbert agreed with Dean Lopes' last statement, stating his appreciation for the simplicity of the model syllabus form. He agreed that a welcome letter may be good, but does not need to be mandated in the model syllabus.

Karen Kaplowitz noted that number five should be rephrased since it's come to attention recently that office hours are not required.

**New Course Proposal Form/Course Revision Form**

This item was deferred to a later meeting, but Dean Lopes said that any feedback should be sent her way.

**General Education Taskforce**

In introducing the new General Education plan, Dean Lopes reminded the committee that the learning outcomes have already gone through College Council and been accepted. Professor Amy Green then officially presented the plan to the committee. She began by thanking the members of the General Education reform committee who were in the room for their collegial and constructive work.

Professor Green asked Professor DiGiovanna to introduce the room to the first of the six clusters, Reasoning and Communication. Professor DiGiovanna explained that this cluster is the largest because this is where traditional skills courses will go, but that all courses are going to be assessed to make sure that they genuinely do produce the learning outcomes that will fit them into this cluster. The goal of this is not simply to inoculate students to write for four years, but to set up an ongoing scaffold that will be carried over into the rest of the curriculum.

Then Professor Andrea Balis introduced the Justice Core Cluster, which is scaffolded so General
Education does not end after the first two years. This cluster reflects the college's mission and the fact that students come to John Jay because they are interested in justice. The progression is designed to move from the individual to the United States, to the global, and the courses can be in any discipline or designed by any department.

Professor Perez then introduced the right-hand column of the plan, which includes four different clusters – the Creative Dimension, Learning from the Past, Natural and Physical World, and Self, Culture and Society. In all of these cases, UCASC would make the decisions about whether or not a course satisfies a cluster's needs.

Professor Green then addressed concerns about the distribution requirements and the disciplinary overlay that was requested by many but ultimately left out of the plan. She said that the task force spent many meetings working with this suggestion, attempting to generate a model that included a disciplinary overlay in addition to the clusters that have been laid out. After a vigorous debate, it was ultimately decided that with the disciplinary overlay, the credit requirements for students were too high, and this is impossible given that 80th Street had mandated a 42 credit limit. Without the disciplinary overlay, the task force has been able to create a General Education model that comprises 47 credits at its leanest. There has been strong feedback from 80th Street for the model, so Professor Green has hope that once the model is approved at John Jay, it will be likely that 80th Street will approve the larger degree than the 42 credits they have called for. John Jay is in good shape to set a standard for the rest of the university with this new model.

Dean Lopes opened the floor to questions.

Professor Adams asked what the case against suggesting a mandatory minor was. The concern is that the number of credits will balloon, and students will not be exposed broadly to subjects they may encounter if they have a minor. Professor Green said the mandatory minor was considered, but it raises the amount of credits up to 73 and is simply not possible to meet 80th Street's demands. She added that there is no reason a major could not require a minor, but it was felt that it was ultimately beyond the charge of the Steering Committee's power to recommend that proposal. It was a strong mission of the task force to make a General Education model that values depth over superficial breadth.

Professor Lapidus had three questions. First, much of the language pertains to courses that will be forthcoming, but how would existing courses that fit into these clusters be dealt with. With courses that fit into more than one cluster, who would choose how it fits into the curriculum? Secondly, he asked about the timeline, and when existing courses would be vetted for the new model. Third, he did not feel that it would be necessary to have another committee in addition to UCASC to work through these course by course decisions about General Education.

Professor Green responded that many decisions about where courses fit would be made next year and many of the existing courses will fall into the General Education model easily with a few tweaks. To his last point, she reminded the committee that General Education has been ignored at John Jay for thirty-five years, which is why there has to be a body designated to keep track of the model. Her task force had considered proposing a committee outside of UCASC but ultimately felt comfortable that a General Education committee within the body of UCASC that works with these concerns would suffice.

Professor Carbonell asked if total credits might be reduced if courses in the justice core might be applied to partially satisfy other clusters. Professor Green confirmed and said that's how the model was
brought down to 47 credits. Professor Carbonell said that a timeline is needed to see how the task force imagines that students would complete the general education requirement within their 120 credits. She also wanted to know how the prerequisites for majors are addressed.

Dean Lopes answered the student-timeline question, stating that a key point of this model is that General Education goes across the curriculum and reaches all the way up to 400-level courses.

Professor Herbert had a concern about how transfer and nontraditional students would negotiate the model. He asked for some sort of statement that tells how those students will be integrated into the model, and that there would be acceptance of students from other paths. Professor Green asked Professor Herbert to draft something specific explaining why a transfer student might have a harder time than others. For the moment, he brought up the example of the fire science program, where specific titles and hierarchies shift the student experience, as well as military transfers who come into John Jay with a different background than the standard undergraduate list of courses.

Vice President Richard Saulnier shared the concern about students progressing through General Education in an organized fashion so that all the requirements are not left to the end, and he added that this could be controlled electronically. Then he added to Professor Herbert's concern about students in Fire Science as well as the students engaged in police training. The Police Department training credit does not usually fulfill General Education requirements in terms of what they do at the academy, and neither does the Fire Department. He said that this is going to have to be worked out as the model is implemented, and there is no one-size-fits-all answer.

Vice President Berenecea Johnson-Eanes added to this discussion of John Jay's in-service populations, who she sees in the Counseling Department. Everyone comes in with a different record and must be advised differently, so one model may not serve the variety of needs in this population. Professor Green asked that someone send her potential language about this issue that might be incorporated or addressed within the model.

Professor Romaniuk asked if there would be a rush by departments on developing courses for the justice core, given that anything in the third column needed to be in the justice core. Dean Lopes didn't feel that that would be a problem in a population of 12,000+ undergraduates. Professor Green said that this is one of the reasons that a committee is needed to monitor that too many versions of the same course will not be created. The General Education committee will need to monitor the array of courses, making sure that the college's offerings remained balanced. One goal of the sea-change that this model wishes to make is to put the responsibility for General Education in everybody's hands.

Professor Tarantino brought up the question of doubling up courses and asked if a limit needs to be set on how many requirements a course can satisfy. Professor Lapidus added that this model requires heavy advising, and John Jay is already falling short on providing adequate advisement to its student population. He felt that advisement needs to be written into the model for the plan to succeed.

Dean Lopes concurred that advisement is a challenging issue, but there is already a vigorous advisement plan that coincides with this. Then she said that she did not feel that the current General Education plan is any less confusing to students than the new plan may be. The new plan will involve electronic coding which should ease students through the clusters, but she concluded by noting that she takes the point about the general state of advisement at John Jay. Professor Adams suggested that the Provost's Office and Faculty Personnel Committee could rethink how advising and counseling duties are factored into a professor's teaching credit at the college when it comes to personnel moves, leave
time, and so forth. There is room at John Jay to give more weight to the work for faculty who engage with students this way.

Professor Romaniuk commended the committee for internationalizing the curriculum.

Professor Pittman was concerned how 80th Street would react to the use of a justice core for General Education, and wondered if they may simply ask that the justice core be stripped to reach the 42 credit limit that has been mandated. Provost Jane Bowers countered that the current thinking in General Education is that it should always be connected to the mission and identity of the institution within which it resides, so it is not something independent of the school. She explained that the Chancellor has been pleased with the steps John Jay has taken to tailor a unique General Education model that engraves the John Jay signature. She said that she was confident that the justice core would not be a liability along the way. Dean Lopes confirmed that 80th Street's feedback has been positive, and added that Middle States is also looking for a General Education with a coherent core that connects to a college's mission.

Professor Pittman also expressed concern that departments will get territorial and competitive over getting courses into clusters. He asked if thought has been given to promoting disciplines working on cross-listed courses, or if a mechanism may be developed to promote cross-listing to curtail the ballooning of course offerings.

Professor Kaplowitz expressed her admiration for the model and congratulated the committee for the culmination of their efforts. She raised a concern about the political reality of getting this model through the Faculty Senate, where this model has been the subject of much discussion already. The Senate's concern is that because students come to John Jay with a criminal justice focus as freshman, this new model may make it possible for them to avoid other courses that they have not been exposed to before, like History or Anthropology. The concern is that without requirements, students will not choose those courses. She reported that the Senate had taken a unanimous vote that a disciplinary overlay specifying that courses must be taken in various departments was absolutely needed.

Professor Adams questioned her phrasing, saying that the concern is not just a political issue, but a genuine concern from the faculty about quality and breadth. He said that when the Senate speaks, they should make clear the difference between disciplinary requirement and departmental requirement. Then he went on to say that the college wants to give students breathing room to come into the college a bit confused and explore courses rather than requiring a lockstep progression of courses that must be taken. He recast the question as a logistical issue rather than a political issue and brought attention to the model before the committee. The model, as presented, requires broad disciplinary exposure, and it certainly exposes students to concepts that they would not have brought to John Jay. He felt that this model expands the John Jay student's knowledge base rather than restricting it.

Vice President Saulnier concurred that the exercise in laying distribution requirements over the model did create a vision of an overly restrictive plan for students. The current plan may not be perfect, but it allows the students to breathe and grow and explore different areas. It certainly exposes students to concepts that they would not have brought to John Jay. He felt that this model expands the John Jay student's knowledge base rather than restricting it.

Professor Perez spoke of the Steering Committee's struggle to answer the feedback, and said that ultimately the committee felt that what the model presents is, in effect, a set of distribution requirements. They tried to think politically about how the new model would be received and addressed in the FAQ section what the model is and what it is not.
Professor Shapiro asked about the role of corporations and the military, which seem to be left until the 400-level to be addressed. Professor Green answered that Professor Shapiro should propose a course. Professor Adams said that in his department's Ethnicity and Race course, the material world is discussed a great deal, and corporations come into that discussion. He suggested that there are creative ways that a concern like Professor Shapiro's can be addressed within existing courses.

Provost Bowers responded to Professor Kaplowitz's mention of the political realities and governance. She said that this curriculum comes from the faculty, reminding all that the steering committee that came up with this proposal after years of study, and consultation, was predominantly a faculty committee. This was their proposal and they voted by a large majority. The same is true of UCASC, which is a governance committee of the college that was constituted to oversee, hear about, think about, and vote on matters of the curriculum. She encouraged the UCASC to exercise its charter right to vote on curricular proposals. In phase two, everything UCASC votes on goes to College Council. She said that the Faculty Senate's voice and opinions obviously carry weight in the final analysis of the vote, but the committee in this room has the responsibility first of sending a clear message yay or nay to the next body. She felt that it was important to clarify the progression of governance at the college for the committee as the members consider the General Education model before them.

Professor Lou Guinta wished to applaud the committee for what has been put forward. “It's radical for a lot of people to look at a change and accept change,” he said. He acknowledged that it is a political issue as well, but this change is an actual change and many of the faculty's objections are philosophically motivated.

Professor Kaplowitz clarified her use of the word “political,” by which she had not meant to simplify anybody's opinions or undermine anybody's passion on the subject. She only wanted to bring the matter of the vote to this committee's attention.

Professor Lee had a question about approval of courses, as addressed on page 5. She wanted to know if there would be a single approval for each course. Professor Green said that had not been determined yet. Professor Lee also asked how the plan would allow for intersectional courses. Professor Green said one of the issues on the table is how to make the plan understandable for students and allow for the richness of offerings that Professor Lee would like. The Steering Committee felt that this issue should be left to the governance of the UCASC committee created to monitor the plan.

Professor Leippe returned to Karen Kaplowitz's point about the disciplinary overlays, expressing concern that the plan appears to make it possible for a student to get through a degree without a basic course like composition or anything in world history. Professor Green said that this impression is incorrect. She pointed out that the draft before the committee does not currently show a list of courses that will fall into each cluster. With such a list, it would be apparent to any reader that a student must have a history course to satisfy the Learning From the Past component and the same is true for the other clusters. This plan provides the framework, and next year's work will determine the courses that fit into the framework.

Professor Roberto Visani said that the disciplinary overlay clearly didn't allow for the concise, deep General Education plan that is called for, and when the Steering Committee realized that, they returned to the approved learning outcomes. He stressed that if every learning outcome is addressed, then every discipline will be addressed. Perhaps not every department, but every discipline will be addressed, and the student will come out of this curriculum with a balanced set of skills. Professor Adams added that
the UCASC committee would ensure that the courses do meet the outcomes.

Dean Lopes said that further feedback could be addressed to the Steering Committee and Professor Green.

*A motion was made and seconded to adjourn.*

It was unanimously acclaimed. The meeting concluded at 12:41 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah Hammond, Scribe
The Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee held its meeting on Friday, April 8, 2011 at 9:30 in Room 610T. Dean Anne Lopes, UCASC Chair, called the meeting to order.


Absent: Virginia Moreno, Ed Snajdr,

Guests: George Andreopoulos, Seth Baumrin, Jane Bowers, David Brotherton, Lyell Davies, Amy Green, Maki Haberfeld, Karen Kaplowitz, Barry Latzer, Cheuk Lee, Sara McDougall, Matthew Perry, Deryn Strange, Staci Strobl, Kate Szur, Davidson Umeh, Roberto Visani, Maria Volpe, Klaus Von Lampe.

Administrative Announcements

Dean Lopes began by expressing her excitement about the agenda for the day, which included the historic vote on the new General Education plan. Because of the packed agenda, she had no further Administrative Announcements. Chad Infante did take a moment to report to the committee on the Debate Team's recent accomplishments. Infante and his partner were the winners of the University of Massachusetts Amherst's tournament, and the novice team won the Junior Varsity Novice National Championship against teams with many more years' experience.

Approval of the minutes of March 18th, 2011

A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of March 18th, 2011. The minutes of March 18th, 2011 were approved unanimously with 24 votes in favor.

Old Business

Dean Lopes summarized the procedural rules for the next business on the table. First, the committee would consider the Faculty Senate's proposed amendment to the General Education model, then there would be a motion to approve the General Education Task Force's Proposal for a new General Education Model and then discussion of that full plan would take place. She said at that point, a member of UCASC could make a friendly amendment to the General Education Model to incorporate the Faculty Senate's amendment if someone so chose. Professor Adams clarified this discussion, noting that the committee would not be voting on the Senate's proposed amendment. That document is a
Faculty Senate Proposal to Amend the Proposed General Education Model

Speaking for the Faculty Senate, Professor Karen Kaplowitz commended the General Education Task Force for their thoroughness, transparency, and collegiality over the past few years' work. She pointed out that the Faculty Senate has considered this general education revision over the course of eight meetings. She explained that the Senate has passed a resolution to amend the proposed General Education model, the text of which follows:

“By secret, written ballot, the Faculty Senate today, April 6, approved the following Resolution:

Resolved, That the Faculty Senate endorse the Steering Committee's Gen Ed Revision Proposal, contingent on students being required to fulfill the 19 unassigned Gen Ed credits by taking a minimum of 2 courses in the humanities; a minimum of 2 courses in the social sciences; and a minimum of 1 course in the arts.

Explanation: In the Steering Committee’s Gen Ed Revision Proposal, the first cluster, “Reasoning and Communication,” is designated 21 credits and the courses for this cluster have been determined: composition, critical thinking, mathematics, foreign language, etc. The fifth cluster, “The Natural and Physical World,” is designated 7 credits and the courses for this cluster have also been determined: a laboratory science course and a non-laboratory Science course. Accordingly, these two clusters add up to 28 credits. The total number of credits being proposed for the Gen Ed Revision is 47. When one deducts 28 credits from 47 credits the result is 19 unassigned credits. These are the 19 credits that the Faculty Senate’s Resolution speaks to.”

Professor Lisandro Perez then pointed out that the language in the document presented to the UCASC members was not the same language that was approved by the Faculty Senate on two days before. Professor Kaplowitz explained that what had seemed perfectly clear to the Senate in the room turned out to be confusing to people outside of the Senate, so the document had been revised by the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate to be more clear.

Professor Perez asked that someone from the Faculty Senate speak to the practical terms of how students would use and understand the disciplinary overlay, how would students know a certain course would satisfy, for example, the social science overlay requirement. Professor Kaplowitz answered that the Steering Committee had told the Faculty Senate that the disciplinary overlay would be one of the items applied to a course when it was submitted by a department to UCASC. The category of the overlay that a course satisfies would be labeled electronically along with its cluster information in the course's online listing.

Professor Perez was concerned as to how these disciplinary designations would affect a department like his, which is interdisciplinary. Professor Kaplowitz proposed the example of an interdisciplinary course like Literature and Law, which could be listed as both Humanities and Social Science, giving students the option to choose which requirement they'd like it to fulfill.

Professor Adams did not see how a student could work through all six of the General Education plan's clusters without taking a humanities course or a social science course. The clusters are tied to the
learning outcomes, and the learning outcomes are tied to the disciplines, he said. Professor Kaplowitz agreed that the General Education model does make it easy for students to get variety, but noted that it has been said that it may be possible for a student to progress through the curriculum without taking an arts course, for example. She also reasserted the point that the disciplinary overlay is a needed statement that John Jay values the Humanities, Social Sciences, and the Arts.

Professor Shapiro asked how it would be possible for anybody to observe that a student could graduate without having an arts course in light of the fact that the courses for the various clusters have not been designated yet. He expressed his thought that the overlay seems pre-mature. Professor Kaplowitz said that members of the Steering Committee had said that this scenario could be possible. Professor Amy Green asked members to concentrate on the learning objectives tied to each cluster to imagine how the disciplines would fit into the model. Professor Ben Lapidus referred to the document that lays out the various clusters, and said that it looked possible that a student could use math to satisfy every cluster, and asked if the answer to this concern might be to remove certain bullet points regarding how departments fall under the various clusters rather than adding an overlay.

Professor Bettina Carbonell felt that the Senate's proposal adds a level of clarity to the new plan. If we are all in agreement that students should be taking courses across the curriculum, then this does not seem to get in the way, it will help students, she said.

Professor Green wished to clarify the way the draft model should be interpreted. She felt that confusion in the faculty may arise from focusing too much on the titles of the clusters as opposed to looking at the learning outcomes, which are the heart of the document. Each outcome is tied to both Essential Knowledge and Abilities which must be met by every student.

Professor Adams said that it would be valuable for the Senate to propose an outcome to be met rather than adding an overlay to the curriculum.

Christopher Sui, a graduating senior, said that sixty credits seems like too many to ask of a student, pointing out that many students are taking extra years to finish their degrees under the current Gen Ed program.

Professor Simon Baatz felt that the Senate's proposal reflects the very real concern that students must be exposed to more than one area outside of their chosen major. He felt it would be an error if, for example, a student majoring in Criminal Justice only took more Criminal Justice courses to satisfy General Education requirements.

Professor Ellen Sexton asked the Steering Committee for their thoughts on the proposed amendment. Professor Green responded that the timing of the amendment, which had only been passed two days before, meant that her committee had not met yet as a body to form an opinion on it.

Professor Sara McDougall, a member of the Faculty Senate, spoke to the Senate's thinking, pointing out that the amendment does not add a lot of classes to the curriculum.

Professor Lapidus said that dividing items up by discipline seems to take the whole initiative back to where it started. As an arts professor, he felt that a cluster like “The Creative Dimension” looked like a positive embrace of the arts, but the Senate's overlay that specifies “At least one arts course” felt meager in comparison.
Professor Green spoke to Professor McDougall's point about the numbers, without advocating for or against the amendment, she wished to clarify that the amendment would not simply add two, two, and one anywhere in the curriculum. In fact, it could be done anywhere in five out of six of the clusters.

Proposal for a New Model of General Education at John Jay College – “Education for Justice”

A motion was made and seconded to approve the General Education Steering Committee’s proposal for a new model of General Education at John Jay College

Professor Angelique Corthals spoke for the Science Department, that she would like to see at least one laboratory science course added to the requirements in the Faculty Senate's proposed amendment. Professor Adams pointed out that this would not be up to the UCASC to change the approved resolution from the Faculty Senate. He said that requests for special requirements would be a regression, as there are any numbers of subjects or areas that different departments would consider essential to student growth.

Vice President Richard Saulnier wished to remind everybody that this draft is only Step One of a process. First, the college must define the frame for the new General Education curriculum. The next step would be to approve the courses that go within that framework. “I think what people are asking for here is trying to put the cart before the horse,” he said. He felt that the proposal, as written, had elegance. The detail work that the Senate would like will have its moment in the next step when courses begin to be proposed for the various areas.

In anticipation of this point, Dean Lopes had prepared a document that laid out a potential timeline for the stages and steps of approval of the component parts of General Education. Her document addressed when and how the various parts of the model would pass through college governance so that the new model could be fleshed out by Fall of 2012. She explained that it would all be quite similar to the way courses are reviewed by UCASC now, with a standing committee of UCASC created to work through all these questions. She felt that UCASC's regular review of courses independent of the new General Education model is already quite rigorous and really exemplary, so the body is well-situated to put those skills into implementing the new General Education model. She then opened the floor to further questions.

Professor Roberto Visani brought up the Senate's amendment again, saying that he felt that the distribution of credit requirements sets up a hierarchy that disadvantages the arts. Professor Kaplowitz answered that she was told that the college doesn't have enough labs and facilities for all students to take two arts courses.

Professor Lapidus asked about the mechanics of how existing courses would fall into the review timeline. Dean Lopes said there are many ways they might be reviewed. One scenario would be for the departments to resubmit the courses with revisions to adapt them to the General Education learning outcomes. Another scenario would involve expediting courses that seem to be a natural fit with a few tweaks. Every course would have to be reviewed by the standing committee, but it's highly possible that some courses could receive an accelerated review. Professor Lapidus felt that this amount of review created needless work, since many existing courses seem to be obvious fits for a cluster. He provided the example of U.S. History, asking if even that would need to be approved for the Learning
From the Past cluster. Dean Lopes confirmed that review is necessary for every single course if the General Education program is to be coherent. The review process would ensure that the learning outcomes will be matched to the cluster and that skills are made overt in the syllabus. The changes may only take five minutes of a professor's time, but they still need to be addressed. She felt that this step provides a useful opportunity for the college to strengthen the curriculum.

Professor Adams added that actually most of the college's courses are not in General Education at present, so the question of adjusting existing courses may not be as large as it seems. He said that his department is already looking at the new model as an opportunity to tweak courses to fit into various clusters. He agreed that it would be a lot of work, but said if professors want General Education and faculty governance, work comes with the territory.

Professor Adams also felt that Dean Lopes could strengthen the last sentence of her document on possible timelines, suggesting that she include something about having an internal “General Education conference” once a year. He added that this should not just be inside of UCASC, and it should not just be a report, but that there should be an ongoing dynamic discussion. Dean Lopes agreed that assessment is exactly what the college needs.

Professor Amy Adamczyk asked who would bring courses to UCASC for inclusion in General Education. Dean Lopes said it would be the same system that works for courses now, in which an individual faculty member or a department can submit a course to UCASC. Professor Adamczyk said that it seemed like an incredible amount of approval.

Dean Lopes asked if the committee was ready to vote, which began a larger discussion about procedure and how to vote on both the General Education model and the Faculty Senate's amendment. Professor Leippe asked if there would be a vote on the Senate's amendment. Dean Lopes explained that if a UCASC member would like to put forward an amendment to the General Education model including the Senate's changes, then that could be done. There was already a motion on the table to approve the General Education model. That motion had been made by Victor Hebert at the beginning of this discussion.

Lior Gideon moved to amend the General Education model based on the Faculty Senate's resolution. Victor Hebert accepted the motion as a friendly amendment.

Professor Ellen Sexton felt that combining those two items could be problematic, and suggested that the committee vote first on the General Education plan as written, and then vote on the amendment separately. Professor Herbert asked if he could retract his acceptance of Professor Gideon's motion. Dean Lopes asked Provost Jane Bowers about the correct rules of order.

Provost Bowers laid out the proper way to go about voting on the two separate items. According to Robert's Rules of Order, since Professor Herbert had accepted the amendment, the body should vote on the proposal as amended. So if someone voting were to disagree with the amendment, he or she must vote no to the whole proposal. If the proposal as amended should fail, then the committee would return to considering the original proposal.

Dean Lopes summarized the status of the motions: that there was a motion on the table to vote on the proposal plus the amendment from the Senate, which included a science credit. There was scattered discussion in the room at this point about which elements of the amendment people thought were being
included. Provost Bowers said that adding the science element would actually be a request for a revision to the Faculty Senate's document, which couldn't be done by this body. For that change, the amendment would need to be passed again at Faculty Senate.

Professor Herbert retracted his acceptance of Professor Gideon's motion.

Vice President Richard Saulnier asked that the model and the amendment be voted on separately, as suggested by Professor Sexton.

Professor Perez moved that the General Education Model and the Proposed Faculty Senate Amendment be divided into two separate votes. The motion was seconded. The motion to divide the two items was approved with 27 votes in favor and 1 abstention.

Dean Lopes summarized the status of the motions, saying that the first motion considered would be Professor Herbert's motion to approve the General Education proposal as put forward by the Steering Committee.

The General Education model as written by the Steering Committee was approved unanimously with 28 votes in favor.

With the proposal accepted, then Dean Lopes turned to the second motion on the table from Professor Gideon to add the Senate's amendment to the Steering Committee's proposal. She asked for discussion, but it was stated that the motion needed to be made again, according to the rules of order.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the Faculty Senate's Amendment to the General Education draft model.

With the motion on the table, Dean Lopes opened the floor to discussion. Professor Perez stepped forward to speak in the strongest possible terms against a disciplinary overlay on this curriculum. He felt that such a step would be premature, given that the college has not yet filled in the details of the framework. He felt that the imposition of a disciplinary overlay would prevent multidisciplinary departments from contributing to General Education. Courses that might fit well into the General Education requirements could be weakened if they do not also fit a disciplinary requirement. Either that would happen, or departments would be forced to define the disciplinary categories of courses that were never meant to be defined as such. A multidisciplinary department prides itself on having faculty from a number of disciplines. He said that his department might create a hypothetical course for the Justice core called, The Struggle for Justice in the Latina/o Community, and that course would be approached very differently by Professor Jose Morin than by Professor Lisandro Perez, who comes from different areas of study. However, in both cases, the professors would teach the learning outcomes. That flexibility is an essential dynamic for a multidisciplinary department. He said that his department has approached the General Education revision with the idea that the college was going to do what is essentially best for the student, and one value that might be conveyed to students is that disciplinary boundaries are changing. He recalled numerous conversations over the years in which colleagues expressed frustration with the limitations of disciplinary boundaries, but here the Faculty Senate would reassert the necessity of disciplinary boundaries. He said that his own department had let some ideas go with the General Education revision, given that there is no race and ethnicity requirement in the model, though there was such a requirement in the old General Education plan. His department let go of that requirement because they believe that in the new General Education model
such courses will be taught and taken.

Dean Lopes asked if there were any further comments or questions before voting. There were not.

*The Faculty Senate's Amendment to the new General Education model was rejected, with 2 votes in favor, 20 opposed, and 5 abstentions.*

**Courses (2nd Readings)**

**New Course: CJBS 1XX Introduction to American Criminal Justice System**

Professor Klaus Von Lampe explained the changes he had made to the proposal since the first reading. Typos were corrected, more detail was included with the learning objectives, the term paper assignment was adjusted, and the terms for online and written requirements were clarified.

*A motion was made and seconded to approve the new course, CJBS 1XX Introduction to American Criminal Justice System. It was approved unanimously with 25 votes in favor.*

**New Course: CJBA 2ZZ Understanding Criminal Behavior**

There were no changes made since the first reading and no discussion about the new course.

*A motion was made and seconded to approve the new course, CJBA 2ZZ Understanding Criminal Behavior. It was approved unanimously with 27 votes in favor.*

**New Course: PED 3XX Community Programs for Health, Wellness, and Physical Activity**

Professor Davidson Umeh summarized the changes, which included a few new items relating to the psychological components of health and wellness.

*A motion was made and seconded to approve the new course, PED 3XX Community Programs for Health, Wellness, and Physical Activity. It was approved unanimously with 27 votes in favor.*

**New Course: CJBA 3XX Historical Perspectives on Violent Crime**

Professor Barry Latzer brought the course forward, noting that the title has been changed to “Historical Perspectives on Violent Crime in the United States.” He listed other changes to the proposal, including an added quiz and readings. HIS 202 was added as an alternate prerequisite due to an agreement with the History department.

*A motion was made and seconded to approve the new course, CJBA 3XX Historical Perspectives on Violent Crime.*

Professor Adams asked about the college's ongoing attempts to have some clarity regarding the difference between 100-, 200-, and 300-level courses. He wondered if a survey course like this was
appropriately labeled at the 300-level. Dean Lopes agreed that the college does not have clear guidelines for faculty on what sort of theoretical perspectives should be taught at the 300-level. She answered that the general question about criteria and scaffolding needs to be addressed in a subcommittee. She asked that the courses subcommittees bring this issue to UCASC in Fall of 2012.

*The new course, CJBA 3XX Historical Perspectives on Violent Crime, was approved unanimously with 28 votes in favor.*

**New Course: POL 2XX Introduction to Public Policy**

Professor Romaniuk explained that a reading had been added to address the feedback from the first reading and pointed to the cover memo from Prof. Rutledge.

*A motion was made and seconded to approve the new course, POL 2XX Introduction to Public Policy.*

Dean Lopes opened the floor for discussion. Christopher Sui said that this course would be a great one for someone in his track.

*The new course, POL 2XX Introduction to Public Policy, was approved unanimously with 28 votes in favor.*

**New Business**

**Programs Subcommittee**

The order of items on the agenda was adjusted for the presence of presenting professors.

**Revision of the BS in Criminal Justice**

Professor Baatz introduced the proposal, explaining that one prior issue has been the question of overlapping majors in terms of criminal justice, but the proposal addresses this as it is more applied. He gave an overview of the structure of the new curriculum. He said that a new aspect that the revision emphasizes is the study of diversity, race, and ethnicity issues that have obvious implications for the study of criminal justice. He said that the subcommittee had questions about the mission statement of the major, and those questions were answered.

Professor Gideon, who had worked on the proposal, spoke to the process of the revision. The department did a very thorough survey of leading programs in the United States, and focused on keeping this program in alignment with the standards of the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences. The former major allowed students to jump from higher to lower level courses, but the revision creates a more scaffolded and logical experience for students. Professor Maki Haberfeld concurred and said that the process involved a lot of thought and research on the other programs around the country. She said it is the Law and Police Science department's goal to be recognized as the best program in the country. This revision worked to match student interests and desires with what the department can currently provide, and what it would like to do in the future as they see how students fare with the four new core courses within the program.
Professor Adams commended the department on the revision, and especially on the section on diversity. He had a question about whether the tension between the American criminal justice system and globalization would be addressed in one course or if it was meant to be spread throughout the curriculum. Professor Staci Strobl answered that she had been considering the same question, and was considering bringing forward an elective on that issue specifically, though it should also be reflected in the core of the curriculum. Professor Haberfeld answered that she shares the concern, but she also has to consider overlap with the International Criminal Justice major. She felt that it would be easy to recommend courses from one to supplement the other.

Professor Romanuk suggested that the title of the table in Appendix 1 should reflect the content. He also felt that the learning objectives should be pared down to six or seven. Dean Lopes added that the appropriate amount of learning objectives is actually three to five, but the objectives listed in the proposal are very unpacked and specific, so they may be easier to assess. She commended the department on the hard work devoted to the revision.

Vice President Saulnier asked if students would take courses in each of the elective areas. Professor Haberfeld said they would.

**Sociology Letter of Intent**

Professor Baatz introduced the Letter of Intent, explaining that the program is organized around two themes, social justice and global change. The Sociology Department currently offers the Criminology major. However, while the college has the second largest Sociology Department at CUNY, John Jay is the only CUNY school without a Sociology major, thus demonstrating the need for the current proposal. Professor Baatz explained that the subcommittee had sent the Sociology department sixteen questions to respond to and it has. Professor Baatz gave an overview of the curriculum, which provides a good grounding and education in Sociology, includes the development of quantitative skills, and compares favorably with programs around the country and the requirements of the American Sociological Association.

Professor Brotherton thanked Professor Baatz and the Programs Subcommittee for their feedback during the process. He then spoke to the introduction of the global perspective to the department's focus, noting that it's not simply an addition of a few courses, but a shift in perspective from the outset. He said that the developing world is not incorporated from the start in the current Criminology major, so this new proposal is a corrective, called for by the faculty and demanded by the students as well. He said that a survey has shown that there is great interest among the students in having a Sociology major.

Professor Adams suggested that the department might rethink the name of the course, “SOC 401 Problems of Minority Groups”, perhaps using the term “issues” rather than “problems”. He also had a question about the sequencing of the study of migration and immigration and pointed out that many people are actually caught between cultures and borders. He suggested tweaking the language to reflect that struggle or transformation. Dean Lopes wondered why there was no History of Sociology course? That is generally covered prior to contemporary issues. Professor Brotherton said that the course on classical sociological theory would deal with that. Dean Lopes wondered at what time period would the “classical” end and the ‘contemporary’ begin.
Professor Romaniuk asked about the reference to the new departmental research center on page 8, and Professor Brotherton responded that it should be removed from the document.

Professor Lapidus had a question about the scaffolding of research methods and the amount of courses devoted to research methods, given that SSC 325 already exists and a new course is being developed. Kathy Killoran added to this that many majors currently use SSC 325, so that should be considered if the new proposal will change the way research methods are taught. Professor Perez said that there are three courses in methods, and that's a heavy load for undergraduates. He also saw two sociological theory courses that might be combined. He said that the curriculum proposed is almost graduate level, considering its emphasis on theory and methods.

Professor Perez also asked if the curriculum would bridge the two thematic concerns social justice and global perspectives.

Vice President Saulnier noted that the section numbering was off in area three where the credit distributions were addressed.

Professor Leippe asked for clarification about the student survey that had found that three out of every four undergraduates said they would change their major to Sociology. He felt that the proposal was very exciting, but was not sure if those numbers could be relied upon. Dean Lopes confirmed that this survey was created by John Jay to show CUNY that student interest supports the development of our new liberal arts majors, so there was definitely a purpose built into the survey. Professor Leippe said that clarified why the statistics were so high.

Professor Lapidus asked why some courses were listed as “under development” but already have course numbers. Professor Brotherton explained that those are existing courses that will be revised.

**Proposal for a New Minor in Human Rights**

Professor Baatz introduced this proposal as very congruent with the mission of John Jay College. The new minor involves the collaboration and cooperation of faculty from many different departments. It will cost the college very little, as it will draw from existing faculty and the readings and materials are already in the library.

Professor George Andreopoulos, who created the minor, then spoke of the embarrassment of riches at the college in terms of faculty, student interest, and library resources. He said that down the line, the program hopes to involve students in internships. There is also discussion of setting up a joint conference with the New School and Barnard with an eye towards putting students in contact with practitioners to give them a hands-on sense of critical public policy issues. He said the minor has been in development for two years and is just the beginning of bigger and better things to come.

Professor Adams felt that the course structure was cause for concern, as it did not adequately represent African-American Studies, though they could be said to be a vanguard group in the struggle for human rights in this country. He said that the office of Undergraduate Studies should ensure diversity of representation in the committees creating programs like this one. Professor Andreopoulos said that the point was well-taken, but noted that when the initiative for this minor was launched, it was announced widely, and the committee was then composed of the professors who volunteered to be involved. That said, he felt that there were a number of courses included from African American Studies.
Professor Adams explained that he is stressing attention to the composition of the committee because of the earlier discussion about how General Education will be executed. Much of the success of that program will rely upon oversight and monitoring committees, and it is critical that the administration pay attention to the make-up of the committees from the outset or problems will arise down the road.

Dean Lopes addressed Professor Adams' point about the amount of the course offerings, noting that she had given Professor Andreopoulos a great deal of feedback encouraging a tight and focused minor. She has seen several programs at John Jay with a laundry list of courses, and has challenged the committee to come up with a minor that balances her call for elegance with breadth of subject matter. This requires programs to make some difficult decisions about courses included.

Professor Perez countered that the other side of that is that this is an area in which the college has strength, and one would expect to see this minor reflect that. He noted that he, personally, had a lot of communication with Professor Andreopoulos, and sees three of his department's courses on the list.

Professor Andreopoulos explained that the committee had taken a very structured approach to choosing courses, which involved asking departments to write about how proposed courses fit into the minor's categories.

Professor Carbonell said that the minor's capstone course means that students would need to declare the minor earlier than they currently do. Professor Andreopoulos confirmed that students would need to commit earlier, but also noted that the committee has not yet developed the intended capstone course.

Professor Shapiro asked if the minor would address economic exploitation. Professor Andreopoulos said that Professor Christopher Warburton from Economics is developing a course for the minor, and also that the topic is embedded in other courses.

Professor Tarantino asked if it was still possible for the Theater department to contribute courses to the minor. Professor Andreopoulos said that courses could be considered by his committee, though they are working very hard not to spread too thin while staying inclusive. He said that anyone who feels they have a course that really fits could send him a proposal. Dean Lopes said that this minor is well-placed to perhaps become a major later on. As there are only twenty-three majors at the college now, a major in Human Rights would be welcome. If that were to happen, there will be room for more departments to participate.

Professor Sexton expressed her support for the minor, but noticed that most of the courses are offered on the 200-level and wondered if there were guidelines about that. Dean Lopes said that this is another thing that needs to be visited in subcommittee.

Professor Perez felt that the list of requirements was not overwhelming, but since most of them are electives, they might not be offered with the frequency needed to fulfill a minor. He also asked if there could be more distinction between themes two and three, or more emphasis on international aspects. Professor Andreopoulos responded that there is overlap between two and three because the mission of the college is “Educating for justice.” As to the use of the word “international,” Professor Andreopoulos felt strongly that tacking the phrase “International human rights” would be misleading, given that international should always be inherent to the term “Human rights” to begin with. “An important dimension of this initiative is to bring the human rights language back,” he said.
Proposal to Revise the Program and Minor in Dispute Resolution

Professor Baatz explained that the present arrangement makes it too difficult for students to switch back and forth between the minor and the certificate, so this revision attempts to create requirements that facilitate that transition.

Professor Maria Volpe, who represents the revision, thanked the committee for their feedback.

Professor Adams asked if it would be useful to break the list of courses into themes. Professor Volpe said that the original had been broken into themes, but it was difficult for students to get all the courses. She explained that this proposal was part of fulfilling the action plan for Dispute Resolution created with the Provost in response their self-study and outside evaluation. Professor Volpe explained this stage of revision attempts to streamline the courses and the next phase would entail a more substantive proposal. Since this step is geared toward simplification, she felt that breaking the list up again would be unwise. Professor Adams pointed out that the current list allows students to choose possible combinations of courses that would be quite one-note. Professor Volpe said that there is advisement within her program to help students choose the elective courses.

Professor Maryann McClure asked if the prior requirements of the certificate were more specific. Professor Volpe responded that it was categorized thematically more along the lines of what Professor Adams was suggesting. However, if courses from one category weren't available, students would have to get permission to take more from another category.

Courses Subcommittee

CJBS 2XX Research Methods and Statistics in Criminal Justice

Kathy Killoran introduced the course as one of the new core requirements for the Criminal Justice BS degree.

Professor Gideon explained that this course responds to the growing emphasis in methodology in the Social Sciences. Practically, this is a skill course that is essential to the students. Also, it will be used as a basis for more advanced courses that deal with theory and practice. The topic of the course is very broad, but the courses do not intend to teach each comprehensively but to introduce students to the basic concepts and how to interpret what they see in tabular data and empirical studies.

Professor Leippe had a question about the sequencing of topics. He felt that descriptive statistics was taught a bit late. Professor Gideon said that the sequencing is based on his own teaching history, but the department is not rigid on the ordering of the topics and the syllabus can be adjusted.

Dean Lopes said that the limits and amount of extra credit offered should be clarified on the syllabus so that students will not have room to bargain. Also, it should be quantified.

Professor Sexton said that database searching is not explicitly covered in the course. It addresses looking at journal articles, but doesn't talk about using tools to identify and find them. Kathy Killoran pointed out some places in the proposal that does address this, and Professor Sexton asked that it be specifically stated in the class calendar.
Chad Infante asked if there might be a way the course could involve the debate team.

Professor Leippe had a question about the reference to “the ten principles of scientific inquiry,” which he was not familiar with. Prof. Gideon agreed to make the language more general.

**CJBS 3XX Criminal Justice: Theory to Practice**

Kathy Killoran introduced this course, which is meant to follow the previous course. Professor Haberfeld explained that this course builds on the 1XX and 2XX level work done in the department. This course deals with seminal concepts in Criminal Justice, looking at how they vary when they move from theory into practice.

The committee did not have any feedback.

**LAS 4XX Colloquium for Research in Law and Society**

Kathy Killoran introduced the capstone course for the Law and Society major that was passed at the last meeting, explaining that the courses have to come shortly after the proposals so there will be a curriculum in place when the program becomes available to students.

Dean Lopes appreciated the amount of writing required in the course, and said any feedback could be directed to the department.

**ENG 2XX Screenwriting for Film, Television and the Internet**

Professor Jay Walitalo, the presenting professor, was not at the meeting, so Kathy Killoran elected to move to the next item.

**ACC/LAW 2XX Business Law**

Professor Sexton gave an overview of the course and Professor David Shapiro explained that this course will replace LAW 203 Constitutional Law as an elective in the curriculum of the Economics BA, Forensic Financial Analysis track. The committee did not have any feedback. Dean Lopes said that further feedback could be directed to Professor Shapiro.

**HIS 2XX History of World Slavery to 1650 CE**

Professor Sexton introduced the course as the first in a sequence of two electives for the History major on world slavery. She introduced Professor Matthew Perry, who was presenting the course.

Professor Adams asked how the course would balance fact and interpretation of fact. Professor Perry said that the course will place increased emphasis on interpretation, asking students to consider not just what the sources say, but how scholars have engaged the existing primary sources. Prof. Perry said his goal was to do exactly what Professor Adams suggests. Professor Adams asked that this be made more explicit in the syllabus.
Professor Adams also had a question about the attendance policy and regular quizzes, the combination of which seemed to create a double-penalty. Professor Perry said that weekly quizzes and participation are separate grading criteria. Dean Lopes noted the nuance that a student could miss five quizzes and not fail, whereas missing five classes would guarantee a fail. Professor Perry said that the participation policy is not an attempt to penalize, but to explain what class participation is. Professor Baatz felt that the two methods grade different skills from the student. Dean Lopes summarized the discussion by stating that the policy seems to set up double penalties to some professors, while to others it seems like two different methods of evaluation. She felt that the distinction was an important one to raise.

Professor Gideon raised the point that certain elements of a syllabus are nuances that the professor needs to negotiate individually with the student, and that there are appeals committees in every department to help students who disagree with particular policies. Dean Lopes responded that this was the case, but Professor Adams' point was that this committee needed to choose whether to take up the issue of attendance policies.

Kathy Killoran suggested that the abbreviated title of the course include the number 1, since it is the beginning of a two-part sequence.

Professor Perez asked if this is the only course on slavery at John Jay. Professor Perry replied that it would be the only course on slavery in the History department so far.

**PSY 3XX Learning and Memory**

Kathy Killoran introduced this as a new course and the proposer was responsive to the subcommittee's feedback. The committee did not offer any feedback. Dean Lopes said that further feedback could be sent to Professor Deryn Strange.

**DRA 3XX Film Criticism**

Professor Sexton introduced the capstone course for the film studies minor, explaining that content would vary depending on the instructor. Professor Lyell Davies explained that this is a criticism and theory course designed to provide students with a robust ability to navigate contemporary and historical film theories. Kathy Killoran had suggestions on technical elements and the prerequisites and gave Professor Davies her written suggestions.

**Course Revisions**

Kathy Killoran explained that two items under this title needed to be held for the next meeting because the proposers could not be present. The remaining courses were all for the revised Psychology major.

**PSY 232 Psychology of Adolescence & the Adolescent Offender**

Kathy Killoran explained that the revision includes adding a prerequisite of PSY 231 Child Psychology (newly renamed: Developmental Psychology) and changes to the title and the course description updated. The course is also being raised to the 300-level. There was no feedback offered. Dean Lopes said that feedback could be addressed to Professor Angela Crossman.
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Minutes of May 13, 2011

The Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee held its meeting on Friday, May 13, 2011 at 9:35 in Room 610T. Dean Anne Lopes, UCASC Chair, called the meeting to order.


Absent: Chad Infante, Susan Larkin, and Virginia Moreno.

Guests: George Andreopoulos, David Brotherton, Lyell Davies, Cyriaco Lopes, Matthew Perry, Andrew Sidman, Maria Volpe, Jay Walitalo

Administrative Announcements

Dean Lopes announced that though CUNY has asked John Jay to slow down on the liberal arts majors and asked for more data which we have provided. They are allowing the Philosophy proposal to go forward to the CAPPR committee and Board of Trustees. She shared that the Vice Chancellor was extremely happy with the work on that proposal and the report that John Jay provided.

Dean Lopes also thanked the General Education Steering Committee for all of their work. The Faculty Senate had endorsed the model, and it would be going forward to College Council on the Monday after this meeting. She then explained some of the details surrounding the implementation of the General Education Model. There will be an annual report on the progress of General Education, which will include statistics on courses students select from each cluster, broken down by discipline. She said that institutionalizing this level of observation is a good thing for the college, which will continue its commitment to providing breadth as well as depth in the curriculum. A second resolution that the Faculty Senate has brought forward for inclusion in the draft of General Education that the College Council will see, is a new subcommittee of UCASC on general education made up of members elected by UCASC and the Faculty Senate. Dean Lopes will select the chair of this new subcommittee. The General Education Model with these additions will be brought to College Council on Monday, and Dean Lopes felt optimistic that the college would have a new General Education model in place after that.

Next, Kathy Killoran distributed a chart summarizing the work UCASC has done this year. Highlights from that document include twenty-four approved courses and nine pending, with fifty courses waiting in the line-up for future approvals. In programs, UCASC has approved one new proposal for a new major and had one letter of intent pending at this meeting, with a few others on hold. In total, UCASC has completed work on 156 items. Professor Jama Adams complimented the Office of Undergraduate Studies for putting systems in place that allowed items to move smoothly but also in a thoughtful
manner. He also shared that Vice Chancellor Logue was very complimentary of John Jay's general
education proposal and process, noting that the culture at John Jay is far along.

Dean Lopes thanked the whole committee for the year's hard work, and noted the hard work of the
chairs of the subcommittees. She discussed the future plans of the PPP subcommittee, which will bring
internship policies and a UCASC website up for discussion next year. She congratulated UCASC's
student members, Chad Infante and Alandra Mitchell, on their imminent graduation.

She also urged the committee to go to the events in the student Research and Creativity week that was
underway at the time of this meeting. She said that students had not been having very large audiences,
and she would be interested in hearing any suggestions about how to improve that aspect of the event
for next year.

**Approval of minutes of April 8, 2011**

A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of April 8, 2011. The committee voted
unanimously to approve the minutes of April 8, 2011 with 27 votes in favor.

**Old Business**

**Programs**

**Sociology Letter of Intent**

A motion was made and seconded to approve the B.A. degree in Sociology Letter of Intent.

Professor Adams asked for a report on changes. Professor David Brotherton, the chair, said that the
changes had been minor and technical, such as a revision to the course title, “Problems of Minority
Groups,” and some changes in word choice throughout the document. The theory courses that need to
frame the periods in classical and contemporary theory have been adjusted to bracket those time
periods. The two thematic areas of the major have not yet been bridged, but the department wants to
look at that once the program gets off the ground.

With the floor open to discussion, Vice President Saulnier noted that the cover sheet said
“implementation fall 2011.” That will be changed to fall 2013.

The committee voted unanimously to approve the Sociology Letter of Intent with 27 votes in favor.

**Proposal to revise the B.S. in Criminal Justice**

Professor Lior Gideon summarized changes the changes, including incorporating a suggestion that the
major include the globalization of policing. The learning objectives were reduced from seven to six.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the proposal to revise the B.S. in Criminal Justice.
The there was no discussion.
The committee voted unanimously to approve the proposal to revise the B.S. in Criminal Justice with 27 votes in favor.

Proposal for a new Minor in Human Rights

A motion was made and seconded to approve the proposal for a new minor in Human Rights.

Professor George Andreopoulos said that the changes were mostly small. Among them, the proposal now makes explicit that the notion of the capstone course will require students to declare this minor early on.

The committee voted unanimously to approve the proposal for a new minor in Human Rights with 27 votes in favor.

After the vote, Professor Andreopoulos thanked the committee, and Dean Lopes said she hoped we will see a major in this field down the road.

Proposal to Revise the Program and Minor in Dispute Resolution

A motion was made and seconded to approve the Revision to the Program and Minor in Dispute Resolution.

Professor Maria Volpe summarized the changes, including an addition that encourages students to take courses in a variety of disciplines.

Professor Adams asked why this step is occurring if the intended goal is a major revision. Professor Volpe said that changes to the major will require an overhaul, and in the meantime, students need this adjustment. They are being harmed because the electives in the program and the minor do not align. Students often decide late to do one or the other.

The committee voted unanimously to approve the Revision to the Program and Minor in Dispute Resolution with 27 votes in favor.

Courses (2nd Readings)

SOC 3XX Evaluation Research

A motion was made and seconded to approve the new course, SOC 3XX Evaluation and Research.

Professor Amy Adamczyk introduced the course, noting an issue of overlap between this course and a course in corrections raised at the first reading, which has been answered in the proposal. Professor Gideon added that the Sociology department was very thoughtful in addressing the overlap. Dean Lopes thanked both departments for their collegiality.

The committee voted unanimously to approve the new course, SOC 3XX Evaluation and Research
with 27 votes in favor.

**CJBS 2XX Research Methods in Statistics in Criminal Justice**

*A motion was made and seconded to approve the new course, CJBS 2XX Research Methods in Statistics in Criminal Justice.*

Professor Gideon summarized the changes to this proposal. The extra credit for doing the CITI tutorial has been weighted and the word “ten” was dropped from the item about the principles of scientific inquiry. Professor Peter Romaniuk suggested that this course be watched closely and compared to STA 250 in future evaluations of the program. Professor Gideon answered that this is already in the assessment plan.

*The committee voted unanimously to approve the new course, CJBS 2XX Research Methods in Statistics in Criminal Justice with 27 votes in favor.*

**CJBS 3XX Criminal Justice: Theory to Practice**

*A motion was made and seconded to approve the new course, CJBS 3XX Criminal Justice: Theory to Practice.*

Professor Gideon said that no changes were requested at the first reading so the proposal is the same.

*The committee voted unanimously to approve the new course, CJBS 3XX Criminal Justice: Theory to Practice with 26 votes in favor.*

At this point the agenda was adjusted to prioritize an item for a presenting professor who was also teaching a class during the meeting.

**DRA 3XX Film Criticism**

*A motion was made and seconded to approve the new course, DRA 3XX Film Criticism.*

Professor Lyell Davies noted that LIT 275 has been added as a prerequisite. Professor Kyoo Lee pointed out a missing word in a sentence in the course description.

*The committee voted unanimously to approve the new course, DRA 3XX Film Criticism, with 27 votes in favor.*

**LAS 4XX Colloquium on Research in Law and Society**

*A motion was made and seconded to approve the new course, LAS 4XX Colloquium on Research in Law and Society.*

Professor Romaniuk introduced the course and said no changes were requested in the first reading or subsequently. He reminded the committee that this is the capstone course for the newly approved Law
and Society major. The 200-level course will come through in early fall.

The committee voted unanimously to approve the new course, LAS 4XX Colloquium on Research in Law and Society, with 27 votes in favor.

**ACC/LAW 2XX Business Law**

A motion was made and seconded to approve the new course ACC/LAW 2XX Business Law.

Professor David Shapiro introduced the course with some formatting changes, but no substantive changes.

The committee voted unanimously to approve the new course, ACC/LAW 2XX Business Law.

**HIS 2XX History of World Slavery to 1650 CE**

A motion was made and seconded to approve the new course, HIS 2XX History of World Slavery to 1650 CE.

Professor Matthew Perry introduced the course with no changes. Professor Bettina Carbonell suggested adjusting the wording about students' understanding from “should” to “will.” Dean Lopes agreed, noting that learning objectives should never be tentative or conditional. Prof. Perry accepted the suggestion.

The committee voted unanimously to approve the new course, HIS 2XX History of World Slavery to 1650 CE, with 27 votes in favor.

**PSY 3XX Learning and Memory**

A motion was made and seconded to approve the new course, PSY 3XX Learning and Memory.

Professor Michael Leippe introduced the course that had no changes since none were requested at the first reading.

The committee voted unanimously to approve the new course, PSY 3XX Learning and Memory, with 27 votes in favor.

Course Revisions (2nd readings)

**PSY 232 Psychology of Adolescence and the Adolescent Offender**
A motion was made and seconded to approve the course revision to PSY 232 Psychology of Adolescence and the Adolescent Offender.

Professor Michael Leippe introduced the course with no changes.

The committee voted unanimously to approve the course revision to PSY 232 Psychology of Adolescence and the Adolescent Offender, with 27 votes in favor.

**PSY 236 Group Dynamics**

A motion was made and seconded to approve the course revision to PSY 236 Group Dynamics.

Professor Michael Leippe introduced the course with no changes, noting that this falls in line with the new major and is being raised to the 300-level. Kathy Killoran pointed out that the course hours should indicate three hours. That will be adjusted.

The committee voted unanimously to approve the course revision to PSY 236 Group Dynamics, with 27 votes in favor.

**New Business**

**Educational Partnerships Subcommittee**

Proposal for a 2+2/Joint Degree with Queensborough Community College for an AS degree in Accounting for Forensic Accounting and a BS degree in Economics (Forensic Financial Analysis Track)

Professor Victor Herbert presented the proposal, noting that David Barnet could not attend today's meeting. Professor Herbert reminded the committee that this joint degree proposal is almost identical to the one UCASC approved for Hostos Community College. For that item, most of the discussion had to do with wording. Among the few substantive issues in play was the question of foreign language requirements and which courses if not taken at the community college would need to be taken at John Jay. David Barnet has been in discussion with Queensborough about these issues and the way that Queensborough groups disciplines is different than other institutions, and all points of contention have been resolved verbally.

Professor Shapiro was curious about the note in the document about Asians being under-represented on page six, which seemed to conflict with information on page one which presented a more general picture of the population.

Professor Adams said that the proposal does not cohere, under the impression that this was a second reading. Dean Lopes answered that this is a first reading, and Kathy Killoran clarified that this is the proposal of Queensborough Community College not John Jay. So inconsistencies in the narrative would be for them to adjust. Since the proposal comes from Queensborough, this committee can give advice, but ultimately any changes must be made by Queensborough.

Professor Gideon said the proposal is interesting, but he would like to see a course about investigative
techniques that might be more appropriate to the curriculum. Kathy Killoran answered that the partnership program is based on John Jay's B.S. degree in Economics, and so a missing course like that one might be absent because John Jay does not include such a course. Professor Shapiro added that he thought 307, 308, and 309 – courses in forensic accounting and auditing – are meant to address investigative techniques.

Professor Lapidus was curious how the overhauling of general education will impact the credit distribution on this and all other partnership programs. Kathy Killoran said that all partnerships will have to be recalibrated. Dean Lopes said it may take several years, but the issues will get worked out.

Professor Herbert spoke on behalf of the committee to commend and acknowledge David Barnet's substantial work on these proposals. He said that David Barnet put in ninety-nine percent of the hard lifting before the proposal reached the committee, and appreciated Barnet's flexibility.

In response to this, Professor Adams asked if curricular issues were being decided by an administrator. Professor Herbert recapped the amount of meetings and paperwork Barnet arranged in order to get this proposal together. Dean Lopes clarified that the person who took the lead was Professor LaSalle, and Barnet acted as the conduit between campuses. She clarified Professor Herbert's wording, “Professor LaSalle did the heavy lifting, and David facilitated – just as Kathy Killoran does for the UCASC.”

Professor Adams suggested that this issue be added to the next UCASC meeting, adding that the line between curricular issues and administrative issues can blur, especially in the case of exceptionally smart administrators, and the committee should keep curricular decisions in the faculty's purview.

Professor Sexton was concerned about the section on library materials and the section on the budget, noting that they call for Criminal Justice Abstracts, a $3,000 database for the library, but do not mention that cost later on in the budget section.

Dean Lopes said that further feedback can be given to Professor LaSalle before the next meeting in September.

**Standards Subcommittee**

**Revision of Policy on GPA Required for Enrollment in Graduate Courses**

Dean Lopes explained that the details of the policy itself are not up for discussion here, since it has been set by the Committee on Graduate Studies. The issue under consideration with this item is the wording of the policy that students would need to the approval by the Graduate Program Director rather than a department chair. Program directors run our graduate programs, not the department chair. The undergraduate bulletin is being updated to match the graduate bulletin. This body, however, is not changing the policy.

Professor Shapiro asked if the functions overlap between Dean of Undergraduate Studies and the Registrar, and wondered why the second signature is necessary. Dean Lopes answered that those functions do sometimes overlap.

Professor Adams asked if there was any way around the GPA requirement. Dean Lopes answered that there is not, though the subject can be brought up with the graduate program faculty and directors. Professor Adams then asked how John Jay gets feedback on student progress in graduate courses.
Lopes said that a discussion could begin about that, and she was under the impression that John Jay students do well. Professor Adams felt like most of the GPAs he sees are 2.9, and would like to know the average. Vice President Richard Saulnier said that kind of hard data is not available for undergraduate students who take graduate courses, though it would be possible to get that data for students entering graduate programs.

A motion was made and seconded to suspend the second reading of the revision of the policy on GPA Requirement for Enrollment in Graduate Courses. The committee voted to approve the motion to suspend the second reading with 25 votes in favor and 1 abstention.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the revision of the policy on GPA Requirement for Enrollment in Graduate Courses. The committee voted unanimously to approve the Revision to the policy on GPA Requirement for Enrollment in Graduate Courses with 26 votes in favor.

Courses Subcommittee

ENG 2XX Screenwriting for Film, Television and the Internet

Kathy Killoran introduced the course, explaining that usually the May agenda does not contain first readings, but this item was left over from the April meeting agenda. She said that the subcommittee had encouraged Professor Walitalo to cut down on some of the learning objectives, and otherwise the course was well-received.

Professor Jay Walitalo apologized for missing the April meeting, explaining that he was unfamiliar with the UCASC process. On the course, he told the committee that other colleges have this course, and it would be a good thing for the institution to include such a course to interest students with inclinations for creative writing. A key aspect to the course is to teach students to notice the writing behind visual presentations.

Professor Adams asked how the course is related to the larger mission of the college. He had concerns about the use of the phrase “conventions of contemporary screenwriting” and the lack of emphasis on justice. He suggested that the course proposal highlight the critical elements of the course, considering that this may be students’ only chance to address how to think of entertainment’s relationship to justice.

Professor Walitalo answered by describing the course’s focus on how visual information must first be written by a writer, and how such an analysis of visual narrative might be useful to a lawyer in a trial. Then, addressing his use of the term “conventions,” he explained that he works on the principle that a creative writer needs to learn the rules in order to break the rules. After students learn the principles of craft, they can inject their own personal vision. He expressed apprehension about projecting his own ideas about justice onto a class of creative writers.

Dean Lopes expanded on Professor Adams’ point, suggesting that the context of justice could surround the process of screenwriting in a theoretical way, even on the practical level of questioning how a writer gets a screenplay read. She said that liberal arts has a mission to teach what the college is about.

Professor Walitalo spoke a bit to his teaching style, explaining that he asks students to write about what they know. He does have discussions about appropriate venues and the marketability of a script, and the first few weeks of the course are about helping students think about paths to creativity beyond writing.
the next Avatar. In that context, issues of justice do come up.

Professor Carbonell suggested adding just a few words to the course description to solidify what seems to be already implicit in Professor Walitalo’s approach, since the course description stands in the bulletin and in the syllabus as a contract with the students and a template for future instructions. She suggested words like “implications” or “consequences.”

Kathy Killoran said the prerequisites are aimed at writing minors but may exclude film studies minors, and suggested adding an alternative to ENG 218 like Drama 110 or LIT 275 to broaden the pool of potential students. Film studies minor have to take either ENG 218 or LIT 275.

Professor Dana Tarantino asked how much the course overlaps with playwriting. Professor Walitalo felt that the courses would differ greatly, given that playwriting is mainly dialogue and screenwriting is extremely visual. Professor Tarantino pointed out that the play Glengarry Glen Ross is included in the syllabus. Professor Walitalo explained the play is used in an assignment that compares the playscript with the screen adaptation.

Professor Adams asked for an adjustment to the attendance policy, which is worded such that it sets a rule and does not allow for extenuating circumstances.

Professor Angelique Corthals spoke to the point of the course’s interest in critical thought. As an advisor to screenwriters on scientific facts, she was interested in how shows like CSI have influenced public thought about science and crime, creating a good deal of misconception about what is possible and what is practical. She wondered if there might be a way to incorporate the notion of facts into some part of the course. Professor Walitalo appreciated this point but felt it might be a bit advanced for the reach of an introductory course. On a practical level, even getting the students to understand the difference between a scene and a sequence is a lot to ask in fifteen weeks.

Professor Adams said that anyone who teaches this course, as well as courses like Introduction to Photography, has the responsibility to address the issue of critiquing and interpretation. A basic course on creativity belongs in another institution. At John Jay, the emphasis should be more heavily weighted toward the critique side, developing students’ intellect, critique, and ethics in keeping with the justice core.

Professor Lee made a friendly suggestion that a how-to course does not exclude content. In many John Jay courses, content is built into the process of learning, as can be seen in freshman composition, where students learn how to write by reading. She felt the issue in discussion could be answered simply by explicitly incorporating the analytic aspect of instruction into the course description. She suggested some language that could serve this goal, such as citing the use of Chinatown by Polanski or adding “teaching students to write for the screen also by analyzing films that depict social justice or political justice.”

Course revision: ANT 208 Cities and Culture

Professor Sexton explained that the course description is being updated to reflect what is actually going on in the classroom. Professor Snajdr explained that the course has essentially become a 200-level survey of urban anthropology, and the department would like the title and description to reflect that.
Professor Lisandro Perez asked if there is a word limit on course descriptions. Kathy Killoran said there is not. Professor Perez said this description could benefit from economy, feeling that portions of it read more like excerpts from a lecture than a blueprint. He asked if John Jay requires full sentences, noting that some schools do not. Kathy Killoran answered that John Jay does require full sentences. Professor Carbonell suggested a way to edit the second sentence. Professor Leippe had a particular comment on the phrasing of one sentence, suggesting that “including the united states” should say “including some in the united states,” because as written, it implies that the whole nation is an urban environment.

Dean Lopes said that further feedback can be directed to Professor Snajdr.

Course revision: PSY 272 Correctional Psychology

Kathy Killoran explained that this comes as part of the Forensic Psychology major revision. The course will be raised to 3xx level, and PSY 242 is being added to the prerequisites to ground the students for the higher level course.

Professor Leippe said that the course has been taught at effectively the 300-level for quite some time.

Professor Adams said that syllabus could profit from including issues of agency, ethics, and self-management, especially as these elements play a key role in a psychologist’s work in corrections.

Professor Sexton asked why prisoner reentry is stated in the course description but appears nowhere else in the syllabus. Professor Leippe answered that most of what goes on in the prison is geared toward reentry, but he took Professor Sexton’s point and would pass it on. Professor Gideon suggested that Professor Leippe might mean reintegration. Professor Gideon explained that reentry is the moment when they transition, but reintegration is the preparation.

Dean Lopes said that further comments can be sent to Professor Angela Crossman.

Course Revision: ART 113 Introduction to Photography & Course revision: ART 114 Intermediate Photography

Kathy Killoran introduced both courses as courses that have not been taught at John Jay for a long time. With the arrival of Professor Cyriaco Lopes, these courses are being revived and students are responding quite well, so the titles and descriptions are being updated. A suggestion was made to discuss both courses together.

Professor Sexton noted the third line on the first proposal, where it says DLSR camera, suggesting that this is a typographical error.

Christopher Sui pointed out that there is no more dark room at John Jay, and asked if that is why the title is being changed. Professor Lopes said this is the reason for the change in title but it reflects the field as well.

Professor Carbonell suggested that these may actually be new courses rather than revisions. In the process of revising the courses to be digital, a tradition is lost, and that should be acknowledged. In
terms of content, she noted that the syllabus does have some important theoretical readings, but the idea of the ethical dimensions of capturing an image does not appear in the course description. She acknowledged that it does in the syllabus. She had two questions about rolling this into a course revision as opposed to creating a new course. First, what happens to the content of those original courses, given that those skills have not disappeared? Second, what about the more theoretical and analytical dimensions?

Professor Lopes answered that most schools are phasing out the dark room, and even Polaroid has stopped producing Polaroid paper. He said that most art schools will keep a dark room class, but it is going the way of printmaking. Given the fact that John Jay only has a minor in art, he could not see a reason for keeping the dark room methods on the books. To her second point about theoretical dimensions, he referenced other course descriptions that he used as a model.

Professor Carbonell asked if there might be a day in class that would historicize the transition to digital. Professor Lopes said he used to teach art history and would love to take that material on, but it should be an entirely separate art history course at the 200-level about the film tradition and other traditions of photography that have faded. Professor Carbonell countered that students would not take the art history class and it probably would not be proposed, so the moment in history should be recognized in the course at hand.

Professor Herbert had a question about the attendance policy’s use of “excused” and “unexcused.” Dean Lopes agreed that those terms give a confusing message to students, and the college’s stance should be that attendance is important, one way or the other.

Professor Sexton noticed that the course requires students to have a camera, and asked if that is currently the case. Professor Lopes said it is not, then spoke to the history of reviving this course. When he arrived, there were no photography classes. Now there are eight sections, and they all have overtallies. The department has bought about thirty cameras and instituted a checkout system, and already those cameras are not enough.

Kathy Killoran said that she thought the Art and Music Department had put in a Student Technology Fee proposal and it was likely to be funded next year.

Professor Tarantino complimented both courses’ assignments, which she found both compelling and nurturing of creativity. She especially liked the 500-word essay in which students explain themselves and how they connect their work and their thoughts. Professor Lopes said that the artist statement is very important in the art world.

Professor Adams asked why the ethics discussion had been placed at the end of the semester rather than the beginning, given how intimately it would be involved in the use or misuse of an image. He said the best practice with ethics is to weave it in over time, and he noted that he thought the course probably did that, but he wished it to be overtly stated in the course description.

Professor Ben Lapidus asked if simply adding “as well as ethics” to the end of the course description would satisfy Professors Adams and Carbonell on the point about content. He asked for a clearer statement that would help the presenting professor understand what kind of change is actually being requested.

Professor Adams explained that the syllabus is an example of the course, but does not bind future
teachers. The course description, however, binds whoever will be teaching it, so it is necessary to capture content aims in the course description.

Professor Lapidus felt that historically, a certain level of scrutiny was being brought to his department in particular. On behalf of Art and Music, he wished for more specific language from UCASC members critiquing course proposals in order for presenting professors to understand the scope of comments, and again asked if the answer was as simple as adding “and ethics” to the description.

Professor Carbonell answered that just insertion of the word ethics would not address the issue of historical context and transition to digital. She offered to correspond outside of the meeting to discuss potential language.

Professor Lapidus wished to emphasize the division between history and practice courses in the creative fields. Even the faculty in Art and Music are divided between those who teach theory and those who teach practical, and there are very real limits as to how much can get covered in the time span of a semester in the practical courses.

Professor Lopes expressed her appreciation for the dilemma, noting that it is a small department that does a lot of heavy lifting. She said that studio courses do not always include the theoretical and historical perspective, which is seen to be a separate thing. However, she felt that the mission of the college needs to be tied into the core of every course. She realized that this does put a high demand on some of the practice courses, and said that the college does ask that. She suggested that she might meet with the department to talk about ways to address that, which may smooth the USCASC presentations.

Professor Lapidus said that if theory were completely absent, he would agree with these points, but he felt like theory was addressed in the proposals on the table. He noted a statement on page two of ART 114 about the goals of the course that did cover theory.

Professor Adams again noted that the issue is the course description that he does see theory addressed in the proposer’s vision of the course, but he doesn’t see it confirmed in the course description, which is the binding contract. Dean Lopes said that there are some things in the course proposal that are not in the description.

Dean Lopes suggested that the courses subcommittee help the studio courses with these technical points in the future. Professor Lopes said that his description was completely technical and he was glad to know he can add more to it.

Course revision: HIS/GEN 364 History of Gender & Sexuality: Pre-History to 1650

Kathy Killoran introduced this course, which is being revised to allow history majors to enroll. Professor Matthew Perry, the proposer, was not in attendance, and Professor Simon Baatz was absence also, so Kathy Killoran said she would relay any feedback to them. The major change to the course was to replace “ands” with “ors” to allow the course to serve both the Gender Studies major and the History major.

Professor Corthals noted that the term “prehistory” is not the same thing as the ancient world.

Professor Perez brought up the point about economy in course descriptions again. He reiterated his feeling that there should be a system that limits the character-count. Dean Lopes said this could go on
the Standards Subcommittee’s agenda in the fall.

Kathy Killoran asked that Standards also look at some of the one-line course descriptions that are in the bulletin, which are too short to be effective. Dean Lopes said a course description needs to say “what will the course do” and “what will students do.”

Kathy Killoran asked if the second reading of this revision could be suspended, given that the course requirements without revision impede History majors from enrolling.

_A motion was made and seconded to suspend the second reading of the course revision to HIS/GEN 364 History of Gender and Sexuality: Pre-History to 1650._

Professor Adams asked how this would affect the students between now and February. Vice President Saulnier said that the registration process is underway. If this change were to be approved by this committee, then prerequisites can be changed for fall enrollment. Otherwise, the prerequisites would stay the same until September. Kathy Killoran added that holding the vote meant that History students would not be able to take the course until after next spring.

_The committee voted to suspend the second reading of the course revision to HIS/GEN 364 History of Gender and Sexuality: Pre-History to 1650 with 25 votes in favor and 1 abstention._

_A motion was made and seconded to approve the course revision to HIS/GEN 364 History of Gender and Sexuality: Pre-History to 1650._

Professor Adams appealed for a broader motion that the committee make time next year to address comments like Professor Perez’s and Professor Lapidus’s about tension. He strongly felt that the UCASC needs space in the itinerary for these sorts of discussions.

_The committee voted unanimously to approve the course revision to HIS/GEN 364 History of Gender and Sexuality: Pre-History to 1650 with 26 votes in favor._

Course revision: POL 215 Legislative Process

Kathy Killoran introduced this course as the first of several to be reviewed as a result of the Political Science Department’s self-study and outside evaluation last year. The course, title, and description are being changed to focus exclusively on the U. S. Congress, rather than including state and local legislators. Professor Andrew Sidman was present to speak about the proposal.

_A motion was made and seconded to waive the second reading of POL 215 Legislative Process._

Professor Romaniuk said that the next course on the itinerary was very similar to this one, and suggested that the second reading be waived on both. The motion was reformulated, but Professor Adams asked that for form’s sake the first motion should be withdrawn before considering a new motion. Dean Lopes agreed and said that first both courses would be discussed and then there could be a motion to waive second readings.

_The motion to waive the second reading of POL 215 Legislative Process was withdrawn._
Course revision: POL 220 Chief Executive

Kathy Killoran explained that the new title will be “The American Presidency,” and the course will no longer study chief executives in other countries.

Professor Sexton asked if the wording should be “United States” rather than “American.” Professor Sidman said he had followed the subfields within Political Science. There, Congress is titled “US Congress,” but presidency is “American Presidency.”

A motion was made and seconded to consider course revisions of POL 220 and POL 215 together and to waive the second reading on both.

The committee voted to approve considering POL 220 and POL 215 together and to waive them both with 25 votes in favor and 1 abstention.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the course revisions for POL 215 and POL 220. The committee voted unanimously to approve the course revisions for POL 215 and POL 220 with 26 votes in favor.

A motion was made and seconded to adjourn. It was unanimously acclaimed. The meeting concluded at 12:13 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah Hammond, Scribe
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Meeting Minutes


Guest: A. Carpi

1. Provost’s Announcements.
   - Jane welcomed Prof. Nancy Velazquez-Torres to the meeting, our new Chair of the SEEK Department.
   - There are two important receptions next week: 1) At the Rubin Museum on March 22 from 6 pm to 8 pm. Donald Rubin has become friends with the College and is offering his space for a faculty/staff social function and to view the art. 2) On Thursday, March 24, from 5 pm to 6 pm in the President’s Office there will be a reception honoring those faculty who have published a book recently. Chairs should be there.
   - Jane passed out Josten’s business cards for those not wanting to order their graduation gowns online.
   - We will not discuss “pre-tenure” review today (labeled “mid-tenure review” on the agenda) but we will take it up at the Faculty Personnel Committee. This is a new CUNY policy effective March 1, 2011 so there will be a draft proposal on it.

2. PRISM Initiative. Anthony Carpi will be doing a presentation which Jane saw at a Foundation Board meeting. She asked Anthony to present it here because it counters the sense of frustration that we’ve all had at one time or another by showing how dedicated faculty can turn a bad situation around with a persistent effort. Years ago the Sciences Department had many interested students but graduated only a handful, even as enrollments rose. From one faculty member the energy grew and involved others so that the Department in a relatively short period of time changed beyond recognition. This is a story about possibilities—for faculty, a Department, and above all for students.

Anthony presented a 20-year picture of enrollment in the Department, noting the explosion in the 1990’s but the continued paucity of graduates. The number of majors stabilized eventually to its current level of over 800, but the story of dramatically increased graduation rates began in 2006 with the creation of the Math and Science Resource Center (MSRC). There students found tutoring support but also a new and vibrant social entity within the Sciences Department. Undergraduate Research became an emphasis in 2001 with some external support, but in 2006 the PRISM grant pulled together several programs to make student support much more manageable. A focus on undergraduate research moved the emphasis away from content and shifted it toward the practice of science. PRISM offered seminars for students, even freshmen; it paired students with mentors (faculty) in their sophomore year; it provided stipends for
student research, for travel grants, and for GRE prep. Faculty development programs taught faculty the meaning of mentorship. In 2007 there was a symposium for student research, both with posters and oral presentations. Today, half the graduating class participates in research projects, which has had a pronounced effect on graduation rates. And in the last 10 years, 24 students have gone on to post-graduate programs.

Jane noted that lots of things have come together to make this happen and that it has been a catalyst for student research across the campus. The transformation of the Sciences Department has had consequences beyond the Department. She also invited faculty with entrepreneurial inclinations to see her about getting support, since she wants to encourage this kind of activity. Jane also welcomes any department doing good work with students to make a presentation at the PAC meeting in the future.

Anthony showed a video featuring students and faculty talking about their research, mentoring, PRISM, and life after John Jay.

Maki asked Anthony about the possibility of cross-department collaboration; he responded positively. Marny pointed to the need and challenges of engaging students in research in the humanities, which looks different than in the sciences and social sciences.

3. Reassigned Time for Major Coordinators and Departmental Administration. Jane has sent out the reassigned time allocations for Departments, and she tried to standardize that for Major Coordinators. The Major Coordinator’s Council (and Anne Lopes) had recommended 1 course per semester, but due to financial constraints only 1 per year was possible; Jane is open to an increase in the future. Harold noted that there were 3 possible model job descriptions for major coordinators and asked which model departments were supposed to follow. Jane advised that the chair and coordinator choose the model that best suits the needs of the major/department. This would differ from department to department. Harold polled Political Sciences Chairs within CUNY and found that none teach more than 1 course per semester. He observed that the Major Coordinator is a big job and that one reassigned course is inadequate. He noted that Interdisciplinary Coordinators get more time than major coordinators and pointed to an equity issue across the College. Ned praised the development of the position, saying that it would transform life in the Department, but he agreed with Harold that one course was not enough reassigned time. Maki argued for more reassigned time up front since there was a lot of initial work that needed to be done, especially for departments revising their majors; perhaps later it would stabilize at a lower level. Jane responded that when she became Provost she surveyed other CUNY Provosts and discovered that the JJ plan seemed to be in the middle of them, in terms of reassigned time for departmental administration. She is open to reconsidering the formula but cautioned that any additional time costs money. She will, however, give thought to the request for more.
She justified giving the Interdisciplinary Coordinators more because their job is similar to the Graduate Program coordinators, in terms of a more open-ended set of responsibilities, not contained neatly within a single department. Ned disagreed. Glenn is concerned about disassociating the advising from the Major Coordinating function. Jane responded that we’ll discuss the Academic Advising plan in the future, and she hopes to begin implementation next academic year.

The meeting concluded at 3 pm.
PAC Meeting
2:30-4:00 pm
April 14, 2011
Meeting Minutes


Absent: C. Adams, BJ. Eanes, A. Green, L. Kobilinsky, L. Perez, L. Sullivan, D. Umeh

1. **Provost Announcements.**
   - Although she wasn’t there, the Provost lauded the presentation by Siegel and Gale on branding for the College. It gives us a voice. The powerpoint can be seen on “Inside John Jay.” A third installment of the presentation, on the logo and general look of John Jay materials, will occur at the next BPC meeting, and Chairs are encouraged to attend.
   - The annual Bravo nominations are open.
   - We’re getting a nice response from the faculty concerning commencement, greater than last year. At this point we have 64 committed for the morning and 69 for the afternoon, with others helping students in the robing area.
   - The Faculty Recognition Awards ceremony will be April 27. All chairs should be there. Jane listed all the awardees in various categories.
   - Research and Creativity week will be May 9-13 with varied events. The official launch is May 9 at 11 am.
   - The Chancellery is collecting data on our graduates (UG and Grad) who have been accepted into “prestigious” graduate programs. If the Chairs know of such students, the information should be forwarded to Jim Llana on forms distributed by email.
   - Jane distributed the newsletter for the Office of Undergraduate Research and copies of “Anthropology News.” The latter has a write-up on some research going on in our Dept. of Anthropology.

2. **Approval of Minutes for March 14, 2011.** Minutes were approved without amendment.

3. **Advising Plan.** Anne Lopes gave a presentation about the proposed comprehensive advising plan, and she distributed a copy of it. John Jay is unique in having five professional advisors for 15,000 students. We should have fifteen professionals and all faculty doing advising. (Jane noted that when she came, there were no professional advisors at all.) Anne cited the Keeling Strategic Retention Report and data to underscore the need for advisors; we provide good access but insufficient student support.

Some faculty think that faculty can do all the advising, but this is not true. Professional advisors play a very different role than faculty: their only job is to advocate for students. They anticipate the needs of students; they help students understand their various options at the College. There are real differences between faculty and professional advisors.

Anne reviewed the plan itself, noting that it moves us through three phases to fifteen full-time advisors with a slightly reduced group of peer advisors. It calls for College Assistant support and full-time staff assistance. Faculty will advise students when they reach the sixty-credit mark. Faculty will do advising in their offices during office hours for one week each semester, right before the registration period. There will be departmental incentives and release time available
for certain faculty in undergraduate programs to handle advising throughout the year (based on a ratio of 1 release for every 200 students in the major).

The program will pilot in the fall with Psychology and Forensic Science. The Psychology Dept is interested in advising sophomores as well as upper-division students.

Marny Tabb noted that she has been told that advising is not part of the union contract, and she hopes it’s not true. She also asked about training for faculty. Anne responded that training will be available. On the contract issue, Jane told the story of raising that issue with her colleagues and being told that faculty certainly do advise on other CUNY campuses. She also pointed out that we’re not asking for very much, just two weeks a year; besides, providing “guidance” to students is an explicit contractual obligation. She continued that we may not be able to hire full-time advisors right away, but we can afford the plan for faculty advisement.

Glenn asked about the role of major coordinators in advising: should they be the ones who take on the continuous role in departments, since they are the most knowledgeable? And he made a plea for turning off the degree audit system, since it is so often wrong. Anne responded that the major coordinators think advising should be defined as a separate function, which would allow a major coordinator to do it or not. As for the degree audit system, Anne said that it works or not, depending on whom you talk to. However, advisement tools are being developed, in hardcopy first and then in an interactive online version.

Seth asked about a timeframe for the phases of the plan. Jane doesn’t know since that will depend on the budget, but she continually pushes for more faculty and more advisors.

Tom made a pitch for catching students before they show up as seniors without basic courses that should have been taken much earlier; ideally he would like to advise freshmen. Hopefully, professional advisors would catch students who have missed courses along the way. Students often change majors mid-stream, and as a result they find themselves without pre-requisites or required introductory courses. Tom urged that students who do so should right away see their new department. Ned would like us to take an active approach that would identify students ahead of time who are likely to take a wrong course; we need to develop better tools for this.

On another topic, Ned questioned the planned allocation of course releases for graduate and undergraduate programs; why should they differ? He also made a pitch for more graduate participation as the program rolls out (grad programs will start with peer advisors).

In terms of moving ahead, Jane plans to bring the first piece to FPS; we can make adjustments and perhaps do more with graduate programs.

In response to a question about the timing of the advising week, Jane said it would occur just before registration.

Harold pronounced the degree audits bad. And with regard to differing resources directed to undergraduates and graduates, he suggested that graduate students may need less help than undergraduates.

Dave asked about the phases, and Jane replied that they are dependent on the budget. She has already requested to spend money on the pilot departments. Next year we may phase in another set of programs.

Marny: If departments want to get started—outside the pilot programs-- can faculty get training. Anne responded “yes” if we have people to do the training.

Allison noted that the History Department is doing advising, but a major problem is getting students to show up. Can we block registration in those cases? We can talk about that.

4. **Learning Goals on Syllabi.** Jim Llana did a presentation on the Chair’s role in getting learning goals for majors and minors on syllabi for the Middle States review. He took the opportunity to talk a bit about learning goals in general, noting that they are the starting point in the
assessment cycle and that they must reflect the collective judgment of the program faculty. It’s not always easy to achieve that consensus, but it’s necessary in order to inform both current and prospective students what the expectations are, and it’s useful for faculty to have a common understanding of the degree program. Learning goals should be limited in number since having ten or twenty will make any assessment unduly burdensome. Goals should primarily reflect higher-order thinking skills, and they should be major things that we want our students to retain a year or more after the course. Learning goals fall into three basic categories: Knowledge; Thinking Skills; Attitudes, Values, Dispositions, and Habits of Mind. Some learning goals are institutional and quite broad, coming from the Mission, Vision statement, Master Plan, or General Education; others are peculiar to degree programs. The broadest goals should be distributed as widely as practical through the institution, to afford as many intentional learning opportunities as possible for students. By taking a broad view of the distribution of learning goals across the College, we can integrate and reinforce them.

Learning goals distributed across courses within a major constitute a “curriculum map.” Such maps are useful in revealing the related opportunities students have for meeting the learning goals.

Why have learning goals on each syllabus? It’s a best practice since students are aided by knowing what is expected of them. And Middle States specifically requires in Standard eleven that we show the goals on each syllabus.

Chairs should inform faculty of the need to include program learning goals on syllabi and collect those syllabi. They should review the learning goals to insure that the appropriate ones are present and that mere activities are not among the goals. Faculty may add their own learning goals to a syllabus, above and beyond the “official” programmatic ones. Syllabi with appropriate goals must be sent to Inez Brown, in either hardcopy or electronic form. Where there are multiple sections of the same course, only one representative syllabus need be sent.

Chairs should insure that all syllabi for multiple sections contain the appropriate goals; if the Middle States team wants to see more than the representative syllabi available centrally, they will be referred to the departments where all syllabi should be housed.

Jim spoke briefly about rubrics since they seem to pose a problem for departments. Any assessment needs a rubric since it takes the learning goals and defines performance measures against them. Those performance measures must be written out descriptively since measures like “1,2,3” or “excellent, good, satisfactory” are not stable from rater to rater, and they cannot be used easily to formulate specific improvements in the curriculum. Jim showed a sample and will gladly distribute it upon request.

To a question on timing, he responded that while syllabi are already coming in—and that is desirable—we would need to get fall syllabi for 2011-12 during that semester and spring syllabi before the end of the academic year.

5. **New Business.** In response to a question, there was a discussion of the new federally-mandated book order policy whose aim is to allow students to see the required books, and costs, before they have to register for courses. Kevin noted that we have discussed this before and brought our concerns to 80th St; we argued there that the system is not ready to go yet, and it was agreed that we could join the CUNY policy not on March 1 as originally planned but for the spring 2012 semester. Ned proposed a change of wording so that everything prior to August 1 is something other than “registration.” “Someone likes this problem,” he said, and it’s created entirely by the words that administrators of the program choose to use. Jane suggested that we need to respond to the spirit of the law and to let students know what their books will cost
before they register. Kevin is the point person on this issue. We won’t solve the problem in this room.
Provoost’s Advisory Council

Meeting Minutes – May 3, 2011

1. Approval of Minutes for April 14, 2011. The minutes were approved without amendment.

2. Provost’s Announcements
   - The Faculty Recognition event was very nice. Some Chairs were there, but others were not; we hope to see everyone there next year. The faculty accomplishments are quite impressive.
   - Jane introduced Will Simpkins, the relatively new Director of Career Services, who will make a presentation later in the meeting.
   - Next week is Research and Creativity Week. Jane distributed a schedule and urged all to attend. Dr. Gillian Small, CUNY Vice Chancellor for Research, will be coming; this is a sign of our progress and research stature within CUNY.
   - Charlene Johnson has won a CUNY-wide speech award.
   - Kevin announced the Department graduation awards on May 18 (3:30 in Auxiliary Gym) and hopes to see everyone there.
   - Jane shared two letters to the President, the first from the Chancellor who commended the College for the spring 2011 issue of John Jay magazine. He wrote about the “palpable sense of purpose and energy across the College...” The Chancellor rarely writes letters of this type. The second letter was from Sandi Cooper, Chair of the University Faculty Senate; she praised the recent John Jay Justice Award ceremony, singling out the “remarkable” choice of awardees and “professional” presentation.
   - The CUNY Board of Trustees approved all the honorary degrees for this year, but they separated the proposed award for Tony Kushner from the list and did not approve it, based on comments from Trustee Wiesenfeld concerning remarks Kushner allegedly made about Israel. Karen amplified the account saying that the remarks attributed to Kushner came from a discredited website. There is an Executive Committee of the BOT that meets and makes decisions between regularly scheduled meetings, and that committee could approve the Kushner award in time for graduation. The Chancellor’s Office is investigating.
   - There are a couple days remaining to submit names of our graduates who have been accepted into prestigious graduate programs or who have won prestigious post-graduate awards. CUNY is collecting this information. Names should go to Jim Llana.
• Richard Saulnier reports that we don’t have enough seats for the summer sessions, in part because we have SEEK students and conditional admits; the university has raised math standards so we have more conditional admits than normal. We’ll have to cancel summer courses when they are severely under enrolled because we don’t have enough classrooms.

• The budget is bad and next year will be bad as well, but we don’t yet know “how bad is bad.” There is some concern that the state will not “recognize” the tuition increase, which means CUNY will not get the funds. We are looking at various drastic measures and getting signs from CUNY that we should be very careful about spending. We have no permission for any faculty searches, although the Provost has to come up with a list of critical faculty needs; necessarily, it will be very short, with perhaps about six positions, but everyone should understand that it could be cancelled. Subs this spring can be filled with subs for the fall, but that’s subject to the budget as well. It’s status quo for summer salary for Chairs at the moment, but that too may not be possible. Travel is the same as last year, and faculty should start booking travel for next year. Harold asked about his Departmental travel situation, and Ben replied that the funding should be just about what he got this year. Our intention is to make commitments, with the understanding that it’s all subject to the budget situation. Ben urged that Chairs forward travel requests for this year now, since it appears we’re underspending. Ben noted that the budget for next year does not factor in the worst possible news from the state.

3. Chair Annual Evaluations. To make Chairs aware of the data that will be available to them in preparation for the Chair evaluations this summer, J. Llana presented in PowerPoint graphic depictions of departmental performance data that has been available in the past only in numerical form. He observed that graphs might be easier to think about than tables of numbers, and he also noted that we could discuss additions to the data pack that Chairs might find useful. The data falls into three categories: trends in instruction; trends in enrollment and degrees awarded; and student characteristics. Instructional data includes a breakdown of full-time faculty contributions to graduate courses, undergraduate courses, upper division, and lower division. One important concern is getting more full-time faculty into lower division instruction. In most cases the graphs allow comparisons among departmental data, College data, and CUNY senior college data. The last item is Mean Teaching hours for veteran faculty and for newer faculty who are eligible for contractual released time. This is an important PMP indicator but one that may not be available in time for the summer discussions. Ned suggested that such data were beyond the control of Chairs and shouldn’t be used in a Chair Evaluation; the administration is largely responsible for distributing course releases, and faculty get releases through grants, but Chairs don’t
control this. There followed some discussion that centered on what might be more useful—though very hard to get—and on the usefulness of mean teaching hours as a way to identify faculty who are not covering the right number of hours. Ned thought it would be useful to have the absolute number of hours covered by the department for all courses and faculty.

Enrollment data for majors will be available in graph form along with five-year trends. Enrollment numbers for first-time students, both freshmen and transfers are also available. Clearly we want to encourage increasing enrollments unless a Department simply cannot accommodate any more students. In addition, the following items will be provided: percentages of students by class standing within the majors; comparison of full versus part-time students. Ned thought it better to use tables of numbers where one can see other departments too; Jim can provide such information. Graphs can be useful in focusing attention on particular trends or numbers, but tables of numbers can provide more information which may, however, obscure items of importance.

For student characteristics, there will be results from at least a couple questions on this semester’s student experience survey; in particular, one concerns experiences with advising and another with difficulties associated with registering for particular types of courses. There will be departmental data on gender and race/ethnicity, compared to the John Jay population at large.

Lisandro pointed out that much of the data featured is not applicable to departments without majors. He would be interested in data on his Department’s service contributions to the College. Jim acknowledged the problem and said he was interested in getting FTE data for faculty and departments; such data would be applicable to any department, but it may prove difficult to get soon. Lisandro also posed the question of whether this exercise was a Chair’s evaluation or a department review. Jane responded that it’s not a personal evaluation but rather a department report and a report on leadership of the department.

4. Undergraduate Research. Prof. Nathan Lents distributed flyers from the Office of Undergraduate Research and gave a brief history of the program. He noted that students who engage in undergraduate research do better as a result. Faculty too experience benefits since the students make them more productive scholars. Chairs can help by promoting undergraduate research opportunities among the faculty. Harold asked about getting credit for Independent Study more than once. We need to create mechanisms at the College for incorporating research into the major and giving credit for it, often through Independent Study courses. Jane mentioned that Psychology is a
model in this regard. She urged everyone to reach out to Nathan for ideas and help in getting both students and faculty involved in undergraduate research.

5. **Update on Student Career Services/Collaborative Opportunities for Faculty.** Will Simpkins reported that JJ students work and often stay in that job after graduation, at least initially. He talked about what employers want from potential employees; communications skills are at the top of the list. The Career Services office teaches students how to build professional networks; the staff doesn’t simply hand students referral information but rather tries to give students the skills to develop their own abilities in the job market. Student attendance at a recent job and internship fair increased 243% over the previous one. The office has an event every day, a workshop or something else. Will reported on his efforts to partner with academic departments and pointed out his willingness to develop career-academic links. Internships are especially important since we know that “grads” of internships often get jobs faster and at a higher salary. Will reviewed his strategic priorities for 2011-12 and a four-year planning initiative. Activities include “Don’t Cancel that Class,” where he or his staff will come into a class that would otherwise be cancelled and run a program, as well as programs to feature guest speakers, referrals to the Center, and experiential learning connections. He concluded by offering the services of the Center to the faculty.