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## Updated 2011-2012 College Council Committee Activity Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Agendas</th>
<th>Minutes</th>
<th>Attendance Lists</th>
<th>No. Scheduled Meetings</th>
<th>Meetings Held</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Personnel Committee</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Council</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Studies</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honors, Prizes and Awards</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Evaluation of the Faculty</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council of Undergraduate Program Coordinators</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Interests</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCASC</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty-Student Disciplinary Committee (formally Judicial Committee)</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget and Planning Committee</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College-Wide Assessment Committee</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee of the College Council</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>9*</td>
<td>9*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint meetings of the Financial Planning Subcommittee of the Budget and Planning Committee and the Strategic Planning Subcommittee of the Budget &amp; Planning</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Interim ECCC meetings on July 20, 2011 and September 12, 2011 included
†May minutes have not yet been approved, therefore not submitted
N/R: not required to be submitted due to confidentiality of its nature

### Submitted Proposals and Reports for Academic Year 2011-2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Number of Proposals/Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Standards</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Studies</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee of the College Council</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate and UCASC</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost Jane Bowers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean Jannette Domingo</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honors, Prizes and Awards</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Roger McDonald</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Standards</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Council</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total: 120**

120 proposals were put on the College Council agenda for consideration in academic year 2011-2012.

**Last Updated: September 26, 2012**
Budget and Planning Committee Meeting
October 6, 2011
Agenda

President Jeremy Travis – Remarks

Senior Vice President Robert Pignatello

FY 2011 Review
Update on 2012 CUNY Budget Developments
FY 2012 Financial Plan
Budget and Planning Committee meeting 10 6 11

<table>
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<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
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<td>Adams, C. Jama</td>
<td></td>
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<tr>
<td>Baumrin, Seth</td>
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<td>Benton, Warren</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowers, Jane</td>
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<td>Brotherton, David</td>
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<td>Green, Amy</td>
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<td>Haberfeld, Maki</td>
<td></td>
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<tr>
<td>Hamilton, Jay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacobs, Jacob</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaplowitz, Karen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kavey, Allison</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ketterer, Patricia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kobilinsky, Larry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kucharski, Tom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Llana, James</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lopes, Anne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandery, Evan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neat, Cadalie</td>
<td>Prox → Daniel Benez Arg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pease, Allison</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td></td>
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<tr>
<td>Pignatello, Robert</td>
<td></td>
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<td>Quintian, Carina</td>
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<td>Saulnier, Richard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheehan, Francis</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shenkin, Peter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sullivan, Harold</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sullivan, Larry</td>
<td>Bonnie hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry, Karen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Till, Robert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travis, Jeremy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trimboli, Dana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umeh, Davidson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Velazquez-Torres, Nancy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams, Lisa Marie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Rothdin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Budget and Planning Committee Meeting  
October 6, 2011

Notes/Minutes

Attendees: See attached list

1. Opening Remarks
President Jeremy Travis gave opening remarks which addressed the most significant budget developments since we last met. Those developments include:

- The NYS legislature passed legislation which enacted a rational tuition policy for the City University of New York and provides for a modest tuition increase of $300 per year for the next 5 years. Embedded in the legislation is a commitment to reinvest the funds in the University and students.
- Tap eligible students will be held harmless and will not have to pay any additional tuition.
- The state will commit to a maintenance of effort which obligates the state to pay for mandatory costs and increases in mandatory costs.
- As a result of the tuition increase, the college will receive an increase in its operating budget this year. The predictable tuition increases allow for multi-year financial planning which runs parallel to multi-year enrollment planning. The multi-year financial plan is presented today and the multi-year enrollment plan will be brought to the Budget and Planning Committee for comments and discussion. The financial plan will be updated accordingly.

There was no discussion

2. Presentation of the Financial Plan
Senior Vice President Robert Pignatello gave an overview of the FY 2011 year end budget report, an update on FY 2012 Budget Developments and a look at the FY 2012 Preliminary Financial Plan. The full presentation is attached. Highlights include the fact that we made it through a very difficult year in FY 2011. The college was facing a significant budget shortfall due to NYS reductions and enrollment decreases. This situation required that the college take drastic actions including: implementation of a hiring pause and vacancy controls, reductions in college assistant and otps spending, careful monitoring of the budget at monthly executive staff meetings and offsetting theatre costs with rental revenues. The college also successfully petitioned the University for additional support and began the FY 2012 planning process with the Vice Presidents and the Financial Planning Subcommittee earlier than ever. The proposed FY 2012-FY 2014 Financial Plan is based on enrollment projections of 11,182 this year and planned growth of 2.3% in FY 13 and an additional 3.4% increase in FY 2014. The FY 2012 plan includes compact investments for 7 full time faculty, student support services,
CUNYfirst, Marketing and Recruitment and is partially funded by philanthropy and productivity/efficiency savings. Other investments in the FY 2012 plan include the funding or over 100 positions and operating needs for the new building as well as investments in programs that are expected to grow revenue such as the Year Round College. The FY 2013 hiring plan includes funds for an additional 15 faculty (6 tenure track and 9 substitutes to teach increased enrollment). In FY 2014 we would plan to hire an additional 14 substitutes to teach new enrollment if enrollment meets projected levels.

During the budget presentation there was a discussion of the plan to staff the Public Safety division by converting some of the part time positions to full time campus security officers. There was concern that this plan had not been fully discussed with faculty and students. The new building budget request which included these positions had been shared with the Financial Planning Subcommittee previously. VP Pignatello shared that the University was only going to fund a plan that included full time campus security officers. President Travis suggested that a separate meeting be held to fully brief the Campus Security Advisory group.

Professor Kaplowitz expressed a concern that if we do not consider the academic profile of students when increasing enrollment, we will not be able to retain the students and they will not succeed. President Travis responded that the overall goal is to simultaneously increase standards and enrollment. Provost Bowers indicated that our plan to increase enrollment includes plans to focus on the first 4 phases of the CUNY admissions process so that we can target the better prepared students. Previously we focused on the later phases of the enrollment cycle.

Professor Benton raised concerns about hiring administrative staff this year when enrollment in the future years is not certain. VP Saulnier stated that a significant portion of the growth was in the transfer population which is fed by the CUNY Justice Academy where enrollment is quite robust.

3. Next Meeting
   Discussion of New Recruitment Strategy
   Update on Middle States
Budget and Planning Committee Meeting

February 29, 2012

Agenda

President Jeremy Travis – Integrated Planning

Provost Jane Bowers – Discussion of Strategic Positioning/ Recruitment Plan
<table>
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Budget and Planning Committee Meeting
February 29, 2012

Notes/Minutes

Attendees: See attached list

1. Integrated Planning
President Jeremy Travis began the discussion with an overview of integrated planning process. The college needs to engage in integrated planning to reverse the enrollment declines of the past few years and to enable the college to develop a multi-year sustainable financial plan. It is most appropriate that the Chief Academic Officer (Provost Bowers) lead the planning because of the inter-connectedness and dependencies of Academic, Enrollment, Financial and Space Planning. The College’s financial plan includes the rebuilding of our faculty lost to attrition and budget reductions. In order to assess where faculty are most needed, we must plan our growth of academic programs based on enrollment trends. Then we can incorporate these plans into the financial plan and space utilization plans of the college.

2. Discussion of Strategic Positioning/Recruitment Plan
Provost Bowers discussed the Strategic Positioning/Recruitment Plan that was developed by the Strategic Positioning Group (SPG) at the College. The SPG is comprised of the Provost, IVP for Marketing and Development, VP for Enrollment Management, VP for Student Affairs and their staff in consultation with outside enrollment strategists. It is critical that we engage in this planning in order to

- Reverse the enrollment decline of the past two years and promote fiscal stability
- Recognize interdependence of academic, enrollment, student affairs, and budget planning
- Achieve goals through continuous assessment of our position within the educational sphere

We learned from our work on developing the master plan that enrollment = retention and retention = revenue. John Jay has lagged behind other CUNY Colleges in enrollment growth. While our one year retention rate has improved due to the FYE and academic advisement, our 2 year rate lags behind that of our peers. The goal of the SPG is to set enrollment targets by type and categories, increase admission yields and provide the support required to retain students and enable their success. The Strategic Enrollment Plan includes targeting the earlier phases of the University’s application pool sooner in the process, creating a plan for “touching” or outreach to and engagement of applicants, marketing the College to current high school students and increasing our capacity to evaluate and process transfer applicants. The plan also includes engaging our relevant Communities of Practice. “A community of practice is a group of experts or practitioners who share a concern or passion for something (a domain), who interact routinely and learn together and who share a competence that distinguishes the
members from others.” It is important that we identify and reach out to leaders of these practices and educate them about the advantages of using John Jay College as a resource, understand more about the career paths that exist within their practice and align our curriculum with their needs.

During and following the presentation a number of questions/comments were offered and discussion ensued:

- There was a discussion regarding the 4 Symposia planned for the Spring 2012 and plan to involve students in the symposia and other “touch” events. Currently students play a crucial role in these efforts by serving as peer ambassadors and participating in focus groups that provide feedback on their experiences at the college.
- A question was raised regarding the availability of data/information about career goals of students when they enter John Jay versus what the student decides to pursue after graduation. VP Saulnier indicated that while this data may be available it is not easily retrievable.
- There was a discussion about marketing plans. A question was raised regarding any plans for additional hires in marketing to support the touch plan. The budget proposal under development by the SPG includes funds for marketing and writers; some may be short term consultants and not staff. Departemtn Chairs expressed concern about the process for making changes to their program/department brochures and need for department input. There seemed to be general agreement by the Committee that this was very important and would be conveyed to the Marketing Department.
- There is a need for research to understand how touches become relevant and how to make best use of social media.
- Overall the short term goal for the current year is to increase yield but the long term goal is to change perceptions and expand the community that is interested in us.
- A need for web page updates was expressed. The SPG budget proposal will include improvements to the website and its functionality.
- Questions were raised about what we are doing to retain 1st year students- we have a number of advisement plan and learning communities established for freshman. We need to expand to other cohorts.

Next Meeting:

- Approval of Minutes/Notes from the October 6, 2011 Meeting
- Update on SPS/FPS meetings
1. Approval of Minutes from February 29, 2012

2. Approval of Minutes from October 6, 2011

3. Chair’s Report - President Jeremy Travis

4. Update on SPS/FPS recommendations for FY2013 – SVP Pignatello, Assoc. Provost Llana & members of Subcommittee

5. Review of sources for Budget Information – Pat Ketterer

6. New Business
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Budget and Planning Committee Meeting  
May 8, 2012  
Notes/Minutes (amended 7/26/12)  

Attendees: See attached list  

1. Approval of Minutes from February 29, 2012  

Whitney Brown identified a spelling error in the second page, third bullet. Minutes will be modified to reflect the correction. Otherwise, minutes approved.  

2. Approval of Minutes from October 6, 2011  

Minutes approved.  

3. Chairs Report – President Jeremy Travis  

President Travis opened the conversation by recognizing the Chairs dissatisfaction with the decision-making process regarding budget and planning items. The Chairs do not feel engaged, nor do they feel the process is consultative or purposeful. Acknowledging the need to change the process, the President consulted with SVP Pignatello, Provost Bowers, and Associate Provost Llana to discuss.  

Philosophically, the President believes there should be an integrated planning and budget process. Integration is necessary because of all of the changes occurring across all aspects of the College. We are a new entity, and big changes are coming. His recommendation was as follows -  

- Regularly Scheduled Meetings: As we look towards next year, President Travis recommended regular BPC meeting be scheduled with topical agendas. He believes meetings should be aligned with the annual planning cycle and should incorporate three major themes –  
  - Seasonal Budget Cycle  
  - Major Policy Recommendations  
  - University Indicators (PMP)  

The first Fall Semester meeting should be focused on the budget with a discussion of the University’s allocation. The second meeting of the Fall Semester should be focused on Enrollment. What did we do? What did we learn? The first Spring Semester meeting should include a “mid-year” budget update. The final fiscal year updates and the year ends. The BPC should hear major policy recommendations as they occur throughout the year (ex: Taskforce findings). PMP indicators should also be part of the discussion and incorporated into our calendar of meetings.
• **More Frequent FPS/SPS Meetings:** The experiment of the joining the FPS/SPS committees appears to be a success. Nominations of ideas should come from the joint sub-committees to the larger BPC.

• **New Chairperson of the BPC:** Responsibility for chairing the BPC will shift from the Senior Vice President Pignatello to Associate Provost Llana.

The goal of the President’s recommendations is to have a strategic, regularized budget planning process in line with annual cycles. By late Spring next year, the BPC should have a prioritized list of recommendations for consideration for the Financial Plan submission in the subsequent Fall.

**Comments / Reactions**

- Karen questioned how the Strategic Positioning Initiative helped the college target “intentional recruits” – such as military veterans. President Travis confirmed it does.
- Jane noted how the recommendations for financial plan initiatives in late Spring of the preceding year aids in faculty recruitment planning. President Travis noted that the transfer of responsibility for the BPC is consistent with the notion of the importance of Academic Planning.
- Harold noted that it appears we are still targeting Criminal Justice in our recruitment efforts and new programs are not being targeted.
- VP Saulnier responded that we will be taking a different approach to recruitment and need to balance making our enrollment targets with raising standards and investing in new majors. Non-criminal justice majors are part of the recruitment plan.
- Bonnie Nelson suggested that meeting minutes and data be put on the Web and meeting dates be put on a public calendar so more people are aware.

**Announcements**

President Travis closed his remarks by announcing two major accomplishments of the College:

- The Chancellor has announced that John Jay College of Criminal Justice will be admitted to the Macaulay Honors College in Fall 2013.
- John Matteson has been approved by the Chancellor to be a Distinguished Professor

**4. Update on SPS/FPS recommendations for FY2013**

Senior Vice President Pignatello reviewed the updated Financial Plan projections and estimated timeline for the FY 2013 Financial Plan process. Since the NYS budget was adopted in a timely manner, we are expecting to receive the Operating Budget allocation from the University in the early summer. The joint Strategic and Financial Planning subcommittee will continue to meet and make preliminary recommendations by the end of May. The president’s executive staff is holding a planning retreat in early June to discuss recommendations and proposal from staff. SPS/FPS will review output from ESM and make final recommendations in late June. Those recommendations will be shared with the BPC.
and the financial plan will be developed in August based on input from the BPC. There will be a meeting in the early fall of the BPC to finalize the plan or, if plans are due prior to that date, the BPC will be called into session.

5. **Review of sources for Budget Information**
   Pat Ketterer reviewed and distributed the screen shot of the information that is available to everyone on Inside John Jay. The information includes Financial Plan Projections, Department Reports of OTPS (purchases) expenditures and Temporary (Part-time) personnel expenditures, Planning Committee Reports and minutes.

6. **New Business**
   The Chair discussed the appropriate frequency for the BPC to hold meetings. After some discussion, it was decided that the BPC would meet at least twice each semester but could convene more frequently if necessary. It was also discussed that perhaps there should be an open budget forum or town hall meeting annually to allow participation by more of the community.

**Next Meeting:** date to be determined
Budget and Planning Committee Meeting

July 25, 2012

Agenda

1. Approval of Minutes from May 8, 2012

2. Opening Remarks – Associate Provost James Llana

3. Update on SPS/FPS recommendations for FY2013 – SVP Pignatello, Assoc. Provost Llana & members of Subcommittee

4. New Business

Associate Provost Llana called the meeting to order at 11:05 am.

1. Approval of Minutes from May 8, 2012.
   Karen Kaplowitz would like the minutes to be amended on page 3, second sentence. She is suggesting the removal of the statement “if plans are due prior to that date, the BPC will review plan as submitted to the University.”
   The minutes are approved as amended and will be recirculated to reflect the changes.

2. Update on SPS/FPS Recommendations for FY2013.
   Associate Provost Llana opened up the meeting by describing the joint SPS/FPS meetings since the start of the spring semester. In total, the group met about nine times. The purpose of those meetings was to develop recommendations and proposals for the FY2013 financial plan. He asked the committee to look at the “Financial Plan FY2013 Recommendations” document, as those recommendations have been approved by the committee. (attached)

   SVP Pignatello noted the fact of greater consultation with this financial plan and that we are discussing it with time yet to make further recommendations. Currently there is no set Financial Plan, nor is there a due date for the Financial Plan, but the BPC will have the opportunity to review the plan prior to submission to the University. We ended the last year with a larger surplus than anticipated; we are carrying over $3.2 million into this year, due in part to accruals and underspending in OTPS. We received the budget allocation in June, earlier than we expected based on the past. The Compact allocation is about $4.4 million, but there are required deductions and constraints. And since we spent money against it in advance, we have a net at this point of about $1.4 million. Expenditures such as fringe benefits for the full-time faculty members John Jay plans on hiring is included in the Compact. He also says the College is in better shape this year, than ever before. With enrollment at John Jay increasing, so does revenue. This will have a positive effect on our budget as it will give us funding to hire full-time faculty, lift the hiring pause, and market John Jay to recruit and attract more students to the College. This in turn will lead to more revenue for John Jay.
Ned Benton pointed out that he did not recall the approval of some positions in the plan by the planning subcommittees. Patricia Ketterer reminded Ned that agreements were made in advance for certain critical positions, but Ned argued for explicit approval for all positions.

On the SPG positions, Jim Llana said that SPS/FPS did discuss the commitments, along with those for new faculty and new professional advisors, but a vote was not taken for each particular position. The SPG initiatives were discussed and approved in general, and targets set for enrollment and academic preparation. Tom Kucharski said that the decision was approved conceptually, but there was no discussion of each position, which should have taken place.

Rob then discussed the recommendations the subcommittees made to President Travis. The ESM took those recommendations under advisement and made changes to them based on their thinking. Their recommendations were presented in the document “Summary of Investment Proposals.” (attached)

According to this plan, faculty hiring is a priority. John Jay is looking to hire 24 faculty members. With enrollment numbers increasing, it is important for John Jay to hire more faculty members to support the increasing number of students.

Ned requested a line by line comparison of the budget plans. Pat agreed to send Ned these documents, which has a side by side comparison of the original proposal, the SPS/FPS proposal, and the proposal presented at the July 25 meeting. She also wanted it to be understood that the initial goal was to hire five additional lecturers, which would be funded by the Compact. The 7 – 10 tenure-track hires were based on the recommendations of the subcommittees.

SVP Pignatello reminded the group that the recommendations were broad.

Provost Bowers moved the conversation to Distance Learning. There was a “pre-meeting” on this subject with faculty, so there is no need to discuss now. She stands by her intention to pursue distance education. There was some discussion of distance education funding, particularly with regard to personnel funding from the student technology fee. There is some urgency to move tech personnel lines off the Tech Fee budget, since it must also carry fringe benefits, but the Tech Fee Committee agreed to fund the Distance Education Director for this year.

Charles Nemeth recommended combining the position for Multimedia Designer, and Instructional Designer into one position. He thinks it is too grandiose to hire two separate people for those jobs, when ideally one person can fill those roles. Karen agreed with his recommendation.

Karen also discussed the initiatives for Veteran Affairs. While the committee approved the proposal Berenecea recommended, Karen thinks there should be room for an additional advisor.
Rob went on to discuss SPG. Commitments to SPG were made last year, but it was pushed to this year. SPG is also asking for more funding for marketing purposes, and research in 5/6 different areas. Jane acknowledged the committee’s request to see evidence of efficacy of these strategies, and has agreed to present data to support the budget request.

Karen would also like the report to include the number of conditional students enrolled at John Jay.

In reference to the document “Summary of Investment Proposals,” Ned asks why the SPG budget is $358,401, but in document “FY2013,” the budget is about 1 million. If the budget has been cut, where has that money gone? Rob responded that the original request for FY 2013 was $911,000 or almost $1 million. Some portion of that was funded through accruals in FY 2012 and the annualized costs of salaries related to the hires approved in FY 2012 have been carried over into the FY 2013 projection. The revised proposal requests less funding. The College will need to prioritize what will be necessary to meet the enrollment targets and goals.

As the University requires a minimum one percent surplus, John Jay cannot spend revenue to the last dollar. As such, International Partnerships will be pushed back a year. However, a Space Consultant, recommended by SPS/FPS, remains in the proposal. SVP Pignatello suggests that Scott Paige may be the consultant John Jay picks, but it is imperative that one is hired, especially if John Jay is hiring more people.

SVP Pignatello would also like to discuss funding for student housing, as it can make John Jay more attractive to prospective students. Ned would like to know, “What are the priorities? What are the risks, and commitments we are willing to make?” in relation to student housing. He recommended a written plan be drawn up before the next meeting. Interim Student Affairs VP Tom Stafford added that student housing will require significant funds and require careful planning.

As the meeting drew to an end, Tom K. asked whether or not a Space Consultant has been approved conceptually. SVP Pignatello answered and said that John Jay cannot hire a consultant if their duties have not yet been decided. However, Ned reminded the group that Associate Provost Llana will set up three meetings in the fall with the SPS to specifically discuss space.

The meeting ended at 12:20

**Next Meeting:** August 20, 2012, at 11:00 am.
Recommendation for the Financial Plan FY2013 from the SPS/FPS Joint Subcommittees:

1) Prioritize hiring full-time, tenure-track faculty, with a goal of hiring 7-10 additional faculty.
2) Defer the distance education spending, pending completion of “Part A” and other related governance actions.
3) Stretch out the SPG spending proposals, pending assessment and evaluation of current efforts.
4) Provide funds for a professional consultant on space planning.
5) Support spending for student services.
6) Defer hiring a Director for International Partnerships, pending recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee on International Programs.
7) Create a contingency fund for unanticipated expenses and other adjustments that may be needed in the course of the year.

The attached document illustrates a way to reconcile the need for reductions in spending with the proposals presented to the sub-committees. [“Faculty Budget Response2”]
## Summary of Investment Proposals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VP Area</th>
<th>Pos</th>
<th>Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$660,882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance &amp; Admin</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$177,084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$113,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPG</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$358,401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Proposals</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$1,309,367</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Enhance Academic Excellence, improve student success and retention through hiring additional Faculty: The FY 2013 preliminary baseline plan included funds to hire approximately 28 faculty to reach our planned headcount of 421 faculty in Fall 2012. With additional funds we propose to hire an additional 10 faculty: 5 tenure track and 5 Lecturers (Phase 3 of the Lecturer Initiative in January 2013).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Pos</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Tenure Track Faculty</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lecturer Plan- Phase 3 (substitutes on board Spring 2013)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$87,829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$437,829</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continue progress towards ensuring student success and University Master Plan goal to facilitate transfers by increasing the number of academic advisors:

| Undergrad Studies   | Academic Advisors                                                       | 2   | $110,000 |

Enhance Institutional effectiveness, expand access, improve student persistence and learning, build strategic partnerships and generate revenue through investments in online education and assessment:

| Assoc Provost       | Distance Learning, Senior Instructional Designer                        | 1   | $79,242 |
|                     | Distance Learning, Multimedia Developer                                 | 1   | $64,956 |
|                     | Distance Learning, Instructional Designer                                | 1   | $55,782 |
|                     | Assessment Specialist, Institutional Effectiveness (HEA)                 | 1   | $71,073 |
| Offsets - Reallocation of FY 12 Year Round College Funds          |                                                           |     | (158,000) |
| Academic Affairs Admin Costs                                    |                                                           | 6   | $223,053 |
| Academic Affairs Priorities                                     |                                                           | 16  | $660,882 |

Enhance Institutional Effectiveness through investments in revenue generating and cost savings initiatives. In addition improve student success by increasing student services:

| AVS                | Additional Support for Events (sound/video)                           | 2   | $93,056 |
| DoIT               | Technical Classroom Support with AVS and video Conferencing background - ITSS (IT Assistant Level-I) | 1   | $46,528 |
|                    | Energy Conservation Engineer 6 mos                                     |     | $37,500 |
| Finance and Admin Total Costs                                  |                                                           | 3   | $177,084 |

Enhance Student success and retention and expand access through investments in veteran and career services:

<p>| Student Affairs: Veterans Affairs  | Veterans Services Liaison/Coordinator* | 1   | $56,000 |
| Career/Prof Dev Center            | Career Counselor                      | 1   | $46,000 |
| Student Affairs: Veterans Affairs  | PROVE INTERNS (part time)              |     | $4,000  |
| Student Affairs: Veterans Affairs  | Veteran Peer Mentors (part time)       |     | $2,000  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Area</th>
<th>Position/Function</th>
<th>Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tutoring Services (part time)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services Total Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPG- Enroll Mgmt Enroll Research Data Analyst (p/t)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$30,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPG- Enroll Mgt Touches Call Center p/t Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPG - Marketing Touches - FUSE - social networking ( net savings)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$56,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPG - Acad Aff Justice Academy part time recruiter</td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPG - Acad Aff Justice Academy Peer Advisor 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPG - Acad Aff Justice Academy Transfer Coordinator 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>$80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPG - Acad Aff Transfer Student Transcript Evaluators (partially funded in FY 12)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$44,926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPG - External Affairs Symposia Honoraria</td>
<td></td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPG - Acad Aff Graduate Channel Coordinator 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Tax Levy SPG</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPG - Auxiliary Services Corp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Touches Student Events</td>
<td></td>
<td>$43,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Touches Review/Update materials</td>
<td></td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symposia Event Production Company</td>
<td></td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Open Houses</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment Management Consultant</td>
<td></td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Aux Corp SPG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total SPG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expansion of Campus Infrastructure, enhance institutional effectiveness and improve retention by investing in services to study space needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary Services Corp</td>
<td>Use proceeds from space rentals to procure a space/housing needs assessment</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Aux Corp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Facilitate articulation, enhance student success and retention and improve institutional effectiveness and retention through expansion of our strategic enrollment initiatives. Manage the enrollment to achieve fiscal stability.
1. Approval of Minutes from July 25, 2012.

Budget and Planning Committee Meeting
Minutes
August 20, 2012


Associate Provost Llana called the meeting to order at 11:08 a.m.

1. Approval of Minutes from July 25, 2012.
Minutes were approved without amendment.

VP Pignatello led the discussion about the financial plan. The financial plan will not be due on August 21, as previously reported. The College asked for an extension, which was granted by CUNY; however, a plan will be submitted to CUNY next week. He apologized for the delay in getting information to the Committee. We were planning on incorporating the increased revenue from tuition next year, but the University did not want us to factor that into the financial plan, something we discovered at the last minute; without being able to count on that extra revenue, we had a $700,000 variance, due to higher than anticipated adjunct costs and lower than expected summer revenue, and so we had to re-work the budget numbers, hence the delay.

He continued with a discussion of the document “FY 2013 – 2015 Financial Plan Update.” Currently, the investment proposal which was discussed at the last meeting is still intact, but to bring the out-year budgets into balance, we have had to slow the pace of non-instructional hiring, and we will have to track the accruals from vacant positions very carefully. We will maximize our return from the Compact funding by substituting some OTPS for salaries, to avoid using the Compact allocation for fringes. The result is a larger surplus for FY2013. The faculty hiring plan will not be affected, and under this plan we are at a steady-state budget for 2015, not relying on CUTRA to cover projected shortfalls.

Enrollment Report

VP Pignatello invited VP Saulnier to share the enrollment numbers. Both freshman and transfer targets will be met for fall enrollment. The college is 26 students ahead of the target for freshman enrollment. For transfers, we are currently 50 students behind the target, but VP Saulnier is sure that the target will be met because transfer students
usually register later or are still completing paperwork. Grad students are lagging just a bit. These numbers are the results after the cancellation cycle ended. The college only canceled 550 students, which is less than the normal 750 – 800. He is cautiously optimistic that we will make our target; we are looking for an increase of 204 FTEs over last year. He also explained that the decrease in summer revenue could be attributed to the dissolution of year-round Pell.

In response to a question, Saulnier reported the following numbers:

Transfer students: target is 1454 with 1404 registered.

Freshman: target is 1856 with 1882 registered.

Of those 1882, about 220 of them are SEEK students. Half of the remaining freshman are regular admits, while the other half are conditionally admitted, so there are about 840 conditional admits.

K. Kaplowitz also inquired about the number of students who failed the Math proficiency exam. Saulnier replied that the main reason for conditional admits was the math proficiency exam, not writing and reading.

K. Chandler inquired about freshmen who opted to begin in the summer session rather than fall. Do they get counted as part of fall enrollment? VP Saulnier answered by saying that there isn’t a large number of freshmen who begin in the summer.

Provost Bowers reminded the group that VP Saulnier will give a more in depth presentation on fall enrollment at the next BPC meeting.

SPS/FPS Recommendations and Distance Learning

N. Benton then moved the discussion to the 7 recommendations from the SPS/FPS subcommittees. Originally, the SPS/FPS had a goal of hiring 7 – 10 new faculty members. The new investment proposal only budgeted for five new faculty members. He would like to know why the new plan is two short. VP Pignatello explained that because the President and Provost are pushing the Distance Learning program, the budget could not accommodate additional expenditures.

N. Benton argued that the numbers should have stayed in the budget until a governance policy on distance education is set. Provost Bowers said that she is in favor of keeping the Distance Learning positions in the financial plan. Positions in that department will be needed sooner rather than later. One position has already been deferred, but the other two are necessary, one of which has already been posted. The Summary of Investment Proposals dated 8/20/12 should be revised to indicate that the Distance Learning Instructional Designer (salary = $55,782) should be deleted and the number of Academic Advisors proposed should be 3 at a cost of $165,000. On November 2, Feng Wang will do a presentation about Distance Learning. Provost Bowers stressed the importance of building an infrastructure for Distance Learning, and to support their activities going on now and for the future. N. Benton would also like to know what the policies in Distance Learning are.

J. Adams said that the administration seemed to work on an “express track.” While he agrees with Provost Bowers on the need to support distance education going on now, he pleaded for some balance. T. Kucharski also agreed with Adams and mentions that
job descriptions for the distance education positions should be brought back to the committee. J. Bowers suggested that the PVN could be reviewed in advance of the actual hiring, but not as a condition for it. She also noted that it was actually the administration that had been deliberate in moving the distance education agenda; it was the faculty that kept pushing for quick approval of the first online program. However, now the essential decisions have been made and distance, education will not stop.

K. Kaplowitz said that while she is not opposed to Distance Learning, she thinks that students are not served due to a lack of full time faculty: “I don’t see how we can expand our brand nationally and internationally without supporting the students who are already here.”

Provost Bowers shared that 2% of our instructional FTE’s are online; the online students belong to us and they are being taught by our faculty. We want better management of the current program and plans for future expansion. VP Saulnier also informed the group that 99% of the online students are John Jay students, so it’s not a matter of educating someone else’s students.

J. Adams asked for data to show that online learning is good for our students. Dean Lopes responded that online programs have been helpful for the conditional math students. She added that we need the proposed positions just to serve existing online activities. We must improve what we have before we move ahead.

N. Benton argued that there seem to be so many different visions for Distance Learning. Director Wang originally wanted to have a three-year plan, which included plans for new students, master’s students, and in time it would be self-funding. Now it seems as though the focus will be on students who are already attending John Jay. He would like clarity on the role of COGS and UCASC with regard to distance education programs. The different versions need reconciliation and to go through governance before further investment.

S. Baumrin said that Distance Learning is nuanced. There needs to be discussions regarding who should be teaching, policies, and compliance issues.

K. Chandler added that great strides have been made with the Center for Advancement of Teaching for online training. While it is important that we take care of the students who are already here, we can still support the building of programs to attract other students. Director Wang’s job is to figure out how to approach distance learning generally. Specific programs need to be done with faculty; the Director cannot do this alone.

T. Kucharski is interested in knowing how far we intend to go with distance education. K. Kaplowitz called for consideration of what other CUNY campuses have done regarding distance education. A. Lopes replied that all the campuses are interested and engaged.

R. Pignatelllo pointed out that hybrid courses could help with the space crunch, and that we could expect increased revenue with online programs.

Further Questions and Review of Recommendations
Continuing to review the 7 recommendations, N. Benton looked at stretching out SPG funding, pending further discussion. That has been done. He also inquired about using the Auxiliary Corp budget to fund recurring expenses, but VP Pignatello said that the Aux. Corp budget is usually reserved for food that cannot be paid out of tax-levy. P. Ketterer added that $46,000 of Aux. Corp already went to pay for a consultant, and the other $58,000 is used for events, mainly student events with food. Continuing on the list of recommendations: The Space Consultant has been included in the proposed plan. The International director has been put off, in line with the recommendations. With regard to the recommendation on a reserve fund, R. Pignatello observed that we are approaching that goal, but we aren’t there yet.

There was a brief discussion of the Tech Fee, specifically moving staff out of the Tech Fee budget, something that has been discussed before. N. Benton argued that the Tech Fee Committee should be allowed to fund what it wants to fund.

T. Kucharski asked whether the College Assistant numbers were cut. P. Ketterer addressed the question and said that it is not a cut. During FY2012, John Jay largely overspent on the College Assistant budget, and we now have to live within the original allocation. N. Benton asked if the college will reconcile the College Assistant budget and conversions. The answer was “yes.” Kucharski pointed out that ultimately we will have fewer CA hours. That’s correct, but we won’t lose people, R. Pignatello added.

Discussion then moved to positions that are being filled. Who gives approval for these positions, and should there have been discussions of them? P. Ketterer said these positions were part of the hiring plan. Some of these positions were outlined in the Compact, or SPG positions from last year. Some are replacements. N. Benton questioned which positions were prioritized? VP Pignatello answered by saying if there was a vacancy the President decided whether or not to replace the person. P. Ketterer added that last year there was a pause on replacing vacancies. Since there is additional funding this year, we can now fill those vacant positions. Those positions will still need the President’s approval. Tom K. also asked about the Space Consultant position as we are currently having space problems. J. Llana assured him that the college is proceeding with plans to resolve space issues: getting background information and scheduling SPS meetings. VP Pignatello added that the space problem is one affecting many departments, but they are looking for different approaches to fix it. Currently there is no “finish line.” Seth said that as a Chair, he has a responsibility to his faculty, but he never has any information to share with them when they ask about space. K. Chandler also assured the group and said that she and Ynes Leon have been working on space concerns as much as possible. Jeffrey Aikens then asked which spaces Student Affairs can utilize for events. VP Pignatello told him that the dining hall in Westport will be the designated area for student events.
Moving to a Vote on the Financial Plan

Ned then asked whether or not the committee will vote on the plan before it goes out. P. Ketterer informed Ned that the committee can vote on the recommendation that goes to the President.

J. Llana said that the BPC is the President’s committee, but if a vote should take place, an official motion needs to be made. VP Pignatello said that in previous years, the proposal went out late to the Committee, with little prior discussion. At the meeting there was a Powerpoint and a vote taken. But in years past, there was less input and development from the BPC. Considering how involved the BPC was in the development of this plan, he questions whether a vote was still necessary.

T. Kucharksi thinks that the committee should vote. There was further discussion, and agreement to take a vote. N. Benton made a motion to approve the financial plan as presented, but he also wanted to vote on two amendments to it. The first amendment was to recommend that 7 to 10 faculty be hired, as opposed to 5 in the plan as presented to the Committee. Provost Bowers told the committee that additional faculty hiring plans will come along in the future. She would not support the amendment because in five years, the college will meet its target for full-time faculty.

K. Kaplowitz thinks that since we will be undergoing the Middle States accreditation process this year, it is important that there be a better balance between full-time and part-time faculty. Sixty-five percent of undergraduate courses are taught by part-time faculty members. This means that most students don’t see a full-time faculty member until their junior year.

N. Benton remarked that the college wants to fill 66 administrative positions, but it is more important to hire full-time faculty.

Mehak Kapoor asks what the breakdown of faculty hired will be. Provost Bowers assured her that hiring will be based on departmental needs.

Jeffrey A. asked what the impact of hiring seven faculty instead of five would have on the budget. VP Pignatello said that the budget would need to be shifted. He also added that if a proposer wants to add more faculty hires, they need to indicate where the money would be coming from.

N. Benton suggested taking money from SPG, or looking at the list of 66 administrative positions.

The Committee voted on the following amendment to the resolution to accept the financial plan as presented: to fund seven to ten new faculty lines (instead of the five lines specified in the recommendation as presented). The results of the vote are: 10 votes in favor, 4 against, 4 abstentions. The motion to amend the recommendation carried.

There was considerable discussion of the second motion of how to pay for the additional faculty and related issues, and in the end it was withdrawn. The Committee finally took up the motion to recommend the FY2013 plan presented to the Committee, as amended by the preceding motion. The motion carried, 12 in favor, 3 against, with 4
abstentions. The Budget and Planning Committee endorses the Financial Plan for 2013, as presented to the Committee and subsequently amended.

Meeting ended at 1:03
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Alternates are Italicized  
Student Council Members are bolded
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
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</tr>
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<tbody>
<tr>
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<tr>
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson Eanes, Berenecea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kan, Shaobai</td>
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</tr>
</tbody>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocejo, Richard</td>
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<td></td>
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<td>Sheehan, Francis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
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</tr>
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<td>Terry, Karen</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson, Denise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travis, Jeremy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsang, Michelle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeLuca, Joseph</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarke, John</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
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<td>Will, Susan</td>
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</tr>
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</tr>
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<td>Volpe, Maria</td>
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</tr>
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</tr>
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<td>Ferreira, Steven</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alternates are Italicized  
Student Council Members are bolded
The College Council held its first meeting of the 2011-2012 academic year on Thursday, September 22, 2011. The meeting was called to order at 1:50 p.m. and the following members were present: Jeffrey Aikens, Andrea Balis, Whitney Brown, Kinya Chandler, Kathleen Collins, Lyell Davis, Virginia Diaz, James DiGiovanna, Mathieu Dufour, Jennifer Dysart, Terry Furst, Laura Greenberg, Maki Haberfeld, Devin Harner, Veronica Hendrick, Berenecea Johnson Eanes, Shaobai Kan, Karen Kaplowitz, Mehak Kapoor, Kwando Kinshasa, Nilsa Lam, Richard Li, Yue Ma, Vincent Maiorino, Even Mandery, Marcelle Mauvais, Roger McDonald, Sara McDougall, Shavonne McKiever, David Munns, Rhonda Nieves, Richard Ocejo, Robert Pignatello, Carina Quintian, Rick Richardson, Michael Scaduto, Francis Sheehan, Davinder Singh, Staci Strobl, Patricia Tovar, Denise Thompson, Jeremy Travis, and Michelle Tsang.


Alternates Present: James Cauthen, and DeeDee Falkenbach

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 May 16, 2011 College Council Meeting**

   It was moved to amend the minutes as presented. Item B6: “Proposal for a New Model of General Education at John Jay – ‘Education for Justice’” the one vote against, will now reflect one abstention. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously as amended.

III. **Approval of the College Council Committee Members**

   It was moved to adopt the members with the following revisions:

   **College Council**
   - Beverly Frazier – should be listed in the department of Law and Police Science
   - DeeDee Falkenbach – should be listed in the department of Psychology
   - Jeffrey Aikens – Treasurer, Student Council and member of the Executive Committee of the College Council.
Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee
SEEK Department: Nancy Velasquez Torres is replacing Monica Son
Sociology Department: Richard Ocejo is replacing Amy Adamezyk

The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

IV. Report from the Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee
(attachments C1 – C13)

It was moved to adopt the marked “C1: Letter of Intent for a BA in Sociology.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the proposal marked “C2: Proposal to revise the BS in Criminal Justice”. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the proposal marked “C3: Proposal for a New Minor in Human Rights”. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the new course proposal marked “C4: Proposal to Revise the Program & Minor in Dispute Resolution”. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the new course proposal marked “C5. SOC 3XX: Evaluation Research”. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the new course proposal marked “C6. CJBS 2XX: Research Methods and Statistics in Criminal Justice”. The motion was seconded and passed.

In Favor: 44  Opposed: 1  Abstentions: 0

It was moved to adopt the new course proposal marked “C7. CJBS 3XX: Criminal Justice: Theory to Practice”. The motion was seconded and passed.

It was moved to adopt the new course proposal marked “C8. LAS 4XX: Colloquium on Research in Law and Society”. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the new course proposal marked “C9. ACC/LAW 2XX: Colloquium on Research in Law and Society”. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the new course proposal marked “C10. HIS 2XX: History of World Slavery to 1650 C.E.”. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the new course proposal marked “C11. PSY 3XX: Learning and Memory”. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the new course proposal marked “C12. DRA 3XX: Film Criticism”. The motion was seconded and passed.

In Favor: 44  Opposed: 0  Abstentions: 1
It was moved to adopt the course revisions marked C13 –C17 as a package:

C13. PSY 232 Psychology of Adolescence and the Adolescent Offender  
C14. PSY 236 Group Dynamics  
C15. HIS/GEN 364 History of Gender & Sexuality: Pre-history to 1650  
C16. POL 215 Legislative Process  
C17. POL 220 The Chief Executive (American Presidency)

The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to accept items marked C13 – C17. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

V. Report from the Committee on Graduate Studies(attachments D1 – D3)

Professor Wulach and Professor Raghavan presented Item D1. It was moved to adopt the course proposal marked “D1: Proposals for a dual BA/MA degree in Forensic Mental Health Counseling.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

Professor Lovely presented on item D2. It was moved to adopt the course proposal marked “D2: Proposal for an Advanced Certificate in Applied Digital Forensic Science”. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

Professor Lovely presented on item D3. It was moved to adopt the new course proposal marked “D3: Resolution to increase the allowable external credit for Forensic Computing students in the Forensic Computing Program”. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

VI. 2010-2011 College Council Committee Activity Report

It was moved to add the July 20, 2011 Interim Executive Committee meeting in the 2011-2012 College Council activity report. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

VII. College Council Calendar

It was moved to accept the revised College Council 2011-2012 calendar. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:10 p.m.
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V. New Business

VI. Administrative Announcements – President Jeremy Travis

VII. Announcements from the Faculty Senate – Professor Karen Kaplowitz

VIII. Announcements from the Student Council – Ms. Whitney Brown
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Alternates are italicized
Student Council Members are bolded
The College Council held its second meeting of the 2011-2012 academic year on Wednesday, October 19, 2011. The meeting was called to order at 1:50 p.m. and the following members were present: Jeffrey Aikens, Elton Beckett, Jane Bowers, Whitney Brown, Erica Burleigh, Kinya Chandler, Demi Cheng, Kathleen Collins, Lyell Davis, Joseph DeLuca, Virginia Diaz, James DiGiovanna, Jannette Domingo, Mathieu Dufour, DeeDee Falkenbach, Terry Furst, Lior Gideon, Demis Glasford, Laura Greenberg, Norman Groner, Maki Haberfeld, Devin Harner, Richard Haw, Veronica Hendrick, Berenece Johnson Eanes, Shaobai Kan, Karen Kaplowitz, Mehak Kapoor, Nilsa Lam, Richard Li, Anne Lopes, Yue Ma, Vincent Maiorino, Even Mandery, Marcelle Mauvais, Mickey Melendez, Brian Montes, Richard Ocejo, Carina Quintian, Rick Richardson, Raul Rubio, Richard Saulnier, Michael Scaduto, Francis Sheehan, Davinder Singh, Staci Strobl, and Patricia Tovar.

Absent were: Zeeshan Ali, Jana Arsovska, Andrea Balis, Mark Benjamin, Brian Costa, Jennifer Dysart, Kwando Kinshasa, Anru Lee, Roger McDonald, Sara McDougall, Shavonne McKiever, Catherine Mulder, David Munns, Rhonda Nieves, Jason Nunez, Robert Pignatello, Karen Terry, Denise Thompson, Donica Thompson, Patricia Tovar, Jeremy Travis, and Michelle Tsang.

Alternates Present: Sylvia Lopez

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

II. Minutes of the September 22, 2011 College Council Meeting
   It was moved to accept the minutes as presented. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

III. Report from the Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee (attachments B1 – B5)
   It was moved to amend the proposal marked “B1: Proposal to Establish a Dual/Joint Program in Associate in Science Degree in Accounting for Forensic Accounting (QCC) Leading to the Bachelor of Science in Economics (John Jay).” The effective date should be changed from Fall 2011 to Fall 2012. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

   It was moved to adopt the new course proposal marked “B2: ENG 2XX: Screenwriting for Film, Television and the Internet”. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.
It was moved to adopt the course revision marked “B3: PSY 272: Correctional Psychology”. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the course revision marked “B4: ANT 208: Cities and Culture”. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to table item B5 “Model Syllabus” to the November 21, 2011 College Council meeting. The motion passed.

- In Favor: 42  
- Opposed: 2  
- Abstentions: 3

IV. Report from the Committee on Graduate Studies(attachments C1)

It was moved to amend the new course proposal marked “C1. CRJ 7XX: Investigation of Violent Crime”. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

V. New Business

It was moved to adopt the College Council Committee Membership List as presented with one addition. John Clarke was nominated by the Student Council to the Committee on Graduate Studies. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:45 p.m.
I. Adoption of the Agenda

II. Minutes of the October 19, 2011 College Council (attachment A), Pg. 3
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IV. Academic Standards
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V. Report from the Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee (attachments D1 – D11) – Dean Lopes

   New Courses
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   D10. POR 1XX  Elementary Portuguese Level I, Pg. 32
   D11. POR 1XX  Elementary Portuguese Level II, Pg. 34

VI. Request for a Departmental Name Change: Protection Management to: Security, Fire and Emergency Management (attachment E) – Provost Bowers, Pg. 36

VII. Change in College Council Committee Membership List (attachment F), Pg. 37

   -John Clarke is not certified to serve as the Graduate Student Representative on the College Council, Pg. 41
- Alaa Alamin replaces Kristen Benjamin as student representative on the Committee of Student Interest, Pg. 45

- John Clarke is certified to serve as student representative on the Committee on Graduate Studies, Pg. 52
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<td>DeLuca, Joseph</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diaz, Virginia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DiGiovanna, James</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domingo, Jannette</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dufour, Mathieu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alternates are italicized  
Student Council Members are bolded
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dunham, Janice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dysart, Jennifer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falkenbach, DeeDee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frazier, Beverly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furst, Terry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gates, Jay Paul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gideon, Lior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasford, Demis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenberg, Laura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groner, Norman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haberfeld, Maki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harner, Devin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haw, Richard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendrick, Veronica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson Eanes, Berenecea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kan, Shaobai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaplowitz, Karen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kapoor, Mehak</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinshasa, Kwando</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lam, Nilsa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee, Anru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li, Richard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lopes, Anne</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alternates are italicized  
Student Council Members are bolded
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lopez, Sylvia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma, Yue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maiorino, Vincent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandery, Evan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mauvais, Marcelle</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDonald, Roger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDougall, Sara</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKiever, Shavonne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melendez, Mickey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montes, Brian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mulder, Catherine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munns, David</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nieves, Rhonda</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nunez, Jason</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocejo, Richard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pignatello, Robert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quintian, Carina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richardson, Rick</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubio, Raul</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saulnier, Richard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scaduto, Michael</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheehan, Francis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Singh, Davinder</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alternates are italicized  
Student Council Members are bolded
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strobl, Staci</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry, Karen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson, Denise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thompson, Donica</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tovar, Patricia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travis, Jeremy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tsang, Michelle</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The College Council held its third meeting of the 2011-2012 academic year on Monday, November 21, 2011. The meeting was called to order at 1:55 p.m. and the following members were present: Jeffrey Aikens, Andrea Balis, Jane Bowers, Whitney Brown, Erica Burleigh, Kinya Chandler, Demi Cheng, Kathleen Collins, Brian Costa, Lyell Davies, Joseph DeLuca, Virginia Diaz, James DiGiovanna, Jannette Domingo, Mathieu Dufour, Jennifer Dysart, Terry Furst, Lior Gideon, Norman Groner, Shaobai Kan, Karen Kaplowitz, Mehak Kapoor, Richard Li, Anne Lopes, Yue Ma, Vincent Maiorino, Even Mandery, Roger McDonald, Shavonne McKiever, Mickey Melendez, Brian Montes, Catherine Mulder, David Munns, Richard Ocejo, Robert Pignatello, Carina Quintian, Raul Rubio, Richard Saulnier, Michael Scaduto, Francis Sheehan, Davinder Singh, Staci Strobl, Karen Terry, Denise Thompson, and Jeremy Travis.

Absent were: Zeeshan Ali, Jana Arsovska, Elton Beckett, Mark Benjamin, DeeDee Falkenbach, Demis Glasford, Laura Greenberg, Maki Haberfeld, Devin Harner, Richard Haw, Veronica Hendrick, Berenecea Johnson Eanes, Kwando Kinshasa, Nilsa Lam, Anru Lee, Marcelle Mauvais, Sara McDougall, Rhonda Nieves, Jason Nunez, Rick Richardson, Donica Thompson, Patricia Tovar, and Michelle Tsang.

Alternates Present: Sylvia Lopez

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

II. Minutes of the October 19, 2011 College Council Meeting
   It was moved to amend the minutes as presented. Item IV, attachment C1 is amended to state that the course be adopted, not amended. The motion was seconded and passed.

   In Favor: 44  Opposed: 1  Abstentions: 0

III. Proposed Policy from Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee and Faculty Senate Regarding Change of Grade After Final Grades are Submitted.
   The proposed policy was withdrawn because it was not ready to be presented to the College Council.
IV. **Model Syllabus** (tabled item B5 from October 19, 2011 meeting)(attachment C1)
It was moved to amend item C1. Model Syllabus, with the following revisions:

- The effective date was revised from September 2011 to Summer 2012.
- Under Model Syllabus Revision, the following sentence is added at the end of the paragraph:
  
  “This is the minimum information required on the syllabus, faculty may add additional information if desired. This model syllabus is to be followed beginning the Summer 2012 semester.”

- Under the heading “Syllabus Content”:
  
  “Faculty Office hours: (Specify appointment or walk-in)” was changed to **Contact hours**.

- Under the heading “Learning outcomes”, the sentence is revised to read as such:
  
  What will the student know or be able to do by the end of the course? List three to five learning outcomes for the course that map to the program’s outcomes. (All Writing Intensive courses need to include a writing intensive outcome that maps to the program’s outcomes).

- Under the heading “Statement of the College Policy on Plagiarism”, the following has been added as a fifth paragraph:
  
  **Plagiarism detection software - the College subscribes to Turnitin.com and Blackboard has a similar module called SafeAssign. If you will be using any plagiarism detection software in your course, you must state it on the syllabus.**

The motion was seconded and passed.

In Favor: 39  Opposed: 4  Abstentions: 0

V. **Report from the Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee** (attachments D1 – D11)

It was moved to adopt the new course proposal marked “D1. CJBA 1XX: Introduction to Major Problems in Criminal Justice I”. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt new course proposal marked “D2. CJBA 1XX: Introduction to Major Problems in Criminal Justice II”. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt new course proposal marked “D3. CJBA 2XX: Crime Prevention and Control”. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.
It was moved to adopt new course proposal marked “D4. CJBA 3XX: Space, Crime and Place”. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt new course proposal marked “D5. SOC 2XX: Sociology of Global Migration”. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was motioned to refer new course proposal marked “D6. ARA 1XX: Elementary Modern Standard Arabic I” back to Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee for additional review. The motion failed.

In Favor: 25  Opposed: 14  Abstentions: 6

It was moved to adopt new course proposal marked “D7. ARA 1XX: Elementary Modern Standard Arabic II”. The motion was seconded and passed.

In Favor: 39  Opposed: 0  Abstentions: 6

It was moved to adopt new course proposal marked “D8. JPN 1XX: Elementary Japanese Level I”. The motion was seconded and passed.

In Favor: 44  Opposed: 0  Abstentions: 1

It was moved to adopt new course proposal marked “D9. JPN 1XX: Elementary Japanese Level II”. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt new course proposal marked “D10. POR 1XX: Elementary Portuguese Level I”. The motion was seconded and passed.

In Favor: 44  Opposed: 0  Abstentions: 1

It was moved to adopt new course proposal marked “D11. POR 1XX: Elementary Portuguese Level II”. The motion was seconded and passed.

In Favor: 44  Opposed: 0  Abstentions: 1

VI. Request for a Departmental Name Change: Protection Management to: Security, Fire and Emergency Management, (attachment E)

It was moved to change the departmental name from Protection Management to Security, Fire and Emergency Management. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

VII. Change in College Council Membership (attachment F)
It was moved to adopt the College Council Committee Membership List as presented. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:45 p.m.
I. Adoption of the Agenda

II. Minutes of the November 21, 2011 College Council (attachment A), Pg. 3

III. Proposed Policy from Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee and Faculty Senate Regarding Change of Grade After Final Grades are Filed (attachment B) – Provost Bowers and Professor Karen Kaplowitz, President of Faculty Senate Pg. 6

IV. Proposed Policy from the Executive Committee of the College Council on the applicability of College policies to Undergraduate and Graduate policies (attachment C) – Provost Bowers and Professor Karen Kaplowitz, Pg. 8

V. Report from the Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee (attachments D1 –D13) – Provost Bowers

New Courses:
D1. POL 3XX Voting and Public Opinion, Pg. 10
D2. LWS 2XX Introduction to Law and Society, Pg. 14
D3. CJBA 2XX Criminal Responsibility, Pg. 17
D4. CJBA 3XX Rights of the Accused, Pg. 21
D5. SOC 3XX Qualitative Methods in Criminology, Pg. 24
D6. GEN 4XX Senior Seminar in Gender Studies, Pg. 28

Course Revisions:
D7. AAP/PSY 240 Psychology of Oppression, Pg. 31
D8. SOC 203 Criminology, Pg. 48
D9. ART 113 Introduction to Photography, Pg. 50
D10. ART 114 Intermediate Photography, Pg. 58
D11. ART 230 Issues in Art and Crime, Pg. 66

Programs
D12. Proposal to Revise the BA in Global History, Pg. 68
D13. Proposal to Revise the BA in English, Pg. 69

VI. Report from the Committee on Graduate Studies (attachments E1 –E2) – Dean Domingo
A proposal for a new course in the International Crime and Justice Program:

E1. ICJ 7XX The Global Economy and Corruption, Pg. 74

Course Revision:
E2. CRJ 753 Investigating Cybercrime, Pg. 77

VII. New Business

VIII. Administrative Announcements – President Jeremy Travis

IX. Announcements from the Faculty Senate – Professor Karen Kaplowitz

X. Announcements from the Student Council – President Whitney Brown
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aikens, Jeffrey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ali, Zeeshan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arsovska, Jana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balis, Andrea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beckett, Elton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin, Mark</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowers, Jane P.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, Whitney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burleigh, Erica</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cauthen, James</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandler, Kinya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheng, Demi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collins, Kathleen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa, Brian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davies, Lyell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeLuca, Joseph</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diaz, Virginia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DiGiovanna, James</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domingo, Jannette</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dufour, Mathieu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alternates are italicized  
Student Council Members are bolded
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dunham, Janice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dysart, Jennifer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falkenbach, DeeDee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frazier, Beverly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furst, Terry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gates, Jay Paul</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gideon, Lior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasford, Demis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenberg, Laura</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groner, Norman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haberfeld, Maki</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harner, Devin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haw, Richard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendrick, Veronica</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson Eanes, Berenecea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kan, Shaobai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaplowitz, Karen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapoor, Mehak</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinshasa, Kwando</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lam, Nilsa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee, Anru</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li, Richard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lopes, Anne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alternates are italicized  
Student Council Members are bolded
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lopez, Sylvia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma, Yue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maiorino, Vincent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandery, Evan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauvais, Marcelle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDonald, Roger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDougall, Sara</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKiever, Shavonne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melendez, Mickey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montes, Brian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mulder, Catherine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munns, David</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nieves, Rhonda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nunez, Jason</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocejo, Richard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pignatello, Robert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quintian, Carina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richardson, Rick</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubio, Raul</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saulnier, Richard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scaduto, Michael</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheehan, Francis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singh, Davinder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alternates are italicized
Student Council Members are bolded
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strobl, Staci</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry, Karen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson, Denise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson, Donica</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tovar, Patricia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travis, Jeremy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsang, Michelle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Alternates are italicized, Student Council Members are bolded*
The College Council held its fourth meeting of the 2011-2012 academic year on Monday, December 12, 2011. The meeting was called to order at 1:53 p.m. and the following members were present: Jeffrey Aikens, Zeeshan Ali, Jana Arsovska, Andrea Balis, Elton Beckett, Jane Bowers, Whitney Brown, Erica Burleigh, Kinya Chandler, Demi Cheng, Kathleen Collins, Brian Costa, Lyell Davies, Joseph DeLuca, James DiGiovanna, Jannette Domingo, Mathieu Dufour, Jennifer Dysart, DeeDee Falkenbach, Terry Furst, Lior Gideon, Demis Glasford, Laura Greenberg, Norman Groner, Maki Haberfeld, Devin Harner, Veronica Hendrick, Berenecea Johnson Eanes, Shaobai Kan, Karen Kaplowitz, Mehak Kapoor, Kwando Kinshasa, Nilsa Lam, Richard Li, Yue Ma, Vincent Maiorino, Evan Mandery, Roger McDonald, Sara McDougall, Shavonne McKiever, Mickey Melendez, Brian Montes, Catherine Mulder, Richard Ocejo, Robert Pignatello, Carina Quintian, Rick Richardson, Raul Rubio, Richard Saulnier, Michael Scaduto, Francis Sheehan, Davinder Singh, Staci Strobl, Karen Terry, Denise Thompson, Patricia Tovar, Jeremy Travis, and Michelle Tsang.

Absent were: Mark Benjamin, Virginia Diaz, Richard Haw, Anru Lee, Anne Lopes, Marcelle Mauvais, David Munns, Rhonda Nieves, Jason Nunez, and Donica Thompson.

I. Adoption of the Agenda

It was moved to adopt the agenda as presented. The motion to approve the agenda was seconded and passed unanimously.

II. Minutes of the November 21, 2011 College Council Meeting

It was moved to adopt the minutes as presented. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

III. Proposed Policy from Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee and Faculty Senate Regarding Change of Grade After Final Grades are Filed (attachment B)

It was moved to adopt the new policy as presented. The motion was seconded and passed.

   In Favor: 40  Opposed: 6  Abstentions: 7

IV. Proposed Policy from the Executive Committee of the College Council on the applicability of College policies to Undergraduate and Graduate policies (attachment C)

It was moved to adopt the policy as presented. The motion was seconded and passed.

   In Favor: 42  Opposed: 0  Abstentions: 9


V. Report from the Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee (attachments D1 – D6)

It was moved to adopt the new course proposals marked D1 – D6 as a slate:

- **D1.** POL 3XX  Voting and Public Opinion
- **D2.** LWS 2XX  Introduction to Law and Society
- **D3.** CJBA 2XX  Criminal Responsibility
- **D4.** CJBA 3XX  Rights of the Accused
- **D5.** SOC 3XX  Qualitative Methods in Criminology
- **D6.** GEN 4XX  Senior Seminar in Gender Studies

The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to accept the new course proposals marked D1 – D6. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the course revisions marked D7 – D11 as a slate:

- **D7.** AAP/PSY 240  Psychology of Oppression
- **D8.** SOC 203  Criminology
- **D9.** ART 113  Introduction to Photography
- **D10.** ART 114  Intermediate Photography
- **D11.** ART 230  Issues in Art and Crime

The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to accept the course revisions marked D7 – D11. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the proposal marked “D12. Proposal to Revise the BA in Global History.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously. Pending Board of Trustee Approval.

It was moved to adopt the proposal marked “D13. Proposal to Revise the BA in English”. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously. Pending Board of Trustee Approval.

VI. Report from the Committee on Graduate Studies (attachments E1 – E2)

It was moved to adopt the new course proposal marked “E1. The Global Economy and Corruption”. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the course revision marked “E2. Investigating Cybercrime”. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:10 p.m.
I. Adoption of the Agenda

II. Minutes of the December 12, 2011 College Council (attachment A), \textit{Pg. 3}

III. Applicability of John Jay Policies to Undergraduate and Graduate Students and Programs (attachment B)—The Executive Committee of the College Council, \textit{Pg. 5}

IV. Report from the Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee (attachments C1 –C22) – Dean Lopes

\textbf{New Courses:}

\begin{itemize}
  \item C1. ECO 3XX Political Economy of Gender, \textit{Pg. 7}
  \item C2. PSY 4XX Senior Seminar in Forensic Psychology, \textit{Pg. 11}
  \item C3. DRA 1XX Self, Media and Society, \textit{Pg. 15}
  \item C4. MUS 2XX Music Technology, \textit{Pg. 18}
  \item C5. MUS 3XX Music Composition Using Technology, \textit{Pg. 21}
  \item C6. HIS 2XX Imperialism in Africa, Asia and Middle East, \textit{Pg. 24}
  \item C7. POL 2XX Introduction to Research in Politics, \textit{Pg. 28}
  \item C8. CJBA 2XX (240) Quantitative Inquiry, \textit{Pg. 33}
  \item C9. CJBA 2XX (220) Race, Gender, Ethnicity, Crime and Justice, \textit{Pg. 37}
  \item C10. AFR 3XX Inequality and Wealth, \textit{Pg. 44}
  \item C11. HIS 3XX Female Felons in Premodern Europe and the Americas, \textit{Pg. 48}
  \item C12. CSL 2XX Case Management in Human Service, \textit{Pg. 51}
  \item C13. PSY 2XX Introductory Undergraduate Research in Psychology, \textit{Pg. 54}
  \item C14. PSY 3XX Supervised Undergraduate Research in Psychology, \textit{Pg. 57}
  \item C15. PSY 4XX Advanced Undergraduate Research in Psychology, \textit{Pg. 61}
\end{itemize}

\textbf{Course Revisions:}

\begin{itemize}
  \item C16. ENG 233 News Reporting and Writing, \textit{Pg. 64}
  \item C17. PSY 275 Family Conflict and Family Court, \textit{Pg. 70}
  \item C18. PSY 442 Key Concepts in Psychotherapy, \textit{Pg. 76}
  \item C19. PSY 228 Psychology and Women, \textit{Pg. 81}
  \item C20. POL 214 Political Parties and Pressure Groups, \textit{Pg. 94}
\end{itemize}
Programs
C21. Proposal to Revise the Minor in African-American Studies and Establish an Honors Option, Pg. 97

Academic Standards
C22. Academic Integrity Committee Proposal, Pg. 103

V. Report from the Committee on Graduate Studies (attachments D1) – Dean Domingo

Course Revision
D1. PSY 748: Empirical Crime Scene Analysis, Pg. 114

VI. Change in College Council Committee Membership List (attachment E), Pg. 117

- James Cauthen (Political Science) replaces DeeDee Falkenbach (Psychology), who is on sabbatical for Spring 2012, on the College Council.

- Peggy Eschar (English) replaces Richard Culp (Public Management), on the Faculty-Student Disciplinary Committee, (formerly known as Judicial Committee).

VII. New Business

VIII. Administrative Announcements – President Jeremy Travis

IX. Announcements from the Faculty Senate – Professor Karen Kaplowitz

X. Announcements from the Student Council – President Whitney Brown
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aikens, Jeffrey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ali, Zeeshan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arsovská, Jana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balis, Andrea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beckett, Elton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin, Mark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowers, Jane P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, Whitney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burleigh, Erica</td>
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The College Council held its fifth meeting of the 2011-2012 academic year on Monday, February 27, 2012. The meeting was called to order at 1:53 p.m. and the following members were present: Jana Arsovska, Elton Beckett, Jane Bowers, Whitney Brown, Erica Burleigh, James Cauthen, Kinya Chandler, Demi Cheng, Kathleen Collins, Lyell Davies, Joseph DeLuca, Virginia Diaz, James DiGiovanna, Jannette Domingo, Mathieu Dufour, Jennifer Dysart, Terry Furst, Demis Glasford, Maki Haberfeld, Devin Harner, Berenicea Johnson Eanes, Shaobai Kan, Karen Kaplowitz, Kwando Kinshasa, Nilsa Lam, Richard Li, Anne Lopes, Yue Ma, Vincent Maiorino, Evan Mandery, Roger McDonald, Sara McDougall, Shavonne McKiever, Mickey Melendez, Catherine Mulder, David Munns, Robert Pignatello, Carina Quintan, Rick Richardson, Raul Rubio, Richard Saulnier, Michael Scaduto, Francis Sheehan, Karen Terry, Denise Thompson, Donica Thompson, Patricia Tovar, Jeremy Travis, and Michelle Tsang.

Absent were:

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

II. Minutes of the December 12, 2011 College Council Meeting
It was moved to adopt the minutes as presented. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

III. Applicability of John Jay Policies to Undergraduate and Graduate Students and Programs (attachment B)
The proposed policy was withdrawn by the Executive Committee of the College Council pending further discussion by the committees.

IV. Report from the Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee (attachments C1 – C22)
It was moved to adopt the new course proposal marked “C1. ECO 3XX: Political Economy of Gender.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.
It was moved to adopt the new course proposal marked “C2. PSY 4XX: Senior Seminar in Forensic Psychology.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the new course proposal marked “C3. DRA 1XX: Self, Media and Society.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the new course proposal marked “C4. MUS 2XX: Music Technology.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the new course proposal marked “C5. MUS 3XX: Music Composition Using Technology.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the new course proposal marked “C6. HIS 2XX: Imperialism in Africa, Asia and Middle East.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the new course proposal marked “C7. POL 2XX: Introduction to Research in Politics.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the new course proposal marked “C8. CJBA 2XX: (240) Quantitative Inquiry.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the new course proposal marked “C9. CJBA 2XX: (220) Race, Gender, Ethnicity, Crime and Justice.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the new course proposal marked “C10. AFR 3XX: Inequality and Wealth.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the new course proposal marked “C11. HIS 3XX: Female Felons in Premodern Europe and the Americas.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the new course proposal marked “C12. CSL 2XX: Case Management in Human Service.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the new course proposals marked C13 – C15 as a slate:

C13. PSY 2XX: Introductory Undergraduate Research in Psychology
C14. PSY 3XX: Supervised Undergraduate Research in Psychology
C15. PSY 4XX: Advanced Undergraduate Research in Psychology

The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to accept the new course proposals marked C13 – C15. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the revised course proposal marked “C16. ENG 233: News Reporting and Writing.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the revised course proposal marked “C17. PSY 275: Family Conflict and Family Court.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.
It was moved to adopt the revised course proposal marked “C18. PSY 442: Key Concepts in Psychotherapy.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the revised course proposal marked “C19. PSY 228: Psychology and Women.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the revised course proposal marked “C20. POL 214: Political Parties and Pressure Groups.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the revised course proposal marked “C21. Proposal to Revise the Minor in African-American Studies and Establish an Honors Option.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

The proposed item, “C22: Academic Integrity Committee Proposal.” was withdrawn by the Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee.

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

It was moved to adopt the revised course proposal marked “D1. PSY 748: Empirical Crime Scene Analysis”. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

VI. Change in College Council Committee Membership List (attachment E)

It was moved to adopt this change with the following correction: Professor Peggy Eschar’s should be listed as Professor Peggy Escher.

Professor Peggy Escher (English) was nominated by the Faculty Senate to replace Richard Culp (Public Management) on the six-member panel of the Faculty-Student Disciplinary Committee. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:46 p.m.
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JOHN JAY COLLEGE OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE
The City University of New York
MINUTES OF THE COLLEGE COUNCIL
Thursday, March 29, 2012


Absent were:

Alternates Present:
Janice Dunham for Veronica Hendrick
Sylvia Lopez for Shavonne McKiever

I. Adoption of the Agenda
It was moved to amend the agenda by withdrawing Item III “Applicability of John Jay Policies to Undergraduate and Graduate Students and Programs (attachment B)”. The motion to approve the agenda was seconded and passed unanimously.

II. Minutes of the February 27, 2012 College Council Meeting
It was moved to adopt the minutes as presented. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

III. Applicability of John Jay Policies to Undergraduate and Graduate Students and Programs (attachment B)

The proposed policy was withdrawn by Professor Karen Kaplowitz pending further discussion.

IV. Report from the Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee (attachments C1 – C5)
It was moved to adopt the new course proposal marked “C1. CJBS 4XX: Capstone Seminar.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the new course proposal marked “C2. POL2XX: Media and Politics.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the revised course proposal marked “C3. GEN205: Gender and Justice.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the proposal marked “C4. Proposal to Rearticulate the 2+2 Joint AA/BA degrees in Criminal Justice with John Jay’s revised B.S. degree in Criminal Justice (Institutional Theory and Practice).” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved that the proposal marked “C5. Proposal to Revise the Grade Appeal Policy” be sent back to the Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee for further consideration. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

V. Distance Learning Education Application for MPA-IO Program (attachments D)

It was moved to adopt the proposal marked “D. Distance Learning Education Application for MPA-IO Program”. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

VI. Proposed Policy Regarding Committee Meeting Dates (attachment E)

It was moved that College Council committees meeting dates be determined by the first of August, where applicable, and no later than the first meeting of the College Council. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

VII. New Business

A motion was made to re-submit the proposal from the Faculty Senate titled “Resolution on Administration Requests of Faculty to Perform Uncompensated Work” to the agenda. President Travis ruled out of order. Professor Evan Mandery motioned for an appeal. President Travis made a statement to the College Council. A motion was made to withdraw the motion to add the Faculty Senate proposal to the agenda. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

A motion was made to adjourn the meeting at 3:20 p.m.
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</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mauvais, Marcelle</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDonald, Roger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDougall, Sara</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKiever, Shavonne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melendez, Mickey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montes, Brian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mulder, Catherine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munns, David</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nieves, Rhonda</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nunez, Jason</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocejo, Richard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pignatello, Robert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quintian, Carina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richardson, Rick</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubio, Raul</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saulnier, Richard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scaduto, Michael</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheehan, Francis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Singh, Davinder</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strobl, Staci</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alternates are italicized  
Student Council Members are bolded
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Terry, Karen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson, Denise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson, Donica</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tovar, Patricia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travis, Jeremy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsang, Michelle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The College Council held its seventh meeting of the 2011-2012 academic year on Wednesday April 25, 2012. The meeting was called to order at 1:51 p.m. and the following members were present: Jeffrey Alkins, Jana Arsovka, Andrea Balis, Elton Beckett, Jane Bowers, Whitney Brown, Erica Burleigh, James Cauthen, Kinya Chandler, Demi Cheng, Kathleen Collins, Lyell Davies, Joseph DeLuca, James DiGiovanna, Jannette Domingo, Mathieu Dufour, Terry Furst, Demis Glasford, Maki Haberfeld, Richard Haw, Veronica Hendrick, Berenecea Johnson Eanes, Karen Kaplowitz, Mehak Kapoor, Kwando Kinshasa, Nilsa Lam, Anru Lee, Richard Li, Anne Lopes, Yue Ma, Vincent Maiorino, Roger McDonald, Sara McDougall, Shavonne McKiever, Mickey Melendez, Brian Montes, Catherine Mulder, Richard Ocejo, Robert Pignatello, Carina Quintian, Rick Richardson, Raul Rubio, Richard Saulnier, Michael Scaduto, Francis Sheehan, Staci Strobl, Denise Thompson, Donica Thompson, Patricia Tovar, and Jeremy Travis.

Absent were:

Alternates Present:
Janice Dunham for Laura Greenberg

I. Adoption of the Agenda

It was moved to adopt the minutes as presented. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

II. Minutes of the March 29, 2012 College Council Meeting

It was moved to adopt the minutes as presented. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

III. Report from the Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee (attachments B1 – B9)

It was moved to adopt the new course proposal marked “B1. PSY 4XX: Clinical Topics in Forensic Psychology.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the new course proposal marked “B2. ECO 3XX: Sustainability: Preserving the Earth as a Human Habitat.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.
It was moved to adopt the new course proposal marked “B3. BIO 3XX: Human Physiology.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the new course proposal marked “B4. MUS 1XX: Introduction to Guitar.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the revised course proposal marked “B5. SOC 222: Sociology of Mass Communication.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the revised course proposal marked “B6. ECO 210: American Economic History and Development.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the revised course proposal marked “B7. PSY/ANT 445: Culture, Psychopathology and Healing.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the program proposal marked “B8. Proposal to Revise the BA Degree in Political Science.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved that the program proposal marked “B9. Proposal to Revise the Minor in Gender Studies.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

IV. Report from the Committee on Graduate Studies (attachments C1 – C3)

It was moved to adopt the proposal marked “C1. A Resolution for Changes to be made in the Graduate Bulletin for Submission of a Grade Appeal Application.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the proposal marked “C2. A Proposal to Revise the Curriculum of the MPA: Inspection and Oversight Program.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the proposal marked “C3. A Proposal to Revise the Curriculum of the MPA: Public Policy and Administration Program.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

V. Report from The Committee on Honors, Prizes, and Awards (attachment D)

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 approved unanimously.

VI. New Business

It was moved to adopt the College Council Membership List as presented with two additions. Navila Abbas and David Guadeloupe were nominated by the Student Council to the Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

A motion was made to adjourn the meeting at 2:52 p.m.
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The College Council
Agenda

Tuesday, May 15, 2012
1:40 p.m.
630T

I. Adoption of the Agenda

II. Minutes of the April 25, 2012 College Council (attachment A), Pg.3

III. Report from the Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee (attachments B1 – B18) – Anne Lopes, Dean of Undergraduate Studies

New Courses:
B1. BIO 3YY Human Anatomy and Physiology Lab (BIO 356), Pg.5
B2. CJBA 4XX Senior Thesis I (CJBA 410), Pg.19
B3. CJBA 4YY Senior Thesis II (CJBA 411), Pg.29
B4. PSY 3XX History of Psychology, Pg.39
B5. PSY 3XX Multicultural Psychology, Pg.50
B6. CSL 3XX Vocational Development and Social Justice in Human Service, Pg.65

Course Revisions:
B7. POL 230 Principles of Constitutional Government, Pg.81
B8. POL 430 Seminar in Problems in Civil Rights and Civil Liberties, Pg.88
B9. SOC 440 Senior Seminar in Criminology, Pg.96
B10. SPA 201-202 Intermediate Conversational Spanish I & II, Pg.98
B11. SPA 211-212 Intermediate Conversational Spanish for Hispanic Students I & II, Pg.102
B12. SPA 321-322 Introduction to Spanish Literature I & II, Pg.106
B13. SPA 331-332 Introduction to Latin American Literature I & II, Pg.110
B14. FRE 201-202 Intermediate French I & II, Pg.114
B15. ITA 201-202 Intermediate Italian I & II, Pg.118
B16. SPA 208 Themes of Justice in 20th Century Spanish Literature, Pg.122

Programs:
B17. Proposal to Revise the B.S. in Criminal Justice Management, Pg.124

Academic Standards:
B18. Proposal to Revise the Undergraduate Grade Appeal Policy (referred back from College Council, revised and approved by UCASC), Pg.127

IV. Report from the Committee on Graduate Studies (attachments C1 & C2) – Jannette Domingo, Dean of Graduate Studies

C1. A course revision of the CRJ program, Pg.131
C2. The Annual Report of the MPA Inspector General Online Program, \textit{Pg.133}

V. Proposed College Council Calendar (attachment D), \textit{Pg.152}

VI. New Business
   - Application for the MPA-PPA Program (attachment E), \textit{Pg.153}

VII. Administrative Announcements – President Jeremy Travis

VIII. Announcements from the Faculty Senate – Professor Karen Kaplowitz

IX. Announcements from the Student Council – President Whitney Brown
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aikens, Jeffrey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ali, Zeeshan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arsovská, Jana</td>
<td>Jana Arsovská</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balis, Andrea</td>
<td>Andrea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beckett, Elton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin, Mark</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowers, Jane P.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, Whitney</td>
<td>Whitney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burleigh, Erica</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cauthen, James</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandler, Kinya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheng, Demi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collins, Kathleen</td>
<td>Kathleen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa, Brian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davies, Lyell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeLuca, Joseph</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diaz, Virginia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DiGiovanna, James</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domingo, Jannette</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dufour, Mathieu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alternates are italicized  
Student Council Members are bolded
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dunham, Janice</td>
<td>Janice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dysart, Jennifer</td>
<td>Jennifer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frazier, Beverly</td>
<td>Beverly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furst, Terry</td>
<td>Terry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gates, Jay Paul</td>
<td>Paul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gideon, Lior</td>
<td>Lior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasford, Demis</td>
<td>Demis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenberg, Laura</td>
<td>Laura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haberfeld, Maki</td>
<td>Maki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harner, Devin</td>
<td>Devin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haw, Richard</td>
<td>Richard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendrick, Veronica</td>
<td>Veronica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennings, Charles</td>
<td>Charles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson Eanes, Berenecea</td>
<td>Eanes, Berenecea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kan, Shaobai</td>
<td>Shaobai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaplowitz, Karen</td>
<td>Karen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapoor, Mehak</td>
<td>Mehak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinshasa, Kwando</td>
<td>Kwando</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lam, Nilsa</td>
<td>Nilsa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee, Anru</td>
<td>Anru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li, Richard</td>
<td>Richard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lopes, Anne</td>
<td>Anne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lopez, Sylvia</td>
<td>Sylvia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Signature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma, Yue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maiorino, Vincent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandery, Evan</td>
<td>E. M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauvais, Marcelle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDonald, Roger</td>
<td>R. M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDougall, Sara</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKiever, Shavonne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melendez, Mickey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montes, Brian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mulder, Catherine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munns, David</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nieves, Rhonda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nunez, Jason</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocejo, Richard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pignatello, Robert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quintian, Carina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richardson, Rick</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubio, Raul</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saulnier, Richard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scaduto, Michael</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheehan, Francis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singh, Davinder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strobl, Staci</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alternates are italicized
Student Council Members are bolded
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Terry, Karen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson, Denise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson, Donica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tovar, Patricia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travis, Jeremy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tsang, Michelle</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Alternates are italicized*  
*Student Council Members are bolded*
The College Council held its eighth meeting of the 2011-2012 academic year on Tuesday May 15, 2012. The meeting was called to order at 1:51 p.m. and the following members were present: Jana Arsovska, Andrea Balis, Whitney Brown, James Cauthen, Kinya Chandler, Demi Cheng, Kathleen Collins, Virginia Diaz, James DiGiovanna, Jannette Domingo, Mathieu Dufour, Jennifer Dysart, Terry Furst, Lior Gideon, Demis Glasford, Maki Haberfeld, Veronica Hendrick, Berenecea Johnson Eanes, Karen Kaplowitz, Mehak Kapoor, Kwando Kinshasa, Nilsa Lam, Anru Lee, Richard Li, Anne Lopes, Evan Mandery, Roger McDonald, Sara McDougall, Shavonne McKiever, Mickey Melendez, Catherine Mulder, David Munns, Rhonda Nieves, Richard Ocejo, Robert Pignatello, Carina Quintian, Rick Richardson, Raul Rubio, Richard Saulnier, Michael Scaduto, Davinder Singh, Staci Strobl, Karen Terry, Patricia Tovar, and Jeremy Travis.

Absent were:
Jeffrey Aikens, Zeeshan Ali, Elton Beckett, Mark Benjamin, Jane Bowers, Erica Burleigh, Brian Costa, Lyell Davies, Joseph DeLuca, Devin Harner, Richard Haw, Charles Jennings, Shaobai Kan, Yue Ma, Vincent Maiorino, Marcelle Mauvais, Brian Montes, Jason Nunez, Francis Sheehan, Denise Thompson, Donica Thompson, and Michelle Tsang.

Alternates Present:
Janice Dunham for Laura Greenberg

I. Adoption of the Agenda

It was moved to amend the agenda by withdrawing Item B18 “Proposal to Revise the Undergraduate Grade Appeal Policy (referred back from College Council, revised and approved by UCASC)”. The motion to approve the amended agenda was seconded and passed unanimously.

II. Minutes of the April 25, 2012 College Council Meeting

It was moved to adopt the minutes as presented. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

III. Report from the Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee (attachments B1 – B17)

It was moved to adopt the new course proposal marked “B1. BIO 3YY: Human Anatomy and Physiology Lab (BIO 356).” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the new course proposal marked “B2. CJBS 4XX: Senior Thesis I (CJBA 410).” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.
It was moved to adopt the new course proposal marked “B3. CJBS 4YY: Senior Thesis II (CJBA 411).” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the new course proposal marked “B4. PSY 3XX: History of Psychology.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the new course proposal marked “B5. PSY 3XX: Multicultural Psychology.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the new course proposal marked “B6. CSL 3XX: Vocational Development and Social Justice in Human Service.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the revised course proposal marked “B7. POL 230: Principles of Constitutional Government.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the revised course proposal marked “B8. POL 430: Seminar in Problems in Civil Rights and Civil Liberties.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to adopt the revised course proposal marked “B9. SOC 440: Senior Seminar in Criminology.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

A motion was made to adopt course revisions marked B10 – B15 as a slate:

B10. SPA 201-202 Intermediate Conversational Spanish I & II  
B11. SPA 211-212 Intermediate Conversational Spanish for Hispanic Students I & II  
B12. SPA 321-322 Introduction to Spanish Literature I & II  
B13. SPA 331-332 Introduction to Latin American Literature I & II  
B14. FRE 201-202 Intermediate French I & II  
B15. ITA 201-202 Intermediate Italian I & II

The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was moved to approve the slate as presented. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

It was agreed upon by members of the College Council to refer Item B16 “SPA 208: Themes of Justice in 20th Century Spanish Literature” to Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee.

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

It was moved to adopt the revised course proposal marked “C1: A course revision of the CRJ program.” The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

V. Proposed College Council Calendar (attachment D)
VI. New Business

A motion was made to consider a new business titled, “Online Evaluation of Faculty Resolution” presented by Professor Roger McDonald.

In Favor: 29  Opposed: 3  Abstentions: 4

The motion failed: A motion requires a minimum of 35 votes to succeed.

A motion was made to adjourn the meeting at 2:59 p.m.
9-13-2011
3pm Clegg's office
Clegg, Long, Lu, Markus
Discussed time line and form design.
Agenda:
Set time line for revisions, contact with Advisory Group and Faculty Senate
Discuss form design, including 5 point vs. 9 point scaling items
Contact Kevin Nesbitt re: turnaround time of printing

9-21-2011
11am Clegg's office
Clegg, Long, Lu, Markus
Discussed form design and process issues. Detailed discussion of uses of ratings, including proposed student use.
Agenda:
Further discussion of 5 point vs. 9 point scaling items
Discuss proposed student use
Discuss roles of Faculty Senate and Advisory Group

9-21-2011
12:05 Karen Kaplowitz's office
Clegg, Long, Lu, Markus
Met with Karen Kaplowitz to discuss SEOF charge and procedures. Resolved concerns regarding roles of Advisory Group and Faculty Senate. Discussed contacting Student Government to recruit new student members

11-9-2011
Noon Clegg's office
Clegg, Long, Lu, Markus
Discussed survey results.
Agenda:
Discuss survey results
Begin incorporating survey results into revisions of the instrument

11-16-2011
Noon Clegg’s office  
Clegg, Long, Lu, Markus  
Discussed revisions to blueprint.  
Agreed to send report to Faculty Senate.  
Agenda:  
1. Finalize revisions of report  
2. Send report to Faculty Senate  
3. Set up meeting with Faculty Senate to discuss survey  
4. Work on blueprint alongside incorporating feedback on survey

11-22-2011  
11:30 Clegg's office  
Clegg, Long, Lu, Markus  
Discussed survey report.  
Agenda:  
1. Discuss survey report  
2. Revisit time line based on survey report and feedback from Advisory Group

11-30-2011  
L.61 NB  
Met with Faculty Senate to discuss survey results. Garnered suggestions and concerns from Faculty Senate

12-20-2011  
L2.69.08  
Abbas, Abramova, Clegg, Long, Lu, Markus  
Discussed item format, reading level and instructions.  
Agenda:  
1. Meet new student members  
2. Garner feedback from student members regarding student perspective of evaluations  
3. Discuss phrasing and item format
1-30-2012
1:30 Clegg's office
Clegg, Long, Lu, Markus
Discussed blueprint, agreed to contact Faculty Senate
Agenda:
   1. Discuss blueprint
   2. Consider contacting Faculty Senate for feedback

2-21-2012
4:15 Clegg's office
Clegg, Long, Lu, Markus
Completed blueprint, agreed to move onto drafting a new evaluation instrument
Agenda:
   1. Complete blueprint
   2. Begin drafting items for new evaluation instrument

3-2-2012
610T 10:45-11:45
Abbas, Markus
Attended presentation on online evaluation at invitation of Kevin Nesbitt presented to College Personnel Committee.

3-21-2012
610T 1:40-2:40
Abbas, Markus
Karen Kaplowitz also in attendance
Attended Council of Chairs meeting to discuss student evaluation of faculty. Two chairs agreed to join Advisory Group. One chair suggested that we stop working on our charge and instead write bylaws. Consensus that SEOF committee cannot make decisions but only recommendations to Faculty Senate and College Council. Also discussed current form, concerns about online evaluation, and availability of ratings to students.

4-4-2012
Cafeteria NB
Long, Lu, Markus
Discussed a proposal to focus on bylaws. Discussed number of response options in rating scales as this relates to sensitivity and reliability.
Agenda:
   1. Discuss proposal for committee to cease work on charge and instead write bylaws
   2. Discuss current form
3. Discuss concerns about online evaluation
4. Discuss availability of ratings to students

4-19-2012
L.61 2:30
Clegg, Long, Lu, Markus
Met with faculty senate to discuss design of new form. Garnered feedback and concerns from Faculty Senate

5-9-2012
1:30pm Nesbitt's office
Long, Markus
Met with Kevin Nesbitt to discuss student evaluation of faculty logistics. Discussed March 2 presentation to College Personnel Committee in relation to design issues.

8-14-2012
Noon conference call
Clegg, Long, Lu, Markus
Completed agenda items 1-3. Discussed and agreed to attempt behavioral anchors.
Agenda:
1. Discussion of online evaluation issues as it impacts our effort.
2. Agree on draft rating item prompts.
3. Agree on draft open-ended item prompts.
4. Attempt behavioral anchors for the first set of rating items.
5. Assess step 3.
6. Either
   6a: complete behavioral anchors for remaining items,
   6b: revise and try again, or
   6c: opt for alternative (proportion of time).
7. Review complete form and circulate to advisory group.
8. Assess progress and decide on next meeting(s).
9. New or additional business.

8-17-2012
Noon conference call
Clegg, Long, Lu, Markus
Worked on behavioral anchors.

Agenda:
1. Any further editing of rating prompts.
2. Agree on draft open-ended item prompts.
3. Review ordering of anchors for first 5 rating items.
4. Adjust and average break point.
6. Choose and compile break points based on averages.
7. Review success of anchor process and make decision about next steps.
   One issue to consider here is the impact of behavioral anchors on the length of the form.
8. Assess progress and decide on next meeting(s).
9. New or additional business.

8-20-2012
Noon conference call
Clegg, Long, Markus
Summary of August 20 meeting: JC, AL and KM met by conference call. We completed the process of pooling anchor ratings, averaging, and choosing the anchors for the first three items sets. We discussed issues of item formatting and arrangement on the page. We briefly discussed process issues. This meeting built on meetings of YL, JC, AL and KM on August 14 and 17.

Agenda:
Continuation of August 17 agenda.

8-22-2012
Noon conference call
Clegg, Long, Markus
Summary of August 22 meeting: JC, AL and KM reviewed AL's edits to draft items and wrote the demographic items, primarily choosing to retain the same questions as used in 1999 for comparability. They also discussed formatting and the next steps for review of the draft form. It was agreed the KM would type up the edits in both a long and short (formatted) form. AL would review the form for consistency of language. JC would experiment with formatting. Once the committee agrees on the draft, the advisory committee will be given 2 weeks to review. AL will request to meet with the Faculty Senate on Sept 19.

Agenda:
1. Review AL's edits to draft items from last meeting.
2. Write demographic items.
3. Discuss placement of demographics.
4. Discuss procedure for sharing draft with advisory group.
5. Discuss next steps.
AGENDA
Faculty Personnel Committee
10/14/11
Room 610 T Building
9:30am - 2:00 PM

I. Charging the Committee
   a. New Members
   b. Confidentiality Statement
   c. Schedule of Meetings

II. Presidential Scholar Appointment

III. New Form C

IV. Digital Measures Walkthrough
   a. Instructions

V. Second Year Reappointments: Presentation (negative/absentee cases) & Vote
   a. Candidate List

VI. Third Year Reappointments: Presentation (negative/absentee cases) & Vote
   a. Candidate List

VII. Fourth Year Reappointment: Presentation and Vote: all cases
   a. Candidate List

Future Agenda Items

I. Pre-Tenure Review Implementation

II. Conflict Resolution: Making Talk Work in your Leadership as Chair

Next FPC meeting
10/28/11: 4th (remainder), 5th, and 6th year reappointment cases
### Fall 2011 Committee on Faculty Personnel  
#### Attendance and Minutes  
**Friday, October 14, 2011**

**Meeting Begin Time:** 9:40 am  
**Meeting End Time:** 10:55 pm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members of Committee</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Left at (time)</th>
<th>Returned (time)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Adams, Carlton Jama</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Baumrin, Seth</td>
<td></td>
<td>12:15</td>
<td>12:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Benton, Warren</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Bowers, Jane</td>
<td>Jane Bowers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Brotherton, David</td>
<td>D. Brotherton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Carbonell, Bettina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Curtis, Ric</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Dania, Silvia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Domingo, Jannette</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Farrington, Lisa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Green, Amy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Haberfeld, Maki</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Hamilton, Jay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Jacobs, Jonathan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Johnson Eanes, Berenicea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Kavey, Allison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of Committee</td>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Left at (time)</td>
<td>Returned (time)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Kobilinsky, Larry</td>
<td>LK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Kucharski, Tom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Lopes, Anne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Mandery, Evan</td>
<td>EJ</td>
<td>12:15</td>
<td>12:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Natarajan, Mangai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Pease, Allison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Perez, Lisandro</td>
<td></td>
<td>10:50</td>
<td>10:53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Petracco Jr., Nicholas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Pittman, John</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Raghavan, Chitra</td>
<td></td>
<td>11:52</td>
<td>16:53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Shenkin, Peter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Solis, Carmen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Sullivan, Harold</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Sullivan, Larry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Terry, Karen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Till, Robert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Travis, Jeremy</td>
<td>JT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Umeh, Davidson</td>
<td></td>
<td>11:50</td>
<td>11:55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Valazquez-Torres, Nancy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12:10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FACULTY PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

AGENDA
October 28, 2011
Room 610 T Building
9:30 AM - 1:00 PM

I. Digital Measures Walkthrough
   a. Instructions for this Week’s Reviews

II. Third Year Reappointments Continued: Presentation (negative/abstention cases) & Vote
    a. Candidate List (Public Management)

III. Special Schedule Change: Law Police Science Fifth Year Reappointments
     a. Candidate List

IV. Fourth Year Reappointments Continued: Presentation & Vote: all cases
    a. Candidate List

V. Fifth Year Reappointments: Presentation (negative/abstention cases) & Vote
   a. Candidate List

VI. Sixth Year Reappointments: Presentation & Vote: all cases
    a. Candidate List

Future Agenda Items:
1. Pre-Tenure Review Implementation
2. Conflict Resolution: Making Talk Work in your Leadership as Chair
3. Online Student Evaluations

*Next FPC meetings
11/4/11: 1st year reappointment, 3 Tenure, 7 CCE, and 3 Tenure/Promotion Cases
11/11/11: Fellowship Leaves/Scholar Incentive; Tenure, CCE and Promotion Cases begin
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members of Committee</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Left at (time)</th>
<th>Returned (time)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Adams, Carlton Jama</td>
<td>KW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Baumrin, Seth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Bowers, Jane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Brotherton, David</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Carbonell, Bettina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Curtis, Ric</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Dapia, Silvia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10:04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Domingo, Jannette</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Farrington, Lisa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Green, Amy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Haberfeld, Maki</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Hamilton, Jay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Jacobs, Jonathan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Johnson Eanes, Berenicea</td>
<td></td>
<td>10:10m</td>
<td>10:13m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Kasey, Allison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of Committee</td>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Left at (time)</td>
<td>Returned (time)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Kobilinsky, Larry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Kucharski, Tom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Lopes, Anne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Mandery, Evan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Natarajan, Mangai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Pease, Allison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Perez, Lisandro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Petraco Jr., Nicholas</td>
<td>2019-01-01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Pittman, John</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Raghavan, Chitra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Shenkin, Peter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Solis, Carmen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Sullivan, Harold</td>
<td>10:45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Sullivan, Larry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Terry, Karen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Till, Robert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Travis, Jeremy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Urneh, Davidson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Valdez-Torres, Nancy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FACULTY PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

AGENDA
November 4, 2011
Room 610 T Building
9:30AM-1:30 PM

I. Digital Measures Walkthrough
   a. Instructions for 6th Year Candidates

II. Fifth Year Reappointments Continued: Presentation (negative/abstention cases) & Vote
   a. Candidate List

III. Sixth Year Reappointments: Presentation and Vote (all cases)
    a. Candidate List

IV. CCE Appointments: Presentation and Vote (all cases)
    a. Candidate List

V. Stand Alone Tenure Appointments: Presentation and Vote (all cases)
    a. Candidate List

VI. Tenure Appointments Coinciding with Promotion Requests:
    a. Candidate List

*Next FPC meeting*

- Reappointment votes on early tenure candidates not awarded tenure
- Tenure and Promotion Cases continued
- Fellowship Leaves

Future Agenda Items:
1. Pre-Tenure Review Implementation
2. Conflict Resolution: Making Talk Work in your Leadership as Chair
3. Online Student Evaluations
4. Question 17 on Form C, Making Your Research and Scholarly Productivity Clear on the Form C
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members of Committee</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Left at (time)</th>
<th>Returned (time)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Adams, Carlton Jama</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Baumrin, Seth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Benton, Warren</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Bowers, Jane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Brotherton, David</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Corbonell, Bettina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Curtis, Ric</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Dapia, Silvia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Domingo, Jannette</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Farrington, Lisa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Green, Amy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Haberfeld, Maki</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Hamilton, Jay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Jacobs, Jonathan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Johnson Eanes, Berenicea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Kavey, Allison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of Committee</td>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Left at (time)</td>
<td>Returned (time)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Koblinsky, Larry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Kucharski, Tom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Lopez, Anne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Mandary, Evan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Natarajan, Mangai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Pease, Allison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Perez, Lisandro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Peteco Jr., Nicholas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Pittman, John</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Raghavan, Chitra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Shenkin, Peter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Solis, Carmen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Sullivan, Herold</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Sullivan, Larry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Terry, Karen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Till, Robert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Travis, Jeremy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Urzh, Davidson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Velazquez-Torres, Nancy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FACULTY PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

AGENDA
November 11, 2011
Room 610 T Building
9:30AM- 2:30 PM

I. Fifth Year Reappointments Continued: Presentation (negative/abstention cases) & Vote
   a. Candidate List

II. Sixth Year Reappointments Continued: Presentation and Vote (all cases)
    a. Candidate List

III. CCE Appointments Continued: Presentation and Vote (all cases)
     a. Candidate List

IV. Stand Alone Tenure Appointments Continued: Presentation and Vote (all cases)
    a. Candidate List

V. Tenure Appointments Coinciding with Promotion Requests: Presentation and Vote (all cases)
   a. Candidate List

VI. Promotion to Senior College Laboratory Technician
    a. Candidate List

VII. Promotion to Associate Professor: Presentation and Vote (all cases)
     a. Candidate List

Future FPC meetings:
11/29/11 1:30pm-4:30pm Room 630T
- Tenure and Promotion Cases continued
- Reappointment votes on Early Tenure candidates not awarded Tenure
- Fellowship Leaves

12/2/11: Appeal Cases
12/16/11: Stand Alone Promotions & Beginning Future Agenda Items
Future Agenda Items:
1. Pre-Tenure Review Implementation
2. Conflict Resolution: Making Talk Work in your Leadership as Chair
3. Online Student Evaluations
4. Question 17 on Form C, Making Your Research and Scholarly Productivity Clear on the Form C
### Members of Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members of Committee</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Left at (time)</th>
<th>Returned (time)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams, Carlton Jama</td>
<td></td>
<td>10:22</td>
<td>10:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baumrin, Seth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benton, Warren</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowers, Jane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brotherton, David</td>
<td></td>
<td>10:22</td>
<td>10:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbonell, Bettina</td>
<td></td>
<td>10:22</td>
<td>10:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curtis, Ric</td>
<td></td>
<td>10:22</td>
<td>10:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dapia, Silvia</td>
<td></td>
<td>10:22</td>
<td>10:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domingo, Jannette</td>
<td></td>
<td>10:22</td>
<td>10:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farrington, Lisa</td>
<td></td>
<td>10:22</td>
<td>10:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green, Amy</td>
<td></td>
<td>10:22</td>
<td>10:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haberfeld, Maki</td>
<td></td>
<td>10:22</td>
<td>10:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton, Jay</td>
<td></td>
<td>10:22</td>
<td>10:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacobs, Jonathon</td>
<td></td>
<td>10:22</td>
<td>10:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson Eanes, Bereneceas</td>
<td>10:12</td>
<td>10:44.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kavey, Allison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes
- 3 approved absences
- Presenter: Benton R. Cured
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members of Committee</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Left at (time)</th>
<th>Returned (time)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17 Kobilinsky, Larry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Kucharski, Tom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Lopes, Anne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Mandery, Evan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Natarajan, Manqai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Pease, Allison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Perez, Lisandro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Petracco Jr., Nicholas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Pittman, John</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Raghavan, Chitra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Shankin, Peter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Solis, Carmen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Sullivan, Harold</td>
<td></td>
<td>10:42</td>
<td>10:44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Sullivan, Larry</td>
<td></td>
<td>10:42</td>
<td>10:44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Terry, Karen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Till, Robert</td>
<td></td>
<td>10:23</td>
<td>10:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Travis, Jeramy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Umesh, Davidson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Velezquez-Torres, Nancy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FACULTY PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

AGENDA
November 29, 2011
Room 630 T, Haaren Hall
1:30PM- 4:00 PM

I. Reappointment of Distinguished Lecturer
   a. Candidate List

II. Fellowship Leave Vote
    a. Candidate List

III. Promotion to Full Professor: Presentation and Vote (all cases)
     a. Candidate List

IV. Pre-tenure Review Schedule Announcement

FUTURE FALL MEETINGS

12/2/11: Appeal Cases

12/16/11: Appeal Cases

Spring Agenda Items:
1. Conflict Resolution: Making Talk Work in your Leadership as Chair
2. Online Student Evaluations
3. Question 17 on Form C, Making Your Research and Scholarly Productivity Clear on the Form C
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members of Committee</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Left at (time)</th>
<th>Returned (time)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Adams, Carlton Jama</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Baumrin, Seth</td>
<td>S. Baumrin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Benton, Warren</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Bowers, Jane</td>
<td>J. Bowers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Brotherton, David</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Carbonell, Bettina</td>
<td>S. Carbonell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Curtis, Ric</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Dapia, Silvia</td>
<td>S. Dapia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Domingo, Jannette</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Farrington, Lisa</td>
<td>M. Farrington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Green, Amy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Haberfeld, Maki</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Hamilton, Jay</td>
<td>J. Hamilton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Jacobs, Jonathan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Johnson Eanes, Berenicea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Kavey, Allison</td>
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FACULTY PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

AGENDA
December 2nd, 2011
Room 610 T, Haaren Hall
9:30AM-1:00PM

APPEAL SCHEDULE

Third Year Reappointment:
Candidate 1  9:40 AM
Candidate 2  10:20 AM

Fourth Year Reappointment:
Candidate 1  11:00 AM
Candidate 1  11:40 AM

Sixth Year Reappointment:
Candidate 1  12:20 PM

FUTURE FALL MEETINGS

12/16/11: Appeal Cases & One Full Professor Promotion Case

Spring Agenda Items:
1. Helping Faculty to Understand and Prepare to Meet the Faculty Personnel Guidelines
2. Conflict Resolution: Making Talk Work in your Leadership as Chair
3. Online Student Evaluations (for Online, Hybrid and Traditional Courses)
4. Question 17 on Form C, Making Your Research and Scholarly Productivity Clear on the Form C
# Fall 2011 Committee on Faculty Personnel Attendance and Minutes

**Friday, December 02, 2011**

**Meeting Begin Time:** 9:55pm  
**Meeting End Time:** 1:00pm
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*Approved, but will arrive*
FACULTY PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

AGENDA
December 16th, 2011
Room 610 T, Haaren Hall
9:30AM-1:00PM

I. Promotion to Full Professor Case
   a. Candidate List Attached    9:30AM

II. APPEAL SCHEDULE

Sixth Year Reappointment:
Candidate 1    10:00 AM

CCE Appointment:
Candidate 1    10:45 AM
Candidate 2    11:30 AM

Tenure Appointment:
Candidate 1    12:15 PM

Promotion:
Candidate 1    12:35 PM

February 3, 2011 and/or March 2nd, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Spring Appeals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Early Tenure &amp;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Promotions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SPRING MEETING DATES: 2/3/12, 3/2/12, 3/30/12, 4/27/12, & 5/4/12

Spring Agenda Items:
1. Helping Faculty to Understand and Prepare to Meet the Faculty Personnel Guidelines
2. Conflict Resolution: Making Talk Work in your Leadership as Chair
3. Online Student Evaluations (for Online, Hybrid and Traditional Courses)
4. Question 17 on Form C, Making Your Research and Scholarly Productivity Clear on the Form C
5. Disciplinary Standards at the FPC: Focus on Creative Artists and Practitioners
6. Conducting Business Policy: Chair’s Prerogative to Motion to Conduct Business below Quorum at 26 members present: Revising the Policy
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Case initiated for home. Directed to arrive late.
FACULTY PERSONNEL COMMITTEE
AGENDA
February 3, 2012
Room 610 T, Haaren Hall
9:30AM-1:00PM

I. Provost's Letter of Advice
   A. Candidate List

II. APPEAL SCHEDULE

   Promotion to Associate:
   10:00 AM

   Promotion to Associate:
   10:45AM

   Promotion to Full:
   11:30 AM

III. Student Representatives to the Subcommittees of the FPC
     A. Spring 12 work in Pre-Tenure Review

IV. Distinguished Professor Case Nomination Review

V. Revise Conducting Business Policy:
   A. Chair's Prerogative to Motion to Conduct Business below Quorum at 26 members

VI. Report on Pilot of Rigorous Peer Observation Model:
    A. Discussions: Anthropology, (Art & Music), Foreign Languages, & (Psychology)

VII. Establish Subcommittee on Service Guidelines/Statement
    A. Subcommittee: Second Year Reappointments Committee
       i. Additional Membership Requested

VIII. Establish the Subcommittee on Teaching Guidelines/Statement
    A. Subcommittee: Assigned will be Second Year Reappointments Committee Academic
       i. Additional Membership Requested

IX. Discuss Departmental/Discipline Based Standards and Incorporation into FPPG
    A. Creative Artists and Practitioners
    B. General Counsel must Review Department/Discipline Based Standards & Statements.
Spring 2021 Committee on Faculty Personnel Attendance and Minutes  
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FACULTY PERSONNEL COMMITTEE
AGENDA
March 2nd, 2012
Room 610 T, Haaren Hall
9:30AM-1:00PM

I. APPEAL SCHEDULE

Promotion to Associate Professor - 9:45 AM

II. Faculty Emeriti Case

III. Distinguished Professor Vote
   a. Candidate List
   b. Letters of Evaluation

IV. Online Evaluations Discussion
   a. Provost’s Office Pilot
   b. Brooklyn College Experience
   c. SEOF Committee

V. Report on Pilot of Rigorous Peer Observation Model
   a. Anthropology, Art & Music, Foreign Languages, and Psychology

VI. Structure of FPC & Reconfiguring Reappointment Review Process and Schedule:
   a. How to Handle 1st, 2nd, and 3rd year reappointments differently/distribution of cases.
   b. Senior College’s and Differentiation in their Processes

VII. Data on Faculty Reappointment and Non-reappointments and Tenure/CCE
   a. Four Year Look-back

VIII. Faculty Sabbatical Update
   a. Data on Reports Turned In
   b. Provost’s “Return from Sabbatical” Lunches

REMANDER Subcommittee Preliminary Reports Due March 30th
   • Service Guidelines and Statement
   • Teaching Guidelines and Statement
   • Conducting Business Process (80% Chair’s Rule)

Next Meeting: March 30th, 2012
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Kucharski, Tom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Lopes, Anne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Mandery, Evan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Natarajan, Mangai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Pease, Allison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Perez, Lisandro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Petraco Jr., Nicholas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Pittman, John</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Raghavan, Chitra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Shenkin, Peter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Solis, Carmen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Sullivan, Harold</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Sullivan, Larry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Terry, Karen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Nemeth, Charles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Travis, Jeremy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Umeh, Davidson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Velazquez-Torres, Nancy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FACULTY PERSONNEL COMMITTEE
AGENDA
March 30th, 2012
Room 610 T, Haaren Hall
9:30AM-1:00PM

I. Fellowship Leaves

II. Review of Candidates Up for Action
   a. Candidate List
      i. Tenure
      ii. CCE
      iii. Promotion
      iv. Other Actions

III. Report on Pilot of Rigorous Peer Observation Model
    a. Anthropology, Art & Music, Foreign Languages, and Psychology

IV. Form C Question 17: Library Presentation on Quantifying and Qualifying Scholarly & Creative Work

V. Subcommittee Preliminary Reports & Recommendations
   a. Service Guidelines and Statement
   b. Teaching Guidelines and Statement
   c. Conducting Business Memo Revisions (80% Chairs Rule)

VI. Structure of FPC & Reconfiguring Reappointment Review Process and Schedule:
   a. How to Handle 1st, 2nd, and 3rd year reappointments differently/distribution of cases.

VII. New Faculty Hires (Tenure Reciprocity)
   a. Candidate List

Next Meeting: April 27th, 2012
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members of Committee</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Left at (time)</th>
<th>Returned (time)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Adams, Carlton Jama</td>
<td>here</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Baumrin, Seth</td>
<td>here</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Benton, Warren</td>
<td>here</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Bowers, Jane</td>
<td>here</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Brotherton, David</td>
<td>here</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Carbonell, Bettina</td>
<td>here</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Curtis, Ric</td>
<td>here</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Dapis, Silvia</td>
<td>here</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Domingo, Jannette</td>
<td>here</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Farrington, Lisa</td>
<td>here</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Green, Amy</td>
<td>here</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Haberfeld, Maki</td>
<td>here</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Hamilton, Jay</td>
<td>approved ab</td>
<td>Graded 10:35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Jacobs, Jonathan</td>
<td>approved ab</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Johnson Eanes, Berenicea</td>
<td>here</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Kavey, Allison</td>
<td>here</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of Committee</td>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Left at (time)</td>
<td>Returned (time)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kobilinsky, Larry</td>
<td>her</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kucharski, Tom</td>
<td></td>
<td>approved ab</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lopes, Anne</td>
<td>approved ab</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandery, Evan</td>
<td>approved ab</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natarajan, Mangai</td>
<td>here</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pease, Allison</td>
<td>her</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perez, Lisandro</td>
<td>her</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petraco Jr., Nicholas</td>
<td>her</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittman, John</td>
<td>her</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raghavan, Chitra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sick last min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shenkin, Peter</td>
<td>her</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solis, Carmen</td>
<td>her</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sullivan, Harold</td>
<td>her</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sullivan, Larry</td>
<td>approved ab</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry, Karen</td>
<td>here</td>
<td></td>
<td>approved ab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nemeth, Charles</td>
<td>here</td>
<td></td>
<td>approved ab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travis, Jeremy</td>
<td>her</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umeh, Davidson</td>
<td>here</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Velazquez-Torres, Nancy</td>
<td>here</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FACULTY PERSONNEL COMMITTEE
AGENDA
April 27th, 2012
Room 610 T, Haaren Hall
9:30AM-1:00PM

I. Fellowship Leaves

II. Review of Candidates up for Action: Material Submission and Evaluator Selections
   a. Tenure
   b. Promotion
   c. CCE

III. New Faculty Appointments
   a. Candidate List

IV. Report on Pilot of Rigorous Peer Observation Model (Continuation)
   a. Psychology

V. Subcommittee Preliminary Reports & Recommendations
   a. Service Guidelines and Statement (Continued)
   b. Teaching Guidelines and Statement
   c. Conducting Business Memo Revisions/80% Chairs Rule

VI. Structure of FPC & Reconfiguring Reappointment Review Process and Schedule
   a. How to Handle 1st, 2nd, and 3rd year reappointments differently/distribution of cases.

Next Meeting: May 4th, 2012 (Final Spring Meeting Unless Electronic Meetings Required)

Topics Include:
- Early Tenure Decisions:
  o How does the committee understand this action and the standards for awarding the status?
- Review of Subcommittee Preliminary Reports
  o Adoption for the Faculty Personnel Process Guidelines Fall 2012
- Announce the At Large and Alternate Members for Fall 2012 & Spring 2013
- Update on Online Evaluations- the future of Online technologies
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members of Committee</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Left at (time)</th>
<th>Returned (time)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Adams, Carlton Jama</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Baumrin, Seth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Benton, Warren</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Bowers, Jane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Bratherton, David</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Carbonell, Bettina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>approved absence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Curtis, Ric</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Dapia, Silvia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Domingo, Jannette</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>approved absence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Farrington, Lisa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Green, Amy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Haberfeld, Maki</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Hamilton, Jay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Jacobs, Jonathan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Johnson Eanes, Berenecea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Kavey, Allison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of Committee</td>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Left at (time)</td>
<td>Returned (time)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Kobilinsky, Larry</td>
<td>L. Kobilinsky</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Kucharski, Tom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Approved Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Lopes, Anne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Mandery, Evan</td>
<td>E. M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Natarajaa, Mangai</td>
<td>M. W.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Pease, Allison</td>
<td>R. P.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Perez, Lisandro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Petraco Jr., Nicholas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Pittman, John</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Raghavaa, Chitra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10:30 to Ready</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Shenkin, Peter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Solis, Carmen</td>
<td>C. S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Sullivan, Harold</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Sullivan, Larry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Terry, Karen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Nemeth, Charles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Approved Absen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Travis, Jeremy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unpresented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Umeh, Davidson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Velazquez-Torres, Nancy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16:30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FACULTY PERSONNEL COMMITTEE
REVISED AGENDA
May 4th, 2012
Room 610 T, Haaren Hall
9:30AM-10:00AM

10:05-1:00 PM (Special PAC Meeting)

I. Announcement of At Large and Alternate Members for Fall 2012 & Spring 2013

II. Subcommittee Preliminary Report & Recommendation
   a. Conducting Business Memo Revisions/80% Chairs Rule (Continuation)

III. Structure of FPC & Reconfiguring Reappointment Review Process and Schedule
   a. How to Handle 1st, 2nd, and 3rd year reappointments differently/distribution of cases.

   - Fall 12 Meeting Dates & Subcommittee assignments will be announced after set with President's Office in June

10:00AM - FPC Meeting Adjourns
(Alternate and At Large Members Excused by 10:00am)

10:05 AM-PAC Meeting to Discuss General Education Platform and Pathways
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members of Committee</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Left at (time)</th>
<th>Returned (time)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Adams, Carlton Jama</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Baumrin, Seth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Benton, Warren</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Bowers, Jane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Brotherton, David</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Carbonell, Bettina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Curtis, Ric</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Dapia, Silvia</td>
<td>kW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Domingo, Jannette</td>
<td>kW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Farrington, Lisa</td>
<td>kW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Green, Amy</td>
<td>kW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Haberfeld, Maki</td>
<td>kW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Hamilton, Jay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Jacobs, Jonathan</td>
<td>kW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Johnson Eanes, Berenecea</td>
<td>kW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Kavey, Allison</td>
<td>kW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of Committee</td>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Left at (time)</td>
<td>Returned (time)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Kobilinsky, Larry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Kucharski, Tom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Lopes, Anne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Mandery, Evan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Natarajan, Mangai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Pease, Allison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Perez, Lisandro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Petraco Jr., Nicholas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Pittman, John</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Raghavan, Chitra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Shenkin, Peter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Solis, Carmen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Sullivan, Harold</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Sullivan, Larry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Terry, Karen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Nemeth, Charles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Travis, Jeremy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Umeh, Davidson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Velazquez-Torres, Nancy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Committee on Graduate Studies

Report of attendance of committee members by date of meeting

September 8, 2011:
Dean Jannette Domingo, Deans Larry Sullivan and Wayne Edwards, Professors Rosemary Barberet, Ned Benton, Diana Falkenbach, William Heffernan, Richard Lovely, Chitra Raghavan, Marilyn Rubin, Robert Till, Margaret Wallace and James Wulach; Jeffrey Aikens, Student Representative

October 4, 2011:
Dean Jannette Domingo, Vice President Richard Saulnier, Dean Wayne Edwards, Professors Rosemary Barbaret, Warren Benton, Diana Falkenbach, William Heffernan, Richard Lovely, Marilyn Rubin, Robert Till and James Wulach; Jeffrey Aikens, Student Representative.

November 10, 2011:
Dean Jannette Domingo, Dean Larry Sullivan, Professors Rosemary Barberet, Diana Falkenbach, William Heffernan, Richard Lovely, Chitra Raghavan, Marilyn Rubin, Robert Till and James Wulach.

December 6, 2011:
Dean Jannette Domingo, Vice President Richard Saulnier, Professors Rosemary Barberet, Warren Benton, William Heffernan, Richard Lovely, Chitra Raghavan, Marilyn Rubin, Robert Till, and James Wulach; Jeffrey Aikens, Student Representative.

February 9, 2012:
Dean Jannette Domingo, Vice President Richard Saulnier, Deans Larry Sullivan and Wayne Edwards, Professors Rosemary Barberet, Warren Benton, Richard Lovely,
March 5, 2012:

Dean Jannette Domingo, Vice President Richard Saulnier, Deans Larry Sullivan and Wayne Edwards, Professors Rosemary Barberet, Warren Benton, William Heffernan, Richard Lovely, Marilyn Rubin, Gabrielle Salfati, Margaret Wallace, and James Wulach.

April 4, 2012:

Dean Jannette Domingo, Vice President Richard Saulnier, Dean Larry Sullivan, Professors Rosemary Barberet, Ned Benton, William Heffernan, Richard Lovely, Chitra Raghavan, Marilyn Rubin, Gabrielle Salfati, Margaret Wallace, and James Wulach and Jeffrey Aikens, Student Representative.

May 2, 2011:

Dean Jannette Domingo, Vice President Richard Saulnier, Deans Larry Sullivan and Wayne Edwards, Professors Rosemary Barberet, Ned Benton, William Heffernan, Richard Lovely, Marilyn Rubin, Gabrielle Salfati, Robert Till, Margaret Wallace, and James Wulach and Student Representative Jeffrey Aikens.
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Meeting of Committee on Graduate Studies

Thursday September 8, 2011

12:15-2:00 p.m.

Room 610T

AGENDA

1. Dean’s Announcements

2. Minutes of the meeting of May 6, 2011

3. New graduate faculty:
   Criminal Justice Program – Kevin Barnes Ceeney

4. New Course Proposal
   Criminal Justice Program – CRJ 7XX Investigation of Violent Crime

Lunch will be available
COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE STUDIES

Minutes of the Meeting

September 8, 2011

Present:  Dean Jannette Domingo, Deans Larry Sullivan and Wayne Edwards, Professors Rosemary Barberet, Warren Benton, Diana Falkenbach, William Heffernan, Richard Lovely, Chitra Raghavan, Marilyn Rubin, Robert Till, Margaret Wallace, and James Wulach; Jeffrey Aikens, Student Representative.

Not Present:  Vice President Richard Saulnier.

Also Present:  Carmen Solis, Faculty Associate to the Dean; Linda Mitchell, Graduate Career Advisor and Azimul Kabir, a student observer.

AGENDA ITEMS:

The meeting began at 12:30 p.m.

1. The Dean’s Announcements

   The committee members were given an update on the Graduate Orientation day which was held on August 26th. She advised that 300 students attended the event. The workshops were a success and were well attended. The Meet and Greet on the 6th floor also appeared to be a success and she thanked those faculty members who took the time to attend and meet the new graduate students.

   For the Spring 2012, course schedules should be submitted with final revisions by that week.
Registration for the Spring semester was scheduled for November 7th.

Winter and Summer schedules were due on September 19th. Winter registration was tentatively scheduled for November 7th.

Program Directors were encouraged to offer winter courses.

Committee members were reminded that October 27th was the Graduate Dean’s List ceremony.

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

There was some discussion concerning the new tuition increases. There had been concerns, especially for the MPA students who had received two increases because of the Differential Tuition. Although there was no decrease in the number of registered students for the Fall 2011 semester, there were still concerns about the FTEs for the semester and the coming spring.

Outcomes Assessments

The Associate Provost was eager to work with programs to garner information about Outcomes Assessments. The Dean was asked to convey to the Provost that the programs needed support for collating this information.

A motion was submitted that the graduate programs should receive the same level of support and assistance as the undergraduate programs to assess the services received by graduate students. The motion was unanimously approved.

Committee members also agreed that a representative from Alumni Affairs and Institutional Research should be invited to attend the CGS meeting sometime later in the Fall so that they could hear the needs of the committee.

The Dean advised that Middle States review was underway. The college was on an outcomes assessment watch from the findings of the last assessment five years ago. She suggested that the CGS should develop a template for self-studies for the graduate programs. Self-studies should be conducted every five years.

The Executive Committee of the College Council wanted the CGS to examine its structure and to evaluate its functions in terms of its membership.

Report on Approvals for 2010-2011

A list of courses, certificate programs and new programs approved by the governance bodies at the college and then at the Chancellor’s Report was circulated to the committee members. This list was provided for informational
purposes and to serve as a guide to ensure that current information was included in the graduate bulletin.

2. MINUTES OF THE MEETING
   The minutes of the meeting for May 2, 2011 were approved with two abstentions and the following correction: the words “or thesis” be included in the second line of the third page. The sentence will read as follows: “This applies to those students who successfully complete the Applied Digital Forensic Science Certification Exam or thesis.”

3. New Courses
   After some discussion, the committee members approved the following course for submission to the College Council:
   a. Criminal Justice:
      CRJ 7XX Investigation of Violent Crime

      The members suggested that changes should be made on Page 3 of the course proposal that would be ensure that the Course Learning Objectives were similarly expressed in the course syllabus. It was also agreed that the formatting of the information relating to text books should be corrected using the APA format.

4. New Graduate Faculty
   The committee members unanimously agreed that Kevin Barnes Ceeney, Criminal Justice Program, should be submitted for the approval of the Provost. Professor Ceeney is recommended as an adjunct lecturer.

There was no further business; the meeting was adjourned at 1:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Janice Carrington, Administrative Manager
Office of Graduate and Professional Studies
Document 1

Meeting of Committee on Graduate Studies

Thursday October 4, 2011
12:15-2:00 p.m.
Room 610T

AGENDA

1. Dean’s Announcements

2. Minutes of the meeting of September 8, 2011

3. Discussion of Middle States Report: Associate Provost Yanos, Virginia Moreno and Ric Anzaldua

4. Other business

Lunch will be available
Present:  Dean Jannette Domingo, Vice President Richard Saulnier, Dean Wayne Edwards, Professors Rosemary Barberet, Warren Benton, Diana Falkenbach, William Heffeman, Richard Lovely, Marilyn Rubin, Robert Till, and James Wulach; Jeffrey Aikens, Student Representative.

Not Present: Deans Larry Sullivan, Professors Chitra Raghavan and Thomas Kubic.

Also Present: Carmen Solis, Faculty Associate to the Dean; Linda Mitchell, Graduate Career Advisor; Associate Provost Llana, Virginia Moreno, Director of Outcomes Assessment and Ric Anzaldua, Director, Institutional Research.

AGENDA ITEMS:

The meeting began at 12:30 p.m.

1. The Dean’s Announcements

1. Committee members were reminded that was the Graduate Dean’s List ceremony would be on October 27th, 2011.
2. The MPA program will offer one course during the winter semester. This course will be offered by an English professor. The outcomes will be assessed and reported.
3. The Criminal Justice program will also run one winter session course which was offered winter. It was suggested that an assessment of learning outcomes for this three week course should also be conducted. What were the learning outcomes for a course of this length?
2. MINUTES OF THE MEETING

The minutes of the meeting for September 8, 2011 were approved with one abstention.

Middle States

The Dean introduced Associate Provost James Llana and new Institutional Director, Ric Anzaldua and welcomed Virginia Moreno, the Director of Outcome Assessment. The committee was advised that Middle States representatives would be at John Jay College in the Spring of 2013. The first draft report will include a description of this semester’s actions with respect to student learning assessment.

Associate Provost LLana identified the following components in which the assessment by each program would be prepared:

1. Establish learning goals or outcomes for each program. There should be four to six goals.
2. Develop a curriculum map, specific to the program with course learning goals that should be linked to the program goals.
3. Select the goals that should be assessed. Choose either the test or rubric with a scoring schematic to evaluate the learning goals with four levels of performance.
4. Sample a large program or address the entire group if it is a small program
5. Program director should work closely with the adjunct to ensure that the assessment goals are being met.
6. Discussion of the result for improvements.

Virginia Moreno explained that the challenge would be to come up with assessments that were linked directly to the course. The workload would be the same for undergraduate and graduate faculty.

Every semester an assessment must be done. Program effectiveness must be accomplished at the end of each semester, the faculty must have some instrument to assess student learning. Each faculty member should be aware of the goals of the program and the assessment of those goals. There should also be a measurement to assess whether the students are meeting those goals.

The role of each course and the way in which each course fulfills the mission of the program should be clear. The Associate Provost promised to forward a model for preparation of the report to each program director.

Student information can be used for internal reports without obtaining permission from the students.
Middle States can examine leaning outcome assessments in two ways. For example, if a report includes an assessment of a course that leads to the Capstone then the rubric used for the capstone will be the final assessment for the course learning goals. If the program focuses on one goal, this report can be done in the time frame set out for the college.

Provost Llana and his team promised that they would be available for all the program directors.

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

Respectfully submitted,
Janice Carrington, Administrative Manager
COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE STUDIES
November 10, 2011
12:15 pm to 2:00 pm
Room 630

AGENDA (amended, V.2)

1. Dean’s Announcements

2. Proposal for College-wide Academic Integrity Committee
   Dean Lopes & Senate President Kaplowitz presenting on behalf of Undergraduate
   Curriculum & Standards Committee

3. Proposed New Faculty Members
   Robert D. Alexander, Digital Forensics & Cybersecurity
   Tom Parker, IC&J

4. Proposed Course Revision
   CRJ 753 Investigating Cybercrime

5. Proposed New Courses
   IC&J Terrorism, Counterterrorism & Human Rights (experimental)
   IC&J Global Economy & Corruption

6. Self Study Template

7. MPA Online Registration

8. New Business
COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE STUDIES
Minutes of the Meeting
November 10, 2011

Present: Dean Jannette Domingo, Dean Larry Sullivan, Professors Rosemary Barberet, Diana Falkenbach, William Heffernan, Richard Lovely, Chitra Raghavan, James Wulach, Marilyn Rubin

Not Present: Vice President Richard Saulnier, Dean Wayne Edwards, Professors Robert Till, Warren Benton, Thomas Kubic, and Student Representatives Jeffrey Aikens and John Clarke

Also Present: Carmen Solis, Faculty Associate to the Dean; Linda Mitchell, Graduate Career Advisor; Dean Anne Lopes, Undergraduate Studies; Prof. Karen Kaplowitz, Faculty Senate President; Paul Wyatt, Director of Student Relations

AGENDA ITEMS:

The meeting began at 12:30 p.m.

1. Dean’s Announcements
   a. Guests Dean Anne Lopes, Prof. Karen Kaplowitz and Mr. Paul Wyatt were welcomed.
   b. Remaining announcements deferred to Dean Lopes’ and Prof. Kaplowitz’ presentation of the Integrity Policy and Committee proposal
2. Proposal for College-wide Academic Integrity Committee
   (Presented by Dean Lopes & Senate President Kaplowitz on behalf of
   Undergraduate Curriculum & Standards Committee (UCASC))
   a. Prof. Kaplowitz described the current framework for academic student
discipline including the College’s Student Faculty Disciplinary Committee, the
   Academic Integrity Officer, and the Academic Integrity Committee.
   b. Under the new CUNY policy
      • Each college may create an Academic Integrity Committee.
      • The Academic Integrity Committee would be a fact finding committee.
      • Faculty members must report allegations of cheating to the designated
        Integrity Officer.
      • The Academic Integrity Officer must keep records of the process.
   c. Prof Kaplowitz indicated the following key points of the proposal to create a
      College-wide Academic Integrity Committee:
      • Academic Integrity Committee to be comprised of tenured faculty only
      • Integrity Officer to be an administrator located in the Provost’s Office
      • Response to complaints to be required within 35 days

After some discussion, the committee voted unanimously in favor of the proposal with the amendment that one of the faculty members of the Committee must also be a member of a graduate program faculty.

3. Dean’s Announcements continued
   a. Going forward, CGS should expect that more proposals will be brought to CGS
      from UCASC for consideration as joint proposals to College Council. Another
      proposal from UCASC will be brought to the December CGS meeting.
   b. Online advisement will replace Advisement Days for students admitted for
      Spring 2012. Advisement videos will be produced for each program and
      posted on the College website.
   c. Proposals are being solicited from graduate faculty by the Dean for funded
      faculty led recruitment initiatives for Fall 2012. The deadline for proposal
      submission is December 2nd.

4. Proposed New Faculty Members
   a. Robert D. Alexander, Digital Forensics & Cybersecurity was unanimously
      approved.
   b. Tom Parker, IC&J was unanimously approved.
5. Proposed Course Revision CRJ 753 Investigating Cybercrime
   The committee voted unanimously to approve the following revisions to CRJ 753.
   a. Removal of pre-requisites.
   b. Replace “Forensic Computing” with “Digital Forensics” in the course description.

6. Proposed New Courses
   a. IC&J Terrorism, Counterterrorism & Human Rights (experimental)
      After some discussion, the committee voted unanimously to approve the IC&J Terrorism, Counterterrorism & Human Rights experimental course.
   b. IC&J Global Economy & Corruption
      After some discussion, the committee voted unanimously to approve the proposed new course IC&J Global Economy & Corruption with the title amended to “Corruption in the Global Economy.”

7. Self Study Template
   a. The template is based on the template for self study of undergraduate majors developed in 2009.
   b. Prof. Rubin raised concerns about the overlap between the self study template and the outcomes assessment guidelines provided by Associate Provost Llana. She volunteered to review both documents for the next meeting with a view toward addressing the redundancy.
   c. Further discussion of the self study template was postponed to the next CGS meeting.

8. MPA Online Registration
   Discussion of the Online Registration Proposal was tabled due to the absence of Prof. Benton.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda Mitchell, Graduate Career Advisor
1. Dean’s Announcements

2. (a) Minutes of the meeting for October 4, 2011
   (b) Minutes of the meeting for November 10, 2011

3. New GRE scoring system

4. Proposed Policy on Final Grades (From UCASC)

5. Proposed Course Revision: Forensic Mental Health Counseling Program
   A change in the course description for the course PSY 748 Empirical Crime Scene Analysis

6. Appeals Process revision

7. MPA Online Registration

8. Differential Tuition update

9. New Business

Lunch will be available
COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE STUDIES

Minutes of the Meeting

December 6, 2011

Present: Dean Jannette Domingo, Vice President Richard Saulnier, Professors Rosemary Barberet, Warren Benton, William Heffernan, Richard Lovely, Chitra Raghavan, Marilyn Rubin, Robert Till, and James Wulach; Jeffrey Aikens, Student Representative.

Not Present: Deans Larry Sullivan and Wayne Edwards, Professors Diana Falkenbach and Thomas Kubic; Student Representative John Clarke.

Also Present: Linda Mitchell, Graduate Career Advisor; Professor Karen Kaplowitz, Faculty Senate President and Bill Devine, Director of Graduate Admissions.

AGENDA ITEMS:

The meeting began at 12:30 p.m.

1. The Dean’s Announcements

   a. Committee members were reminded that the Patrick V. Murphy Lecture which was the responsibility of the Office of Graduate Studies for 2011 was scheduled for Thursday, December 8, 2011. The speaker was Superintendent Victor Olisa of the Metropolitan Police Service of London. Program Directors were asked to encourage their faculty to attend.
b. The third Lecture in the Graduate Career Symposium Series: Connecting Students to the Community of Practice was scheduled to take place on the same day, Thursday, December 8\textsuperscript{th} at 1:30 in the Faculty Dining Room. The speaker for this event was Ms. Erin Tarica, CORO New York Leadership Center.

c. Program Directors were asked to remind graduate faculty that final grades for the Fall semester should be submitted to the Registrar’s by December 28\textsuperscript{th}. It was anticipated that Program Directors would receive transcripts for the probation/dismissal review during the week of January 2\textsuperscript{nd}.

d. Winter sessions were scheduled to begin on January 3\textsuperscript{rd} and end on January 24\textsuperscript{th}. Five winter courses were being offered for the first time. Program Directors were advised that at least 12 students must register for a course to remain on the schedule.

e. Spring 2012 Overtally days have been set for January 11\textsuperscript{th} and 12\textsuperscript{th}. Students have been directed to send their requests to the graduate studies email address. Program Directors will be advised if a high number of requests are received.

2. MINUTES OF THE MEETING

a. The minutes of the meeting for October 4, 2011 were approved unanimously.

b. The minutes for the meeting held on November 10, 2011 were approved with the following corrections:

Page 2: 2(b) Faculty members must report allegations of cheating to the designated Integrity Officer.

Changed to:

\textit{Faculty members must report allegations of cheating to the designated Integrity Officer only in cases where the final grade is changed because of academic dishonesty.}

Page 2:2(c) The Academic Integrity Committee to be comprised of tenured faculty only.

Changed to:

\textit{The Academic Integrity Committee to be comprised of at least one member of the graduate faculty.}

There were two abstentions.
3. The New GRE Scoring System

The Office of Graduate Admissions had received many calls from prospective students about the new scoring for the GREs. William Devine, the Director of Graduate Admissions. He indicated that the new GRE scoring table had been sent to all the program directors so they could restate the requirement for their individual programs. He asked Program Directors to forward this information to his office as quickly as possible – hopefully before December 9, 2011.

4. Proposed Policy on Final Grades (From UCASC)

Professor Kaplowitz presented a proposal for a Policy on Final Grades that was under consideration by the UCASC. The proposed policy would allow a final grade change only to correct a computational error. Professor Kaplowitz stated that the policy had been considered previously by College Council but was withdrawn because the Faculty Senate had some concerns. It was agreed that the ambiguous language should be clarified and the proposal brought back to the next College Council agenda. Professor Kaplowitz asserted that some students were very unhappy when they realized that they might have had the option to do extra work to have a grade changed, but either did not know about this arrangement or were denied the privilege.

A change of undergraduate grade would have to be approved by the department chair and then the Dean of Undergraduate Studies. For a graduate grade change, the change would be approved by the graduate program director and the Graduate Dean.

Members of the committee expressed concern about the term computational. At the graduate level, all grades are not done by computation. There was also concern about the use of an incomplete grade and the suggestion that there should be a statement about the incomplete grade indicating that it should not be used to allow students to do extra work to receive a higher grade. Members observed that this new policy limits professors’ discretion and may lead to more grade appeals.

It was agreed that the minutes should reflect the following: “The sense of the CGS was that the term ‘computational’ was not limited to purely arithmetic errors but also was intended to embrace other mechanical, clerical or transmission errors in conferring the grade.” It was also agreed that the Dean should convey this understanding to the College Council.
5. Approval of a course revision proposal: PSY 748 Forensic Mental Health Counseling Program

It was agreed that the prerequisites should be changed and that the following revisions (in italics) should be submitted to College Council for the course PSY 748: Empirical Crime Scene Analysis:

Current Course Description

This advanced level course introduces students to empirical methods of crime scene analysis and profiling research, using the FBI crime files held at John Jay. Students will learn how to develop the theoretical knowledge of profiling, learned in PSY 821 into applied research. The course will take them through the process of completing a publication-level research project from start to finish. This is a time-intensive course, which will consist of some lectures, student-led group research and regular meetings to discuss progress.

Prerequisites: PSY 715, PSY 737 and PSY 821

Proposed Course Description

This advanced level course introduces students to empirical methods of crime scene analysis and profiling research, using the FBI crime files held at John Jay. Students will learn how to develop the theoretical knowledge of profiling, learned in PSY 746 into applied research. The course will take them through the process of completing a publication-level research project from start to finish. This is a time-intensive course, which will consist of some lectures, student-led group research and regular meetings to discuss progress. Students are expected to have a working knowledge of SPSS prior to course enrollment.

Prerequisite: PSY 746

6. Revisions in the Appeal Process

A resolution to change the information contained in the graduate bulletin with respect to the grade appeal application was submitted to the committee. After some discussion the committee agreed unanimously to the proposed resolution. The following change in the first line of the resolution was made:
In the event that the faculty member reaffirms the final grade, after consultation with the faculty member, students who question the grade should consult their program director.

7. A proposal for the registration of the MPA online program

The proposal for the registration of the MPA online program, which required state approval was circulated and tabled at the November 9th meeting. Members discussed the proposal at length. The Program Director explained that the proposal before the committee formalized the previous submission for an MPA-IG online program. The requirements for NYSED and Middle States are different. Middle states has stated that if a student could take more than 50% of the courses online then the program is an online program. The program has been registered with Middle States and now requires registration with the State.

After a lengthy discussion, the committee agreed to submit the proposal for the consideration of the college council.

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

Respectfully submitted,
Janice Carrington, Administrative Manager
1. Dean’s Announcements

2. Minutes of the meeting for December 6, 2012

3. Revision to the format for a new syllabus

4. Proposal for an experimental course in the ICJ program:
   ICJ 8XX Human Trafficking

5. Self-Study Template with accompanying documents

6. An application for the MPA Advanced Certificate in Public Management

7. New Business

Lunch will be available
COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE STUDIES

Minutes of the Meeting

February 9, 2012

Present: Dean Jannette Domingo, Vice President Richard Saulnier, Deans Larry Sullivan and Wayne Edwards, Professors Rosemary Barberet, Warren Benton, Richard Lovely, Gabrielle Salfati and James Wulach; Jeffrey Aikens, Student Representative.

Not Present: Professors Chitra Raghavan, William Heffernan, Marilyn Rubin and Robert Till; Student Representative John Clarke.

Also Present: Linda Mitchell, Graduate Career Advisor.

AGENDA ITEMS:

The meeting began at 12:30 p.m.

1. The Dean’s Announcements

   a. The Dean welcomed Professor Gabrielle Salfati, Acting program director for the Forensic Psychology program.
   b. The committee members were reminded that Graduate Open House was scheduled to take place on March 12th, 2012.
   c. The Dean informed the members that the Graduate Internship Fair would be held on March 22nd, 2012.
d. Program Directors were reminded that they should assist the committee members who were working on the Middle States report as much as possible. Meetings would be arranged with Virginia Moreno to discuss outcomes assessments.

e. She reported that faculty-led recruitment initiatives for the Protection Management, International Crime and Justice, Forensic Psychology and Forensic Mental Health Counseling programs were proceeding. Reports on the initiatives will be received at the end of the semester.

f. The Committee’s grade appeal process resolution which had been forwarded to college council had been tabled by the Executive Committee of the College Council in light of a decision to ask the Undergraduate and Graduate Deans to review the bulletins to ensure that all policies are in keeping with the new direction of the college. The Dean also explained that the ECCC was proposing to the College Council an agenda item which would require the Graduate and Undergraduate Deans to review the respective bulletins and identify and address those policies that were not homogeneous. A lengthy discussion followed.

The main points of the discussion were as follows:

- In initiating and bringing these proposals to the floor, the ECCC was exceeding its agenda management function as defined by the College Charter.
- The assumption should not be that Graduate and Undergraduate Studies are alike, but rather that they are different unless, after consultation and in individual cases, a uniform policy is deemed to be appropriate.
- Addressing the multitude of policies reflected in the Bulletins by June 1 (i.e., in 3 months) was unreasonable.

The discussion resulted in 2 resolutions:

1. The CGS charged the Dean to ask the College’s Legal Counsel for an opinion as to the authority of the Executive Committee to initiate agenda items that were not previously authorized by the College Council.

2. The CGS charged the Dean to convey to College Council that the CGS sees no principled reason for CGS to be yoked to the Undergraduate Curriculum and Standards Committee with respect to the formation of policy

2. MINUTES OF THE MEETING

The minutes of the meeting for December 8, 2011 were approved unanimously with the following amendment.
On Page 3: A proposal for the registration of the MPA online program, the first paragraph was stricken.

3. Revision of the format for a new syllabus

The committee agreed to table consideration of this revision pending the outcome of the discussion of the proposal to mandate that all policies from the Undergraduate and graduate Committees should be the same.

4. Proposal for an experimental course in the ICJ program:

After some discussion the committee agreed unanimously that the experimental course ICJ 8XX: Human Trafficking should be approved.

5. Self-Study Template with accompanying documents

The committee agreed unanimously that the Self-Study template would be adopted for use by the graduate programs for their reports to the Middle States committee.

6. An application for the MPA Advanced Certificate in Public Management

After some discussion, the proposal was withdrawn.

There was no further business; the meeting was adjourned at 1:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Janice Carrington, Administrative Director
1. Dean’s Announcements

2. Minutes of the meeting for February 9, 2012

3. New graduate faculty member in the ICJ program:
   
   Alexis Ann Aronowitz

4. Review of Advisement and Orientation days

5. Revisions for the MPA programs

6. A resolution to expand the membership of the Committee on Graduate Studies

7. New Business

Lunch will be available
Committee on Graduate Studies
Minutes of the Meeting
March 5, 2012

Present: Dean Jannette Domingo, Vice President Richard Saulnier, Deans Larry Sullivan and Wayne Edwards, Professors Rosemary Barberet, Warren Benton, William Heffernan, Richard Lovely, Marilyn Rubin, Gabrielle Salfati, Margaret Wallace and James Wulach

Not Present: Professors Chitra Raghavan and Robert Till; Student Representatives Jeffrey Aikens and John Clarke.

Also Present: Linda Mitchell, Graduate Career Advisor and 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 reminded the committee that Summer and Fall 2012 schedules were due that day. The schedules should be submitted via CSS.
   b. Graduate Open House was scheduled for Monday, March 12, 2012.
   c. The Dean had been charged by the committee to indicate their opposition to the policy to make the undergraduate and graduate policies congruent. She advised that the
Executive Committee had withdrawn the motion from the college council agenda. However, since it anticipated that this idea was not going away it would be wise for the CGS to develop its own plan.

d. The Dean also reported that the opinion from the Legal Counsel about the role of the Executive Committee was that it was in their capacity as a committee of college council to submit agenda items for consideration.

e. The Director of Graduate Admissions, Bill Devine will retire as of May 30, 2012.

Members were asked to express their thoughts on a replacement at a later meeting.

2. Minutes of the Meeting

The minutes of the meeting for February 9, 2012 were approved unanimously with the following amendment.

On Page 2: Instead of “The main points of the discussion were as follows“ it was agreed that the heading “Discussion of the Announcements” should be inserted.

On Page 2: Instead of “The Discussion resulted in 2 resolutions” the heading should read “Resolutions resulting from the Announcements.”

3. Review of Advisement and Orientation Days

Committee members expressed the view that the larger college orientation was not meeting the needs of the programs. It was felt that a vital piece was missing with the absence of advisement by the program directors especially for the Spring Graduate Orientation day. For the next Spring Orientation Day, Dr. Solis informed the committee that Vice President Eanes had agreed to build advisement sessions into the program.

4. Approval of a graduate faculty – ICJ program

The committee agreed to forward for the approval of the Provost the appointment of Professor Alexis Ann Aronowitz, to teach in the ICJ program for Summer, 2012.

5. Revisions for the MPA Programs

After some discussion the committee agreed that the revisions for the MPA: IO and MPA: PPA programs, with amendments, should be forwarded to College Council.
6. A Resolution to expand the membership of the CGS

There was a lengthy discussion on the question of expanding the membership of the committee. The matter was deferred for discussion at a later meeting. Members were of the opinion that the committee could function within its existing parameters to accomplish to the work of the committee.

There was no further business; the meeting was adjourned at 1:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Janice Carrington, Administrative Director
1. Dean’s Announcements

2. Minutes of the March 5, 2012 meeting

3. Acting Registrar Cheuk Lee: Fall/Summer scheduling

4. 2010-2011 Annual Evaluation of the National Online MPA Inspector General program

5. Online Course Enrollment Management Proposal

6. New graduate faculty – CRJ Program

   Nicole Hanson

7. New graduate faculty – PMT Program

   Charles Nemeth

8. New Business

   Lunch will be available
COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE STUDIES

Minutes of the Meeting

April 4, 2012

Present:  Dean Jannette Domingo, Deans Larry Sullivan and Professors Rosemary Barberet, Warren Benton, William Heffernan, Richard Lovely, Chitra Raghavan, Marilyn Rubin, Gabrielle Salfati, Margaret Wallace and James Wulach; Student Representative Jeffrey Aikens.

Not Present: Vice President Richard Saulnier, Dean Wayne Edwards, Professor Robert Till and Student Representative John Clarke.

Also Present: Cheuk Lee, Interim Registrar, Linda Mitchell, Graduate Career Advisor and 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 welcomed Cheuk Lee, the interim Registrar, who attended the meeting to speak about issues relating to the Registrar’s office. She reminded the committee that Spring break was scheduled for April 6th to 15th.
   b. Committee members were reminded that the last day to withdraw from a class without academic penalty was April 19th.
   c. The Dean announced that the Office of Graduate Studies had partnered with the Urban Male Initiative and the Asian Women’s Center to host a forum on Human Trafficking. This event was scheduled for April 24th at 6:00 p.m. in the new building. Flyers were distributed.
   d. The Dean informed members that data updates for their annual reports should be available after the Spring Break from Institutional Research.
e. The Dean also reported that the proposal to make all current policies congruent in the graduate and undergraduate bulletins had been withdrawn from the agenda of college council.

2. Minutes of the Meeting

The minutes of the meeting for March 5, 2012 were approved unanimously.

3. Cheuk Lee – Interim Registrar

Mr. Lee, the interim registrar, informed the committee that a change of grade can be completed online. The Registrar’s office will, after auditing the student’s file complete the process of changing the grade. He also distributed a list of the various responsibilities held by members of his staff. This should assist the program directors and the office of graduate studies to reach out to the person specifically responsible to resolve problems as they arise.

The committee members thanked Mr. Lee for his continued support of the programs.

4. The 2010-2011 Annual Evaluation of the National Online MPA Inspector General Program

The Committee agreed to submit the 2010-2011 annual evaluation of the National online MPA Inspector General program to the College Council for their information.

5. The Online Course Enrollment Management Proposal

The Committee accepted the proposal for the Management of Online Course Enrollment for all courses offered in the graduate programs. Members were informed that all new applications for NYSED approval of distance education delivery of a program would require a section of the application specific to that program.

6. New Graduate Faculty

The Committee agreed to forward for the approval of the Provost the appointment of the following faculty:

a. Charles Nemeth – Protection Management Program
b. Nicole Hanson, adjunct faculty - Criminal Justice Program

There was no further business; the meeting was adjourned at 1:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Janice Carrington, Administrative Director
1. Dean’s Announcements
2. Minutes of the April 4, 2012 meeting
3. Two proposals to change information in the graduate bulletin for the CRJ Program
   - A change in the specializations for the program
   - A change in the requirements for the Thesis Option for the program
4. Proposals for the Digital Forensics and CyberSecurity Program
   - A new course: FCM 7XX Digital Forensics and Cybersecurity Professional Seminar
   - Course Revisions for FCM 740 and FCM 745
5. Proposals for two new courses in the International Crime & Justice Program
   - ICJ 7XX International Perspectives on Women in Criminal Justice
   - ICJ 8XX The United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues: International Rights and Beyond
6. Proposals for four new courses in the Protection Management Program
   - SEC 7XX Legal, Regulatory and Administrative Issues in Private Sector Justice
   - SEC 7XX Private Security: Function and Role in Homeland Defense
   - SEC 7XX Privatization: Models and Application for Private Justice
   - SEC 7XX Risk, Threat and Critical Infrastructure
7. An application to offer the MPA: Public Policy & Administration program as a fully online distance education program
8. A new graduate faculty for the ICJ program: Markus González Beilfuss

Lunch will be available
Present: Dean Jannette Domingo, Vice President Richard Saulnier, Deans Larry Sullivan and Wayne Edwards and Professors Rosemary Barberet, Warren Benton, William Heffernan, Richard Lovely, Marilyn Rubin, Gabrielle Salfati, Robert Till, Margaret Wallace and James Wulach; Student Representative Jeffrey Aikens.

Not Present: Professor Chitra Raghavan and Student Representative John Clarke.

Also Present: Linda Mitchell, Graduate Career Advisor, Carmen Solis, Faculty Associate to the Dean and Professor Chuck Nemeth, Chair, Department of Security, Fire and Emergency Management.

AGENDA ITEMS:

The meeting began at 12:30 p.m.

1. The Dean’s Announcements
   
   a. The Dean circulated information for the Graduation Ceremonies scheduled for Thursday, May 31st at the Javits Center.
   
   b. The Dean reported on the Provost’s meetings with faculty from I C & J and CRJ in which the emphasis was on connections that programs should have with their communities of practice in order to improve enrollment outcomes.
   
   c. Program Directors were reminded that their self evaluations were due May 1st and evaluation conferences would be set up with the Provost. Program Directors were asked to make sure that evaluations that had not yet been submitted were completed and sent to the Dean.
d. In order to give all committee members the opportunity to be actively engaged in reviewing agenda items and allow sufficient for feedback to the proposers before the meeting next semester, committee members will be asked to submit their agenda items earlier.

e. The Dean acknowledged the presence of Professor Chuck Nemeth, the Chair of the Security, Fire and Emergency Management Department.

2. Minutes of the Meeting

The minutes of the meeting for April 4, 2012 were approved unanimously.

Note to the Committee

Chief Librarian Larry Sullivan announced that he would be on sabbatical in Fall 2012 and in the interim Acting Chief Librarian Bonnie Nelson will represent the Library at the CGS.

3. Changes in the Specializations for the CRJ program

The committee agreed unanimously to the curriculum changes proposed to the CRJ program for the next academic year.

4. A Proposal to change the requirements for the Thesis Option in the CRJ Program

The committee agreed that changes should be made to the proposal for the requirements of the Thesis option in the CRJ program. The proposal was withdrawn pending further discussion by the Criminal Justice faculty.

5. Proposals for the Digital Forensics and Cybersecurity Program

The Committee accepted the proposal for the course revisions for FCM 740 and FCM 745. However, the proposal for the new course FCM 7XX Digital Forensics and Cybersecurity Professional Seminar was tabled for consideration at a later meeting.

6. Proposals for two new courses in the International Crime and Justice Program

The Committee agreed to forward to the College Council the following course:

   a. ICJ 7XX International Perspectives on Women in Criminal Justice
   b. ICJ 8XX The United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues: International Rights and Beyond was approved as an experimental course for the Summer and Fall 2012 sessions.

7. Proposals for four new courses in the Protection Management Program

The committee approved the following four courses:
8. New Graduate Faculty

The Committee agreed to submit Professor Markus Gonzalez Beilfuss as a new graduate faculty member in the International Crime and Justice Program for the period of one year.

There was no further business. The meeting was adjourned at 1:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Janice Carrington, Administrative Director
Honors, Prizes, and Awards Committee Meeting Minutes

Date: February 27, 2012

Meeting was called to order by Michael Scaduto at 12:00PM

Present:

Navila Abbas – Student Representative
Marta Bladek, Library
Effie Cochran, English
Shuki Cohen, Psychology
Berenecea Johnson-Eanes, Vice President for Student Affairs
John Leebens, Student Life
Jerrell Robinson, Student Life
Michael Scaduto, Scholarship Coordinator

Overview

• Michael Scaduto welcomed the group and provided a list of the Graduation Awards and an overview of the ranking procedure
• A description of each graduation award was provided for reference
• The deadline for submission is March 19, 2012
• As agreed last year, the Honors, Prizes, and Awards Committee will select the recipient of the Faculty Service to Students Award
• The next meeting is scheduled for March 26, 2012

Meeting was adjourned at 1:10 PM by Vice President Eanes.

Respectfully submitted:
Honors, Prizes, and Awards Committee Meeting Minutes

Date: March 27, 2012

Meeting was called to order by Michael Scaduto at 12:00PM

Present:

Navila Abbas – Student Representative
Marta Bladek, Library
Effie Cochran, English
Shuki Cohen, Psychology
Wayne Edwards, Dean of Students
Michael Scaduto, Scholarship Coordinator

Overview

Below you will find the decisions of the Honors, Prizes, and Awards Committee from yesterday's meeting:

Leonard E. Reisman Medal – Marybeth Apriceno

Scholarship & Service Award – Vipul Rana

Howard Mann Humanitarian Award – Krystle Lynn Caraballo

Distinguished Service Awards –
(1) Alandra Mitchell
    (2) Abigail Padilla
    (3) Ronald Rafailov
    (4) Stephanie M. Rojas
    (5) Nagela Tetteh

Graduate Student Service Award – Melia Polynice

There were no applications for the new graduate awards.

In addition, the Committee selected Professor Geert Dhondt (Economics) as the recipient of the "Faculty Service to Students Award." Academic Affairs (specifically Kevin Nesbitt) should be informed of this decision.
Meeting was adjourned at 1:10 PM by Dean Edwards.

Respectfully submitted:
Chair: Dean Edwards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Available/Present</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dan Palumbo (ext. 8397)</td>
<td>........................</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerrell Robinson (ext. 8717)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorraine Moller (ext. 8320)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick Richardson (ext. 8689)</td>
<td>........................</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acevedo, Amanda (Phone 631-398-3122) Email: <a href="mailto:amanda.acevedo@jjay.cuny.edu">amanda.acevedo@jjay.cuny.edu</a></td>
<td>........................</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin, Kristin (Phone 718-622-8741) Email: <a href="mailto:kristin.benjamin@jjay.cuny.edu">kristin.benjamin@jjay.cuny.edu</a></td>
<td>........................</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabriel, Rue-Ann (Phone 718-629-5643) Email: <a href="mailto:rue-ann.gabriel@jjay.cuny.edu">rue-ann.gabriel@jjay.cuny.edu</a></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hutson, Sadari (Phone 212-316-6133) Email: <a href="mailto:sahdari.hutson@jjay.cuny.edu">sahdari.hutson@jjay.cuny.edu</a></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irigoyen, Cesar (Phone 646-463-5208) Email: <a href="mailto:cesar.irigoyen@jjay.cuny.edu">cesar.irigoyen@jjay.cuny.edu</a></td>
<td>........................</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maldonado, Steve (Phone 718-825-7370) Email: <a href="mailto:steve.maldonado@jjay.cuny.edu">steve.maldonado@jjay.cuny.edu</a></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Committee on Student Interests
Tuesday, October 18, 2011
At 1:40 PM in Room 3143N

AGENDA

1. Introduction

2. Committee Charge

3. Community Hours Events

4. Agenda Items

5. New Business
   a. Next Meeting Date: **November 15, 2011 at 1:40 PM.**
Committee on Student Interest (COSI)

Tuesday, October 18th, 2011
John Jay College of Criminal Justice
Room 3143N
Time Start: 1:45pm         Time end: 2:30 pm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendance Log:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wayne Edwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerrell Robinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cesar Irigoyen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Maldonado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorraine Moller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda Acevedo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sadari Hutson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick Richardson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Present: Dan Palumbo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristin Benjamin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introductions-Committee Charge</td>
<td>To look at issues of concern and see how we can assist with the issues i.e. last year – Community Hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Charge</td>
<td>Invite appropriate stake holders to meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Format of meeting</td>
<td>Past difficulties getting agenda items- If committee members or fellow students have concerns, please bring to the table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agenda items</td>
<td>Created list with Whitney Brown Student Government President of “Hot Topics” New building move New food vendor Charter changes Student Activity Fee referendum New curriculum changes New logo Peace officers Student Life Guide Capacity issues in new building Space reservations in new building Community Hour events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessing information –i.e. reports concerning new vendor</td>
<td>Invite stakeholders, like VP Pignatello, to answer questions related to the new vendor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Gym</td>
<td>Often times when the gym has been reserved for students they are bumped – By athletics or by bigger events-Invite Dan Palumbo and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recorded by: Jennifer Escobosa
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Radio station in the new building?</th>
<th>Facilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ways to use Community Hour</td>
<td>Discuss with Paul Brenner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting COSI</td>
<td>Social, intellectual, culture and creative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top List of “Hot topics” to discuss in future meetings</td>
<td>How do we advertise?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do we need to have more meetings?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Community Hour Events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Vendor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Peace Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Curriculum Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Invite representative to come and answer questions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Committee on Student Interest

**Meeting Date:** Jan 29, 2011  
**Time:**

Chair: Dean Edwards

#### Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Available/Present</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dan Palumbo (ext. 8397)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerrell Robinson (ext. 8717)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorraine Moller (ext. 8320)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick Richardson (ext.8689)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Students

- **Acevedo, Amanda** (Phone 631-398-3122)  
  Email: amanda.acevedo@jjay.cuny.edu  
  - [ ] Yes  
  - [x] No

- **Alamin, Alaa** (Phone 718-404-2343)  
  Email: alaa.alamin@jjay.cuny.edu  
  - [x] Yes  
  - [ ] No

- **Gabriel, Rue-Ann** (Phone 718-629-5643)  
  Email: rue-ann.gabriel@jjay.cuny.edu  
  - [x] Yes  
  - [ ] No

- **Hutson, Sadari** (Phone 212-316-6133)  
  Email: sahdari.hutson@jjay.cuny.edu  
  - [x] Yes  
  - [ ] No

- **Irigoyen, Cesar** (Phone 646-463-5208)  
  Email: cesar.irigoyen@jjay.cuny.edu  
  - [ ] Yes  
  - [ ] No

- **Maldonado, Steve** (Phone 718-825-7370)  
  Email: steve.maldonado@jjay.cuny.edu  
  - [x] Yes  
  - [ ] No
Committee on Student Interests
Tuesday, November 29, 2011
At 1:40 PM in Room L.65.08NB

AGENDA

1. Discussion food vendor “Guest Services Incorporate” by Ms. Patricia Ketterer

2. New Business
   a. Next Meeting Date: **December 13, 2011 at 1:40 PM**
      Location: TBA
## Committee on Student Interest (COSI)

**Tuesday, November 29, 2011**  
**John Jay College of Criminal Justice**  
**Room L 65.08NB**  
**Time Start:** 1:40pm  
**Time End:** 2:30 pm

### Attendance Log:
- Wayne Edwards  
- Jerrell Robinson  
- Rick Richardson  
- Amanda Acevedo  
- Alaa Alamin  
- Rue-Ann Gabriel  
- Guest: Patricia Ketterer

- Sadari Hutson  
- Cesar Irigoyen  
- Steve Maldonado  
- **Not Present:**  
- Dan Palumbo  
- Lorraine Moller

### Agenda Item | Action
--- | ---
Discussion on Food Vendor: Guest Service Incorporated | Contract-GSI  
5 years with 2 year renewal option  
Vending machines – price discrepancy – vending machines are not under GSI -but price discrepancy will be investigated  
Spring semester  
2nd floor T building area should have food service  
Food Advisory Committee-has not be formed yet  
Will consist of:  
3 or 4 student  
2 Faculty members  
HEO representative  
Representative from Business or Facilities Offices  
Food Service Director  
Purpose of committee is to provide feedback

Questions, concerns or comments regarding new food service vendor can be directed to Ms. Ketterer or GSI

Pre-wash prayer station for Muslim Student Association | Schools that currently have areas  
Queens College  
Stony Brook  
Kaplan  
Area requested for John Jay

How do we disseminate information? | Follow up with student newspaper(Jerrell)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possibility of developing an email app for smart phones- application to easily access your john jay email-Mayra Nieves</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Next meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bring ideas on how we can disseminate information to students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chair: Dean Edwards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Available/Present</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>or</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dan Palumbo (ext. 8397)</td>
<td>Laura West</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerrell Robinson (ext. 8717)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorraine Moller (ext. 8320)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick Richardson (ext. 8689)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Available/Present</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>or</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acevedo, Amanda (Phone 631-398-3122)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:amanda.acevedo@jjay.cuny.edu">amanda.acevedo@jjay.cuny.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alamin, Alaa (Phone 718-404-2343)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:alaa.alamin@jjay.cuny.edu">alaa.alamin@jjay.cuny.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabriel, Rue-Ann (Phone 718-629-5643)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:rue-ann.gabriel@jjay.cuny.edu">rue-ann.gabriel@jjay.cuny.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hutson, Sadari (Phone 212-316-6133)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:sahdari.hutson@jjay.cuny.edu">sahdari.hutson@jjay.cuny.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irigoyen, Cesar (Phone 646-463-5208)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:cesar.irigoyen@jjay.cuny.edu">cesar.irigoyen@jjay.cuny.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maldonado, Steve (Phone 718-825-7370)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:steve.maldonado@jjay.cuny.edu">steve.maldonado@jjay.cuny.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Committee on Student Interests
Tuesday, December 13, 2011
At 1:40 PM in Room L.65.08NB

AGENDA

1. Discussion on Disseminate Information to Students Regarding the Food Vendor

2. Space Reservation

3. New Business
   a. Meeting Dates For Spring 2012: To Be Determined in January 2012
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendance Log:</th>
<th>Not Present:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wayne Edwards (Dean left at 1:50pm)</td>
<td>Lorraine Moller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerrell Robinson</td>
<td>Alaa Alamin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick Richardson</td>
<td>Sadari Hutson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura West</td>
<td>Cesar Irigoyen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rue-Ann Gabriel</td>
<td>Steven Maldonado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda Acevedo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How to disseminate information to students- Re: food vendor</td>
<td>A newsletter for the new building has been created – perhaps including some information about food vendor in the future Create eye catching posters Twitter Committee could create a website general announcement flyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerrell Robinson (in place of Dean Edwards)</td>
<td>Has meet with Newspaper – how much space available determines what can be printed – newspaper asked for a sample – next issue comes out next semester Ms. Acevedo- The school has a lot to offer, but nobody knows about anything – hard to find out information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space- student events</td>
<td>Atrium – cannot be used for events – safety concerns – Other areas available for student events- spring semester *Lecture halls *Class rooms *Conference rooms *Black box thereafter *Cafeteria *Exhibit gallery L3 *Mute court Posting Flyers Bulletin boards will be purchased Electronic boards Reservation process – is being tightened up Ms. West – tabling – do we have a procedure in place in the new building? Rue-Ann – follow up with Ms. Ketterer- re: prices in vending machines- still no change Cigarette butts by the entrance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next semesters meetings</td>
<td>When creating next semesters COSI meeting schedule – there should be some flexibility and rotating dates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Committee on Student Interest

Meeting Date: 2/15/12
Time: 1:40pm

Chair: Dean Edwards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Available/Present</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dan Palumbo (ext. 8397)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerrell Robinson (ext. 8717)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorraine Moller (ext. 8320)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick Richardson (ext. 8689)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Available/Present</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acevedo, Amanda (Phone 631-398-3122)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:amanda.acevedo@jjay.cuny.edu">amanda.acevedo@jjay.cuny.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alamin, Alaa (Phone 718-404-2343)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:alaa.alamin@jjay.cuny.edu">alaa.alamin@jjay.cuny.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabriel, Rue-Ann (Phone 718-629-5643)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:rue-ann.gabriel@jjay.cuny.edu">rue-ann.gabriel@jjay.cuny.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hutson, Sadari (Phone 212-316-6133)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:sahdari.hutson@jjay.cuny.edu">sahdari.hutson@jjay.cuny.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irigoyen, Cesar (Phone 646-463-5208)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:cesar.irigoyen@jjay.cuny.edu">cesar.irigoyen@jjay.cuny.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maldonado, Steve (Phone 718-825-7370)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:steve.maldonado@jjay.cuny.edu">steve.maldonado@jjay.cuny.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Committee on Student Interests  
Wednesday, February 15, 2012  
At 1:40 PM in Room L.65.08NB

AGENDA

I. Time in Between Classes

II. On-Line Elections

III. New Business  
a. Next Meeting Date: Monday, March 12, 2012 @ 1:40 PM in room L65.08NB
Chair: Dean Edwards

**Faculty**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Available/Present</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dan Palumbo (ext. 8397)</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerrell Robinson (ext. 8717)</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorraine Moller (ext. 8320)</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick Richardson (ext. 8689)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Students**

Acevedo, Amanda (Phone 631-398-3122)
Email: amanda.acevedo@jjay.cuny.edu

Alamin, Alaa (Phone 718-404-2343)
Email: alaa.alamin@jjay.cuny.edu

Gabriel, Rue-Ann (Phone 718-629-5643)
Email: rue-ann.gabriel@jjay.cuny.edu

Hutson, Sadari (Phone 212-316-6133)
Email: sahdari.hutson@jjay.cuny.edu

Irigoyen, Cesar (Phone 646-463-5208)
Email: cesar.irigoyen@jjay.cuny.edu

Maldonado, Steve (Phone 718-825-7370)
Email: steve.maldonado@jjay.cuny.edu
Committee on Student Interests
Monday, March 12, 2012
At 1:40 PM in Room L.65.08NB

AGENDA

I. On-Line Elections

II. Food Vendor

III. New Business
    a. Next Meeting Date: Tuesday, April 17, 2012 @ 1:40 PM in room L65.08NB
Chair: Dean Edwards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Available/Present</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dan Palumbo (ext. 8397)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerrell Robinson (ext. 8717)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorraine Moller (ext. 8320)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick Richardson (ext.8689)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acevedo, Amanda (Phone 631-398-3122)</td>
<td>Email:<a href="mailto:amanda.acevedo@jjay.cuny.edu">amanda.acevedo@jjay.cuny.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alamin, Alaa (Phone 718-404-2343)</td>
<td>Email:<a href="mailto:alaa.alamin@jjay.cuny.edu">alaa.alamin@jjay.cuny.edu</a></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabriel, Rue-Ann (Phone 718-629-5643)</td>
<td>Email:<a href="mailto:rue-ann.gabriel@jjay.cuny.edu">rue-ann.gabriel@jjay.cuny.edu</a></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hutson, Sadari (Phone 212-316-6133)</td>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:sahdari.hutson@jjay.cuny.edu">sahdari.hutson@jjay.cuny.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irigoyen, Cesar (Phone 646-463-5208)</td>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:cesar.irigoyen@jjay.cuny.edu">cesar.irigoyen@jjay.cuny.edu</a></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maldonado, Steve (Phone 718-825-7370)</td>
<td>Email:<a href="mailto:steve.maldonado@jjay.cuny.edu">steve.maldonado@jjay.cuny.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Committee on Student Interests  
Tuesday, April 17, 2012  
At 1:40 PM in Room L.65.08NB  

AGENDA

I. On-Line Election Results  

II. Food Vendor  

III. New Business  
   a. Last Meeting Date: Thursday, May 17, 2012 @ 1:40 PM in room L65.08NB
COSI Committee Meeting

Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, April 17th, 2012
Time: 1:50p-2:30p

Present: Dean Edwards (Chair); Laura West (on behalf of Dan Palumbo); Jerrell Robinson; Rick Richardson; Alaa Alamin; Rue-Ann Gabriel; Cesar Irigoyen

Not Present: Lorraine Moller; Amanda Acevedo; Sadari Hutson; Steve Maldonado

Next meeting: Thursday, May 17, 2012 @ 1:40 pm in Room L65.08NB

I. On-Line Election Results
   • Jerrell Robinson stated that we saved $8,000- $9,000 by having an online election process
   • Very convenient for students
   • Jerrell will be attending a debrief meeting discussing issues and challenges that occurred during the process. We will discuss this during our next COSI meeting.

II. Food Vendor
   • Opening Ceremony of the New Building Cafeteria will take place this Thursday (04/19/12).
   • Johnny has rejoined officially as our food vendor!
   • Dean Edwards raised questions about having a variety of food choices, international food? We are not sure if MBJ has specifically noted what types of food they will offer in their contract.

III. New Building Remarks
   • Dean Edwards mentioned that the walkway to the Jaywalk seems limited. We need to confirm what space we can use? How can we utilize this space? Are we allowed to have outside bands perform? Will neighbors complain?

IV. New Business
   • Jay Express lacking customer service
   • Water supply for prayers will be addressed.
   • How do we institute evening hours for student services?
   • Why do students need to redeclare majors each semester?
   • Students should be informed when majors are changed.
   • Eco-Friendly Flushers
COUNCIL OF UNDERGRADUATE MAJOR PROGRAM COORDINATORS

MEETINGS FOR Fall-Spring 2011-2012

Meeting #1:
Tuesday September 13th from 1:30pm to 2:50pm in room 630T

Meeting #2:
Tuesday October 11th from 1:30pm to 2:50pm in room 630T

Meeting #3:
Tuesday November 15th from 1:30pm to 2:50pm in room 630T

Meeting #4:
Tuesday December 13th from 1:30pm to 2:50pm in room 531T

Meeting #5:
Tuesday January 17th from 1:30pm to 2:50pm in room 630T

Meeting #6:
Tuesday February 14th from 1:30pm to 2:50pm in room 630T

Meeting #7:
Tuesday March 13th from 1:30pm to 2:50pm in room 630T

Meeting #8:
Tuesday April 17th from 1:30pm to 2:50pm in room 630T

Meeting #9:
Tuesday May 8th from 1:30pm to 2:50pm in room 531T
Council of Major Coordinators Meeting
Agenda
September 13, 2011

1. Introductions
2. UGS priorities 2011-2012—Anne
3. Assessment updates on the capstone course—Virginia
4. New business
Council of Academic Program/Major Coordinators
September 13, 2011

Meeting Minutes


- Introduction
  - Two course releases given this year to regularize assessment
    - The extra release time must be taken during Spring
      - 1 regular as a coordinator (should be given by chairs)
      - 1 given by Provost (for assessment work)

- Undergraduate Studies Priorities (2011-2012)
  - Will talk about assessment in capstone (with goal to show improvement)
  - Cross-listing of courses will end this year
    - Courses will all have the same number, name, title, prefix
    - Kathy Killoran is point person to begin discussion with Chairs
    - Being done to try to avoid confusion for students, but also because of Middle States
  - Launching new majors: Philosophy and Law and Society
    - In pipeline are Anthropology and Latina/o studies. We soon will have an array of liberal arts majors
  - Proposal to adopt standards for academic internships (those who bear credits)
    - Proposal will first go through PPP, then UCASC committee
  - Standards for online courses
    - Search ongoing for an Online Director (should have person by end of year)
  - Grand experiment pilot: Academic Advisement in FOS major
    - Incentivizing the department
    - For every 200 students in major, department will receive release time (for advisors)
    - Pilot could be extended this Spring in a small major (maybe ISP)
  - Prior Learning Assessment
    - What can students get?
      - Work on establishing and expanding this because John Jay has the youngest student population of any CUNY
      - If we had these tools in place, we could attract an older, larger, and more varied student population
      - Important as well in view of the fact that New York State high schools population will be on decline soon
  - As economy goes up, retention will go down
    - Regardless of this fact, if students complete 50% of program requirements, most are committed to completing the rest (keep that in mind while scheduling, etc.)
• Will start seeing publicity around campus for a “Finish in Four” campaign
  • Will help students to start thinking about planning
  • Help get the message out to other faculty
• These were some of the UGS priorities that Dean thought would perhaps be of interest to the council
  • New coordinators are asked to reach out to Anne for help/catching up on council’s work
  • Should council require other training needs, also reach out to Anne

• Assessment updates on the Capstone Course
  • Many majors completed works
    • They were due at the start of the term; will hear today from those who did
  • Virginia’s Announcement
    • Identified two major issues:
      • assessing students versus
      • assessing major/ program
    • Interested in finding out if learning goals for the programs are evident, and if they are being met
    • Because we’re using capstone, challenge is to demonstrate a reflection of knowledge and skills that students need to get from the program
    • Advise that rubric be sent and link between program and learning goals are evident from it
  • Now we need to accumulate data and evidence during Fall and Spring semesters
    • Expectation is that all the learning goals for program be evaluated, so we comply 100% with Middle States Standard 14, Assessment of Student Learning
    • There’s a New College Wide Assessment committee
      • Chaired by AP Jim Llana (comprised of faculty and HEOs)
        • Will hear more about this in future
        • They will look at the “Draft” distributed
    • Will call meetings with Chairs to see what’s been done and how to be more helpful
    • Chairs will present sample of syllabus (learning objectives need to be included)
      • Model syllabus may change by adoption at Friday’s UCASC, new model will include specification of learning outcomes
  • Bettina shares progress:
    • Humanities and Justice (joint venture History/English/Philosophy) – no chair responsible for major
    • One constant: rotating faculty from participating departments return year after year in interdisciplinary major
    • Major has a 2-semester senior thesis component; students generally remain with the same instructor for both semesters
  • Assessment of Senior Thesis
    • We identified 8 learning objectives (but 2 deal with writing; not specifically with major)
    • We reviewed all syllabi and identified learning objectives (developed a rubric based on learning objectives → used these to analyze data)
    • Created an Assessment Task Force (5 people)
• Results were reasonably positive but we found areas where students are not sufficiently prepared for senior thesis
  • Assessment of thesis is now being done by instructor in each section of the course
    ▪ 3 courses leading to senior thesis prepare students to meet expectations of learning outcomes
    ▪ Now that we have History/Philosophy major – major needs to rethink itself
    ▪ Assessment results found that students have trouble formulating an original research question or research problem – we are now placing more emphasis on this in the 3 courses leading up to the senior thesis
  o Caroline Reitz shares progress in English: created a qualitative survey
    ▪ Enlightening to figure out where in major they should go (shaping their next steps)
    ▪ Administered survey of capstone course during Spring (Saddened by results – and currently analyzing data)
    ▪ Surveying with goal of having students understand the learning goals of the program
  o Virginia Moreno: As we develop survey, please share a copy with Virginia Moreno
    ▪ The survey used to be about general student satisfaction. Now we are more interested in surveys that are linked to the learning objectives or services trying to be assessed
    ▪ Need to provide assessment of learning goals twice (survey or grades could be second assessment)
  o ICJ – used rubric to evaluate capstone
    ▪ Sharing reports? To help colleagues?
    ▪ Will eventually be public document
    ▪ Will need to report on it regarding feedback loop (as part of the self-study)
  o Betsy: problem found in rubric
    ▪ How close are you to sending report? Should have assessment plan for major, draft of rubrics and collected/piloted a rubric
    ▪ By end of month should have draft of findings (2-3 pages suffice)
    ▪ As you work on report – think of how many program goals have you assessed?
    ▪ Due by October 15

• New Business
  o Enrollment trends in majors for 2010
    ▪ Will talk about this at next meeting; hope to have 2011 enrollment data as well
  o Will do more around data
    ▪ Student profile: mean SAT score 934 out of 1600
    ▪ Who are they?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
<th>COORDINATOR</th>
<th>PHONE NUMBER</th>
<th>Initials/Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Computer Information Systems</td>
<td>Shamik Sengupta</td>
<td>212-237-8826</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctional Studies</td>
<td>Lior Gideon</td>
<td>212-237-8991</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice (B.A.)</td>
<td>Evan Mandery</td>
<td>212-237-8389</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stanley Ingber</td>
<td>212-237-8382</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice (B.S.)</td>
<td>Serguei Cheloukhine</td>
<td>212-237-8391</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice Management</td>
<td>Richard Culp</td>
<td>212-237-8929</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminology</td>
<td>Douglas Thompkins</td>
<td>212-484-1118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture and Deviant Studies</td>
<td>Elizabeth Hegeman</td>
<td>212-237-8289</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>Jay Hamilton</td>
<td>212-237-8093</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Caroline Reitz</td>
<td>646-557-4755</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Science</td>
<td>Robert Till</td>
<td>212-484-1379</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire and Emergency Services</td>
<td>Charles Jennings</td>
<td>646-557-4638</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forensic Psychology</td>
<td>Deryn Strange</td>
<td>212-484-1345</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forensic Science</td>
<td>Lawrence Kobilinsky</td>
<td>212-237-8884</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Studies</td>
<td>Katie Gentile</td>
<td>212-237-8110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Criminal Justice</td>
<td>Peter Romaniuk</td>
<td>212-237-8189</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial Studies</td>
<td>James Cauthen</td>
<td>212-484-1109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities and Justice Studies</td>
<td>Bettina Carboungell</td>
<td>212-237-8702</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Studies</td>
<td>James Cauthen</td>
<td>212-484-1109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Studies</td>
<td>Jon Shane</td>
<td>646-557-4625</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>Andrew Sidman</td>
<td>646-557-4613</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>Maria Josephine Dagostino</td>
<td>212-237-8068</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Management</td>
<td>Robert McCrie</td>
<td>212-237-8386</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World History</td>
<td>Sara Mc Dougall</td>
<td>212-237-8817</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Council of Major Coordinators Meeting
Agenda
October 11, 2011

1. Announcements
   - Strategic positioning and the major
   - Development of new majors

2. Minutes of September 13th meeting
3. Planning for the major
   - Using enrollment data (potential and limitations)
4. Assessment
5. New business
Council of Major Coordinators
October 11, 2011

Minutes

Present: Anne Lopes, Katie Gentile, Lawrence Kobillinksy, Sara McDougall, Lior Gideon, Deryn Strange, Caroline Reitz, Elizabeth Hegeman, Andrew Sidman, Peter Romanuik, Jim Cauthen, Bettina Carbonell, Robert McCrie, Shamik Sengupta, Jay Hamilton, Virginia Moreno, James Llana, Representative of CJBS (don’t know name), Maria Josephine Dagostino, Sara McDougall, Peter Romaniuk, Robert Till

1. Announcements
   a. AL: Hope majors are taking off well
   b. First major announcement: How will increasing enrollment numbers impact the majors?
      i. Developing strategies to increase
      ii. Last year they were down
      iii. Increased enrollment = higher revenue = better things!
   c. “Strategically positioning” of college
      i. Jim Llana – Fall 2010 – 15,330 Fall 2011 15,206
         1. Slight decrease
         2. We want enrollment to go up
         3. Some parts are more important than others (Transfers vs. Freshman)
   d. Reasons for lower enrollment
      i. General demographic – HS grads will decrease in next 10 years
      ii. Other reasons that are uncontrollable
   e. We need to get the John Jay name out there
      i. Lots of attention at all levels are going toward increasing enrollment
      ii. Distributed across majors
         1. Students should get the ones they want early
         2. Graduate in a timely fashion
      iii. Need proper advisement tools
         1. Handouts
         2. Putting things on web
         3. Clear programming
      iv. If students understand the major, they are more likely to complete it
   f. Second Major Announcement: Anne is working on a new major broadly in Fraud and Forensics
      i. Looking for applied referrals of faculty
      ii. Interdisciplinary major
      iii. Need to talk to those in the field
   g. UGS Development of Major
      i. Need to bring committee of practice into development
      ii. Need proper curriculum that closely ties to the real world
iii. Real world and ideas need to be mixed in
iv. Important to this in a recession/post-recession economy
v. The more engaged you (faculty) are the better your major will tie and
draw in enrollment
vi. Students put a lot of focus on careers that a program leads too

h. James Cauthen – Is the university open to new majors?
i. Anne – We have 23 now which is not a lot for the size of the student body
   i. University is open if we have the faculty and resources to support it
      1. This is a big challenge
   ii. Philosophy was just approved
   iii. Sociology, Anthropology, and Latina/o Studies should be approved by
        the end of the year
iv. Limited number of majors
   1. Retention
   2. Balancing act
v. Could do with strategically though out majors
vi. Look outward toward trends that should impact curriculum
   1. Profiles of people we want
   2. Expand scope of enrollment

j. Larry Kobiinsky - May want to change the name of the major
   i. Careful in use of Forensics
k. Jay Hamilton – There are only like 5 majors in whole country that use the word
l. Sara McDougall - How about just Fraud?
m. Jay – Possibly something like Criminal Justice of Economic Crime
n. Anne – Need to update the names and content of majors
   i. Through assessment
   ii. Need to update regularly
   iii. Bring up to date yearly
   iv. Will begin to review curriculum in more depth and make suggestions
      1. Something we haven’t always been good at doing

2. Minutes
   a. Caroline – Question of protocol
   b. Anne – Give changes to Anne by hand, or can give to Sandrine
      i. Final minutes sent out after meeting
   c. James Cauthen – Does college have document for standards of online courses?
   d. Anne – PPP and UCASC looking at standard for UGS online courses
      i. PPP will recommend this probably in the spring
   e. Virginia – Guidelines can be based off Middle States for now
   f. Anne – Or best stands practices
      i. 1 percent of courses are online
      ii. Definitely need standards
      iii. Give Anne any changes of minutes

3. Planning for the Major
   a. Attachment of Enrollment Data
   b. Number are from SAli
   c. Sara – Problem with who is or isn’t a history major
      i. 230 majors – more than on sheet
   d. Anne – For spring students are required to claim a major in registration
i. How many?
   ii. Who are they?

e. Handout are the latest numbers as of 9/20
f. Average undergrad changes their major 3-5 times
   i. Problem for degree completion
   ii. Need enrollment with major, aren’t allowed to enter as undecided
g. Bettina – How do you know who are taking courses for minors?
   i. Don’t collect the data well
h. Anne – Students tend to only claim minors in time for degrees
   i. Will be brought up in UCASC
   ii. Minor is a part of the major
      1. Students claim they have minor because they already have base classes and only need a few extra
      2. There is no limit on courses that count twice
         a. Standard needed for this
      3. Can declare minor at anytime
      4. Need rational degree planning – planning on minor from the start

i. Larry – You cannot be a Forensics Major and then have a minor it is as well
   i. Stops from “double dipping”
j. Anne – Minors are only 18 credits
   i. How many should be shared?
k. Caroline – What about double majors?
l. Anne – Up for discussion
   i. New Gen Ed model will be 42 credits
   ii. Go from there
m. Caroline – Double dipping may be a good thing for departments like English
    i. Journalism minor
n. Anne – Students will take electives they haven’t taken to widen the scope
    i. Need degree to have integrity
o. On chart – How major is growing over time?
   i. Gender Studies is slowly growing – good!
   ii. Numbers falling/low numbers have concerns
      1. Become not viable
      2. Would need independent study to complete
   iii. Always going to vary in sizes
p. Virginia – Looking at retention
   i. Maybe students get stuck in the middle
   ii. Not issue of retention
   iii. Transfers come in middle so numbers in middle would be higher
   iv. May want to think about what the numbers represent and look at corresponding curriculum to fix problems
q. Anne – Legal Studies students will be advised into Law and Society
   i. Legal Studies will be retired in 3-5 years
   ii. Didn’t even know anyone was left in Judicial Studies
r. Virginia – What about internal transfers? What point is the change at?
s. Anne – CJBA and CIBS will have movement between the two in first year as students figure out what they want
i. Policy and Research vs. Institutions and Practice
ii. Will look again in Spring
iii. SALI Training is available
   1. Use major code to contact students
   2. Pull up students not just registered
iv. Look at other enrollment information next time

4. Assessment
   a. Jim Llana – Handout passed around
      i. Guidelines and due dates for chairs
      ii. Check to see where we stand with what's come in and what needs to come in
      iii. Report due Oct 15 for last spring
      iv. Continuous loop of assessment
      v. Oct 30 – Assessment plans for this semester due
         1. Should take place every semester
      vi. Dec 1 – Academic Department Assessment Plan due starting next summer
         1. Record of our Activities
   b. Virginia – Many drafts have been sent in
      i. Want to know about final plan
   c. Larry (Forensic Science) – On target
   d. Robert (Security Management) – New chair starting next semester
      i. Lot of work to do
   e. Bettina (Humanities and Justice) – Owe final version of last year
      i. Rubric will look a little different next year
      ii. In good shape
   f. Betsy (Culture and Deviance) – Virginia has draft, needs work
   g. Andrew (Political Science) – Draft sent
   h. Peter (ICJ) – changes are being made
      i. In good shape
   i. Shamik (CIS) – Turning in by Oct 15
      i. Fall 2011 – looking at two courses
   j. Katie (Gender Studies) – Draft submitted
      i. 101 every semester
      ii. Biology of Gender and Gender & Justice – next year
   k. Caroline (English) – Draft sent back with comments
   l. CJBS (don't know his name) – Maki will be submitting to Virginia
   m. Virginia – Rubrics are crucial
      i. Should send draft
   n. Sara (World History) – Should be in by 15th
      i. Plan – Methods courses
      ii. Know by end of month
   o. Maria (Public Management) – On target
      i. By 15th – getting ready for assessment
   p. James (Legal Studies) – Law and Society Proposal was focus of last year
      i. More efficient to do plan for Law and Society as opposed to a retrospective assessment when major is retired?
q. Virginia – Develop new assessment tool for new program and then use that to look back at what was wrong with old major
r. Jay (Economics) – We are behind
   i. Hopefully by October 30th
s. Lior (Correctional Studies) – Put together a good outline
   i. Problems with getting materials from last year's capstone
   ii. Glenn Corbett giving capstone now
t. Jim Llanas – Traction across the board
   i. On track
u. Andrew – On course syllabus, what outcomes to do you put for a course that is in multiple programs?
   i. List objectives relative to the course
v. Virginia – Have to follow whether or not the next steps happen and that pointed out
   i. Need to be concrete and of the short term
   ii. Need to be updated in next report, not forgotten about
   iii. Continuous narrative

5. New Business
a. Anne – Has work on assessment with department chairs improved? Have we done enough to improve?
   i. Sara – No complaints
b. Virginia – Middle States can ask any one
   i. Don’t want that person to refer them somewhere else
   ii. Everyone needs to know
c. How do you integrate the department in the assessment process?
   i. Shamik – work closely, the chair is in the loop
d. Jim Llana – one person should not be solely responsible
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
<th>COORDINATOR</th>
<th>PHONE NUMBER</th>
<th>Initials/Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Computer Information Systems</td>
<td>Shamik Sengupta</td>
<td>212-237-8826</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctional Studies</td>
<td>Lior Gideon</td>
<td>212-237-8991</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice (B.A.)</td>
<td>Evan Mandery</td>
<td>212-237-8389</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stanley Ingber</td>
<td>212-237-8382</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice (B.S.)</td>
<td>Serguei Cheloukhine</td>
<td>212-237-8391</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice Management</td>
<td>Richard Culp</td>
<td>212-237-8929</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminology</td>
<td>Douglas Thompkins</td>
<td>212-484-1118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture and Deviant Studies</td>
<td>Elizabeth Hegeman</td>
<td>212-237-8289</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>Jay Hamilton</td>
<td>212-237-8093</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Caroline Reitz</td>
<td>646-557-4755</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Science</td>
<td>Robert Till</td>
<td>212-484-1379</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire and Emergency Services</td>
<td>Charles Jennings</td>
<td>646-557-4638</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forensic Psychology</td>
<td>Deryn Strange</td>
<td>212-484-1345</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forensic Science</td>
<td>Lawrence Kobilinsky</td>
<td>212-237-8884</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Studies</td>
<td>Katie Gentile</td>
<td>212-237-8110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Criminal Justice</td>
<td>Peter Romaniuk</td>
<td>212-237-8189</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial Studies</td>
<td>James Cauthen</td>
<td>212-484-1109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities and Justice Studies</td>
<td>Bettina Carbonell</td>
<td>212-237-8702</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Studies</td>
<td>James Cauthen</td>
<td>212-484-1109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Studies</td>
<td>Jon Shane</td>
<td>646-557-4625</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>Andrew Sidman</td>
<td>646-557-4613</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>Maria Josephine Dagostino</td>
<td>212-237-8068</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Management</td>
<td>Robert McCrie</td>
<td>212-237-8386</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World History</td>
<td>Sara Mc Dougall</td>
<td>212-237-8817</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Council of Major Coordinators Meeting
Agenda
November 15, 2011

1. Announcements
2. Minutes of October meeting
3. Assessment
   - Update on the assessment committee.
   - Sharing plans and results.
4. Internship guidelines
Council of Academic Program/Major Coordinators  
November 15, 2011

Meeting Minutes

Present: Shamik Sengupta, Stanley Ingber, Serguei Cheloukhine, Caroline Reitz, Deryn Strange, Katie Gentile, James Cauthen, Bettina Carbonell, Jon Shane, Andrew Sidman, Maria Josephine Dagostino, Robert McCrie, Sara McDougall, Karen Okamoto, Anne Lopes, Virginia Moreno, Jim Llana

1. Announcements (Assessments)  
   - Virginia received a total of 17 Assessment plans so far (13 are totally completed, 4 are waiting for department approval before they can be forwarded)  
     - There are an additional 4 or 5 plans that are still currently being worked on  
   - The submitted reports will be shared with General Education (Gen Ed) Assessment Group (aligning the Gen Ed outcomes against learning goals (and criteria used to assess them) for programs  
   - Also there is a Middle-States sub-group that is already looking at Assessment outcomes and plans

   - According to AP Llana, results of reports will need to be shared with the College’s all new Assessment Committee because they’re looking at set of policy and procedures to recommend for adoption to the college  
     - Sharing reports is really about using the information to improve our programs and services for students  
     - The College’s all new Assessment Committee Group comprises mostly faculty (7) and HEOs (3)  
     - The group looks to create a website (containing hub of activities on assessment)

   - Announcements (Advisement Pilot)  
     - Anne shared that the pilot is going better than anticipated  
     - Deryn Strange said that the pilot has been very successful in the Forensic Psych department  
       - there was very good buy-in from faculty  
       - Faculty enjoyed contact with students  
       - As direct result of pilot – more students are going to office hours (and they are more engaged with faculty)

   - Next term – the pilot will be expanded to History and Forensic Science departments

4. Internship Guidelines  
   - Many majors have (for credits) internships attached to them but they have no guidelines or standards so the PPP sub-committee of UCASC took this project on.
   - The PPP looked at SUNY Guidelines; liked them and decided to adapt them to John Jay. The PPP brought the proposal for adoption to the UCASC group.
   - The Proposal was approved by UCASC and was on its way to the College Council but was rescinded from that agenda as it was “rumored that faculty was not aware of the proposal”
     - Guidelines have since been sent to faculty senate
- Dean Lopes is hoping the major coordinators will disseminate it as well and she would also like this body to review the information in order to have a “second reading” of the guidelines at the next meeting.

- Meanwhile, the guidelines were disseminated wrongly during a meeting held by staff members of office of student development.

- Dean Lopes wanted to assure the coordinators that they are basically vetting the policy/proposal this year.

- James Cauthen asked how committed the institution is about internships since he received lots of questions on it during this past Sunday’s Open House. He added that if the commitment is there, then resources should be put behind it!

- The Dean believes there should be internship office (since it’s an Academic function)
  a. There will be an internship coordinator who will report dually to Dean and Career Services person (but so far that person has not been hired)
  b. The person will still be housed in student development office

- Katie Gentile asked whether the internship still need to be approved first. Dean asked her to keep following our regular process for now until the new internship office in career services is in place.

- Lastly, the committee was asked to read, take apart and offer some suggestions on the proposal by e-mailing her.
### Coordinator of Majors November 15th Meeting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
<th>COORDINATOR</th>
<th>PHONE NUMBER</th>
<th>Initials/Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Computer Information Systems</td>
<td>Shamik Sengupta</td>
<td>212-237-8826</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctional Studies</td>
<td>Lior Gideon</td>
<td>212-237-8991</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice (B.A.)</td>
<td>Evan Mandery</td>
<td>212-237-8389</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stanley Ingber</td>
<td>212-237-8382</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice (B.S.)</td>
<td>Serguei Cheloukhine</td>
<td>212-237-8391</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice Management</td>
<td>Richard Culp</td>
<td>212-237-8929</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminology</td>
<td>Douglas Thompkins</td>
<td>212-484-1118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture and Deviant Studies</td>
<td>Elizabeth Hegeman</td>
<td>212-237-8289</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>Jay Hamilton</td>
<td>212-237-8093</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Caroline Reitz</td>
<td>646-557-4755</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Science</td>
<td>Robert Till</td>
<td>212-484-1379</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire and Emergency Services</td>
<td>Charles Jennings</td>
<td>646-557-4638</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forensic Psychology</td>
<td>Deryn Strange</td>
<td>212-484-1345</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forensic Science</td>
<td>Lawrence Kobilinsky</td>
<td>212-237-8884</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Studies</td>
<td>Katie Gentile</td>
<td>212-237-8110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Criminal Justice</td>
<td>Peter Romaniuk</td>
<td>212-237-8189</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial Studies</td>
<td>James Cauthen</td>
<td>212-484-1109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities and Justice Studies</td>
<td>Bettina Carbonfeld</td>
<td>212-237-8702</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Studies/Law + Society</td>
<td>James Cauthen</td>
<td>212-484-1109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Studies</td>
<td>Jon Shane</td>
<td>646-557-4625</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>Andrew Sidman</td>
<td>646-557-4613</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>Maria Josephine Dagostino</td>
<td>212-237-8068</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Management</td>
<td>Robert McCrie</td>
<td>212-237-8386</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World History</td>
<td>Sara Mc Dougall</td>
<td>212-237-8817</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Council of Major Coordinators Meeting
Agenda
December 13, 2011

1. Announcements
2. Minutes of November meeting
3. Feedback on Internship DRAFT guidelines
4. Assessment
5. New Business
Council of Academic Program/Major Coordinators
December 13, 2011

Meeting Minutes

Present: Shamik Sengupta, Lior Gideon, Stanley Inger, Serguei Cheloukhine, Elizabeth Hegeman, Jay Hamilton, Caroline Reltz, Deryn Strange, Lawrence Kobilinky, Katie Gentile, Peter Romaniuk, James Cauthen, Karen Okamoto, Catherine Kemp, Jon Shane, Maria Josephine Dagostino, Robert McCrie
Kathy Killoran

1. Announcements — none
2. Minutes of November meeting
   - Approved by all
3. Feedback on Internship DRAFT Guidelines: Prof. James Cauthen led the discussion on behalf of Dean Lopes who was absent.
   - Draft guidelines came out of PPP, a UCASC subcommittee. They adapted guidelines in order for us to adopt them.
   - Some voiced concerns about how guidelines developed for SUNY are broad but without any policies. They wondered whether we are first implementing the guidelines and then formalizing the policies. How, for example, would John Jay interpret SUNY Guidelines for Learning Objectives, Outcomes, and Activities (on p.7)?
   - Kathy mentioned that since there is no degree requirement for internships, some of these can fall within department’s purview — no strict rule about it.
   - Other concerns cited were site supervisor 37 question sample — it was deemed too invasive
   - Jon Shane was not clear on why we just do not develop our own policies as opposed to having SUNY guidelines sent to UCASC. He added that these guidelines are full of conditionals/vagueness.
   - Kathy answered that vagueness can be good since we do not want to dictate what departments will do.
   - Prof. D’Agostino believes the guidelines formula would allow programs flexibility.
   - Kathy said that Internships could follow “tweaked” NY state guidelines that presently states that for every credit = 45 hours must be done (class hours plus supplemental work outside of classroom).
   - What approximately constitutes a 3 credit internship? A combination of:
     i. 15 contact hours
     ii. 100 hours in field
     iii. 40 hours of assignment
   - Kathy stated that our objectives in instituting guidelines for internship were for
     i. Middle states
     ii. Solidify and insure academic component of internship
     iii.
   - Prof. Cauthen asked committee members to send their comments/feedback to Anne so she can forward them to the PPP
   - It was announced that an “academic” internship manager will be hired in order to smooth the process

4. Assessment
   - Jim Llana could not come today and asked Virginia to inform committee on 2 areas
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
<th>COORDINATOR</th>
<th>PHONE NUMBER</th>
<th>Initials/Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Computer Information Systems</td>
<td>Shamik Sengupta</td>
<td>212-237-8826</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctional Studies</td>
<td>Lior Gideon</td>
<td>212-237-8991</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice (B.A.)</td>
<td>Evan Mandery,</td>
<td>212-237-8389</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stanley Ingber</td>
<td>212-237-8382</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice (B.S.)</td>
<td>Serguei Cheloukhine</td>
<td>212-237-8391</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice Management</td>
<td>Richard Culp</td>
<td>212-237-8929</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminology</td>
<td>Douglas Thompkins</td>
<td>212-484-1118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture and Deviant Studies</td>
<td>Elizabeth Hegeman</td>
<td>212-237-8289</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>Jay Hamilton</td>
<td>212-237-8093</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Caroline Reitz</td>
<td>646-557-4755</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Science</td>
<td>Robert Till</td>
<td>212-484-1379</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire and Emergency Services</td>
<td>Charles Jennings</td>
<td>646-557-4638</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forensic Psychology</td>
<td>Deryn Strange</td>
<td>212-484-1345</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forensic Science</td>
<td>Lawrence Kobilinsky</td>
<td>212-237-8884</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Studies</td>
<td>Katie Gentile</td>
<td>212-237-8110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Criminal Justice</td>
<td>Peter Romaniuk</td>
<td>212-237-8189</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial Studies</td>
<td>James Cauthen</td>
<td>212-484-1109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities and Justice Studies</td>
<td>Bettina Carbonell</td>
<td>212-237-8702</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law and Society</td>
<td>James Cauthen</td>
<td>212-484-1109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Karen Okamoto</td>
<td>646-557-4777</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>Catherine Kemp</td>
<td>212-237-8908</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Studies</td>
<td>Jon Shane</td>
<td>646-557-4625</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>Andrew Sidman</td>
<td>646-557-4613</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>Maria Josephine Dagostino</td>
<td>212-237-8068</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Management</td>
<td>Robert McCrie</td>
<td>212-237-8386</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World History</td>
<td>Sara Mc Dougall</td>
<td>212-237-8817</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Council of Major Coordinators Meeting
Agenda
January 17, 2012

1. Announcements
2. Minutes of December meeting
3. Data collection needs
4. Assessment
5. New Business
Council of Academic Program/ Major Coordinators
January 17, 2012

Present: Shamik Sengupta, Lior Gideon, Elizabeth Hegeman, Deryn Strange, Catherine Kemp, Andrew Sidman, Maria Josephine Dagostino, Sara McDougall

1. Announcements
2. Minutes of November Meeting
3. Data Collection Needs
   - Any routine data collection that would be helpful for major coordinators to have
     - Number of students in a major and interest in major.
     - What is the impact of the new general education requirements?
       - Smaller core may not be inclusive.
       - Departments will be competing with each other to get their courses in.
       - If courses are not included in general education there may be a loss of faculty.
       - Once required courses may now be optional.
       - Possible “race to the bottom” as standards are lowered and grade inflations are high.
       - On the positive side we have nowhere to go but up.

4. Assessment
   - How assessment data has been used by departments?
   - What might an ideal process look like?
   - What kind of changes and how?
   - Who should review and when?

A.) Faculty Performance
   - Departments should have a dialogue on what should be expected in terms of assignments.
   - We need a balance when looking at outcomes holistically.
   - Outcomes- more focused on breadth than depth.
   - Coordinators must assess who teaches what? / at what levels? (assess workload of professors by department)
   - Student evaluations are only one indicator of the course or professor.
   - In general students are generous in evaluations.
   - *Possible dumbing down of courses as professors seek tenure.
   - Professors free at how to teach- not on what to teach (departmental standards in place).
   - Major Coordinators don’t have power over hiring so they work closely with the chair.

B.) Student Performance
   - Grades- give a sense of how students are doing and to address problems that come up.
   - Individual learning outcomes- percent of students that fall into each student performance level. Exceeds, meets and does not meet outcome.
   - Collection of student data in general is poor due to limited survey response and limited resources in terms of personnel and funding.
   - Grads- selecting courses that
     1.) represent benchmarks “key to completing program”
     2.) represent best outcomes (summary outcomes)- look at these to see the big picture
Middle States
- Read the course goals and compared them with the actual number of goals met by students.
- Is course consistent with curriculum map?
- We need steps along the way of assessment
- Immediate action/those that can be changed over the semester
- Multiple sections of one course can send one sample syllabus.
- Indirect assessments- Call Virginia for Assistance
- Timely response needed from departments to allow for changes and student benefit.
- Chairs informed in April that they are to give in samples of Fall classes in the Fall and Spring classes in the Spring.
- Input has been erratic- not enough syllabi with information relevant to learning goals being sent to Inez Brown.

Recommendations
- Major coordinators should get grade reports.
- Problems with working with difficult faculty should be explored
- Chair responsible for personnel functions
  - I.e. Collecting syllabi to ensure quality control.
- Major Coordinators should be tenured- some John jay coordinators are not- weak link to quality control.
- Data on average professor grades should be readily accessible.
- Need better advising for students in terms of registration, major declaration and help in appealing.
- Some variation in rubric (departmental standards should override this)
- Learning outcomes are broad but must be rigorous. (Microanalysis of outcomes)
- General Education can be tweaked to be inclusive.
- Follow up on what comes of Data sharing.

5. New business
- New General Education (details)
  1. Committee (UCAST- headed by Lisandro Perez) working on turning John jay requirements into CUNY requirements to maintain compliance.
  2. Working on learning outcomes and translating them to new General Education- must be in by April (format) compliance in by Fall.
- Yearly efforts should be taken to keep majors fresh.
  1. Size of major- how many people are enrolled
     a. Is there interest.
     b. Is it possible to know the minors selected by our majors- No required advisors for minors.
- If all programs had common elements- teach major coordinators.
  - A presentation could be made to help implement changes.
  - Data packets which should include information on majors could be put out mid-year.
    - It isn’t great on post graduate employment (although a survey is sent out)
    - Average scores on standardized tests included.
- NSSE- National Survey of Student engagement
  - Helpful for comparing John Jay’s overall performance in comparison to other schools.
- What’s available on IR website? Or on SIMS?
- IR must be built back. It will be a slow process.
# Coordinator of Majors January 17 Meeting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
<th>COORDINATOR</th>
<th>PHONE NUMBER</th>
<th>Initials/Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Computer Information Systems</td>
<td>Shamik Sengupta</td>
<td>212-237-8826</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctional Studies</td>
<td>Lior Gideon</td>
<td>212-237-8991</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice (B.A.)</td>
<td>Evan Mandery</td>
<td>212-237-8389</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stanley Ingber</td>
<td>212-237-8382</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice (B.S.)</td>
<td>Serguei Cheleoukhine</td>
<td>212-237-8391</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice Management</td>
<td>Sal Gujardo</td>
<td></td>
<td>gujardo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminology</td>
<td>Douglas Thompkins</td>
<td>212-484-1118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture and Deviant Studies</td>
<td>Elizabeth Hegeman</td>
<td>212-237-8289</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>Jay Hamilton</td>
<td>212-237-8093</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Caroline Reitz</td>
<td>646-557-4755</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Science</td>
<td>Robert Till</td>
<td>212-484-1379</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire and Emergency Services</td>
<td>Charles Jennings</td>
<td>646-557-4638</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forensic Psychology</td>
<td>Delyn Strange</td>
<td>212-484-1345</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forensic Science</td>
<td>Lawrence Kobilinsky</td>
<td>212-237-8884</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Studies</td>
<td>Katie Gentile</td>
<td>212-237-8110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Criminal Justice</td>
<td>Peter Romaniuk</td>
<td>212-237-8189</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial Studies</td>
<td>James Cauthen</td>
<td>212-484-1109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities and Justice Studies</td>
<td>Bettina Carbonell</td>
<td>212-237-8702</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law and Society</td>
<td>James Cauthen</td>
<td>212-484-1109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Karen Okamoto</td>
<td>646-557-4777</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>Catherine Kemp</td>
<td>212-237-8908</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Studies</td>
<td>Jon Shane</td>
<td>646-557-4625</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>Andrew Sidman</td>
<td>646-557-4613</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>Maria Josephine Dagostino</td>
<td>212-237-8068</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Management</td>
<td>Robert McCrie</td>
<td>212-237-8386</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World History</td>
<td>Sara Mc Dougall</td>
<td>212-237-8817</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Council of Major Coordinators Meeting
Agenda
February 14, 2012

1. Announcements
   - Additional training needs
2. Minutes of January meeting
3. Study Abroad, study away and the majors
4. Middle States preliminary information – closing the loop based on findings so far
   - Political Science--Andrew Sidman Report
5. Assessment
6. New business
Council of Academic Program/ Major Coordinators
February 14, 2012
Meeting Minutes

Present: Shamik Sengupta, Elizabeth Hegeman, Catherine Kemp, Andrew Sidman, Maria Josephine Dagostino, Serguei Cheloukhine, Caroline Reitz, Robert Till, Katie Gentile, Peter Romaniuk, James Cauthen, Bettina Carbonell, Karen Okamoto, Anne Lopes

1. Announcements
   - Additional Training Needs
     o SIMS and SALI training for those new to major coordinator list (Sheet to be passed around and scheduled by Sandrine).
     o SALI- user friendly S drive- selected data that people have found useful (gives enrollment for certain courses- not meant for research- helpful for operations).
     o Degree works- training as part of advisement pilot.
       ▪ English and History working on advisement pilot this semester.
       ▪ Works better for some majors.
       ▪ General Education issues- around transfers.
   - Student Retention
     o Large increase in transfer students- “becoming a force at John Jay.”
     o 1 year retention rate is improving (78.4%).
     o 6 year grad rate is low (38.4%).
     o It improves at 8 years.
   - New Majors (3 new degrees)
     o Latin American and Latina Studies
     o Anthropology and Sociology
     o Fraud and Forensics- broadly defined (Traditional white collar crime would fit into this)
       ▪ Looking for interested faculty from varying departments.
       ▪ Suggestions are welcome for Faculty members.
       ▪ Huge gap in this area at John Jay.
       ▪ All sorts of possibilities- i.e. literature studying forgery.
   - Pathways
     o Global Learning outcomes attached to initiatives.
     o New Pathways initiative serves as ties between 101s and General Education.
     o Justice Core (300- going forward- will have some global dimension to it).
     o Massive change underway.
   - Committee Structure
     ▪ Gen. Ed. Committee- Virginia sits on this committee.
     ▪ Wrote to chair about process of establishing common core.
     ▪ The 12 credit college option (for senior colleges)
       (proposal to decide for UCASC).
     ▪ 100 and 300 level justice core (learning outcomes will be established).
     ▪ Version for transfer as well.
     ▪ Once it goes through governance they can be put through.
     ▪ Will probably make March meeting.
     ▪ Implementation plan must be submitted to CUNY by April. Funds set aside for Gen Ed.
       Restructuring by CUNY. Schools will be competing for funds.
     ▪ Huge cost for the school. Hopefully CUNY will pay.
     ▪ Middle States Self Study- subcommittee falls to Dean’s Proposal write-up.
     ▪ Betsy Gitter (great on learning outcomes) will work with us on curriculum as a consultant.
She will help in selecting courses - what will go in the core.

- The Prerequisite Issue
  - The commonsense core does not differentiate between 100 and 200 level.
  - Establishing some uniformity in transfer credits is essential.
- The Common Core
  - Required course in the major can be in the common core.
  - Since students change majors all the time, flexible core can easily be set in place.
  - In the flexible core is there a cap in the number of courses offered? Hopefully not to give students options.
  - The number of General Education courses we have and will need are being assessed.
  - The number of sections will mainly be affected. It will be difficult for coordinators to accommodate.
  - Scheduling will be messy and hard for a while.
  - Everything you do in the classroom must meet learning outcomes i.e. critical thinking, writing.
- Subcommittee of UCASC
  - Developed to assess old General Education requirements
  - CAP Stone Assessment
  - Will be asking for a couple of papers already created for majors.
  - Apply new standards to old General Education
  - We fell short according to retroactive study.

2. Minutes of January Meeting

3. Study Abroad, study away from the majors
   - President Travis has great interest in expanding the program
   - Interested in enriching curriculum and offering experiential learning
   - Working on a report to the chancellor
   - Would like to double the number of students
   - Issues of scholarships and curriculum need to be worked out
   - Linkage between study abroad opportunities for majors is important.
   - Global thrust with our new General Education
   - New Director of study Abroad (Maureen Brady Coyle)
   - Some students have never traveled so give students the opportunity to travel within the US.
   - When chancellor reviews report, the Dean will share the results with the major coordinators.

4. Middle States preliminary information-closing the loop based on findings so far
   - Charting out Assessment Plans
     - What you did this year so far
     - 4 departments have not submitted plans (reports) yet
     - Currently have reports that range from detailed to insufficient.
     - To help these can be given around - Privacy will be maintained.
   - Political Science - Andrew Sidman Report
     - For the 2010-2011 Academic Year learning outcomes were assessed for the Political Science major through the analysis of research, writing and critical thinking skills. Findings (not entirely unexpected) include:
     - Out of 4 sections student papers were chosen arbitrarily yielding a sample of 60 papers
     - Rubric was developed relatively early
     - Students performed alright
     - Most help needed with research skills
     - Solution: Introduction to Research Skills course (200 level) was developed
     - Proposal was passed by college committee
   - Thoughts on single person assessments
     - Pros: The assessor ensures a standardized rubric which ensures consistency in assessment (which can either be good or bad depending on the quality of the rubric)
- Cons: It is a huge undertaking since the process is very time consuming

- Thoughts on the assessment process
  - Key to sampling is randomization
  - The size of the sample relates to the research question.
  - Better students are more likely to pick up their papers at the end of the semester so getting papers immediately at the end of the semester makes randomization easier
  - Run a mini reliability study
  - The results should resonate with the department’s faculty

5. Assessment
- Given the extra administrative duties is there a way to get rid of external review (looking at major and courses) and focus on learning outcomes.
- At John Jay outcomes assessment came late.
- It was imposed from the outside
- It will take a couple more years for it to be natural
- Think about models that work for your dept.
- If you agree on the rubric the second evaluation or assessment is easier.
- Hopefully you can identify changes that can be addressed in a short time frame.
- Rewrite learning outcomes and activities and assignments- must fit learning outcomes.
- Send rubric and changes To Virginia- with the report.

6. New business
- Humanities Fair (Thursday) – “raising the spectrum”- all are welcome
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
<th>COORDINATOR</th>
<th>PHONE NUMBER</th>
<th>Initials/Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Computer Information Systems</td>
<td>Shamik Sengupta</td>
<td>212-237-8826</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctional Studies</td>
<td>Lior Gideon</td>
<td>212-237-8991</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice (B.A.)</td>
<td>Evan Mandery</td>
<td>212-237-8389</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stanley Ingber</td>
<td>212-237-8382</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice (B.S.)</td>
<td>Serguei Che loukhine</td>
<td>212-237-8391</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice Management</td>
<td>Sal Guajardo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminology</td>
<td>Douglas Thompkins</td>
<td>212-484-1118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture and Deviant Studies</td>
<td>Elizabeth Hegeman</td>
<td>212-237-8289</td>
<td>Hegeman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>Jay Hamilton</td>
<td>212-237-8093</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Caroline Reitz</td>
<td>646-557-4755</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Science</td>
<td>Robert Till</td>
<td>212-484-1379</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire and Emergency Services</td>
<td>Charles Jennings</td>
<td>646-557-4638</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forensic Psychology</td>
<td>Deryn Strange</td>
<td>212-484-1345</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forensic Science</td>
<td>Lawrence Kobilinsky</td>
<td>212-237-8884</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Studies</td>
<td>Katie Gentile</td>
<td>212-237-8110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Criminal Justice</td>
<td>Peter Romaniuk</td>
<td>212-237-8189</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial Studies</td>
<td>James Cauthen</td>
<td>212-484-1109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities and Justice Studies</td>
<td>Bettina Carbonell</td>
<td>212-237-8702</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law and Society</td>
<td>James Cauthen</td>
<td>212-484-1109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Karen Okamoto</td>
<td>646-557-4777</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>Catherine Kemp</td>
<td>212-237-8908</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Studies</td>
<td>Jon Shane</td>
<td>646-557-4625</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>Andrew Sidman</td>
<td>646-557-4613</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>Maria Josephine Dagostino</td>
<td>212-237-8068</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Management</td>
<td>Robert McCrie</td>
<td>212-237-8386</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World History</td>
<td>Sara Mc Dougall</td>
<td>212-237-8817</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Council of Major Coordinators Meeting
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March 13, 2012

1. Announcements
2. Minutes of February meeting
3. COPS
4. Assessment
5. New business
Council of Academic Program/ Major Coordinators
March 13, 2012

Meeting Minutes

Present: James Llana, Shamik Sengupta, Elizabeth Hegeman, Catherine Kemp, Andrew Sidman, Maria Josephine Dagostino, Katie Gentile, Peter Romaniuk, James Cauthen, Bettina Carbonell, Karen Okamoto, Stanley Ingber, Jay Hamilton, Deryn Strange, Lawrence Kobilinsky, Robert McCrie, Sara McDougall

1.) Announcements
   • James Llana is filling in for Anne at this week’s meeting.

2.) Minutes of February meeting
   • The few people that voted were in favor of the minutes. Lawrence Kobilinsky and Robert McCrie mentioned that they were not included in the attendance for the last meeting. This information has been updated.

3.) COPS
   • Community of Practice
     o Group of people with common interests and problems
     o Leading edge of practice in relevant field
     o Looking at Practice Based Degrees
   • COP and new degree
     o Anne will soon be working with faculty to create Fraud and Forensics major
       ▪ She will identify key individuals in COP
       ▪ Assemble 10-12 representatives for Fraud and Forensics
       ▪ Schedule breakfast- solidify relations with these COP
       ▪ After initial breakfast, Anne will create survey to study larger COP
     o A human services degree will be developed later on and take on the same steps as Fraud and Forensics.
   • COP and Goals
     o We want to align the new degree proposal with COP
     o They may be interested in sponsoring students, offering scholarships
     o Annual follow up with faculty- always keep programs current
     o Human services- combination of courses and Public Administration
     o Look at current associate degrees- offered at CUNY and possibly generate a bachelors degree.
   • COP and standards
     o We have to do research first- Make sure there’s a market for the programs we’re putting out
     o English would not have to pass COP standards
     o Litmus test
       ▪ COP- applies to practitioner based programs
       ▪ Speak to Liberal Arts Majors
       ▪ Many COPs looking for certain competencies
         I.E. FBI wants solid liberal arts majors
       ▪ Relation between liberal arts and Justice Spheres
       ▪ An accrediting body for most of these standards
       ▪ Counseling will be accredited soon
       ▪ Accreditation important for externship and jobs
       ▪ Internship guidelines have not yet been approved
4.) Assessment

- Overcoming the Challenges of assessment
  - Crucial that faculty take control of assessment
  - We need to spread enthusiasm for assessment
  - Other campuses have culture of assessment
  - Great antagonist to assessment- Some faculty feel it’s unnecessary
  - Virginia- “The problem of assessment is not going away. We are a public institution and our funding may depend on it”.
  - “Assessment, at least it’s not pathways”
  - The allegory of the cave- we need to come out in the sunlight.
  - The worst that can happen- we can have a stronger program.
  - We need more provocative ways to attract fence sitters (strategic communication)
  - Setting standards for tenure
    - Tenure for positions (like coordinator) was never decided
    - This leads many to ask “How did we get here”- are we appointed, or chosen? and “What’s my role”- what documents state that?
    - Some people not willing to take on the role of coordinator.
    - Curriculum and Senate Council meetings have terms in place.
    - The first generation of individuals is in this forum so in the next two years, there will be a new group of coordinators.

- Advisement
  - We need deghettoization of advising at John Jay
  - Faculty should take on advising from top to bottom.
  - Good chance for everyone to get to learn about the process.

- Middle States
  - PowerPoint slides on what middle states expects will be e-mailed to everyone.
  - All departments should submit Minor reports- smaller version of Major- subset of major (less ambitious- omit research). State purpose for the minor i.e. statement of purpose and outcomes
  - Virginia will give feedback on reports (draft)
  - Majors in pretty good condition
  - Certificate programs and Minors need to be assessed
  - Individual offices need assessment as well
  - Some level of information needs to be public. 50% of colleges put up everything i.e. Student performance.
  - Committee will respond once it gets going.
  - We don’t get feedback until Middle states is done (Summative report gets sent to the school, not individual faculty)
  - We’re only as strong as our weakest link.
  - Middle States- are our peers
  - You can sign up to be a middle states evaluator.

- New all college committee
  - 7 faculty and 3 HEOs with Virginia
  - Develop guidelines for assessment that will go through governance
  - Several normal sessions to create a common plan
  - Carla Barrett- Sociology went to training workshop
    - “Understanding and using student assessment results”

- Workshops
  - Currently offered at John Jay
• Developing student surveys
• Developing assessment plans
• Related to Humanities and Math
• Workshops on assessment - usually do fill up.
• People are receptive.
• At some point we may do grad programs or first year.
  o New Workshop at Philadelphia
    • A little role play, develop recommendations (May 3rd - all day)
    • Costs covered by John Jay
    • Need 3 people to attend
• An informal meeting
  o To collectively develop an awareness of how other depts. are meeting the challenges of assessment.
  o Not a nuts and bolts meeting - an experience meeting (broad terms)
  o Meeting to be held as part of the Major Coordinator’s Meeting - (date not yet determined).
  o Refreshments will be provided.
  o Each Coordinator should bring someone (preferably from curriculum).
  o Meeting will not focus on rubrics or boring outcomes.
  o Instead there will be talk about possibility for assessment.
  o Virginia will discuss what has been found and where we go from here.
• Formal meeting
  o To be held later on with other CUNY members to learn about their experiences with assessment.
  o Peter will attend one on one program review at the end of April.
  o Program review process - not going well

5.) New business
• Middle States
  o Middle States Team Chair - President of Baltimore University will be visiting John Jay later this year or early January of next year.
  o He’ll have a draft of the self-study.
  o Recruitment of team will take place in upcoming months.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
<th>COORDINATOR</th>
<th>PHONE NUMBER</th>
<th>Initials/Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Computer Information Systems</td>
<td>Shamik Sengupta</td>
<td>212-237-8826</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctional Studies</td>
<td>Lior Gideon</td>
<td>212-237-8991</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice (B.A.)</td>
<td>Evan Mandery, Stanley Ingher</td>
<td>212-237-8389, 212-237-8382</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice (B.S.)</td>
<td>Serguei Cheloukhine</td>
<td>212-237-8391</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice Management</td>
<td>Sal Guajardo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminology</td>
<td>Douglas Thompkins</td>
<td>212-484-1118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture and Deviant Studies</td>
<td>Elizabeth Hegeman</td>
<td>212-237-8289</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>Jay Hamilton</td>
<td>212-237-8093</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Caroline Reitz</td>
<td>646-557-4755</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Science</td>
<td>Robert Till</td>
<td>212-484-1379</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire and Emergency Services</td>
<td>Charles Jennings</td>
<td>646-557-4638</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forensic Psychology</td>
<td>Deryn Strange</td>
<td>212-484-1345</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forensic Science</td>
<td>Lawrence Kobilinsky</td>
<td>212-237-8884</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Studies</td>
<td>Katie Gentile</td>
<td>212-237-8110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Criminal Justice</td>
<td>Peter Romaniuk</td>
<td>212-237-8189</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial Studies</td>
<td>James Cauthen</td>
<td>212-484-1109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities and Justice Studies</td>
<td>Bettina Carbonell</td>
<td>212-237-8702</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law and Society</td>
<td>James Cauthen</td>
<td>212-484-1109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Karen Okamoto</td>
<td>646-557-4777</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>Catherine Kemp</td>
<td>212-237-8908</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Studies</td>
<td>Jon Shane</td>
<td>646-557-4625</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>Andrew Sidman</td>
<td>646-557-4613</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>Maria Josephine Dagostino</td>
<td>212-237-8068</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Management</td>
<td>Robert McCrie</td>
<td>212-237-8386</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World History</td>
<td>Sara Mc Dougall</td>
<td>212-237-8817</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Council of Major Coordinators Meeting

Agenda

April 17, 2012

1. Announcements

2. Minutes of last meeting
   - Follow-up issues
     A. Role of the major coordinator; election/appointment
     B. Assessment work—extending the sphere of responsibility
     C. Advisement—Dr. Sumaya Villanueva, Director of Academic Advisement

3. The major and the college option

4. Assessment and General Education

5. Assessment update

6. New business
Council of Academic Program/ Major Coordinators
April 17, 2012

Meeting Minutes

Present: Shamik Sengupta, Sal Guajardo, Caroline Reitz, Charles Jennings, Deryn Strange, Lawrence Kobilinsky, Katie Gentile, Bettina Carbonell, Karen Okamoto, Catherine Kemp, Andrew Sidman, Maria Josephine Dagostino, Robert McCrie, Sara McDougall, Richard Li, Summaya Villanueva, Virginia Moreno

1.) Announcements
2.) Minutes of March meeting
   • Follow-up issues
     A. Role of the major coordinator: election/appointment
        ○ Bylaws do not specify terms
        ○ Bettina: “Some majors (Interdisciplinary majors) have 3 year terms. We could follow that”.
        ○ A formalized document describing the role of the Major Coordinator does exist in case anyone is interested.
        ○ No one was in favor of an election.
     B. Assessment work—extending the sphere of responsibility
        ○ We need more people in assessment process (in case coordinators are replaced.)
        ○ A kick off in the Fall rather than an informal meeting within the Coordinator’s meeting this semester is in the works to thank everyone involved in institutional function and improvement.
        ○ In the meantime Dean Lopes will send personal acknowledgements to each of the departments for all their hard work.
     C. Advisement—Dr. Summaya Villanueva, Director of Academic Advisement, brought in to discuss current and future endeavors of the Academic Advisement department
        ❖ SIMS
           ▪ Student information data system
           ▪ Allows faculty to look at student’s individual transcripts and see whether they are on academic probation.
           ▪ If you’re teaching a course you have access to the course roster on SIMS. You can grant permission for students to register.
        ❖ SALI
           ▪ Lists students in a particular major or minor (enrollment in minors is a little more challenging to find out since students don’t always declare their minor).
           ▪ Provides the names, e-mails, phone numbers and GPAs of students.
        ❖ General Advisement Information
           ▪ Not ghettoized on administrative end especially for first year
           ▪ Now 7 advisors assist 13,000 undergraduates
           ▪ Advisors do 90% of first year students
           ▪ Recently started advising transfers (was previously done by counseling).
        ❖ Advisement Pilot
           ▪ Fall 2011 was the first semester the pilot was put into effect.
           ▪ This semester starts off the 2nd year.
           ▪ Advisement is done two weeks prior to when registration opens.
           ▪ Student had to come in the 2 week period for priority registration.
           ▪ Timeframe ended April 5th for Priority Registration.
• In working with chairs, coordinators and administrators it was evident that not every dept. has a system of keeping track of how information is provided to students.
• The pilot brought some systemization to the process.
• Psychology dept. reported that faculty who didn’t normally advise actually enjoyed it and many students need it.
• Data collected from upper sophomores and lower juniors
  ▶ Fall 2011
    ▷ 725 Forensic Science and Psychology majors flagged - 364 actually advised (51%)
    ▷ 26 Psychology faculty agreed to participate - 23 actually met with students
    ▷ 17 Forensic Science Faculty agreed to participate - 14 actually met with students
  ▶ Spring 2012
    ▷ 547 Psychology majors flagged - 271 actually advised (51%)
    ▷ 113 English majors flagged - 48 actually advised (42%)
    ▷ 145 forensic Science majors flagged - 60 actually advised (41%)
    ▷ 27 global history majors flagged - 14 actually advised (52%)
    ▷ 6 History Faculty agreed to participate - 6 actually met with students
    ▷ 33 English faculty agreed to participate - 19 actually met with students
    ▷ 16 Science faculty agreed to participate - 13 actually met with students

✾ Academic Advising Council
- Started in September 2011
- Administrative units that have responsibility over advising.
- Representatives from the Athletics dept., SEEK, Admissions, and Registrar were brought together to make sure other units responsible for advising are up to date and communicating information to one another (to curtail miscommunication).
- Council meets once a month
  - Issues with Advisement
    - The major coordinator or chair usually has to deal with advisement issues. We need to spread it out to the department.
    - Junior faculty are also overburdened with advisement duties.
    - Advisement in major is expensive and not part of John Jay’s culture - we need a shift.
    - We need more dialogue and discussion
    - Faculty don’t routinely advise at John Jay
    - We want to recognize faculty role and potential
    - Suggestion - Do survey of Faculty

3.) The major and the college option
- 12 credit option in the process (puts stamp of college on it) - committee meeting this afternoon
- 100 level justice course - for first year seminar
- 300 level justice course - justice and equality or global perspective (would help with transition - has a transfer flavor).
- Foreign language requirement also to be added.
- 2 other buckets: learn from the past “history” & “Communication and fine arts”.
- 30 credits required for liberal arts
- The science part of 12 credit - (6 credit - 2 courses)
  - Needs to Specify outcomes of sciences more
  - Ensure lab experiences are more hands on
- UCASC will meet on Friday for the 2nd reading. Then the decision will pass to the college council and then onto implementation by Pathways in Fall 2013. (Some issues with people being pressured to vote one way or another by colleagues - assistance regarding this issue can be found with Dean Lopes).
- The sooner we have a college option, the sooner we can develop courses and deal with infrastructure issues.
4.) Assessment and General update
   • Pathways
     o It's here and it's going to stay
     o How will we implement it on the deadline?
     o Students are for Pathways- student government and chancellery endorses it.
     o Larry: "pathways cheats students of a solid general education and "What we had was better than what we're heading for".
   • General Education
     o Ad hoc committee on UCASC- assessing old general education.
     o Old general education was in bad shape- students were not getting the most out of it.

5.) Assessment update
   • Assessing student performance
     o Assessment of capstone
       □ Samples of papers used for capstone project not sent it
       □ We need oral presentations/ communication data of students
       □ Indication of where student communication skills are by graduation
       □ Need 1 or 2 papers for each level (meets expectations and does not meet expectations).
       □ Rubrics will be sent electronically
   • Reports (to be sent to Virginia)
     o documentation (closing the loop)
     o We need a written record
     o Few people have incorporated graphs data in reports
     o We need multiple measures (2 or 3) for each learning objective
     o Many people do not attach dates to revised reports
     o Please attach date to front page
     o New committee set up in the fall to give feedback on reports and plans
     o We need to keep community flavoring and address changes as soon as possible
   • New workshop on assessment at the end of the month
     o Programs review
     o Peter from ICU will be presenting

6.) New Business
   • We need to make the assessment and report process fun
   • July 1st is the deadline for the normal cycle
   • Reports should be sent prior to this date
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
<th>COORDINATOR</th>
<th>PHONE NUMBER</th>
<th>Initials/Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Computer Information Systems</td>
<td>Shamik Sengupta</td>
<td>212-237-8826</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctional Studies</td>
<td>Lior Gideon</td>
<td>212-237-8991</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice (B.A.)</td>
<td>Evan Mandery</td>
<td>212-237-8389</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stanley Ingber</td>
<td>212-237-8382</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice (B.S.)</td>
<td>Serguei Cheloukhine</td>
<td>212-237-8391</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice Management</td>
<td>Sal Guajardo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminology</td>
<td>Douglas Thompkins</td>
<td>212-484-1118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture and Deviant Studies</td>
<td>Elizabeth Hegeman</td>
<td>212-237-8289</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>Jay Hamilton</td>
<td>212-237-8093</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Caroline Reitz</td>
<td>646-557-4755</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Science</td>
<td>Robert Till</td>
<td>212-484-1379</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire and Emergency Services</td>
<td>Charles Jennings</td>
<td>646-557-4638</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forensic Psychology</td>
<td>Deryn Strange</td>
<td>212-484-1345</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forensic Science</td>
<td>Lawrence Kobilinsky</td>
<td>212-237-8884</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Studies</td>
<td>Katie Gentile</td>
<td>212-237-8110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Criminal Justice</td>
<td>Peter Romaniuk</td>
<td>212-237-8189</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial Studies</td>
<td>James Cauthen</td>
<td>212-484-1109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities and Justice Studies</td>
<td>Bettina Carbonell</td>
<td>212-237-8702</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law and Society</td>
<td>James Cauthen</td>
<td>212-484-1109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Karen Okamoto</td>
<td>646-557-4777</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>Catherine Kemp</td>
<td>212-237-8908</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Studies</td>
<td>Jon Shane</td>
<td>646-557-4625</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>Andrew Sidman</td>
<td>646-557-4613</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>Maria Josephine Dagostino</td>
<td>212-237-8068</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Management</td>
<td>Robert McCrie</td>
<td>212-237-8386</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World History</td>
<td>Sara Mc Dougall</td>
<td>212-237-8817</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Richard Li
Suraya Villanueva
Virginia Moreno
Council of Major Coordinators Meeting

Agenda

May 08, 2012

The agenda will include an overview of prior learning assessment, curriculum development in summer for the core and assessment.

1. Introductions
2. Prior Learning Assessment
3. Curriculum Development
Council of Academic Program/ Major Coordinators
May 08, 2012

Meeting Minutes

Present: Shamik Sengupta, Stanley Ingber, Sal Guajardo, Elizabeth Hegeman, Jay Hamilton, Caroline Reitz, Deryn Strange, Peter Romaniuk, Bettina Carbonell, James Cauthen, Karen Okamoto, Catherine Kemp, Andrew Sidman, Maria Josephine Dagostino, Sara McDougall, Virginia Moreno.

1.) Introductions

2.) Prior Learning Assessment
- Guest Speaker Kesiah Scully from NYU spoke about the assessment of adult learners in college context and how it was set up at Empire State.
  - Adult Market in NYU reached its pinnacle 15 years ago
  - Adult Market is now remerging in NYU
  - Issue of access for returning students
  - Scully will write her recommendations which the dean will go over
- John Jay has the youngest student population of any school in CUNY so we have fewer adult learners. Hunter and Baruch in particular have more returning adults.
- Ways that we might recruit adult learners
  - Hire someone to come up with creative recruitment strategies
  - Advertising in union newsletters may be beneficial for John Jay College.
- The current state of assessing prior learning at John Jay
  - John Jay offers credits for life experience from qualified training programs and work programs (college level learning acquired outside of the classroom). Emphasis is on knowing, not doing.
  - The life equivalent form is difficult to locate and process
  - Veterans are having a horrible time acquiring life equivalent credits and only about 4 students a year actually use it.
  - Article in Atlantic (February,) college not available to everyone. There is a decline in the number of students taking courses at night.
- What constitutes college level learning?
  - Utility of the problem, what you’ve done, what’s been accredited. How can you get accredited?
  - Kale- large study on prior learning assessment in student outcomes. Respect for prior learning and standards further along in credits.
- Ways to assess past experience for college level learning
  - Passing scores from the CLEP test
  - CUNY sponsored seminars that bring together faculty members from different colleges to perform a thorough evaluation of what constitutes prior learning and to formulate theories behind the experience of adult learners.
  - Besides looking at standards- students can put forth portfolios. An expert in the field would evaluate the student’s portfolio or essay.
- Public Service mission
  - Engage community for our justice focus
o Mission driven concerns- not all programs speak to our mission
o Engaging adult learners requires great flexibility and time but it is well worth the effort
o Pair readings with skills to enhance learning
o By Spring 2014- dean wants to market plan for vets and returning students

3. Curriculum Development
   • There is a need for a Blanket General Education
     o To make transition easier for students with very old credits otherwise Gen Ed has to be repeated.
   • Jim Llana wants feedback and templates to frame the response to outcome assessments.
     o Some thought it was too constricting or too much of a compromise
     o Structure seems a challenge for some
     o He welcomes ideas for template
     o Be sure to link capstone to overarching goals
     o Claims need to be substantiated with data collected
     o The overall table needs to be provided
     o Recommendations tend to be vague and general
     o Should be concrete and tied to action
     o Many do not send drafts of Reports
     o No samples of student papers used for last report with scores
     o Utilize exit survey for students graduating
     o Standards don’t feel right in the beginning
     o Assessment committee will send feedback for strengths and weaknesses
     o Assessment does matter for allocation of resources and deadlines help
     o CSI and Hostos went to Middle States recently and received detailed feedback
   • How can we stimulate more interest for assessment in your department and address assessment issues?
     o Possible assessment prize (incentive to include more colleagues) could be release from 3 credit course
     o What’s considered services for those up for tenure?
     o Chairs are concerned that untenured faculty are being overburdened
     o Tenured folk- we would like them to continue service
     o Figuring out how to get more help
     o Show us you’re closing the loop
     o All committee work counts as service
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
<th>COORDINATOR</th>
<th>PHONE NUMBER</th>
<th>Initials/Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Computer Information Systems</td>
<td>Shamik Sengupta</td>
<td>212-237-8826</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctional Studies</td>
<td>Lior Gideon</td>
<td>212-237-8991</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice (B.A.)</td>
<td>Evan Mandery</td>
<td>212-237-8389</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stanley Ingber</td>
<td>212-237-8382</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice (B.S.)</td>
<td>Serguei Cheloukhine</td>
<td>212-237-8391</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice Management</td>
<td>Sal Guajardo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminology</td>
<td>Douglas Thompkins</td>
<td>212-484-1118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture and Deviant Studies</td>
<td>Elizabeth Hegeman</td>
<td>212-237-8289</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>Jay Hamilton</td>
<td>212-237-8093</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Caroline Reitz</td>
<td>646-557-4755</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Science</td>
<td>Robert Till</td>
<td>212-484-1379</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire and Emergency Services</td>
<td>Charles Jennings</td>
<td>646-557-4638</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forensic Psychology</td>
<td>Deryn Strange</td>
<td>212-484-1345</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forensic Science</td>
<td>Lawrence Kobilinsky</td>
<td>212-237-8884</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Studies</td>
<td>Katie Gentile</td>
<td>212-237-8110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Criminal Justice</td>
<td>Peter Romaniuk</td>
<td>212-237-8189</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial Studies</td>
<td>James Cauthen</td>
<td>212-484-1109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities and Justice Studies</td>
<td>Bettina Carbonell</td>
<td>212-237-8702</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law and Society</td>
<td>James Cauthen</td>
<td>212-484-1109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Karen Okamoto</td>
<td>646-557-4777</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>Catherine Kemp</td>
<td>212-237-8908</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Studies</td>
<td>Jon Shane</td>
<td>646-557-4625</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>Andrew Sidman</td>
<td>646-557-4613</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>Maria Josephine Dagostino</td>
<td>212-237-8068</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Management</td>
<td>Robert McCrie</td>
<td>212-237-8386</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World History</td>
<td>Sara Mc Dougall</td>
<td>212-237-8817</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
JOHN JAY COLLEGE OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE
The City University of New York
The Interim Executive Committee of the College Council
Agenda

Wednesday, July 20, 2011
2:00 p.m.
531T

I. Adoption of the Agenda for the Executive Committee

II. Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee for academic year 2010-2011

Sept B11. Policy on Courses Repeated after Failing Three Times. Pg. 1
Sept B12. Policy on Credit limits for Students Coming off of Academic Probation. Pg. 3
Nov B1. Undergraduate Admissions Standards 2011-12. Pg. 9
Dec B2. Proposal to Establish a Second Chance Policy. Pg. 13
Dec B3. Proposal on the Rescission of the College’s Policy on the APA Style of Documentation. Pg. 15
Feb C3. Proposal to revise the College’s Incomplete Grade Policy. Pg. 17
Feb C4. Proposal on the Eligibility of Transfer Students for Graduation Awards. Pg.20
Mar B14. Proposal to revise the Latin Honors Standards. Pg. 21
Mar B15. Policy on Extra Work Assigned after Final Grades are Submitted. Pg. 23
May B6. Proposal for a New Model of General Education at John Jay – “Education for Justice”. Pg. 25 (Provost Bowers will send note to faculty at the beginning of the fall semester.)
III. Committee on Graduate Studies academic year 2010-2011

Sept 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. *Pg. 33*

Dec C1. Amended Version of the MPA proposal – Version 2.3. *Pg. 34*

Mar C5. A Resolution to Change the Prerequisites for the Completion of the Master of Arts in Criminal Justice. *Pg. 56*

May C11. A Resolution Regarding Program Registration. *Pg. 57*

---

IV. Faculty Senate for academic year 2010-2011

Feb E. Proposal from the Faculty Senate to Amend the John Jay Charter of Governance. *Pg. 58*

Mar B. Second Reading and Vote on Charter Amendment Proposed by the Faculty Senate. *Pg. 61*

May B.7. Two Proposed Resolutions Regarding the Proposed revision of John Jay’s General Education Curriculum. *Pg. 64*

May D. Request for Name Change by the African-American Studies Department. *Pg. 66*

May E. Proposal to Create a College Campus-wide Assessment Committee. *Pg. 67*

---

- How should these policies be disseminated to the college community?
- When should these policies go out to the college community?
- How should this process be done in the future?
The Interim Executive Committee of the College Council held its ninth meeting of the 2010-2011 academic year on Wednesday, July 20, 2011. The meeting was called to order at 2:10pm and the following members were present: Jane Bowers, Robert Pignatello, Berenecea Johnson Eanes, Andrea Balis, Jennifer Dysart, Karen Kaplowitz, Francis Sheehan, Carina Quintian, Dana Trimboli, Whitney Brown, Mehak Kapoor.

Absent were: 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. Proposals approved by the College Council for academic year 2010-2011
   It was moved to create a document, titled “New College Council Policies” that were approved by the College Council from September 2010 to May 2011. This document will be posted in the College’s Policies and Procedures Compendium, and J-Stop. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously

The meeting was adjourned at 3:15pm.
I. Adoption of the Agenda for the Executive Committee
II. Minutes of May 9, 2011 Executive Committee Meeting
III. Adoption of the Agenda for the September 22, 2011 College Council
IV. Nominations to Executive Committee of the College Council
V. Election of Secretary for Executive Committee of the College Council and the College Council
VI. New Business
The Interim Executive Committee of the College Council held its second meeting of the 2011-2012 academic year on Monday, September 12, 2011. The meeting was called to order at 1:40pm and the following members were present: Andrea Balis, Jane Bowers, Whitney Brown, Jennifer Dysart, Berenecea Johnson Eanes, Karen Kaplowitz, Mehak Kapoor, Robert Pignatello, Carina Quintian, Francis Sheehan, and Dana Trimboli.

Absent were: Jeremy Travis

I. Minutes of the May 9, 2011 Executive Committee Meeting

It was moved to adopt the minutes. The Departmental bylaws will be distributed to the next Executive Committee of the College Council.

The motion was seconded and passed.

In Favor: 6  Opposed: 0  Abstentions: 5

II. Adoption of the Agenda for the September 22, 2011 College Council

It was moved to adopt the agenda as amended. Item VI 2010-2011 College Council Activity Report (Attachment D) will include Faculty Senate to the list of Committees that submitted proposals. The motion was seconded as amended and approved unanimously.

III. 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. Andrea Balis History / ISP
  2. Elton Beckett Communication And Theater Arts
  3. Janice Dunham Library
  4. Jennifer Dysart Psychology
  5. Karen Kaplowitz English
Two (2) higher education officers
1. Shavonne McKiever                        Registrar
2. Michael Scaduto                        Financial Aid

Three (3) students
1. Whitney Brown                        President of the Student Council
2. Mehak Kapoor                          Vice President of the Student Council
3. Jeffrey Aikens                        Treasurer of the Student Council

The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

IV. Election of Secretary for Executive Committee of the College Council and for the College Council
It was moved to nominate Rulisa Galloway Perry for the position of secretary. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

V. New Business
The secretary of the Executive Committee of the College Council will amend the 2010-2011 Activity Report.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:30pm.
I. Adoption of the Agenda for the Executive Committee

II. Minutes of the July 20, 2011 Interim Executive Committee

III. Minutes of September 12, 2011 Interim Executive Committee Meeting

IV. Adoption of the Agenda for the October 19, 2011 College Council

V. New Business
The Executive Committee of the College Council held its third meeting of the 2011-2012 academic year on Wednesday, October 5 2011. The meeting was called to order at 1:50pm and the following members were present: Elton Beckett, Jane Bowers, Whitney Brown, Jennifer Dysart, Berenecea Johnson Eanes, Karen Kaplowitz, Mehak Kapoor, Shavonne McKiever, Michael Scaduto, Francis Sheehan, Staci Strobl, and Jeremy Travis.

Absent were: Jeffrey Aikens, Andrea Balis, Janice Dunham, and Robert Pignatello

I. Adoption of the Agenda for the Executive Committee
   It was moved to amend the agenda. Item III will be ‘Proposals Approved by the College Council”. In the future, item III will now be listed as “Proposals Approved by the College Council”. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

II. Minutes of the July 20, 2011 Interim Executive Committee Meeting
    Minutes of the September 12, 2011 Interim Executive Committee Meeting

   The minutes were not approved. There was a discussion on finalizing the procedure of disseminating College Council Policies in the future. An ad hoc committee on communication was formed to bring forth a recommendation for this process.

III. Proposals Approved by the College Council on September 22, 2011

   -Policy to Revise the BS in Criminal Justice (item C2): Effective date: Fall 2012
   -Policy for a New Minor in Human Rights (item C3): Effective date: Fall 2012
   -Policy to Revise the Program & Minor in Dispute Resolution (item C4): Effective date: Spring 2012
   -Proposal for a Dual BA/MA Degree in Forensic Mental Health Counseling(item D1): Effective date: Pending BOT and NYSED approval.
   -Policy for an Advanced Certificate in Applied Digital Forensic Science (item D2): Effective date: Fall 2012
- Policy to Increase the Allowable External Credit for Forensic Computing Students in the Forensic Computing Program (item D3): Effective date: Fall 2012

IV. Adoption of the Agenda for the October 19, 2011 College Council
It was moved to adopt the agenda as presented. The motion was seconded as amended and approved unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:40pm.
I. Adoption of the Agenda for the Executive Committee

II. Minutes of the July 20, 2011 and September 12, 2011 Interim Executive Committee
   Minutes of the October 5, 2011 Executive Committee

III. Proposals Approved by the October 19, 2011 College Council

IV. Adoption of the Agenda for the November 21, 2011 College Council

V. New Business
The Executive Committee of the College Council held its fourth meeting of the 2011-2012 academic year on Tuesday, November 8, 2011. The meeting was called to order at 1:50pm and the following members were present: Andrea Balis Elton Beckett, Jane Bowers, Whitney Brown, Joseph DeLuca, Janice Dunham, Jennifer Dysart, Berenecea Johnson Eanes, Karen Kaplowitz, Mehak Kapoor, Robert Pignatello, Michael Scaduto, Francis Sheehan, Staci Strobl, and Jeremy Travis.

Absent were: Shavonne McKiever

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 July 20, 2011 and September 12, 2011 Interim Executive Committee Meeting
   It was moved to adopt the minutes as presented. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

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

III. Proposals Approved by the College Council on October 19, 2011
   The proposals approved by the October 19, 2011 were presented to the Executive Committee of the College Council.

   Programs
   B1. Proposal to Establish a Dual/Joint Program in Associate in Science Degree in Accounting for Forensic Accounting (QCC) Leading to the Bachelor of Science in Economics (John Jay), Pg. 5 Effective Date: Fall 2012 Pending BOT and NYSED approval

   New Courses
   B2. ENG 2XX Screenwriting for Film, Television and the Internet, Pg. 49 Effective Date: Fall 2012
Course Revisions

B3. PSY 272 Correctional Psychology, **Pg. 68 Effective Date: Fall 2012**

B4. ANT 208 Cities and Culture, **Pg. 76 Effective Date: Fall 2012**

C1. A proposal for a new course in the Criminal Justice Program:
CRJ 7XX Investigation of Violent Crime, **Pg. 80 Effective Date: Fall 2012**

IV. **Adoption of the Agenda for the November 21, 2011 College Council**

It was moved to amend the agenda to reflect the following changes:

Item III, attachments B1-B13 “Report from the Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee”, will now become Item V.

Item III, attachment B13 “Guidelines for Academic Internships” was removed from the agenda.

Item III, attachment B1 “Model Syllabus” will now become Item IV, attachment C1.

Item IV, attachment C, “Proposed Policy from Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee and Faculty Senate Regarding Change of Grade After Final Grades are Filed”, will now become Item III, attachment B.

Item V, attachment D, “Request for a Departmental Name Change: Protection Management to: Security, Fire and Emergency Management”, will now become Item VI, attachment E.

Item VI, “New Business”, will now become Item VIII.

Item VII, “Administrative Announcements”, has been replaced with “Change in College Council Committee Memberships List”, attachment F. Administrative Announcements will now become Item IX.

Item VIII, “Announcements from the Faculty Senate”, will now become Item X.

Item IX, “Announcements from Student Council”, will now become Item XI.

The motion was seconded as amended and approved unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:40pm.
JOHN JAY COLLEGE OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE  
The City University of New York  
The Executive Committee of the College Council  
Agenda

Monday, December 5, 2011  
1:40 p.m.  
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I. Adoption of the Agenda for the Executive Committee

II. Minutes of the November 8, 2011 Executive Committee

III. Proposals Approved by the November 21, 2011 College Council

IV. Adoption of the Agenda for the December 12, 2011 College Council

V. New Business
The Executive Committee of the College Council held its fifth meeting of the 2011-2012 academic year on Monday, November 21, 2011. The meeting was called to order at 1:50pm and the following members were present: Andrea Balis Elton Beckett, Jane Bowers, Whitney Brown, Joseph DeLuca, Janice Dunham, Jennifer Dysart, Karen Kaplowitz, Shavonne McKiever, Robert Pignatello, Michael Scaduto, Staci Strobl, and Jeremy Travis.

Absent were: Berenecea Johnson Eanes, Mehak Kapoor, 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 November 8, 2011 Executive Committee Meeting
It was moved to amend the minutes as presented.

Under Proposals Approved by the College Council on November 21, 2011, Item II, D6. ARA 1XX Elementary Modern Standard Arabic I should be added to the list of new courses that were approved by the November 21, 2011 College Council.

The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

III. Proposals Approved by the College Council on November 21, 2011
The proposals approved by the November 21, 2011 were presented to the Executive Committee of the College Council.

C1. Model syllabus (tabled item B5 from October 19, 2011 Meeting
Effectice Date: Summer 2012

New Courses
- D1. CJBA 1XX  Introduction to Major Problems in Criminal Justice I
- D2. CJBA 1XX  Introduction to Major Problems in Criminal Justice II
- D3. CJBA 2XX  Crime Prevention and Control
Departmental Name Change: Protection Management to: Security, Fire and Emergency Management (attachment E)

**Effective Date: Summer 2012**

IV. **Adoption of the Agenda for the December 5, 2011 College Council**

It was moved to amend the agenda to reflect the following changes:

- Item III, will be presented by Provost Bowers and Professor Karen Kaplowitz.

- Item VI, attachment E, “Proposed Policy on the applicability of College policies to Undergraduate and Graduate policies” will now become Item IV, attachment C, “Proposed Policy from the Executive Committee of the College Council on the applicability of College policies to Undergraduate and Graduate policies”.

- Item IV, attachments C1-C13, “Report from the Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee”, will now become Item V and will be presented by Provost Bowers.

- Item V, attachments D1-D2, “Report from the Committee on Graduate Studies”, will now become Item VI.

The motion was seconded as amended and approved unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:14 pm.
JOHN JAY COLLEGE OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE
The City University of New York
The Executive Committee of the College Council
Agenda

Monday, February 6, 2012
1:40 p.m.
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I. Adoption of the Agenda for the Executive Committee

II. Minutes of the December 5, 2011 Executive Committee

III. Proposals Approved by the December 12, 2011 College Council

IV. Proposed policy regarding the Applicability of John Jay Policies to Undergraduate and Graduate Students and Programs

V. Adoption of the Agenda for the February 27, 2012 College Council

VI. New Business
Ministers of the Executive Committee of the College Council

Monday, February 6, 2012

The Executive Committee of the College Council held its sixth meeting of the 2011-2012 academic year on Monday, February 6, 2012. The meeting was called to order at 1:50pm and the following members were present: Jane Bowers, Whitney Brown, Janice Dunham, Jennifer Dysart, Berenecea Johnson Eanes, Karen Kaplowitz, Mehak Kapoor, Shavonne McKiever, Robert Pignatello, Francis Sheehan, Staci Strobl, and Jeremy Travis.

Absent were: Andrea Balis, Elton Beckett, Michael Scaduto, and Joseph DeLuca

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

II. Minutes of the December 5, 2011 Executive Committee Meeting
   The meeting was moved to adopt the minutes as presented. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

III. Proposals Approved by the College Council on December 12, 2011
    The proposals approved by the December 12, 2011 were presented to the Executive Committee of the College Council and amended as follows:

    New Courses:
    D1. POL 3XX Voting and Public Opinion, Pg. 10
    D2. LWS 2XX Introduction to Law and Society, Pg. 14
    D3. CJBA 2XX Criminal Responsibility, Pg. 17
    D4. CJBA 3XX Rights of the Accused, Pg. 21
    D5. SOC 3XX Qualitative Methods in Criminology, Pg. 24
    D6. GEN 4XX Senior Seminar in Gender Studies, Pg. 28
    Effective Date: Semester following BOT approval

    Course Revisions:
    D7. AAP/PSY 240 Psychology of Oppression, Pg. 31
    D8. SOC 203 Criminology, Pg. 48
    D9. ART 113 Introduction to Photography, Pg. 50
D10. ART 114 Intermediate Photography, Pg. 58
D11. ART 230 Issues in Art and Crime, Pg. 66

Effective Date: Semester following BOT approval

Programs
D12. Proposal to Revise the BA in Global History, Pg. 68
Effective Date: Semester following BOT & NYSED Approval
D13. Proposal to Revise the BA in English, Pg. 69
Effective Date: Semester following BOT & NYSED Approval

New Course:
E1. ICJ 7XX The Global Economy and Corruption, Pg. 74
Effective Date: Fall 2012

Course Revision:
E2. CRJ 753 Investigating Cybercrime, Pg. 77
Effective Date: Fall 2012

The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

IV. Applicability of John Jay Policies to Undergraduate and Graduate Students and Programs
Professor Kaplowitz will submit revisions for the College Council meeting on February 27, 2012. The motion was seconded as amended and approved unanimously.

V. Adoption of the Agenda for February 27, 2012 College Council
It was moved to amend the agenda as follows.

Item IV, “Proposed Policy Regarding Committee Meeting Dates” was tabled. Vice President Kapoor will circulate the list of requests for students to serve in College-wide Committees to the Executive Committee of the College Council to update for the March 12, 2012 College Council meeting.

Item V, “Report from the Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee” attachments D1 – D22, will now be listed as Item IV, attachments C1-C22.

Item VI, Committee on Graduate Studies, Attachment E2, “A resolution to change the Grade Appeal Process for Graduate Students.” was tabled.

Item VI, “Committee on Graduate Studies, Attachment E1”, will now be listed as Item V, attachment D1.
Item VI, “Committee on Graduate Studies, Attachment E1” will now become “Change in College Council Membership List”

The meeting was adjourned at 3:15 pm.
JOHN JAY COLLEGE OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE
The City University of New York
The Executive Committee of the College Council
Agenda

Monday, March 12, 2012
1:40 p.m.
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I. Adoption of the Agenda for the Executive Committee

II. Minutes of the February 6, 2012 Executive Committee

III. Proposals Approved by the February 27, 2012 College Council

IV. Adoption of the Agenda for the March 29, 2011 College Council

V. New Business
The Executive Committee of the College Council held its seventh meeting of the 2011-2012 academic year on Monday, March 12, 2012. The meeting was called to order at 1:50pm and the following members were present: Andrea Balis, Elton Beckett, Jane Bowers, Whitney Brown, Joseph DeLuca, Janice Dunham, Jennifer Dysart, Karen Kaplowitz, Mehak Kapoor, Shavonne McKiever, Robert Pignatello, Michael Scaduto, Francis Sheehan, Staci Strobl, and Jeremy Travis.

Absent were: Berenecea Johnson Eanes

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 6, 2012 Executive Committee Meeting
   It was moved to adopt the minutes as presented. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

III. Proposals Approved by the College Council on February 27, 2012
    The proposals approved by the February 27, 2012 College Council were presented to the Executive Committee of the College Council. There was an error made on item C21 in the name of the department, and it now reads as “Policy to Revise the Minor in Africana Studies and Establish an Honors Option.”

New Courses:
C1. ECO 3XX Political Economy of Gender, Pg. 7
C2. PSY 4XX Senior Seminar in Forensic Psychology, Pg. 11
C3. DRA 1XX Self, Media and Society, Pg. 15
C4. MUS 2XX Music Technology, Pg. 18
C5. MUS 3XX Music Composition Using Technology, Pg. 21
C6. HIS 2XX Imperialism in Africa, Asia and Middle East, Pg. 24
C7. POL 2XX Introduction to Research in Politics, Pg. 28
C8. CJBA 2XX (240) Quantitative Inquiry, Pg. 33
C9. CJBA 2XX (220) Race, Gender, Ethnicity, Crime and Justice, Pg. 37
C10. AFR 3XX Inequality and Wealth, Pg. 44
C11. HIS 3XX Female Felons in Premodern Europe and the Americas, Pg. 48
C12. CSL 2XX Case Management in Human Service, Pg. 51
C13. PSY 2XX Introductory Undergraduate Research in Psychology, Pg. 54
C14. PSY 3XX Supervised Undergraduate Research in Psychology, Pg. 57
C15. PSY 4XX Advanced Undergraduate Research in Psychology, Pg. 61

Effective Date: Semester Following BOT Approval
Course Revisions:
C16. ENG 233  News Reporting and Writing, Pg. 64
C17. PSY 275  Family Conflict and Family Court, Pg. 70
C18. PSY 442  Key Concepts in Psychotherapy, Pg. 76
C19. PSY 228  Psychology and Women, Pg. 81
C20. POL 214  Political Parties and Pressure Groups, Pg. 94

Effective Date: Semester Following BOT Approval

Programs
C21. Policy to Revise the Minor in Africana Studies and Establish an Honors Option, Pg. 97

Effective Date: Semester Following BOT and NYSED Approval

Course Revision
D1. PSY 748: Empirical Crime Scene Analysis, Pg. 114

Effective Date: Semester Following BOT Approval

IV. Adoption of the Agenda for March 29, 2012 College Council
It was moved to amend the agenda as follows:

- The following proposal was added under new business as item V, attachment D, “Distance Learning Education Application for MPA- IO Online Program” from the Committee of Graduate Studies.

- The following proposal was added under new business as item VI, attachment E, “Proposed Policies on Online Education” from the Faculty Senate.

- The following proposal was added under new business as Item IV, attachment C5 “Proposal for the College Option Portion of CUNY Pathways Gen Ed”. The former Item IV, attachment C5, “Proposal to Revise the Grade Appeal Process, has been made attachment C6.

- The following tabled item was added to the agenda Item III, attachment B as “Applicability of John Jay Policies to Undergraduate and Graduate Students and Programs” by the Faculty Senate.

- New Business will become Item VII.

- Administrative Announcements will become Item VIII.

- Announcements from Faculty Senate will become Item IX.

- Announcements from Student Council will become Item X.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:25 pm.
I. Adoption of the Agenda for the Executive Committee

II. Minutes of the March 12, 2012 Executive Committee

III. Proposals Approved by the March 29, 2012 College Council

IV. Adoption of the Agenda for the April 25, 2012 College Council

V. New Business
The Executive Committee of the College Council held its seventh meeting of the 2011-2012 academic year on Tuesday, April 17, 2012. The meeting was called to order at 1:50pm and the following members were present: Elton Beckett, Jane Bowers, Whitney Brown, Janice Dunham, Jennifer Dysart, Berenecea Johnson Eanes, Karen Kaplowitz, Mehak Kapoor, Shavonne McKiever, Robert Pignatello, Michael Scaduto, Francis Sheehan, Staci Strobl, and Jeremy Travis.

Absent were: Andrea Balis and Joseph DeLuca

I. Adoption of the Agenda for the Executive Committee
The agenda was amended to reflect the additional agenda item for discussion titled, Jurisdiction and Functions of the Executive Committee of the College Council. It was moved to adopt the agenda as amended. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

II. Minutes of the March 12, 2012 Executive Committee Meeting
It was moved to adopt the minutes as presented. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

III. Policies Approved by the College Council on March 29, 2012
The proposals approved on March 29, 2012 by the College Council were presented to the Executive Committee of the College Council and amended as follows:

New Courses:
C1. CJBS 4XX Capstone Seminar, Pg. 7
C2. POL2XX Media and Politics, Pg. 10
Effective Date: Semester following BOT approval

Course Revisions:
C3. GEN205 Gender and Justice, Pg. 14
Effective Date: Semester following BOT approval

Policies:
C4. Policy to Rearticulate the 2+2 Joint AA/BA degrees in Criminal Justice with John Jay’s revised B.S. degree in Criminal Justice (Institutional Theory and Practice), Pg. 17
Effective Date: Semester following BOT & NYSED Approval

Distance Learning Education Application for MPA-IO Program (attachments D), Pg. 33
Effective Date: March 29, 2012

Proposed Policy Regarding Committee Meeting Dates (attachment E), Pg. 47
Effective Date: March 29, 2012
IV. **Adoption of the Agenda for February 27, 2012 College Council**

It was moved to amend the agenda as follows:

- The following proposal would be added to the agenda Item III, attachment B10, “Proposal for the College Option Portion of CUNY Pathways Gen Ed,” pending approval by the Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee.

A motion was made to adjourn the meeting at 3:25 pm.
JOHN JAY COLLEGE OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE
The City University of New York
The Executive Committee of the College Council

Agenda

Wednesday, May 2, 2012
1:40 p.m.
610T

I. Adoption of the Agenda for the Executive Committee, Pg.1

II. Minutes of the April 17, 2012 Executive Committee, Pg.2

III. Policies Approved by the April 25, 2012 College Council, Pg.4

IV. Adoption of the Agenda for the May 15, 2012 College Council, Pg.5

V. Continued Discussion of the Jurisdiction and Functions, and Chairs’ Recommendations for the Executive Committee of College Council

VI. New Business
The Executive Committee of the College Council held its eighth meeting of the 2011-2012 academic year on Wednesday May 2, 2012. The meeting was called to order at 1:50pm and the following members were present: Andrea Balis, Jane Bowers, Whitney Brown, Janice Dunham, Berenecea Johnson Eanes, Karen Kaplowitz, Shavonne McKiever, Robert Pignatello, Michael Scaduto, Francis Sheehan, Staci Strobl, and Jeremy Travis.

Absent were: Elton Beckett, Joseph DeLuca, Jennifer Dysart, and Mehak Kapoor.

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 17, 2012 Executive Committee Meeting
    It was moved to adopt the minutes as presented. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

III. Policies Approved by the College Council on April 25, 2012
    The proposals approved on April 25, 2012 by the College Council were presented to the Executive Committee of the College Council and amended as follows:

New Courses:
B1. PSY 4XX Clinical Topics in Forensic Psychology, Pg.5
B2. ECO 3XX Sustainability: Preserving the Earth as a Human Habitat, Pg.20
B3. BIO 3XX Human Physiology, Pg.35
B4. MUS 1XX Introduction to Guitar, Pg.44
Effective Date: Semester following BOT approval

Course Revisions:
B5. SOC 222 Sociology of Mass Communication, Pg.55
B6. ECO 210 American Economic History and Development, Pg.58
B7. PSY/ANT 445 Culture, Psychopathology and Healing, Pg.75
Effective Date: Semester following BOT approval

Policies:
B8. Policy to Revise the BA Degree in Political Science, Pg.84
B9. Policy to Revise the Minor in Gender Studies, Pg.92
Effective Date: Semester following BOT & NYSED Approval

C1. A Resolution for Changes to be made in the Graduate Bulletin for Submission of a Grade Appeal Application, Pg.96
Effective Date: Semester following BOT & NYSED Approval
C2. A Policy to Revise the Curriculum of the MPA: Inspection and Oversight Program,

Effective Date: Semester following BOT & NYSED Approval

Pg. 98

C3. A Policy to Revise the Curriculum of the MPA: Public Policy and Administration Program, Pg. 105

Effective Date: Semester following BOT & NYSED Approval

IV. Adoption of the Agenda for May 15, 2012 College Council

It was moved to amend the agenda as follows:

- The proposal titled ‘Proposed Amendments to the College Council Bylaws to Insure Full Representation By Students” Item V, attachment D, was removed from the College Council agenda because of the following statement in Article V, Section 2 titled Amendments of the college’s Charter of Governance:

  “Any amendment to the Charter to be made by action of the College Council shall be proposed and discussed at regular meeting of the College Council and shall be voted on at the next regular meeting of the College Council.”

- Proposed College Calendar will become Item V.
- New Business will become Item VI.
- Administrative Announcement will become Item VII.
- Announcements from the Faculty Senate will become Item VIII.
- Announcements from the Student Council will become Item IX.

A motion was made to adjourn the meeting at 3:25 pm.
Agenda
Joint Meeting of FPS/SPS
Thursday, September 1, 2011  3:00 pm
Room 610T

1. Approval of Minutes for April 14, 2011

2. Financial Reports. CUNY Allocation, Compact, and Financial Plan

3. CUNY PMP. Committee participation in process, timelines, targets and goals for next year.


5. Meeting schedule for year. Some general discussion should inform this planning.

Joint Meeting: FPS/SPS
Minutes
September 1, 2011

Present: Jane Bowers, James Llana (SPS Chair), Robert Pignatello (FPS Chair), Karen Kaplowitz, Staci Strobl, Harold Sullivan, Thomas Kucharski, Ned Benton, Carina Quintan, Ricardo Anzaldua, Virginia Moreno, Ben Rohdin, Pat Ketterer, Richard Saulnier, Marcella Duque (Recorder)
Absent: Francis Sheehan, Inez Brown, Maki Haberfeld, No student representative assigned as of yet

1. **Approval of Minutes for April 14, 2011.** Minutes were approved without amendment.
2. **Introduction of new members.** Ric Anzaldua, new Director of Institutional Research (non-voting staff), and Staci Strobl, new Faculty Senate Representative to the SPS, were introduced.
3. **Status of Financial Plan.** (Rob) The last time we met the news wasn’t good, but over the summer there was a budget agreement which “recognized” the earlier tuition increase and raised tuition predictably for the next several years. Our initial allocation was received less than a month ago, and there were base budget reductions. We did not get the entire allocation; lump sums are still to come and there’s a 2% reduction there. Overall, we’re probably looking at a 2.5% reduction instead of the 4% one we were anticipating earlier. The news for the future is good: with the tuition increases we expect an investment program to recoup some of the losses we have sustained.
   The Compact allocation is $1.2 million but since some of that is self-funding, it is effectively about $400 thousand. We don’t have a date yet, but the financial plan will probably be due near the end of this month.

   [Referring to handout, “FY 2011 Financial Plan Projection and FY 2012-13 Estimate”] Note that the year-end balance for last year is $2.972 million, significantly more than we had anticipated, and this will give us a good cushion for the coming year. The next year looks a little scary.
   Pat continued the discussion, pointing out that we will end this year with almost $3 million in surplus, thanks to everyone. The revenue target for FY2012 is up $6 million because of the tuition increase. Our hope for next year is that the Compact will be more, but we just don’t know that at this point. Last spring we were looking at flat enrollment, but it then looked like it would be less so we revised the budget accordingly.
   On the expenditures side: we have included exemptions from the pause; we’re figuring adjuncts to be the same or less; temp services will be steady; with OTPS we’re sticking with the plan, but last year we spent less than plan. These are conservative projections with no separations figured in.
   Rob pointed out that the financial plan may include hires, although there will be no automatic re-hiring. The President will share exemptions with the Sub-Committees.
   Ned questioned the process concerning the Year Round Director and Distance Learning Director, positions that are now being searched. Were there consultations on these?
   Rob responded that it’s not unusual that plans get put together in this way. The budget wasn’t adopted until late and it’s difficult to create a financial plan until that plays out. The Distance
learning position has priority because it is for raising revenue. The Tech Fee Committee has approved funds so there’s no tax-levy impact for this position. The President likes the Year Round position, and he has approved it. Karen pointed out that the Senate discussed both Task Force reports [Year Round and Online] and didn’t object, and since no other body objected, the reports became the basis for policy decisions. Jane shared that both reports were widely publicized and that we had discussed the importance of revenue-sharing initiatives. Tom responded that SPS/FPS did not vote on either hire; perhaps the Reports should have been brought to this committee for votes. Jane cited the minutes for April 14 to show that discussion had taken place. Harold said we were supposed to vote on positions; the positions may make perfect sense, but there was a problem with the process. Karen reported that she had been asked by a VP to name faculty committee representatives for a search that had never been publicized: Director of Commencement and Student Orientation. Interviews have been scheduled. We do need a protocol for this process, she concluded. Rob stated that “we” have made a good faith effort to bring positions here and for the most part we have brought positions to the Committee. We’re making a good effort at transparency. There was some continued discussion of the sub-committees’ role in approving exempt positions.

4. Enrollment Report. [item added to agenda after distribution, at request of member] Richard distributed a handout with enrollment data. We have to submit targets each spring to CUNY. We were told by CUNY initially to count on flat enrollment but we ended up with lower targets than the University wanted. For this semester we still have 550 students who haven’t paid yet. We’ll know more next week, most significantly about College Now which typically builds back our FTEs. In sum, we’re probably looking at 11,484 FTEs for this fall, and that’s the budget figure we have been working with. We’re low on undergraduates because we reduced our SEEK students by 100. Transfers are strong because of the Justice Academy impact. Graduate admits are up; Ned did good work with the MPA. We “held our own” in the Criminal Justice MA; we may have turned the corner there.

Ned asked for enrollment reports for prior years to establish a context. The number of CJ students in classes is 80% of what we had last year, he claimed, and he challenged the idea that we are holding our own. Richard responded that we can run the numbers for previous years. Ben said we haven’t talked about revenue targets and that maybe we should have that discussion. We are “way down” over last year in FTEs—and about a 500 FTE drop over two years; this is over $3 million. We need to have year-to-year comparisons and need to keep track of when we lower targets.

In response to a question about the conversion rate, Richard said it’s down this year. Generally it’s 30% for freshmen and SEEK; we were number 2 in CUNY last year because students who apply to us often want to come here first.
Karen asked about the impact on enrollment of the new class schedule and community hour. Richard doesn’t know, but we do have a high fill rate. The first period did fine even though it’s now earlier. Friday slots are in demand. The new schedule doesn’t seem to have an impact. Ben asked how CUNY assigns revenue targets. Can we look for an “injection” because of all our conditional admits, for example? Pat responded that she had never seen a reduction in a revenue target. Ben pointed out that we took a big hit on faculty relative to other CUNY’s and so we should ask for more money.

5. **PMP Report.** Jim distributed a copy of the latest PMP Goals and Targets for 2011-12 and said that the sub-committees should have some involvement in shaping this report next year. The due date is in June, and it’s difficult to gather the proposed targets from across the College in time; if the sub-committees are to offer some advice it will have to be on a fine timeline before the due date. Ned thought that much earlier involvement would be good if we’re to “materially affect” the contents. Jane pointed out that much of the content is fixed by CUNY. Jim agreed that many items are automatically calculated by CUNY, but there are self-reports of targets aimed at satisfying the CUNY goals, strategies, and objectives. We will have a preliminary discussion in January to see what’s possible.
Agenda
Joint Meeting of FPS/SPS
Tuesday, September 13, 2011  1:40 pm
Room 531T

1. Approval of minutes for meeting of September 1, 2011.


3. Campus-Wide Assessment Committee. Brief status report (carried over from last meeting)

Joint Meeting: SPS/FPS
Minutes (amended Sept. 28, 2011)
September 13, 2011

Absent: F. Sheehan, N. Benton, C. Quintian, V. Moreno

1. Approval of Minutes for September 1, 2011. Minutes were adopted without amendment.

2. PMP Presentation. Jim presented a Powerpoint analysis with hardcopy of the slides [added to the agenda and emailed to the committee earlier] of the negative indicators and trends from the 2010-2011 CUNY PMP Year-End Report. Based on our performance over the year we were assigned by CUNY to the bottom quintile, down from a first quintile performance a year earlier. The PMP ratings are always relative to other campuses so it is possible to maintain performance and move in the rankings. He identified weaknesses in full-time faculty coverage, mean teaching hours, credit accumulation, retention and graduation rates, enrollment and FTEs, as well as offering observations on the relative numbers of freshmen and graduate students at John Jay, compared to the other senior colleges. Of 14 “key indicators” John Jay lagged on 13. Rob took a moment to say that the one above average performance was “institutional support services as a percent of the total tax-levy budget.” This shows we do a good job of keeping our dollars devoted to instruction.

By way of explaining the drop in grants, Jim pointed out that relatively few faculty account for a major share of grant funding, and that a decrease in one or two grants can spell the difference between an increase or decline overall. Fund-raising should increase significantly next year as we formally open the capital campaign. College Now did not meet enrollment targets; it needs more focus on recruitment.

3. Financial Plan. Rob distributed the following documents: “DRAFT Financial Targets: FY2011 – 12 Budget Including Compact (as of Sept 13, 2011 FPS),” “John Jay College; FY 2011 Financial Plan Projection and FY 2012-13 Estimate,” and “DRAFT Summary of Proposed FY12 Compact Funding and Potential FY13 Compact Investments.” This year it looks good for an annualized FTE of 11,159. We ended the 4th quarter with a positive balance of $3.9 million. We had better collections ($300,000 better), and one cut was revoked ($700,000). Hopefully we’ll have Compact money next year, but of course it’s for things that the University wants. We need to invest part of the surplus and Compact strategically in order to raise revenue to counter the seemingly perpetual lack of balance in the budget. The Master Plan and PMP indicators should shape our investments, so the proposed Year Round program and advising are on the list. There is still not due date for the financial plan. We will have to take the plan to the College Council and consult with elected student and faculty leaders.

A nine-page handout on vacancies was distributed: “Financial Planning/Strategic Planning Subcommittee Meeting, September 13, 2011, Exemptions to Pause.” Then the discussion returned to the budget.
Regarding the Compact, we’ll get about $473,000 of the $1.2 million, since we’re obliged to make up the difference. [The Compact document shows net new funding of $413,700.]

Pat, referring to the “DRAFT Financial Targets: FY2011 – 12 Budget Including Compact (as of Sept 13, 2011 FPS),” noted ideas from the VP’s last spring. Under expenditure reductions, there is doctoral student support, increasing efficiency in scheduling, and taking advantage of larger classrooms in new building. Tom pointed out that losing two doctoral students means we’ll have to hire adjuncts to cover what they do. On another point, Ben said that he feels confident that the adjunct savings are real since enrollment is down.

In terms of investing for new revenue, Pat went through the Marketing/Recruiting plan on the same page. Richard pointed to hiring a new recruiter for improving the yield on out-of-state students and new call center staff to answer the phones. He explained the EPS service agreement to sharpen our focus in the high schools. We’ll learn what our high school audience wants. Pat pointed to increased retention through advisement, the Year Round program, John Jay online (paid for by tech fees), Continuing Education, and course fees.

Jane discussed advisement; we’ve requested a new group of 3 professional advisors. Pat reviewed other items on the handout (investments/initiatives): the need for a small furniture budget for the upcoming move; the need to continue CA conversions (we have many CA’s who work nearly full-time hours, and CUNY has tightened control over this title); need for athletics van and vehicle replacement plan; branding; career advisement plan; and new building audio/visual equipment.

Jane described faculty hiring: six critical need tenure-track faculty have been authorized to start in fall 2012 (two in Science; two in Public Management; one in ICJ; and one in Foreign Languages). We are hiring lecturers in math and composition, including a coordinator in math who in essence will report to Dean Lopes. We don’t have full-time faculty in the Math Department to teach foundation courses, but lecturers will teach only foundation courses. Jane will be seeking chairs’ advice for a five-year hiring plan.

Karen noted that the pledge to the Faculty Senate and the College Council to not have our Honors Program funded from tax-levy funds, but rather from philanthropic gifts, is being honored. Pat noted that Richard put in exemptions, all of which are in the vacancies report cited above.

Meeting was adjourned at 3:10 pm.
Joint Meeting of SPS/FPS
Agenda
September 28, 2011
1:30 – 2:30 pm
Rm. 531 in Haaren Hall

1. Approval of Minutes for September 13, 2011. See attachment.
2. Discussion of Financial Plan for FY 2012 and out years.
3. Discussion of Enrollment Plan for FY 2012 and out years.
4. Discussion of CUNY Master Plan 2012-2016. Brief introduction to request by CUNY to contribute to University Master Plan.

Please try to be on time; the agenda is dense and the time is short. Thanks!
Joint Meeting: SPS/FPS
Minutes
September 28, 2011
1:30 – 2:30 pm Rm. 531H

Absent: S. Strobl, T. Kucharski, Anna Singh

1. Approval of Minutes for September 13, 2011. Following an amendment to the minutes from Karen, the minutes were approved and adopted as amended.

2. Financial Plan (FP) Presentation. Presented by Rob (handouts). The College received its allocation in August; there was a meeting and discussion by the Executive Staff. An extension was requested from CUNY in order to satisfy the consultation requirements; there will be a meeting of the larger Budget and Planning Committee (B&PC) on 10/06, and the financial plan will be submitted the following day. Rob stated that this has been a historic year for financial planning for the College. The tuition deal with the state means steady funds, and there is a guarantee against cut-backs in the form of the “maintenance of effort” provision. Now it is possible to plan. We can address weaknesses in the PMP, build back faculty, operate the new building, balance the new budget, and create a true reserve (not simply making cuts one year to pay for things the next). In order to do this we must rely on enrollment (ENR), and the planning there is now more actively tied to academic planning. Over the next two years the enrollment will grow to cover investments and create a foundation for further growth and investment.

Rob reviewed the handout (emailed in advance) entitled “John Jay College – FY 2012 Financial Plan Projection and FY 2013-14 Estimate.” The College is required to have a balanced budget for 2012, 2013 and 2014; we will grow modestly over the next few years. Pat brought slightly updated documents, and she reviewed carefully “FY2012 Compact Plan Investments,” which included hires across the College. The COMPACT = $1.2 million; a part of it is self-funded, resulting in approximately $414K in new money, with the remainder coming from internal shifting. It is important for the College to make some investments with a portion of the money. We have held OTPS and Temp Services pretty constant, but there is now a higher baseline because of the new building. We will be asking for additional allocations next year (i.e. for the Science Labs, which will not be moving until next year). We are holding off on hiring three professional academic advisors.

Ned expressed concern that we are not doing enough to hire faculty, and that the faculty has not participated in developing the plan. Pat explained that the categories and allocations are set by the University, and that deviation from the plan is limited. Rob followed with a brief history of the Flagship Program investment when heavy
investments were made in faculty. The proposed plan is a minimum of what the College needs in order to support growth in other areas, namely increased ENR. We have to invest to get funds in order to hire faculty. Jane agreed that we have to invest in creating more revenue, and she noted the immediate plan for faculty: six faculty hires and one line being converted to HEO Counselor. Once we build revenue we can plan to return to 2009 faculty level. She will present to the President a plan to reach that level over the next 4-5 years.

Ned is concerned that the College will not hit the ENR targets, thus reducing revenue, which will result in not hiring faculty. When we run out of money we’ll be left with only non-faculty positions filled. Jane stated that the College was granted permission to hire three additional academic advisors, but she took these out of the equation. Rob argued that we have to create revenue in modest and thoughtful ways; we need to leverage the new building, and he thinks we can meet the enrollment numbers. Ben added that the College could get 7 lecture lines plus 30 in the next few years if the plan is successful. Ned then presented his projections (handout: “Financial Plan Projections Through FY 14”) which challenged the numbers presented in the proposed financial plan. In his model he changed three numbers in order to show that “small” changes in assumptions mean big differences in outcomes. Rob floated the suggestion of hiring substitutes in order to maintain flexibility through the plan; given the economy, we should have no problem getting good people willing to take jobs even if there are no certain long-term prospects. Karen made a motion that we present this as a formal recommendation to the Budget and Planning Committee and the President, but before acting on the motion we decided to proceed with the enrollment discussion.

3. Enrollment Plan Presentation, Presented by Richard (emailed handouts: “Financial Plan Projections Through FY 14”). The yield rate on the incoming class went from 30% to 25%. The College did not do a good job in bringing in the last class; we did not have enough staff to support effective recruitment of those who were accepted. The College has to invest in additional support staff; subs may be hired as HEOs but they cannot be hired as Gittlesons, and the support staff is comprised of HEOs. Richard does not share a lot of Ned’s concerns.

There was further discussion of the motion concerning the use of substitutes. Karen made a motion that this committee recommend to the B&PC and President Travis that where possible ALL positions in the financial plan be made substitutes. The motion was seconded by Harold. It was made clear that this motion applies to positions that are in the plan and DOES NOT APPLY TO COMPACT POSITIONS.

Freshmen are the real driver; 98% are full-time with an average of 13 credits. Richard noted that the Hobson’s online application was successful for graduate students; admissions for graduate students increased 13%. It is important to note that each graduate student is equal to 6/10th of an FTE. On a positive note, there are approximately 700 potential transfers (students with 39 credits at the end of last spring)
in the Justice Academy programs; these students are being contacted by JJC. Richard went on to explain that fall to spring does change, and that the return rate is being brought down beginning spring 2012; this number will decline slightly even if retention increases. Our data is coming from David Crook’s office; our estimates are low until we have some history (more than two years). There are other ways we are working to increase/improve retention.

In response to the number of potential transfers, Virginia expressed concern that the number may not be realistic because research on students graduating from community colleges states that this population of students is more concerned/preoccupied with getting jobs.

Ned discussed his thoughts about the investment in Year-Round College; he tried to see what the payback would be, but could not see where summer or winter ENR changes. He stressed the need to have some metric to tell us if an investment does or does not work; it is a bit of a struggle getting our hands around summer ENR. Richard stated that no projections had been made about summer ENR. Pat offered that winter and spring are tracked separately and that no growth has been built in. Ned expressed his idea that if we could say as a committee what we are expecting to see, it would be good. In response, Jim referred to the Year-Round College (YRC) report – there is a range that was based on average CUNY senior colleges that have a ratio of summer to fall enrollment of 40% or so; JJC has a ratio of 27%, and the enrollment and revenue potential was based on the gap between John Jay and the senior college average.

Finally, there was a vote on a motion to make the following recommendation to the President and the Budget and Planning Committee: “Where titles make doing so possible, substitutes should be hired for all non-faculty positions that are part of the 2012 financial plan.” The motion carried, 9 in favor, 2 opposed, and no abstentions.

4. Jim distributed the CUNY PMP report and advised that this report was not to be copied or distributed to any individuals beyond this group. He also distributed some information on the development of the CUNY Master Plan 2012-2016, and said he would be in touch concerning this via email.

The meeting was adjourned ~ 2:45 pm.
Joint Meeting Agenda
Strategic and Financial Planning Sub-Committees
October 25, 2011
1:40 pm - Room 531 Haaren

1. Approval of Minutes for September 28, 2011.
2. Budget update.
3. CUNY Master Plan 2012-2016. Continued from last meeting. Co-chair received no response to emailed solicitation for suggestions in the interim, but we will have a chance to discuss. Attached is a background piece from CUNY and summary of what CUNY is asking from us; the latter was distributed at last meeting. We should focus on the five bulleted questions in the summary.
4. Strategic Positioning. Presentation of plan to increase enrollment and strengthen position of the college in the learning environment, locally and globally.
Joint Meeting: SPS/FPS
Minutes
October 25, 2011
1:40 – 3:00 pm Rm. 531H

Absent: R. Pignatello (FPS Chair), F. Sheehan, A. Singh, M. Haberfeld, R. Saulnier

1. Approval of Minutes for September 28, 2011. Minutes were approved as proposed.

2. Budget: Removed from agenda.

3. CUNY Master Plan 2012 - 2016. Jim solicited ideas from the SPS/FPS via email but no feedback was received. The subject came up at the PAC Meeting, and it was suggested that it be revisited at the upcoming SPS Meeting. CUNY provided questions to think about when formulating ideas for the CUNY Master Plan; the Faculty Senate did not have time to consider suggestions, but the HEO Council submitted some great ideas. Jim met with student representatives, and they expressed their feelings about having no connection to CUNY the system; they are interested in social and networking events with students from other CUNY schools, as well as being ambassadors to educate other CUNY students about JJC not being a ‘cop school’. There was further discussion about the CUNY MP ideas.

Ned stated that if students are asked to pay 30% more, there should be some consideration of student input regarding how the monies are distributed. It was noted that this item was also presented as part of the HEO submission. He felt that some of the 30% should be focused on the historically inequitable monies—across campuses—from CUNY. The allocation is based on the CUNY model which probably has not been revisited in quite some time. Pat’s view is that CUNY deducts money from the top and then distributes the remaining money. Ben would like CUNY to strategically invest in the success of John Jay College as opposed to simply using baseline numbers. Virginia noted that JJC may not fare well if the determination is based on success (retention and graduation rates) and that the College needs to represent itself differently. In the assessment section, the College should refrain from talking about sustaining a culture of accountability; this speaks to Middle States.

Virginia raised a question regarding the mention of work-family balance for faculty in the material from CUNY. She found this offensive and felt that once again the staff was overlooked; this is not an amusing scenario but rather a matter that should be taken seriously. Jane noted that the staff at John Jay always appears to be overworked and the offices understaffed.
Tom feels that there are disconnected groups around the college implementing projects that require more work and resources, the equivalent of unfunded mandates (i.e. CUNY First). The question posed was, “What are the CUNY priorities?” Jim had no idea what the priorities are, thus he discussed the cover letter that was sent with solicitation for CUNY Master Plan input; it stresses the terrible economic times, how the College needs to prepare students for jobs, the importance of taking advantage of technology, how the College must address and be able to work across cultures, and the globalization of the curriculum. There was also an explicit reference to the College becoming more entrepreneurial in developing revenue. A couple questions remain: How these new initiatives will be implemented? Is the MP really a guiding document?

4. **Strategic Positioning.** Jane spoke with faculty about the new strategic initiative involving key units of the College; Academic Affairs is central and primary in this effort. Jane stressed that the College is looking ahead to eventually build back faculty to the previous high number. There are concerns about slipping enrollment numbers.

Distribution of SEM Funnel Handout by Jane, the document received as part of strategic positioning planning. We’ve done little work with the top of the funnel—“suspects and prospects”—two categories of potential students. We will not have enough students in the funnel if we do not increase the number of suspects → prospects → respondents. The College has improved in various aspects, and we are poised to leverage these advancements. JJC needs to work on its story and positioning, featuring our justice mission. We need to start thinking very strategically about how we bring students in; there are various “channels” that need to be developed. The focus for now will be on three key channels:

I. Admission phases from CUNY: there is a system called CARS in which all CUNY applications are listed in a database — whether or not the application is complete. John Jay College will soon use this system to communicate to all students who have applied to the college prior to the time when CUNY releases those applications to the College. This will allow us to get ahead of the multi-phased CUNY allocations of applicants to the College. The goal is to ‘touch’ the students twelve times in hopes of enticing them to attend the campus via various planned events; this will require a tremendous amount of staff and energy. JJC never accessed the CARS database before, and in the past waited to receive the first phase allocation from CUNY in late January or early February, with successive phases running into the summer. Since the better prepared students tend to show up in the early phases, the CARS approach will allow us to reach out to them earlier and often—and hopefully attract more of them.

II. CUNY Justice Academy Students

III. Transfers Students

A series of symposia, driven by faculty, are lined up for this year that could be of interest to potential students and their parents (with a format similar to the “Actor’s Studio”). The objective is to make JJC a place for issues of justice. The events will
generate high-press attention, advertorials to the High Schools and the community at large, and provide opportunity for JJC image projection. The topics will be viewed as hot and important, i.e. Cyber bullying, child abuse, wrongful convictions and sex crimes. We will establish a Justice Matters website where proceedings from the symposia are posted, and links from this website would take users to the faculty research. All students in CARS would be invited to participate. The College has to change the yield so that we have different student profiles, better prepared students and increased enrollment.

This initiative must link to the financial planning of the College; there will need to be some initial investments in order to foster success. Tom believes the College could do better with regard to how we are projected in the media, via enhanced coordinated connections between JJC and the press coverage of our faculty. Prime examples of when this could have been done were in the Troy Davis and Amanda Knox cases.

Jane will have Mayra speak about our efforts once the College is further along in the process; Mayra is currently meeting regularly with Karen Terry to discuss the research component, and there are other components. Ned interjected that it is important to identify ways of knowing how effective the College’s efforts are. In response, Jane decided to share the list of “touches”—some are very specific— with the SPS/FPS. One aspect is ongoing research and assessment on the prospects, which will be reviewed on a daily basis. We hope to get prospects via the process and suspects via the image projection. There is some sense of urgency; the relevant units will be engaging applicants while the College is simultaneously using reimaging to connect with suspects, the widest pool of prospective applicants at the top of the funnel.

The number of College Now students currently enrolled has decreased in comparison to the number who actually attends John Jay College. Unfortunately, the College is not allowed to recruit CN students. The majority tends to move away from CUNY, and with the high school student population shrinking, the college must project increasingly to adult learners.

Karen stated that there is skepticism in the Faculty Senate regarding the success of the phone-a-thon, and wanted to know whether or not the phone-a-thon report is available. Jane responded on Richard’s behalf, stating that the phone-a-thon was successful and that another one will be conducted to invite prospective students to the Accepted Student Days, which will be held on Saturday mornings. Post cards will also be sent to students who cannot be reached during the phone-a-thon. Jane will ask Richard to share the report at the next SPS/FPS meeting. Karen stated that there is also a need to address the concern some junior faculty have about feeling pressured into participating in weekend events (ex: Open House).

The meeting was adjourned ~ 3:00 pm.
Joint Meeting Agenda
Strategic and Financial Planning Sub-Committees
December 6, 2011
11:00 am - Conference Center (New Building)

1. Approval of Minutes for October 25, 2011.

2. Presentation and Discussion of Strategic Positioning and Enrollment Plan.
   Jane will present an update on programming and resources to support the plan.

3. Review of exemptions to hiring pause.
SPS/FPS Meeting Minutes  
December 6, 2011  
11 am – 12:30 pm, New Building Conference Center


Absent:  S. Strobl, F. Sheehan, T. Kucharski, A. Singh (student)

1. Approval of Minutes for October 25, 2011. Minutes approved by vote.
2. Presentation and Discussion of Strategic Positioning and Enrollment Plan. Jane reviewed the parts of the plans, referring to several documents provided in advance (“Communication Plan and Context for the CUNY Justice Academy Draft 2 11/27/11,” “Touch Plan,” “Strategic Positioning & Enrollment Proposed Budget, December 3, 2011,”). Symposia on topics linked to faculty interests will occur once a month in the spring, and they will be packaged for web-based publications. Branding and communications will be linked. The active management of “channels” of transfer students, Justice Academy students, and early phase students aims to maximize yield, especially of students with relatively strong academic preparation. Carefully planned multiple contacts with prospective and accepted students should increase their interest in the College. VP Eanes estimates that Student Affairs will run 17 extra events through the winter and spring. We will have a program to bring interested students into John Jay classes during the spring, to get a feel for the academic environment. Ned asked if all this is to address a problem, and Jane responded that we are doing all this to meet our enrollment targets, while longer term we want to adjust our academic standards upward. We want to keep more of our better-prepared students and to do that we need to have more better-prepared students to reinforce a culture of academic achievement. Karen thought that you need about five well-prepared students in each class to serve as a model for others. Jane continued that if we are successful in getting better-prepared students then we can shift some money from the Summer Academy to special programs. Virginia pleaded for us to do what we have to do to serve our students, the ones who come through the door.

Ned asked about the budget, and Jane responded. Certainly it involves a lot of time, but of course also money. We are asking for an Enrollment Research position to work on data tracking.

Rob observed that Jane has prepared a “bare bones” proposal to fund the Strategic Positioning plan; the original budget was challenged by the President, Rob, and Pat, and it was subsequently reduced. We have already submitted a financial plan to the
University, and it was accepted. We have $223,000 in 2012 costs for Strategic Positioning. We haven’t completed looking for funds that can be used against this; Rob thinks we can get the number down. He is looking at the compact funding next year and we might use it to cover the annualized amount of this program. Pat added that there are funds in the financial plan committed and baselined for this year but that will be available next year. Current marketing funds can be used each year for marketing in the Strategic Positioning plan; some expenses incurred this year for marketing will not repeat next year and so we will have money available in the base.

Ned stated that graduate admissions are down this year relative to last but there is a large number of grad students sitting in Hobson’s. Some of the Strategic Positioning techniques can be applied to graduate admissions. Richard is also worried about the graduate numbers.

Ben suggested that the expenses ahead for Strategic Positioning will be much larger next year; new channels will require more money to manage.

Pat reviewed the first quarter projections, referring to “FY2012 Financial Plan Projection and FY 2013-14 Estimate,” emailed to the sub-committees. She judged that the $800,000 removed from our base did not affect this year’s plan by much. While we don’t have details yet for the out years we don’t expect a significant impact. Some personnel changes gave us additional income. Expenditures are “pretty much in line with what we expected.”

Ben asked about our return rate for spring; what are the spring numbers based on? The response was “enrollment projections from VP Saulnier.” The number does go up, and it reflects the Justice Academy students.

Ned was interested in how to formulate a second year “ask” for new building support. Specifically he was interested in the simulator; can the College ask the University to fund this? Rob replied that we are working on this.

The subcommittees voted on a recommendation to the President and the Budget Planning Committee: “The College should implement the Strategic Positioning Plan and fund the relevant parts in 2012.” The vote was unanimous among the voting members present: 7-0-0.

3. Exemptions to Hiring Pause. Pat presented a list of proposed exemptions to the hiring pause (“FY2012 PS Projection Hiring Assumptions--Financial Plan Submission”). There was an extensive discussion of one item on the list: the Associate Director for Undergraduate Academic Internships. There is concern that the split between Undergraduate and Graduate programs has created two different layers of the College that are competing with employers to place students. In the end, the sub-committees voted to endorse the list and so recommend to the President and Budget and Planning
Committee: 8-0-0. [One member who was not at the meeting earlier had arrived to vote for the second recommendation of the day.]
Joint Meeting of SPSFPS
Agenda
February 7, 2012
3:00 to 4:00pm in Room 531H

1. Approval of Minutes for December 6, 2011. Minutes are attached.

2. Discussion of New Budget/Planning Model. To include:

   - Planning Development and Transparency -- who are the stakeholders?
   - Incorporating data and evidence in planning
   - Integrated nature of strategic planning: academic, enrollment, space, budget etc.
   - Timetable and results

The attached Planning Guide attempts to bring data to bear on Master Plan Goals and Objectives; it will hopefully inform the planning/budgeting discussion which will just begin at this meeting, or perhaps not until the next, and continue well into the spring. Suggestions for including additional data will be welcomed. We anticipate a very open discussion.

Separate reports on the following items may be sent to you in advance of the meeting in the interest of saving time at the meeting.

5. Enrollment report.
6. Hiring pause exemption.
Joint Meeting: FPS/SPS
Minutes
February 7, 2012

Present: Jane Bowers, James Llama (SPS Chair), Robert Pignatello (FPS Chair), Karen Kaplowitz, Staci Strobl, Thomas Kucharski, Ned Benton, Carina Quintian, Maki Haberfeld, Ricardo Anzaldua, Virginia Moreno, Ben Rohdin, Pat Ketterer, Richard Saulnier, Inez Brown (Recorder)

Absent: Harold Sullivan, Francis Sheehan, Anna Singh

1. Approval of Minutes for December 6, 2011. Minutes were approved without amendment.
2. Discussion of New Budget/Planning Model. Rob began by suggesting that there be more regularly scheduled meetings because there is a lot of information to share. He believes the fiscal environment of the college looks good; we are doing a better job aligning recurring expenses and revenues thus placing less of a strain on OTPS. The tuition increase supports this; looking forward, we may expect a “healthy” CUNY COMPACT next year.

Planning Development and Transparency: The joint SPS-FPS meeting seems to be helping with regard to the strategic planning and vision of the college. However, the group needs to continue to look at how we can involve stakeholders beyond this committee in the process (public forums and established groups) in order to further improve the financial planning of the College and make the process transparent.

Gina Galligan will be the Budget and Planning point person who will create new and improved reports, and support the budget integration and transparency process. Rob believes the college will end the year with a $2 million surplus; given the new building, he would like to request additional funds for custodial services and Science labs.

Stacy questioned the “transparency” and presented her concerns as a result of a recent experience when attempting to secure emergency funds for a student. Rob explained that transparency happens at different levels, and that many different individuals and areas are responsible for ensuring transparency. Jane stated that some of the frustration surrounding transparency may be related to the fact that depending on the source of funds, we don’t always know what is available. For example, a large donation was recently made to the college (foundation) to specifically support student emergencies; this is managed by Berenecea, and the faculty does not know what is really available. Pat stated that although the Budget office is aware of the fund balances, they are not privy to the policies that govern the distribution of funds. FYI: There are more than 50 accounts in the foundation.

The general consensus is that we need to report more of everything so that faculty are aware of what is available. The fact that many faculty at this meeting are not aware that a student emergency fund even exists, or that there are emergency metro cards for students, is indicative of the fact that more communication is needed.
Incorporating data and evidence in planning: Ned is currently working with external agencies and has four ideas about this topic.

1) Present personnel information at a level that can be broken down by position. This makes it easy to manage 70-80% of the budget.
2) Organize non-personnel funds around programs. We could then identify the programs that cost the most, need additional funding, etc...
3) Organize reporting around decision points. What are we changing? This would help with the analysis.
4) Cross-cutting cost-center analyses would be useful. We could review revenues and expenditures together.

The information would be transparent to this committee and eventually to all.

Other ideas regarding how to go about setting priorities: develop a deeper perspective on the revenue side; first concentrate on having simpler reports that would be easier to share with department chairs, and then with other constituencies; generate granular budget report(s) because the current budget reports do not tell where the funds are actually going. Rob noted the JJC spends the least amount of all CUNY colleges on administrative expenses, and agreed that there is not enough transparency regarding how the large chunks of funds assigned to VPs are allocated and used in each area. It was noted that chairs are more concerned about the decision-making process; it is transparency about the existence of the process and engaging faculty in that process. Faculty should be integrally involved in the development of the five-year faculty plan. Granted there are external entities that govern how some monies are spent, but the line allocation process should be more consultative.

Historically the college has not started the budget planning process early enough, thus has not allowed enough time for consultation and revision. Jane is currently working to improve this process in her area. There was concern expressed that the annual process often gets sidetracked by short-term issues that arise. The entire framework should be in place and the suggestion is that a calendar be established and that the college stick to it. Rob hopes to develop a multi-year budget that involves the chairs. We should begin to have the discussion about how the money will be spent. It is important for this committee to understand the concerns of the chairs because some of the recent budget changes have affected them in catastrophic ways, i.e. loss of support staff. This has created anger, suspicion and resentment, something that will not be resolved easily. It will take some time and effort to rectify this. It was noted that the college will begin to build back the support staff in the departments.

Future Goals:

1) Develop a set of recommendations for fiscal year 2013.
2) The joint SPS-PFS committee would like to meet every 2 weeks; we will continue to meet until we get through this agenda. Tom asked that meetings not be held on Mondays.
3) Jim has provided an analysis of the Master Plan, in terms of data drawn from various sources; suggestions for additional data are welcome.
4) CUNY First has the programmatic structure that would be useful; it should be coming up this spring in anticipation of being used next year. Our current system has reporting limitations.

3. The remaining agenda items will be covered at future meetings.
 Agenda for SPS/FPS Meeting, Feb. 27, 2012

To expedite the agenda, please review the budget handout from the last meeting and the report linking data to the Master Plan.

1. **Approval of Minutes for February 7, 2012.** (attached)

2. **Discussion: Planning Targets for the committees.** Proposed outcomes for the subcommittees in this planning cycle:
   - Recommendations for the FY2013 financial plan and, ideally, two years beyond.
   - Recommendations for strategic priorities, which should be few, consequential, linked to the Financial Plan and based on evidence of performance to date.
   - Recommendations for the PMP, Goals and Targets for 2012-13, due June 27, 2012. (See template from CUNY).

3. **Discussion: Meeting Schedule.** In order to be useful we will have to develop our recommendations by the end of May, 2012. This will likely mean we will need to meet six times or so before June 1.

4. **Discussion: Expanding consultation.** How and when to widen the circle of consultation for this planning cycle?

5. **Report: Mid-Year budget and university budget outlook for FY2013.** (10 minutes)

6. **Report: Enrollment for fall 2012 and beyond.** (5 minutes)

7. **Discussion and vote: Exemptions to the hiring pause.**

8. **Begin Discussion: recommendations from item 2 above and/or what data we need to proceed.** (time permitting)
Joint Meeting: FPS/SPS
Minutes
February 27, 2012
12:15 – 1:30 pm New Building Conference Center

Present: Jane Bowers, James Llana (SPS Chair), Robert Pignatello (FPS Chair), Karen Kaplowitz, Staci Strobl, Francis Sheehan, Harold Sullivan, Thomas Kucharski, Carina Quintian, Maki Haberfeld, Ricardo Anzaldua, Virginia Moreno, Ben Rohdin, Pat Ketterer, Richard Saulnier, Inez Brown (Recorder), Gina Galligan

Absent: Ned Benton, Anna Singh

1. Approval of Minutes for February 7, 2012. Minutes were approved without amendment.
2. Discussion: Planning Targets for the Committee. Jim led a discussion of the planning targets for the SPS-FPS subcommittees and informed the group the CUNY had recently published its goals & targets; the JIC goals and targets must align with CUNY’s. In developing the college’s plans he recommended that we identify strategic priorities that are few, consequential, and subject to measurement. When developing plans it is important to be inclusive of the wider college community because the Chancellor will ask the college in the PMP report to describe its consultation process on the PMP. Rob stated that it would be good if the SPS-FPS had enough meeting time to discuss the budget/financial plan, and stressed that the college should have a financial plan before the end of the fiscal year. He reiterated that we want to open the process up to other constituencies/college community.
3. Discussion: Meeting Schedule. Some of the suggestions regarding the SPS-FPS meeting schedule were as follows: Have shorter meetings with greater frequency; it was stated that community hour meetings are pretty booked so time slots should be considered. Another suggestion was to have very focused meeting agendas and perhaps address one key issue at a time. It was also recommended that applicable reports be distributed prior to the meetings so that committee members have time to read and digest prior to discussion. In response, additional SPS-FPS meetings will be scheduled for this semester.
4. Discussion: Expanding Consultation: The question Rob posed to the group was, “How can we make the College feel more a part of the process regarding how we spend funds?” Some of the suggestions given were as follows:
   a. Take the decision making process to the other college constituencies.
   b. FYI: Jane will be giving a special presentation regarding Strategic Positioning at the Budget and Planning Committee (BPC) meeting scheduled for later this week.
   c. There should be a BPC meeting that is consultative and not merely a presentation.
   d. There is an inherent challenge in consulting with so many people. As plans are developed, they should be discussed widely in a number of areas and not just with this group.
   e. It would be a good idea to establish deadlines for input/feedback.
f. We could perhaps put up a website, mimicking the Gen Ed model, which allows the College community to input feedback regarding upcoming plans and/or recommendations.

g. Have the BPC host a public forum; the SPS-FPS could propose this idea to the larger BPC.

h. The proposed recommendations should incorporate the Chairs.

i. **FYI:** At the last meeting Pat distributed a document that lists the current budget reports available on Inside JJ. Some financial presentations are also available online and eventually all funds will be added. A suggestion was made that the reports be annotated so that they could be read and understood with greater ease.

5. **Report:** Mid-Year Budget and University Outlook for FY2013: Pat presented a budget report based on handouts distributed at the last meeting. Rob reported that outlook numbers are currently being revised. The revised plan will have assumptions about future year COMPACTS and breakdowns by categories. The big assumption is FTE growth; everything else is tied to this. **Financial Plan FYIs:** There are no COMPACT hires in the outyears; 40 new full-time faculty hires have been built into the plan – this would cover the new FTEs and have faculty teaching 70% of the additional courses. In response, some committee members felt the 70% coverage is not realistic based on the current teaching percentages for their respective departments.

Budget revisions also include the following items: $797K removed because it is not a recurring outlay from CUNY; reduction in tuition – the College met enrollment but the FTEs were not projected accurately because of issues related to FT, PT, Transfer, Freshmen and Graduate students; greater accruals in areas (may result in a ONE-TIME surplus); the College is projected to overspend for College Assistants in the areas of security and offices where they is a shortage of FT staff; $3.3 million is still available as of mid-year.

In summary, Rob stated that the College must continue to align budget operations and planning – revenue with expenditures. We do not want to rely on surplus from the previous year in order to make up the budget; we need to have recurring revenues in order to support recurring expenditures.

6. **Report:** Enrollment for fall 2012 and beyond. Richard gave an enrollment report [I will try to get these handouts sent electronically to members, Jim]. A question was posed regarding the increased number of FTEs projected, “Where will the growth be?” Richard responded that the student profile, mix, graduate programs and other things will determine growth. It was noted that a deeper conversation is needed just to understand where our capacity is because we are basically at 2007 levels for faculty and students.

7. **Discussion and vote:** Exemptions from the hiring pause. There was a very brief discussion regarding the positions to be exempted from the hiring pause (see handout from Pat). The committee members voted in favor of the exemptions.

8. **Discussion of recommendations from item 2 above.** To be addressed at a future meeting.
1. Approval of Minutes for February 27, 2012 (attached).
2. Update from the Strategic Positioning Group (Provost Bowers). In addition to the update, we can briefly discuss any issues connected to the BPC presentation last week, but we have to leave time for the next item.
3. Discussion: Planning Recommendations. Jim will provide a brief overview of the document distributed earlier, “Master Plan Planning Guide,” which aligns data with objectives of the Master Plan. The premise of our planning exercise is that we should base recommendations for strategic priorities and associated funding on the Master Plan, informed by where we are relative to the goals and objectives. Jim will offer his view of where we are and, based on the data, point to some of the most obvious opportunities for improvement. The hope is that this information and perspective will provide a jumping-off point for discussion of our strategic priorities for the next year. We’ll want to end the meeting well into this discussion with a clear sense of what should follow in the next meeting, along with ideas for additional data and perhaps further thoughts for engaging the larger community in this discussion.
Joint Meeting: SPS/FPS Minutes  
March 08, 2012  
12:15 – 1:15 pm New Building Conference Center

Present: Jane Bowers, James Llana (SPS Chair), Karen Kaplowitz, Francis Sheehan, Thomas Kucharski, Ned Benton, Ricardo Anzaldua, Ben Rohdin, Inez Brown (Recorder), Mark Haberfeld, Gina Galligan (Guest), Richard Saulnier (Guest), 
Absent: Robert Pignatello (FPS Chair), Staci Strobl, Harold Sullivan, Carina Quintian, Anna Singh, Virginia Moreno, Pat Ketterer

1. Approval of Minutes for February 27, 2012. Minutes were approved without discussion. 
2. Discussion: Update from Strategic Positioning. 
   Jane distributed Strategic Positioning Group (SPG) schedule of prospective student touches. 
   - Hobsons system is being utilized for this effort. 
   - Activities are designed to increase the college’s yield; Jane described them and distributed a “Student Affairs Touch Programs Summary” dated March 5, 2012. 
   - There was a suggestion that we have another “touch” for the prospective students who have been admitted but have not made a decision. Jane responded that the SPG group will be evaluating all of the activities (there are many more now) to determine the best use of resources, determining what works best, fine-tuning, etc...
3. Planning Recommendations (Jim) 
   The data is not perfect, some of it is old, but we should use it for planning. (See handout) 
   We all need to talk about what is important. At the end of the semester the goal is to have a short list of priorities, enabling us to concentrate dollars and time on them. In the end we need recommendations on what the institution should do and recommendations on fundraising. 
   Some of the ideas discussed were as follows:
   - Ned - Create a baseline budget that continues what we need, then have a reserve of non-committed funds that reflects the needs of the Master Plan. We should do planning and then wait for Rob to show up with the budget. The biggest investment (being built in now and funded for next year) was for the Strategic Positioning project. 
   - Gina - The enrollment (ENR) number is key because it impacts all the other numbers; we have to manage our expectations regarding enrollment. 
   - Ned - The idea of separating a base budget from fundamental planning is key to begin with. 
   - Tom - The alternative is to plan all over, but we need to know what the base is, and have several predictions for ENR. (Operational expenses; strategically plan on the lowest ENR#s.) – Then have prioritization of MP priorities. 
   - Ben - We should establish a conservative revenue estimate and identify what is meant by “conservative.” Everyone needs to participate in the plan as opposed to being given a plan and then asked to review it. 
   - Karen - In Faculty Senate discussions there is a real sense that the faculty is not compensated for all the extra work beyond course load. I.e. Assessment, Middle States; faculty working on
Pathways ARE being paid cash. This paid work is not happening at the college and I would like to see this added to the college’s “pot.” This could be in the form of cash or reassigned time. Jane responded by citing examples of faculty compensation:

- Every major coordinator (this period of time only) gets two classes of release time;
- Each MS faculty co-chair gets reassigned time;
- Reassigned time was offered in the advising pilot.

The university is investing large sums of money in Pathways and colleges may apply to Pathways for this type of funding. Jim asked whether the Senate had considered any data about teaching loads and committee responsibilities before framing a request for more money, and the answer was no. He suggested requests to the subcommittees be informed by data.

- A request was made of Ric to provide the number of FT faculty who taught their full load for the 2011-2012 AY. The mean teaching hours of veteran faculty is available by dept. Jim stressed the importance that the data be accompanied by text to help everyone understand it.
- Ned - Budget objectives and plans, how do we get to those plans from the goals? If we allow the goals to determine what we spend our money on, are we perhaps not meeting our primary mission of “teaching students?” There is a fundamental issue here; the goals do not mechanically lead us to the other things that are important. One idea is to create a table of Categories & Investment Priorities, then determine the implications and identify fiscal impacts. A technical process is needed.
- Maki expressed her concerns about not having enough junior faculty to spread the additional work to do (i.e. Assessment). She doesn’t feel that there was always the issue of feeling overwhelmed and it is not about the money; it is about the logistics of assigning the extra work.
- What steps do we need to get the process started? Evaluate the 3-yr projection/plan understanding that priorities may change. Take a look at what we are spending today and create base allocations. What is the University really giving us? What are we relying on with additional ENR?
- There was a brief discussion of new hires and initiatives. Jane noted that we have spent a lot of money on new hires just trying to catch up.
- Ben - The group should spend time expanding the descriptive pieces of our revenue; we must look at the revenue streams – cost centers, etc... Raising money is part of the planning exercise.
- Tom - We must begin to redirect and recreate the culture of collaborative spending.
- Jane - In the past there was a college wide discussion, hosted by President Travis, to solicit ideas on how to raise money. There was concern expressed that whatever the results were of this discussion, they were not taken back to the departments.
- We should be able to associate cost and expenses. Perhaps take a programmatic look at our expenses. A request was made to see a breakdown of personnel budget by department/program. Review expenditures by department and develop a different technique for analysis. *Valuing various categories of FTEs will capture the subtleties in the different programs.
- Ned volunteered himself and Tom to develop a departmental financial analysis.
- Gina – Budget department can project mid-year plan but not the new initiatives (SP).
Next Meeting March 19th: Propose discussion of baseline budget.
Joint Meeting: SPS/FPS
Agenda – March 19, 2012
3:00 pm – Room 610H

1. Approval of Minutes for March 8, 2012. (attached)
2. Mid-Year All Funds Budget Report. Pat will discuss this in response to the request at the last meeting to understand our “baseline budget.” It will take a few weeks to prepare the breakdown of expenses by department. In the meantime, it is important to gain a better understanding of the other funds and their impact on the base tax levy budget.
3. New Business. If there is time remaining after the budget discussion, the Committee should begin to consider planning recommendations. The College needs strategic priorities regardless of how much money is available. At the conclusion of the meeting, we should have a clear sense of what the goals are for the next meeting on April 3.
Joint Meeting: FPS/SPS
Minutes
March 19, 2012
3:00 – 4:30 pm

Absent: James Llana (SPS Chair), Robert Pignatello (FPS Chair), Thomas Kucharski, Virginia Moreno, Ben Rohdin, Francis Sheehan, Anna Singh

1. Approval of Minutes for March 8, 2012. Minutes were approved without amendment.
2. Discussion: Mid-Year All Funds Budget Report. Pat led an in-depth discussion of the all funds budget. (See handout: FY 2012 Tax Levy Financial Planning Mid-Year Projection) The Tax Levy (first page of the handout) was discussed in detail at the previous meeting.
   • The Income Fund Reimbursable (IFR) monies are state funds and must be used in accordance with the state guidelines/regulations; it is a way to capture revenues other than tuition. In an ALL-FUNDS budget the monies are fungible. There is an 11.6% surcharge on expenditures plus a 5.9% surcharge paid to the University. This is expensive so if you do not have to have a program here, it is a good idea to move it. The College has to pay fringe benefits to personnel – 33% for FT and 10% for PT; there is no collective bargaining for the personnel on IFR accounts. The Tech Fee could be liable for back-pay as related to union contract(s). The University just announced that any course fees must be placed into an IFR account. However, for now, they will exempt the associated fees. The College is working hard to pay down the current IFR deficit.
   • Depository accounts are maintained in the Accounting Department; they are designed to be temporary accounts (i.e. Retirement Parties) and are not included in this report because they zero themselves out.
   • The University counts all of the monies in the Foundation. One goal of the Development Office is to get unrestricted monies.
   • Two strategic questions were posed: 1) How do we grow the money? 2) How are we spending the money?
   • Technology Fee: $615K worth of the Tech Fee funds is used for staff - these are fixed costs. A small portion of the tech fee is used for summer; this carry over is used to cover salaries. The Tech Fee Committee meets to determine the priorities for spending; they raised concern regarding the expenses for staff – i.e. new Director of Distance Learning. Rob will discuss this at a future meeting.
   • Research Foundation: The College is not interested in direct grant expenditures; they are a very limited portion of the research foundation. The new proposed Distribution Model is a different way of calculating so that there is more money available for Principal Investigators; it is currently being reviewed by the Research Advisory Council. This model would benefit faculty and incentivize them to write in more release time. Distribution to everyone comes out of the indirect; the College would like to make this “pot” of monies larger by including
release time net of ADJ release time. The surplus listed is a combined balance of basically all the overhead accounts.

- Adjuncts are hired on the College payroll but release time funds are used to pay adjuncts, then the College is reimbursed from the Research Foundation (RF). Release Time, RT Tran, Interest, College Travel, Start-Up Funds and Research Assistance Fund (all listed on page 5) are purpose-driven sub accounts.

- **John Jay College Foundation, Inc.** consists of largely restricted funds. Each account manager provides an estimate and most monies are intentionally spent over time. The Other Program Expenses category is where almost everything else is paid from. The numbers presented do not include any estimates associated with the Capital Campaign.

- **Auxiliary Services Corporation (Not-For-Profit 5013-C)**: Revenue is largely derived from contracts and/or services. I.e. Food services, book store, cell towers, pouring rights (Pepsi), room rentals, facility rentals (historically $10K, but last year the College earned $30-$40K). The new building should bring in even more income; we project that this will be a strong revenue stream to offset the decrease in food services and the bookstore. The money from AUS is largely spent on things that we cannot use tax-levy dollars on; i.e. Orientation, commencement events, miscellaneous consultants.

- **Student Activities Association**: This is administered by the student association; the College does not really have much say in this process. Athletics Department HEOs are paid out of the tax-levy budget; this covers the PT staff also. This is related strictly to teams and not the credit-bearing athletics.

- **Children’s Center**: The College does not have much say in this, as the center is funded largely from a New York State grant, student activities fees and some portion from the parents.

A breakdown by department is forthcoming and will be available for the current year. The revised out-year projection will be available at the next meeting. It will have a conservative estimate of next year’s COMPACT; we should have a sense of how much with an understanding that it is subject to change.

3. **New Business.** There was a brief discussion of priorities and Jane shared her top priorities; this discussion will continue at the next meeting – April 3rd.
   1. A multi-year plan of building up the faculty (this is in the Master Plan).
   2. Stabilizing enrollment and stabilizing the revenue stream.
   3. Finish our retention plan.

It will be important to translate what is meant by increase and decrease; this may apply to more than just the number of students. I.e. Increase investment to improve quality.
SPS/FPS Joint Meeting
Agenda
April 3, 2012
2:50 pm - 4 pm

2. Updated Financial Projection including Budget by Division.
3. Discussion of Strategic Priorities. Jim and Jane have proposed some planning priorities for next year. Please come with your ideas tied to objectives of the Master Plan and supported with data.
Joint Meeting: FPS-SPS
Minutes
April 3, 2012
2:50 – 4:00 pm

Present: James Llana (SPS Chair), Robert Pignatello (FPS Chair), Ned Benton, Jane Bowers, Thomas Kucharski, Virginia Moreno, Karen Kaplowitz, Staci Strobl, Harold Sullivan, Carina Quintian, Ricardo Anzaldua, Pat Ketterer, Inez Brown (Recorder),
Absent: Richard Saulnier, Maki Haberfeld, Francis Sheehan, Anna Singh, Gina Galligan

1. Approval of Minutes for March 19, 2012. Minutes were approved with amendments from Jane.
2. Strategic Priorities Discussion. Jim led a discussion of the Strategic Priorities. Using examples from the Provost (see handout), Ned presented his strategy for determining the impact/priority of the goals in a way that shows how each goal would affect the achievement of objectives. Several agreed that this would be a good way to present the results. A suggestion was made that the last two columns be used to describe exactly what the money will be spent on. Jim asked that we state the goals as particular targets where possible, to focus attention on specific actions and to make assessment of progress easier and more obvious. For example, instead of listing retention or hiring advisors, we should aim for an increase in the percentage of students who see advisors.

There was a brief discussion of some key issues that need to be addressed under retention. Tom pointed out that Degree Works falls out of date, and thus offers bad information, unless it is continually updated. Jim reported that Cheuk Lee will be reprogramming Degree Works to reflect the recent curriculum changes. There is currently a time lag between changes approved by governing bodies and implementation in various systems. With the new Pathways everything will have to be reprogrammed and there is concern regarding what this project entails. Jim will pose the question to Richard and ask him to respond to the group. It was suggested that perhaps this could be more sustainable if consultants were used to address this matter. Some felt as though consultants would not suffice because the project is more than just programming because knowledge of the curriculum/courses, and other institutional knowledge, is required in order to effectively implement the changes. It was stressed that this group really needs to evaluate these types of scenarios.

Tom expressed his ideas of having a fourth goal focused on space planning. Jane agreed and stated that despite the new building, there are several departments that are already pressed for space. There is no additional room available, but perhaps repurposing could be a viable option once the college receives the Certificate of Occupancy. He noted that there is open space in Psychology that could perhaps be reconfigured for some other use. Rob followed up with some comments regarding additional space by stating that the idea of getting a new building or additional space from the University is not likely or even feasible right now. Also, there is no additional space available at 54th Street because it was recently occupied by several large departments, HR and Business Services. Karen commented that we should fully utilize North...
Hall so that when the time comes to move out of that space then the argument for additional space is stronger.

**Discussion around a fourth goal:** Ned agreed that there should be a fourth goal but it should encompass more than space; it should be integrated planning that encompasses ENR, financial, space and personnel. He also suggested that perhaps the goals should be divided into two categories: programmatic and instrumental. Pat explained that integrated is more of the “How?” the college achieves its goals. The challenge is focusing our attention on making sure we actually do this. It was also noted that there are several aspects of planning that are beyond the control of the college, i.e. the monies for space come from elsewhere. Karen believes the fourth goal should be to increase staff (HEOs) – non-teaching instructional. Jane would like to put this in more of a context regarding where and how and would also include increasing revenue as a top goal as well. It was also noted that stabilizing enrollment and increasing revenue should be separate goals. Carina questioned what exactly does the “stabilizing environment” mean? There seems to be a real problem with the connection between revenue and enrollment. Jim stated that recalibrating is necessary so that ENR provides us with a budget, but we do not have a grasp on the numbers. Jane commented that as of right now the college’s budget really depends on meeting the stated objectives: 1) stop the decline; 2) meet our projections; 3) move in the direction of a different mix and profile of students (level, quality and identity). What is our target? What do we aspire to? We are doing a disservice to students if we bring them in and they cannot succeed or if they have challenges meeting the basic qualifications. Rob commented that before the college can grow it must first stabilize and that there should be different categories: *Stabilizing and Strategically Growing; Grow/Develop Other Revenue Streams; Restoring Faculty and Increasing FT Coverage*. We should be as specific as possible because we are creating an actual budget document. Jim will come up with more precise language that reflects what was discussed, in order to write the goals.

3. **Updated Financial Projection Including Budget by Division.** Pat led an in-depth review of the original financial plan and out-year projections (for 3 years) and reviewed the 3rd quarter preliminary budget report [see attachment]. The budget by division was not distributed or discussed. Facts about the financial plan projection: there was an increase in adjunct spending; an increase in some Administrative Staff; an increased Year-End surplus due to assumptions regarding OTPS savings. The out year projection assumes the same level of COMPACT funding as what the College received in FY 2012. The compact funding is net Philanthropy, Financial Aid and Productivity (target has to be met). The increase in adjunct spending was due partially to an increased number of sections taught (the shift in the ENR mix has had an impact and there are more upperclassmen), and the fact that the college lost some faculty. It appears the adjunct projection was not realistic; as we are currently spending $800K over the budget. The spending on full time faculty decreased, however; the initial workload report states that FT faculty taught roughly the same number of courses. It was noted that faculty attrition in the out years has not been factored in. The nine subs are budgeted for FY 2013 and at some point they will be converted to FT lines; they are being funded by the increase in ENR. Pat noted that the tuition
increase provides the funding for the COMPACT allocation; there has been no word yet about the actual allocations for next year. She also stated that the hiring plan assumes that people who leave will be replaced. However, there is $770K worth of savings because there is a time lag between when people leave and when they are replaced. All faculty being paid now will be paid in 2013 and 2014.

The joint committees decided to discuss the Master Plan (MP) further at the next meeting. Jim will place this item on the agenda.

The exception to the pause for a new position related to Special Opportunities was brought to the floor, but those in attendance decided not to vote on this item today. There was concern regarding programmatic investments until other things are resolved. Jane stated that she understood the concern and offered commentary that Brooklyn College has a robust Special Opportunities office and they have the highest number of Rhodes Scholars; to be successful in this area the College will have to invest in it.

Meeting adjourned at 4:10 pm.
Joint Meeting: SPS/FPS
Agenda for April 19, 2012
Rm. 610H – 4:00 to 5:30 pm

1. Approval of Minutes for April 3, 2012. Proposed minutes are attached along with the budget material distributed at the last meeting.

2. Discussion of Strategic Priorities for FY2013. We seem to be closing in on three priorities that we will recommend, but we have not formally approved anything yet. There was some discussion of a fourth that needs resolution, and there’s still time for further adjustments, but our target is to reach a decision by our meeting in late May. I will come in with some language that will frame the priorities identified so far as targets. As we sharpen the strategic priorities, we will have to assign price tags to them and consider in the context of the whole budget proposal.

3. Questions/Discussion on Third Quarter Projected Expenditures by Division. Gina has sent this to everyone. Plan on asking questions; in the interest of saving time, there will not be a presentation outside the context of addressing questions. It won’t happen tomorrow, but the next step is to break this down by Department and for the out years. We should try to be clear at the meeting about what budget information we will need to complete our work leading up to budget and planning recommendations.

4. Consultation with outside constituencies. As we began the semester, we thought it important to involve other groups in the planning and budgeting discussions. Let’s talk about how to proceed.

5. PMP update on Goals and Targets for AY2012-13. CUNY has re-thought a number of the metrics; for background, I distributed copies of the PMP end-of-year report for 2010-2011 earlier this academic year (dated July 7, 2011). We need to discuss recommendations for what the campus will submit by way of PMP goals and targets in late June; the template (attached) is extensive, so we should probably concentrate on those goals with real strategic significance for the campus. This will be only a preliminary discussion to identify areas for further attention, if we get to it at all.
Joint Meeting: FPS-SPS
Minutes, Revised (5/16/12)
April 19, 2012
4:00 – 5:30 pm

Present: James Llana (SPS Chair), Robert Pignatello (FPS Chair), Jane Bowers, Thomas Kucharski, Virginia Moreno, Karen Kaplowitz, Harold Sullivan, Carina Quintian, Ricardo Anzaldua, Pat Ketterer, Richard Saulnier, Maki Haberfeld, Francis Sheehan, Inez Brown (Recorder), Gina Galligan

Absent: Ned Benton, Staci Strobl, Anna Singh

1. Approval of Minutes for April 3, 2012. Minutes were approved with an amendment from Jane.

2. Strategic Priorities Discussion. Jim led a discussion of the Strategic Priorities [handout is attached with notice of Agenda for May 10]. Strategic Priority #1 Restore Full-Time Faculty: The discussion began with some clarification regarding the Restore FT Faculty strategy; the related target of raising full-time faculty coverage to 43% is related to 40 hires (over the next 3 years) and the metric is FTEs. It was noted that there are a lot of assumptions to be made here. It was determined that the current heading should be reflective of what we are actually doing – Full-Time Faculty and FTE Coverage. Further discussion ensued and Tom stated that the argument for more faculty is not always FTE related, so FTE should not be included in the priority. Sub-line vs. tenure track makes a difference regarding coverage, but we do not want too many subs; we are looking for permanent faculty. We will omit the reference to coverage and we will say, based on an observation by Rob, that we are “increasing” instead of “restoring” faculty. Strategic Priority #2 Contribute to Better Retention by Hiring Professional Advisors: Jim consulted Sumaya regarding professional advisors; there is a general assumption that retention will increase as a result of hiring professional advisors. He pointed to some indirect data in the handout showing that students in a nationwide survey (Noel-Levitz report) valued academic advising more than safety and security. He showed other data from the John Jay Student Experience Survey that indicate students don’t typically see an advisor, but conceded that it’s hard to draw precise conclusions from it. Jane informed the committee that Psychology and Science participated in an advisement pilot (82% and 81% of faculty respectively) where 50% of the target population was advised. Tom added that the Psych faculty really enjoyed advising. Jane would like to offer compensation, monetary or otherwise, for faculty advising. We let the targets stand except for the retention rate for freshmen entering in fall 2012; there we preferred “increase retention above level for entering 2011 freshmen,” a more modest aim. Strategic Priority #3: Rob asked for clarification about what was meant by “stabilize.” Richard recommended that the committee think more strategically about ENR and not just the numbers. He felt that the committee needs to begin to think about the dollar amount for each student and not simply and AAFTE (Annualized Average FTE). Targets would have to be established by target groups of students. This would be a fundamental change in how we think about the process; we have to focus on the sub-groups and how they contribute to the budget. For example, the most valuable student in the summer is the visiting student. It was also noted that the quality of students should change; perhaps the College could consider alliances with community colleges outside of CUNY – including New Jersey. This really is a proxy for the
Strategic Planning Group (SPG) initiatives; it is already partially factored in the budget. Richard stated that the AAFTE changes during the FTE process, but it’s dollars that matter. Rob posed the question as to whether or not the College is structured to reasonably reach any of the targets. The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) expects Distance Learning to fund itself after the first year; Jane stated that two years is more realistic. It is important that we come up with a revenue target and not an FTE target. Pat stated that she is working with Richard and Ric to develop FTE numbers based on ENR; they are working on this for the purpose of better projecting, but this will not be ready for next year. Richard does not expect the target until June; he needs this information in order to plan recruiting efforts. He also stated that it is a little more challenging to project ENR because of retention rates. The retention rate for new students has increased, but the retention rate for continuing students is flat. This is not surprising given the fact that the College has invested more monies in first year students. There was a discussion surrounding philanthropy, and Tom suggested that philanthropy be a separate strategy. The revenue streams interact but there is still a certain sense of functional independence, i.e. new programs, Distance Learning, etc... The group consensus was to change the name of the strategy to Contribute to Increased [instead of “better”] Retention by Hiring Professional Advisors. Strategic Priority #3 Stabilize Enrollment and Revenue through new Recruitment and Marketing Plan: The committee decided to keep the current AAFTE although everyone is aware of the fact that it is going to change. There was a discussion of SAT and CAA scores. It was noted that the College’s retention is more related to CAA, which went up almost one full point this year. Karen suggested increasing the minimum CAA score by one point; Richard would like to see the next incoming freshman class before committing to this (around October/November). For now, the committee decided that the minimum SAT score should increase to 955 and the minimum CAA score should increase to 83.5. These numbers are subject to change based on additional discussion. The topic of graduate student targets was introduced. The committee discussed developing an enrollment strategy that relied not solely on increasing the number of students but on strategically targeting out-of-state students and graduate students. The higher tuition paid by out-of-state and graduate students would result in greater revenue and allow the college to be more selective in admissions that would in turn affect retention rates. It was noted that this is a huge discussion about mix of students, who are we admitting, are they getting jobs, etc... It was acknowledged that this is a long and complicated discussion that must occur, but will not happen before the end of this semester. Jim stated that other CUNY schools have a greater ratio of graduate to undergraduate students than John Jay. Richard also commented that we have almost zero non-degree students in our graduate programs; there is growth potential here. The group consensus was to change the name of the strategy to Increase Revenue through Strategic Enrollment and Marketing.

Rob and Jim will discuss a fourth strategic priority for discussion next time.

3. The meeting was adjourned at 5:20 pm.
Joint Meeting – SPS/FPS  
May 10, 2012  
2:50 pm - Room 610H

1. Approval of minutes for April 19, 2012. Minutes are attached (along with handout for April 19 meeting).

2. Presentation on Distance Learning. Feng Wang, Director of Online and Distance Learning, will present a multi-year plan with significant implications for the budget.

3. Tech Fee Committee Perspective on Distance Learning. Bonnie Nelson from Tech Fee Committee will raise issues.

4. Continuation of Discussion on Strategic Priorities. Since a few of the targets linked to priorities were provisional, we can revisit them if need be. We will consider a new priority—fund-raising—which would include expanding private and corporate fund-raising; developing continuing ed and professional studies; distance education; facilities rental; and on the horizon, international programs. We should get pricetags—year by year—on all our recommendations before making them final.

5. Calendar for balance of year. We need to consider what can be done by the last regular meeting scheduled for May 23, and we will probably want to schedule another meeting later in June if we are to consider our recommendations for Strategic Priorities in the context of spending proposals coming from the Vice Presidents. It is important that we understand the place of our recommendations in the budget as a whole, and it will only be later in June when we can see the full array of spending proposals. At that point we will also know a little better the revenue picture, although that will not likely come into sharp focus until August.
Joint Meeting: FPS-SPS
Minutes
May 10, 2012
2:50 – 4:20 pm


Absent: Jane Bowers, Francis Sheehan, Harold Sullivan, Kinya Chandler, Gina Galligan, Anna Singh

1. Approval of Minutes for April 19, 2012. Tom suggested that an important part of the discussion from the meeting was not reflected in the minutes. Since the matter seemed to involve more than adding a few words, Jim asked Tom to take some time to propose language for the minutes, and once that is done the minutes will be brought back to the group for approval at the next meeting.

2. Presentation on Distance Learning. Feng Wang, Director of Online and Distance Learning, presented his multi-year plan for distance learning – see PowerPoint presentation for details (attached). Following the presentation several committee members expressed their concerns. Ned (Re: page 13) stated that there is a lot of attrition in the MPA program and asked several key questions: Have we looked at competition? What is our projected market share? Feng responded by stating that attrition was built into the numbers and that a market survey is currently being done. Tom expressed his concern about how the online program would get rolled out and the impact on FT faculty teaching on campus, and wanted to know how the College planned to manage this. There have been no conversations with the department chairs. Where is the plan for additional faculty? Certainly there will be an impact on FT and ADJ faculty, so a hiring plan is needed. The hiring plan must take into account the need for additional faculty, and there has to be an enrollment cap. Tom is concerned that the online program has not been fully thought out. It was noted that the proposed class size of 25 is in fact comparable to current graduate program classes. Feng stated that he was asked by President Travis and Provost Bowers to develop a revenue-sharing program which will allow for hiring faculty. There was discussion about several of the ideas and numbers presented by Feng. Ned felt it important to note that many students switch from a two- to three-year track, thus effectively reducing the number of students; Virginia noted that the average number of courses per student per semester is two. Ned suggested that instead of rolling out a brand new online program, that the College put the PMT program online in order to gauge the market, and then take the next step(s) based on the response. The College could take the PMT degree and re-launch it as an online program of high quality with enhanced services for people in the area. Rob stated that the College does not have the discretionary dollars to adopt the model as presented; the College may have to implement a small pilot really well before embarking on the larger project. He posed two key questions: 1) Where are the funds going to come from? 2) How much can the College afford to invest in anything? Virginia informed everyone that there are high attrition rates for new online programs. No decisions were made and it was noted that this discussion will be continued in the future.
3. Tech Fee Committee Perspective on Distance Learning: Bonnie Nelson, Tech Fee Committee representative, discussed the Tech Fee’s concerns regarding the monies used from tech fee to cover personnel services (see handout attached). The committee’s plan was to take on the expenses for the technical personnel services temporarily, but the plan has gone in the opposite direction. There are now seven FT positions funded by the Student Tech Fee. The committee wants to have these positions removed from the tech fee; it is very costly because the tech fee has to cover benefits (33% of each position) and contractual increases for every position. A question arose regarding whether or not OTPS items could be covered instead of personnel. Rob stated that the College is currently looking into this, and reiterated how important it is for the College to be careful not to violate the guidelines regarding the use of tech fee funds. The College has relied on tech fees to help out with expenses, i.e. OTPS. Approximately one-half million dollars has historically been used to staff labs and supply departments with people and technology, and there have been very good results in terms of student satisfaction with labs. There is only $250K to invest in new technologies. There needs to be a plan to reduce the personnel costs on the tech fee budget over time. Bonnie stated that they understand that the positions are valued and needed, but they need to come off the tech fee. Rob would like Pat to work with TAC to come up with a plan.

The next Budget Planning Committee is May 23rd. Jim requested that another meeting of the SPS-FPS be scheduled in late June in order to have a comprehensive look at the budget, in light of further requests that will be coming from the Vice Presidents. On Karen’s advice, we will schedule that meeting right away. Rob noted that there is no commitment to when CUNY allocations will come out; the College will get it over the summer and be required to submit a financial plan in September. There is reason to believe that the COMPACT will be slightly higher. Tom expressed his concern that commitments will be made to the online program without further consideration of the issues. A key question needs to be asked regarding the online program: “Is this the vision of the College?” Karen noted that there was no time on the Faculty Senate agenda this semester to review the proposed online program plan. Ned believes that a version of an online program could be done in a less expensive manner. Pat believes that the College should do the market research up front to determine if in fact there is a demand. How much research has been done?

4. The remaining agenda items will be discussed at a later date. The meeting was adjourned at 4:20 pm.
Joint Meeting – SPS/FPS
May 23, 2012
12:30 – 2:00 pm - Room 610H

1. Approval of Minutes for April 19, 2012 and for May 10, 2012. We deferred the approval of the minutes for April 19, pending the insertion of language proposed by Tom. The revised minutes are attached along with those for May 10; with regard to the latter, Feng Wang’s presentation (PDF) about online education and Bonnie Nelson’s report (PDF) from Tech Fee Committee are attached.

2. Continue Discussion of Proposed Online Program. There is a revised financial projection underway based on starting the program in spring 2014 instead of fall 2013, with some savings. I will send out the new numbers so we can see another option, sometime before the meeting.

3. Discussion of Strategic Priority for Fund-Raising. We haven’t gotten very far with this, although it was on agenda at last meeting. We need to revisit.

4. Discussion of PMP key targets. I attach a chart with some key metrics for targets and goals for next year. Where data is available, it is included for previous years to give a sense of our trajectory. We may wish to make recommendations or discuss these metrics in light of our planning recommendations and discussions. I also attach a PowerPoint on the considerable number of changes in the PMP for 2012-13.

5. Discussion of what we will want and have at June 20 meeting. We will try to wrap up a package of recommendations at the June 20 meeting; at that point we should have a better view of spending proposals and revenue. We will need to plan ahead and have on hand any necessary information.
Joint Meeting: SPS-FPS Meeting
Minutes
May 23, 2012

Absent: J. Bowers, F. Sheehan, T. Kucharski, A. Sing, K. Chandler

1. **Approval of minutes for April 19\(^{th}\) (revised) and May 10\(^{th}\).** Approved without discussion.
2. **Discussion of Distance Education Proposal.** This may stand on its own as a strategic priority or be folded into one on fund-raising. Ned asked how the numbers were calculated. Pat and Gina had reviewed the income statement for the proposed program. Ned continued by making the point that this is a gigantic governance discussion. He argued that it would involve redoing Part A for NYSED, and creating a new Master’s program in Security Management. What is the effect of this new program on our existing program? There are so many contingencies here.

Enrollment estimates are considered conservative relative to 3 other universities Feng looked at. One assumption is that 1/3 of new courses will be taught by FT faculty and 2/3 by adjuncts. All the teaching expenses, based on those assumptions, are built into the budget. The budget assumes expenses of $4200 per credit for FT faculty and about $1100 for part-time coverage, but there is no direct payment to faculty anticipated. We are assuming in-state tuition; Ned sees an issue here since we need approval by the CUNY BOT.

To support the Distance Education budget, Jane is ready to redirect the funding from the year-round college. There are also some additional funds available in Academic Affairs for administrative costs.

Ned argued that foregoing the year-round program program is a very big decision. He believes we could get revenue sooner and be subject to fewer difficulties with governance and cost if we expand the existing online program in Protection Management. Rob believes that the College should do both (online and summer/winter) in an effort to increase revenue. We have potential tiers of investment opportunities depending on the CUNY Compact; allocation will probably not be until the end of July. Jim supports moving forward with the distance education program because it is ready to go.

Ned believes there are a lot of things happening in the next 12 months that will have an impact on this decision, so why move ahead now? Ned is not convinced that betting on security is the way to do this; we should evaluate what exists, evaluate what we offer.
It doesn’t seem to him that we have the faculty to support the new degree. How many students are actually enrolled in the Protection Management program? It is the 3rd lowest among graduate programs.

One member observed that we are virtually the only criminal justice college in the country that does not offer a degree in Homeland Security.

Maki feels that it is very speculative to think that Protection Mgmt. will sell; subjects like Terrorism or Intelligence Gathering would be more successful.

Carina believes that we need to see if the courses being offered are marketable. Has research been done to determine if people would be interested in this degree?

Ned feels that the distance learning program should address instructional technology in general. If we frame the program so that we have useful deliverables for the entire college as opposed to just this focused entity, then we will benefit. The proposal should show how this effort could assist existing areas of the college, i.e. space concerns; we will run out of classroom space in the next few years. (Rob)

What is it that we do now regarding hybrid courses? It seems that there is no focused/intentional approach to developing hybrid courses. A system needs to be built; this could really help to alleviate the space pressures.

What do we need to know in order to frame a recommendation? Marketability – General benefits – path to governance approval.

Is this a Revision to Protection Management? Jim was not assuming this was a start from scratch program. Ned states that it appears that Feng basically splits the current MPT program into two separate programs.

Maki states that it takes months to effectively convert courses to online; Jim responded that most of the courses are or have been offered online in Protection Management.

Ned suggested we do something similar to what was done in the MPA program and then really market it. This could generate money and support future revisions.

Jim will get responses to the basic questions raised and distribute prior to the next meeting.

Funding the entire Distance Ed proposal assumes the CUNY compact is greater than last year and that there are no other programs that take priority.
3. **Discussion of Strategic Priority for Fundraising.** Fundraising is something we really need to think about. Rob stated that the College has been successful in attracting major gifts; we now have a new VP and should be able to continue the success. There is revenue opportunity in renting the facilities. He suggested we create a bucket of things that will produce revenue; there are some missing opportunities in Continuing Education. Cont. Ed is a lower-bearing fruit than credit-bearing programs; other CUNY colleges are making millions on Cont. Ed.

Ned thought it would be helpful to see a return-on-investment in the fundraising activity in the last couple of years. We could re-invest those revenues. Rob states that many of the contributions (donated funds) have strings attached/restricted.

Can we get a summary of the investments we have made in the last 5 years? Marketing, fundraising, etc... Pat stated that generating this type of report is doable; she will email prior to the next mtg.

Jim asked if everyone was clear on the other 3 strategic priorities: 1) hiring new faculty; 2) hiring new advisors; 3) strategic positioning and enrollment management support.

4. **PMP key targets.** PMP Targets and Goals are due to CUNY on June 27; we are pressed every year by the Chancellor’s Office to include governing bodies like this in the PMP process. There was no discussion of the targets, but we can revisit this at the meeting in late June.
SPS/FPS Meeting Agenda  
June 20, 2012 – Room 610H  
2:30 pm

1. **Approval of Minutes for May 23, 2012.** Proposed minutes are attached.

2. **Recommendations for Financial Plan, 2012-13.** Actually the plan we submit to CUNY extends through the academic year 2014-15. Our task tomorrow is to frame some formal recommendations, if possible, concerning the financial plan, and I hope the following information will clarify that task. There is already a draft financial plan projection for 2013-15, which is attached in summary form (“FY2012 REVISED Financial Plan and FY 2013-15 Estimate,” page 1 of the “FPS SPS packet). The column for 2013 contains the recently assigned compact amount, which allows us to have a year-end balance of nearly $1.4 million. This plan also includes the pending hires previously distributed at the April 3 meeting and the additional exemptions listed in the accompanying two-page document entitled “FY2013-15 PRELIMINARY YEAR END PS PROJECTION HIRING ASSUMPTIONS.” A few of these positions may be filled, but most are not; they are assigned across the College, and a number of them are linked to the new building. This plan already includes the proposal to hire the 40 new faculty and backfills of any faculty who left. (See attached faculty hiring plan)

As you know, the subcommittees have been discussing strategic priorities for much of the previous semester, and we have agreed tentatively agreed to support hiring 40 new faculty members, 3 professional advisors, and to support the Strategic Positioning and Enrollment Management initiative. Pending is the proposal for online and distance education, which may be part of a broad priority for revenue-generation. We knew that the VPs would be meeting on June 5 to discuss their spending proposals, and now we have them, attached as “VP Requests Summary,” in the document subtitled “Summary of Investment Proposals/Requests.” The last two pages of that attachment is a separate list of items for the SP & EM initiative. While those items do not appear in the main table, their total estimated cost is listed in the summary table at the top of “Page 1 of 3”: “SPG $682,751.” Note that the VP’s list includes major items that we have endorsed or that we are currently discussing, namely the Academic Advisors, the Strategic Positioning and Enrollment initiative, and the online and distance education proposal.

So here’s the challenge. When we factor in the Compact funding and pending hires, we project a surplus of about $1.4 million, and there are about $1.9 million worth of investment proposals. If we think the full $1.9 million list should be covered, we’ll have to go back to the current 2013 plan and reallocate items to cover the new proposals. Or we’ll have to pare down the $1.9 million list to fit into a $1.4 million budget or do some combination of those two actions. There’s another important consideration: we should probably not wipe out completely the $1.4 million balance for the year. Instead, we should likely plan on spending about $1 million of it. We can count on some accruals through the year to replenish that surplus, but spending it all would not be prudent. Effectively, we have about $1 million to spend, but we can certainly make a different recommendation about that as well.

Since not all the spending proposals can survive, it makes sense for the subcommittees to recommend programmatic priorities, and I would like to see some formal action to that end tomorrow. Hopefully, we’ll be able to vote on one or more motions. In any event, we will need to update the BPC very soon.
3. **PMP Targets and Goals.** We’re not likely to get to this, but I attach a somewhat incomplete draft of our 2012-13 goals statement. At the last meeting we looked at the University template; this contains targets from across the College. The document will be completed and submitted to CUNY by June 27. I welcome any comments at any time.

Attachments: In addition to the documents referred to in the agenda, I attach a “report card” for progress on the Master Plan, in the interest of bringing data to bear on planning and financial recommendations. I previously distributed other analyses of the Master Plan, based on data from various sources.

I sent earlier as an attachment a memo from Feng Wang addressing issues raised about the Distance Education proposal. I should add here that the number of students in the Webster program is 200 and the number for Eastern Kentucky is 350; our projected enrollment is 160.
Joint Meeting: SPS – FPS Meeting
Minutes
June 20, 2012

Present: James Llana (SPS Chair), Robert Pignatello (FPS Chair), Jane Bowers, Thomas Kucharski, Virginia Moreno, Karen Kaplowitz, Carina Quintian, Ricardo Anzaldua, Pat Ketterer, Richard Saulnier, Warren Benton, Kinya Chandler, Jay Hamilton (Left Early), Mariani Mewengkang (Recorder)
Absent: Staci Strobl, Francis Sheehan, Harold Sullivan, Anna Singh, Maki Haberfeld, Gina Galligan

At 2:37 p.m., Jim called the meeting to order.

1. **Approval of Minutes for May 23, 2012.** Minutes were approved as proposed.

2. **Discussion of FY2013 Budget.** Rob led the discussion of the draft financial Plan & Compact Funding. While no firm deadline for the Financial Plan has been set, it will most likely be due sometime in late July or early August, which is much earlier than normal. Because of this, finalization of these plans should be done at the next meeting. Rob discussed the “FY2013 Compact Allocation.” (Chart is attached). He has not received much information regarding the allocations towards Financial Aid, but it is important to note that $268,000 must be budgeted for Financial Aid. In terms of “Self-Financing Components,” it was noted that the Philanthropy Target is rather low compared to other senior colleges. The target is set at $348,000, but John Jay has exceeded those expectations. Another $376,000 must be allocated towards Restructuring/Efficiency. Ned asked whether or not the Philanthropy and Restructuring money would disappear if John Jay does nothing. Rob responded that while that is not the case—the money is real—money received as gifts often is dedicated to specific purposes. It is legitimate, however, to ask about savings from efficiencies and restructuring. Richard then discussed the enrollment targets: “Nothing is off target.” Registration is about the same, graduate applications are up, but graduate enrollment so far is down, and much of our transfer population is made up of students from the Justice Academy. Other than the lowered numbers of graduate students, Richard feels that we are doing okay, “we are at, or ahead of last year’s numbers.” The University is also encouraging John Jay to shrink the number of SEEK students we enroll.

3. **Discussion of Spending Recommendations.** Rob again led the discussion on what the new investments should be. The University has suggested five “Areas of Investment” that John Jay should look into. Rob then asked the committee to look at the “Summary of Investment Proposals/Requests” chart. (Chart attached). Ned requested information which would identify the changes that occurred between FY2012 and FY2013. Pat agreed to send Ned this information. (Ins and Outs Chart).

Rob mentioned that some of the spending must go towards the conversion of College Assistants. The conversion is to happen over a period of two years. Spending must also go towards the hiring of new faculty. Plans to hire 20 new faculty members already existed, but according to the Compact chart, the University is encouraging hiring 18 new faculty members. Karen questioned whether or not the 18 recommended hires will be included as part of the 20 hires originally planned, or if they are separate. That would be part of our discussions but the cost of 18 additional faculty would add to the “deficit” relative to spending proposals already on the table. Tom then brought up the importance of faculty retention. He is also concerned about
the adjunct budget. He stated that although enrollment keeps increasing, the adjunct budget has been stagnant. Pat explained that it is hard to predict what the adjunct budget will be. (this topic remains unresolved) It was also noted that the Compact only gives out money, not lines. Discussion was also had about whether faculty hiring is keeping up with enrollment. As enrollment grows, so should the growth of faculty. 
Ned also expressed his concern about the new lines not being included in the projections. He also wishes to be included in discussions regarding new lines.
Pat then told the committee that John Jay had already pre-spent some money. As a result, John Jay now has $1.4 million, rather than $2.6 million. Kim further explained the situation. Due to the fact John Jay did not do a balanced budget, money had to be pre-spent to cover deficits.
Jim asked the committee how to identify the priorities. The committee agreed to save conversations regarding FY2014, and FY2015 for a later time, and instead focus on FY2013.
Positions such as the Director of Media, Crime and Justice, and the Director of International Partnerships/Programs are among two positions that have been recommended for consideration during FY2014 or FY2015.
Ned asked to see a funding model as he is concerned about how money is being allocated. Rob told him that money was allocated based on what the needs were for each Vice President. Karen mentioned her concern over the budget allocated to Student Affairs. She says the numbers seem low, especially considering John Jay is trying to increase the number of Veteran enrollments.
As the meeting was coming to an end, Jim asked the committee for formal recommendations to be discussed at the next meeting. The next meeting should happen as soon as possible, since the BPC will be meeting on July 25, 2012.

Jim will send the committee possible dates for the next meeting.

Meeting ended at 4:01p.m.
1. Approval of Minutes for June 20, 2012. Proposed Minutes are attached.
Joint Meeting: SPS – FPS Meeting  
Minutes  
July 10, 2012

Present: James Llana (SPS Chair), Jama Adams, Ricardo Anzaldua, Warren Benton, Kinya Chandler, Maki Haberfeld, Jay Hamilton, Karen Kaplowitz, Pat Ketterer, Thomas Kucharski, Virginia Moreno, Mariani Mewengkang (Recorder)  
Absent: Robert Pignatello (FPS Chair), Jane Bowers, Carina Quintian, Richard Saulnier, Francis Sheehan, Staci Strobl, Anna Singh

Jim called the meeting to order at 10:05 am.

1. Approval of Minutes for June 20, 2012. Minutes were approved as proposed.

2. Continued Discussion of Recommendations for Financial Plan FY2013. As the BPC will be meeting on July 25, final recommendations must be made. The BPC will meet again in September and later in the fall semester. VP Saulnier will make a report on the fall enrollment picture at the September meeting, and the BPC will hear a report on distance education at its second meeting of the semester.

Jim reported that the faculty proposal on faculty hiring was discussed at the ESM, and there was general agreement at that meeting to add five more full-time faculty lines to the plan. In addition, it looks as if we can add more faculty lines in the out years than the current plan calls for. Karen mentioned that Jane originally wanted to hire ten more faculty members. Ned suggested recommending to the President that Distance Learning be pushed back by a year. He also said assessment must be done to determine whether or not the “touching” strategy is working. Before trying the same strategies with the Graduate program, we should see if it has been effective at the Undergraduate level. By way of evidence for the success of the touch plan, Jim reported on Richard’s behalf that the enrollment numbers to date suggest we will make the fall targets. Of course we don’t have final numbers, but what we do have is very encouraging.

Karen said that while enrollment may be up, she had heard from a reliable source that we have admitted a higher number of conditional students, not a good trend. She would like to know how many of the conditional students there are, and what the targets are. Ned agreed. He proposed having a five year plan to see what the goals are, and to determine if they are met. The committee agreed that having that information would be useful. Jama also added that it is important to have information earlier in the process. It will help us determine if we are adequately funding the agreements that have already been made.

Tom then discussed the importance of having an Enrollment Plan, other than simply getting more students. Currently, John Jay wants more students, but he thinks it is important to reach out to out-of-state students and grad students so we can get
students who pay more tuition, rather than just having more students as a way to meet revenue targets.

Jay asked whether or not the SPG has any plans set. Jim assured him that there are specific enrollment plans in the making, and he thinks it a good idea for the SPG to report more frequently to the sub-committees. The SPG work is fundamental because it is aimed at stabilizing enrollment as the basis for fiscal stability; everything else hangs on it. Ned expressed concern over what he’s seen in SPG.

He then asked us to look at the chart he created based on staffing trends from 2007 – 2010 (attached). He raised the point that John Jay trends toward hiring more non-teaching personnel than faculty. Pat told Ned that we shouldn’t look at the data in terms of “head count” but rather in dollars spent. Kim agreed with Pat, adding that the numbers do not reflect the number of part-time faculty John Jay hires. John Jay spends about $12 million on part-time faculty, so using head-count as a metric gives a distorted sense of where the money is going.

Karen would like to suggest operating procedures so work can be more efficient and collegial. Arrangements should be made regarding receiving data. The Vice Presidents should create proposals explaining what the position is for. Jim agreed and said he will urge the other VPs to create short narratives to accompany budget requests in the future, especially if they cannot attend a meeting where the proposals are under discussion.

Ned then moved to adopt the document that he had prepared as the sub-committee recommendation, and it was seconded by Karen. Ned presented the group with a proposed balanced budget (proposals against available balance) based on what was discussed at previous meetings. (attached)

Maki objected because she disagreed with the idea of deleting the Director of International Programs position. Jama questioned whether or not Maki had any input in the budget proposal Ned drew up. There was some discussion of whether or not to select particular items for discussion, and there was agreement not to do that. After further discussion, Pat suggested that we base the recommendations on broad levels of priority rather than assessing each item. At this suggestion, Ned withdrew his original motion, and agreed to have the recommendations restructured to reflect priorities.

The discussion then turned to Distance Learning. Jim wanted to correct the sense that Distance Learning is a new program. John Jay has been doing Distance Learning for some time and at different levels; two task forces have studied it. It is well established and led by the faculty. There is a plan, which we have seen. The current proposal is needed just to ensure the quality of what we already do. We have received from Dr. Wang an explanation of how the proposal benefits current online programming. Ned said that though John Jay has had a Distance Learning program, there is no governance behind it; plans, allocations have never been presented. Tom argued that Distance Education will change what the faculty does. He referred to a proposal that would create a non-credit course for 10,000 students in Forensic Psychology. He also thinks Distance Education will move John Jay into a different direction, and discussions should be held before deciding if that is what the college wants to do.
A new motion was framed by working through the various recommendations with the following result:

**Recommendation for the Financial Plan FY2013 from the SPS/FPS Joint Subcommittees:**

1) **Prioritize hiring full-time, tenure-track faculty, with a goal of hiring 7-10 additional faculty.**
2) **Defer the distance education spending, pending completion of “Part A” and other related governance actions.**
3) **Stretch out the SPG spending proposals, pending assessment and evaluation of current efforts.**
4) **Provide funds for a professional consultant on space planning.**
5) **Support spending for student services.**
6) **Defer hiring a Director for International Partnerships, pending recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee on International Programs.**
7) **Create a contingency fund for unanticipated expenses and other adjustments that may be needed in the course of the year.**

*The attached document [Ned’s proposals] illustrates a way to reconcile the need for reductions in spending with proposals presented.*

The committee voted 6-0 in favor of the new recommendations for the FY2013 financial plan. As Co-Chair, Jim did not vote.

The meeting concluded with a request from Ned that SPS should have three separate meetings in the upcoming semester to address space concerns. Jim will propose a schedule for such.

Meeting ended at 11:45am.
Faculty and Student Disciplinary Hearings
Dates for Academic Year
2011-2012

Fall 2011

November @ 3:30PM
--Monday, 21\textsuperscript{st} – Cancelled
--Monday, 28\textsuperscript{th} - Cancelled
--Wednesday, 30\textsuperscript{th} - Cancelled

December @ 3:30PM in Room L65.08NB
--Monday, 5\textsuperscript{th}
Chair – Professor Robert McCrie

Professor Effie Cochran
Professor Ali Kocak

Student – John Cusick
Student – Kateryna Kagan

--Thursday, 8\textsuperscript{th} - Cancelled

--Wednesday, 14\textsuperscript{th} - Cancelled

Spring 2012

March @ 3:30 PM in Room L65.08NB
--Thursday, 15\textsuperscript{th} - Cancelled

--Tuesday, 20\textsuperscript{th} - Cancelled

--Wednesday, 28\textsuperscript{th}
Chair – Professor Robert McCrie

Professor Margaret Escher
Professor Ali Kocak

Student – Iseult Leger
Student – Lewquay Williams
April @ 3:30 PM in Room L65.08NB
--Thursday, 5th
Chair – Professor Robert McCrie

Professor Lori Latrice-Martin
Professor Liliana Soto-Fernandez

Student – Ammarah Karin
Student – Lewquay Williams

--Tuesday, 24th
Chair – Professor Stanley Ingber

Professor Effie Cochran
Professor Barbara Josiah

Student – John Cusick
Student – Zakeia Rodgers

May @ 3:30 PM in Room L65.08NB
--Thursday, 3rd
Chair – Professor Stanley Ingber

Professor Barbara Josiah
Professor Lori Latrice-Martin

Student – Ammarah Karim
Student – Zakeia Rodgers

--Wednesday, 9th- Cancelled

--Tuesday, May 15th
Chair – Professor Robert McCrie

Professor Effie Cochran
Professor Liliana Soto-Fernandez

Student – Lewquay Williams

--Tuesday, May 29th
Chair – Professor Robert McCrie

Professor Effie Cochran
Professor Liliana Soto-Fernandez

Student – Lewquay Williams
Agenda

1. Approval of 9/14/11 Minutes
2. Provost’s Announcements
3. Chairs’ agenda item: Consultation
4. CUNY Master Plan
5. Workload Reporting Process – Ben Rohdin
6. New Business
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>C. Jama Adams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Ned Benton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Seth Baumrin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Jane Bowers, Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>David Brotherton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Richard Curtis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Silvia Dapia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Lisa Farrington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Amy Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Jonathan Jacobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Berenecea Johnson-Janes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Maki Haberfeld</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Jay Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Karen Kaplowitz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Allison Kavey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Larry Kobilinsky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Tom Kucharski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>James Llana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Evan Mandery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Kevin Nesbitt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Allison Pease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Lisandro Perez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Ben Rohdin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Francis Shechan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Peter Shenkin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Harold Sullivan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Robert Till</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>David Umeh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Larry Sullivan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Nancy Velazquez-Torres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 35 pm
Provost’s Advisory Council
Minutes – October 18, 2011

Present: J. Adams, N. Benton, J. Bowers, D. Brotherton, R. Curtis, S. Dapia, A. Green,
L. Farrington, M. Haberfeld, J. Hamilton, J. Jacobs, K. Kaplowitz, A. Kavey, L. Kobilinsky,
T. Kurcharski, J. Llana, L. Perez, K. Nesbitt, A. Pease, B. Rohdin, Shenkin, H. Sullivan, L. Sullivan,
D. Umeh, N. Velazquez-Torres

Absent: S. Baumrin, B. Johnson Eanes, E. Mandery, F. Sheehan, R. Till

1. Approval of Minutes for September 14, 2011. Approved as submitted.

2. Provost’s Announcements.
   • Conference. Jane distributed the brochure, “International Conference. Global
     Perspectives on Justice, Security and Human Rights,” and urged everyone to get
     the word out for the conference at John Jay from June 6-9, 2012. In response to
     a question about whether there was money to bring in “stars,” Jane referred the
     person to Karen Terry.
   • Preview of Move. Some offices have moved already. Phase II involves moving
     into concourse offices on October 28. The official ceremony with lots of
     dignitaries will occur on Nov. 2. Ben asked that Chairs appoint a “move
     coordinator” from each Department who will work with Ben on moves to Haaren
     and the new building. Jane pointed out that faculty may not be able to bring all
     their books; the moving consultant will provide boxes consistent with the size of
     the receiving space, and the movers will not move more than a certain amount
     of material.
     On Nov. 3 there will be an Open House in the new building so people can
     celebrate the space and get oriented. Nov. 7 will mark the first day of classes in
     the new building; most classes will be moving but not all.
     Ned asked if we can be assured of getting classroom space at any time in the
     spring since this should be the semester when we’ll have enough space. Jane
     responded “no,” that we will not have options in North Hall any longer.
     At the end of November the Tower will be done.

3. Consultation. Harold, speaking for the Chairs, said they felt inadequately consulted. In
   the Financial Planning Subcommittee, the Chairs representing the Senate were not
   aware of some hiring decisions; they were not in the loop. Ned observed that the
   President and Rob assumed Jane consulted with the faculty, but the faculty just go to
   meetings “to be told things.” Ned continued: the thinking on hiring was that the
Provost would announce that hiring faculty would take place and then allow Departments to make their best case for lines. These decisions should be informed by metrics but they are not. The consultation with Ynes was not good and there is no discussion about how space is used. Tom reminded the group of the time when Jane would meet with Executive Committee of Chairs. Harold raised the example of the decision to go with lecturer lines: many Departments had lost lines and this decision was never discussed.

Karen asked Jane if she was involved in the decision to hire 31 CUNY Peace Officers, since this will change the culture of the College more than anything else. Allison pointed to the Task Force reports where findings were announced, but there was no consultation. Larry Sullivan, going back to the Public Safety issue, reported that a visitor from Lehman had to sign in three times when visiting John Jay; the CUNY ID should be good at all campuses.

Jane responded to the points raised by faculty. She agreed that it was very helpful for her to meet with faculty members of FPS, and she would be happy to resume those meetings, or with the Executive Committee of the Chairs. She’s always ready to meet with the Council of Chairs, since she is interested in transparency. A query will go out today to faculty members for the upcoming SPS/FPS meeting.

On the subject of administrative versus faculty lines, Jane pointed out that she makes decisions only for academic lines. The other VP’s submit requests to the President, and the President sends exemptions and that’s the form of consultation there. Lisandro observed that it’s not just a matter of consultation on budget; it’s rather a campus culture issue.

Jane, responding to Karen’s question, said she wasn’t aware of the proposal to hire Peace Officers, although she probably saw some reference to it in a document on the way to 80th Street. Karen replied that it’s “shameful” that a decision like this was made without the Provost fully participating in the discussion. She is “shocked and disappointed.” Jama urged that Academic Affairs be consulted on such matters.

Amy reported that a student who had helped organize the recent protest had her ID deactivated pending a meeting with the Director of Public Safety, and that this was indicative of the campus culture. Karen suggested that this should be on the ESM agenda. Jane responded that she would put it on the agenda of a VP’s meeting.

Getting back to the general discussion on consultation, Jane said she was told she could consider filling “critical” positions, and that she already knew where we had problems offering degrees. She admittedly did not consult, but ahead of the new hiring plan she will call for ideas from Departments. On the lecturer lines, she got “carried away” with her idea, and did not consult. She favors the strategic use of lecturers for teaching and prefers they be part of a community and not isolated in a Department. She would
rather hire tenure-track faculty in general and not throw a single lecturer into a Department.
On the comment about Task Forces, recommendations were made to hire in each case. Ned suggested that Task Forces are a way to develop ideas and proposals; they are not a substitute for governance, and the Charter is being violated. Some discussion followed on these points, with Jane arguing that between the Task Force reports and spending money there was a space for consultation.

4. **CUNY Master Plan.** Harold criticized the CUNY process for developing its Master Plan. Karen argued that the Master Plan is now serious in CUNY, citing earlier examples of major items in the Master Plan being realized. Jama argued for campus distinctiveness. Allison will consult with Jim on ideas for the Master Plan. Jim observed he followed up on ideas for the Master Plan with SPS/FPS but received no comments. Karen replied that she suggested it should be on the agenda for that group. It will be on the SPS/FPS agenda for Sept. 25.

5. **Workload Reporting Process.** Ben is getting lots of reports of problems with this year’s workload reporting process. He attempted to align workload reporting with Enrollment Management’s scheduling calendar, but this hasn’t worked well. Among Chairs, some want all faculty to report through them and others don’t want anything to do with it. The Chairs are frustrated that the administration approaches faculty regarding the allocation of Reassigned Time directly and apart from the scheduling process. A new, standard release time authorization form will be developed and rolled out in the spring. Records, particularly regarding reassigned time, dating back prior to Fall 2007 are a problem and reconciling them sometimes boils down to a negotiation. Ben has to work out a baseline workload balance (banked time or time owed) at the beginning of each year for faculty members and this may take beyond the academic year to straighten out; eventually this will be online. Tom urged that we should ignore the balance for now and roll out the new process in two phases. Re-creating the workload history for a faculty member is extremely time-consuming. Ben predicted a two-year process before this is cleared up. John Jacobs asked if there is no office that can do an accurate accounting; he suggests that information should flow to one office and that each year the account would be sent to everyone. Lisandro is reluctant to share the workload reports with his faculty until he can understand it. He requested an orientation be done for Chairs new to the CUNY workload process.
Provost Advisory Council

November 15, 2011

2:00 – 4:00 p.m., Room 610T

Agenda

1. Approval of 10/18/11 Minutes

2. Provost’s Announcements

3. Middle States Update – AP Llana

4. Contract Review Procedures

5. The Move into the Tower and Haaren Backfill: Faculty Concerns

6. New Business
Provost Advisory Council  
11-15-11  
Attendance Sheet

1. C. Jama Adams  
2. Ned Benton  
3. Seth Baumrin  
4. Jane Bowers, Chair  
5. David Brotherton  
6. Richard Curtis  
7. Silvia Dapia  
8. Lisa Farrington  
9. Amy Green  
10. Jonathan Jacobs  
11. Berenicea Johnson Eagles  
12. Maki Haberfeld  
13. Jay Hamilton  
14. Karen Kaplowitz  
15. Allison Kavey  
16. Larry Kobilinsky  
17. Tom Kucharski  
18. James Llana  
19. Evan Mandery  
20. Kevin Nesbitt  
21. Allison Pease  
22. Lisandro Perez  
23. Ben Rohdin  
24. Francis Sheehan  
25. Peter Shenkin  
26. Harold Sullivan  
27. Robert Till  
28. David Umeh  
29. Larry Sullivan  
30. Nancy Velazquez-Torres

2:45pm
Provost’s Advisory Council Meeting
Draft Minutes – November 15, 2011


1. Jane sadly announced the sudden death of Prof. Richard Culp, and some discussion followed of the circumstances.

2. Jane tore up the agenda with the idea of devoting the remainder of the meeting to addressing things she has heard said about her, and she wants to understand why. She has not changed over the years of her tenure as Provost, but something has changed very recently in her relationship with the faculty-- perhaps a lack of confidence in her-- and she needs to talk about it.

   It is a difficult time on campus, a time of heightened tension due no doubt to the move and other changes, and so complaints are running high about many things large and small. Among the things she has heard—indeed the worst thing—is the claim that she is not an effective advocate for the faculty. She very much wants Chairs to speak with her so she can be their advocate and confidence can be restored, but she has heard too that Chairs think they are not able to do so. To remedy that situation she proposed that PAC meeting agendas henceforth begin with the Provost’s announcements and then turn to the airing of issues from chairs. Only then will the Council move onto other matters.

   Jane also pointed out in the context of communication that she has been invited to the Council of Chairs only once in four years and has yet to attend a single meeting.

   To illustrate the challenges to Academic Affairs and the active responses to those challenges, Jane related the events surrounding the removal of the security person from the Library on the previous morning. The Library Director was informed that the security service at the entrance was discontinued, leaving only a College Assistant to perform the security functions. She took this up with SVP Pignatello but to no avail, and so she went to the President, and henceforth there will be security at the library. It was a troubling response to faculty concerns, but it is now fixed.

   Harold explained his request for a meeting with the President and the Chairs, assuring Jane that the purpose of the meeting had nothing to do with Academic Affairs or her, but rather with general administration and faculty relations. Jane responded that
concerns about administration should go to her since she’s on the “faculty team.” And Jane has worked hard to restore the stature of Academic Affairs.

Karen thanked Jane for the College response to the CUNY Pathways project; it represented the faculty with integrity. She added that the Senate should find a separate place on the agenda of PAC meetings or be included explicitly on the proposed new set agenda. She implored the Provost to consult with faculty at PAC, before decisions are reached.

Jane stated that she had heard some people say there was a lack of consultation on the Task Force reports even though they have been public for a long time. And some apparently believed that the administration had hand-picked members so it could get the result it wanted. Ned responded that the issue connected to the Task Force reports is that they didn’t go through governance. The recommendations were just acted on; he would like to see the Task Forces engage with governance before implementation.

Jama observed that we have senior people and junior people and no one in the middle. Consultation with a handful of senior people is not working. Jane should be more political and get the word out about where she stands. She responded that people have advised her to tell her story; she has been very active and doing a great deal but maybe needs to be explicit, but some things simply cannot be made public.

Tom said he did not believe the statement that Jane does not care, but he and others are experiencing a process where decisions are disconnected from the faculty. We feel more like employees than partners in the decision-making process. We are becoming more and more distant. Jane expressed frustration with planning and limited control.

Tom continued: we complain in PAC and the Council of Chairs but don’t use whatever power we have; the FPS doesn’t do planning.

Jane acknowledged that when the cuts came she made the decision that the last thing to be touched was support services for students. She also acknowledged that as a result Departments have been stripped of administrative and clerical support. Recently she decided to build back administrative support in Departments, and she will develop a multi-year plan to do this. The lack of support is surely a source of stress. Tom said he didn’t normally like course releases but in a time of stress they are useful.

J. Jacobs observed that there is increasing friction between faculty and administration because more and more imperatives originate outside the institution. The faculty has to make these imperatives happen. Many faculty have the sense that there is no longer clarity about their deliberative and consultative role. It would be helpful if the faculty had clarity on when and where they have a genuinely consultative role. The sense now is that there is more to do but less to decide. Jane acknowledged the constraints and demands from outside. It’s often difficult to build in consultation; the Pathways
initiative is a good example of this. We spent five years on General Education and Pathways quickly undermined our very extensively planned program. Ned thinks we defined accountability in the Charter but that we have departed from the norms about how to relate to one another. The discussions of space did not reflect Charter arrangements. And budget decisions are made elsewhere; afterwards we get to hear about them. The administration defines certain kinds of decisions as administrative when in fact they should go to academic structures. Let’s renew our commitment to the Charter. Jane wondered if any kind of decision can simply be made; it’s hard to know what the balance is with regard to consultation.

Harold brought up the example of the Corrections major, claiming that any decision that goes through a Charter body for approval should go through a Charter body for dissolution. Jane asserted her belief that the CAO and President can close programs. The issue is now going through governance, but she strongly believes that students should no longer be enrolled in this major. L. Kobilsinsky stated that many things are not under the control of Academic Affairs: security; upkeep of facilities; the terms of the move; food service changes. We have no input on these things but we need an advocate. Jane is much concerned about North Hall with people working in isolation there. She has talked to Rob Pignatello about consolidating work areas to avoid leaving individuals alone. Ben announced that he is developing a plan to consolidate stray operations in North Hall and a FAQ page for the move.

Lisandro noted that at many places, faculty governance is all but gone. Here we at least have expectations, and yet we feel powerless. By way of example he cited a rule that prevents faculty from having in their possession keys to both their former offices in North Hall and their new office, even during the move. Such decisions seem to alight from nowhere; the prohibition on cross-listed courses is another example. Ben responded that he is trying to resolve the key issue. Jane replied that it is her understanding that CUNYFirst prevents us from cross-listing courses; we have no choice. Again on the move, Ben advised faculty to come to him rather than to Ynes Leon, if they anticipate problems with the move.

Allison weighed in on the governance issue: everyone has to go through governance; we deserve a vote.

Evan followed up: we need true consultation, and the institution only works through consensus regardless of how things are set up. This means that the status quo may prevail.

Jay asked where we could go with the frustrations. There are real issues with some individuals. Jane suggested that the faculty has already done something through its request for a meeting with the President.
Jane supports consultation and sharing information, but at some point she has to make a decision. The process of collaboration is important, but there is also a time for a decision.

Tom pleaded for administrators to stay open and not to present decisions to the faculty that have already been made. Real consultation is not possible otherwise. Jama opened a discussion of Jane’s role in getting the Honors Program approved; the process broke down in the face of an a priori decision. If the substance is there but no process then it’s as if Jane has done nothing. Jane argued that she has been motivated by CUNY’s changed perception of John Jay; when she was at Macaulay, she heard that John Jay would never be able to join. She was similarly told that John Jay could not have a philosophy degree, but after much effort we now have it. Still, Jane conceded Jama’s point that she could do better with the political process.

Allison asked about the rumor that the budget is wrong. Jane described how CUNY gave us $800,000 a year ago to help and then did not remove the money from the past year’s budget. We assumed it was permanent, but recently it disappeared so we have less money than we thought. It’s not too much of a disaster since it only reduces our surplus, and we are expecting a larger enrollment; given the turn-out at Open House we may do better than expectations.

We will try to have discussions of faculty concerns at every PAC meeting. Jane has been disturbed for six weeks hearing things indirectly, and the meetings will serve as a forum for direct discussion.
Provost Advisory Council

December 19, 2011

2:00 – 4:00 p.m., Room 610T

Agenda

1. Approval of 11/15/11 Minutes
2. Provost’s Announcements
3. Chairs and Faculty Matters
4. Middle States Update – AP Llana
5. Contract Review Procedures
6. New Business
Provost Advisory Council
12-19-11
Attendance Sheet

1. C. Jama Adams
2. Ned Benton
3. Seth Baumrin
4. Jane Bowers, Chair
5. David Brotherton
6. Richard Curtis
7. Silvia Dapia
8. Lisa Farrington
9. Amy Green
10. Jonathan Jacobs
11. Berenice Johnson Eanes
12. Maki Haberfeld
13. Jay Hamilton
14. Karen Kaplowitz
15. Allison Kavey
16. Larry Kobilinsky
17. Tom Kucharski
18. James Liana
19. Evan Mandery
20. Kevin Nesbitt
21. Allison Pease
22. Lisandro Perez
23. Ben Rohdin
24. Francis Sheehan
25. Peter Shenkin
26. Harold Sullivan
27. Robert Till
28. David Umes
29. Larry Sullivan
30. Nancy Velazquez-Torres

(present)
1. Approval of Minutes for November 15, 2011. Minutes were approved by acclamation.
2. Provost’s Plans for Spring. Jane will be doing a research project on “Communities of Practice,” formal and informal organizations and activities that our graduates may want to join. We want to shape new Master’s programs and post-graduate certificates, but before doing so we should discover what skills and knowledge are needed or will be needed out there in the world. You will hear more about this in the spring. Jama observed that before English was offered as a major, he would not have guessed the demand was there; we should find out what the demand is for programs. Jane added that at the undergraduate level, we will not be too prescriptive, but graduate students are typically focused on specific post-graduate outcomes. The communities of practice study will show students pathways to desired as well as unexpected fields. The effort will drive mostly graduate studies, at least initially.

Jane announced that she is increasing her leadership in enrollment planning, and “it’s high time.” Enrollment is tied to academic planning. There’s a sense that we are not bringing in the type of students we envisioned after discontinuing associate programs. She will make a presentation to the Budget and Planning Committee early in the spring. Jama asked if the 9th and 10th graders he sees in the hallways are getting in touch with faculty. Jane wasn’t sure but noted the fact of planned classroom visits by accepted high school students in the spring. If we are competing with other schools, academic programs have to be front and center. J. Jacobs asked if we know where our potential students go. The answer is “no,” but we are now on track to discover this. L. Perez asked about recruiters. Jane responded that we do have recruiters but perhaps we don’t use them very strategically. VP Saulnier has reorganized in enrollment management team with a more focused view of recruiting. On the subject of student recruitment, N. Velasquez-Torres noted that thanks to CUNY the number of SEEK students will be reduced to less than 200. Jane noted that we should not have in the past used SEEK students to cover deficits in our enrollment numbers.

We’re building forty new faculty into the financial plan and so in the spring departments should be thinking about their needs. At the same time we are working to improve the
lives of our part-time faculty. A. Pease is working with a group to address adjunct needs. Allison said the group has draft recommendations and has heard from 175 adjunct faculty as part of a survey. Jane suggested we have lots of work to do to improve the lives of our part-time faculty, on whom we depend so much. We are working on generating new revenue through enhanced programs in professional studies, and winter and summer sessions. There will be a revenue-sharing plan to support departments. An important goal of the next several years is to build back administrative support in the academic departments. We will soon embark on the CUNY Pathways project. All courses in the new General Education program will have to be reviewed by CUNY. We have been asked to provide eight faculty to staff the CUNY review committees.

Harold asked about the process for submitting requests for new faculty positions. Will everyone know what others are asking for? Jane replied that we can all share requests in the interest of transparency.

Space Plans. Ned asked about the use of space in North Hall and about the “backfill” in Haaren. Jane acknowledged that it’s being talked about, but she is not central to those discussions. Ned claimed that Rob Pignatello and Ynes Leon don’t seem to make information available. Jane doesn’t know the details, but believes that things won’t go as originally planned due to delays in finishing the 6th floor of the new building. That floor should be ready by spring break. Jane will have Ben Rohdin respond to Ned’s questions.

Karen heard Rob say that there could be a delay in getting a CO, and he was wondering about what to say publically. Karen argued that such a contingency should be publicized. Jane will raise the issue with Rob. R. Till reported that he had asked for modification to Westport but had received no information. Jane’s guess is that the January move will take place, but there is a small possibility it won’t. Parts of the move that are dependent on other things happening may not occur until the end of the summer. Ned wants to know the plans, whatever they are, and to know something about the funding for backfill work in Haaren. Jane responded that funding has not been approved for the backfill, but she is not involved in those discussions and cannot say more. The request for funding is at CUNY so no one at John Jay may know what’s going on. Jane will ask Rob to communicate with PAC.

Bureaucracy and Attendance. L. Perez has been getting emails from Yvonne Purdie regarding training for online timesheets. He didn’t even know about paper timesheets, let alone the new ones online. Jane reminded everyone that in the past there were paper timesheets but the practice of completing and approving them was lax. The impetus for enforcing the requirements now is that faculty have retired with a great deal of to-be-paid sick leave. The timesheets serve to document the use of sick leave.
Jane doesn’t understand the supervisory function but sees the need for documentation. We’ve been remiss for years, but now we have to be more accountable. M. Haberfeld is uncomfortable with the policing aspect of timesheet approval, and there ensued a long discussion of same.

3. **Middle States Update.** J. Llana reminded Chairs that fall syllabi with appropriate learning outcomes should be submitted this semester to Inez Brown, either in electronic form or hardcopy. This was discussed at the PAC meetings of April 14, 2011 and September 14, 2011. Syllabi for spring courses should come in during the spring semester. In addition, reports for spring 2011 assessment should be sent now to Virginia Moreno. In general the discussion of results and proposed changes should be made in time to incorporate those changes into the next course cycle: for example, spring assessment should yield changes for courses the following spring. The discussion of assessment results and proposed changes must be documented in the assessment report due each summer. Chairs have guidelines for assessment, distributed at PAC on Sept. 14. Jim encouraged Chairs to get in touch with him or Virginia Moreno if there are questions about assessment; they can often save Departments a lot of work.

The Middle States Steering Committee met last week to present preliminary findings. As expected, some groups are right on schedule, but one or two are lagging seriously. We are entering the period of the most intense work for the Self-Study; the Steering Committee will meet twice a month throughout the spring. The visiting Team Chair will be identified soon, and that person will visit the campus for a preliminary visit in November, at which point we must have an approved draft of the Self-Study. The final draft must be sent to the team six weeks prior to their arrival, most likely in April, 2013. Preparing for the visit and completing the Self-Study is an enormous task, involving scores of people. Hundreds of decisions large and small must be made in a coordinated, campus-wide effort. Everyone will have to be on campus for the Monday and Tuesday of the team visit. Since we are vulnerable from a Middle States perspective concerning our formal support and review of part-time faculty, Chairs are urged to do what they can in this respect; the Pease workgroup on part-time faculty will come out with recommendations. Assessment is also a great challenge.

4. **Contract Review Procedures.** Jane cannot discuss this because she could not find the document, but provisionally do not sign anything without an official review. A few chairs indicated that the contract review procedures had been sent out as a general or important announcement, so everyone should have them or at least know about them.

5. **New Business.** L. Kobilinsky asked if we can use a third party for food? A number of people complained about lateness of food delivery. Jane urged all those with concerns
to inform Rob Pignatello or Pat Ketterer. Karen asked that she, Harold, and Jane be copied on such communication. In response to a question, Jane announced that gifts from students should be returned to the students. The policy is to accept no gifts from students.
Provost Advisory Council

February 16, 2012

2:00 – 4:00 p.m., Room 610T

Agenda

1. Approval of 12/19/11 Minutes
2. Provost’s Announcements
3. Chairs and Faculty Matters
4. Follow up on PAC concerns - Kevin Nesbitt
5. Some Thoughts on Academic Program Planning
6. New approach to Line Allocations
7. New Business
Provost Advisory Council
02-16-12
Attendance Sheet

1. C. Jama Adams
2. Ned Benton
3. Seth Baumnin
4. Jane Bowers, Chair
5. David Brotherton
6. Richard Curtis
7. Silvia Dapia
8. Lisa Farrington
9. Amy Green
10. Jonathan Jacobs
11. Berenicea Johnson-Kanes
12. Maki Haberfeld
13. Jay Hamilton
14. Karen Kaplowitz
15. Allison Kavey
16. Larry Kobilinsky
17. Tom Kucharski
18. James Llana
19. Evan Mandery
20. Charles Nemeth
21. Kevin Ncsbitt
22. Allison Pease
23. Lisandro Perez
24. Ben Rohdin
25. Francis Sheehan
26. Peter Shenkin
27. Harold Sullivan
28. David Umeh
29. Larry Sullivan
30. Nancy Velazquez-Torres
Provost’s Advisory Council  
Meeting Minutes – February 16, 2012

Absent: L. Farrington, T. Kucharski, D. Umeh, J. Llana, E. Mandery, L. Sullivan, K. Nesbitt left early

1. “Goody bags”. One for each of the chairs, containing items with the new JJ logo and a price list. Glass cube paperweight suggested as gift for honorees in department – special showing by Jane.
2. Introduction of Chuck Nemeth, New Chair of Protection Management
3. IT Attestation moved up. Kevin Nesbitt presenting new IT attestation, and addressing faculty and chair concerns about it.
4. ADI. New timekeeping system for faculty. Jane asked other provosts if they were aware of the system, and if they used it. Some do, some don’t. It is going to be rolled out for faculty, but the system will only be used for the next two years, until it is replaced. It is only to record absences, and in theory, will help with grievances, as well as providing record keeping for leaves, etc. In fall 2012, there will be online training for the system, and it will migrate easily to other systems. Kevin has put forward suggestions for improvements, such as one click options for chairs reviewing faculty who have not had any absences. HR is also willing to come to the meeting and address concerns. Karen K. asked what happens if faculty do not put in their information. Response – it is a self-policing system and chairs can intervene and work with HR to get correct information if faculty do not use it. Lisandro asked for qualification – saying that it only technically monitors when you are not in the classroom, but what if you make up the class? Jane answered that it is still an absence even if you make up the class. Students are under no obligation to come to a class that is scheduled outside of the normal time. That is why make-up classes are so difficult. Whether you schedule a make-up class or not, it still counts as an absence. Jama asked – even conferences? Jane – yes. There was some discussion over this, with some faculty saying that it then acted as a deterrent to conferences etc. Jane pointed out that it is not meant to be discouraging, but that there are state and contractual obligations that need to be met. Therefore, absences still need to be recorded. There are absence codes as well on the system that allow for absence types to be noted. Ned B. said that it doesn’t matter. Charles N. said that a person that
doesn’t show up won’t self-police, so the Chair is put in the position of acting as a police officer. Kevin pointed out that it has traditionally been policed by the chairs, and documented. Charles N. then claimed that the process was creating conflict. It was decided that there was no solution, and to move to IT. CUNY has asked for attestations. Kevin pointed out that he has pushed for a shorter report – it is now one to two pages. The key difference is rather than deans or department chairs being responsible for a cumbersome and unintelligible attestation process, now individual faculty will be responsible on an annual basis for affirming that they adhere to basic information security protocols that protect their devices, student, and faculty and staff data. Kevin indicated that Praveen had signed off on the shorter document and indicated Praveen worked with General Counsel for final approval. It was now IT’s responsibility, and it was due to his efforts on behalf of the faculty that IT was now in charge of attestations.

5. Minutes for Dec 19, 2011 were approved.

6. Humanities Open House. Jane wanted to express her happiness at the success of the Humanities Open House in the New Building. Gorgeous views, beautiful offices – and how wonderful it was to have a Humanities Quad and humanities majors.

7. New Logo and letterhead. Jane reminded everyone that they needed to remove all the old stationery, recycle it, and get the new stationery. She asked that faculty use the brand new letterhead!

8. Raises for faculty promoted 2010/2011/2012. This brought a very warm response. Jane pointed out that although it was not a lot of money, the thought behind it does count.

9. Model Syllabus. Must be used from fall 2012. In addition, all department syllabi must be on file and sent electronically to Inez Brown. To date, only 71 have been received – out of 1000s. It must be submitted every semester. Only five departments have submitted them – and they are needed for Middle States.

10. Faculty Lunches for Pre-Tenure Review. 2 groups have met so far – it’s been very successful.

11. Status and Timetable for Move from North Hall. Ned wanted an update on the process. Jane will speak to Rob about need to communicate updates about the move and renovations to buildings other than the New Building. Information has not been forthcoming, and people need to know what is happening.

12. Academic Program Planning. Issues are coming up – firstly, that it be strategic, transparent, and consultative. There is a need for a wide-ranging discussion. Science major is very popular, but it is a key retention point – students fail and leave. There is a need for a softer science major for students who couldn’t handle Forensic Science. Jane pointed out that Science needs thoughtful academic planning, but that the college was not waiting two years to proceed. Ned said that the Health professions were growing, and that would be a good direction for the college. It was pointed out that adding a new
major to Science would be expensive, because of space and cost of equipment, etc. The Corrections major has been suspended; students would possibly be better served by a Social Work major. Jane indicated that there needs to be a process for these discussions, one that is inclusive and collective. Jama said that part of the problem was that the percentage of students who were well prepared for college was shrinking. He said that the college, and particularly the science major, needed to diversify. Jane respectfully disagreed, stating the science major is diverse. Jama continued to state his point that now there was a class bias, and JJ was too middle class, and the poor were not represented. Consensus was that diversity issue was important.

Seth asked how do we know why the students pick a major. Jane said that what we need to do is more enrollment analysis. Particular questions needed to be asked such as: why are students not coming here, and where do they go? How do we advertise? There are constraints on the planning process, and questions that need to be addressed. How big do we want to be? Jane pointed out that the college needs to change curriculum planning from reacting to whatever bubbles up, and instead consider where resources are allocated. Alison Kavey stated that it was good to have failed Science majors, because they were exposed to the Humanities and could choose. There is a need for advisors. Jane indicated that introducing admissions criteria to Forensic Science was not just a check on numbers. David Brotherton asked about the length of this conversation. We need to move on to faculty hiring.

Jane asked that departments consider their line requests in terms of academic planning. David B. asked if we should divide into schools. Jane said that she was open to thinking about it. Karen K. said there could be no more discussions on the subject until there were more Humanities majors. Jane said that the questions on how to restructure were probably far into the future.

Harold Sullivan introduced the topic of the Justice Academy and asked if the college was being pigeonholed into Criminal Justice even more than before, as the Academy now had 7000 students. Jane answered that the Academy had never expected to have so many students – the projection was 3000. However, the concern over whether the program was too big had to be weighed against the very low completion rates at community colleges, which stand at 16%. In addition, it was pointed out that there was no contract – the students did not have to major in those areas. Karen said that they also do not have to come to John Jay. Jane stated that the cohorts are being tracked, but there is not yet enough data. However, for the first time at CUNY, colleges are sharing data – therefore, for many reasons, it was a very interesting program. Amy
Green asked what does the college want to influence – what does John Jay want to be part of? Jane said these were all good questions, and that research should be done on communities of practice. An overall question regarding the meaning of expanding the definition of justice was raised. Jon Jacobs had two points – 1) that data was needed on what grads were doing three years after they leave and 2) data on national trends. It was pointed out that there were preconceptions about what students did with their majors, and that perhaps students needed to understand that there were many ways to succeed. The idea of introducing an Environmental Studies major was raised – as it would combine the concepts of justice and science. Larry Kobilinsky said that the department was not ready, and that ecology was from the 60s. He brought up the possibility of attracting post-bac students who were preparing for med school. Jane said that there was not enough data yet, but that JJ was starting to follow the data trail, and had applied to receive information on test scores, etc. Monitoring of students currently needed to be accomplished. Nancy pointed out that most of the students who needed to have discussions about their future were in the Forensic Science program. Larry suggested mandatory advisement.

13. Faculty Hiring. Jane stated that a number of new lines were available, and that she would advocate for more, in order to get back to the same coverage as in fall 2009. Kevin N. was working with HR to ascertain how many faculty we had lost – it was estimated between 18-19. Jane said that we were back to the horrible/wonderful years of searching so many lines. Vacant faculty lines would be filled – but not necessarily in the same department. Lines stay when a search fails, or you dismiss someone. In 2009 every line was filled with subs – who were ultimately let go. There was a perceived need for more openness in the process of allocating lines – however, it was not open for argument. Transparency and feedback are necessary. Hiring decisions are not all about data. It also concerns rewarding departments who are doing well in terms of moving their curriculum forward, etc. IR data is used to show departmental data over a three year period – the number of students; the number of degrees awarded; and the number of enrollments. Jane is providing these numbers for everyone.

Alison H. asked why we are hiring people when we don’t know about the new Gen Ed? She said that it was uncertain that we could provide employment to the people that we have. Ned pointed out that we need to reflect on what departments do. Jama said that students still need 120 credits, therefore there was not going to be such a great change. Jane replied that the college needs people. She added that this was an opportunity to create interesting courses in Gen Ed. and give students electives. It does make it difficult for administrators, as we don’t know what will happen. In English and History, full time professors teach Gen Ed. Allison K.
pointed out that some adjuncts were better than the full time faculty. Jane said that all professors should teach Gen Ed classes at some point. Fewer students may take the new Gen Ed courses since the credit requirement is smaller, but we still can’t stop hiring while we wait to determine the impact of the new Gen Ed. Karen K. said that the figures on Undergraduate and Graduate coverage put together were not accurate. For example, in Public Administration, only 8% of undergraduate courses were taught by full-time faculty. The point was made that better prepared students will transfer out if they are not challenged, and that we need more full-time faculty. Full-time coverage was not enough. It had been 45% Undergraduate and 56% Graduate, but this had gone down to 38% overall. It is a very low number in terms of percentage of students being taught by full-time faculty. Jane followed up by pointing out that this made growing the faculty essential. Overall comments reflecting on Gen Ed: Ned – projections were difficult. Ben – projections can be done in terms of potential and impact on the program. Jane – how big will Gen Ed. become – chairs need to answer that question. David B. asked if we were not replacing retirees. Jane answered that we were not replacing people who retired ERI. We can replace people who left this year and last year. Jane stated that requests for lines had to be in by April 1.

14. April meeting. The meeting will include: discussing these requests, and a general discussion. Decisions will be made based on these discussions by May 15.
Provost Advisory Council

March 14, 2012
2:00 – 4:00 p.m., Room 610T

Agenda

1. Approval of 02/16/12 Minutes
2. Provost’s Announcements
3. Chairs and Faculty Matters
4. Middle States Update – Jim Llana
5. Supporting Adjunct Faculty: Report and Recommendations—Allison Pease
6. Pathways – Anne Lopes
7. New Business
Provost Advisory Council
03-14-12
Attendance Sheet

1. C. Jama Adams
2. Ned Benton
3. Seth Baumrin
4. Jane Bowers, Chair
5. David Brotherton
6. Richard Curtis
7. Silvia Dapia
8. Lisa Farrington
9. Amy Green
10. Jonathan Jacobs
11. Berenecea Johnson Eanes
12. Maki Haberfeld
13. Jay Hamilton
14. Karen Kaplowitz
15. Allison Kavey
16. Larry Kobilinsky
17. Tom Kucharski
18. James Llana
19. Evan Mandery
20. Charles Nembhard
21. Kevin Nesbitt
22. Allison Pease
23. Lisandro Perez
24. Ben Rohdin
25. Francis Sheehan
26. Peter Shenkin
27. Harold Sullivan
28. David Umeh
29. Larry Sullivan
30. Nancy Velazquez-Torres
Provost’s Advisory Council  
Meeting Minutes – March 14, 2012

Absent: L. Farrington, T. Kucharski, E. Mandery, L. Sullivan

1. Approval of Minutes. Minutes for February 16, 2012 were approved with a correction by Seth Baumrin. He noted that his question, cited in the minutes, pertained to why students chose John Jay, not why they chose a particular major.

2. Provost’s Announcements. To some mild applause, Jane announced that MBJ is back. There is some doubt whether the new cafeteria will be open this semester since negotiations will have to take place with MBJ to get a better variety of offerings. “Tejas” will close. Services will be provided in Haaren and North Hall. The 11th avenue café is trying to find a tenant, perhaps Starbucks. Catering will be open under the new contract, with a preferred list of providers. Ben Rohdin is leaving the College to take a great offer from the School of Criminal Justice at Rutgers, Newark. Jane commented on his many contributions to the Provost’s office. Ben said he needed a situation that would allow him to get back to school, and he expressed his appreciation to his colleagues at John Jay.

Kevin Nesbitt reminded people that they had received a message from the Office of Research, asking for CV’s. A report will be developed so that Chairs can see information on their own departments.

3. Chairs and Faculty Matters. Harold announced that he is withdrawing from his Pathways committee; he found VC Logue’s letter so offensive that he cannot continue to serve. Jane has been asked to replace him.

Regarding online evaluations, the Chairs have invited the SEOF Committee to a Chairs meeting. Jane recalled the committee chaired by Pat O’Hara to look at online evaluations of online courses and noted that their work was extended to hybrid courses and to select traditional courses. Lisa Farrington is testing online evaluations in her department. If we decide to go this way it should go thorough governance. Karen said she was impressed with the presentation by people from Brooklyn College, but the stumbling block is posting of results online. This would have to be worked out, and Jane agrees. She notes that students want the results to be public and easily accessible.

Harold discussed the evaluation of chairs, which takes time but is not that useful. Lisandro, in the same context, asked if there should be departmental evaluations of chairs. Jane responded that the evaluations as they have taken place are very useful. She noted too the fact that virtually everyone is evaluated, including her. She would be happy to discuss how the evaluation might be made less onerous.
Ned observed that faculty evaluation is multi-dimensional: by peers, by chairs, and by students. He wants to see more perspectives on the Chair, including from departmental faculty. Jane sees nothing wrong with this. Given the calls for an enlarged perspective, Lisandro wondered if the faculty should evaluate the Provost.

Jama wasn’t sure whether the evaluations were of chairs, *per se*, or of departments. The template provided should highlight the constraints under which departments operate, and the letter back from the Provost should acknowledge those constraints. Jane clarified that the evaluation pertains to the department and that it reflects on the leadership offered by the chair, but it’s not a personal evaluation of the Chair. And the current template invites an open-ended critique of the administration.

David Umeh suggested that there should be follow-up with promises made during the evaluation. Dave Brotherton agreed that it was an onerous process, but it does force chairs to reflect so it’s not a waste of time for him.

Maki acknowledged that a 360 evaluation can be effective, but often faculty have no idea what chairs do. There would be no time for Chairs to deal with many faculty evaluations, if they were involved in the process. Jane will leave it to the Chairs to discuss.

Allison agreed with a comment by Ned that the information provided by way of justifying requests for additional lines is inadequate, and Jane agreed that there should be additional information.

Allison acknowledged that information can be gotten, but that it won’t be consistent across departments. Ned argued that information is useful only if it’s developed systematically; the administration talks data but will not get the data for basic decisions like faculty hiring. Ben provided some context for the data discussion with reference to the transition to CUNYFirst. The data there is terrible, but in the coming year good data should be available. We discussed moving back the deadline for new line requests. Jane doesn’t mind but reminded all that the deadline was set so that PAC would have time to weigh in. We do have numbers for full-time faculty coverage and the number of faculty. Ned wants the administration to provide all the relevant data to SPS/FPS. Not all the data is available now so Jane is happy to push back the deadline. Lisa and David Brotherton do not want to delay.

There are 18 or 19 lines to search, although how many new lines are available Jane cannot recall at the moment. Jane discussed her view on the use of lecturers: they should not be scattered across departments to work in isolation, but rather to address concentrated problem areas, such as math and writing. As a consequence, she does not want proposals for lecturer lines.

4. **Report on Middle States.** Jim reported. We now have a Team Chair for the Middle States visit next spring: Robert Bogomolny, President of the University of Baltimore. He will make a preliminary visit either this fall or in late January, and the likely team visit is in April, 2013. We are beginning to plan for them. We need to develop a general awareness about the Middle States reaccreditation process, so please discuss it with your departments. While assessment is now underway in majors and most graduate programs, we need to catch up with assessment plans for all minors and certificates. Please initiate this with your faculty if it is not already underway. Many syllabi with learning outcomes have still not come in; we cannot wait until the last minute to assemble them so please get them to Inez Brown, in either hardcopy or electronic
form. Self Study drafts for standards are due April 2. We will turn them around quickly so the workgroups will be busy in April preparing new drafts for an early May deadline.

5. **Report on Adjuncts at John Jay.** Allison Pease chaired a committee on this. She noted that 65% of the courses are taught by adjuncts, but we have no policies covering them. Allison went on to read sections of the report, including three major findings: the importance of culture; lack of information; need for space and resources. The survey of adjuncts indicated that many feel left out; this is not necessary, and we should welcome them as part of our departmental communities. There was some discussion of the kind of encouragement and development that adjuncts need; clearly there are different needs. Allison argued for the creation of a standing committee on adjuncts. Adjuncts need to know what’s going on, especially with regard to the reappointment process. Adjuncts need a proper space with adequate office supplies.

6. **Pathways.** A subcommittee of UCASC prepared a report on the college option, the 12 credits offered at the discretion of each college. (submitted to UCASC on March 1, 2012) Nothing in this report should be considered favorable to Pathways. We are trying to preserve the spirit and some of the content of our newly developed and recently preempted general education program. There is a 6-credit “justice core” with a required FYS course on “Justice and the Individual” with options at the 300 level for “Struggles for Justice and Equality in the US” and “Justice in Global Perspective.” Foreign language is included in the Communications sections, for those without an exemption. Those with an exemption will take a communications course. Courses can be approved for fall 2013, but they can come in for approval indefinitely. In fall 2013, both general education programs will run concurrently; we will probably “teach out” the current Gen Ed for five or six years.

With regard to the question of whether or not John Jay’s flexible core would need CUNY approval, no one was certain.
Provoest Advisory Council

April 24, 2012

2:00 – 4:00 p.m., Room 610T

Agenda

1. Approval of 02/16/12 Minutes
2. Provost’s Announcements
3. Faculty/Chair Matters
4. Line Requests and Line Allocations
5. Pathways
6. CUNY Sexual Harassment Policy
7. Administrative Assigned Time
1. **Welcome from the Chair and Approval of 2.16.12 Minutes** Introduction of Patti Myatt, new recorder of minutes; Discussion of minutes from last meeting, minutes approved.

2. **Provost’s Announcements** The Provost asked that faculty try to attend the Departmental Awards on May 8th in the Aux. Gym. She indicated that Patti Myatt was the point person, and would contact faculty concerning the ceremony. Jane also pointed out that the following week had the Student Research and Creativity events. The opening ceremony was set for 140pm Monday April 30 in L61, and Gillian Small from CUNY was due to attend. Jane said that there was a whole slew of events going on all week long, and she encouraged those present to come out and support the students. Lastly, Jane mentioned two lectures, one given by Cathy Widom at 4pm on April 26, and one given by Monica Varsanyi on May 10 in the lecture hall. Jane said that although she realized that there was so much going on at the end of the Academic Year, it would be nice to see those present in attendance.

3. **Faculty/Chair Matters** Jane mentioned that there was some trouble getting Council of Chairs and Faculty Senate together to meet. She said that she would be willing to come to the Council of Chairs to discuss her budget request, if the chairs approved. Harold Sullivan said that the next Council of Chairs meeting was due to be on May 9th. Although it was an election meeting, everyone was in agreement that the Provost could attend. She said that she would check her calendar and would come and talk through her budget priorities. The discussion then moved to line requests and allocations. Jane pointed out that the discussion was about her thinking in general, not about individual requests. She said that she didn’t know if chairs had had a chance to look at what others have proposed, but she wanted to point out what she looks at. 1) Enrollment – which doesn’t drive decision making entirely. 2) new programs – Gen Ed is a little uncertain. It’s a matter of factoring in new and keeping old Gen Ed for the moment. It’s still difficult to tell what enrollment will be in new programs. She probably will wait until the next allocations for Gen Ed. 3) Curricular Coverage – which areas are not currently being taught because of lack of faculty. The importance of assessment was brought up. Jane was pleased that some chairs had used this as a basis for their requests. Additionally, program review – something was missing, therefore there was a need. 4) Viability – some departments are too small to be viable, and they are having a hard time functioning. Normal size departments that are not functioning very well do not encourage investment; rather it is better to wait for them to get themselves together.
before placing a junior faculty member there. 5) Stewardship of the Major – the commitment shown by the department to the major and/or Masters Degree, as well as dedication to Gen Ed in general. 6) It was of import how much forward planning had been done – in other words, if there was a thoughtful plan about the future in place. 7) Logic and Clarity – another important factor in looking at the requests. Jane stated that there were approximately 32 lines; however, it was a question of a pot of money, not lines. To hire someone at a high level could potentially take up two lines. She stated that she likes to reserve a couple of lines for things that come up – so overall, only roughly 30 lines. Unless the bottom fell out of NYS, this was a multi-year faculty hiring plan. So if a request wasn’t granted this time around, you could contemplate getting it in the future.

Harold Sullivan asked about the timing. Jane said that before the next PAC meeting, she would reach out to some chairs individually. She expects that by the next PAC meeting May 21st – that she will have done the first allocation of lines. Jay Hamilton said that he had taken a look at the proposals, and noticed differences in format, logic, and clarity. He asked if the process could be refined for next year – was there a proper way to format? Larry S. pointed out that the library was unable to talk about elements such as class sizes and student contact. Jane asked if there were any other comments. David Brotherton said that his department was proposing a Sociology major, so surely that would be taken into account. Jane replied that yes, it would be, very definitely. However, she wanted to point out that some programs were still mere gleams in people’s eyes, but the Sociology major was pretty far along, and it was a safe bet that it would have students. Jay H. said that everyone was predicting growth, but that there was only so much room. Students wouldn’t be going to other majors, and it might be helpful for all to understand an overall plan and know where we expect all the majors to be. Jane replied that incoming students come predominantly to three majors: Forensic Psychology, Forensic Science, and Criminal Justice. She said that we do track these things, but Criminal Justice was so huge, it was nice to think that students might move to other majors. English, History, and Philosophy were competitive with Humanities and Justice – so that wasn’t so great. Jon Jacobs asked if in the proposals for substitute positions for one year, was there the possibility of a second or third year, or was it a regular tenure stream or nothing? David B. pointed out that there were substitutes. Jane said that the problem with sub appointments by semester was that when they had served two years they couldn’t continue. Jon J. said that maybe just hiring someone for 2 years was a way to find out if they were viable. Jane said that the university had very little room for these types of appointments, unlike in the past. There were new rules for subs now. Tom Kucharski said that the teaching load was so onerous, 4/4 or 5/4, but it would be an interesting opportunity to try someone out. This was met with cries of “you’ll kill them!” Jane pointed out that it was one more course than for regular faculty and that CUNY was against keeping them on forever and forever, instead of hiring tenure – track faculty. In addition, a person can go away for two years, then return. Lisandro Perez then turned the discussion to Jay H’s first point, and that having a specific form would curtail creating a request. H. Sullivan added that we did not want to be too rigid about this. Jane mentioned that she was thinking when reading them, therefore chairs should be as well when making line requests, and that some were more interesting than others. L. Perez said “entertaining,” and Jane replied that the ones that said “Can we have 9 lines please,”
were a hoot. She added that she would discuss the lines at the next meeting, and that she was sorry to disappoint, but that she was still thinking. She stated that she was interested in ideas, and that if you wanted to influence her thinking, please speak up. J. Bowers then indicated that President Travis would be there at 315 to talk about Pathways.

4. **CUNY Sexual Harassment Policy** Jane introduced this topic by pointing out that it was still a draft and inviting suggestions or comments. She opened the floor to Karen Kaplowitz. K. Kaplowitz said that about a year ago, President Travis asked to come to the Faculty Senate to talk about sexual harassment. Rosemarie had read 10 scenarios of what had happened last year, and the entire Senate was horrified, the men even possibly more so. But it had raised consciousness. Subsequently, the Faculty Senate discussed the issue. They asked if relationship between faculty and students was not already prohibited behavior, but apparently it is “discouraged” but not prohibited. The Senate recommended to the Chancellor that it should be changed. K. Kaplowitz wrote the Chancellor and they decided to change the policy. The Senate had recommended that faculty be prohibited from having relationships with undergraduate students and for graduate students with those whom you teach. The draft CUNY policy only prohibits relationships between faculty and students from whom they have a professional responsibility. In addition, relationships between employees of the college are strongly discouraged. If you are having a relationship, you must tell your supervisor. Seth Baumrin pointed out that some faculty are married and wanted to know if this was a conflict, especially if one was supervising the other. K. Kaplowitz said that you would have to switch them. J. Bowers pointed out that we make it so that they are not in supervisory positions, and that this wasn’t about people who were already married. Rather, this issue concerned having an affair. Larry Sullivan said that in government the rules were very strict – no marriages or relationships at all. T. Kucharski said that they should recuse themselves from writing observations. L. Perez pointed out that we were talking about two different things, and that a Sexual Harassment policy goes beyond having affairs. We were talking about a conduct that isn’t really sexual harassment. K. Kaplowitz pointed out that when Rosemarie Maldonado read the scenarios, the situations became known because they led to sexual harassment. For example, when a relationship ended, then the student reported harassment. This was a way of avoiding sexual harassment lawsuits. L. Sullivan said that one thing that comes up all the time is that relationships should be discouraged, as even to have a relationship in a department disrupts everything. J. Bowers said that most examples are reported by another student who claims that another student gets preferential treatment. T. Kucharski said that while he commended the work of the Faculty Senate, the CUNY policy is too weak. J. Bowers agreed, and said that it didn’t go far enough. She said that it was not what was proposed and it wasn’t strong enough. She indicated that if you wanted to register your feeling that it is not strong enough, you can send feedback.

5. **Reassigned Time** J. Bowers said that she had sent a notice out about this already. Syllabi were needed. She wasn’t sure if she needed a carrot or a stick for this, but we need the syllabi. We already missed fall 2011, and we have gotten very few. We need this spring and next fall. As a result, when all the syllabi are in, the productivity credit (that had
been taken away) would be restored. She said that she was sorry to have to do this, but it was important to get them in. T. Kucharski asked whether every syllabus was needed. J. Bowers replied that this had been discussed before. What was needed was a sample syllabus with learning outcomes – one for each course. Lisa Farrington said that they had submitted 40. Jim Llana replied that the list was out of date, and they had received a lot that had not been logged. Jane pointed out that the date on the list was 4.10.12. L. Farrington said that they had turned in every single one. J. Bowers said that everyone needed to do fall 2012. L. Perez asked for confirmation – both semesters? J. Bowers said yes, and then the productivity credit would be restored. J. Llana asked that everyone send the copies electronically to Inez Brown. J. Bowers then spoke about the reassigned time formula. She said that we have been doing this for three years – so how was it working? She indicated that we talked about a formula, and that she had been applying it, so she wanted to hear some feedback. H. Sullivan said that the major coordinator release time was working well, and that it certainly made the job of chair more manageable. Jane said that it was three credits at first, but now she has given three more credits for leading assessment. It would stay in place through Middle States. After that, assessment should be a fairly routine part of a department, and a job description had been created. T. Kucharski said that it was a pretty equitable system that works well, but that the workload for chairs goes up and up. He brought up the new time sheets that will need to be filled in for faculty, and said that it was one thing to be busy, but worse to then to be given a stupid meaningless task. She agreed that the workload was increasing, and underlined that it was also increasing for Provosts and Deans as well. Everything was increasingly bureaucratized and coming from a central place. It is a different world now, and after having been here for 25 years, she can say that much less was demanded back then. T. Kucharski said that the pre-tenure review could be done better. Too many meetings were necessary for faculty members who were doing well. J. Bowers said that she agreed. Maki Haberfeld said that we needed more. J. Bowers replied that she couldn’t give reassigned time for every minor, but that she would think it over. D. Brotherton said that the size of the faculty needed to be taken into account – if you had 10 it was a different matter than if you had 20 or 30. J. Bowers said that we measure size by students, and that she would consider using number of faculty. Allison Kavey returned to the time sheet issue. K. Nesbitt said that HR was moving to a new vendor, and that he would try to implement improvements for the new system. C. Nemeth said that he needed a description of the major coordinator. J. Bowers said that she would take all the suggestions under advisement.

6. President Travis – 3:15pm Pathways Discussion

J. Bowers introduced the President by saying that she asked him to come and talk to this group about Pathways. President Travis thanked the PAC for allowing time on the agenda to discuss Pathways. He stated that he wanted to frame the issue in the context of our Gen Ed reform. He explained that the college went through a multi-year, 4-5 year reform. Many of you played an important role in rethinking general education. J. Bowers was the person to lead the effort and it involved hard work to get this done. J. Bowers added that Gen Ed should be done slowly, through a faculty-driven process. President
Travis said that the Provost was right. In order to do deep work, certain questions needed to be considered: What is the purpose of Gen Ed? What is the purpose of requirements for students? and what is distinctive because it is here? We got through that process a year ago, and here we are. That is the John Jay story – which is a backdrop to the larger CUNY story. For decades, there has been an issue around the transfer of credits from one institution to another. Many of our students – over 50% - start somewhere else. We at John Jay celebrate that, but not all colleges do. Transfer did not work well, and students had to take credits and spend money that they didn’t need to. So the university had a reason to do something. Hence Gen Ed, now called Pathways. To be blunt, it has not gone smoothly. If we had done it the way we wanted it, it would be different, but that’s not the exercise here. The reality we face now is that our Gen Ed structure is somewhat different from that of the university. We are not masters of our own fate entirely here. One could hope that the policy could change. The question we face is how do we maintain the integrity of our own product yet follow what has been recommended. Lisandro has led the committee for developing the college option. I wanted to talk to you because you are key players in this. I am happy to give you my view, but now I’d like to open the floor for discussion.

Karen K. wanted to confirm whether the college option would be brought back to UCASC for another vote. Allison Pease stated that she voted no, and that it was not a good idea to bring it back to UCASC. President Travis then asked how he should think about it, and what was the way forward. Allison Pease asked how to bring the curriculum forward without faculty approval, to general laughter. President Travis then stated that the protest vote was recognized, but wanted to know what was in the best interest of the college. J. Bowers stated that the challenge was to have the courses in place by April 2013. When registering students, we have to have courses for them to take in the Pathways framework. We have already approved some courses. Allison Kavey said that most people were unwilling to vote for the college option until Pathways is resolved and we know whether it is going to go through. There is a lawsuit against it. We will fight it until we win. President Travis said that there could be a long wait. A. Kavey said that she was young. President Travis said that he was looking for a way forward. A. Kavey said that until we lose we will stay on high road. H. Sullivan said that Pathways will not go through, and that 80th Street would have to back off. President Travis said that they had shown no hesitation about moving forward. Karen K. said - except for the faculty. H. Sullivan added that in response to current pressure, they would have to do something. President Travis indicated that he did not see the BOT backing down. Larry Kobilinsky said that in regard to Science, he wanted to make it clear that the Science Department was very opposed to Pathways and it was not pedagogically sound. L. Perez said that it would be helpful if President Travis could take us through a scenario of what will happen – what will happen to faculty who will not do anything. President Travis said that he can’t play out every possible scenario. They are not going to back down, and we are going to have to figure it out. There are timelines to honor. This is the important question – what if we can’t move forward? If people withdraw, where do we end up? J. Bowers stated that we have to have courses for the students coming in fall 2013. We have Pathways framework that has been approved by the BOT. As a community, we are going
to have to have the college option. President Travis said that it could be a proposal that he puts forward as your President to the Board of Trustees. Allison K. mentioned withdrawal of service options. Lisa Farrington said that thousands of faculty were against it – how could 80th St. be deaf to this? The faculty is angry and 80th St. is arrogant. Larry Sullivan asked if the university will impose Pathways on us. Everyone is against Pathways. What will John Jay do? President Travis replied that he had three possible courses of action, in order of preference: 1) that the College Council votes in favor of the College Option; 2) that UCASC approves the College Option and we sent it forward to CUNY; 3) UCASC doesn’t, then the President forwards the Gen Ed. He added that this is a bad place for us to be – caught between our Gen Ed experience and Pathways. Jon Jacobs said that there was one core feature of the current situation – that authoritative governance had endorsed curriculum that the faculty is unwilling to execute. But there must be some other option besides compliance. We need real clarity about the chief gains being sought from Pathways, and then try to seek an imaginative, constructive approach – then the landscape is negotiated, instead of a collision. C. Nemeth asked if the President had ever found himself in this position. He added that everyone is reasonable here, but the heavy-handedness of 80th St was surprising. He had been in six different state systems, and he had never seen anything like this. President Travis said that he was personally disappointed but that he would like to be able to lead the college through this. He asked if there was any part of the discussion of the college option that would get a favorable vote at UCASC. Evan Mandery replied that he thought this conversation was premature. He said that he thought that it was understood that the fundamental experience here was how powerless the faculty was. He said it was a fresh cut, and that we can’t move past this. He added that he felt disrespected. K. Kaplowitz said that she commended the President for not doing what some presidents did – they had told chairs that they would remove them if they didn’t get a yes vote in their department. President Travis said that he was trying not to pay attention to other colleges that approved it – he was trying to pay attention to us. He stated that he was optimistic for the college. Allison Kavey said that we wrote the curriculum – we do our job, and we will serve our students if there are no other options. It was not solely a transfer issue. President Travis agreed that it was not solely a transfer issue. Allison Kavey continued by saying that transfer had become a red herring. It had been superseded by other considerations that had little to do with pedagogical issues. President Travis said that he agreed – that curriculum and governance issues had warped the transfer issue. Allison Kavey said that there were ways that we could deal with the transfer issues. K. Kaplowitz said that of the three options, her preference was that the President sends forward what the General Education subcommittee worked on. K. Kaplowitz said she would rather do that than manipulate the vote at UCASC. President Travis said that two students resigned over Spring Break. The new students would be fully authorized to vote – that wasn’t manipulating the vote. B. Eanes stated that they resigned close to Spring Break and that they will be replaced. In addition, the University Student Senate supports Pathways. President Travis said that it looks suspicious when students resign. Evan Mandery stated that he thought it was a manipulation of the process if students resigned and the vote was manipulated. B. Eanes said that there was nothing stopping faculty from talking to students. Students take their
role very seriously. If there are legitimate vacancies, they act according to the rules. Evan Mandery asked why replace these students with only one meeting left in the semester. President Travis said that we will try to use the governance structure to move forward. K. Kaplowitz said it was a crisis. She had never seen a president faced with anything like it since the fight not to close John Jay. She said that the President did have the option to send his recommendation forward, which would do more for his relationship with faculty. K. Kaplowitz said that she thought the faculty would understand if the President had to send something formal. Allison Kavey said that there was nothing wrong with the process at UCASC. The problems came long before last Friday. This was a bigger discussion. The administration was not an evil opponent, and the faculty were not freaks. We needed to have a conversation about where the college should go. Jane Bowers said that Lisandro Perez headed an elected committee. We set it up last year to develop our curriculum. The Committee was well constituted and they came up with the college option. Allison Kavey said that those were good learning outcomes – our Pathways outcomes. President Travis agreed. Jane Bowers said our college option can have the same outcomes. Allison Kavey said that if we have to live with this, we need to go back to being able to generate shared learning outcomes for coming up with some meaningful curriculum here. That’s the conversation that needs to be held. K. Kaplowitz said that we have the 12 credit proposal. President Travis said that he would put it forward stating that we hadn’t voted on it. He was willing to do so to get through this crisis. Then we could take Allison K.’s suggestion about designing learning outcomes. A. Kavey said that we needed to pull the college option away from Pathways. J. Bowers said that voting against the college option was to avoid looking as though there was support for Pathways. L. Sullivan said the problem, as Jane Bowers stated, was that they were linked – the college option and Pathways. President Travis said that the college option has support. He could put that forward to the Board of Trustees, if people feel comfortable with that. Then ok – without governance approval. K. Kaplowitz said why don’t we see what the Senate says – it is the voice of the faculty on non-contractual issues. We have a week – it’s possible that some yes votes will turn to no. President Travis asked if there was a proposal that would generate more approval. K. Kaplowitz said that if it goes to college council, it will never pass. K. Kaplowitz said that her position was that yes, we have to create courses, we will create courses. It was suggested that we separate college option from protest statement and make a strong separate protest statement to go to College Council with College Option- 1) college option 2) college council statement 3) moving forward with curriculum – three birds with one stone. We want this as a collective activity. Evan Mandery said that would be the beginning of the way forward. Allison Kavey said there are ways to win this. Larry Kobilinsky said that the Science problem needs to be addressed. Lisandro P. said that Science needs to present its best proposal – one. Narrowing the scope of “scientific world” to “science” was workable. Science needed to choose what they want. President Travis said that these options needed to be in full display before the next UCASC vote. Science must pick one proposal that it wants. The next UCASC vote is May 18th. Anything that comes back to UCASC must be fully transparent a week before, so... Allison Kavey interrupted and said two weeks. Larry Sullivan said that a clear and political statement against Pathways had to be there. K. Kaplowitz said that no one would vote for it. Allison Kavey said that fight
needed to be in the ring – we needed to vote. K. Kaplowitz said that her gut feeling was that the statement would pass – but the college option would fail. President Travis closed by saying that it had been a terrific discussion, and that in the good times and the bad times we work together.

The meeting adjourned at 5pm.
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Jama</td>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>African-American Studies</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>Snajdr</td>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>Lapidus</td>
<td>Art and Music</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dana</td>
<td>Tarantino</td>
<td>Communication &amp; Theater Arts</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Larkin</td>
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<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon</td>
<td>Baatz</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Ann</td>
<td>McClure</td>
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<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen</td>
<td>Sexton</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisandro</td>
<td>Perez</td>
<td>Latin American and Latina/o Studies</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klaus</td>
<td>Von Lampe</td>
<td>Law, Police Science &amp; CJA</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Puls</td>
<td>Mathematics and Computer Science</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyoo</td>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monica</td>
<td>Varsanyi</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenn</td>
<td>Corbett</td>
<td>Protection Management</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Leippe</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy-Lynne</td>
<td>Peters</td>
<td>Public Management</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angelique</td>
<td>Corthals</td>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Velazquez-Torres</td>
<td>SEEK</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Ocejo</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy</td>
<td>Killoran</td>
<td>Undergraduate Studies</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabrielle</td>
<td>Sinclair-Compton</td>
<td>Scribe</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgin</td>
<td>Moreno</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay Walitalo</td>
<td>Student Member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate Szur</td>
<td>Student Member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumaya Villanueva</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheuk Lee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vielka Holness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy LaSalle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Barnet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Garot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangai Natarajan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evan Mandery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Kaplowitz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valerie West</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee held its meeting on
Friday, September 16, 2011 at 9:30 a.m. in Room 610T. Dean Anne Lopes, UCASC
Chair, called the meeting to order.

Present: C. Jama Adams, Simon Baatz, Gabrielle Compton, Angelique Corthals, Silvia
Dapia, Berenecea Johnson-Eanes, Kathy Killoran, Ben Lapidus, Susan Larkin, Kyoo
Lee, Michael Leippe, Anne Lopes, MaryAnn McClure, Virginia Moreno, Richard Ocejo,
Allison Pease, Lisandro Perez, Judy-Lynne Peters, Michael Puls, Richard Saulnier, Ellen
Sexton, David Shapiro, Hung-En Sung, Dana Tarantino, Monica Varsanyi, Nancy
Velazquez Torres, Klaus Von Lampe.

Absent: Glen Corbett, Edward Snajdr.

Guests: David Barnet, Robert Garot, Vielka Holness, Karen Kaplowitz, Randall LaSalle,
Cheuk Lee, Evan Mandery, Mangai Natarajan, Kate Szur, Sumaya Villanueva, Jay
Walitalo, Valerie West

Administrative Announcements

Dean Lopes welcomed members back for the first meeting of the school term. New
members introduced themselves. The new scribe, Gabrielle Sinclair Compton, introduced
herself.

Dean Lopes announced that the new philosophy major proposal has almost completed the
processes for approval. She said she expects approval from New York State, which is
behind this year, any day. In addition, the Law and Society major, which will replace the
Legal Studies major, is also expected to be approved. She then said John Jay has three
letters of intent in the queue that had been held up by CUNY, but will now be able to
progress through the process: Latin American Studies, Anthropology and Sociology.

Dean Lopes also discussed the Pathways Project for General Education reform at CUNY.
This will be concerned with students who transfer to the four-year schools. She said the
plan is to establish common core credits that will be fully accepted by any school in
CUNY. A large steering committee and a working group of 45 to 50 people are working
throughout the fall, with 14 meetings scheduled. She reported that the discussion in the
first meeting (or “retreat”) two weeks ago was good, and that some broad outcomes were
articulated. Dean Lopes urged members to go to the Pathways web site, read the
announcement from the Chancellor, look at what’s being recommended and provide
feedback. By November 1, there will be a draft of CUNY’s Gen Ed model circulated. Feedback will be assembled by November 15. The Steering Committee is charged between November 15 and December 1 with providing an outline for Gen Ed to the Chancellor. Beginning January 2012, John Jay will begin tweaking the new Gen Ed model to fit the CUNY mandate. She urged committee members to engage in the debate and learn what’s happening.

Next, Dean Lopes gave some preliminary information on the new Honors Program. The school has had one cohort who has moved into sophomore year. There are now three cohorts moving through the Honors Program. She reported that the first cohort last year is doing considerably better than the old Honors Program. She thanked the leadership from John Matteson and Linda McNickle. Dean Lopes reported better GPAs and less attrition, although she said a few students have been dismissed because of low GPAs. There is a probation period to give the opportunity to recover their GPA. Honors students receive a stipend of $1,000 per year. A fuller report will be available shortly for the committee.

Dean Lopes next introduced planned changes regarding prefixes for courses. She said there have been issues where courses might have different names, numbers and prefixes and be the same course. She said cross listing in this way is problematic as students are confused and don’t know whether they already took the course. With CUNY First coming, courses cannot be input this way.

Dean Lopes said a transition would be made, working with chairs, to have one prefix for each course, and end the practice of multiple prefixes this term. She met with some department chairs to acquaint them, and would be meeting with chairs as needed to do that and review the process to make sure everyone is comfortable with what goes on before any final decisions are made.

A committee member asked which department is responsible for this? Dean Lopes answered that departments would continue to share responsibility. She said if a course is under a major, it would be remain listed under that major and faculty who teach those courses would continue to teach them. She said that it is not happening by administrative fiat and that it is a fully engaged process.

Professor Klaus Von Lampe noted that this change could be extremely important and asked why there has been no discussion as to why this must happen and what the possible consequences may be. Professor Jama Adams noted that it might be helpful to look at how other schools do this. He stated that though it might seem to be not technically possible, it might be that the technology CUNY has is unable, and should be looked at if a work around has to be made. Dean Lopes agreed to add the issue to the agenda for the next meeting to discuss. Dean Lopes will bring the CUNY First details and specifics as to the problems students are having.

Dean Lopes then continued with two issues that will need work this year, firstly, standards for scaffolding the undergraduate curriculum. John Jay has no standards in place for defining 100, 200, 300, and 400-level courses. The Course Subcommittee has
no standards to go by, and none were adopted by UCASC. Dean Lopes said she will ask
the PPP to put this on its agenda. In the standards, there may be differentiations by
discipline, but there will also be many similarities across disciplines so that rigor issues
may be dealt with.

Dean Lopes explained another issue that UCASC will deal with this year is standards for
online courses. A Director for Online and Distance Learning will be hired soon, and
guidelines for online courses will be needed. Currently there are none. Dean Lopes
clarified that the PPP is the Principles, Policies and Procedures subcommittee.

In addition, Dean Lopes shared a few of the Office of Undergraduate Studies priorities
for this year. First, an advisement pilot is underway to provide faculty advisement for
specific majors. Pilots are happening in Forensic Science and Psychology this year. The
pilot will involve at least 80 percent of department faculty giving 5 hours of advisement
in a two-week pre-registration period. John Jay currently has only seven full-time
advisors for 13,000 undergraduates, less than half of what the school should have. The
two departments will each receive $2,000 to use for research, equipment, etc. if they
reach the 80% benchmark.

Dean Lopes noted that the more engagement students have outside the classroom, the
better retained they are. She said that as a commuter campus, faculty has less of those
informal interactions, which advisement can help with. Results of the pilot will be
studied, and next semester another department will be added to be part of the pilot.

Dean Lopes introduced the “Finish in Four” initiative. She explained the idea is to work
with students through a PR campaign beginning when they arrive to help them finish
their degrees in four years by careful program planning and use of winter and summer
semesters. She said that students who complete their studies in four years are much more
successful. She noted that the advisement center would be working with them on
intentional degree planning.

Professor Adams commented that as many or as little as a third of students can finish in
four years, and that he has been advising his students to take no more than four classes.
He said that with summer school, if you aren’t highly organized you crash and burn. He
noted there is a large subgroup of students who need to be told to slow down, and advised
putting an asterisk in for them. Dean Lopes noted that those students will be worked with
as well, and that students who are lower achieving do better in more intensive
immersions. Professor Jama responded that they have more support and that the context
of the teaching is a factor. Dean Lopes answered that if one learns how to teach in a more
immersive way students can do better, and that this will be assessed.

Dean Lopes noted that John Jay has the youngest students in CUNY, and that as high
school graduation rates are declining, John Jay needs to diversity its student base. Dean
Lopes said that the school will begin to see more transfer students, and John Jay is
working hard to provide transitional services for those students coming in to retain them.
However, we need to attract other populations to the college as well including adult
learners. The research shows traditional-aged students benefit from being in classes with older students. One new initiative for Undergraduate Studies is to bring more adult learners to the college – they bring rich experiences and often professional training. John Jay needs to develop some expertise in prior learning assessment and better communicate its policies in this regard.

Lastly, Dean Lopes informed the committee that she would miss the October and November meetings and that she has asked the Provost to chair in her stead.

**UCASC Subcommittees**

Dean Lopes passed around a sign-up sheet for UCASC subcommittees and asked members to sign up for at least one subcommittee. She thanked the members for all their hard work and being involved in the curricular process. She explained the seven subcommittees including the new General Education Subcommittee that is being established as mandated by the new Framework for General Education at John Jay last spring.

Dean Lopes said she is establishing a Committee on General Education Assessment and she has chosen Amy Green to chair. Two other faculty have volunteered to serve – Andrea Balis from History/ISP, and Andrew Sidman from Political Science who has developed a nice assessment instrument for his program. She said the committee could use another member. Ellen Sexton and Angelique Corthals volunteered. Virginia Moreno, the Director of Academic Assessment will take part as well. This subcommittee will begin by assessing our current general education program.

**Elections**

**General Education Subcommittee (5 members elected by UCASC, 5 members elected by Faculty Senate)**

Dean Lopes explained the purpose of the General Education Subcommittee, which will be constituted by election. Dean Lopes announced her selection for the Subcommittee’s chair which she chose in consultation with the President of the Faculty Senate. The chair will be Professor Lisandro Perez, the chair of the Department of Latin American and Latina/o Studies who was part of the Steering Committee last year. This committee will be charged with looking at all the proposals for our new Gen Ed framework, and in January putting together a proposal for how we will adapt it to meet CUNY’s new pathways for Gen ed.

Five members have already been elected by the Faculty Senate and they are listed on your voting sheet. The UCASC is charged with electing five members.
Dean Lopes proposed Professors Jama Adams (Africana Studies), Angelique Corthals (Sciences), Peter Shenkin (Math), Maki Haberfeld (LPS), and Lisa Farrington (Art & Music). Additionally, Professor Leippe nominated Simon Baatz (History) and Silvia Dapia (Foreign Languages) nominated herself. Kathy Killoran asked Dean Lopes to give the committee a little background on how she put together her proposed nominees.

Dean Lopes said she selected Prof. Adams because he was instrumental in the gen ed revision process over the past several years and understands it inside and out. She selected Professor Corthals because the sciences are a big part of Gen Ed as is mathematics, so she selected Prof. Shenkin, the chair of Mathematics and Computer Science. She selected Prof. Haberfeld because of the large number of students in the Criminal Justice degrees. She selected Professor Farrington because no one was elected from the arts.

It was clarified that under the law, the Gen Ed Subcommittee meetings must be open to the public. Only members can vote, but anyone can speak. Professor Peters suggested that the calendar of meetings be publicized, perhaps via e-mail. Professor Perez noted that because of the short turnaround, the meetings must be working meetings and not particularly suitable for a public audience. Dean Lopes said the schedule could be posted as Gen Ed is of particular interest, she also pointed out that the subcommittees can invite people they need to consult with or set aside a few minutes to hear from concerned individuals. Professor Adams suggested that as was previously done in Gen Ed meetings, if there was pertinence to an individual, the subcommittee will make sure that individual participates fully in the debate. Dean Lopes said that the subcommittee would work along the same communication strategies that worked well in the previous Gen Ed Steering Committee.

Professor Lapidus asked if there is disciplinary overlap in the membership proposed and noted that it seems the thinking behind these nominees is they represent different aspects of the curriculum. He wondered if it is logical to divide it up this way. Dean Lopes answered that not all the disciplines can be represented, and that UCASC is being asked to think outside the disciplines and to think broadly about Gen Ed.

Professor Baatz noted that anyone on this committee should be looking at the benefits and welfare of the college as a whole and pointed out that the social sciences are not as well represented.

Professor Lapidus noted that there is representation from two different people from African studies. Dean Lopes pointed out that these faculty serve different purposes on the committee. Professor Leippe seconded Prof. Baatz’s point that it is quite worrisome that social science is so barely represented.

Professor Adams said Gen Ed committees have met for years, and some people who were not on the committee consistently came and made vital contributions, and that there is no way to create the perfect committee with only ten members.
As secret ballots are not allowed, committee members wrote their names on the ballots and selected up to five nominees on the form and passed them in. Sandrine Dikambi will tally the votes and report the results later in the meeting.

**Vice Chairperson**

Dean Lopes thanked Ellen Sexton for serving as vice chair last year. Professor Adams nominated Professor Sexton as vice chair for this year. No other nominations were made.

*A motion to elect Prof. Ellen Sexton as Vice Chairperson was made and seconded. The committee voted unanimously to re-elect Prof. Sexton with 23 votes in favor.*

**Representative to the Criminal Justice BA/BS Advisory Committee**

Dean Lopes asked for nominations for a representative to Criminal Justice BA/BS Advisory Committee. VP Saulnier nominated Professor Judy-Lynne Peters who did it last year. She accepted.

*A motion was made and seconded. The committee voted unanimously (23 votes in favor) to re-elect Prof. Peters as representative to the Criminal Justice BA/BS Advisory Committee.*

**Two representatives to the Honors Program Advisory Committee (from different disciplines)**

Dean Lopes noted that the committee already has two representatives elected by the Faculty Senate – Professors Demi Cheng from Science and Andrea Balis from History. She asked for nominations and noted that the committee meets two or three times a term. Dean Lopes nominated Professor Kyoo Lee from Philosophy, who accepted. Professor Adams self nominated.

*The committee voted unanimously to elect Professor Kyoo Lee and Professor Adams as Representatives for the Honors Program Advisory Committee with 23 votes in favor.*

**Approval of the minutes of May 13, 2011**

*A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of May 13, 2011. The Committee voted unanimously to approve the minutes with 23 votes in favor.*

**Old Business**

**Courses**

*ENG 2XX Screenwriting for Film, Television and the Internet*
A motion was made and seconded to approve the new course, ENG 2XX Screenwriting for Film, Television and the Internet

Professor Walitalo summarized the changes made based on comments from the previous meeting. The syllabus was updated to relate the course more to John Jay’s mission statement. The prerequisites were adjusted to allow for more enrollment avenues for the course. Professor Walitalo added on the syllabus a lecture/discussion about artistic license versus responsibility to the facts when writing screenwriting.

A motion was made and seconded to approve ENG 2XX Screenwriting for Film, Television and the Internet. The committee voted unanimously to approve the course with 24 votes in favor.

Course Revisions (2nd readings)

ANT 208 Cities and Culture

Kathy Killoran explained that Professor Snajdr was not able to be here today but he did provide a cover memo which addressed feedback from the May meeting.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the revision of ANT 208 Cities and Culture.

There was no discussion.

The committee voted with 23 votes in favor and 1 abstention to approve the revision, ANT 208 Cities and Culture.

PSY 272 Correctional Psychology

Professor Leippe noted that there were minor suggestions having to do with incorporating more ethics. Changes were made to incorporate discussion of ethics associated with correctional psychology, and also some rewording was done involving the word reintegration in addition to reentry as a focus to the course.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the course revision for PSY 272.

There was no discussion.

The committee voted unanimously to approve the revision to PSY 272 Correctional Psychology with 24 votes in favor.
Educational Partnerships (2nd reading)

A motion was made and seconded to approve the 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 Barnet noted that he wasn’t present at the May meeting, but there were a number of places where the phrasing was ambiguous to some degree, especially in foreign language. He said that language has been rendered clearer.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the joint degree with Queensborough Community College For an AS degree in Accounting for Forensic Accounting and a BS Degree in Economics, The committee voted unanimously to approve the joint degree with 24 votes in favor.

Academic Standards (2nd readings)

Model syllabus

Dean Lopes explained that revisions have been made to the model syllabus to make it clearer and consolidate and update some of the items to those that are standard practice today. The learning objectives have been changed to outcomes. Other changes include the recently approved academic standards for incomplete grades and extra work.

Professor Lapidus asked how to handle the subject of attendance policies. Dean Lopes acknowledged that there is not a school policy on attendance, but it is indicated on the model syllabus that if faculty have a policy, it should be included. The Academic Standards Subcommittee will be looking at the issue this year and the model syllabus will be updated when we have one.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the changes in the model syllabus and the committee voted unanimously to approve it with 24 votes in favor.

New Course Proposal Form

Dean Lopes noted that the new course proposal form has been simplified, with the simplification of the information literacy area, and consolidation and clarification of the learning outcomes sections. The expectation of number of outcomes has been reduced.

Professor Sexton suggested that question seven, the rationale for the course, be moved up to the top, right under the title, as an immediate explanation as to why the course is needed or wanted. Dean Lopes agreed to make the change.
Professor Adams noted that his understanding that the rationale is to be consumed by faculty, and not the student. Dean Lopes confirmed this. Professor Sexton noted that question fourteen, which asks how the course is similar to another course, should also include how it differs. Dean Lopes agreed to make that change.

Professor Peters noted that faculty had been asked who they conferred with at the library and suggested adding a way for faculty to show they in fact went for a consult. Dean Lopes said a place for signatures would be added. Kathy Killoran noted that since everything is done electronically, there could be a place on the form that asks for the name rather than the signature. Dean Lopes added that insufficient consultation came up a few times last year.

Kathy Killoran mentioned that the course prefix should not specify a specific number of letters since CUNYFirst can have longer prefixes.

Virginia Moreno suggested combining question seventeen with number seven as they both relate to the rationale. Dean Lopes was agreeable to this.

Professor Lapidus asked whether the new course form would take precedence over the syllabus. Dean Lopes answered that a sample syllabus is needed for all our courses and it should be used to think about how a particular faculty member would take the information on the form and teach it over a semester. The information provided differs from the proposal form to the syllabus, Dean Lopes said we need both.

Professor Adams noted the new course proposal form gives a broad sense of where it fits into other courses. He said it is more of a conceptual expression. Professor Lapidus pointed out that faculty spend a lot of time on the syllabus, he wondered if the committee should recognize the supremacy of the form.

Dean Lopes agreed that there is an overlap. She said it is there for the reviewer’s ease. Professor Lapidus said a lot of time is spent going back and forth between the two, and that the committee goes over things many, many times. Professor Adams said, in his view, there is a healthy tension between the two. He said neither takes supremacy.

Professor Sexton asked how accessible course proposal forms are to instructors who are assigned to teach these courses so they can look at them. Dean Lopes answered that she hopes to have a public repository for syllabi. The course proposal forms are kept by the Office of Undergraduate Studies.

Virginia Moreno noted that to avoid problems that have occurred in the past, as professors propose new courses, they should try to present the outcomes for the course broadly and comprehensively enough so that small differences in content may be accommodated in the syllabi.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the revised New Course Proposal Form. The committee voted unanimously with 24 votes in favor to approve the revisions.
At this point Dean Lopes noted that there was insufficient signup for subcommittees. She urged members to think about whatever commitment they can make and reiterated that committee work is incredibly important.

Sandrine Dikambi then informed the committee on the outcome of the General Education subcommittee vote. The results were: Professors Adams – 21 votes, Corthals – 19 votes, Shenkin – 15 votes, Haberfeld – 17 votes, Farrington – 18 votes, Baatz – 8 votes and Dapia – 11 votes.

**Professors Adams, Corthals, Farrington, Shenkin and Haberfeld were officially elected to the Gen Ed Subcommittee.**

The agenda was adjusted to prioritize an item for a presenting professor.

**New Business**

**Courses subcommittee**

**Course revision: PSY 228 Psychology and Women**

Professor Leippe thanked the committee for adjusting the agenda. He noted that this is a common course in psychology curriculum across the country, and John Jay has been offering it for a long time. He explained that the course description has become outdated as has the course title. In any case, the Psychology Department is proposing to change the name to what is commonly used today, which is Psychology and Gender. He explained that the course looks at psychology as a variable across the sub disciplines of psychology, how gender is influenced by all facets of psychology and culture. He said there has been a great deal of research on gender and gender roles and the impact of gender in the world. The Psychology Department is proposing to raise it to the 300-level. It will be a course that has the appropriate level of content and analysis for a 300-level course.

Prof. Leippe also explained that several other programs are interested in having their students be able to take this course. In our consultations with the other disciplines, concern was voiced about having only PSY 101 as a pre-requisite. It could make it difficult for non-psychology majors to take the course so we have added GEN 101 and SOC 101 as alternative pre-requisites. We are also adding a course in research methods to the pre-requisites so students will be prepared to succeed in the course at the 300-level.

Professor Adams noted that he teaches a 200-level gender studies course and given the ambitious nature of the course, he would suggest reconsidering the inclusion of a psychology pre-requisite. Dean Lopes said further feedback can be directed to Professor Crossman.
**CJBA 1XX Introduction to Major Problems in Criminal Justice I**  
**CJBA 1YY Introduction to Major Problems in Criminal Justice II**

Professor Sexton explained this is proposed as one-year sequence for the BA degree in Criminal Justice, and that the subcommittee found the modular arrangement interesting and feels the high interest topics will interest freshmen. However, the subcommittee continues to be concerned the course is a bit ambitious for freshmen. Professor Sexton acknowledged that Professor Mandery made changes particularly to first week of readings which the subcommittee was happy to see. Prof. Mandery said that it is to the students’ benefit to have them aim high. He said he envisions teaching this class in a large session format using weekly breakout groups where students would get more of the traditional vocabulary. The lectures and discussions will be focused on problems faced in criminal justice. With the rigorous expectations, he said they want to signal that they are doing something different early on so that students do not find themselves in the junior year surprised they have to write a thesis. He said the hope is to get fulltime faculty in front of the class so they have a sense of the different research agendas faculty have. He said if this model fails, it will be revised. He predicted a high retention and expected the course would help to build relationships between faculty and students.

Professor Sexton reiterated that if the syllabus is too ambitious it can be changed. Professor Perez suggested cutting a line from the course description that is actually about the context and not the course itself. Professor Pease said she loved the syllabus but the description should be about what students will learn and the skills they will get.

Professor Mandery said he hoped to have an ongoing relationship with English 101.

Professor Pease said she understood why you would want to differentiate, but I don’t think the student will care. In five years it will be different.

Dean Lopes said she loved the syllabus, and the problem approach. She said though she has problems with the learning objectives, they need to be stated as outcomes. She said Betsy Gitter, who is working as a consultant in the Office of Undergraduate Studies this year could provide some help on outcomes. She is creating some guidelines for faculty. Dean Lopes asked whether the students would understand the impact factors of journals or what primary and secondary sources are. She was not sure whether those things would be appropriate for first semester freshmen. She asked Professor Mandery to think about that.

Professor Von Lampe noted a typo in the course description, rather than “major crime strategies,” he guessed they meant “crime control strategies.” He said he thought the description should be even more bold in propagating the nature of the course. He noted that the objectives are primarily in the area of critical thinking with not many relating to knowledge. That students will be familiar with institutions should go in the second semester description. If I understand your approach correctly, you are not really concerned with covering all bases in the traditional way. He suggested Professor
Mandery think about including some level of self-reflection. He also stressed the
importance to introduce students to the relativity of empirical research.

Professor Mandery answered that he hoped by the time students have completed this and
other courses, they will have a very good understanding of that. He said it is a question of
what can be presented to them right off the bat.

Virginia Moreno endorsed the advice to work with Betsy Gitter and said there should be
different learning outcomes for each course. Dean Lopes said that further feedback can be
directed to Professor Mandery before the next meeting.

**CJBA 2XX (250) Crime Control and Prevention**

Professor Sexton introduced the course proposed by Professors Natarajan and Kennedy.
She said the objectives really give an idea of what the course is about and noted the
college surprisingly does not already have such a course on crime control and prevention.

Professor Natarajan gave an overview of the course. Professor Sexton said the
subcommittee liked this course and had little in the way of changes. Dean Lopes said she
agreed but would like to see some simplification of the learning outcomes if possible, but
otherwise it’s beautiful.

Professor Natarajan inquired about changing the pre-requisites slightly to open the course
up to students from different majors to take as an elective. Kathy Killoran said that to
unlock it from the CJBA, she could discuss this with the criminology folks, who might be
interested. She said to consider whether Sociology 101 would prepare them adequately
and discuss it with the department.

Dean Lopes said that at the 200 level it should not have a huge list of pre-requisites.
Kathy Killoran said that there would be alternatives though that would open it up to a
larger group such as CRJ 101, SOC 101, and CJBS 101.

Professor Lapidus asked about the attendance policy and whether it needs to be clarified.
Dean Lopes suggested saying “more than four absences except in the case of extreme
emergency, will result in a grade reduced by X.” Professor Natarajan said he would add
that for the record. Professor Adams noted that if students aren’t there for learning but
just for attendance it will be reflected in their papers and tests.

Professor Kyoo Lee made a friendly suggestion that given the rationale for the course, to
add that this course will introduce students to “standard and new approaches” in the
course description. Dean Lopes said that further feedback can be directed to Professor
Natarajan.
**CJBA 3WW Space, Crime and Place**

Professor Sexton introduced the course, which will come after students complete either statistics or a quantitative inquiry course. She said the subcommittee really liked this course, but had problems understanding what it is about.

Professor West thanked Professor Sexton and Kathy Killoran for their helpful feedback. She said the course is trying to give students a variety of methodological tools to understand crime and justice. It examines the relationship between physical space and social phenomenon. He said that John Jay does a beautiful job of mapping crime, but not necessarily analyzing it using these spatial methods. She apologized for the jargon, but noted it is important to use the vocabulary of the field.

Professor Pease commented that she loved the course but she suggested rewording the second line in the course proposal to make it more student-friendly. Professor Perez suggested removing “this will be covered here” from the third sentence in the course proposal, and to change “analysis” to “analyze” in the last sentence. Dean Lopes said that further feedback can be directed to Professor West.

**SOC 2XX Sociology of Global Migration**

Professor Sexton introduced the course. She said it very timely and a great interest to many students in the college. Professor Garot said this course is central for our proposed Sociology major, which has a real emphasis on globalization. He noted that traditionally the school has been a bit myopic regarding immigration to the U.S. and the topic is becoming more complex than assimilation including hybridization and transnationalism.

Professor Adams suggested tweaking the last sentence to say something about gender not just about women so that whoever is teaching has more flexibility. Professor Garot answered that the history of immigration and men is well covered, and that he thought the migration of women needs to be covered specifically. As women constitute over half of all migrants and that issues with domestic work and oppression of women in sex work deserve to be treated separately.

Professor Adams said that whereas men have been written about, the psychological cost to men has not been written about. Using the word “gender” gives more flexibility. Professor Pease noted that the final two clauses stuck out to her as well, and she suggested striking out everything after the semi-colon.

Professor Von Lampe said that he supported Professor Adams’ point about gender. He noted there is human trafficking for males for sexual purposes and that this should not be ignored. He said it is important to understand migration on a global level, and to understand what is left behind by migrants. He said it may be a more dramatic change. Professor Garot said that is a big theme in the reading, he questioned whether it should be added to the course description.
Professor Varsanyi said she teaches a course on the politics of immigration and would like to discuss the differences between the two courses with Professor Garot.

Professor Perez noted that there is a great deal on assimilation in the objectives, and asked where this is reflected in the class topics. Professor Garot answered that week two is all about assimilation.

Professor Lapidus asked for clarification regarding the weekly reflection writings, he asked if students are posting them online and if they are part of the overall grade.

Dean Lopes responded that it is an option for the professor if he or she feels like the students are tuning out. It’s seems clear that it is part of the participation grade.

Virginia Moreno reminded Professor Garot that if he removes women from the description, he would need to be consistent with the rest of the syllabus, course description and assignments. Dean Lopes said that further feedback can be directed through e-mail.

ARA 1XX Elementary Modern Standard Arabic I
ARA 1XX Elementary Modern Standard Arabic II
JPN 1XX Elementary Japanese Level I
JPN 1XX Elementary Japanese Level II
POR 1XX Elementary Portuguese Level I
POR 1XX Elementary Portuguese Level II

Dean Lopes said the committee has been waiting for these courses for a very, very long time. Professor Sexton said the subcommittee dealt with the courses as a group as the structures are so similar. She explained there is a sequence of two courses for each language and there was no serious feedback other than some aesthetic issues.

Professor Corthals asked which specific Arabic would be taught. Professor Dapia answered that it will depend on the instructor. The instructor this time teaches Egyptian Arabic, but she said she does not know who might teach it next time so she is leaving it a little open.

Dean Lopes asked if there were questions about specific courses. Professor Von Lampe asked, regarding Japanese Level 1, page 7. “The A student asks questions only in Japanese.” He asked if this means students would not get an A unless you do this?” Professor Dapia answered that it is assumed students would ask questions with the vocabulary he or she was taught, not all questions.

Kathy Killoran noted that because lab hours are not required, no lab hours should be specified but could be included as a recommendation. Professor Perez joked that he is sure Professor Dapia has gotten three tenure-track positions for faculty for these
languages. Dean Lopes said these foreign language courses are a priority. Professor Perez said there must be a commitment to do this in long term. Dean Lopes said we hope there will be a commitment of resources. She expressed the enthusiasm for these new courses, and noted it is very exciting for the students and the college in general. Dean Lopes said that further feedback can be directed to Professor Dapia.

**Academic Standards Subcommittee**

**Guidelines for Academic Internships**

Dean Lopes noted that she brought this issue to the PPP subcommittee. The issue is that John Jay’s internships do not have any guidelines or standards specified. She explained that NY State has requirements about the number of hours students to take to earn credit and theory/practice integration, etc. The subcommittee looked at the SUNY guidelines for academic internships which were approved by their Faculty Senate and liked them. Dean Lopes has gotten permission from the President of the Faculty Senate at SUNY to use them.

She explained that John Jay would like to adopt them with some minor changes for adapting to our own environment such as class size and faculty expectations. Dean Lopes said uneven things are happening at John Jay with internships, in part because we do not have professional programs like nursing which have external organizations that give accreditation. Middle States will look for us to have very clear guidelines.

Dean Lopes said President Travis is very interested in having more internships because they are such a selling point for the college and for majors. Students are very interested because it helps them get jobs. These guidelines would only be for-credit internships but the president is interested in increasing non-credit internships as well.

Dean Lopes asked for responses to the SUNY guidelines. Professor Peters asked whether the amount of credit for internships will be standardized. Dean Lopes answered no, but we need to be sure students are spending the appropriate amount of time/work being done for the amount of credits earned, as per NY State guidelines. We need to be sure that students are doing substantive readings and assignments and thinking about their learning as they go through their experiences.

She said the faculty role needs to be clarified so that the faculty member is responsible for making contact with the field supervisor, reading the supervisor’s reports, perhaps talking with them at mid-semester, making sure the student shows up, and assigning a grade, etc. Otherwise they’re just allowing the person in the field to give the grade. Additionally, she said, some faculty members do not know much about the internship experience students are having. She said this is problematic.

Professor Varsanyi asked whether there would be minimum requirements. Dean Lopes answered yes but some internships require more, for example, forensic science internships require 400 hours, which she said is over the top. However, she said, we need to make internships meaningful but also that allows students to complete their degrees.
Professor Von Lampe asked how these guidelines will affect the number of internships available to students or if the number of students taking internships declined when they were put into place at SUNY?

Dean Lopes said she did not expect these guidelines to affect students much except to hopefully give them better experiences. The guidelines are more for the college, faculty and the relationships with outside sites. She explained that there will be learning contracts so expectations are more clearly identified.

Kathy Killoran noted that the issue of compensation for internships is very vague. Dean Lopes clarified that students can get paid and receive credit, it is not a problem with NY State. The credit is about the learning. She said there are instances where students can use their jobs to earn internship credit. The learning earns a grade and internships are part of most majors now. She also stressed that internships must show college-level learning.

Dean Lopes said that further feedback should be directed to her by e-mail and that she would take it to the PPP to discuss it before the next meeting.

A motion was made and seconded to adjourn. It was unanimously acclaimed. The meeting concluded at 12:17 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Gabrielle Compton, Scribe
Katherine Killoran, Executive Director, Undergraduate Studies
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The Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee held its meeting on Friday, October 21, 2011 at 9:30 a.m. in Room 610T. Provost Jane Bowers called the meeting to order.


Absent: Anne Lopes, Rizwan Ali Raja.


Administrative Announcements

Provost Bowers welcomed new and returning members. New student members Ervin Balazon and Ryan Cunningham introduced themselves.

Provost Bowers reported that the College Council has approved the Proposal for a 2+2/Joint Degree with Queensborough Community College for an AS degree in Accounting for Forensics and a BS degree in Economics. The College Council also approved the new course ENG 2XX Screenwriting for Film, Television and Internet, and the course revisions for PSY 272 Correctional Psychology and ANT 208 Cities and Culture.

Provost Bowers reported that the Model Syllabus has been tabled by the College Council. She reported that at the meeting the Faculty Senate introduced several amendments, including one that would permit faculty to have only virtual office hours. The Provost stated that her expectation is that faculty would hold some in-person office hours, as personal contact with faculty is a key to retention, and cited data that showed students complain about that lack of available faculty outside of class. The Provost said some discussion was had on whether the PSC contract would permit such language. Prof. DiGiovanna made the motion to table and requested a written statement from legal counsel that it is not illegal to have office hours specified. Provost Bowers said she feels very strongly about this issue and hoped Dean Lopes would bring the proposal back to UCASC so that the language would be amended.
Professor Adams said it was appropriate that the Provost linked faculty accessibility to retention. He said that whether faculty are required to or not, is not the issue. Faculty should show they are not indifferent to students. He noted that data is helpful to show the specific need for in-person office hours. Provost Bowers agreed that additional literature and data would be helpful.

Provost Bowers introduced the new CUNY Pathways General Education Model. The Model was issued November 1, and feedback from the college and individuals is due to CUNY by November 15. She proposed a special UCASC meeting either November 8 or 10th during community hour for those who could attend to gather feedback from the committee. She explained committee members could now read the proposals at www.cuny.edu/pathways and register feedback online. The college is required to have individual responses as well as a consolidated response, which Provost Bowers will draft for the president. She has asked the Faculty Senate and others to collect feedback from their committees. Once the CUNY proposal has been approved by the Board of Trustees, the college must comply.

Provost Bowers added individual input must be sent to her by November 13th. Professor Perez noted some confusion with the timetable. Provost Bowers said she would clarify outside of the meeting.

Approval of the minutes of September 16, 2011

A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of September 16, 2011. The Committee voted unanimously to approve the minutes with no changes with 23 votes in favor.

Old Business

Courses

CJBA 1XX Introduction to Major Problems in Criminal Justice I
CJBA 1XX Introduction to Major Problems in Criminal Justice II

A motion was made and seconded to approve the CJBA 1XX Introduction to Major Problems in Criminal Justice I and II.

Professor Mandery summarized the changes made based on comments from the previous meeting. The learning outcomes were updated to be more measurable. The course description was also revised.

It was noted by Prof. Von Lampe that “major crime strategies” should read “major crime prevention strategies.” Professor Mandery said that change will be made. Professor Sexton noted a typo in the course objectives as well.

Virginia Moreno suggested adding that the courses are not independent of the other.

The committee voted unanimously to approve both courses with 23 votes in favor.
A motion was made and seconded to approve CJBA 2XX Crime Control and Prevention

Professor Natarajan was absent but provided a cover memo describing her changes. Professor Mandery was also in attendance.

It was noted that the prerequisites would make this course difficult for some students to enroll. Kathy Killoran referenced Professor Natarajan’s cover letter, which says she would prefer to start with the prerequisites for the new Criminal Justice BA program and later consider opening it up to other majors.

Professor Adams noted a possible redundancy in the attendance policy. Provost Bowers stated that it’s not really redundant as the first reference says attend regularly, and the second reference specifies the number of absences.

Kathy Killoran noted that UCASC referred the issue of attendance policies to the Standards Subcommittee.

Professor Adams argued that we are not penalizing the students who actually come to class and are conscious. He said it was a logical contradiction since class participation is part of the grade and missing class will result in the grade being lowered. It is a double penalty. Provost Bowers responded that until the Standards Subcommittee considers this issue and decides whether all will have a set attendance policy, we cannot dictate one. It was pointed out that UCASC is not endorsing the attendance policy when we approve a course, it is up to individual faculty.

Professor Mandery stated that they feel very strongly about the need for a pre-requisite to sequence their introductory courses. He does not want students take this course before they take the 100-level courses. He said they would develop alternate prerequisites for non-majors, but that this is a course people would not be able to benefit from with no prerequisites.

It was noted that CJBS101 is designed to cover the basics. Professor Mandery responded that this is being discussed and that it could be expanded beyond the major.

Provost Bowers clarified that the neither the major nor the course is up and running, and she said she had confidence the departments would work this out.

Professor Adams asked where corporate crime would come in, as the revised course description seems to focus on street crime. Professor Von Lampe said the principle focus is on crime control strategies, and that the course description has enough flexibility for the inclusion of white collar crime.

The committee voted unanimously to approve the course with 24 votes in favor.

CJBA 3XX Space, Crime and Place

A motion was made and seconded to approve the revision of CJBA 3XX Space, Crime and Place.
Professor West stated that she updated the course description to make it more reader friendly as suggested in the first reading. Professor Torres noted a period missing in the last two lines of the course description in the syllabus.

*The committee voted unanimously to approve the course with 26 votes in favor.*

**SOC 2XX Sociology of Global Migration**

*A motion was made and seconded to approve the course SOC 2XX Sociology of Global Migration.*

Professor Ocejo noted that the problematic phrase “women in global migration” has been removed from the course description as advised at the first reading.

Professor Varsanyi noted that she had requested to be consulted by Professor Garot, and had not been. Provost Bowers asked Professor Ocejo to tell Professor Garot to meet with Professor Varsanyi. Professor Varsanyi continued, noting that the rationale for the course includes a statement that the school does not currently have courses in this area. She noted that the school has several, including one she teaches. The sentence will be deleted from the rationale. The Provost asked if that would be okay with the Sociology Department representative, Professor Ocejo and he agreed to the change. Professor Varsanyi also suggested the possibility of sequencing the courses for students interested in taking both this and hers and scheduling should be coordinated.

*The committee voted unanimously to approve the course with 25 votes in favor.*

**ARA 1XX Elementary Modern Standard Arabic I**  
**ARA 1XX Elementary Modern Standard Arabic II**  
**JPN 1XX Elementary Japanese Level I**  
**JPN 1XX Elementary Japanese Level II**  
**POR 1XX Elementary Portuguese Level I**  
**POR 1XX Elementary Portuguese Level II**

*A motion was made and seconded to approve the courses ARA 1XX I and II, JPN 1XX I and II, and POR 1XX I and II.*

Professor Dapia summarized the change made, clarifying that lab hours are not required. Professor Adams suggested adding language stating that though lab hours are not required, they are recommended. Professor Dapia responded that the department uses texts that have online exercises so students can do them on their computers outside of the lab.

Professor Snajdr noted a typo under class hours. Professor Dapia will make the change. Professor Adams asked about the location of the required attendance policy. Professor Dapia responded that it is included under the grading policy.

*The committee voted unanimously to approve the course with 25 votes in favor.*
Guidelines for Academic Internships

A motion was made and seconded to approve the Guidelines for Academic Internships.

Professor Shapiro reviewed the changes made by the 3P Subcommittee to the guidelines since the first reading. First, the language was adjusted to clarify that in person faculty site visits are not required. He said this does not mean they are not recommended, but might not be possible. Alternate measures are therefore included for a faculty member to employ to supervise the internship.

Second, the language was changed to read that the college will share the financial burden with the department offering the internship and will set appropriate seat limits.

Lastly, language was added to make it clear that there must be some sort of routine monitoring of the students’ progress during the internship and that the student must demonstrate learning and not just doing.

Vice President Eanes asked whether the 3P Subcommittee was aware of the changes going on with the Office of Career Services and internships.

Provost Bowers noted that previously, some of the academic internships were handled by a staff member in the Career Development Services area, and some were handled by faculty in various departments. Now all credit bearing internships will be brought under the purview of Undergraduate Studies. A new staff person will be hired to ensure these academic components of the guidelines are followed and assessed. However, Career Services will continue to manage the internships, serve students, and maintain records and placements. Provost Bowers continued, saying the college is consciously establishing greater collaboration between Student Development and Academic Affairs, but also making sure that academic oversight of academic internships is there.

Vice President Eanes stated that it is important to clarify the differences between the different internship experiences. In an ideal world, she said, you would want to have better guidelines but also improve the level of management. She and the Provost have been working on this for quite a while and the guidelines are just one piece of it.

Given that, Professor Adams noted that on item 2, the wording is awkward. Kathy Killoran responded that this could be changed to “the Provost in consultation with academic departments”. Setting seat limits is the purview of the Provost.

Provost Bowers stated that the issue of seat limits is a shared conversation with enrollment management. The language will be changed to “the appropriate college administrators.”

Professor Sexton asked whether the Learning Agreement includes language that the site can terminate the internship if they want to. Professor Shapiro said that off hand he was not sure. Also, it was asked if the references to SUNY would remain in the document. The Provost said the language will be modified for John Jay.
The committee voted unanimously to approve the guidelines for academic
internships with 25 votes in favor.

New Business

Courses Subcommittee

POL 3XX Voting and Public Opinion

Kathy Killoran introduced the course proposed by Professor Sidman. She said the Courses
Subcommittee liked the course and had feedback mostly related to clarifying the wording of the
rationale for the level of the course and making the learning objectives measurable. The
subcommittee also raised a question about whether a math prerequisite would be helpful. She
said this is being proposed as part of the revision of the Political Science major as a result of
their self study and site visit about a year and a half ago. She said Professor Sidman was
responsive to the feedback.

There were no issues raised by UCASC members. Provost Bowers said that feedback can be
directed to Professor Sidman.

LAS 2XX Introduction to Law and Society

Kathy Killoran introduced the course proposed by professors Wilson and Cauthen. This course
is for the new BA major in Law and Society that was approved by the Board of Trustees in June.
The Courses Subcommittee suggested making the course description clearer and using more
measurable language for the learning objectives. The rationale was also adjusted.

Professor Pease suggested making performance outcome #1 more measurable. Professor Perez
asked for confirmation on the prefix LAS for this course, as it can be confused by both faculty
and students with Latin American Studies. Provost Bowers agreed we could consider changing
it.

Professor Leippe noted that the word “engaged” needs to be a different verb. He also stated that
the second variety of research methods on page 4 should be reframed in terms of what is
covered and the disciplines not the specific authors’ names.

Professor Torres noted that the learning outcomes imply this is an introductory course and
suggested adjusting the language to reflect that this is at a 200-level level.

Further addressing the higher level of the course, Professor Tarantino suggested including the
word “scope” in the rationale to reflect not only the amount of reading and writing assignments
but the scope and depth.

Provost Bowers said further feedback can be directed to Professor Wilson.

CJBA 2XX Criminal Responsibility

Professor Sexton introduced the course, which is proposed by Professor Ingber. It is designed to
be a required course in the new Criminal Justice BA major. She summarized the course’s
approach as based on exploring and analyzing legal cases. The subcommittee had a number of
conversations with Professor Ingber and is very happy to have the course.

Professor Peters asked whether “criminal responsibility” is a distinct term in the literature.
Professor Ingber confirmed that it is, and noted that the course was originally titled something
in the order of “Legal and Policy Analysis of Criminal Responsibility” but was too wordy.

Professor Leippe noted repetition in the rationale for the course level and the course description.
He also suggested reframing the performance objectives using action verbs and more
measurable terms.

Professor Leippe asked Professor Ingber to illuminate the reason for the comment that if
students are not prepared they should let him know before class. He also suggested using
“negatively” instead of “poorly” in the syllabus.

Professor Ingber answered that he teaches using the Socratic Method, and that it is terrible to
the rhythm and continuity of the process if he calls on students and they are not prepared. He
confirmed that lack of preparedness affects the student’s classroom participation grade.
Professor Mandery added that he also does this in his law classes to avoid humiliating students.

Professor Bowers asked for a rationale for the course being at the 200 level. Professor Ingber
answered that though it is an introductory course, it is too sophisticated for a 100-level course.

Professor Corthals cited the objectives on page 3 as more appropriate for a 100-level than a 200-
level course.

Professor Adams asked whether students would need some background in psychology to
succeed in the course. Provost Bowers asked whether it would be helpful to require PSY 101 as
a pre-requisite. Professor Mandery stated that criminal law is taught without psychology, and
that faculty will be able to bring in basic psychological literature.

As to the level of the course, Professor Mandery said that the proposers would prefer it to be
pitched higher than this, but were advised it was too high. He stated there is very clear mandate
for the course, which is focused on policy issues and structure and research questions around
legal issues. He said they would be happy to develop clearer learning objectives.

Kathy Killoran added that the feedback the subcommittee gave corresponded to the structure of
the major. This is a 200 level required class for all students in the major and it was felt that it
was pitched at a 300 level.

Professor Mandery reiterated that in the structure of the major, it’s at a 200 level required
course for all students.

Provost Bowers suggested that perhaps some of the language in the course description may be
leftover from the 300-level description. And that’s why they don’t match. Professor Corthals
noted that the learning objectives are 100-level. Provost Bowers asked for help for Professor
Ingber to find a balance. Virginia Moreno will assist in making the language accessible and more
reflective as to why they want it to be a 200-level course.
Professor Snajdr added that he was on the 3P Subcommittee that dealt with course levels, and it was decided that course levels should be set by the departments for their courses but they should have guidelines for identifying them.

Vielka Holness asked that the proposers consider the pre-law students who may be engaged and interested in this course, and for whom it would be helpful if it were pitched higher.

Professor Mandery stated that they have a very clear internal sense of where this fits in the major; this is the first of several social problems students begin to research so it is at the 200-level. He said he would like it to serve the students who want to go on to graduate school.

Professor Adams reiterated that in the absence of college-wide levels, it’s up to the departments to come up with their own requirements, and it would be helpful to know what they are.

Professor Peters stated that the 3P is not trying to dictate what departments decide. The intent is rather to help understand the rationale for making the course one level or another.

Professor Corthals again noted the language, i.e. “basic research,” which sounds like it’s at the 100 level. Kathy Killoran commented that all law courses start at the 200 level.

Professor Lee asked whether changing the title to “Introduction to Criminal Responsibility” might help clarify. Professor Mandery responded that he doesn’t think that is descriptive.

Professor Lee said that the Philosophy Department has a course on Law and ethics at the 300-level. That could be a good option for these students. Professor Mandery said they have a criminal justice ethics course at the 100-level and we have a very clear scaffolding.

Professor Ingber suggested perhaps using “discussion of” rather than “introduction to.”

Provost Bowers stated that this is a decision the department has to make. This is a specific field of inquiry, but it’s not in essence an introductory course to their major, but a concept.

Professor Torres suggested that it’s helpful to go back to Bloom’s Taxonomy with determining levels and then knowing if your course description matches your course objectives.

Further feedback can be directed to Professor Ingber.

**CJBA 3XX Rights of the Accused**

Professor Sexton introduced the course as an elective in the new Criminal Justice BA program. It too is being proposed by Professor Ingber.

Professor Ingber stated that they would like to make it as clear as possible that this is not an introductory course, but builds on the Criminal Responsibility course and prepares students to move from this informational base on to courses with a research focus so they can consider topics for their 400-level research projects. He stated that it sequences perfectly into the major.

Professor Snajdr asked whether Criminal Responsibility would be a prerequisite for the course. Professor Ingber answered that Criminal Responsibility is required in the second year of the major, but it is not specifically listed as a prerequisite for this course. Provost Bowers noted that someone could take this course out of sequence unless it is specified.
Provost Bowers than asked what is the minimum necessary to take this course.

Professor Adams stated that his sense of this new major is it’s very intellectually challenging. He strongly suggested requiring the 200-level course in criminal responsibility as a prerequisite or approval from the professor for entry into the course, as students who jump from 100 to 300 level courses do not usually perform well.

Further feedback can be directed to Professor Ingber.

**SOC 3XX Qualitative Methods in Criminology**

Professor Sexton introduced the course, which is a 300-level course proposed by Professor Ocejo that focuses entirely on qualitative methods. She stated the subcommittee recommends approval.

There was no discussion. Provost Bowers said comments can be directed to Professor Ocejo.

**GEN 4XX Senior Seminar in Gender Studies**

Professor Sexton summarized the course, which is being proposed by professors Perry and Pease.

Professor Pease noted the changes, including changing the page number and changing the thesis to a 25 page senior thesis. Professor Adams pointed out the use of the word ‘intensive’ in the course description. He likes the course but suggested they may not want to use that word.

Further feedback can be directed to Professor Pease.

**Course revisions**

**AAP/PSY 240 Psychology of Oppression**

Kathy Killoran introduced the course revision from Professor Adams. It remains in the revised major for Forensic Psychology and will be an option in the General Elective area. A prerequisite is being added to the course because it is being raised to the 300-level. She said the subcommittee also had some feedback on the learning objectives.

Professor Perez commented that is seems the race ethnicity component is being taken out of the course description. He also noted that 200-level course sounded more rigorous than the new 300-level course.

Professor Adams answered that the course description now leans more toward the psychological and exploring the larger issues as well as how it affects students. He said students do not understand how individuals sometimes partake in their own oppression. He said he understands the comment and he will work on clarifying.

Professor Lapidus noted that the execution of some of the assignments in the syllabus seems too nebulous and urged Professor Adams to make them more precise. He specifically noted the
language under extra credit and the portfolio, which does not state how the content would be evaluated. He suggested offering a rubric so students can know how they are being graded and why the purpose of doing the portfolio.

Professor Lapidus also suggested including a bibliography so that students would have a starting point for reading more and writing and talking about selected themes.

Professor Leippe noted that based on the description, this seems to be a different course than what is usually covered in the psychology of oppression. It is one that is more focused on identity of the self, rising above and overcoming oppression. He asked whether the course should have a different title.

Professor Adams responded that his take on this is that making a distinction between the individual and oppression is a blurred line. Sometimes in the psychology courses there’s no individual in it. I’m trying to probe the tension between those two systems. He pointed out the opening paper which focuses specifically on the psychology of oppression but he does not want to approach the topic in the usual way.

Provost Bowers suggested that perhaps there is something about the description that needs to better address the fullness of the course.

Professor Lapidus noted the last line of attendance, which states that 50 percent of the student’s grade is based on in-class activities. He stated that because this puts the onus on the professor to tally up participation, it is well intentioned but not achievable.

Professor Adams responded that this would be solved by a quiz at the beginning of every class, and that the general thrust of this is the quizzes, the participation and talking in class. Professor Lapidus said that students need to know what the expectations are, and that it’s worth spelling it out a bit more clearly.

Professor Pease returned to the topic of the course title. She noted that because the last third of the course is on positive psychology, this is not necessarily a well-labeled course. Professor Adams responded that part of the psychology of oppression is how one transcends oppression, and that any discussion on oppression must have how you transcend it.

Professor Varsanyi noted that “prerequisites” is spelled wrong on the first page, and on page 3 the brief course description is missing a period. The model syllabus is also not uniform to the eye, layout wise.

Vielka Holness suggested clarifying the grading system, as at the moment it appears a student might think that the highest grade they could receive is a 90 and not a 100.

Professor Perez followed on Professor Pease’s notes on the title of the course. He stated that as the course description, the term “liberation” needs to be clarified as liberation on a psychological and individual level.

Professor Shapiro then added to Ms. Holness’ suggestion for clarifying the grading scale, pointing out that the extra credit verbiage does not look optional at present and should be adjusted for clarity.
Professor Leippe suggested moving quizzes to under the course requirements. Further comments can be directed to Professor Adams.

**SOC 203 Criminology**

Professor Sexton noted the course description is being updated.

Professor Pease asked to make the beginning of the course description more specific – both the second and third sentences begin with ‘it’. Professor Snajdr suggested, “This course will introduce the main theoretical perspectives and issues of criminology” to make the description more concise.

Further comments can be directed to Professor Mooney.

**Programs Subcommittee**

**Proposal to Revise the BA in English**

Professor Baatz introduced the proposal. He stated this is a proposal to expand the choice of elective courses. At the moment the choice is 4 LIT courses, and the changes would allow students to choose both from the LIT and the ENG courses. The motivation for this is it causes confusion in terms of students who choose ENG courses. By allowing this expansion it will increase enrollment in the writing courses. This proposal aims to facilitate that.

Professor Peters asked whether there is a standardized proposal form for revising majors. Kathy Killoran answered there is not.

Professor Adams suggested putting the courses with the asterisks (Literature and Law courses) into one list for better presentation.

Professor Pease noted that students who are concentrating on Lit and Law need to know which courses count but the courses are open to all students in the major.

Kathy Killoran asked about the timeline for the advanced poetry and fiction writing courses which have not been submitted yet. They are also listed as part of the Writing Minor. Killoran suggested omitting them now and adding them under the major and minor when the course proposals comes through.

Professor Sexton suggested adjusting some of the language to make it clearer that students can choose any four English courses above English 201. Professor Pease said she would clarify with Professor Sexton after the meeting and make the changes.

Further comments can be directed to Professor Pease.

**Proposal to Revise the BA in Global History**

Professor Baatz stated that this revision is to correct an oversight where some regularly taught history courses were not included in the major proposal. There was no discussion.
Comments can be directed to Professor Baatz.

**Academic Standards Subcommittee**

**Proposal to Establish a Committee on Academic Integrity**

As Professor Kaplowitz was not present, VP Saulnier gave an overview of the issue and introduced the proposal.

VP Saulnier stated that last June the university approved a new academic integrity policy which gave colleges the option of removing it from the student disciplinary process and moving it into Academic Affairs. As a part of that implementation process, the Academic Integrity Officer would move from Student Development to Academic Affairs where the subcommittee thinks it appropriately belongs.

The proposed committee would meet in cases where a faculty member alleges violations of academic integrity and seeks to impose an academic sanction and the student disputes that a violation has taken place.

VP Saulnier continued that one of the purposes is to keep track of student violations over an extended period of time and across courses. If a student is repeating that behavior in multiple courses, committing a series of violations, the Academic Integrity Officer will become aware and may decide to take further action, more than just a reduction or failing grade. If the student does not dispute the allegation, it does not have to be reported but to keep records of multiple offenses, we hope faculty will report.

Professor Bowers added that one purpose of the new policy is to provide protection for the students. Currently a professor can fail a student and that student cannot dispute it. With this change in policy the student would have a means of disputing the charge. She encouraged the committee to share this with their colleagues. She said she is hopeful faculty will participate in the process once this proposal is approved. It is a problem that all faculty should be addressing and now we will be able to track student records.

Professor Corthals asked to clarify that if a student plagiarizing, we should report it to the office even if the student doesn’t deny. Provost Bowers confirmed, but that it would be a confidential record only open to the Academic Integrity Officer.

Professor Adams asked, regarding Item B, how to distinguish between students cheating and unintentional plagiarism. Would I have to report that? Provost Bowers said faculty only have to report if they are imposing an academic penalty. Professor Adams then said, faculty cannot impose a sanction and not report it. The Provost confirmed that he is correct.

Professor Adams noted that many students unintentionally plagiarize. He asked whether he would be expected to report everything. Provost Bowers answered that first the professor would have a conversation with the student and give them a chance to talk about it. She clarified that a professor cannot penalize unless that professor files a form.

Provost Bowers clarified that when there might be a clear case of plagiarism, the teacher can give the student a zero, but the teacher must file a report. This way it is on record that he did it
in that class, and if he does it again his prior record will be there. If a student contests, when it
gets to be time for grades, that student doesn’t get a grade for the course until it’s worked out.

Professor Saulnier noted that the PEN grade may be assigned any time in the semester by
Corresponding with the registrar. A faculty member could then wait till the final grade because a
PEN grade prevents a student from dropping the course.

Provost Bowers explained that once the policy has been passed it is going to require a large
messaging out to faculty. She said she hopes this will increase our knowledge about plagiarism,
will act as a deterrent, and that it will encourage faculty to follow through and report and take
plagiarism seriously.

Professor Von Lampe asked about the possible duplication of process. Provost Bowers explained
the process. The Academic Integrity Officer will make a determination whether the offense is
egregious enough to warrant disciplinary charges. Those egregious cases will go to the Student
Judiciary Committee. The new piece of the picture is now there is a process to track instances of
plagiarism and other cheating. We will be able to see multiple offenses. The Academic Integrity
Officer will keep the records and they are confidential.

Kathy Killoran asked if students could report an instance where they are receiving an academic
penalty from faculty but the faculty member has not reported it. This would ensure that
students get the required opportunity to contest the assessment.

Professor Peters asked how a student would know whether faculty reported it. Kathy Killoran
answered that the student is supposed to be informed by the Academic Integrity Officer when
reported. If the student fails to be notified, it would imply it was not reported.

Kathy Killoran asked for an effective date to be added to the policy. She also raised her concern
regarding the implementation of this process and the volume of offenses. She also noted that
there is no mention of a timeline for resolution and that has been problematic in the past, for
example with the grade appeal process. Provost Bowers agreed that she is also concerned about
the volume, and that a staff member must be identified.

VP Eanes stated that she would like to go on record that she would like a student to be included
on the committee. She also raised the question of how the charged student would be informed.
She added that there is a different level of comfort in addressing these issues among faculty, and
it takes time to meet with faculty and students, and following up with those meetings.

Provost Bowers noted that Dana Trimboli has done a tremendous job as the Academic Integrity
Officer and clarified that this change does not reflect on her performance.

Professor Leippe stated that he did not see where it explicitly reads that a faculty member is
required to report. He noted filing a report every time seems unreasonable. Professor Bowers
responded that under the CUNY policy, the use of the word “shall” on page 7 is a legal verb form
that means “must.” She said the policy exists now and we are charged with implementing this by
the spring semester. This is the law of the university now.

Dr. Villanueva asked whether this had been implemented in some of the other colleges and
whether we might get suggestions from other colleges on volume and how they dealt with it.
Provost Bowers said there will be a lot of messaging on it out to the faculty.
Professor Corthals asked whether advisors would know about multiple cases. Provost Bowers answered no, the records are confidential. Professor Corthals noted that they are very relevant to advising, especially if a student is on the verge of having too many violations.

Professor Saulnier explained that the value of each violation will be a judgment of the AI Officer. He stated that over time there might be one or two serious violations or several that accumulate. There will be an art to it.

Katalin Szur, Director of the First Year Experience, said that students will need a messaging blitz as well as faculty. She suggested that certain courses in the first year include learning outcomes to educate students about academic integrity.

Educational Partnerships Subcommittee

Letter of Intent for a 2+2/Joint degree with LaGuardia Community College for an A.S. degree in Science for Forensics and a B.S. in Forensic Science

Provost Bowers introduced the Letter of Intent, which she said follows the college’s usual pattern for the forensic science partnerships. She asked that because the committee had already endorsed five of these letters, which she said were almost identical, that the committee dispense with a second reading.

Professor Corbett reported that the subcommittee met and reviewed the documents. The subcommittee made suggestions for clarity, and worked on several issues, and the research course for forensic science. The subcommittee’s recommendation was that LaGuardia’s faculty and John Jay’s faculty would work much more closely to develop that course, to entice people to come into our program, to get a sense of what forensic science is all about. The committee proposed these changes and the Department of Science endorsed them.

Provost Bowers called for a motion to dispense with a second reading.

A motion was made and seconded. The committee voted to dispense with the second reading with 24 votes in favor and 1 abstention.

A motion was then made and seconded to endorse the Letter of Intent with LaGuardia Community College for a 2+2/joint degree for an A.S. in Science for Forensics and a B.S. in Forensic Science. The committee voted unanimously to endorse the letter with 25 votes in favor.

A motion was made and seconded to adjourn. It was unanimously acclaimed. The meeting concluded at 12:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Gabrielle Compton, Scribe
Katherine Killoran, Executive Director, Undergraduate Studies
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The Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee held its meeting on Friday, November 18, 2011 at 9:30 a.m. in Room 610T. Provost Jane Bowers called the meeting to order.


Absent: Ervin Balazon, Angelique Corthals, Ryan Cunningham, Anne Lopes, Virginia Moreno, David Shapiro, Nancy Velazquez Torres,

Guests: Ben Bierman, Lyell Davis, Jessica Gordon-Nembhard, Vielka Holness, Stanley Ingber, Karen Kaplowitz, Howard Matthews, Kathy Mulder, Andrew Sidman, Sumaya Villanueva, Josh Wilson

Administrative Announcements

Provost Bowers welcomed back members, and noted that she was glad to be a part of this collegial, congenial and highly functioning committee. She also shared a New York Times article about the annual national survey of student engagement, which measures how hard and effectively students are working in their academic classes, specific to areas of focus. It was given to 400,000 college students and showed wide differences in the amount of time students spend studying. Engineering and science students worked the longest, humanities were next and then social sciences. Provost Bowers said she expected John Jay students were the exception.

Provost Bowers then reported that the Philosophy major and the Law and Society major had been registered with the state, and are fully on board with the college. She noted that this is particularly good news as the board had stopped approving new majors at John Jay for about a year.

Provost Bowers continued, addressing the college’s consolidated response to CUNY, which UCASC members received and were to have read to see where the college stands. A link was sent out to the web site on which all the college’s responses were placed. Provost Bowers said she was pleased to see all were “right there fighting the good fight.”
Professor Kaplowitz thanked Provost Bowers for her draft of the President’s response, commenting that it was powerful, accurate and eloquent and reflected the varied feedback on this issue and being bold in presenting the College’s opinions to the University. Provost Bowers thanked Prof. Kaplowitz but responded that she had known Hunter, Queens and Brooklyn colleges would stand firm on the 12 credits. She clarified that the purpose of the 12 college-optional credits is so that each college may put its stamp on its own graduates.

Lastly, Provost Bowers updated the committee on the proposal to revise the Model Syllabus. The Model Syllabus will come up again to the College Council agenda on Monday. Some amendments have been introduced to the language, and a conversation had been had about the amendment regarding office hours. It will read “Contact hours,” and faculty will decide where those hours take place.

Approval of the minutes of October 21st, 2011

A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of October 21, 2011. A typo was noted on page two, line one. Also, Ms. Holness was incorrectly listed as absent. The Committee voted unanimously to approve the minutes with changes with 17 votes in favor.

Old Business

Courses

POL 3XX Voting and Public Opinion

A motion was made and seconded to approve POL 3XX Voting and Public Opinion. There was no discussion. The committee voted unanimously to approve the course with 17 votes in favor.

LAS 2XX Introduction to Law and Society

A motion was made and seconded to approve LAS 2XX Introduction to Law and Society. Kathy Killoran addressed the issue of the LAS prefix. She said the Registrar and the Department of Political Science have taken up the suggestion to use LWS instead of LAS. Professor Wilson summarized the changes. “Level” was added to the amount on page one. On page 2, he added that students would critique and apply theories. On page 3, the performance outcomes were clarified to read that students would be able to structure and write an essay. On
page 4, he clarified that the readings are from anthropologists, etc. On page 10, he included the action verbs that had been requested. There was no further discussion.

*The committee voted unanimously to approve the course, LWS 2XX Introduction to Law and Society with 17 votes in favor.*

**CJBA 2XX Criminal Responsibility**

*A motion was made and seconded to approve the course CJBA 2XX Criminal Responsibility.*

Professor Ingber addressed the changes suggested in the previous meeting. He noted that concerns mainly focused on matching the course to the level.

Professor Ingber noted that language in the course description was adjusted to reflect an approach to the research agenda, and how it sets up the course for the 300 level. On page 4, the Performance Objectives were adjusted to focus on the formulation of a research agenda. On page 5, language was added to reflect how this course provides opportunities to hone the types of skills students need for what will come after. There was no discussion.

*The committee voted unanimously to approve the course with 17 votes in favor.*

**CJBA 3XX Rights of the Accused**

*A motion was made and seconded to approve the course CJBA 3XX Rights of the Accused.*

Professor Ingber noted that CJBA 210 (Criminal Responsibility) has been added as a prerequisite. In addition, approval from the instructor has been added as an alternative. There was no discussion.

*The committee voted unanimously to approve the course with 17 votes in favor.*

**SOC 3XX Qualitative Methods in Criminology**

*A motion was made and seconded to approve the course SOC 3XX Qualitative Methods in Criminology.*

Professor Ocejo noted that no changes were made. There was no discussion.

*The committee voted unanimously to approve the course with 17 votes in favor.*

**GEN 4XX Senior Seminar in Gender Studies**
A motion was made and seconded to approve the course GEN 4XX Senior Seminar in Gender Studies.

Professor Pease noted that she fixed a discrepancy in page numbers. Professor Adams reminded the committee that UCASC can only suggest changes, but does not demand changes.

The committee voted unanimously to approve the course with 17 votes in favor.

Course revisions

AAP/PSY 240 Psychology of Oppression

A motion was made and seconded to approve the course revision for AAP/PSY 240 Psychology of Oppression.

Professor Adams reviewed the changes made since the first reading. The course intro was changed to highlight the discussion in the class, as well as due processes. On page 2, regarding the final he added that students should find the articles and bring them to the professor so they will receive guidance but should make the first move. The extra credit was clarified to show that students would have to complete 6 of the extra assignments. The purpose of the portfolio was clarified as a means for students to get feedback. On page 5, the syllabus was modified to reflect an overview of issues of prejudice, discrimination.

There was no discussion.

The committee voted unanimously to approve the course revisions with 17 votes in favor.

SOC 203 Criminology

Professor Ocejo speaking for the proposer, Professor Mooney, noted that she altered the language in the course description, adjusting the pronouns. Also, the description highlighted on page 2 was changed in response to feedback.

The committee voted unanimously to approve the course revisions with 17 votes in favor.

ART 113 Introduction to Photography

A motion was made and seconded to approve revisions to ART 113 Introduction to Photography.

Professor Lopez relayed the changes made based on feedback from the May 2011 meeting. The concerns had focused on the intellectual content, and attempts were made by Professor Lopez to show that in more detail. The format of the syllabus in this version is just for the committee, this is not what the students will see.
Professor Varsanyi noted a spelling error in the course description. In reference to the attendance policy, Professor Adams noted that by missing class a student is already penalized. 

*The committee voted unanimously to approve the course revision with 18 votes in favor.*

**ART 114 Intermediate Photography**

*A motion was made and seconded to approve revisions to ART 114 Intermediate Photography.*

Professor Lopez noted that as in the ART 113 revisions, he introduced language about ethics and revolution as recommended. He also fleshed out information on the readings and the lectures to show their intellectual content. There was no discussion. 

*The committee voted unanimously to approve the course revisions with 18 votes in favor.*

**Programs (2nd readings)**

**Proposal to Revise the BA in Global History**

Provost Bowers noted that this was just a proposal to revise.

*A motion was made and seconded to approve the course additions. The committee voted unanimously to approve the proposal with 19 votes in favor.*

**Proposal to Revise the BA in English**

Kathy Killoran summarized the changes. They were mostly related to the layout and providing the bulletin information.

*A motion was made and seconded to approve these changes to the BA in English. The committee voted unanimously to approve the proposal with 19 votes in favor.*

**Academic Standards (2nd reading)**

**Proposal to Establish a Committee on Academic Integrity**

*A motion was made and seconded to approve the Proposal to Establish a Committee on Academic Integrity.*

Professor Kaplowitz shared that the Standards Committee met and decided to make one more change to the proposal. She reviewed the changes since the first reading. She also explained, at the recommendation of UCASC, when the College Council adopts a policy, it is a policy that affects all students college-wide unless is explicitly states otherwise. The Graduate Studies
committee had met and reviewed this proposal and noted the importance of including representatives who teach graduate courses. They unanimously approved the proposal.

She continued, noting that on the bottom of page 1, the committee thought it was important to say that the Academic Integrity Committee (AIC) had to respond in a certain amount of time. Now it must act within a certain number of days.

Continuing through the proposal, Professor Kaplowitz noted that everything underlined on the next two pages is verbatim language from the CUNY policy that clarifies all the questions asked by the committee last month. She then distributed the new language on the last paragraph on this page, which was added after concern from UCASC. As the point of creating the AIC is to provide more due process for students, it was added that the AIC shall adopt procedures and a set timeline.

Professor Adams introduced the scenario that at the end of the semester, a student says he or she has a concern. He asked whether the professor must file within 30 days, as many students don’t check their grades until the summer.

Professor Kaplowitz agreed that it must be within the following semester. Professor Adams noted that the Academic Integrity Officer (AIO) should be someone who works throughout the summer.

Kathy Killoran suggested adding being more explicit about what the student should expect within the time period specified. Prof. Kaplowitz said the AIO will issue a response to the student. She clarified that the AIO does not have the authority to resolve the issue. Kathy Killoran noted concern that students may misinterpret that their case would be resolved in 35 days.

Professor Kaplowitz noted that Dean Lopes wanted to add the timely response. She agreed that the language could be clearer.

Provost Bowers suggested replacing the wording with the office and not the committee itself. Kathy Killoran added the related concern about a sense of a timeline. Provost Bowers agreed that this would also be a way to note whether the AIO is getting back to students. Professor Kaplowitz suggested perhaps adding that the office shall communicate with the student within 35 calendar days.

Professor Ingber asked whether there is there a separate policy for faculty, and whether there is a formal process. Provost Bowers responded that any time a faculty member does anything unethical or offensive, there’s a process, including issues of academic integrity.

It was asked whether a student or adjunct might serve on the committee. Professor Kaplowitz answered that adjuncts are not allowed, and that students are not included because of the issues of confidentiality. She stated that with a committee of 5, the weight that a student member might have is too great, and this is a matter of extreme sensitivity and confidentiality.

Professor Adams asked that since students could be sent to death and to war, why can’t they be put on the committee. He added that leaving them off the committee implies that we don’t trust students.
Professor Lapidus raised concerns about the confidentiality of the process. He referred to part of 4.2 of the CUNY Policy involving Sanctions. He asked who at what levels will know about this aspect of the policy as clearly as they might the other aspects and how will the whole process of discovery and defense be made known. Provost Bowers responded that sanctions and the process will be posted on the web site and explained repeatedly to both students and faculty. In terms of confidentiality, until the committee meets, only the AIO will know about the files. The files will be kept locked up.

On the subject of an appropriate database for the files, Professor Johnson-Eanes noted that the university has had an ongoing investigation for an appropriate tool that is secure and accurate.

VP Johnson-Eanes then returned the discussion to the issue of a student presence on the committee. She noted that student presence is different based on each institution, and that at her last school, students who served were trained. She added that students only learn by being a part of the process.

Professor Adams asked whether the records would be forever. Provost Bowers answered that yes, they will. Professor Adams noted that other institutions argue that something one does as a naïve freshman should not stay on a permanent record. Professor Saulnier clarified that the bylaw states if something involves suspension, it goes on the students’ permanent record, and that the key word is “permanent.” Professor Adams responded that in terms of this issue, knowing that this will be for the students’ life, he might take a more conservative attitude toward filing.

Provost Bowers clarified that these cases will not appear on the student’s record except as a grade unless they are brought before the Student Judicial Committee.

Professor Kaplowitz noted that when the original policy was developed in 2004, the Task Force wanted to have an XF grade, which would indicate that the F was for academic dishonesty, but when the student graduated it would removed and just showed an F. However, the Registrar can’t change a record. So it was decided to not have an XF grade because it would follow a student forever.

Provost Bowers clarified that if a student admits to violating academic integrity, the professor does not put the case forward to the AIC. This is to protect students. The idea is that we need to know if a student is doing this in a lot of different classes and to have this on record.

Rizwan Ali Raja suggested putting the student on probation, as a permanent mark would carry with him as a label and there would be no point for the student to change his behavior. Provost Bowers responded that if a student plagiarizes once but then never plagiarizes again, nothing will happen with that record. Professor Saulnier stepped in to clarify that because these are permanent, if the student applies for a Federal job, he or she must sign a waiver to give access to all records.

Professor Kaplowitz added that this is why it is important to educate the students that it’s in their best interest to apologize than to fight and take a chance. She referred to the CUNY policy that details how all faculty must have orientation sessions, that all new students have sessions, and that they all receive packets each semester. Kathy Killoran confirmed that this past year students did not receive copies of the Undergraduate Bulletin but it is available on the John Jay web site. Professor Adams noted that you have to push this information; you can’t tell them to go look for it.
Dr. Villanueva asked to clarify in the case when a student admits to the professor that he or she engaged in academic dishonesty, if a faculty will lower the grade, it has to be reported.

On the subject of the AIO, Professor Kaplowitz noted that he or she would report to the College Council. The AIO would present general data and not individual student names.

Professor Leippe referred back to the subject of a bad first semester versus a charge of plagiarism, as plagiarism is more a reflection of character, and psychologically it's different. Professor Ocejo asked whether if a student plagiarizes could the professor give the student another chance to rewrite the paper under the Extra Credit policy we approved recently? Provost Bowers answered that's an academic opportunity to learn, and not about improving the grade. Professor Kaplowitz advised that if a professor wants to give his or her students a chance to redo the paper, they should still be penalized in their final grade, and that it is a case-by-case situation.

Provost Bowers clarified that as soon as a student admits to plagiarism, the sanction can be imposed. If they don’t admit, it’ll go to committee. If halfway through, they can stop the train and say I did do this, then there’ll be a report but it won’t go to the committee.

Professor Kaplowitz noted that she and Dean Lopes are making a flow chart to make it clearer for both students and faculty. Professor Adams suggested doing some focus groups.

Kathy Killoran asked that the effective date be moved higher in the proposal.

Professor Adams proposed an amendment to add a student to the committee. It was seconded by Professor Peters. Provost Bowers suggested adding that the student would receive training in academic integrity. A discussion then followed regarding the amendment.

VP Eanes suggested adding peer-to-peer governance and confidentiality to the amendment. Professor Kaplowitz stated that if this were to be included, the student should have a minimum GPA. VP Eanes responded that the requirements would follow the same parameters as membership on other committees with student members. Professor Kaplowitz suggested that a minimum of a certain number of credits. It was accepted that a minimum of sophomore standing was needed so that the student can be familiar with the college procedures in order to make decisions.

The amendment reads: Motion to amend the proposal to add one student to the integrity committee. Students shall receive training to serve on the Academic Integrity Committee on academic integrity, peer to peer governance and confidentiality.

A motion was made and seconded to vote to approve the proposal with the amendment. The proposal with the above amendment was not approved, with 13 votes in favor, 5 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

[Note: a vote of a majority of committee members is required as per the Perez decision, the committee census is 30 so 16 votes are required for approval.]

Provost Bowers returned to the original proposal.

The original proposal had a motion and second. The committee did not approve the original proposal with 14 votes in favor, 1 vote opposed, and 3 abstentions.
Provost Bowers noted that John Jay is expected by the university to comply by the spring semester, and that if this proposal is not passed then the school will likely not have a policy in place until late spring.

Professor Leippe said if the only issue relates to a student member, maybe we can revisit that. Professor Kaplowitz said that someone who voted no or abstained can ask for UCASC to reconsider the proposal. Professor Pease made a motion that was seconded by Professor Varsanyi to reconsider the amendment.

Professor Sandrine noted that for the proposal, there were 14 in favor. Sixteen in favor is needed for it to pass.

Professor Sexton noted that the student member could serve the purpose of communicating to the student being charged. Professor Leippe stated that he didn’t understand the objection to not include the student, and that it seemed that there are more positives than negatives.

Professor Kaplowitz noted that there is a tremendous learning curve and that the student on the committee would have to be chosen by the Student Council and then voted to the College Council. This would take 3 months, and so they could not start until February. So on a practical level there would be an entire semester without a student, in which the committee would develop the procedures, and understanding what it means by egregious versus minor offenses, and seeing cases beginning in August. She continued that because this is so important to a student’s career, it doesn’t make sense for the committee to not be fully formed until months after it’s started. She went on to clarify that there are students on the Judiciary Committee. But this different, as it is only a fact-finding committee.

Professor Adams responded that we have a chicken and egg problem. We have started to change the campus from marginalizing students. I have been on many faculty committees that do not get off the ground until October. We do not use our authority to disenfranchise faculty, we should not do it to students. We can have a process in place to get students up and running.

Someone asked whether the student could be a graduate student.

Professor Kaplowitz noted that at the next meeting on December 9th there would be more people present to vote.

Professor Perez asked what the consequences will be if we do not have something in place by spring? Provost Bowers stated that UCASC could make the College Council if we vote on this at our next meeting. She conceded that the consequences of voting this proposal down today are not so dire, and that maybe more time is needed to consider these matters.

A motion had been made and seconded to reconsider the amendment. The committee voted to reconsider the amendment, with 17 votes in favor and 1 abstention.

The committee voted to approve the proposal with amendment again and it was not approved. There were 14 in favor, 4 opposed and no abstentions.
The committee voted again on the original proposal. The proposal was not approved with 12 votes in favor, 0 against and 6 abstaining. The amendment did not carry.

A motion was made and seconded to reconsider the original proposal without the amendment. The motion did not pass with 14 votes in favor, 4 opposed and no abstentions.

The committee will reconsider the proposal at the next meeting. Further feedback can be directed to Professor Kaplowitz.

New Business

Courses Subcommittee

PSY 4XX Seminar in Forensic Psychology

Kathy Killoran introduced the course, which is to be one of the capstone courses of the revised psychology major. The subcommittee worked with them several times. She noted the work done on the learning objectives for this particular course. The subcommittee recommends approval.

Professor Leippe stated that this course will focus on particular topics depending on who teaches it. For example, he said, if he were to teach the class he would focus on eye witness behavior. A term paper would bring together the students’ experiences and demonstrate that they are strong psychology majors.

Professor Sexton asked whether all capstone courses require a PSY 311 as a prerequisite. Professor Leippe clarified that they do.

Professor Adams suggested modifying the language to show that late assignments would only be accepted at the discretion of the professor.

Further feedback can be directed to Professor Leippe.

CSL 2XX Case Management in Human Service

Kathy Killoran introduced this course, which was already included in John Jay’s minor in Human Service. The course focuses on the skills of case management. The committee had recommended that the course be moved down to the 200 level, which is the usual level for this course in Human Service programs. She stated that they took the committee’s suggestions and were a joy to work with.

Kathy Killoran also noted that the rationale has been omitted from the form. It should be question 3 on the new form. Further comments can be directed to VP Johnson-Eanes.

DRA 1XX Self, Media and Society

Kathy Killoran introduced the course, which is currently being taught experimentally as part of a Freshman Learning committee. The subcommittee had thought it was ambitious for a 100-level
course. The committee had asked for the real syllabus from this fall be included, to make the
course description more student friendly, and to adjust the learning outcomes. She added that
there are three faculty members who have been added that can teach the course.

Professor Davies stated that working with the committee has been a positive experience, and
added that the course is a nice way for students to see how they can apply scholarship to their
lives.
Professor Davies also noted that it might be put forward as a new general education course.

Professor Varsanyi noted a typo in the course description; in line 6, it should read “policies” not
“polices.”

Professor Pease suggested 3 minor wording changes. First, line 3 of the course description, to
explain “way” should be “ways.” She suggested changing “the media” to “media.” And on page 11
under the plagiarism policy, she suggested changing “unintentional shall” to “must.”

Professor Adams suggested tweaking to the wording to clarify that the course covers
transnational media and not only American media.

Further feedback can be directed to Professor Davies.

---

**ECO 3XX Political Economy of Global Gender**

Professor Sexton introduced the course. The subcommittee loved the way it is presented, and
had questioned the term “political economy,” but that appears to be a standard term with a
specific meaning. The subcommittee also suggested adding that “global” be added but admitted
the title is now awkward.

Provost Bowers noted that it is usually assumed that gender is global. Professor Adams
responded that that’s not necessarily true because the default is often about entitled gender
elites.

Professor Mulder noted that it does read awkwardly, and that she had added the wording
because it because the subcommittee asked her to. She noted that the course includes all classes,
genders and races, and that the term “political economy” means a specific paradigm/ideology
that is inclusive of things like race, class, genders, cultures, all those things that are excluded
from the mainstream economics classes. Professor Mulder explained that her department is
undergoing a general transformation from a service program to one with a new major and three
new faculty members.

Provost Bowers invited suggestions for a less awkward title. Professor Varsanyi suggested that if
global must remain, renaming it ‘global political economy.’

Professor Lee suggested taking a phrase from the description, and offered “Gender and the
Global Economy.” Professor Mulder agreed that this sounded better, but doesn’t reflect the
content of the course, which is specific in the discipline. She noted that “political economy” is
needed because it’s more inclusive.
Provost Bowers reminded the committee that feedback here is simply feedback, and that people in the discipline need to follow their best instincts. She also noted that when prospect employers look at the students’ transcripts, they will look for the title that is the standard in the discipline.

Professor Adams suggested reworking the course description to speak specifically to the using of different cases and scenarios outside the United States. Secondly, he added that the syllabus seems more focused on women, when men are also sold into the sex business. As it is a gender course, he suggested making it clear that this course deals with the exploitation of both men and women.

Kathy Killoran noted the abbreviated title, which is limited to 20 characters. She said if the original title is used, she suggested Political Eco Gender. Additionally, she noted that if this is going to be placed in the Gender Studies major as an elective; we would need formal approval from the major coordinator.

Further feedback can be directed to Professor Mulder.

**MUS 2XX Music Technology**

**MUS 3XX Music Composition Using Technology**

Professor Sexton introduced the two courses, which the committee highly recommends.

Professor Bierman noted that MUS 297 is currently running experimentally and is a very popular class. The 3XX course will build on this.

Professor Adams suggested adding the full citation for books in the syllabus and making the reading assignments more obvious on course calendar. He also suggested tweaking the penalties for late or missed assignments.

Further feedback can be directed to Professor Bierman.

**Course revisions**

**ART 230 Issues in Art and Crime**

Professor Sexton introduced the course revision. The required prerequisites of ART 101, 103 or 105 are being dropped as it is reducing the number of students who can take the course.

Professor Matthews added that this course has been offered a couple times as an experimental course and he has found that a background in art is not necessary to succeed in the course.

*Professor Lapidus moved to dispense with the second reading. It was seconded. The committee voted unanimously to dispense with the second reading with 17 votes in favor.*

*The committee then voted unanimously to approve the course revision with 17 votes in favor.*
Programs Subcommittee

Proposal to Revise the Minor in African-American Studies

Professor Leippe spoke for the Programs Subcommittee and introduced the proposal, which is a revision to the African-American Studies minor. He said it’s basically 18 credits with an honors minor proposed of 21 credits. The revisions involve making it more intellectually focused and more attractive to students. There are some new courses available, but they all quite nicely fit the theme of the African diaspora. All minors have to take AFR 199 Intro to Africana Studies. Students must also complete an upper-level course which can be a methods or an experiential learning course. There are also four electives required, with possibilities to choose from that range across themes of justice, humanities, equality and psychology.

Professor Nemhard noted that the department’s name was recently changed to Africana Studies. She said department has changed a lot in the past few years, and that the name of the minor was also being changed.

Professor Lapidus noted that the Music department has a 300-level comparative music course and another on the music of the Caribbean as well as numerous sections that cover blues and hip hop, which would fit the minor’s humanities area. Professor Pease added to that, noting that the English department offers a course on Literature in Africa. She asked whether it was considered.

Professor Nemhard responded that it was partially an oversight, but also the department wants the courses to focus on its offerings for their minor. She said they did put the ones that were cross-listed with their department, but they could discuss adding others. Professor Adams added that if a student approaches the department with a certain course they feel applies, the department will usually accept it.

Professor Perez lamented the disappearance of cross-listed courses.

Professor Pease asked what is the rationale for including AFR 248, the masculinities course? Professor Adams responded that the course speaks a lot to the changing idea of masculinities and speaks a lot about people of color. Professor Pease challenged that, noting that while that should be a part of that course, she noted that Professor Adams would not always be teaching that course. It was noted that the reason the Africana Studies department considered that course was because it is a course under their jurisdiction.

Professor Lapidus pointed out that the Africana Philosophy course had not been included. Professor Nemhard said that was an oversight.

Professor Sexton noted 6 credits in Africana studies as the prerequisite for the 300 level Research Methods course. She asked why the department wouldn’t just specify the 3-credit Introduction to Africana Studies as the prerequisite. Kathy Killoran explained that the 6 credits is the current prerequisite for the AFR 310 course.

Kathy Killoran noted that it’s appropriate that students have a background in the area before they learn research methods. Professor Sexton stated that that’s not typical for a research methods course.

Kathy Killoran stated that she commend the department for starting to address their curriculum. This has been a long-standing course on the books with these prerequisites, and
that pinpointing one specific course to be a prerequisite is difficult because it serves different purposes and students do sample.

It was noted that in the eventuality of cross listing, there will have be a negotiation as to what courses will go in what departments, and you want to be open not closed to include it. Professor Nembhard agreed that they are planning to include cross listed courses.

Further feedback can be directed to Professor Nembhard.

A motion was made and seconded to adjourn. It was unanimously acclaimed. The meeting concluded at 12:26 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Gabrielle Compton, Scribe
Katherine Killoran, Executive Director, Undergraduate Studies
THE UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM & ACADEMIC STANDARDS COMMITTEE
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Agenda for December 9, 2011
Minutes of November 18, 2011
Proposal to Revise the Minor in African-American Studies
Proposal to Close the BS in Correctional Studies

New Courses:
ECO/GEN 3XX Political Economy of Gender
PSY 4XX Seminar in Forensic Psychology
CSL 2XX Case Management in Human Service
DRA 1XX Self, Media and Society
MUS 2XX Music Technology
MUS 3XX Composition through Technology
POL 2XX Introduction to Research in Politics
CJBS 4XX Capstone Seminar
HIS 3XX Imperialism in Africa and Asia
CJBA 2XX (240) Quantitative Inquiry
CJBA 2XX (220) Race, Gender, Ethnicity, Crime & Justice
AFR 3XX Inequality and Wealth
HIS 3XX Female Felons in Premodern Europe and the Americas
PSY 2XX Introductory Research Experience in Psychology
PSY 3XX Supervised Research Experience in Psychology
PSY 4XX Advanced Research Experience in Psychology

Course revisions:
ENG 233 News Reporting and Writing - Alexa
PSY 275 Family Conflict and Family Court
PSY 442 Key Concepts in Psychotherapy
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Initials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anne</td>
<td>Lopes</td>
<td>Dean, Undergraduate Studies</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Saulnier</td>
<td>VP, Enrollment Management</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Jama</td>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>African-American Studies</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>Snajdr</td>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>Lapidus</td>
<td>Art and Music</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dana</td>
<td>Tarantino</td>
<td>Communication &amp; Theater Arts</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berenecea J.</td>
<td>Eanes</td>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hung-En</td>
<td>Sung</td>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allison</td>
<td>Pease</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silvia</td>
<td>Dapia</td>
<td>Foreign Languages &amp; Literatures</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Larkin</td>
<td>Health &amp; Physical Education</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon</td>
<td>Baatz</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Ann</td>
<td>McClure</td>
<td>Interdisciplinary Studies</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen</td>
<td>Sexton</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisandro</td>
<td>Perez</td>
<td>Latin American and Latina/o Studies</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klaus</td>
<td>Von Lampe</td>
<td>Law, Police Science &amp; CJA</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Puls</td>
<td>Mathematics and Computer Science</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyoo</td>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monica</td>
<td>Varsanyi</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenn</td>
<td>Corbett</td>
<td>Protection Management</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Leippe</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy-Lynne</td>
<td>Peters</td>
<td>Public Management</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angelique</td>
<td>Corthals</td>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Velazquez-Torres</td>
<td>SEEK</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Ocejo</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy</td>
<td>Killoran</td>
<td>Undergraduate Studies</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabrielle</td>
<td>Compton-Sinclair</td>
<td>Scribe</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ervin</td>
<td>Balazon</td>
<td>Student Member</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Moreno</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan Cunningham</td>
<td>Student Member</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rizwan Ali Raja</td>
<td>Student Member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Guests:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ned</td>
<td>Benton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumaya Villanueva</td>
<td>Grose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katie</td>
<td>Szur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valerie</td>
<td>West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xerxed</td>
<td>Malki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara McDougal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Bierman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Mulder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lita McNickie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica Gordon-Nembhard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Sidman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee held its meeting on Friday, November 18, 2011 at 9:30 a.m. in Room 610T. Dean Anne Lopes called the meeting to order.


Absent: Berenecea J. Eanes, Virginia Moreno, Ryan Cunningham, Richard Ocejo, Michael Puls, Ed Snajdr, Hung-En Sung

Guests: Ned Benton, Ben Bierman, Lyell Davies, Lior Gideon, Jessica Gordon-Nembhard, Jill Grose-Fifer, Maki Haberfeld, Xerxes Malki, Sara McDougall, Litna McNickle, Cathy Mulder, Andrew Sidman, Kate Szur, Sumaya Villanueva, Valerie West

Administrative Announcements

Dean Lopes called the meeting to order, adding that she was happy to be back at UCASC after being unable to attend the past two meetings due to CUNY Pathways work.

Dean Lopes updated the committee on the Pathways Initiative. The task force put forward a proposal to the Chancellor that lays out a new General Education framework, a flexible core and a required core. It is not so far from what John Jay had and will be adaptable for John Jay more easily than any other college in CUNY.

Regarding the process and timeline, Dean Lopes announced that the 30-credit core will be put into place by the Chancellor, and that our 10-member subcommittee that will begin meeting at the start of 2012 to work through what the additional 12 credits will be.

Dean Lopes noted that the timeline will be a challenge, as departments will need to bring forward courses they want to include in the Gen Ed and propose soon. By October 2012 all courses will need to go to CUNY. The date for implementation is Fall 2013.

Dean Lopes added that the 30-credit core is a great way to put John Jay’s stamp on the students, and that there are ways to get some of what was originally wanted in. The main concern was how to accommodate the colleges. Dean Lopes stressed that it is a very tight timeline, and a heavy lift...
for departments to bring forward those courses. She asked that members talk to their chairs and faculty and make clear what that timeline is, and to be communicating with everyone around this so that all will start thinking about how UCASC wants to do it.

Professor Adams asked whether there is a requirement to stay within those categories that have been developed. Dean Lopes answered that yes, the college is required by CUNY. She added that the Chancellor has not formally accepted the proposal, but will act today to accept the work of the task force.

Professor Corthals raised the problematic issue of fitting all the learning outcomes for the new clusters into one course. Dean Lopes agreed that the learning outcomes were very ambitious for 100 and 200 level courses.

Professor Adams suggested that it would be important for Virginia Moreno to be on the subcommittee. He noted that the most substantive approach would be to have a good assessment system to observe whether the outcomes have been met. Dean Lopes agreed, adding that she planned to ask the committee to invite Kathy Killoran and Virginia Moreno to serve the committee as they both have an understanding that no one else has.

Dean Lopes said this will be UCASC’s heavy lift for the spring semester, as this committee will also need to look at these courses. The subcommittee will review the courses and bring them to UCASC at least by October 2012. She added that there will be some accelerated pace to our work here to meet that deadline.

Professor Hamilton asked whether there is a mechanism for adding new courses after the first round. Dean Lopes answered in the affirmative; the committee will become a standing committee at CUNY.

Professor Adams noted that in the spring UCASC meetings these courses will likely be fast-tracked, which might mean other courses may be delayed. Kathy Killoran responded that UCASC is essentially up to date with the backlog of courses – there were 50 or so at the start of the semester but we have caught up. Dean Lopes added that she would like to see a lot of courses and more variety going forward, noting that with 13,500 undergrads there can be many courses, and that many of the topics of interest can be adapted.

Next, Dean Lopes made an announcement regarding the guidelines for academic internships UCASC approved at the last meeting. Before it went to College Council, Dean Lopes explained that she withdrew the guidelines because the faculty members who teach the internship courses were not informed and felt they were not consulted. They received some misinformation that upset them and so she withdrew the guidelines and has asked for wider consultation. She has asked the faculty to provide feedback on the guidelines themselves, and asked the chairs and the major coordinators to provide input as well.

Professor Adams asked what went wrong, as the guidelines had gone through two readings, and asked what could be done as everything should have wide consultation. Dean Lopes answered that it seems like a process problem. Dean Lopes said she should more frequently say to UCASC please, please consult with your department. She also added that it may be worth it for UCASC to slow down its process on these standard issues in order to consult very broadly and deeply.

A discussion followed as to the best means of preventing this issue, as it is committee members’ jobs to consult with their departments. Professor Varsanyi asked about an electronic version of
the complete document Dean Lopes said she will resend it, and added that the PPP will be
meeting with this faculty group.

Dean Lopes again stressed the importance of consulting with departments so that this will not
be an issue in the future.

A discussion on a better means of communication followed. Kathy Killoran clarified that she
creates an archive file for each meeting’s materials that usually comes out to about 300 pages.
That file could be shared with members. Dean Lopes said that UCASC is working on a web page,
which could be password protected for members of the committee and will hopefully be easier to
use than Blackboard.

Professor Varsanyi added that it’s a tight timeline with the paper file to get feedback to people.

Approval of the minutes of November 18th, 2011

A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of November 18, 2011.

Page 9, line 11 should read Sandrine Dikambi. Professor Von Lampe was not present. Cathy
Mulder’s name was spelled incorrectly. On page 7, line 138, it should be added that Rizwan Ali
Raja supported having a student member on the Committee on Academic Integrity.

The Committee voted unanimously to approve the minutes with the above
changes with 21 votes in favor.

Old Business

Courses (2nd readings)

ECO 3XX Political Economy of Gender

A motion was made and seconded to approve ECO 3XX Political Economy of
Gender

Professor Mulder reviewed the changes. The name of the course was changed to Political
Economy of Gender, which is the standard title in many universities. The Gender Studies
Committee has approved the course to be a part of their major. Professor Mulder took seriously
comments about including gender and men, and the discrepancy of male and female wages. She
concluded that the course addresses these issues.

There was no discussion.

The committee voted unanimously to approve the course with 22 votes in favor.

PSY 4XX Seminar in Forensic Psychology

A motion was made and seconded to approve PSY 4XX Seminar in Forensic
Psychology
Professor Leippe stated there were no changes. There was no discussion.

*The committee voted unanimously to approve the course with 22 votes in favor.*

**CSL 2XX Case Management in Human Service**

*A motion was made and seconded to approve CSL 2XX Case Management in Human Service*

The discussion of this course was held until next meeting. Professor Adams said he still had some questions.

**DRA 1XX Self, Media and Society**

*A motion was made and seconded to approve DRA 1XX Self, Media and Society*

Professor Davies summarized the changes. A more global sense was added. The wording of the course description was simplified. There were minor changes to the rationale, and a toughening up to the language regarding plagiarism.

*The committee voted unanimously to approve the course with 22 votes in favor.*

**MUS 2XX Music Technology**

*A motion was made and seconded to approve MUS 2XX Music Technology*

Professor Bierman summarized the changes, which included a clarification regarding late assignments and the addition of full citation for the required texts. He also clarified the language on how the assignments are related to the text.

*The committee voted unanimously to approve the course with 22 votes in favor.*

**MUS 3XX Composition through Technology**

*A motion was made and seconded to approve MUSC 3XX Composition through Technology*

Professor Bierman stated there were similar changes to the previous course. He clarified that the course does not require additional instruments. In response to a question of whether all students could afford headphones, Professor Bierman responded that he has a collection of headphones for their use.

*The committee voted unanimously to approve the course with 22 votes in favor.*
Programs (2nd readings)

Proposal to Revise the Minor in African-American Studies

Professor Gordon-Nembhard summarized the changes. All the suggested electives from the previous meeting have been added. An explanation was added to why the Masculinities course was included to the list, and it has been left in as an elective. Also, additional learning outcomes and more requirements have been added to the Honors minor to give it more teeth and to put it at a higher level. Eligibility is the same as before – GPA 3.3 or higher, an introductory course, and 21 credits.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the revision to the Minor in African-American Studies

Professor Lapidus asked how this Honors minor interface with the Honors program in the college. Dean Lopes answered that John Jay College has an Honors program and then some majors usually have honors options that can each be structured differently.

Professor Lapidus next asked for clarification as to how the minor and the minor with honors are different. Dean Lopes answered that what makes it honors is the difficulty, the scaffolding across with these honors level learning outcomes. She also clarified that a student does not need to be a member of the College Honors program to earn honors in a major or minor.

Dean Lopes noted that she would love to see additional opportunities to structure honors-level work like this to retain our highest achieving students; this Minor in Africana Studies addresses that concern. Dean Lopes also noted that she hopes to see 10 percent of students engaging in honors experiences.

The committee voted unanimously to approve the revision with 22 votes in favor.

New Business

POL 2XX Introduction to Research in Politics

Professor Sexton introduced the course. The subcommittee thought it was beautifully written and had some small suggestions.

Professor Adams asked how the ethics of research in political science would be addressed. Professor Sidman responded that he tried to address ethics in required readings, and that every chapter in the text ends with ethical considerations.

Rizwan Ali Raja asked whether POL 409 would change once this course is added, as POL 409 already teaches research skills. Professor Sidman answered that once this course is running, the hope is that POL 409 will be able to spend less time on this issue, as by the time students take their capstone, they’ll be ready.

Rizwan Ali Raja then asked whether the course addresses statistical analysis. The course does not, as this is not a statistics course. It is intended to introduce students to how political scientists approach research and to prepare them to conduct basic research.
Professor Adams asked whether this is robust enough to analyze the Russian election. Professor Sidman answered yes, as the course is designed to show students how to write basic arguments and conduct research.

Dean Lopes added that it is great to scaffold these research skills. Further feedback can be directed to Professor Sidman.

**PSY 2XX Introductory Research Experience in Psychology**
**PSY 3XX Supervised Research Experience in Psychology**
**PSY 4XX Advanced Research Experience in Psychology**

Kathy Killoran introduced the courses. The subcommittee’s feedback focused on explicitly differentiating the three courses and making it more obvious what students will get to do at the 200 level. The 200-level course will have variable credits, and it is proposed as pass/fail. The subcommittee asked the proposers to look at the CITI training and whether it was necessary to duplicate it at the 300 and the 400 levels.

Professor Grose-Fifer noted that these courses will provide students with hands-on experience, working closely with faculty, and with research, which is important for graduate school applications. She clarified the differences between the courses and explained why the 200-level course is pass/fail.

On the 200-level course, Professor Adams asked how this research approach would allow students to engage a person as opposed to a trait or a sub trait. Professor Grose-Fifer answered that the course serves to help students reflect on that experience as well as provide context and to ask how does this fit into what they know about people and behavior and experiences.

Professor Hamilton asked how the differences of other faculty’s syllabi would fit into the scaffolding. Professor Grose-Fifer answered that the department’s faculty will address this as it comes up.

Professor Velazquez-Torres suggested adding a rubric for minimum requirements for passing.

Professor Varsanyi asked whether these courses are intended to be offered by any faculty every semester. Professor Grose-Fifer stated that the department has run the 300 level as experimental, and each semester there will be an instructor of record. The professors will rotate, and it’s unlikely that one faculty member would have an entire class of students.

Rizwan Ali Raja noted similarities between the courses. Professor Grose-Fifer responded that at the 200 level students are not expected to come up with hypotheses, and that at the 300 level is about coming up with an independent research idea.

Professor Grose-Fifer clarified that not everyone will take the 200-level course. For instance, the human subject issues and the ethical issues will have to be addressed in all three courses. The 200-level course allows students to have the experience but not necessarily continue to pursue this.

In regards to student expectations, Kathy Killoran asked what the difference will be between the 2 credit and 3 credit options, as an estimated number of hours is a legal requirement for how many credits students receive.
Dean Lopes added that pass/fail course typically will not transfer.

Professor Grose-Fifer noted that the 200-level course does not count toward the major. Another rationale for having the 200-level course is just to have students exposed into that research without having to invest, and becoming closer to a faculty member. Advising is built in as well. The 400-level course is for students who are thinking of pursuing grad school in psychology.

Further feedback can be directed to Professor Grose-Fifer.

CJBA 2XX (240) Quantitative Inquiry

Kathy Killoran introduced the course, which focuses on an applied approach to criminal justice. The subcommittee has talked with Professor West about aligning the syllabus and the course proposal, which talks more about the context.

Professor West clarified that grad school would accept this course in lieu of statistics. She added that the course does have a strong statistics element and compared it to teaching kids to read as a technique and then later reading to gather information.

Professor Adams asked how one would manage the tension between real world issues and the students’ lack of statistical skills needed to analyze. Professor West responded that the course is attempting to get students to take their innate faith-based understanding and use the data to understand it.

Further feedback can be directed to Professor West.

CJBA 2XX(220) Race, Gender, Ethnicity, Crime & Justice

Kathy Killoran introduced the course. The subcommittee had questions about content with ethnicity.

Professor West said she revised it to address the issue of ethnicity, and clarified that the course is particular to the United States. The course is set at a 200 level so that it informs the rest of the students’ work. She said this course is not meant to be an account of how the world is bad, but how these issues influence many other things.

Further feedback can be directed to Professor West.

HIS 3XX Female Felons in Premodern Europe and the Americas

Professor Sexton introduced the course, which will be an elective for the Global History and Gender Studies majors.

Professor McDougall explained that the course focuses on the Western tradition and what happened when women are accused of crimes throughout history and the response.
Professor Adams asked how the course defines crime. Professor MacDougal answered that she’s following how it’s been defined by the people accusing them in the past. Professor Adams noted the importance of students understanding the distinction of a crime as the Western model defines it and someone’s humanity that is not necessarily a crime.

Professor Corthals noted concerned that there isn’t enough of South Americans, such as the Mayans. Professor McDougall responded that she omitted pre-Columbian history because she followed a very traditional path, working through Mesopotamian.

Professor Adams pointed out that it seems that Professor McDougall would be adept at giving a broader understanding, and asked why she wouldn’t include that. Professor McDougall responded that she didn’t know if it would be fair to call them western and wanted them to be treated on their own terms.

Professor Perez noted that slavery in the North American colonies and in the Caribbean has been left out of the course, as well as the criminalization of inter-racial relationships.

Professor Perez also noted that the course description seems to include the rationale in it, and can be tightened up.

Professor Varsanyi highlighted the title, which presupposes guilt, whereas the course description seems more focused on the process. Professor MacDougal replied that the title was originally Women On Trial, but that was not entirely accurate.

Professor Velazquez-Torres asked for clarification in the learning outcomes. Dean Lopes answered that the learning outcomes are not just what the students will learn but what they will do.

Further feedback can be directed to Professor MacDougal.

AFR 3XX Inequality and Wealth

Kathy Killoran introduced the course, which she said is an ambitious, in-demand and a not-yet-explored subject at John Jay. There are three departments interested in adding it to their majors. The committee recommended making the language more student-friendly in the course description and adjusting the prerequisites so that more students can enroll.

Professor Gordon-Nembhard stated that the course focuses on asset building in the fields of economics and sociology. She added that there is not a lot of research in this area because the data wasn’t broken down by race or gender. The department wants to make sure that it’s a data-driven course, with a policy driven approach.

Professor Lapidus complimented the course and the materials. He suggested leaving the diaspora and extended sense of the world out of the course description as it is not touched upon extensively in the course. Professor Gordon-Nembhard responded that the course does begin talking about the worldwide distribution. She agreed that the course mostly focuses on the United States because that is where most of the progress is being made as far as data. As this course has not been taught yet, she said she wanted to make it generic so the department can add that data when there’s more of it.
Professor Von Lampe asked whether the course might leave out the notion of class completely because you focus on race, ethnicity and gender or if this would be an incomplete picture.

Professor Sexton noted readings that refer to the mortgage crisis but had not seemed to be mentioned as part of the course.

Further feedback can be directed to Professor Gordon-Nembhard.

**HIS 2XX Imperialism in Africa and Asia**

Professor Sexton introduced the course, which was co-developed by Professor Delorenzi from the History Department and Professor Malki from Africana Studies.

Professor Malki noted that this is an appropriate time for this course, given what’s happening in the Middle East and Africa, and added that the History department gives appropriate prerequisites that give the background but don’t give the detail that this course will.

Professor Corthals noted that as the Middle East is not all part of Africa, she suggested that Professor Malki may want to include the Middle East.

Professor Lapidus suggested adding the topic of indentured servants. Professor Velazquez-Torres pointed out that the course description needs revising. Rizwan Ali Raja added that he would love to see this course as offered in partnership with the political science department.

Feedback should be directed to Professor Malki.

**CJBS 4XX Capstone Seminar**

Kathy Killoran introduced the course, which the subcommittee has looked at several times. She said the department articulated a clear vision, and the subcommittee helped them clarify it in the course description and learning outcomes. The subcommittee also asked them to add more description of what the paper will entail in the course.

Dean Lopes added that the capstone courses help students integrate what they’ve learned and that being explicit about that is important.

There was no discussion. Further comments should go toward Professor Strobl.

**Course revisions**

**ENG 233 News Reporting and Writing**

Professor Sexton introduced the course revision, which is to remove Digital Journalism from the course prerequisites. This course is a writing course and not reliant on learning from the digital journalism course.
Professor Sexton moved to waive the second reading. It was seconded. The committee voted to dispense with the second reading with two abstentions.

The committee then voted to approve the revision with 19 votes in favor and 1 abstained.

**PSY 275 Family Conflict and Family Court**

Kathy Killoran introduced the revision, which would raise the course to the 300-level. The subcommittee had a question about the course description and adding a sentence about cultural factors.

Professor Leippe moved to waive the second reading. It was seconded. The committee voted to dispense with the second reading with 18 votes in favor and 1 abstained.

The committee then voted unanimously to approve the revision with 19 votes in favor.

**PSY 442 Key Concepts in Psychotherapy**

Kathy Killoran introduced the revision, which would move the course down from the 400 level because this will not be a capstone. The revision would also change the class standing required for the course.

Dean Lopes added that the department is trying hard to scaffold the program and make sure students are in the right place to take the course.

Professor Perez noted that the course description has gone from smaller to larger.

Professor Leippe moved to waive the second reading. It was seconded. The committee voted to dispense with the second reading with 18 votes in favor and 1 abstained.

The committee voted to approve the revision with 19 votes in favor and 1 abstained.

**Report on the Honors Program**

Dean Lopes updated the committee on the Honors Program. She passed out a document for reference, which showed information on the three cohorts of students. She explained that freshmen receive a $2,000 yearly scholarship and a laptop, and that the sophomores receive a laptop. John Matteson has been the faculty program director and is moving to be the associate director of the Center for Biography at the Graduate Center. He will be replaced by Professor
Patricia Licklider as the interim director, and Professor Dara Byrne will serve as director when she returns from sabbatical leave in the fall. She will serve a three-year term.

Dean Lopes walked the committee through a table that showed some data about the program, as UCASC had asked for a report. The eligibility criterion has been increased by one point, and the program will be growing exponentially. Enrollment is pretty much aligned with the general John Jay population, and there is a large disparity between the freshman entry and the sophomore entry, which resembles more of John Jay’s usual mix of students.

Dean Lopes then moved on to the honors students’ average SAT scores. She noted that for those students who score the highest, it’s a strong predictor of success. However, for those who scored lower it is not an indicator of success in the program.

Dean Lopes addressed concern about science students not doing so well in the Honors program. The first cohort has only retained one science student. There are a variety of reasons: Some left because of the commute, and students change their majors many times as well.

Professor Adams asked how students are informed about the program. Dean Lopes answered that the students get the application and there are rigorous, hands-on advisement opportunities that meet with every student. There’s switching for all students, including honors majors. She added that the program has only been around for a semester and a half and there is very little data.

Dean Lopes continued, citing a comparison is to the old honors program. She was happy to see the overall performance was better, as well as dismissal rates. In the old program we dismissed 32% of the students at the end of the fall term because of their GPAs. In the new program we only dismissed 7.6%, which includes those students who could not have raised their GPA up to 3.3 even with a semester of probation. As there were still concerns about the number that were dismissed, an early warning system was added to ask faculty how students are doing early in the term. It’s very important for our sophomore cohort going forward.

Additionally, Dean Lopes said, there were science students who were self removed. Some moved to other colleges and others in forensic science who wanted to concentrate more on their major and thought the program asked for too much work.

Next, she summarized the information gathered from the focus groups, which were based on 14 people out of the 80 people in the program. The focus groups found that almost all students experienced the program as reasonable or demanding, and only one person thought it was too demanding. There was praise for the honors courses. Most students are looking for more intellectual engagement outside of class time. They enjoy their extracurricular events. The first cohort had a hard time with them. As a response to that, students now sign contracts so they understand why the extracurricular activities are important and designed to do. They like the lounge. They generally like working with other honors students. Almost all would recommend the program. And they’re enjoying the sense of community. Most really enjoy the academic advisement. Suggestions they gave for improvement included that opportunities be announced in advance, and the addition of holding some activities in outer boroughs.

Dean Lopes opened up the floor for additional information to probe for future reports.
Professor Adams asked whether there was a way to do an exit interview to find out why students didn’t make it. Dean Lopes responded that one of the biggest issues was the commute. Many honors students are coming from the suburbs and have 2 to 2.5 hours of commute.

Professor Lapidus stated that he’d like to know more about the nuts and bolts of the honors curriculum, specifically the contract and what is the long-term project.

Dean Lopes answered that there are 3 courses that have been launched experimentally in the year and a half since the program was started. Students have enjoyed the beginning English courses and are into their second semester courses. The faculty developing the courses are Professors Matteson, Burleigh, DiGiovanna, Estevez and Curtis. She said she hopes to see honors courses begin to come through in the spring.

Professor Hamilton requested for further reports to have geographical distribution, adding that some city commutes can be 1.5 hour subway rides.

Professor Lapidus asked whether portfolio work was a required piece of this program. Dean Lopes answered that it is not at this time.

Professor Perez asked why the sophomore cohort was more diverse but also more successful. Dean Lopes answered that that group did not meet the SAT or GPA requirements as freshmen or they did not apply.

Professor Hamilton noted that some groups might not know the benefits of applying to the honors program. He complimented the program on a good job of letting them know once they’re here.

Rizwan Ali Raja asked why there is not entry in the junior year. Dean Lopes answered that that is the next phase of the program.

Dean Lopes concluded that she is very interested to see how the sophomore cohort will do, and that she hopes to report regularly to UCASC.

Programs Subcommittee

Proposal to Close the BS in Correctional Studies

Professor Baatz read the proposal, which cites a 2002 self study conducted by the department, a May 2002 external evaluation conducted by site visitors, a 2005 Blue Ribbon panel established by President Travis and a 2007 report on the major conducted by Martin Horn and Lior Gideon.

Provost Bowers spoke next, addressing her reasons for bringing this proposal before UCASC. These reasons include an concern with the quality of the major as it exists and it has not been satisfactorily revised; curriculum inadequacies; very low enrollment (only one degree was awarded last year); and unresponsiveness to her requests to overhaul the program. She also noted that she does not believe the major serves students well in pursuing future careers.

The Provost continued, saying that she commissioned the final report from Marty Horn and Lior Gideon, to help her determine whether the major is necessary in order to prepare students for
work in this area, and to report in their opinions on what it would take to make this major truly functional for John Jay students. The Provost added that she was convinced by this report that John Jay students don’t in fact need the major to have a career in corrections.

Provost Bowers clarified that current students who are enrolled in this major would have it until such time that they graduate, and that this would not affect faculty who teach these courses because the courses are part of other majors. She also noted that many corrections courses are full because students take them to fulfill requirements for their other majors (i.e. criminal justice) and that the minor in Corrections will stay. Faculty will still be able to submit proposals for corrections courses.

Provost Bowers next addressed the question of whether she has the authority to close this major. She referred to CUNY documents in which it is clear that the primary authority over curriculum is the faculty’s but which gives the ultimate authority to close a program to the President in consultation with the faculty of the college. By bringing this proposal to UCASC, Provost Bowers said, she is consulting with the faculty. She has also discussed the matter with the Council of Chairs. But ultimately, she added, the President can make such a decision regardless of what is decided here.

Rizwan Ali Raja asked whether the 38 students currently enrolled in the Corrections major are getting the message that their major is not worthwhile. Provost Bowers responded that that is not the idea, it’s the reality. She agreed that it’s tricky to send this message to students in this major, but this is what is in the best interest of the students.

Professor Hamilton noted that President Travis has research interests in the area and asked where he stands on the issue. Provost Bowers responded that she consulted with the President and that he is supportive of her decision.

Professor Hamilton asked why the decision has been made to move this direction with the Corrections major, as opposed to what was done with the Security major, where the decision was made to recruit senior faculty and devote resources. Provost Bowers answered that as a field of study, Corrections is covered in currently existing majors, and this is not the case with the major in Security. She continued saying that the Security major is worth it because the courses in that field of study are not found anywhere else in the college.

Next, Professor Benton read his rebuttal, which details the reasons he is deeply opposed to the proposal to close the Corrections major. On the issue of academic governance, Professor Benton stressed that just because it is possible to eliminate a major does not mean it should be done. He also added that Professor Gideon is not in favor of terminating the major and that there is a separate proposal that has not been shared with the committee. He likened closing the major to academic corporal punishment. Professor Benton continued, noting that the Provost cites the study she asked them to do but has not shared the study with the committee.

Professor Benton next explained his concerns regarding curriculum design for John Jay and its focus on criminal justice as the college’s core focus of its identity. He stated that if there’s one college that should be offering a BA in Corrections, it is John Jay. He added that he believes the BA in Corrections is essential to the field and is where criminal justice has the most profound effect and that while the major may not be as vibrant as it should be, the field is exciting and the issues are important.
Finally, Professor Benton summed up his issues with the proposal by stating that first, the frustrations with the leadership in the department are fundamentally relevant, but that is a reason for change, not a reason to eliminate the major. Second, that while a person does not need a degree in Corrections to get an entry level job in the field, none of the majors are explicitly designed to lead you to a job, but are rather a fascinating area of study that is part of a baccalaureate education. And third, that the financial arguments presented are not clearly stated and asked for specifics on how much money will be saved.

He concluded with a suggestion to consider the alternative proposal in the study, and stated that he will be embarrassed for the college if this major is eliminated.

Professor Corthals asked Professor Benton to clarify a statement in his document, which says that the reason that few students pick the major is that there are few courses offered. She asked why these courses haven’t been offered if they are essential courses. Professor Benton responded that it is not his department, but it is a question of what to do, not what has been done.

Professor Perez confirmed that this is a first reading and there will be no vote today.

Provost Bowers responded to points made in Professor Benton’s rebuttal. She clarified that there are and have been no proposals to revise the major, and that she will share the report that was done for her with the committee. She reiterated that the report found that it would take an entirely new curriculum to bring the program up to date. She posed the question of who is going to do this work. And finally, in reference to the financial burden, many new faculty with different expertise would need to be hired.

Professor Haberfeld stated that the position of the Department of Law, Police Science and Criminal Justice Administration is against closing the Corrections major. She detailed the attempts made over the past few years to revise the major, and agreed that those attempts made previously were not sufficient. However, she said, today the department has 5 full-time faculty with the expertise, the will and the structure needed to revise the major, and added that if she is re-elected as chair, she will give her full attention to fully revising it, noting that it could take two years. She noted that John Jay is the premier institution in this field and that the worst thing would be to close the major.

Professor Gideon added that he had been at John Jay for one semester when he was asked to begin working on the revision of the major, and at the time he did not have the expertise that they have now in terms of the proposal. He agreed that the major does need to change, including a new name and new courses for a Corrections major that leads to a BA/MA. He added that there is a lot of interest in Corrections, and that eliminating the major would be a mistake.

Professor Hamilton asked what would happen to the students in the corrections classes if the corrections track were eliminated. Kathy Killoran clarified that there is no corrections track in the criminal justice BS major, but rather a distribution where students take 9 credits of courses, one each in Corrections, Policing and Law/Courts.

Vice President Saulnier pointed out that the growth in Corrections enrollment almost parallels the college’s increase in criminal justice majors. Professor Pease followed up on that statement, asking why there is a pressing need for a major and not just a selection of great courses.
Professor Benton stated that as a field, corrections has evolved where there are more and more professional requirements involved in getting and maintaining performance objectives, the entire field is now heavily driven by performance matrices.

Provost Bowers then announced she would send out the report for the committee to read. It will be distributed by e-mail.

Professor Haberfeld concluded by stating that John Jay is an academic institution, and our goal is to have a requirement to have a degree in policing to be a police officer. We feel the same way about corrections. We have an obligation to move with the profession forward. The message would be to the profession.

Professor Gideon added that he is getting emails and calls from other colleges asking how John Jay’s program might be replicated. He reiterated that it would be a horrible mistake to be a college with an interesting corrections major and to kill it.

Dean Lopes wrapped up the discussion. She stated the enrollments are disturbing, and that all majors should be strong and totally up to date. Every student should be in a major here that is at the cutting edge of the field so that our students are the absolute best prepared. She stated that though the college may close a major that is not working, it does not mean that the discipline or area of study is not valid or valued. We can go forward with the idea of creating a new revitalized major. So allowing students to register for this program in its current state is problematical. She asked that committee members think about this over the break.

Dean Lopes thanked everyone who attended today. A motion was made and seconded to adjourn. It was unanimously acclaimed. The meeting concluded at 1:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Gabrielle Compton, Scribe
Katherine Killoran, Executive Academic Director, Undergraduate Studies
1. Administrative Announcements – Dean Lopes

2. Approval of the minutes of December 9th, 2011

3. Old Business

Courses (2nd readings)
- HIS 3XX Imperialism in Africa and Asia
- POL 2XX Introduction to Research in Politics – no change
- CJBS 4XX Capstone Seminar
- CJBA 2XX (240) Quantitative Inquiry
- CJBA 2XX(220) Race, Gender, Ethnicity, Crime & Justice
- AFR 3XX Inequality and Wealth
- HIS 3XX Female Felons in Premodern Europe and the Americas
- CSL 2XX Case Management in Human Service (3rd reading)
- PSY 2XX Introductory Undergraduate Research in Psychology
- PSY 3XX Supervised Undergraduate Research in Psychology
- PSY 4XX Advanced Undergraduate Research in Psychology

Course revisions (2nd reading)
- PSY 228 Psychology and Women (1st reading at Sept 2011 mtg)

Academic Standards
- Academic Integrity Committee Proposal (3rd reading)

Programs (2nd readings)
- Report on Proposal to Close the BS in Correctional Studies (no document)
  – Dean Lopes

4. New Business

Program Review Subcommittee
- Self Study of the BA in International Criminal Justice

Courses Subcommittee
- POL 2XX Media and Politics
- Course revision: POL 214 Political Parties and Pressure Groups
- Course revision: SOC 222 Sociology of Mass Communication

Academic Standards Subcommittee
- Proposal to Revise the Grade Appeal Process
General Education Process – Dean Lopes

Attachments:
Agenda for January 27, 2011
Minutes of December 9, 2011
Academic Integrity Committee Proposal
Proposal to Revise the Grade Appeal Process
Self Study of the BA in International Criminal Justice

New Courses:
HIS 3XX Imperialism in Africa and Asia
POL 2XX Introduction to Research in Politics – no change
CJBS 4XX Capstone Seminar
CJBA 2XX (240) Quantitative Inquiry
CJBA 2XX(220) Race, Gender, Ethnicity, Crime & Justice
AFR 3XX Inequality and Wealth
HIS 3XX Female Felons in Premodern Europe and the Americas
CSL 2XX Case Management in Human Service (3rd reading)
PSY 2XX Introductory Undergraduate Research in Psychology
PSY 3XX Supervised Undergraduate Research in Psychology
PSY 4XX Advanced Undergraduate Research in Psychology
POL 2XX Media and Politics

Course revisions:
PSY 228 Psychology and Women
POL 214 Political Parties and Pressure Groups
SOC 222 Sociology of Mass Communication
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Initials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anne</td>
<td>Lopes</td>
<td>Dean, Undergraduate Studies</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Saulnier</td>
<td>VP, Enrollment Management</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Jama</td>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>African-American Studies</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>Snajdr</td>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>Lapidus</td>
<td>Art and Music</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dana</td>
<td>Tarantino</td>
<td>Communication &amp; Theater Arts</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berenicea J.</td>
<td>Eanes</td>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hung-En</td>
<td>Sung</td>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allison</td>
<td>Pease</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silvia</td>
<td>Dapia</td>
<td>Foreign Languages &amp; Literatures</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Larkin</td>
<td>Health &amp; Physical Education</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon</td>
<td>Baatz</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Ann</td>
<td>McClure</td>
<td>Interdisciplinary Studies</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen</td>
<td>Sexton</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisandro</td>
<td>Perez</td>
<td>Latin American and Latina/o Studies</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klaus</td>
<td>Von Lampe</td>
<td>Law, Police Science &amp; CJA</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Puls</td>
<td>Mathematics and Computer Science</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyoo</td>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monica</td>
<td>Varsanyi</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenn</td>
<td>Corbett</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Leippe</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy-Lynne</td>
<td>Peters</td>
<td>Public Management</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angelique</td>
<td>Cortals</td>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Velazquez-Torres</td>
<td>SEEK</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Ocejo</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy</td>
<td>Killoran</td>
<td>Undergraduate Studies</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Hammond</td>
<td>Scribe</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ervin</td>
<td>Balezon</td>
<td>Student Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## CURRICULUM COMMITTEE
January 27, 2012

**ATTENDANCE**
Quorum = 16 Voting Members

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Moreno</td>
<td>Academic Assessment</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan</td>
<td>Cunningham</td>
<td>Student Member</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rizwan</td>
<td>Ali Raja</td>
<td>Student Member</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Guests:**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cheuk</td>
<td>Lee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Kaplowitz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vielka</td>
<td>Holness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>DeLorenzi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Romaniuk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valerie</td>
<td>West</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica</td>
<td>Gordon-Nembhard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela</td>
<td>Crossman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>McDougall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Sidman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Arbor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee held its meeting on Friday, January 27, 2011 at 9:30 in Room 610T. Dean Anne Lopes, UCASC Chair, called the meeting to order.


Absent: Ryan Cunningham, Silvia Dapia, Susan Larkin, Mary Ann McClure, Lisandro Perez, Rizwan Alı Raja, Dana Tarantino.


Administrative Announcements

Dean Anne Lopes convened the meeting with an announcement about the upcoming Justice Academy Summit. President Travis has set up a summit with partner campuses to review how the Academy functions at this early stage in the collaboration with the community colleges. She also spoke of the rearticulation of the criminal justice partnerships with the new BS program that will be coming before UCASC in the coming months.

She reminded the group that some time is set at the end of the meeting to discuss Pathways and how CUNY's new mandates will affect John Jay's new General Education curriculum.

She announced that John Jay has hired a new study abroad/international programs person named Maureen Brady Coyle, who will start on February 27. Professor Jama Adams asked if the new position would receive funding to help students, given that most John Jay students cannot afford the regular costs of study abroad trips. Dean Lopes said that the new hire will be working with development as soon as Jane Rosengarten, the new Vice President for Development, is in place. Rosengarten comes to John Jay from Hunter College.

Last of Dean Lopes' announcements was assessment of minors, which Associate Provost Jim Llana has reached out to chairs about recently. With Middle States on the horizon, inactive or ineffective minors need to be scrutinized now, and Dean Lopes encouraged the UCASC members to speak to their chairs about ensuring that the necessary thought is put into the assessment of minors.
Professor Adams asked for an update on advisement. Dean Lopes said there are advisors in place for first year and transfer students as well as students with academic difficulty. Otherwise, students within majors are the responsibility of the departments. She acknowledged the degree of difficulty this places on departments and chairs. Professor Monica Varsanyi asked who is responsible for students who need to do a graduation degree audit, and Dean Lopes and Vice President Richard Saulnier explained that a student applies for graduation and the Registrar does the degree audit and notifies students of anything they may be missing. It is mostly done by technology on DegreeWorks, but there are some professional advisors helping. Dean Lopes again acknowledged that John Jay needs better advisement tools, but until those are in place, priority has been placed on freshmen and transfers.

Approval of the minutes of December 9, 2011

A number of typos were noted, but the only substantive error was the date, which should have read “December 9, 2011.”

A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of December 9, 2011 with typographical errors corrected.

The minutes of December 9th, 2011 were approved unanimously with 21 votes in favor.

Old Business

Courses

HIS 3XX Imperialism in Africa and Asia

Professor James Delorenzi, the co-proposer of the course summarized changes made, including a title change to “Imperialism in Africa, South Asia, and the Middle East” and updated learning outcomes to add objectives. Dean Lopes said that the syllabus shouldn’t have both outcomes and objectives, and the new syllabus guidelines only ask for outcomes. Kathy Killoran said this has to do with course proposal forms, and she would work with the department on the details here. Professor Nancy Velazquez-Torres felt the course description was a bit long on the syllabus. Dean Lopes said that it benefits a course to have a succinct description because if it is too long for the catalogues and databases, someone unfamiliar with the course may wind up with the task of editing it. Professor Adams pointed out that a succinct description leaves room for a student to project their idea of the course, and asked if there could be a compromise that would allow for appropriate student expectations. Dean Lopes felt that the outcomes would lay out the expectations for students, but Professor Adams said that by the time the students see the outcomes, they are already in the class. Dean Lopes said it is tricky, but the issue here is to write very clear descriptions.

Professor Ben Lapidus asked about the thinking behind the lack of discussion of slavery in the syllabus. Professor Delorenzi explained the thinking behind the day to day breakdown, noting that the first four sessions must set up a historical foundation for the rest of the semester.
A motion was made and seconded to approve the new course, HIS 3XX, Imperialism in Africa, South Asia, and the Middle East. It was unanimously approved with 21 votes in favor.

POL 2XX Introduction to Research in Politics

A motion was made and seconded to approve the new course, POL 2XX Introduction to Research in Politics.

Professor Andrew Sidman was present to speak for the course. There were no revisions, and so there was no discussion.

POL 2XX Introduction to Research in Politics was unanimously approved with 21 votes in favor.

CJBS 4XX Capstone Seminar

Professor Klaus Von Lampe was present to explain the adjustments to the proposal since the first reading. The course description was edited and the rationale changed. The course will focus on issues that are present in one seminal work. Dean Lopes said this is an unusual kind of capstone, given that major works usually come up at the 3xx level, not the 4xx level, which is generally for synthesis.

Professor Jama Adams added to that point, noting that the earlier courses in this major are very demanding and there have been questions about the rigor of what's expected at the 1xx level. He found it odd that the entry to the major is extremely hard, but then in the capstone they're still introducing material. He asked if the major is trying to do too much.

Professor Von Lampe answered these concerns by pointing out that the students will be exposed to these seminal works earlier, but the capstone course is a tool to go in depth. He also said that the seminal work is only one part of the course. The students' two main assignments are to work with the topic addressed by the seminar and to work with a controversial issue. He explained that students are not ready for complete books until the 400-level. Dean Lopes said that the department may want to look at the general scaffolding of the courses as assessment takes place.

As to the issue of the complexity of the literature, Professor Adams suggested the department consult with other departments like English, Philosophy, or Gender Studies, all of whom read complex works and also have more traditional capstones. He felt that the department's concern over unprepared students is unjustified, given that a third of students over the whole college population cannot do the work at the level any department would like, and it is the burden of those students to pass or fail the course.

Professor Velazquez-Torres asked why there is so little learning application in the learning outcomes. Dean Lopes concurred, saying that terms like “describe” and “identify” are for the 100 and 200-levels.

Professor Adams raised the point again about being wary of arranging course scaffolding
around the least prepared students, because John Jay already has a history of seeing the
bright students transfer out. Dean Lopes agreed that high-performing undergraduates tend to
leave and creating sufficient community for them is problematic. One way to address the
problem is to create more rigorous standards, which is why a course like this is a cause for
concern. Professor Von Lampe said that theory is introduced in earlier courses. Dean Lopes
remained concerned about the introduction of the seminal work so late in the degree.
Professor Von Lampe felt that there is a need to reemphasize the basic structure of the subject
matter at the 400-level, as basic understanding gets lost over the course of the program. Dean
Lopes said that rigor remains an enormous concern at the college and on the PPP committee,
and she recommended tweaks to the syllabus that would make clear that it is a worthy 400-
level course. Professor Von Lampe said that tweaks had already been made for every meeting.
Dean Lopes strongly recommended the tweaks, noting that really it's a linguistic change she's
asking for and Virginia Moreno could help the department.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the new course, CJBS 4XX Capstone Seminar. CJBS 4XX Capstone Seminar was NOT approved, with 4 votes in favor, 18 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

Since the course did not pass, Dean Lopes said that Professor Von Lampe could consult with Virginia Moreno or herself about how to work on the proposal.

CJBA 2XX (240) Race, Gender, Ethnicity, Crime & Justice

Professor West had not yet arrived, so this course was held until later in the meeting.

AFR 3XX Inequality and Wealth

Professor Jessica Gordon-Nembhard explained changes to content in the syllabus that
addressed wealth, class, and Latino issues.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the course, AFR 3XX Inequality and Wealth.

Kathy Killoran noted that she has not yet received a response from the Sociology department
about this course, so for the moment, it will not be listed as part of the Sociology minor.

AFR 3XX Inequality and Wealth was approved unanimously with 22 votes in favor.

HIS 3XX Female Felons in Premodern Europe and the Americas

Professor Sarah McDougall began her presentation of the course by addressing a concern
from the last meeting about the inclusion of non-European women in the course. After
considering the suggestion, Professor McDougall felt this subject matter would come up in
discussion, but that the topic would be best handled in its own course.
A motion was made and seconded to approve the course, HIS 3XX Female Felons in Premodern Europe and the Americas.

Professor Varsanyi pointed out a typo in the course description - “gender students” should be “gender studies.”

Professor Adams raised his concern about diversity in the course content, noting that the terminology “non-European” and “non-American” as a reason of exclusion of certain cultures is confusing, given that the Americas have often been populated by many ethnic groups.

Professor McDougall explained various ways in which the course does cover a breadth of humanity, and explained that her rationale for organizing the content was to focus on which women and which offenses rather than determining content by region, and she asked what he thought she might have left out.

Professor Adams responded that the content is up to her discretion, as the historian, but to his eyes, it looked like the “ethnic groups” in consideration were “white ethnic groups” like Ancient Greece, Ancient Rome, and so forth, which gives the incorrect message that other ethnic groups did not exist in the timeline set forth by the course. Dean Lopes clarified this point that the issue is the relationship between the title and the content. The title implies that one would have more non-white sources, and since they are not in the course, there might be a statement addressing that. Professor Nancy Velazquez-Torres echoed Professor Adams’ concerns for the coverage of Latin America.

Professor Ben Lapidus pointed out examples in the course plan where it looked like non-white groups are addressed substantially, not as footnotes.

HIS 3XX Female Felons in Premodern Europe and the Americas was approved unanimously with 22 votes in favor.

CSL 2XX Case Management in Human Services (3rd Reading)

Vice President Johnson-Eanes introduced the course, noting that this was actually the second reading, since she was not able to be present during the scheduled second reading. The learning outcomes were tweaked in response to feedback. Kathy Killoran added that there had been concern about students having emotional reactions to the material, so language has been added to address that possibility.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the course CSL 2XX Case Management in Human Services.

There was no discussion.

CSL 2XX Case Management in Human Services was approved unanimously with 19 votes in favor.

PSY 2XX Introductory Undergraduate Research in Psychology

Professor Angela Crossman introduced the course, noting that the number of hours has been
specified and differentiated between the two and three credit options.

A motion was made and seconded to approve PSY 2XX Introductory Undergraduate Research in Psychology.

There was no discussion.

PSY 2XX Introductory Undergraduate Research in Psychology was approved unanimously with 20 votes in favor.

PSY 3XX Supervised Undergraduate Research in Psychology
PSY 4XX Advanced Undergraduate Research in Psychology

A motion was made and seconded to jointly accept PSY 3XX and PSY 4XX.

Professor Ellen Sexton asked for a clarification as to the breakdown of the courses. Professor Crossman explained that the introductory course does not count towards the major, and is meant to be an opportunity to figure out what research is in a very low-stakes way. There are still quite a few content courses that they would have to take toward the major later.

The motion to jointly accept both PSY 3XX and PSY 4XX was approved unanimously with 21 votes in favor.

A motion was made and seconded to approve PSY 3XX Supervised Undergraduate Research in Psychology and PSY 4XX Advanced Undergraduate Research in Psychology.

There was no discussion.

PSY 3XX Supervised Undergraduate Research in Psychology and PSY 4XX Advanced Undergraduate Research in Psychology were unanimously approved with 21 votes in favor.

Course Revisions (2nd Reading)

PSY 228 Psychology and Women (1st Reading at Sept 2011 mtg)

Professor Crossman noted the change in the prerequisites and the addition of an option of one or two methods courses. In the first reading, the issue was the prerequisites, and why PSY 101 is not a required course. Given that every professor who taught this at a 2xx level said that students struggle without PSY 101, the department is concerned that it would handicap the students to go without PSY 101. Nonetheless, Psychology did in good faith discuss the option with other departments, and has now adjusted the prerequisite to read “PSY 101 or instructor permission.”

A motion was made and seconded to approve PSY 228 Psychology and Women.

PSY 228 Psychology and Women was unanimously approved with 21 votes in
favor.

Academic Standards

Academic Integrity Committee Proposal (3rd Reading)

Professor Karen Kaplowitz recapped this proposal's journey. At the last discussion, the
question to add a student was raised, and the proposal did not pass. The proposers have
added language to the proposal that would add a student to the committee with two
requirements: first, that the student must have had 60 credits if an undergraduate or half of
the degree credits if a graduate student; secondly, that the student must have no record of any
disciplinary action and no disciplinary action pending. Whereas the term of office for the
faculty is two years, the term for student is one year. The committee shall elect a chair from
among its faculty members. Just as faculty members will be nominated by senate, the student
member will be nominated by student council. The student shall receive training by legal
office, including the necessity for absolute confidentiality, which was one of the concerns
about including a student.

Professor Kaplowitz added that she will be bringing another item to UCASC soon regarding
academic integrity rules in general.

Currently, there is no policy now for how many days a faculty member has to bring a
complaint against a student, or how long the student has to respond. Language has been
added to the proposal to answer UCASC's questions about when the academic integrity
committee functions, and when it's the university by-law proscribed, student-faculty
discipline committee. If a faculty member says that a student has committed plagiarism,
cheating, stealing, forgery, and the student says "no I did not," the academic integrity
committee decides whether the student did or did not, except under certain conditions under
which this goes to the student-faculty discipline committee.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the Academic Integrity
Committee Proposal.

Professor Adams asked if the 60 credit requirement was reasonable and asked how many
John Jay students are transfers who would be excluded by that rule. Professor Kaplowitz said
that 50% of John Jay students are transfers, but that leaves thousands of students who are
eligible. Professor Adams wondered why there is not a similar rule for faculty, and Professor
Kaplowitz said that faculty must be tenured. Professor Adams also asked why faculty are not
held to the same standard as students in regards to the clean record rule. Professor Kaplowitz
clarified that the rule does not exclude all students who have been brought up on charges, only
those who have been found guilty. Then the question arose whether the college has access to
those sorts of records for faculty, given that they would be confidential personnel files. The
Registrar would certify students' clean records, but checking faculty records may not be
possible. Professor Adams said that student records are also confidential, and Vice President
Saulnier confirmed. Professor Adams was concerned about the implication in the new set of
rules that students are suspect and faculty are not.
The Academic Integrity Proposal was approved with 17 votes in favor, 1 opposed, and 2 abstentions.

Dean Lopes summarized that the proposal has been approved and will now move on to College Council.

Programs (2nd Readings)

Report on Proposal to Close the BS in Correctional Studies (no document)

Dean Lopes recapped the first reading. The proposal was brought forth by the Provost and caused lengthy discussion. After the last meeting, Professor Maki Haberfeld, Dean Lopes, and Provost Bowers had a conversation and agreed to suspend admission to the major rather than close it entirely until the major can be revised. All parties were satisfied with the compromise. Professor Adams asked if there is a timeline on the resolution, and Dean Lopes said there isn’t one yet but that could be considered.

After a break, the itinerary was adjusted to revisit the Quantitative Problems in Criminal Justice Course, now that Professor West was present.

CJBA 240 Quantitative Inquiry

A motion was made and seconded to approve CJBA 240 Quantitative Inquiry.

Professor West introduced the course, explaining that it uses the foundation of STA 250, but asks students to use those tools on actual issues in criminal justice. The goal is to ground statistics in problem solving.

Professor Adams asked how ethical practice is addressed as students learn about the manipulation of data. Professor West answered that this is a fundamental question of the course, as there is no such thing as impartial data.

CJBA 240 Quantitative Inquiry was unanimously approved with 19 votes in favor.

Dean Lopes commended the course for providing an effective, problem-based alternative to STA 250.

CJBA 220 Race, Gender, Ethnicity, Crime, and Justice

Professor West reported no changes.

A motion was made and seconded to approve CJBA 220 Race, Gender, Ethnicity, Crime, and Justice.

There was no discussion.
CJBA 220 Race, Gender, Ethnicity, Crime, and Justice was unanimously approved with 19 votes in favor.

New Business

Program Review Subcommittee

Self Study of the BA in International Criminal Justice

Professor Velazquez-Torres spoke for the subcommittee, which thought the document was thorough and forthright. The subcommittee noted the number of students attracted to the major, reviewed the numerous recommendations from outside evaluators, noting that many of these had been addressed. The subcommittee had noted a weakness, that the department already addressed by adding prerequisites. The subcommittee did think for an International program, the foreign language requirements should be higher. Overall the subcommittee asked the department to be more analytic in the document, and they were very responsive to that feedback.

Professor Peter Romaniuk, present coordinator of the International Criminal Justice BA, explained that when the major was founded, there were no other International Criminal Justice programs in the US, and that remains the case today. The major has already been through the UCASC proposal process, and has benefited from revisions in 2001, 2004, and 2007. At the moment, there is an outcomes assessment plan attached; no changes to the major are planned until the results of that study are apparent. After the external reviewers visit, the International Criminal Justice faculty would like to have a retreat to study the outcomes assessment and external evaluation.

Professor Adams asked if the language on the section about internships could be tweaked to reflect the possibility of international experiences within New York City. He also asked how ethical issues can be integrated into all courses and course outcomes.

In regards to internships, Professor Romaniuk directed the committee to pages 9-11, which address what previous external evaluators have recommended and how John Jay has chosen to address those suggestions, considering what is actually feasible with this student body. The internship is not required for all students, but there is an International Criminal Justice class set up to facilitate internships and identify opportunities, or help students initiate and create opportunities themselves.

Professor Adams asked that the word “international” be tracked specifically for internal purposes. He also asked why analytical skills are not a requirement of the ICJ 101 learning outcomes. Professor Romaniuk said that course is based on a textbook, and is about integrating descriptive knowledge. Professor Adams said that 101, by definition, should involve some analytical thinking. Dean Lopes said that the curriculum could be more rigorous in its scaffolding of skills across the curriculum.

Professor Adams asked about the multiple choice test as an assessment tool. Professor Romaniuk explained that this is an assessment tool to study the program’s effect rather than to grade students. Dean Lopes said that using one test across sections gives the major a
chance to get a broad sample. Professor Von Lampe said that students come to ICJ 101 with very little preexisting knowledge, so the amount of descriptive learning is necessary, but that there is analytical work incorporated into the final paper. Virginia Moreno added that the multiple choice test is there to assess the course, not the students.

Vielka Holness had a question about contradictory information in the statistics about trajectories of graduates of the program. Dean Lopes noted that the particular statistics were for different years. Professor Romaniuk said the language could be clarified, but the main point of the statistics was that the number of students who go onto graduate school is extremely small. Professor Holness said that she noticed the number because she is personally aware of many more that might be added to this number, and is concerned with such low reporting, which makes her question the survey. Professor Romaniuk said the table is required by the self-assessment instrument, and everybody wishes there was more data to include. Dean Lopes said that in the future, the college will go to the National Clearinghouse to collect this information.

Courses Subcommittee

POL 2XX Media and Politics

Professor Sexton introduced this course, proposed as an elective in Political Science major and the Journalism minor.

Professor Brian Arbour presented the course, noting that media and politics is lacking in the department's current offerings. Professor Adams asked if new media and ethnic media would be integrated. Professor Arbour said a great deal of focus is given to new media, but ethnic media is addressed more tangentially through the broad umbrella of specialized media. Professor Adams felt this was problematic, since a huge population gets its information from non-mainstream sources that aren't covered in the course. He was also concerned that the course is too focused on the American relationship with the media. Professor Arbour said this had been discussed in the department. The proposal has been put forward this way because Professor Arbour’s focus is American, but he did not want to limit the course's scope for future professors. Professor Adams warned that the course description is for life, so if it is going to be an international course at some point, it can't be taught early on as a purely American course.

Professor Varsanyi contributed from the departmental point of view. The issue of flexibility of scope had been discussed, and the department felt that this proposal accurately reflects what you would want in a new course. If anything, it reflects democracies in media, not American politics specifically. Professor Adams noted that the discrepancy is in the difference between the course description, which is unlimited, and the rest of the package, which skews American. Kathy Killoran added that the course description should be worded in third person, “the course will.”

Professor Lapidus asked if keeping articles on blackboard is in line with fair use copyright laws if they're not on e-reserve. Professor Sexton explained the library's policy on copyright is that the copyright issues on e-reserve are the same as on blackboard. It is the responsibility of the faculty to make sure that they comply with copyright law. On blackboard, the articles cannot be open to the entire world, but restricted to the students in that class.
Course revision: POL 214 Political Parties and Pressure Groups

Professor Sexton introduced this revision to an existing course with a new title. Professor Arbour represented the course. Professor Adams complimented the language regarding interest groups, which deliberately left off the common term “special.” Professor Arbour explained that he doesn’t like the working definition of “special interest groups,” and the choice here was to help people think about this from a citizen standpoint.

A motion was made and seconded to dispense with the second reading of POL 214. It was approved with 16 votes in favor and 1 opposed.

A motion was made and seconded to approve POL 214 Political Parties and Pressure Groups. It was approved with 16 votes in favor and 1 opposed.

Course revision: SOC 222 Sociology of Mass Communication

Professor Sexton introduced this course with a new description and title. The presenting Professor was not present, but Professor Richard Ocejo was present to take feedback. There was little discussion, and the question was raised about whether the second reading could be suspended, but consensus was that the presenting professor must be present before a vote can take place.

Academic Standards Subcommittee

Proposal to Revise the Grade Appeal Process

Karen Kaplowitz presented the proposal, summarizing the details of the document, which would speed up the grade appeal process and provide sure deadlines for students and professors in order to ensure fairer treatment. The proposal would add a college-wide grade appeals committee, but keep the first step of the process in the department. If the dept fails to act within thirty-five calendar days, then the appeal goes to a college-wide grade appeals committee. Students would have their verdict right away. Faculty would know it’s a discreet amount of time and will not be popping up throughout the year.

Professor Angelique Corthals asked how this item relates to last year’s policy that professors cannot change grades. Professor Kaplowitz said this is separate, because there must be a channel for students to appeal grades.

Professor Judy Lynn Peters had a logistical question about the part of the proposal that says a proposal that is not acted on by the department would automatically be sent to the college-wide committee. If the department hasn’t acted, who would have access to forward the appeal? Professor Kaplowitz answered that the registrar oversees the process, and will ensure the timeline is met. This raised concerns that ten days is an extremely short timeline for the registrar during registration period that’s already very busy. Dean Lopes concurred, adding that some professors get grades in late, regardless of deadlines, so that would affect students' ability to appeal under this framework.

Professor Adams commended the spirit of the proposal, because a year is too long, but asked
that practical timeline issues be considered in light of undergraduate students’ adjustment to
college responsibilities at the beginning of the semester. He suggested a thirty-day window.
He also had a strong objection to restricting the department’s response window, considering
the amount of meetings departments must set up and attend with the beginning of each
semester, and many appeals may be more complicated than can be addressed in a thirty day
window. Forty-five days is not realistic for the department. Dean Lopes disagreed, saying that
forty-five days is the best practice to resolve it by the end of term. Professor Adams felt that
sixty days would be a fair window for the department.

In defense of the proposal’s consideration of departments’ busy schedules, Professor Jay
Hamilton noted what Karen Kaplowitz had said about departments’ ability to pre-schedule
meetings around these deadlines. He felt that making a department is aware of its routine
obligations ahead of time allows the department to maneuver around the crowded timeline.

Professor Hamilton also wondered if this multi-step process implicitly gives departments the
option to “punt” the decision. He wondered what the ramifications of that might be, whether
good or bad. And if the college does think this practice is acceptable, perhaps it would be
possible to let departments immediately send appeals to the college-wide committee, rather
than making students wait.

Professor Von Lampe suggested adding the option of departments to declare a fifteen day
extension if they are unable to come to a decision within thirty days, so that if schedules do
not permit the department to act, they can indicate that they do still intend to act.

Dean Lopes closed discussion of the timeline here, noting that the subcommittee has heard
the main point, which is that more flexibility is needed and the timeline needs more scrutiny.

Vice President Saulnier explained the reality of the issue of appeals that has created the need
for this proposal. There are some really good departmental grade appeals committees, and
then there are some that rarely meet, whether appeals come in or not. So the timeline is not
the issue at stake, the issue is how to bring the rest of the departments into some reasonable
time frame. It is key for students to have appeals resolved by the time they’re getting ready to
register for the next semester. With the double committee, the chance that the student will get
the appeal resolved before the next semester is better. He noted that the registrar is not
mentioned in the proposal, but the clock starts when the registrar gets the material to the
department.

Kathy Killoran echoed Vice President Saulnier’s sentiment that this has been an issue, and
fairness to students is central. She added that forms have been developed to guide students in
the dismissal appeal process and the same should be done with grade appeals. Currently, the
students have no information or guidance in preparing their appeals. According to this policy,
students will have to hand in a packet with their rationale and evidence. Guidelines will help
give students the message that they need to save their work, but it does mean that time must
be factored in for the student to put that package together.

Professor Adams worried that requiring the professor to respond to the student within the
first week of the semester will have the unintended effect of shifting the agency away from the
professor.
As to the steps, Dean Lopes said that at other institutions, the usual practice is that after going
to the faculty, the student goes to the chair, and an informal resolution is found.

Professor Kaplowitz recalled a prior comment by Dean Lopes at the standards subcommittee
discussion, that John Jay is the first institution Dean Lopes has been to where a committee is
permitted to change a faculty member’s grade.

Dean Lopes confirmed that she has never seen this practice before. A committee can
recommend a change, but nobody other than the faculty member can change the grade.

Acknowledging the philosophical import of this comment, Professor Kaplowitz wondered if
the language should be changed such that the committee cannot change the grade.

Dean Lopes thought the subcommittee could look at the policies at other CUNY colleges.

**General Education Process**

Dean Lopes distributed CUNY’s Common Core Structure handout to discuss the new
mandates from CUNY that will affect the recently redrawn General Education plan at John
Jay.

She summarized the handout. The Common Core is a thirty credit core. It has two parts, the
required core and flexible core. The courses in the required core must meet all the stipulated
learning outcomes that are specified in their area. There is a variant in the required core
allowing students to earn credits through courses they place into, to avoid a “race to the
bottom” in which overqualified students take introductory courses just to satisfy
requirements. In math and so forth, students might place at a higher level. There was some
discussion of the details regarding three-credit courses versus four-credit courses and how
John Jay’s offerings fit this proposal.

Dean Lopes said that her opinion is that it will be very difficult to achieve these learning
outcomes. She sat on this committee at CUNY, and she thought there were too many
outcomes, and the existing outcomes were too sophisticated for the 100 and 200-level, but in
the end, the chancellor wants a rigorous General Education curriculum, so this is the
mandate.

Kathy Killoran said that outcomes assessment will be very important to show that this plan is
not feasible.

Dean Lopes further explained the flexible core, which is divided among various
interdisciplinary areas. Every course in the flexible core must meet the three learning
outcomes set forth by CUNY. When designing a course for this area, professors must choose
three additional learning outcomes. She emphasized at this point that the faculty are the ones
who are the interpreters of this document, so it needs to make sense to the professors in the
room, who will represent the document to colleagues.

Dean Lopes then spoke about implementation. Last year, John Jay cast a new forty-seven
credit General Education plan. This mandate means that plan will need to be winnowed down
to forty-two, and the main choice to be made is how to use the additional College Option
twelve credits. John Jay's General Education subcommittee will make recommendations to
UCASC about what those twelve credits should look like. By the end of February, that
committee will need to have its recommendations in place, so that decisions can be made in
the March meeting. This timeframe is necessary because Dean Lopes must tell CUNY by April
how the college will implement the plan.

Professor Kaplowitz asked if it would go to College Council. Dean Lopes said she'd like to at
least get it through UCASC in April. Professor Adams suggested adding a meeting in March.

Dean Lopes addressed the fact that this will create an enormous amount of work for certain
people to create an implementation plan. She asked departments to look at their current
offerings and consider which can be tweaked, and what bucket those courses can go in. Some
courses will need to be offered up to UCASC as course revisions to satisfy the learning
outcomes.

Professor Lapidus asked why a course can only fit in one bucket. Dean Lopes said it's a CUNY
rule, decreed by the Vice Chancellor, in order for coursework to be more transferrable.

Vice President Saulnier said that it's the kind of change that means they've implemented a
policy, and after it goes into effect, they'll decide how it works. He said course prefixes will
determine what a course is and where it fits.

Dean Lopes said that Kathy Killoran and consultant Betsy Gitter will be working with
departments to provide resources in this transition.

More questions were raised about how the areas and buckets make transfer more simple.

As to process, Dean Lopes said that course revisions should go first to department committee,
then to Kathy Killoran as a course revision. Killoran will route it to the new General Education
subcommittee and then it will go to CUNY pathways at the same time it goes to UCASC.

Professor Adams asked what happens if the course passes at CUNY but not at UCASC. Dean
Lopes said the simultaneous review is not desirable, but it is the only way to make the
deadlines. If conflicting decisions occur or CUNY asks for revisions, John Jay will simply have
to work through it. She explained that CUNY will be sending guidelines and a template, and
the backend work of submitting these revisions will be enormous, but Betsy Gitter and Kathy
Killoran will support departments with this. She said CUNY is just building the website for
this now.

Professor Lapidus asked if CUNY will have power over John Jay's courses. Dean Lopes
answered that the chair is a professor at the Graduate Center, and he seems to have a
reasonable understanding of classroom practice.

Professor Adams asked if John Jay has anybody on that committee. Dean Lopes said
recommendations have been made, but the committee isn't set up yet.

As to the timeline, she wanted to make perfectly clear that this new plan will be implemented
September of 2013, so it is imperative that John Jay have enough courses in place by April
2013 for registration, and it would be better to have enough in December of 2012. She said that as soon as the CUNY template comes in, departments should begin tweaking courses and submitting revisions. There will also be a schema for new course proposals.

Professor Lapidus felt that simultaneous consideration of courses by two separate subcommittees is not a productive way to go, and would in fact hinder the process rather than accelerating it as it is intended to.

Dean Lopes felt that getting feedback all at once ought to expedite a process. Professor Lapidus said the consultations involved would draw out the process. Dean Lopes answered that mainly there is no choice here, because of the CUNY deadlines and the administrative back-end work involved in getting all of these changes in place. She asked the professors to be on the lookout for the templates, which would be distributed soon.

A motion was made and seconded to adjourn the meeting. It was unanimously acclaimed. The meeting concluded at 12:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah Hammond, Scribe
1. **Administrative Announcements** – Dean Lopes

2. **Approval of the minutes of January 27, 2012**

3. **Old Business**

   **Courses (2nd readings)**
   - CJBS 4XX Capstone Seminar
   - POL 2XX Media and Politics

   **Course revision (2nd reading)**
   - SOC 222 Sociology of Mass Communication

   **Program Review (2nd reading)**
   - Self Study of the BA in International Criminal Justice

   **Academic Standards**
   - Academic Integrity Committee Proposal revised (4th reading)
   - Proposal to Revise the Grade Appeal Process (2nd reading)

   **General Education Update** – Dean Lopes

4. **New Business**

   **Courses Subcommittee**
   - PSY 4XX Clinical Topics in Forensic Psychology
   - ECO 3XX Sustainability: Preserving the Earth as a Human Habitat
   - BIO 3XX Human Physiology
   - BIO 3YY Human Anatomy & Physiology Lab
   - MUS 1XX Introduction to Guitar

   **Course revisions:**
   - PSY 4XX Culture, Psychopathology and Healing
   - GEN 205 Gender and Justice
   - ECO 210 American Economic History

[OVER]
**Educational Partnership Subcommittee**
- Proposal to Rearticulate the 2+2/Joint AA/BA degrees in Criminal Justice with John Jay’s BS degree in Criminal Justice (Institutional Theory and Practice)

**Programs Subcommittee**
- Proposal to Revise the BA in Political Science
- Proposal to Revise the Minor in Gender Studies

**Attachments:**
- Agenda for February 24, 2012
- Minutes of January 27, 2012
- Self Study of the BA in International Criminal Justice (rec’d via email)
- Proposal on Academic Integrity Committee
- Proposal to Revise the Grade Appeal Process
- Proposal to Revise the BA in Political Science (will be emailed)
- Proposal to Revise the Minor in Gender Studies
- Proposal to Rearticulate the 2+2/Joint AA/BA degrees in Criminal Justice with John Jay’s BS degree in Criminal Justice (Institutional Theory and Practice)

New Courses:
- CJBS 4XX Capstone Seminar
- POL 2XX Media and Politics
- PSY 4XX Clinical Topics in Forensic Psychology
- BIO 3XX Human Physiology
- BIO 3YY Human Anatomy & Physiology Lab
- ECO 3XX Sustainability: Preserving the Earth as a Human Habitat
- MUS 1XX Introduction to Guitar

Course revisions:
- SOC 222 Sociology of Mass Communication
- GEN 205 Gender and Justice
- PSY/ANT 445 Culture, Psychopathology and Healing
- ECO 210 American Economic History
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Initials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>C. Jama</td>
<td>African-American Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ali Raja</td>
<td>Rizwan</td>
<td>Student Member</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baatz</td>
<td>Simon</td>
<td>History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balazon</td>
<td>Ervin</td>
<td>Student Member</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corbett</td>
<td>Glenn</td>
<td>Protection Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corthals</td>
<td>Angelique</td>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cunningham</td>
<td>Ryan</td>
<td>Student Member</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dapia</td>
<td>Silvia</td>
<td>Foreign Languages and Literatures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eanes</td>
<td>Bernecea J.</td>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>Jay</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammond</td>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Scribe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Killoran</td>
<td>Kathy</td>
<td>Undergraduate Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lapidus</td>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>Art and Music</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larkin</td>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Health and Physical Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacobs</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leippe</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lopes</td>
<td>Anne</td>
<td>Dean, Undergraduate Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McClure</td>
<td>Mary Ann</td>
<td>Interdisciplinary Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moreno</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Academic Assessment</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocejo</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pease</td>
<td>Alison</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perez</td>
<td>Lisandro</td>
<td>Latin American and Latino/a Studies</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peters</td>
<td>Judy-Lynne</td>
<td>Public Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puls</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saunier</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>VP, Enrollment Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexton</td>
<td>Ellen</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snejdr</td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sung</td>
<td>Hung-En</td>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarantino</td>
<td>Dana</td>
<td>Communication and Theatre Arts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Field</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varsanyi</td>
<td>Monica</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Velazquez-Torres</td>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>SEEK</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Von Lampä</td>
<td>Klaus</td>
<td>Law, Police Science, CJA</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Guests:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maki</td>
<td>Haberfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shavonne</td>
<td>McKiever</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Arbour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Romaniuk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Kaplowitz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate</td>
<td>Szur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan</td>
<td>Hoffman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassandra</td>
<td>Evans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathy</td>
<td>Mulder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shu-Yua</td>
<td>Cheng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Barnet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee held its meeting on Friday, February 24, 2012 at 12:10 in Room 610T. Dean Anne Lopes, UCASC Chair, called the meeting to order.


Guests: David Barnet, Demi Chang, Cassandra Evans, Katie Gentile, Maki Haberfeld, Joan Hoffman, Karen Kaplowitz, Shavonne McKiever, Cathy Mulder, Peter Romaniuk, Kate Szur.

Administrative Announcements

Dean Anne Lopes convened the meeting with an announcement of some issues that came up in the PPP committee. She distributed a handout and directed the committee to look at the “quick facts” sheet. The PPP is concerned about the disconnect between students' preparation and the curriculum's expectations.

She began by recapping some quick facts about undergraduates. The mean SAT score has gone up three points since Dean Lopes has been at John Jay, and the retention rate and graduation rate have also risen slightly. She noted that these statistics are always available at the Office of Institutional Research's webpage. She directed the group to look at the table about student majors that sheds light on how student interest in various fields has changed over time, especially with attention to students' entrances and exits. She asked the group to think about scaffolding in light of this data, considering how best to prepare students fully without “dumbing down” the curriculum. She stressed that all the difficult work everybody is doing in assessment is helping enormously with these reports in tracking student progress.

Professor Jama Adams asked about getting data for the gap between students coming in, the minimum standards they should meet, and evidence of interventions taken. Dean Lopes said a summary sheet can be generated to describe successes and actions that were not successful.

Professor Klaus Von Lampe asked about the practice of default enrollment for the BA rather than the BS, since most students want to be in the Criminal Justice BS. Vice President Richard Saulnier said that his office is still working out how to correctly communicate to students the difference between the BA and the BS in Criminal Justice. Professor Von Lampe asked if it would be a better practice to default students in the BS. Vice President Saulnier said that this is a technical issue of coding. Dean Lopes said the shift in process is underway and advisement should aid in preparing students to move into the BS. Professor Von Lampe raised the concern that the BA requires a one year introductory course, and students who are automatically enrolled in the BA spend a full year in a course for a degree
they may not pursue if they switch into the BA.

Approval of the minutes of January 27, 2012

There is a typo in Judy-Lynne Peters' name, as well as in the year on the cover page, which should read 2012. On page 10, line 39, “democracies in media” will be transposed to read “media in democracies.” The vote count for the Criminal Justice capstone course will be revised to accurately reflect the amount of abstentions. Brian Arbour's name will be added to the guest list. Page 3, line 44 will be corrected to read “There is so little higher order learning.”

A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of January 27, 2012 with typographical errors corrected. The amended minutes of January 27, 2012 were approved unanimously with 21 votes in favor.

Old Business

Courses (2nd readings)

CJBS 4XX Capstone Seminar

Professor Von Lampe summarized the changes, including the course description and the learning outcomes, which have been adjusted to reflect the goals of capstone courses in other departments. Dean Lopes thanked the department for its work on the course.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the new course, CJBS 4XX Capstone Seminar. CJBS 4XX Capstone Seminar was unanimously approved with 18 votes in favor.

POL 2XX Media and Politics

Professor Brian Arbour spoke for the course. The course description has been changed to reflect the department’s goal for the scope of the course to reach beyond America. Dean Lopes asked if the course would be in the Journalism minor, and Professor Arbour confirmed.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the new course, POL 2XX Media and Politics. POL 2XX Media and Politics was unanimously approved with 18 votes in favor.

Course revision (2nd reading)

SOC 222 Sociology of Mass Communication

Professor Greene was not present, and nobody in the room was able to represent the course, so Dean Lopes held this course for a future meeting. Professor Ellen Sexton raised a point that in the last meeting there was little discussion and a point had been made that maybe the course did not need a second reading. Dean Lopes said that it is important for a departmental representative to be present for course examinations.
Program Review (2nd Reading)

Self Study of the BA in International Criminal Justice

Professor Romaniuk was present to represent the Self Study. There was no discussion.

A motion was made and seconded to accept the Self Study of the BA in International Criminal Justice. The BA in International Criminal Justice was unanimously accepted with 18 votes in favor.

Academic Standards

Academic Integrity Committee Proposal Revised (4th Reading)

Professor Karen Kaplowitz spoke for the proposal, reporting that this policy is on the agenda for next week’s Faculty Senate meeting. When the lawyers at the senate read the CUNY policy in the proposal, they found serious contradictions and problems. After consulting with Dean Lopes, Professor Kaplowitz has determined that the best course of action is to withdraw the Academic Integrity Committee Proposal. It is of the utmost importance to get the language and legalities correct in this important proposal, so the committee wants to revisit and present again at another date.

Proposal to Revise the Grade Appeal Process (2nd Reading)

Professor Kaplowitz summarized the changes to the proposal. The timeline was in question at the last meeting, so that has been adjusted to provide the departments a little more time while keeping the deadline tight enough to fit the process into the number of days in a semester. The main goal of the revision is to be sure that the process is completed within a semester, so that students can retake a course if needed.

The committee did revisit the philosophical underpinnings of this proposal, given that grade changes are not usually taken out of the faculty’s hands at other colleges. The document has been revised to allow the college-wide committee to make a recommendation to the faculty member to change a grade, and then the professor can agree or disagree with the recommendation. There is also a clause allowing for extraordinary circumstances when faculty members on the committee can send an egregious case back to the department chair, to be presented to the departmental P & B, who may change a grade in this most rare of circumstances.

Cassandra Evans, an academic advisor, brought questions from Sumaya Villanueva. What would be the provisions for a student with a GPA under 2.0? Also, how would the student be notified once the grade was changed? Dean Lopes said she had been thinking about this also, and suggested adding a sentence now along the lines of “the faculty member needs to submit his or her decision to the registrar’s office,” and after that the registrar would determine how to communicate the decision to the student.

Professor Judy-Lynne Peters asked why this would go to the departmental P&B committee rather than the Curriculum Committee. Professor Kaplowitz said that usually the department elects those people to the P&B who are the most senior, and these people have the department’s best confidence as far as students’ rights and faculty rights go. Professor Peters was concerned that untenured faculty might feel pressured by scrutiny like this from the departmental P&B. The room agreed that this was a valid concern. Professor Kaplowitz asked if making the Curriculum Committee that final step would make
more sense. Professor Ben Lapidus said that the overlap between the grade appeals committee and the curriculum committee seemed like an extra layer of bureaucracy. He also wasn’t sure what a “truly exceptional circumstance” might be. Dean Lopes described one – perhaps a faculty member has given every student an F. She said this sort of thing is not a common occurrence, but it does happen. There have been professors with serious illness or disability who have not graded. She said the committee would be surprised at the arguments that come to her office. Sometimes faculty members change in the middle of the semester, or sometimes disagreements between professors and departments require larger processes for intervention. This is more of an issue in large departments than smaller ones.

Professor Adams remained concerned about the 15 day deadline. The combination of very young students and adjuncts that are not often on campus makes it quite difficult for students to get to complicated paperwork like this within 15 days. He suggested allowing students to file a form without meeting a professor. Professor Kaplowitz said this is possible. Professor Adams said that it’s an issue of communicating to the student a culture change, because they will naturally want to speak to the professor before filing a form.

Cassandra Evans brought attention to the same paragraph about first steps, noting that the advisement department wanted to encourage the student very clearly to try hard to contact the professor first.

Professor Jay Hamilton asked for clarification on the reasoning for the 15 days and suggested that there might be a larger window or various steps in the cases for students who are not concerned with getting a decision by the end of the semester. Vice President Saulnier explained that these grade appeals tend to go on forever and the process is too cumbersome. Currently, the student receives a grade as soon as a professor submits it, so they have the information fairly quickly. The college wants students to take responsibility earlier.

Professor Adams said that any system that sets up that kind of hard line, 15-days or 30-days, requires someone to file something. But at John Jay, the faculty member is not available, and the student cannot find that person. This system punishes students who cannot find faculty. He wanted to assign the responsibility to contact the faculty member to the department rather than the student.

Professor Peters wished to speak to both sides – suggested changing the language to “file form and contact professor” rather than one or the other. She noted that in the middle of the semester leading up to graduation, students realize the impact of the GPA and that’s when the appeals tend to come in. She said the college must stress the process and educate students as to how this works.

Dean Lopes said this may need redrafting. Professor Kaplowitz revised some language on the spot to attempt to answer these concerns.

1. All mention of the P & B committee will be struck and replaced with Departmental Curriculum Committee.

2. Student must file a grade appeal form, the student may thereafter elect to try to informally resolve the grade issue with the professor, and then the professor goes forward.

Professor Adams said from a chair’s standpoint, there still should be language indicating that the student and the professor need to speak at some point. Dean Lopes and Professor Kaplowitz said that’s not actually part of it.

Professor Adams asked where students will find this form – would it be in the same spot where they add and drop courses? Vice President Saulnier said that is not the case at the moment, but it could be digitized. Dean Lopes said that this will increase grade appealing. Professor Peters asked where the
copies of the form will go. Vice President Saulnier said that the registrar will log it in and then forward to the professor. Kathy Killoran added that the college is now asking students to submit documentation, so the application cannot be entirely digital, but it could be a two-step process.

Professor Adams asked if the document would be automatically kicked forward in the case of faculty errors. Dean Lopes answered yes.

Prof. Kaplowitz recapped the three changes to this as it will be redrafted:

1. Add sentence at the bottom of the page “the faculty member needs to communicate the decision to the registrar’s office and then the registrar lets the student know.”

2. Any mention of the P & B will be changed to Department Curriculum Committee.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the Revision to the Grade Appeal Process as amended. The Revision to the Grade Appeal Process as amended was approved with 17 votes in favor and one abstention.

Professor Adams asked for a copy of the final document with the revisions and asked when this would be effective. Dean Lopes said it would be effective in Fall of 2012 if it goes through College Council.

General Education Update

Dean Lopes reported that the UCASC Committee has been meeting to address the common core. She stressed that all departments may contribute to the Justice section of the common core. The committee hopes to have a proposal for the six credits to present to UCASC at the next meeting in order to meet CUNY’s timeline.

Professor Hamilton asked if meeting the April 1 timeline takes into account all presentations to this committee and College Council. Dean Lopes said it does. She said that the need to meet this deadline is extremely important because CUNY will have implementation funds, and John Jay needs to be able to apply for these funds for the expensive back-end issues associated with the curriculum change. She wants as smooth a process as possible, with adequate scrutiny and debate. She felt that ultimately all the work done on Gen Ed already will help set up the decisions made here. Many useful questions have already been raised – can major courses be part of the common core, and so forth – and CUNY has said that John Jay is moving along at a good clip in comparison to other colleges. The questions raised by John Jay have been helpful to CUNY.

Dean Lopes said there is a timeline waiver request in to CUNY, for which she is hopeful but concerned about. She said that CUNY has a resistance to customize the plan for colleges. Science has been experiencing resistance in response to its requests for variations.

Professor Kaplowitz said that she has heard that after pressure from several groups, CUNY is going to allow more hours for Science. Dean Lopes said that the guidance so far has been that they will absolutely not move on those issues.

Dean Lopes said that the big, unforeseen complication CUNY has been grappling with is unification of community colleges and senior colleges in the common core. Many of the problems had not at all been anticipated, so John Jay is moving gingerly in relation to CUNY.

The question was raised about when a decision will come in regarding science, because that affects how departments bring courses to Kathy Killoran. Dean Lopes said any change would reflect a change
to the major, not to the core, so departments should not work with possible changes from 80th street in mind. She stressed that departments need to create courses to meet this common core's requirements as described already.

Professor Adams told the committee that he is on one of the CUNY-wide Gen Ed committees, which would start meeting in early March.

New Business

Courses Subcommittee

PSY 4XX Clinical Topics in Forensic Psychology

Professor Sexton introduced this capstone course then handed the floor to Professor Michael Leippe.

Professor Leippe explained that the capstone courses in Forensic Psychology are split into two tracks – clinical areas and experimental areas. This is the clinical capstone course, which will allow the professor to teach a focused course that specializes in the classic capstone model. The students will have primary readings, extensive writing assignments, a final paper, all requiring integration and command of the broader literature in the field.

Professor Adams asked if one of the knowledge objectives could be tweaked to include the level of critique of the material implied by Professor Leippe’s statements.

Professor Sexton felt the abbreviated title was a bit awkward and suggested changing it to “Clinical Forensic Psy.”

Professor Adams asked how easy it is, given the constraints of the library, to find journals from other cultures. Professor Leippe could not speak for the clinical part of the field, but said in his own area that hasn’t been a problem, because the college does subscribe to some cross-culture journals.

Dean Lopes said that further comments could be directed to Professor Grosse-Fifer, who put the course forward.

At this point, Professor Sexton suggested adjusting the agenda to visit the PSY revision that had been skipped earlier.

PSY 4XX Culture, Psychopathology, and Healing

Professor Sexton described the revisions to the course, which mostly involve a change in level from 400 to 300, since it didn’t fit the capstone model.

Professor Leippe explained that the course has been completely retooled by Professor. He said it’s a good elective course for students, and is clearly 3xx level. The idea of cross-cultural discussion of psychopathology is very current in Psychology, so this is a nice survey to add to departmental offerings.

Dean Lopes noted that the course objectives are written more at the 200 level in the syllabus than the 300 level, and she would want to see more complexity in a 300 level course. She felt the assignments justified 300-level, but there was not agreement between the articulated goals and the assignments. The PPP has been concerned with the question of rigor, in general. Professor Leippe agreed that the course objectives on this particular syllabus do not match that well with the department's overall
standards and he would pass this note on.

**ECO 3XX Sustainability: Preserving the Earth as a Human Habitat**

Professor Sexton introduced Professor Joan Hoffman and this course, which is meant to be an elective in several majors. Professor Hoffman said that the college has very few courses on the environment, and this course responds to student interest. She is working on getting together a college-wide committee of people interested in the environment to set up a sustainability minor. The human habitat is in danger, and the college should be doing more to prepare students for those issues.

Professor Adams asked about the learning outcomes, which could be tweaked to highlight analysis and critique, rather than just understanding, identifying, and learning. He also questioned the wording in the policy about prior arrangements and asked for more generosity. Professor Hoffman said she is generous in person with students, but thought the college required hard rules in writing. Professor Adams also had a question about the requirement about students’ laptops. Professor Hoffman asked if there is a college policy on laptops.

Kathy Killoran said the learning outcomes need to be tweaked to reflect outcomes and she can help the professor with that. She also explained the requirements for documentation about approval from majors who would fit this into their curriculum.

**BIO 3XX Human Physiology**

Professor Sexton introduced this course, which has been taught experimentally twice. It prepares students for standardized tests in the field and is especially good for the toxicology students. She introduced Professor Demi Chang who elaborated on how this course prepares students for demanding tests and gives them a chance to get into the lab.

Professor Adams had questions about the 300 level. He felt the language should be tweaked to highlight skepticism about what cannot be known or explained, so that students would not get the impression that all knowledge can be memorized.

Professor Von Lampe asked for a clarification of the term “physiological examination of life.” Professor Chang spoke to the use of lab animals and human subjects in the course. She said both are needed at different stages and for different sorts of lessons. Professor Von Lampe asked if ethical standards are addressed, and Professor Chang said that much attention is given to discussion of the ethical ramifications of each demonstration.

Professor Peters said that the connected syllabus does not fit with the syllabus guidelines, especially in terms of the attendance policy.

Professor Adams asked about the “word count” of the final research paper, which was incorrectly listed as a “page count.”

Dean Lopes said that further comments could be addressed to Professor Nathan Lentz.

**BIO 3YY Human Anatomy & Physiology Lab**

At this point, Professor Sexton noted that Professor Von Lampe's question about animal testing was actually in reference to this course rather than the previous course. This two-credit course brings students into the lab, where they work with live humans and frogs and so forth. Dean Lopes noted that
pre-med students need these courses more than anybody else. Professor Cheng confirmed.

Professor Adams noted a typo, where “goggles” are referred to as “goggle.” He also asked that the plagiarism statement be examined to comply with John Jay’s official statement and separate the “turn it in” section from the official statement.

Professor Hamilton asked how this course works as a co-requisite with the previous course, and wondered if there would be problems if students cannot take both at the same time. He asked if there might be an informal way to handle students who do not take the courses concurrently.

Dean Lopes said further comments can be directed to Professor Chang.

**MUS 1XX Introduction to Guitar**

Professor Sexton introduced Professor Lapidus’s course, which is brought forth in response to student interest. Professor Lapidus spoke, noting that previous experimental offerings of the course have been quite popular.

Professor Adams asked Professor Lapidus to speak to the reflective aspects of the course, which Professor Adams felt were not articulated as thoroughly as they could be in the proposal, though clearly Professor Lapidus had them in mind. Professor Lapidus said he is open to such elaboration but had left it out because the course is at the 100-level. He said that there is an aspect of reflection in the weekly quizzes. While learning the basic nuts and bolts of music theory, students are exposed to music’s range across cultures and genres. Professor Lapidus said the journey of the course asks the students to become active listeners through many and varied assignments in and outside the classroom. Professor Adams said that this is just a tweak in the language in the learning outcomes to expose some of that thinking. Professor Lapidus was concerned about this because there is a limit of three to five outcomes, and the proposal already includes five. Professor Adams asked him to look at the verbs - “use” “apply” “execute” “read” – to see if he could make the reflective elements of the course more explicit.

Professor Peters asked if there is a provision made to make sure the live performance is accessible to all students. Professor Lapidus said he does come up with a list before each semester of many possible venues students might visit that would be accessible to the average John Jay student.

Professor Ed Snajdr asked about the live performance, wondering if two or more students might go together to a performance. Professor Lapidus said that happens invariably, but he does not encourage it. Professor Snajdr also wondered why a subway platform would be an unacceptable place to observe music. Professor Lapidus said that it has to do with intention and attention, that the act of going to see music on purpose rather than fitting it into one’s own commute is an important part of the assignment.

Kathy Killoran asked if there will be another 100-level that is a second half to this course. Professor Lapidus said there will be a 200-level course in ensemble, but otherwise, this is not a two-part course.

**Course Revisions**

**GEN 205 Gender and Justice**

Professor Sexton summarized the elements of this proposal that would revise the course, including an Anthropology prerequisite, and an e-mail from Professor Maria Volpe that would add Gender and Justice to the minor in dispute resolution.
Professor Katie Gentile was present to speak for the course. She said that many people want to take the
course, but there have not been enough GEN 101 courses to prep students with a prerequisite to take
this course, so this is an effort to meet student interest. She said advisement was thrilled with the
proposed change.

A motion was made to waive the second reading of GEN 205 Gender and Justice. The
motion to waive the second reading of GEN 205 Gender and Justice was approved with
16 votes in favor and 1 abstention.

Professor Peters had a question regarding the course description, which seemed to have odd question
marks in it. Professor Gentile thought that was a mistake based on how the document was pulled off of
the web. The question marks are meant to be commas.

A motion was made to approve Gen 205 Gender and Justice. Gen 205 Gender and
Justice was approved unanimously with 17 votes in favor.

ECO 210 American Economic History

Professor Sexton explained that this is a proposal to change the name of the course, change the course
description, and adjust it from 200 level to 300-level.

Professor Cathy Mulder was present to discuss the course. She said the department has always wanted
to have a history of thought or economics history course, so they went back into the books to see what
was already on file. The course wants to use seminal thinkers from the 1700s and earlier to explore
how we have arrived at Capitalism. The department wants its majors to understand where they fit
within the context of the field of Economics as it has developed through time. She said that the course
does currently focus on Western cultures, but they look forward to adding more global outlooks in the
future.

Professor Adams had a question about her closing sentence and asked in particular about the scope of
the fourteenth week of the course. Professor Mulder said that international perspectives are
incorporated there.

Professor Snajdr asked if the word Western could be left out of the description to leave the course open
for future professors. Professor Mulder said that the department went back and forth over the use of
the word Western and ultimately decided that since the texts are Western until the end, it would be
necessary to include the word to accurately reflect the subject of the course. Also, the department is
not currently staffed to teach a completely international course.

Professor Adams understood why the department wanted to limit the scope and suggested including
language explaining what the course will not cover, so that students are clear on the scope. It was
suggested again that the department might want to keep the course more open for future professors to
have leeway for more international scope.

Educational Partnership Subcommittee

Proposal to Rearticulate the 2+2/Joint AA/BA degrees in Criminal
Justice with John Jay’s BS degree in Criminal Justice (Institutional
Theory and Practice)
Dean Lopes introduced this, noting that the prior version of the proposal no longer makes sense given the new BA and BS in Criminal Justice. David Barnet reiterated the point, noting that this change is not optional, given the new requirements.

A motion was made and seconded to waive the second reading of the Proposal to Rearticulate the 2+2/Joint AA/BA degrees in Criminal Justice with John Jay’s BS degree in Criminal Justice (Institutional Theory and Practice). The motion was approved with 16 votes in favor and 1 abstention.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the Proposal to Rearticulate the 2+2/Joint AA/BA degrees in Criminal Justice with John Jay’s BS degree in Criminal Justice (Institutional Theory and Practice). The proposal was approved unanimously with 17 votes in favor.

Programs Subcommittee

Proposal to Revise the BA in Political Science

Professor Simon Baatz introduced this revision, which comes on the heels of assessment of the major. The categories of the foundation courses have been changed and students are now required to take one course from each category, which gives the students a common experience. He noted the addition of concentrations to the major. He also noted an increase in the number of courses that students take in their concentrations.

Professor Monica Varsanyi was present to represent the department and take comments. She said the department is excited to get this launched in the Fall if it moves forward.

Professor Adams asked about the reasoning behind dropping the history requirement, and how that can set up the current political climate. Professor Varsanyi said the change reflects a convention in the field as a whole and the recommendation of the external review. She thought those units would be better used for a 200-level research course.

Dean Lopes added that a lot of these courses incorporate an historical element. These are historicized courses, which is one reason already why there is not a need for a separate history section.

Professor Hamilton asked if a major had to have a required number of credits for all students. Dean Lopes said it’s a good idea to have a core, though it’s not required. She said the best practice in structuring a major is to have an intro, a capstone, and a core. Kathy Killoran explained the nuts and bolts of how this curriculum makes a core.

Professor Adams felt that the learning outcomes as written did not stress the critique or analysis, though such elements are clearly part of the curriculum when described by Professor Varsanyi. Professor Adams reminded the room he makes this sort of comment with an eye toward Middle States’ reviewers.

Dean Lopes then pointed out how nice it is to see that assessment has led to very good changes to a major that will enrich student experience. She said that any further feedback should be directed to Professor Harold Sullivan, with Professor Varsanyi copied.
Proposal to Revise the Minor in Gender Studies

Professor Baatz recapped the changes to this minor, as laid out in the proposal. Professor Katie Gentile was present to speak for the proposal. The revision is needed in this new program because currently students do not bring common knowledge to Gender Studies courses.

Dean Lopes commended the coherence in the minor, which comes when students take common courses. Kathy Killoran reminded the room that new guidelines were issued for minors in 2006, and all minors are up for review. Killoran said that the learning outcomes need to be included in this proposal. There was a discussion about how the program has to articulate its learning outcomes, whether course by course, or by program. Dean Lopes said that a minor, in general, has its own set of learning outcomes, on top of the courses’ individual learning outcomes. She reminded the room that Associate Provost Jim Llana is overseeing the reevaluation and assessment process for all minors.

Professor Adams asked if it would be helpful to list the electives unless there are too many to list. Professor Gentile said this could be possible. Dean Lopes suggested grouping the electives to add coherence to the minor and to help students envision the minor as an organized experience rather than a loose collection of courses.

ONE LAST ANNOUNCEMENT

Dean Lopes told the room that Mike Wallace is at John Jay today to give a speech, a symposium on Occupy Wall Street. At 4 p.m. She encouraged everybody to go support this new symposium series about justice at John Jay. The symposium series aims to spotlight John Jay faculty working in justice areas.

A motion was made and seconded to adjourn the meeting. It was unanimously acclaimed. The meeting concluded at 2:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah Hammond, Scribe
THE UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM & ACADEMIC STANDARDS COMMITTEE

AGENDA
March 23, 2012
9:30 A.M. – 12:30 P.M.
ROOM 610T

1. Administrative Announcements – Dean Lopes

2. Approval of the minutes of February 24, 2012

3. Old Business

Programs (2nd reading)
- Proposal to Revise the BA in Political Science
- Proposal to Revise the Minor in Gender Studies

Courses (2nd readings)
- PSY 4XX Clinical Topics in Forensic Psychology
- ECO 3XX Sustainability: Preserving the Earth as a Human Habitat
- BIO 3XX Human Physiology
- BIO 3YY Human Anatomy & Physiology Lab
- MUS 1XX Introduction to Guitar

Course revisions (2nd reading)
- SOC 222 Sociology of Mass Communication (tabled at Feb meeting)
- ECO 210 American Economic History and Development
- PSY/ANT 445 Culture, Psychopathology and Healing

4. New Business

Program Review Subcommittee
- Self Study of the BS in Computer Information Systems

General Education Subcommittee
- Proposal for the College Option portion of Pathways Gen Ed Program

Courses Subcommittee
- CJBA 4XX Research and Writing in Criminal Justice I
- CJBA 4YY Research and Writing in Criminal Justice II
- PSY 3XX History of Psychology
- POL 2XX Western Political Thought
- CSL 3XX Vocational Development and Social Justice in Human Service

[OVER]
Course revisions:
- POL 230 Principles of Constitutional Government
- POL 430 Seminar in Problems in Civil Rights and Civil Liberties
- SPA 201-202 Intermediate Conversational Spanish I & II
- SPA 208 The Themes of Justice in 20th Century Spanish Literature
- SPA 211-212 Intermediate Conversational Spanish for Hispanic Students I & II
- FRE 201-202 Intermediate French I & II
- ITA 201-202 Intermediate Italian I & II

Attachments:
- Agenda for March 23, 2012
- Minutes of February 24, 2012
- Proposal to Revise the BA in Political Science
- Proposal to Revise the Minor in Gender Studies
- Self Study of the BS in Computer Information Systems
- Proposal for the College Option portion of Pathways Gen Ed Program

Courses
- POL 2XX Western Political Thought
- CSL 3XX Vocational Development and Social Justice in Human Service
- CJBA 4XX Research and Writing in Criminal Justice I
- CJBA 4YY Research and Writing in Criminal Justice II
- PSY 3XX History of Psychology
- PSY 4XX Clinical Topics in Forensic Psychology
- ECO 3XX Political Economy of Sustainable Economic Development
- BIO 3XX Human Physiology
- BIO 3YY Human Anatomy & Physiology Lab
- MUS 1XX Introduction to Guitar

Course revisions:
- POL 230 Principles of Constitutional Government
- POL 430 Seminar in Problems in Civil Rights and Civil Liberties
- SOC 222 Sociology of Mass Communication (tabled at Feb meeting) – David will attend
- ECO 210 American Economic History and Development
- PSY/ANT 445 Culture, Psychopathology and Healing
- SPA 201-202 Intermediate Conversational Spanish I & II
- SPA 208 The Themes of Justice in 20th Century Spanish Literature
- SPA 211-212 Intermediate Conversational Spanish for Hispanic Students I & II
- FRE 201-202 Intermediate French I & II
- ITA 201-202 Intermediate Italian I & II
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Initials</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>C. Jama</td>
<td>African-American Studies</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ali Raja</td>
<td>Rizwan</td>
<td>Student Member</td>
<td></td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baatz</td>
<td>Simon</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balazon</td>
<td>Ervin</td>
<td>Student Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corbett</td>
<td>Glenn</td>
<td>Protection Management</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corthals</td>
<td>Angelique</td>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cunningham</td>
<td>Ryan</td>
<td>Student Member</td>
<td></td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dapia</td>
<td>Silvia</td>
<td>Foreign Languages and Literatures</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eanes</td>
<td>Bernicea J.</td>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>Jay</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammond</td>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Scribe</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Killoran</td>
<td>Kathy</td>
<td>Undergraduate Studies</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lapidus</td>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>Art and Music</td>
<td></td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larkin</td>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Health and Physical Education</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeppe</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lopes</td>
<td>Anne</td>
<td>Dean, Undergraduate Studies</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McClure</td>
<td>Mary Ann</td>
<td>Interdisciplinary Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moreno</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Academic Assessment</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocejo</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pease</td>
<td>Alison</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perez</td>
<td>Lisandro</td>
<td>Latin American and Latino/a Studies</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peters</td>
<td>Judy-Lynne</td>
<td>Public Management</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puls</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saulnier</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>VP, Enrollment Management</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexton</td>
<td>Ellen</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snajdr</td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td></td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sung</td>
<td>Hung-En</td>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarantino</td>
<td>Dana</td>
<td>Communication and Theatre Arts</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varsanyi</td>
<td>Monica</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Velazquez-Torres</td>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>SEEK</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Von Lampe</td>
<td>Klaus</td>
<td>Law, Police Science, CJA</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Guests:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sumaya</th>
<th>Villanueva</th>
<th>Joshua</th>
<th>Clegg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>Kobilinsky</td>
<td>Kate</td>
<td>Szur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold</td>
<td>Sullivan</td>
<td>Joan</td>
<td>Hoffman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathan</td>
<td>Lents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug</td>
<td>Salane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>Bierman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Shenkin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mickey</td>
<td>Melendez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>Mak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josh</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee held its meeting on Friday, March 23, 2012 at 9:30 in Room 610T. Dean Anne Lopes, UCASC Chair, called the meeting to order.


Absent: Ryan Cunningham, Ben Lapidus, Mary Ann McClure, Rizwan Ali Raja, Ed Snajdr


Administrative Announcements

Dean Anne Lopes convened the meeting with an announcement about the coming general education core curriculum, reminding everyone that she and Kathy Killoran are available to consult with departments about courses. She also said she would ask for status reports from departments about their plans for proposing new courses and course revision for inclusion. The John Jay course revision form was being tweaked to help the committees make assessments swiftly, and that form would be distributed in the following week. Professor Jama Adams had a question about whether courses put forward for the Justice Core would need to be approved by CUNY or whether the approval would be internal at John Jay. Dean Lopes said that would be internal, since the Justice core would be part of John Jay’s College Option.

Approval of the minutes of February 24, 2012

Professor Von Lampe noted that page 2; line 1 should read “B.S. instead of “B.A.” Page 3, line 40, should read “Also, how could the student be notified.”

A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of February 24, 2012. The minutes of February 24, 2012 as amended were approved unanimously with 19 votes in favor.

Old Business

Programs (2nd readings)

Proposal to Revise the BA in Political Science

A motion was made and seconded to approve the Proposal to Revise the BA in Political
Science.

Professor Harold Sullivan was present to represent the revision. He and Professor Monica Varsanyi told the committee of a small change in the wording outcomes on page five, which now includes some text about critical thinking skills. Dean Lopes commended the department on the revisions to the program.

The Proposal to Revise the B.A. in Political Science was approved with 19 votes in favor and one abstention.

Proposal to Revise the Minor in Gender Studies

Professor Katie Gentile was not present, so this item was put on hold.

Courses (2nd readings)

PSY 4XX Clinical Topics in Forensic Psychology

Nobody was present to represent the course, so this item was delayed to later in the meeting.

ECO 3XX Sustainability: Preserving the Earth as a Human Habitat

Professor Joan Hoffman summarized the changes to the proposal, which included wording changes in response to feedback from the last meeting. Kathy Killoran told the room that the ICJ and PAD majors have approved adding this course to those two majors since the paperwork was finalized and that will be added to the proposal for the College Council.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the new course, ECO 3XX Sustainability: Preserving the Earth as a Human Habitat. ECO 3XX Sustainability: Preserving the Earth as a Human Habitat was unanimously approved with 20 votes in favor.

Proposal to Revise the Minor in Gender Studies

This item from earlier in the agenda was visited now.

Professor Katie Gentile explained the changes made to the proposal based on feedback from the last meeting. She said the electives have now been thematically grouped based on the national standards for minors. She also revised the learning outcomes chart after speaking with Virginia Moreno.

Professor Lisandro Perez had corrections to page 3, reminding her that the Latin American Studies prefix is now LLS, not LAS, and noting a course that is cross-listed with LLS. Professor Von Lampe noted a typo where two courses were listed as three.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the Proposal to Revise the Minor in Gender Studies. The Proposal to Revise the Minor in Gender Studies was approved with 20 votes in favor and one abstention.
BIO 3XX Human Physiology

Professor Lawrence Kobilinsky was present to represent the course. He reported that there are no changes since the last reading, and explained the importance of this course to the trajectory of the department, which is developing a new minor in biology as well as a new major. This course is important for students in this major and other majors who intend to pursue medical degrees at the postgraduate level.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the new course, BIO 3XX Human Physiology.

Professor Adams asked how the course integrates the need to master content with a properly skeptical attitude toward science. Professor Angelique Corthals answered that in this course, and any course, students are introduced to the Scientific Method that is, by definition, critical. The Scientific Method is based on constantly questioning data that is observed so that data can be pushed to the absolute limit. Since the Scientific Method itself is based on critical approach to observed fact, critical inquiry is inherent in the course. Professor Adams still asked that the critique be made more explicit at the 300-level. Professor Corthals felt that this may not be the purview of this course. Dean Lopes felt that Professor Adams might be asking for examination of the limitations of science and suggested that this may be addressed elsewhere in the department's curriculum. Professor Adams reiterated that his question is raised in light of the 300-level in particular.

Professor Nathan Lents said that he does use an approach that incorporates skeptical inquiry, but he did not include that in the course proposal because he had understood that the proposal should be a template for any professor to use. Professor Adams wanted Professor Lents’ approach enshrined in the course proposal, but Professor Lents wasn’t sure how to do so without being prescriptive to other professors.

Professor Corthals pointed out a section of the proposal – not the course description – that did address the point in its coverage of discussion during the course. Dean Lopes said the language in the description could be tweaked to include this. Professor Lents was not sure how to phrase such a thing naturally, but he was open to the discussion. He provided examples of how critical inquiry has been included in the course. Professor Adams clarified that he is not questioning how the course is taught, but the UCASC’s job is to make sure that the template for the course includes the appropriate standards for each teacher who may inherit the course after the proposer. Professor Lents was still concerned about putting too specific a stamp on the course. Dean Lopes clarified the issue of how these documents must set the standard for what 300-level or 400-level is in each discipline, and how such standards must be embedded in a course proposal.

Professor Ellen Sexton felt that all disciplines have inherent limitations, and the committee does not necessarily ask every discipline to account for its inherent limitations, so she was not sure if the principle at hand could be applied so inflexibly.

Professor Corthals felt that the level of critique being requested would actually be more appropriate at the 400-level. She explained the larger departmental scaffolding, and how this 300-level course fits within the overall trajectory of the Science student.

Professor Adams felt there is a higher burden on scientists to maintain a certain distance in critiquing their process. He also noted that the Science Department has to struggle with how to get all of this material into the limited amount of credits available in the curriculum, and with that struggle, it may be easy for critique and inquiry to be left out of the template as skills are acquired. Professor Corthals said that critique is central to the major but not to this course. Professor Adams said that it must be central to this course, even at this level.
Professor Judy-Lynne Peters asked if the language could be redrafted, since the author is willing. Professor Lents said he would rather have a vote first and then redraft the language if required.

**BIO 3XX Human Physiology** was approved with 19 votes in favor, 2 opposed, and 1 abstention.

**BIO 3YY Human Anatomy & Physiology Lab**

Professor Nathan Lents spoke for the course. He said the proposal revised the language about the use of live animals, and some page number issues were addressed. Professor Von Lampe asked if it would be possible for a student to pass the class if he or she chose not to work with live animals. Professor Lents was not sure, but spoke about options that have been available in other courses, where there are always alternate assignments available that would not penalize students in grading. In this course, those alternate assignments may not serve the purpose, which is why the particular experiment is embedded in the course description. The department felt this was appropriate, since the course is not a required course. Embedding that assignment in the template would ensure that a student would enter the course aware of the assignment. If the student’s objections were strong, then they could simply elect not to take the course. Professor Lents did think that a student could pass without doing the experiment, but could not promise it.

Professor Adams was frustrated that the proposer was not present to address the question absolutely. Professor Adams felt that the function of the committee is stunted when proposers are not present to address important feedback.

Dean Lopes felt that the course description is rather graphic, which seems a successful way of preparing students for the required dissection. She felt the introduction created the appropriate options for students.

Professor Adams clarified that he is addressing the process of the committee, which should not need to resort to “thought exercises” to guess at a professor’s intent in a proposer’s absence.

Professor Adams also asked the committee to look at a few key places in the syllabus that did not mention skeptical approaches to knowledge or the ethics of how to operate in the lab. He reiterated that he does know that these professors teach these topics, but it is not embedded in the template for the course anywhere.

Professor Kobilinsky said that the department supports ethics around the curriculum. Every single course is supposed to have and does have an ethics component. Those are the rules in the Science department. The laboratory is a hands-on skills-based course. If there is a need to critique science, it would be in the lecture, but the lab course is dedicated to developing skills and knowledge.

Professor Adams was deeply concerned about the implied “trust us” notion that allows a course proposal to leave an entire principle unstated.

Professor Von Lampe spoke to the principle of experimenting on live creatures, and the requirement thereof. He was concerned with excluding students from the course who would object to that in principle.

Professor Michael Leippe addressed the science and critique question. He noted that this is a descriptive course. This is not a course where scientific inferences are being made about the nature of reality and so forth, so he didn’t see the need to add language about critique to this course. He suggested that the language could be tweaked to address Professor Adams’ concerns.
Dean Lopes agreed that adding a bit of language about ethics to the discussion of practice would be appropriate, especially when thinking about undergraduates. Professor Kobilinsky agreed that such a thing could be more clearly spelled out.

On the topic of live animals, Professor Kobilinsky spoke to the measures the Science Department takes to make the work with live animals as humane as possible, reminding the room that the department is cognizant that animals feel pain, so much attention is paid to making sure that nothing resembling torture goes on in the class.

Professor Corthals summarized how she might tweak the language in the course by rewording a sentence to include the phrase: “and contain ethics.” Professor Lents agreed to the way that revision might be approached. Both agreed that this course description will need to be tweaked before a vote can proceed.

Kathy Killoran said this will come back for a third reading, and she also requested a further change to the agenda to visit Professor Hung-En Sung’s first readings as he needed to leave the meeting shortly.

A motion was made and seconded to table BIO 3YY Human Anatomy and Physiology Lab until a 3rd Reading. The motion to table Bio 3YY Human Anatomy and Physiology Lab was unanimously approved with 22 votes in favor.

CJBA 4XX Research and Writing in Criminal Justice I
CJBA 4YY Research and Writing in Criminal Justice II

At this point, the new courses, CJBA 4XX and 4YY were brought forward in order to address them while Professor Hung-En Sung could be present.

Professor Sung introduced the two sequential capstone courses, which are designed to help students write a thesis. The first course focuses on the crafting of a research proposal, while the second course focuses on the execution of that plan.

Professor Adams commended the course, but had logistical questions. He asked what percentage of the students would take this course, would the mentors be adjuncts or full-time professors, and would there be adequate availability of mentors for evening students. His concerns about mentors were practical. Dean Lopes said that the machinery to facilitate student-mentor contact not in place yet because the major is new. Professor Adams said he just wanted to be sure this is being considered.

Kathy Killoran asked if the mentor would be the teacher of the course. Professor Sung said not necessarily. Dean Lopes agreed with Professor Adams' concern, that it is often difficult for students to connect to faculty, especially if the systems are not put in place for students to reach out to professors. Professor Adams noted that 25% of the grade is meeting with the mentor and wondered if that could be done by telephone if the student is an evening student.

Professor Monica Varsanyi asked if there might be a better title for the course to communicate better to employers, something like “Senior Thesis.” Dean Lopes said that the current title does make it sound like a lower level course than it is. Professor Nancy Velazquez-Torres asked about the date, which seemed far off at Fall 2016. Dean Lopes said this is because the degree is new, and will just start being offered in Fall 2012. Kathy Killoran added to the remark about the title, noting that the course proposal refers to the thesis as a “research report” and “research paper” but if it is in fact a thesis, the language should be more specific and consistent. She also noted an issue with course prerequisites; the major proposal indicated that CJBA 380 would be a prerequisite for the first course.

Professor Leippe asked if students would need to submit for IRB protocol, and if so, how does the timeline of the two semesters reflect that reality. It takes a few months to get the IRB submitted, but
students are meant to be gathering data in the first semester. He asked how the timeline incorporates that sort of delay or restriction.

Dean Lopes said other comments could be directed to professor Sung.

At this point, the agenda carried on as scheduled, with second readings.

**MUS 1XX Introduction to Guitar**

Kathy Killoran said that Professor Ben Lapidus could not attend because of an illness in the family, but he did send his cover memo and Professor Benjamin Bierman was present to represent the course. Professor Bierman told the room that the course is extremely popular.

*A motion was made and seconded to approve the new course MUS 1XX Introduction to Guitar. MUS 1XX Introduction to Guitar was unanimously approved with 22 votes in favor.*

**PSY 4XX Clinical Topics in Forensic Psychology**

This earlier item from the agenda was visited at this point.

Professor Leippe summarized changes to the course, including more language about critique in the rationale. The department curriculum committee elected not to change the abbreviated course title, though that was a suggestion in feedback at the last UCASC meeting.

*A motion was made and seconded to approve the new course, PSY 4XX Clinical Topics in Forensic Psychology.*

Kathy Killoran said that the abbreviated title is more than 20 characters and must change, but if Psychology is simply shortened to PSY, it will fit.

**PSY 4XX Clinical Topics in Forensic Psychology was unanimously approved with 22 votes in favor.**

**Course revision (2nd reading)**

**SOC 222 Sociology of Mass Communication (tabled at Feb meeting)**

Professor David Green was present to speak for the course. Since the first reading, there had been a discussion with Professor Schulz from Law and Police Science about possible overlap, but that had turned out not to be an issue. Also, the English department had accepted the course in the journalism minor. Dean Lopes said that it might also go into the new Gen Ed.

*A motion was made and seconded to approve the revisions to SOC 222 Sociology of Mass Communication. The revision to SOC 222 Sociology of Mass Communication was unanimously approved with 22 votes in favor.*

**ECO 210 American Economic History and Development**

Professor Cathy Mulder explained the changes she had made in response to feedback at the last meeting, including removing the word “Western,” and adjusting the plagiarism policy.
Professor Perez was curious as to why this is presented as a course revision instead of as an entirely new course. Professor Mulder said that it has been a long time since the course was offered. Dean Lopes said this is probably the kind of revision that should be presented as a new course proposal in the future because the changes are so deep-seated.

Professor Perez also questioned the wording for “economics and historical perspectives.” Professor Mulder said a good deal of attention had been paid to that wording. “What we’re doing is we’re studying economics through the eyes of the thinkers of those times. It’s a compilation of both economic history and history of thought, so we’re using the seminal thinkers of those times to discuss what they saw or what they think they saw.” Professor Perez said he was referring to the syntax issue, could it just be “Historical Perspectives in Economics.” He felt the plural in “perspectives” was clumsy. Professor Mulder said one of the comments received in the assessment of her major was that students were lacking in different perspectives. Professor Perez said his comment was not substantive but grammatical.

Professor Perez also asked about incomplete sentences and the UCASC rule that there cannot be incomplete sentences in the course description. With this course, the original description was full of incomplete sentences and he found it remarkably crisp. He wished the committee to notice how extra wording could obscure the clarity of the paragraph. Dean Lopes said the old format cannot be brought back.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the revision to ECO 210 American Economic History and Development. The revision to ECO 210 American Economic History and Development was unanimously approved with 22 votes in favor.

PSY/ANT 445 Culture, Psychopathology and Healing

Professor Leippe was present to speak for the course, noted the changes to the learning objectives in the syllabus to include higher level thinking skills.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the revision to PSY/ANT 445 Culture, Psychopathology and Healing.

Professor Velazquez-Torres asked about the knowledge objectives, course objectives, and skills, suggesting that some of these items could be consolidated. Professor Leippe agreed.

The revision to PSY/ANT 445 Culture, Psychopathology and Healing was unanimously approved with 22 votes in favor.

New Business

Program Review Subcommittee

Self Study of the BS in Computer Information Systems

Kathy Killoran introduced the Self Study, noting that she was reporting for Professor Ed Snajdr who could not be present at this meeting. She said the subcommittee met at length with the department and told them that they need to be more constructively critical and analytical. The subcommittee asked the department to be more explicit in how they express ethical issues and address how the center for cybercrime engaged with undergraduates. The subcommittee also had concerns about retention and graduation data. She said the department did express that they wanted to change the curriculum, so
the subcommittee encouraged the department to use this self-study as a channel to convey the changes they wish to make. She said their second draft does address those issues and was very responsive.

Professor Michael Puls thanked the subcommittee, and began by noting that right now the major is in transition. Currently, there are two concentrations, but it will be revised to focus on cyber security and forensic analysis, where the growth is now. In previous versions of the major, the focus was on data, but enrollment is dropping in computer science programs across the country because demand has changed. In the past year, enrollment has increased, so hopefully after revising the major, the major can focus on the area of cyber-security, which will make the program easier to assess.

Professor Douglas Salane from Mathematics and Computer Science, who did the last two reviews of the major, came to speak to the subcommittee’s concerns. He spoke of the historical context of computer science, which took a tremendous hit after the dot-com bust. In 2001 there were 650 majors, which was incredible, and with the dot-com bust in 2001, computer science departments everywhere dropped, in some places down to 8%. Students were very attuned to the impact on job prospects, so enrollment dropped. Fortunately, that situation is changing now. The faculty has been working to develop new programs. He felt that this revision would not be a “gutting” of the major, but a chance to fine-tune the upper levels of the major. This major has benefitted from relationships with community colleges, and a good portion of the students in this degree are transfer students, so Professor Salane is now developing a draft of an articulation agreement that would formalize the pathway from BMCC to John Jay. He said the country is suffering now from a dearth of people with these skills, so it is a good niche to open up, as there are real job prospects for interested students.

The floor was opened to questions. Professor Sexton asked if there would ever be a place for courses about search, retrieval, and so forth. Professor Puls said that computer games have been quite popular, but they would need more students before there could be a whole track in gaming.

Professor Sexton asked about the numbers, given that the major begins with 650 students in the early courses, and ends with 18. Dean Lopes said high attrition occurs with programs of this sort. Many students are interested but do not know what it will take to get through the major, so they switch out early on.

Kathy Killoran asked if calculus is required in other computer science majors. Professor Puls said there used to be two tracks, and the standard track did not require calculus so there were more students. After comparing the major to other programs, it became apparent that it is rare for computer science not to require calculus.

Dean Lopes said that she is studying the retention and enrollment numbers for the major so they can be addressed.

Professor Salane said that the calculus requirement was introduced in 2003 and was a blow to the department for enrollment. Professor Adams asked if there is a career niche in which calculus would not be needed. Professor Salane felt there is a niche for graduates who do not need calculus, and maybe this could be addressed in a minor that is coupled with another domain to be more IT oriented. Computer science itself, though, does need calculus. The symbolic manipulation required for mastery of calculus is necessary to computer science all the time. However, he agreed that there might be an IT niche that would not require it.

Kathy Killoran said she had not heard any comments in the meeting that required revision of the self-study, and since they are looking ahead to an outside review, she wondered if the self-study could be accepted today.

Professor Adams wished to reiterate that something in the self-study could address the question of the large amount of entering students and low graduation rate. Professor Puls said there are already recommendations on the table for how to examine this question on the level of the courses.
Professor Velazquez-Torres noted a typo on page 7, where it should read “were” instead of “where.”
Also, on page 25, initial information was added to letter I in response to the subcommittee’s feedback, but she asked that it would be helpful if the document cited specific universities.

**A motion was made and seconded to waive the second reading of the BS in Computer Information Systems. The motion to waive the second reading of the BS in Computer Information Systems was approved with 20 votes in favor and 1 abstention.**

**A motion was made and seconded to accept the Self-Study of the BS in Computer Information Systems with the verbal changes that have been specified. The Self-Study of the BS in Computer Information Systems with the changes was approved with 21 votes in favor.**

**General Education Subcommittee**

**Proposal for the College Option portion of the Pathways Gen Ed Program**

Professor Adams suggested that the vote on this item be anonymous or private, in the form of a secret paper ballot. He noted that such a vote would not be secret after the meeting, because all votes must be disclosed, but it would allow for a level of honesty within the meeting by allowing professors to vote on paper rather than raising hands in front of each other.

Professor Karen Kaplowitz said that this is allowable if the person is identified on the ballot, but there must be no way for a professor to be misidentified. Transparency must be possible after the fact.

Dean Lopes asked if this procedural change would need a vote. Professor Kaplowitz said that according to law, there must be a vote to change the procedure.

**A motion was made and seconded to have written ballots for the Proposal for the College Option portion of Pathways.**

Professor Kaplowitz explained the procedures associated with a paper ballot. Each paper ballot must have the identifiable and correct name of the voting member, and those ballots would need to be handed into the President’s office, where they will be kept for a legally prescribed amount of time, probably five years.

Professor Leippe asked about the rationale of such a procedure change, since storing ballots in the President’s office seemed to mean that the written record of the vote would be less anonymous than usual. Professor Adams said that taking a paper vote might allow for brief privacy, if not total anonymity, because people are not likely to go to the President’s office to track down the ballots. He felt with the high level of controversy to this issue, less individual scrutiny within the meeting could protect committee members as they vote.

To clarify a point of order, Professor Sexton noted that even without paper ballots, the UCASC committee always keeps an identifiable, written record of each vote, noting each professor’s stance on each item. Kathy Killoran clarified that records of UCASC votes are kept but not routinely shared with the President’s Office unless requested.

**The motion for written ballots for the Proposal for the College Option portion of Pathways was not approved with 15 votes in favor, 8 opposed, and no abstentions.**
Professor Perez introduced the proposal generated by the General Education Subcommittee in response to CUNY’s request for John Jay’s plan for the college option portion of the curriculum by April 1st. He started by assuring the committee that nobody on the committee prefers Pathways over JJ’s model or likes this timeline. The subcommittee met weekly to deliberate over how to respond to CUNY’s mandate, and now has set forth this proposal with full awareness that the solution is not ideal, but it has been generated under difficult constraints which are required and inflexible. In choosing how to set up the College Option, the subcommittee wanted to see how much it could salvage of the John Jay General Education plan that was approved last year, which had already undergone a good deal of deliberation and consultation, and was passed with support from the faculty. The unenviable task from the subcommittee was to try to put the spirit and some of the content of that 47 credit plan into this 42 credit plan, using the college option. He summarized the details of the plan as documented in the proposal, which works to keep the learning outcomes as they are while adjusting the exact scheme of courses.

He presented the document to UCASC, asking the committee to recognize the difficulties of trying to get in everything that everyone would like while noting the impossibility of that. “There are a lot of things we would like students to have that are not present, but we think this formula maximizes that, and there’s not a lot we can do with respect to CUNY.”

Dean Lopes asked Professor Sexton (the elected Vice Chairperson) to assume the Chair as she wishes to speak on this issue. Professor Sexton noted that due to the tight constraints from CUNY, this vote must happen today.

**A motion was made and seconded to suspend the second reading of the Proposal for the College Option portion of Pathways. The motion to suspend the second reading of the Proposal for the College Option portion of Pathways was not approved with 12 votes in favor, 11 opposed, and no abstentions.**

Professor Sexton opened the floor to discussion.

Professor Adams said this is a messy situation that entwines a number of issues. Since so much work was put into John Jay’s Gen Ed, Pathways creates genuine issues. Pathways would require John Jay to accept a set of parameters to which many people object. He felt that the Central Office administration has shown no qualms about violating the spirit of how a university works, a process based on dialogue and contemplation. That disregard for the thinking faculty with blunt directives to vote as needed has stirred resistance in the faculty separate and apart from the actual curriculum question at hand. He felt that the second issue on the table, not addressed in the motion, was how this body might convey to CUNY Central the faculty’s acute concern for the process and for the lack of respect for faculty governance. He also wished that this committee acknowledge that the unrest is a separate issue from the question of how to plan the College Option, which is the actual vote at hand.

Professor Jay Hamilton explained why he voted against waiving the second reading rule. Addressing the same question of process that Professor Adams raised, Professor Hamilton said he had to oppose rushing the process, not because he disagreed with the exact proposal, but because he opposes CUNY’s demand that the college dispense with rules that have been carefully decided by the faculty as the best way to determine a curriculum.

Dean Lopes said that she asked to put aside the chair on this item because she needed to be able to bring several issues forward. She reminded the committee that she is required to submit an implementation plan to CUNY by April 1st. She personally had been directed to provide a plan to CUNY by that date in order to request funds for implementation, which John Jay truly needs. She said the maximum amount of funds she could request was $150,000, and she intended to request the full amount, even though such an amount had been earmarked by CUNY for “complex institutions.” Though not a complex institution, John Jay is in particular need of these funds because
administratively, John Jay is the thinnest-staffed college in the CUNY system.

She reiterated to the committee that she feels that Pathways is not going to be stopped by these lawsuits. Courts do not get involved in college governance issues or curricular issues. "My job as Dean is to figure out how to do this done on the timeline that's before me and the only way to do this is with money. I need that $150,000 for faculty development, for SIMs, for the curriculum, for DegreeWorks, to print bulletins, to provide materials to students so they can figure out what the new Gen Ed is, and for a person who can work with Kathy Killoran - we have to meet these tight deadlines and we need help." She noted that her department is already understaffed as is, and the burden of all of these structural changes will fall to herself and Kathy Killoran.

She then reminded the committee that the common core that CUNY has proposed is actually very similar to what John Jay has already developed in its revision of general education. She noted the same distinction that Professor Adams had articulated, that the faculty’s unease is more due to CUNY’s process of implementation than to the learning outcomes set forward, and she asked the committee to consider the big picture. She knows that the faculty is angry about CUNY’s process. “I ask you to set that aside to do what we need to do to help implement this. Nobody has been successful at stopping it yet. Four hundred faculty have engaged in developing curriculum for Pathways. Four hundred people have worked on committees and done this work, and it seems to me that we don’t have a choice. We’ve been such a great community at working through our own issues. That flies in the face of Pathways and CUNY. We’ve really created a community that grapples with our own curricular issues.”

Professor Allison Pease spoke for the faculty’s resistance to this vote. “I am in almost all things a pragmatist, and do applaud Lisandro and his committee, and the ways in which they’ve worked. That said, approving this proposal is approving a game of twister, approving something that is so deeply flawed.” She felt that the moment of this vote would be a moment she would look back on in her future at John Jay, as the ramifications of this curriculum play out in students’ actual lives and careers. She pictured a moment eight years down the road, sitting across from the student and trying to explain to a student how the curriculum was put together. She felt this vote would be her one chance to register disapproval of Pathways, and she would be ashamed to approve it.

Professor Kobilinsky added to that sentiment. Though he had sympathy for Dean Lopes and her position, he wished to express his viewpoints as a scientist and an educator. He had polled his faculty, and the Science department was 100% opposed to Pathways. He said the new plan would water down science and math to such a point that actual education would be impossible, and the lack of concern for the field was deeply troubling to him.

Professor Anthony Carpi also spoke for the Science Department’s point of view on Pathways. The proposal would devastate science education by boiling it down to one course that has to be combined with some field. In response, the Science Department has submitted its own proposal, though belatedly, with requests for adjustments to Pathways that would focus the “scientific world” category by asking for more science in the proposal itself. He said that though he is a supporter of the justice-based curriculum, the problem of adding justice to every field is that it does not acknowledge students’ basic needs for fundamentals. He cited ballpark figures of examples of a number of common basic errors John Jay students bring into a science classroom. “15 to 20 percent of our students believe that the earth is the center of the universe; 30 or 40 percent believe we were placed on earth in our current form; a fraction still believes black and white people are different organisms. So the problem is you’re about to teach justice to students who need to learn their basic concepts of science.” One major task of the Science Department at John Jay is to make students understand what science is at all, and this cannot be done in three credits. He said he understood the deadlines, but he remained concerned about the vote at hand because it would set a status quo that the science and math component of the curriculum is to be trivial.

Professor Perez raised a point of order, asking how the science proposal impacts the subcommittee’s
proposal on the table. Given that this is now a first reading, would the science proposal have any
impact on the subcommittee’s document? Secondly, he asked those opposed to voting today what the
alternative plan might be. “Are we saying we might want to adopt this later in a modified form, or are
we saying we don’t want to adopt anything? If it’s an act of disobedience, that’s fine, but I want to
know if we’re going down the ultimate path there. What will probably happen is we will not get the
money and CUNY central will say ‘this is your Gen Ed.’ Are we willing to walk out over Gen Ed?”

Dean Lopes said that Professor Perez had summarized the issue very clearly. If rejecting Pathways,
how far would the faculty be willing to go?

Professor Corthals wished to know if comments or feedback were allowed at this point, given that the
proposal is now a first reading.

Professor Glenn Corbett asked if there is something on paper that articulates Pathways’ requirements
and how they match the proposal that JJ approved. Professor Perez said JJ’s approved model has been
on the web, and the subcommittee has referred to it and considered how to boil it down. There was no
way to do everything.

As to the proposal on the table at this meeting, Professor Leippe asked if it would be possible to do a
contingent approval here, with language along the lines of “if in fact Pathways is inevitable, if it comes
to pass, this is what we’ll do.” He felt that such language would allow the college to return to its own
plan if Pathways did not in fact go forward.

Professor Hamilton asked Dean Lopes to articulate what CUNY has actually required her to provide by
April 1. He wanted to know if CUNY required that the college option be approved by college
governance or if they had left it more vague than that. Dean Lopes said that it was both more vague
and more specific in that she had been told to provide the implementation plan for the College Option.
Professor Hamilton said that it sounded like this meant it did not have to be approved by College
Council yet.

Professor Kaplowitz felt that Dean Lopes could send CUNY central an absolutely accurate statement
that a 10 faculty member committee unanimously developed a College Option that Dean Lopes
supported, but that this has not yet gone through governance.

Dean Lopes said she intended to do just that and had little choice to say anything else, given that the
vote to suspend the second reading was not passed a few minutes ago. She said that her concern was
for the implications for the college and the follow up phone call, because the issue has become so
politicized. She asked the room again, “How far are people willing to go, and what will the cost to the
college be? How are the people who have to implement this going to be able to implement this? How
many students are not going to graduate because we couldn’t hire a programmer for three months to
get the programming into SIMS? These issues are very practical and very behind the scenes, but they
are real.” She also said that she has only been at the college for two and a half years, so she does not
have a strong sense of how severe the University’s reaction might be if she did not provide a faculty-
sanctioned plan on April 1st as required.

Professor Adams said that the “Machiavellian beauty” of the central office’s actions here was that this
situation sets the faculty up to lose no matter what. Neither going along nor opposing Pathways can
give the faculty a good outcome. He asked the committee to step back and be aware that the
administrators have the power in the short run, but this could be a chance for the faculty to regroup
and think about a long-term response. He said that he has been sitting on one of the CUNY-wide
committees, and he was personally aware that several of the committees have resolved to support the
colleges on this issue. Those committees do not intend to override the colleges. However, the
institution has set rigid boundaries, and pushing back against those boundaries will take longer than
three months. He asked this committee to think past June and past this vote.
Professor Hamilton felt that Dean Lopes could answer any follow up phone calls from CUNY with a statement that the college is following the faculty’s agreed-upon process for how to determine a curriculum.

Professor Von Lampe asked what the consequences to students might be if John Jay simply did not implement Pathways at all. He asked if it was correct that whatever Pathways imposes on John Jay could not impact students unless it was channeled through College Council first.

Dean Lopes said that Pathways will impact current students. The current freshman class, as of 2012, will be impacted by Pathways. She said the university can do many things to enforce its policy.

Professor Kaplowitz spoke to the probable thinking of CUNY central. She began by detailing John Jay’s careful work on Gen Ed as a good example of deliberate, inclusive faculty governance on what is often “the third rail of higher education.” She felt that 80th Street did not understand the care involved in that process, and that CUNY administration recklessly ignoring warnings from her and other faculty early on, but that when Pathways was addressed in June, the voices of dissent were not loud. She felt that if Dean Lopes had voiced dissent in May, the response might have been punitive, but today there are 3500 signatures on a petition. The voice of faculty opposition is clear and is not limited to any one CUNY campus. She felt this shift in sentiment contextualized whatever happened at this meeting in a different way now than it would have in June. She felt that the administration of CUNY has a great deal invested in making sure Pathways succeeds, as it is their legacy now, and so they would not be likely to harm the colleges, or Dean Lopes, by withholding needed funds, an act that would weaken the college’s ability to carry out CUNY’s wishes. She felt that CUNY administration can be punitive, but in this case, it would not be in their self-interest to do so, and so she felt that it would be right and necessary to stand up and say, “this is not the way the trustees of a great university treat the students and the curriculum and the faculty.”

Professor Dana Tarantino noted that the faculty’s wishes and the faculty’s actions in this matter were dissonant. “If the sentiment of the faculty is to be against Pathways, and if we continue to hand in revisions and course proposals that map to Pathways outcomes, then we have cognitive dissonance because we’re doing one thing but we’re saying another – and I don’t think we can do this.” She said that she had stopped sending in revisions in recent weeks, but she posed this question of procedure to the room. What is the impact of voting against the proposal if a professor then goes home to work on a course revision that would fit a course to CUNY’s proposed curriculum?

Dean Lopes said that a number of those course revisions could fit John Jay’s own Gen Ed, and there is a middle ground to be considered here.

Professor Carpi said that isn’t the case for Science. Science cannot offer the courses it has developed if Pathways passes.

Dean Lopes brought the discussion back around to the original proposal on the table, which was to consider the plan for the College Option. She said there was still work to do there. She asked the room to consider how this committee could take ownership of this process, even though the process had been prescribed.

Professor Adams said the structural problem of process is long-term, but for the short-term, the flexible core could be considered. He felt that the faculty should consider the actual question of students’ ability to transfer within CUNY that brought Pathways about to begin with. “We need to sit down and think about what Pathways says about us. What is it about the system that made this come about? It’s not a question of just going along versus not doing anything.”

Professor Sexton brought discussion back to the policy document on the table, and the fact that it does
not address Science’s problem. As a point of order, she wanted to know what the next step should be.

Dean Lopes said that the proposal would go back to the General Education subcommittee, which should receive any further feedback as is our normal process.

Professor Perez wanted to be very clear with UCASC about his subcommittee’s timeline, so feedback could make its way to him in a timely manner. He said he would call a meeting of the subcommittee for April 2, and all comments should be sent to him by then in as specific a form as possible. As an example, he said that if Science proposes that the scientific cluster be narrowed down, they should provide language to him that states specifically how to do so. He reiterated that he must have all feedback by April 2.

Professor Perez also wished to clarify the course of action that was decided upon in this meeting. Dean Lopes said that she would contact CUNY by April 1st, saying that the subcommittee has received its first level of feedback and so the subcommittee was working on finalizing the proposal for a second reading.

Professor Perez asked if she would show CUNY the draft of the proposal that was being considered, even though it had not passed governance. Dean Lopes said she would not.

Professor Adams was concerned that some part of John Jay’s charter might mean that Dean Lopes would be penalized somehow, as Dean, for contacting CUNY about the proposal. He clarified that his question was about governance, and was purely technical. If Dean Lopes has been set up by CUNY to sidestep governance by communicating about an issue before it passed, would she be violating the charter? Dean Lopes clarified that she planned to tell CUNY that the college option “has not gone through governance.”

Professor Kaplowitz asked if Dean Lopes would rather say “this is a draft.” Dean Lopes said she would not do that. She said that if the process is underway, and a proposal is being worked on, then she could not know what would ultimately be approved, so she would not show it to CUNY, but she could explain the process to CUNY.

Courses Subcommittee

At this point, because the meeting had gone past the scheduled ending time, a number of first reading agenda items were reordered.

CSL 3XX Vocational Development and Social Justice in Human Service

Kathy Killoran introduced this course, which has been taught experimentally. Professor Mickey Melendez explained that the course is a survey to cover basic vocational theory and train students to apply vocational theory in a number of human services contexts in order to assist people in choosing jobs. The course spends a lot of time on economic trends, special populations, gender, race, culture, sexual orientation, age, and so forth. Professor Berenecea Johnson-Eanes added that quite a few of the minor courses prepare students to work in Human Service professions, and many of those students will help people in direct and indirect ways, so this course will better prepare students who will be sitting with clients in human services capacities.

Professor Adams raised a concern about the broad range of introduction of new material in a 300-level course, where more depth is called for. He also felt that the course seems to overlap with the course Professor Gentile teaches on work. Professor Adams felt that there was a discrepancy between what the survey material the course is actually about and the theoretical material the course claims to be
about. The integration of practice issues are not highlighted. He also objected to multiple choice

testing at the 300-level. He said that by this time students should have mastered theories and have

begun using them. He had some particular points about the syllabus, including striking TBAs,

softening attendance requirements, and including low-stakes testing.

Dean Lopes said that the syllabus reads like a career counseling course as opposed to Human Services

or Justice. She noted that it would be fine to offer a career counseling course, but it should be stated.

Kathy Killoran noted a discrepancy between the writing section and the grading section, which were

inconsistent about the number of papers. Professor Melendez clarified his rationale. Eanes said it

should be spelled out.

On the subject of the level of the course, Professor Hamilton noted that the rationale for the 300-level

presented was that it builds on 200-level courses, but those courses were not presented as

prerequisites.

**PSY 3XX History of Psychology**

Kathy Killoran introduced the course, which is new. The subcommittee liked the course as described in

the proposal form and asked Professor Joshua Clegg to better describe it in the syllabus. Professor

Clegg was present and introduced the course by noting that 70% of Psychology curricula have this

course across the country, but it has never been offered at John Jay. In other departments it is often

offered as a capstone course to engage creative thinking. It is also thought of as a GRE test prep course.

Once it passes, it will probably run fairly regularly.

Professor Adams asked if the history of otherness could be attended to. For example, he would like the
term Golden Age of psychology to be put in quotation marks, because of all that it excludes in terms of
culture. He felt that the syllabus lacked appropriate mention of critique. Professor Clegg said the
textbook is actually a critical text. But Professor Adams noted that procedurally, all this body has to

analyze is the course proposal document, so this document needs to convey any critical stances that

may be inherent in the textbook.

Professor Sylvia Dapia wondered why a history of Psychology could come forward without mentioning

Freud, Lacan, or other iconic thinkers. Professor Clegg asked for examples of where those names

should appear in this document. Professor Dapia referred to the use of the term “gestalt theory.”

Professor Clegg said that the students would learn about these various thinkers but was not clear on

why specific names needed to be cited in the syllabus. Dean Lopes recast the question by asking if

there is a schema of who the major thinkers are, what is the course’s rationale for including some and

omitting others. That could be included in the proposal. Professor Clegg responded by noting that this
course does not approach Psychology in “the usual approach to history that lists a lot of dead white

men.” He said the approach here is to contextualize sociocultural movements, with more interest in

place, space and contexts than in individuals. Professor Adams pointed to the psychoanalysis lecture

listed for October 17 in the syllabus, noting that the discussion is about the way the material is being

presented. “One can get away from the great man idea, but not from the great idea idea,” said

Professor Adams. Dean Lopes brought up the point of order that this feedback is meant for Professor

Clegg to consider and possibly incorporate, but the vote would not take place until the second reading.

On the point about Freud, Professor Leippe pointed out that people outside of the discipline see Freud

as “a much bigger piece of the Psychology pie” than those inside of Psychology.

Dean Lopes said the issue is really about how the course’s content is framed.
POL 2XX Western Political Thought

Kathy Killoran introduced the course, which was originally called Great Political Thinkers, but was renamed after the subcommittee’s strong reaction. Professor Monica Varsanyi was taking feedback for Prof. Jack Jacobs who could not be present.

Dean Lopes asked if the department would consider splitting this into two courses, as this kind of approach is out of date. Conceptually, the content of the course was not clear to her. What are students supposed to get out of it other than the survey? She felt this was manifested particularly in the course description. She also found the model syllabus out of date with the discipline, as it relied on secondary texts and old editions, though there have been major changes to the field and how political theory should be taught in the last ten years. She felt the course is a very exciting idea, and with an update would be more exciting for the students.

Professor Monica Varsanyi responded to the question of scope, noting that Professor Jacobs already teaches a POL 375 that covers contemporary thinkers. Given that such a class exists, she was not sure how feasible it would be to split this course into two, offering three altogether. Dean Lopes said then students would have a choice of courses.

Professor Von Lampe asked if Dean Lopes was speaking against the idea of covering antiquity through early modernity. He said he enjoyed the recurring themes that connect those eras in history, and felt that it would help students to see the connections in a whole body of thinking.

Dean Lopes said that might be possible at Yale, but it would be a lot to ask of a John Jay student who comes in with a 900 SAT score. She felt a two semester course would be more appropriate to the John Jay student’s abilities.

Professor Varsanyi said there might be faculty coverage issues if the course is split. Professor Adams wondered if there might be a contingent of students who can handle this amount of material. He felt this would be a good chance for outcomes assessment.

Dean Lopes suggested limiting the course to a few major concepts in order to limit the scope, noting that there are numerous ways to reduce the amount of material covered. She offered to meet with Prof. Jacobs as this is her area of expertise.

Course Revisions

PSY 3XX Multicultural Psychology

Professor Leippe was present to represent the proposal.

Professor Perez objected to the list of professor consulted, since they were members of the Psychology department. Professor Leippe said he did not write it but he agreed and would convey the point. Professor Perez also noted that LLS does have a psychologist in the department who should be consulted about this course.

Kathy Killoran said the subcommittee gave feedback on this course a long time ago, and Professor Angela Crossman did meet with subcommittee a number of times. They have consulted a lot. It was a year ago, so maybe some of those conversations were not fresh in the proposer’s mind when the document was drafted recently.

Professor Adams asked if this course is optional. He was curious about the level of the reading assignments, which seemed demanding.
Kathy Killoran noted that this course is being taught as study abroad in Bali this summer.

Professor Adams felt the course may be attempting to grasp too much content, choosing breadth over depth. In terms of scaffolding, do those 100 and 200-level courses address multicultural issues that would alleviate the pressure on this course to cover so much.

Dean Lopes noted that feedback should be directed to Professor Crossman.

**POL 230 Principles of Constitutional Government**

Kathy Killoran explained the changes of this course, which include a change to the title, level and prerequisites. This change impacts the PAD major, in that it is currently a required course. PAD has been consulted, and they will likely remove the course from their major and replace it with LAW 203 Constitutional Law.

Professor Varsanyi explained that both of the courses from Political Science here are part of the Political Science proposal that was approved earlier in the day.

Professor Joshua Wilson was present to explain that the course’s material is more suited for upper level students, and the department is trying to bring this in line with national standards. These courses are typically offered as upper division courses.

**POL 430 Seminar in Problems in Civil Rights and Civil Liberties**

Kathy Killoran explained that this course is being dropped to the 300-level and prerequisites are being revised to reduce senior standing to junior standing and refresh the description of the course and the title.

Professor Von Lampe felt that this is a very legalistic approach, and wondered if there are more sociological or political perspectives to bring to the material. Professor Wilson said that this varies depending on who teaches it, and has been a subject of discussion in the department. Professor Maxwell Mak provided an example of this by explaining how his approach to the material varies from Professor Wilson’s.

**SPA 201-202 Intermediate Conversational Spanish I & II**  
**SPA 208 The Themes of Justice in 20th Century Spanish Literature**  
**SPA 211-212 Intermediate Conversational Spanish for Hispanic Students I & II**  
**FRE 201-202 Intermediate French I & II**  
**ITA 201-202 Intermediate Italian I & II**

Kathy Killoran explained that the above courses could be explained as a package. This series of Foreign Language courses standardizes the language that describes the level of the courses in terms used in national standards. Also, the prerequisites are being changed to reflect the fact that there are placement exams, so students can be placed into courses based on their placement score without a prior course. The changes clarify titles and prerequisites and various tracks.

Professor Perez asked if in SPA 208, the definition of justice was being removed from the courses in the revisions. Dapia confirmed that this was intentional, because the department wanted to make these courses more general.
A motion was made and seconded to adjourn the meeting. It was unanimously acclaimed. The meeting concluded at 1:13 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah Hammond, Scribe
THE UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM & ACADEMIC STANDARDS COMMITTEE
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- POL 4XX Senior Seminar in Law, Courts and Politics
- PHI 4XX Senior Seminar in the History of Philosophy
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- Guidelines for Course Levels
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CJBA 4XX Research and Writing in Criminal Justice I
CJBA 4YY Research and Writing in Criminal Justice II
PSY 3XX History of Psychology
BIO 3YY Human Anatomy & Physiology Lab
PSY 3XX Multicultural Psychology
LIT 3XX Writing Nature: Literature and Ecology
CJBA 4XX Criminal Justice Internship Experience I
CJBA 4YY Criminal Justice Internship Experience II
ENG 3XX Advanced Fiction Writing
FL-INT Introduction to Interpreting
POL 2XX Judicial Processes and Politics
POL 4XX Senior Seminar in Law, Courts and Politics
PHI 4XX Senior Seminar in the History of Philosophy

Course revisions:
POL 230 Principles of Constitutional Government
POL 430 Seminar in Problems in Civil Rights and Civil Liberties
SPA 201-202 Intermediate Conversational Spanish I & II
SPA 208 The Themes of Justice in 20th Century Spanish Literature
SPA 211-212 Intermediate Conversational Spanish for Hispanic Students I & II
FRE 201-202 Intermediate French I & II
ITA 201-202 Intermediate Italian I & II
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Initials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>C. Jama</td>
<td>African-American Studies</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ali Raja</td>
<td>Rizwan</td>
<td>Student Member</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baatz</td>
<td>Simon</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balazon</td>
<td>Ervin</td>
<td>Student Member</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corbett</td>
<td>Glenn</td>
<td>Protection Management</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corthals</td>
<td>Angelique</td>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cunningham</td>
<td>Ryan</td>
<td>Student Member</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dapia</td>
<td>Silvia</td>
<td>Foreign Languages and Literatures</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eanes</td>
<td>Bernecea J.</td>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>Jay</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammond</td>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Scribe</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Killoran</td>
<td>Kathy</td>
<td>Undergraduate Studies</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lapidus</td>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>Art and Music</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larkin</td>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Health and Physical Education</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>Kyoo</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leippe</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lopes</td>
<td>Anne</td>
<td>Dean, Undergraduate Studies</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McClure</td>
<td>Mary Ann</td>
<td>Interdisciplinary Studies</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moreno</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Academic Assessment</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocejo</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pease</td>
<td>Alison</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perez</td>
<td>Lisandro</td>
<td>Latin American and Latino/a Studies</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peters</td>
<td>Judy-Lynne</td>
<td>Public Management</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puls</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saulnier</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>VP, Enrollment Management</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexton</td>
<td>Ellen</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snajdr</td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sung</td>
<td>Hung-En</td>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ATTENDANCE

Quorum = 16 Voting Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tarantino</td>
<td>Dana</td>
<td>Communication and Theatre Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varsanyi</td>
<td>Monica</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Velazquez-Torres</td>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>SEEK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Von Lampe</td>
<td>Klaus</td>
<td>Law, Police Science, CJA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Guests:**

- James Cauthen
- Angela Crossman
- Shu-Yuan Cheng
- Kate Szur
- John Pittman
- Karen Kaplowitz
- Alexander Schultz
- Adam Berlin
- Maxwell Mak
- Cathy Kemp
The Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee held its meeting on Friday, April 20, 2012 at 9:30 a.m. in Room 610T. Dean Anne Lopes, UCASC Chair, called the meeting to order.


**Absent:** Glenn Corbett, Ryan Cunningham, Ben Lapidus, Ali Raja Rizwan,

**Guests:** Adam Berlin, Jane Bowers, James Cauthen, Angela Crossman, Shu-Yuan Cheng, Karen Kaplowitz, Cathy Kemp, Maxwell Mak, John Pittman, Alexander Schlutz, Kate Szur, Jeremy Travis.

**Administrative Announcements**

Dean Lopes announced that the grade appeals proposal was not approved at College Council but referred back to UCASC. It has gone to the Standards Subcommittee who revised the proposal to be revisited on today's agenda. Also, she mentioned that President Travis and Provost Bowers would be coming for the Pathways section of the meeting, which would take place at 11 a.m.

She also announced work to develop an interdisciplinary human services major at John Jay. She said the Counseling Department will be working with her on the design the major along with a group of faculty from appropriate departments. The faculty group is now forming so please share this opportunity to participate with any interested faculty from your departments.

**Approval of the minutes of March 23, 2012**

A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of March 23, 2012 with typographical errors corrected.

No discussion.

The amended minutes of March 23, 2012 were approved with 22 votes in favor and 1 abstention.

**Old Business**

**Courses (2nd readings)**

**BIO 3YY Human Anatomy & Physiology Lab**
Professor Cheng was present to speak for the course.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the new course, BIO 3YY Human Anatomy & Physiology Lab.

Professor Cheng spoke to the feedback from the last meeting about the Science department’s conscientious approach to experiments with live animals.

Professor Jama Adams raised a question about critique in Science, then Dean Lopes clarified that Science teaches ethics issues in the lecture course, but not the lab portion.

Professor Klaus Von Lampe asked about the exemptions for students who object to the use of live animals on ethical grounds. Professor Cheng said that students may present a note to be exempted from those experiments.

BIO 3YY Human Anatomy & Physiology Lab was approved with 23 votes in favor and 1 abstention.

CJBA 4XX Research and Writing in Criminal Justice I

A motion was made and seconded to approve the new course, CJBA 4XX Research and Writing in Criminal Justice I.

Professor Hung-En Sung listed the changes made to the course since the committee’s feedback at the last meeting. Among those, the name of the course has been changed to “Senior Thesis.” Also, the requirements for face-to-face meetings with mentors have been revised to accommodate the needs of working students. Issues related to research ethics and IRB oversight are covered in the first course, and now the language in the proposal and the syllabus reflects that.

Kathy Killoran asked if the omission of a prerequisite was intentional. Professor Sung said that was an accident, and CJBA 380 should be a prerequisite for the course.

Professor Adams asked if this course is formally a Writing Intensive course. Dean Lopes noted that there is no such formal distinction for courses at John Jay, though a professor may be certified to teach a Writing Intensive section of a course. Professor Adams still had a question about the department’s resources for students in this course, given how much writing is involved in the course. To him, it looked like a high-risk course. Dean Lopes said the major itself has quite a bit of writing in it, unlike many Social Science majors. She also said the department can work with the Writing Center directly to bring resources into the classroom. Professor Adams said it might be useful to put that up front in the syllabus, because the risk of failure seems high in this course. Dean Lopes said that given that this is a senior capstone, students should have adequate writing skills by the time they reach this course.

CJBA 4XX Research and Writing in Criminal Justice I was unanimously approved with 24 votes in favor.

CJBA 4YY Research and Writing in Criminal Justice II

A motion was made and seconded to approve the new course, CJBA 4YY Research and Writing in Criminal Justice II.
Professor Sung described the changes, which are similar to the prior course. There was no further discussion.

*CJBA 4YY Research and Writing in Criminal Justice II was unanimously approved with 24 votes in favor.*

**PSY 3XX History of Psychology**

Professor Joshua Clegg was not present, so this item was held for later.

**CSL 3XX Vocational Development and Social Justice in Human Service**

Vice President Berenecea Johnson-Eanes was present to speak for the course in lieu of her colleague Professor Mickey Melendez. She said the amount and kind of assignments have been revised, as well as the depth and breadth of the material covered in each session.

*A motion was made and seconded to approve the new course, CSL 3XX Vocational Development and Social Justice in Human Service.*

Professor Nancy Velazquez-Torres had a question about the essay questions for the in-class exam, which seemed too demanding. There was some discussion of how the syllabus might be tweaked to be clearer about the requirements of the exam, such as saying “a brief paragraph,” or other such language.

Professor Karen Kaplowitz felt that this level of critique of the design of an exam was not appropriate. There was further discussion at this point about what this body will actually approve, and whether the syllabus is being approved here or not.

Dean Lopes said there are assessment issues associated with the exam and it would be appropriate for this body to examine that sort of question. Professor Ed Snajdr respectfully disagreed, and said such a question about the manner and form of an exam should be left to the professor's discretion.

*CSL 3XX Vocational Development and Social Justice in Human Service was unanimously approved with 24 votes in favor.*

**PSY 3XX Multicultural Psychology**

*A motion was made and seconded to approve the new course, PSY 3XX Multicultural Psychology.*

Professor Angela Crossman spoke to the revisions to the course since the first reading. Breadth was added to the syllabus and ethnicity content was addressed. The scaffolding of the topics and assignments was also strengthened. She also spoke to the suggestion that ANT 101 be added to the prerequisites, and said this had been seriously considered, and would benefit students. However, to avoid creating a bottleneck, the department elected to make that course an alternative prerequisite.

*PSY 3XX Multicultural Psychology was unanimously approved with 25 votes in favor.*
Course revisions (2nd reading)

POL 230 Principles of Constitutional Government

Professor Jim Cauthen was present to speak for the course.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the new course, POL 230 Principles of Constitutional Government.

There was no discussion.

POL 230 Principles of Constitutional Government was unanimously approved with 25 votes in favor.

POL 430 Seminar in Problems in Civil Rights and Civil Liberties

Professor Cauthen said there were no changes to this course since the last meeting. Professor Lisandro Perez brought up the procedural question about course descriptions, and wanted to know if the course description must be in complete sentences. “Any time I read the old course description, I like it much better than the revised one,” he said, noting how much crisper a description reads without complete sentences. Dean Lopes said there is no policy about course descriptions, but there is a practice of writing in complete sentences. Professor Perez asked when the practice changed. Kathy Killoran said the practice changed about seven years ago, when the bulletin was significantly changed. Professor Allison Pease said it is a good thing to model full sentences to students. Dean Lopes recommended that the PPP subcommittee consider this issue in consultation with Professor Pease and Professor Perez.

Professor Adams asked if Professor Cauthen would consider revising the attendance policy; especially broadening the language regarding absences for religious holidays to other scenarios students often face. Professor Cauthen disagreed with the point, and said over the years this particular policy has been the most effective for allowing him to remain more of a teacher than an administrator when it comes to dealing with student attendance.

Professor Adams felt the statement about religion seemed needlessly discriminatory against non-religious students. Professor Cauthen said that he is fair and flexible with students who speak with him about medical issues, and would be willing to add language about that to the syllabus. Professor Adams said that the issue here is the difference between a professor's personal practice and what is documented in the syllabus. Dean Lopes said that this should be addressed in the Standards Subcommittee. Professor Cauthen wished to speak for his resistance to including the language “at the professor's discretion,” which arises from a history of receiving an overwhelming amount of doctor's excuse notes.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the revisions to the course, POL 430 Seminar in Problems in Civil Rights and Civil Liberties. It was unanimously approved with 24 votes in favor.

SPA 201-202 Intermediate Conversational Spanish I & II

Professor Silvia Dapia was here to speak for the course. She asked if these Foreign Language course revisions could be addressed as a package, as they were at the last meeting.
A motion was made and seconded to approve SPA 201-202-211-212 as a package.

Dean Lopes opened the floor to discussion of the set of courses.

The motion to approve SPA 201-202-211-212 was unanimously approved with 24 votes in favor.

A motion to approve the revision of SPA 208 Themes of Justice in 20th Century Spanish Literatures was made and seconded. It was approved unanimously with 24 votes in favor.

A motion to take FRE 201-202, ITA 201-202 as a package was seconded and unanimously approved with 24 votes in favor.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the course revisions to FRE 201-202 and ITA 201-202. The course revisions were approved unanimously with 24 votes in favor.

Grade Appeals Process 3rd Reading

Professor Karen Kaplowitz spoke for this proposal and its reception at College Council. The Standards Subcommittee has revisited the policy in response to the students' feedback. The timeline has been revised to clarify deadlines for both faculty and students at various points in the process. The language has also been revised to address a few common obstacles, such as professors who are no longer at the college, and departments who do not complete the paperwork in time.

Dean Lopes opened the floor to discussion. Professor Susan Larkin had a question about whether a formal appeal goes to the faculty member or the committee first. Professor Kaplowitz said it should go to the professor first. Professor Larkin said the form seems to say otherwise. Vice President Richard Saulnier clarified that there are two separate appeals forms, and on the first form, only the professor's signature is required. The second form does go to the committee.

Professor Adams had concern about the 15-day deadline and asked that the language about the documentation aspect of the student's package be modified. Dean Lopes suggested changing that language to “available documents” for cases in which professors have not returned work to the students.

Professor Adams also felt that the rule about limiting the amount of appeals in a student's career might be unnecessary. Professor Kaplowitz said that policy had been set up in response to historical examples of students who appeal any grade that is not an A. Vice President Saulnier said it was a practice but acknowledged that this limitation is not in the bulletin. He said that now it is not commonplace for a student to appeal more than three times anyway. He felt that it is appropriate to have a limit, though three might be too low.

Professor Judy-Lynne Peters disagreed, on the premise that it could be that the tenth appeal is the legitimate one, and producing an arbitrary number limitation seems unnecessary. Professor Jay Hamilton was also opposed to the limit, on the grounds that students might look at the policy and choose not to make legitimate appeals because of a desire to reserve the opportunity to appeal for later. He did feel that the issue of the serial appeal raises valid concerns about a student's behavior and future, but should be dealt with directly through channels other than this.

Professor Von Lampe felt a limit was not necessary, in that students would realize that serial appealing would not be effective every time. Professor Kaplowitz felt that perhaps a condition could be added to
the limit.

Professor Velazquez-Torres felt the limitation on appeals is not just, which is at the very core of the college’s values. Professor Adams felt that if departments have difficulty standing up to students, and grant A grades for every appeal, putting a limit on the number of times students can appeal, is not the way to deal with it.

Professor Kaplowitz said she would accept adding a condition for egregious cases. Professor Adams said that every case could be an egregious case. Professor Larkin suggested changing it to four appeals to make it 10% of the number of courses students take to earn their degrees.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the Grade Appeals Process policy.

Professor Adams asked if Professor Kaplowitz would consider removing the limit from the proposal and revisiting in two years.

Vice President Saulnier spoke to procedure, clarifying the rules of order for this discussion.

Professor Larkin withdrew her motion to approve the Grade Appeals Process policy. Vice President Saulnier who seconded, agreed to withdrawing the motion.

A discussion ensued about the appropriate way to go about approving and voting for this proposal with the various changes needed.

A motion was made and seconded to amend the Grade Appeals Process Proposal by removing the sentence “Student can file no more than 3 times.”

The amendment to the Grade Appeals Process Proposal was approved with 21 votes in favor, 2 opposed, and 2 abstentions.

A motion was made and seconded to change further wording in the Grade Appeals Process Proposal regarding availability of students work materials.

The motion to change further wording in the Grade Appeals Process Proposal was approved with 24 votes in favor and 1 abstention.

A motion was made and seconded to vote on the Grade Appeals Process Proposal as revised. It was approved with 24 in favor and 1 opposed.

Courses

PSY 3XX History of Psychology

Professor Angela Crossman arrived at the meeting and spoke for changes to the course in response to last meeting’s feedback. She explained that the textbook is more explicitly described making it clear that it provides a critical context of the material. Professor Clegg has also added Freud and Brewer to class topics.

A motion was made and seconded to approve PSY 3XX History of Psychology.

Professor Adams asked about the agenda for class on December 16, which seemed to indicate that students drop off an essay without a class meeting. He felt that should be modified.

Professor Velazquez-Torrez asked about page 6, which seems to have a typo in the numbering.
Professor Crossman agreed and said this would be changed. She also agreed to adjust the language for December 16th on the class calendar.

*PSY 3XX History of Psychology was unanimously approved with 25 votes in favor.*

**Programs**

**New Certificate Program in Legal Interpretation**
**New Certificate Program in Translation**
**Certificate Program in Translation**

Professor Baatz presented the three certificates, to be considered together. Students taking these certificates will be prepared to take exams both at the federal and state levels, as well as prepared for graduate level work in this field.

Professor Silvia Dapia pointed to the cover memo regarding the certificate in legal translation. She noted a mistake in the document, where the word “Spanish” was meant to be struck from the memo. The department wishes this certificate to be as inclusive as possible of any language, with an eye toward future offerings. Kathy Killoran addressed the issue of changing prefixes to from SPA to FL, and so forth, and said that this would be problematic for students earning Spanish minors, these certificates, and their degree audits.

Dean Lopes said it is usual to offer programs in translation and interpretation and also to offer courses in particular languages, with a separation between the programs, sets of courses in each language, and courses that address translation in general. She said there are various ways that such a program could be rolled out.

Professor Dapia also said the course titles have been changed in response to the committee’s feedback. These have been listed in the cover memo and will be on the proposals for the second readings.

Professor Adams asked about the language in the memo that requires exact translation, and wished for an acknowledgment of the limitations of translation. He noted that some things get lost in translation. Professor Dapia said this is the central definition of the term translation. Professor Adams felt that the notion of “lost in translation” is not conveyed in the document. It was suggested that adding the word “potential” would do the trick. Dean Lopes said this is a tweak.

Professor Perez felt the program would be wonderful for the college, but had a serious concern about who would teach it. Professor Dapia said the department has a search underway to hire a specialist in this area, and it would be an area of development for other languages.

Vice President Saulnier addressed the question of prefixes. He asked if there would be a series of courses related to interpretation that would not be language-specific. Professor Dapia said that is not likely, but it might be organized by sections. Dean Lopes said this could be addressed outside of this meeting.

Virginia Moreno asked that the learning outcomes be clarified.

Dean Lopes said that further feedback can be addressed to Professor Dapia.
General Education Subcommittee

Proposal for the College Option portion of Pathways Gen Ed Program

Dean Lopes introduced President Jeremy Travis and Provost Jane Bowers, who came to the meeting in order to discuss the College Option.

President Travis thanked the committee for the opportunity to speak. He said this is a very important moment for the college and UCASC. He began by providing a historical framework for the deliberations. Five years ago, the college revised its own General Education curriculum. Such an endeavor was high-risk, or “the third rail of higher education” as Karen Kaplowitz had put it. President Travis recalled asking Provost Bowers at that time how long it might take to make a new Gen Ed, and remembered his own surprise at her answer, that it might take four years. He recalled her saying that this needed to be done slowly and consultatively. When our new Gen Ed passed last year after much soul-searching and useful jockeying he was as proud as the faculty of the success. Concurrently, the university was examining the issue of student transfer. The university found that transfer is central to student experience at CUNY and the different standards and rules in use from college to college were damaging students’ academic progress and financial aid eligibility. Students were losing time, duplicating courses, and losing a lot of money trying to navigate the transitions from one CUNY campus to another. Central to this examination was the question of general education.

He noted that the differences between CUNY’s proposed Gen Ed and John Jay’s Gen Ed can be big or small depending on one’s perspective. “I get the irony of the situation,” he said. “We live in a world with a larger university that we’re part of, and a Board of Trustees.” He said that he believed that no amount of signatures on the current petition that is circulating would change CUNY’s decision on Pathways. He urged faculty to vote with the best interests of John Jay students in mind.

He went on to stress the student perspective on Pathways. CUNY has to solve the problem of students’ difficulties moving from one college to another. Things may be right at John Jay, but they are not elsewhere, and the burden falls on students when disagreements between various campuses create obstacles on the path to a degree. So despite the process, he supports the university on this and change must happen.

“I want you to think of the latitude we have as really close to the latitude we want when it comes to designing our curriculum,” President Travis said. He reminded everyone that today’s vote is about our own College Option portion of the general education curriculum. Addressing the urge to civil disobedience, he said that if people want to express a point of view about the university, he hoped that it would not be in terms of our own curriculum. He concluded with a reminder that student success is critical and that he hopes that faculty will unleash their creativity on creating a strong curriculum.

Provost Bowers spoke next. She noted that the culture at John Jay values and respects shared governance, with an understanding that it does not happen quickly, and so CUNY’s rapid movement to push Pathways may feels like a violation of that spirit. “As the chief academic officer of the college, I feel very deeply for the faculty’s feeling of having their authority usurped through the process, by the way the process has been handled. The President and I have faithfully reported that feeling to the University on several occasions and in writing. We have actually let the university know of your dissatisfaction, unlike many of our colleagues.”

She felt that John Jay’s work on Gen Ed had been a model process with a model outcome and felt terrible about having to change it now. However, she wanted to emphasize that today’s vote would be on the College Option, which is a discrete block of credits that John Jay can have complete control over. “It is our own 12 credits, and they are our credits, to do with as you, our faculty, wish to do with them. I ask you to base your decision on your substantive objections, not based on your feelings,
justified as they are, as to how this has been handled.”

Dean Lopes opened the floor to discussion.

Professor Von Lampe asked if there have been any changes to the level of rigor in the Pathways common core. Dean Lopes said there has been considerable movement on items like the Pathways learning outcomes, which do not need to be spelled out on individual syllabi, though courses do need to map to the outcomes. She said she had been seeing flexibility on the curricular level, but not on the administrative level. The university has been reaffirming its administrative demands clearly when it comes to deadlines and paperwork. At the implementation meeting a few weeks prior, she was clearly told “we will need to adhere to the schedule for implementation,” and she is responsible for the schedule on the campus.

Provost Bowers reminded the room that the learning outcomes in the College Option are John Jay’s learning outcomes, not CUNY’s, and those learning outcomes would not be reviewed by 80th Street.

Professor Jay Hamilton raised a concern about the unpredictable nature of the Board of Trustees. Even if there is no special pathways committee, any curriculum that goes through the Chancellor’s Report will be reviewed by the Board of Trustees. President Travis clarified that this is the Chancellor’s report, which is a very different situation.

Professor Kaplowitz said that it will have to be approved by Chancellor Logue’s office, and she would scrutinize the items in the College Option.

Dean Lopes said that there have been no guidelines from CUNY about the college option, so the prior concern was unfounded. President Travis agreed, stating that there is no chance that Chancellor Logue would object to our college option. Dean Lopes explained that the college option proposal includes parts of our John Jay Gen Ed proposal and the university liked it very much. She does not anticipate any issues with the college option. The faculty who worked on our general education process are highly respected by CUNY.

Professor John Pittman referenced last year’s issue with the Board’s reaction to our honorary degree candidate and commencement speaker, which also seemed like an item that was completely up to the college.

As there were no further questions for the Provost and the President, they left the room at this point.

Dean Lopes brought the room back to the agenda, handing the floor to Professor Perez to report from his subcommittee on the College Option.

Professor Perez spoke to the context of the subcommittee’s work. The subcommittee was tasked with deciding a plan for the college option by March 1. At the last UCASC meeting, they did present that plan, with a preamble to explain the document and to express the difficulty of the task. At the last UCASC meeting, there was a motion to waive the second reading due to the deadline from 80th street, and that motion failed by one or two votes. So the subcommittee heard comments on the plan. They received essentially only one proposal for change from the Science Department. After that meeting, the subcommittee met twice to consider the amendments proposed by the Science department. At the subcommittee’s meetings, most of the discussion concerned the subcommittee’s discomfort with taking action. Eventually, there was a vote on the Science proposition. Each one of those specific proposals from Science was turned down, with very split votes. Some members of the subcommittee abstained, not because of the Science proposal itself, but because they wanted to abstain from the Pathways process. Because the Science proposal was turned down, at this meeting, Professor Perez was presenting the original plan for the college option, unchanged from the first reading.
A motion was made and seconded to approve the College Option.

Professor Angelique Corthals spoke for the science proposal, explained the three points that had been proposed by the Science Department, and how they had been meant to achieve the learning outcomes of the required core.

Professor Corthals was charged by her department to convey the following message. “The Science department has voted on Pathways, and almost unanimously rejected Pathways, and therefore as a representative of the department, I will not be able to vote positively on the current proposal.”

Dean Lopes asked for further discussion.

Professor Pittman spoke for the Philosophy department, explaining that the Philosophy Discipline Council held a meeting a year ago to discuss Pathways. At that meeting, they decided unanimously to reject Pathways, call for its withdrawal, and call for a revision based on genuine faculty governance. Earlier in April, he put forward a similar resolution, which was approved by the department. In light of this history, he wanted to address the strategic question raised by the President of the significance of today’s vote. He felt that it would be a false premise to consider today’s vote a vote on purely the College Option itself. Since the College Option is part of a larger package, approving it would signify “making good on what most of us in this room would agree is a bad deal.” Though the President had said that no amount of signatures or disobedience would adjust the university’s stance, Professor Pittman disagreed. “I would submit to you that there is only one reason the university has moved, and that is because of the strident voice of opposition, and so it seems to me that every member of this committee has to vote on Pathways itself, not just on the College Option.”

Professor Adams was sympathetic to both Professor Pittman and President Travis’s arguments. He said that he had problems accepting that this is the right vehicle to fight the battles that need to be fought. On the point of faculty governance, he felt that the university has never allowed the faculty to speak in a deliberative and coherent voice on curricular activities, so collective action only took place around issues like dental plans and health benefits. He asked how the faculty might mobilize against this system, and said that he didn’t feel this vote on Pathways was the way to do it. His second point was about the faculty’s complicity in the awkward transfer policy. The disregard for student interests is a festering problem and a part of faculty governance. As to the big picture, he said “I see no opportunities that have been created for all faculty to come together outside of the union.” He pointed out the lack of faculty participation in genuine activism on these issues, and called for greater movement outside of meetings like this. “We can fight this, but this is not the battle, this is a skirmish, and I’m reluctant to put out political energy to fight this particular battle, when there is a much larger battle to be fought in the long-term.”

Vice President Eanes presented a letter from the President of the Student Council, Whitney Brown, and reported widespread support of Pathways from the students at all levels of student governance.

Vice President Saulnier said that Pathways is the result of a twenty-year effort by the university to have reasonable transfer policies for students. “The University has put a lot of work into different efforts to tackle this on the course level and departmental level, and it hasn’t worked.” He said there are students who have had to take up to 135 credits to complete a degree in transferring from one campus to another. “Pathways seems to be a radical reaction to that, but it’s an effort to help students get their degrees. This document being voted on today is not that. We should consider what’s before us as opposed to the entire Pathways issue because Pathways is not going to go away, and this is the proposal that came out of our governance structures.”

Professor Kaplowitz agreed that transferring between colleges has been terrible for students, due to policies of elitism at some colleges, arrogance, ignorance in many cases, and failures to actually look at
the courses. She noted that one part of this problem is that the university has not funded the colleges to update the TIPPS system, and only one person at John Jay updates that system. As a point of information, Kathy Killoran disagreed with that statement, explaining that TIPPS gets updated by each Chancellors’ Report as it is submitted.

Professor Kaplowitz continued by saying that only three CUNY colleges have approved Pathways, and all the other colleges have declined to approve, so she wanted the UCASC committee to know that a negative vote today would not make John Jay an outlier. Dean Lopes disagreed with the statistics here, noting that the College Option is in the process of governance at many colleges, just as it is at John Jay, and has been approved at one College. There was a discussion at this point of which outcomes were actually known.

Professor Jay Hamilton wanted to address the question of whether the College Option is separate from Pathways. Referred to the President’s language about this feeling like a violation, Professor Hamilton said, “It’s one thing to be violated, but it’s another thing to have that then used to say that we want to be violated, or we’re okay being violated, and it sets up a bad precedent. Part of the reason I went into the academy is that I didn’t want to work in a business environment where pragmatism is the rule of the day and the bottom line is the most important thing. I want to support my view of what the ethical thing to do is. I think it is important that we don’t have our college option be used as an endorsement of the general program.”

Professor Perez felt that it is essential for voting members of the committee to be clear on which issue they are taking up when they express dissent. Since the proposal in the document on the table was no longer the subject of discussion, he wished to step out of his position as chair of that subcommittee and speak as a member of the faculty. “For me, at least, this is not a good battle in which to take up the issue of faculty governance. My concern with this as a battlefield is I believe there are some cross-currents with this anti-Pathways movement that are disturbing.” He saw a number of colleges demonstrating elitism in response to this, in their rough handling of students and courses that come from the community colleges. Secondly, some resistance to Pathways demonstrated traditionalism, where Pathways does present an opportunity. There has been interest in evolving Gen Ed beyond discipline-bound curriculum, and Pathways allows for that. He felt that the current plan is reasonably close to the plan John Jay originally proposed.

Professor Monica Varsanyi reported that her department had voted unanimously for her to vote no on this proposal. Though the Political Science department does believe that transfers should have a good way to get around the university, the curriculum they would like to see cannot be fulfilled with the College Option as it is. They also share Professor Hamilton’s concern that the vote for this will be seen as an endorsement of Pathways overall, so unfortunately, it does bleed over to the Pathways question.

On this point, Dean Lopes suggested strengthening the statement against Pathways in the preamble to the College Option proposal. The purpose would be twofold – to make criticism of the process a real part of the debate, and also to prevent the university from claiming this as a victory. She felt there is room for the faculty to assert its critique and outrage in writing as an intermediate idea that would bridge the debate and clarify the boundaries of the conflict.

Professor Allison Pease appreciated the canniness of the idea, but felt that by construction, the College Option is purely a reaction to Pathways, and so there would be no way to endorse the College Option without endorsing Pathways as a whole.

Vice President Saulnier said that Pathways is inevitable and it is imperative for the college to have a plan for the College Option portion for fall 2013.

Professor Hamilton asked if there is a requirement to offer a college option. Given the wording,
“option,” would it not be possible to leave those 12 credits out of the curriculum? Dean Lopes was not sure about the wording.

In terms of actual consequences, Professor Adams predicted that if UCASC rejects the College Option, the college will effectively be releasing any level of authority over the curriculum. “What will happen is we will reconvene in September and we will be told: this is what needs to be done because the Board of Trustees has decided your curriculum.” He wanted everybody to think clearly about the university’s likely response in the months to come. “I am very curious to see what we as a faculty are going to do in the face of this insult to our process. If we want to take moral positions, we have to deal with the consequences. If we take a stand against this, I’m curious to see where affirmation is going to come. I sit on a lot of committees where action is not taken, so I’m a little skeptical of people who jump up and say ‘morality this,’ ‘morality that,’ when morality is something that has to be dealt with every day. If we continue to act this way that is how the university mobilizes against us, because they see that we have no forward movement.”

Professor Hamilton agreed that there are problems with faculty participation, but thought that on this issue; there have been good signs of faculty activism. He applauded those departments who have given their untenured faculty the protection of a departmental vote. “I see that as a very positive sign that there is a sense of unity among the faculty.”

On that point, Professor Richard Ocejo said that the Sociology Department had instructed him to vote no. Professor Dana Tarantino reported the same mandate from the Communications and Theater Arts Department.

Professor Von Lampe asked if it would be possible to consider the Science department's proposals in this body. Professor Perez pointed out that part of the reason at least one of the Science Department’s proposals was turned down by the subcommittee was because some people chose to abstain. “So as a case in principle, that was an example where a curricular decision was decided because someone took a stand against the process. Abstentions are in effect negative votes so the folks who voted on principle essentially deep-sixed the science proposal.”

Dean Lopes asked if there was any other discussion on the science proposal. Professor Von Lampe said since the Science Department will not be voting for the College Option, I guess the point is moot.

The College Option Portion of Pathways Gen Ed Program was not approved, with 13 votes in favor, 7 opposed, and 4 abstentions.

Dean Lopes brought the meeting back to order and commended the committee for the high level of discussion. She reminded the committee that she would be asking departments to begin working on the 100-level Justice Core course since it was part of the John Jay approved Gen Ed model. She thanked everyone who served on the Gen Ed subcommittee.

New Business

Programs Subcommittee

Proposal to Revise the BS in Criminal Justice Management

Professor Baatz had to leave for class, so Professor Varsanyi summarized the proposal and the Programs Subcommittee’s feedback.

Professor Peters said this proposal had to change based on curricular changes from another
At the last UCASC meeting, the Political Science major revision. She also noted an edit to
the proposal, that POL 101 will have to be kept because it is a prerequisite for the new CJBS 101 course,
though that is not listed in the proposal. Kathy Killoran volunteered to make that adjustment before it
goes to College Council.

A motion was made and seconded to suspend the second reading of the Revision to the
BS in Criminal Justice Management. It was approved with 20 votes in favor and 1
abstention.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the proposal as amended by Professor
Peters. The Revision to the BS in Criminal Justice Management as amended was
approved unanimously with 21 votes in favor.

Courses Subcommittee

LIT 3XX Writing Nature: Literature and Ecology

Kathy Killoran discussed the subcommittee’s comments, which included a critique of the title.
Professor Schlutz had gotten feedback from students on the title and they felt that the title was right,
so it was kept the same. She reported that the subcommittee had asked questions about the balance of
fiction and nonfiction as well as the meaning of phrases like “meaningful blog entry.”

Professor Adams asked about Professor Schlutz’s term “automatic F” in the attendance policy.
Professor Schlutz described the way he handles attendance, and said he wanted to be clear in the
syllabus about the connection between attendance and grades. Professor Adams agreed with the
principle, but not with the wording of the policy.

Professor Corthals complimented the course and had a question about how students are introduced to
scientific ecology and natural sciences. Professor Schlutz said ultimately he is not qualified to teach the
course as a scientist, so he has supplemented the course with websites that include scientific reports.
He gives the students the ways and means to follow up on the science. He expressed a desire to team
teach the class in the future.

Kathy Killoran reminded the room that with the current Gen Ed, students are required to take two
science courses. Dean Lopes suggested that a possible future track would be to provide an Ecology 101
course that could lead to this course.

Professor Adams suggested a change in the wording about deadlines for the final paper and final exam.

Professor Adams asked if field trips would be supported. Professor Schlutz said this is not part of it so
far, but the Great Swamp in New Jersey is an important ecological site, and is not far away. Dean
Lopes said this might be possible to support, as it would be very in line with the college’s goal to expose
students to different experiences.

CJBA 4XX Criminal Justice Internship Experience I
CJBA 4YY Criminal Justice Internship Experience II

Professor Ellen Sexton introduced this package of courses and Professor Hung-En Sung, who
presented the course in lieu of Professor Jeff Mellow, who could not attend. Professor Sung said the
courses have been set up as a package for field work in semester one and reflection in semester two.
Professor Varsanyi had a question about the rationale for the 400-level of the course, noting a discrepancy in the math between the course description and the rationale. Professor Sung said he would relay this to Professor Mellow. Dean Lopes then reminded the committee that the PPP Subcommittee is still working on the Guidelines for Internships. This course requires 90 hours of fieldwork and along with class time and supplemental assignments, should meet the NYS requirements for a 3 credit course.

Dean Lopes said that the title of the second course is a bit misleading in that students will not be doing any internship hours in the second course but reflecting on their experiences from the first course. She suggested perhaps using some language about “practice, evaluation, and policy” in the title.

Kathy Killoran brought up CJBA 380, prerequisite, asking whether it should be a required. Professor Sung said he thought it should be included.

Dean Lopes said feedback should be directed to Jeff Mellow.

**ENG 3XX Advanced Fiction Writing**

Professor Adam Berlin was present to speak for the course. He said this is a continuation of a creative writing class, which they have in place. There was no further discussion.

**FL-INT 2XX Introduction to Interpreting**

Ellen Sexton introduced this course and Professor Dapia briefly introduced it. This course will be part of the new certificate programs that her department is proposal and discussed at UCASC today.

Kathy Killoran was concerned about the course description, which did not give students clear guidance about the level of language fluency expected for entry into the course. Professor Dapia said the course will be made up of students who have already interviewed for the certificate, so have been vetted by the department. Kathy Killoran asked that a note about that be added to the course description so it would appear in the UG Bulletin and the online schedule of courses.

Professor Peters asked if registration would be restricted to students who have been admitted to the certificate. Vice President Saulnier said that is possible, but the course has not been proposed that way here. Dean Lopes said that leaving the course open might help bring students into the certificate. However, the details surrounding the entrance requirements do need to be examined.

Kathy Killoran and Vice President Saulnier brought up the issue of prefixes and character-counts in course names. They said a larger conversation should take place outside of this meeting to discuss the logistics of naming courses and admitting students to John Jay for certificate programs without admitting them to the larger college, and so forth. Professor Dapia will meet with them before the second reading.

**POL 2XX Judicial Processes and Politics**

Kathy Killoran said this new course will now become part of the foundational areas in the Political Science major and the 400-level senior seminar flavor of this course will no longer be offered (POL 435 Seminar in Judicial Processes and Politics).

Professor Cauthen said this course and the revision of the major are products of the self study and site visit by outside evaluators. The benefit of making this a 200-level course is that it exposes students to
and lays the foundation for students to move into the Justice and Politics concentration.

Dean Lopes said feedback could be addressed to Professor Cauthen

**POL 4XX Senior Seminar in Law, Courts and Politics**

Kathy Killoran introduced this course, which has been designed to replace the senior seminar above that was being removed (POL 435). She noted that this course is not intended to be a capstone, but a senior seminar. Professor Maxwell Mak was present to speak for the course.

Professor Adams asked where this course makes room to discuss the ethos that justice is unfair in the United States. Professor Mak first wanted to clarify that this course is a special topics course, so whoever teaches it will determine the content. To answer Professor Adams' question, Professor Mak said in his own version of the course, such content would be implicit in material throughout, such as discussions of justices who vote their policy preferences or justices who take external factors into account in their verdicts. Professor Adams asked if there is a plan in the Political Science department to address the growing sense of fundamental flaws in the justice system itself. Professor Mak said that every course in Political Science deals with this, but there is not one course specifically devoted to it. Professor Cauthen added that there is a course on the politics of rights, but took Professor Adams' point and said he would convey it to the department.

Professor Perez asked if there is a course in which students learn about significant court decisions. Professor Cauthen said that the two courses presented in the first half of the meeting for course revision (POL 230 & 430) are case-based.

Dean Lopes said that feedback could be addressed to Professor Mak.

**PHI 4XX Senior Seminar in the History of Philosophy (Kemp)**

Professor Sexton presented the course and Professor Cathy Kemp was present as well. The course is one of three capstones being generated for the major in Philosophy.

Professor Adams asked about the syllabus' mention of alternate forms of skepticism and whether or not the course would include non-Western philosophy. Professor Kemp said the sample syllabus is from her Skepticism class. She said the major itself is structured around Western philosophy with a layer of critique built in, so by the time students reach this class, they will have many points of view. Professor Adams felt that a senior seminar in the history of philosophy that does not discuss anything outside of Western ideas seemed odd. Dean Lopes noted that the course description declares that this course could be about any particular idea, person, or movement, and will vary from semester to semester.

Professor Kyoo Lee added that the way the course is structured, it must be inclusive. Dean Lopes felt that the title is misleading, because the openness of the structure means that the course may be about a great many things. Professor Kemp said the department does wish for this course to deal with history. Professor Adams said that it would fine for the course to be called “western” philosophy, but it should have that in the name if the bias is there. He felt that the syllabus attached to the template should reflect the possible future options of the course. In this case, the syllabus has a bias, but the description does not, so how can the UCASC committee anticipate future offerings? Professor Lee said that every professor has a particular field of expertise, and this course syllabus reflects the expertise of the proposing professor.

Dean Lopes said further feedback could be addressed to Professor Kemp.
Course revisions

**SPA 321-322 Introduction to Spanish Literature I & II**
**SPA 331-332 Introduction to Latin American Literature I & II**

Kathy Killoran introduced the various literature courses from Spanish, which can be described as a package. The change to this bundle of courses is to change the prerequisites to have students to take a high intermediate level language courses before moving on to the 300-level literature courses.

*A motion was made and seconded to suspend the second readings of SPA 321-322-331-332. It was approved with 20 votes in favor and 1 abstention.*

Professor Perez noted that he was very pleased to see sentence fragments in the original course descriptions. There was no further discussion.

*A motion was made and seconded to take SPA 321-322-331-332 as a package. It was unanimously approved with 21 votes in favor.*

*A motion was made and seconded to approve the package of SPA 321-322-331-332. It was unanimously approved with 21 votes in favor.*

**SOC 440 Senior Seminar in Criminology**

Kathy Killoran introduced the revisions to this course, which include some changes to the assignments listed in the course description.

*A motion was made and seconded to waive the second reading of SOC 440 Senior Seminar in Criminology. The motion was approved with 20 votes in favor and 1 abstention.*

*A motion was made and seconded to approve SOC 440 Senior Seminar in Criminology. It was unanimously approved with 21 votes in favor.*

**SPA 230 Theory and Practice of Written Translation**

Kathy Killoran explained that these are the course revisions that pertain to the certificate programs that were approved earlier. Professor Sexton explained that changes in title of this course reflect an effort to link the course to the new certificate program.

**SPA 340 Court Interpreting and Translation**

Professor Sexton said this course has a title change also, and the course description is being adjusted a bit for content.

Professor Perez had a concern about the language of the course description, which seemed to be more about teaching the course than about the course itself. He felt it could be edited. He clarified that his critique was directed at this committee’s requirements rather than the department’s draft.
Principles, Policies and Procedures Subcommittee

Guidelines for Course Levels

Dean Lopes distributed an updated version of the document from the PPP Subcommittee which proposes general guidelines for course levels.

Professor Corthals spoke for the PPP committee, which chose to address this issue because of the frequent discussions at UCASC of appropriate levels of content and methods when courses are presented for approval.

Professor Adams wished to speak to how this links to Pathways. He presented anecdotal evidence from students about frustration with the scaffolding of course levels university-wide. Sometimes course numbers do not reflect how demanding a course might be. These guidelines address the problem of lack of equivalency across disciplines, departments, and colleges. In terms of departments’ freedom to self-govern, he reminded everybody that each department may choose its own way to address and define the various elements set forth in the guidelines. Dean Lopes also said that this chart is meant to provide guidelines for faculty who have not had a clear sense of what those levels are, in order not to flood them with critique when a course comes up for review. What has been assumed by this committee can now be made more transparent to faculty. This articulation of scaffolding will also be helpful in demonstrating John Jay’s commitment to rigor for Middle States, where this has been a concern.

Kathy Killoran asked for a brief overview of how the draft in the room differed from the original. Professor Corthals said it was mostly corrections of typos and cuts of overwritten material. The item about capstones was substantively changed.

Kathy Killoran felt the jump from “acquire” at the 200-level to “advanced” in the 300-level made too wide a gap, and the language at 3xx level could be adjusted. She felt “advanced” should be at the 400-level.

Professor Dapia felt that 2xx level would be difficult for her department to fulfill when it comes to the courses presented for the translation certificate. Dean Lopes clarified that these are guidelines, not prescriptions, and there is room for some variation in philosophical approach from discipline to discipline.

Professor Pease suggested a left-hand column to define the category across the grid which would clarify the taxonomy of the chart. She was also confused by the use of verb tenses within the Intellectual and Practical Skills field, which varied from “will have” to “continue developing.” This made the angle of attack of the guidelines unclear.

Professor Peters asked if this had been reconciled with the learning outcomes for each course level. Dean Lopes said this document is separate. Professor Peters felt that it would be useful to link the two. Professor Tarantino wanted to know if examples of workload would be useful here, such as “five pages for the first paper” and so forth. Dean Lopes said that we already have Writing across the Curriculum guidelines for that.

Virginia Moreno had comments about the language. She said that outcomes should be stated in light of exiting course outcomes. Rather than what students are acquiring or doing, the language should reflect the result of the course. Dean Lopes explained that these are not outcomes, but are intended to be descriptive.

Professor Corthals asked Virginia Moreno to clarify her points. Virginia Moreno explained that
AAC&U has “value rubrics” for general education for assessment and the document before the committee was far too broad to be evaluated as a rubric. Professor Corthals was concerned about enlarging the guidelines. Though more descriptive text might be clearer, the PPP Subcommittee wanted one accessible table that could give all departments and disciplines a sense of the general level, without it feeling like a restrictive prism. Virginia Moreno felt that the document is so broad now that it could be defined any way by any person.

On the subject of attaching examples to the document, Professor Von Lampe said they might need to be discipline-specific, and departments might need to weigh in here. He felt it would be important to make sure examples do not burden the reader or block the view of basic principles.

Professor Von Lampe was also concerned about the overall movement from general to specific, which seemed to him to be an inappropriate pedagogical technique. How would comparisons at high level courses fit into this rubric? There may be 2 or 3 different types of 200 or 300 level courses. Dean Lopes said that even when topics narrow, the scope of the course deepens. She said integration begins to happen at the 300-level, and then synthesis begins to happen at the 4xx level and with capstone courses. She did feel that his question was a good one for the committee to grapple with.

Professor Snajdr noted that three or four years ago each department was asked for examples of appropriate assignments for each level, so that work has already been done, and he knew his department still had those on file. Dean Lopes said UCASC could probably collect those documents. Professor Adams said that every department did not produce a document. Professor Peters added that several years ago, a committee collected syllabi from every department, and in that collection it became clear that there was so much variability that it would be impossible to come to a conclusion that could define course levels based on syllabi. So the current document was a conscious attempt to avoid that kind of controversy by providing broad guidelines.

Dean Lopes said that some departments already have clear ideas about course level standards, but this document will be useful to those who do not have any such standards in place.

Dean Lopes said further feedback could be addressed to Professor Corthals.

Dean Lopes thanked the room for the thoughtful comments today.

*Motion was made and seconded to adjourn the meeting. It was unanimously acclaimed. The meeting concluded at 1:40 p.m.*

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah Hammond, Scribe
THE UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM & ACADEMIC STANDARDS COMMITTEE

AGENDA
May 18, 2012
9:30 A.M. – 12:30 P.M.
ROOM 610T

1. Administrative Announcements – Dean Lopes

2. Approval of the minutes of April 20, 2012
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   Programs (2nd readings)
   - New Certificate Program in Legal Interpretation
   - New Certificate Program in Translation
   - Certificate Program in Legal Interpretation and Translation

   Courses (2nd readings)
   - POL 2XX Western Political Thought (1st reading on March 23, 2012)
   - SPA Introduction to Interpreting
   - CJBA 4XX (400) Criminal Justice Internship Experience I
   - CJBA 4YY (401) Agency Analysis: Connecting Practice to Research
   - PHI 4XX Senior Seminar in the History of Philosophy
   - ENG 3XX Advanced Fiction Writing
   - LIT 3XX Writing Nature: Literature and Ecology
   - POL 2XX Judicial Processes and Politics
   - POL 4XX Senior Seminar in Law, Courts and Politics

   Course revisions:
   - SPA 230 Theory and Practice of Written Translation
   - SPA 340 Court Interpreting and Translation

   Principles, Policies and Procedures
   - Guidelines for Course Levels

   General Education Update – Dean Lopes

4. New Business

Attachments:
Agenda for May 18, 2012
Minutes of April 20, 2012
New Certificate Program in Legal Interpretation
New Certificate Program in Translation
Certificate Program in Legal Interpretation and Translation
Guidelines for Course Levels

Courses
POL 2XX Western Political Thought
SPA Introduction to Interpreting
CJBA 4XX (400) Criminal Justice Internship Experience I
CJBA 4YY (401) Agency Analysis: Connecting Practice to Research
PHI 4XX Senior Seminar in the History of Philosophy
ENG 3XX Advanced Fiction Writing
LIT 3XX Writing Nature: Literature and Ecology
POL 2XX Judicial Processes and Politics
POL 4XX Senior Seminar in Law, Courts and Politics

Course revisions:
SPA 230 Theory and Practice of Written Translation
SPA 340 Court Interpreting and Translation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Initials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abbas</td>
<td>Navila</td>
<td>Student Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>C. Jama</td>
<td>African-American Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baatz</td>
<td>Simon</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balazon</td>
<td>Ervin</td>
<td>Student Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corbett</td>
<td>Glenn</td>
<td>Protection Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cormhals</td>
<td>Angelique</td>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dapia</td>
<td>Silvia</td>
<td>Foreign Languages and Literatures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eanes</td>
<td>Bernece J.</td>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guadeloupe</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Student Member</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>Jay</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammond</td>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Scribe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Killoran</td>
<td>Kathy</td>
<td>Undergraduate Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lapidus</td>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>Art and Music</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larkin</td>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Health and Physical Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>Kyoo</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leippe</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lopes</td>
<td>Anne</td>
<td>Dean, Undergraduate Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McClure</td>
<td>Mary Ann</td>
<td>Interdisciplinary Studies</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moreno</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Academic Assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocejo</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pease</td>
<td>Alison</td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perez</td>
<td>Lisandro</td>
<td>Latin American and Latino/a Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peters</td>
<td>Judy-Lynne</td>
<td>Public Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puls</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saulnier</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>VP, Enrollment Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexton</td>
<td>Ellen</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snajdr</td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sung</td>
<td>Hung-En</td>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarantino</td>
<td>Dana</td>
<td>Communication and Theatre Arts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varsanyi</td>
<td>Monica</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Velazquez-Torres</td>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>SEEK</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Von Lampe</td>
<td>Klaus</td>
<td>Law, Police Science, CJA</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Guests:
- Kate       | Szur |
- Adam       | Berlin |
- Max        | Mak |
- Jonathan   | Jacobs |
- Jack       | Jacobs |
- Alexander  | Schultz |
- Joshua     | Freilich |
The Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee held its meeting on Friday, May 18, 2012 at 9:30 a.m. in Room 610T. Dean Anne Lopes, UCASC Chair, called the meeting to order.


Absent: Simon Baatz, Mary Ann McClure, Hung-En Sung, Klaus Von Lampe.

Guests: Adam Berlin, Joshua Freilich, Jack Jacobs, Jonathan Jacobs, Maxwell Mak, Alexander Schlutz, Kate Szur.

Administrative Announcements

Dean Lopes convened the meeting by thanking the members of the committee who are finishing their term and welcoming the new student members. She told the room she is looking for ways to integrate students more into UCASC proceedings.

She announced that several items from UCASC did not pass at College Council. The new course, History of Psychology, was voted on and did not pass. Spanish 208 did not receive a vote at all and was sent back to UCASC. The third item, the Grade Change Policy, was withdrawn from the agenda by Dean Lopes because she had information that it would not pass. She was concerned about bringing the document up for review for a third time, and would like to find a way to work more cooperatively with other governance branches so review can happen more expeditiously.

Dean Lopes has been working with an outside expert on evaluating John Jay's practices with prior learning assessment. The expert will offer guidance about best practices that John Jay might adopt moving forward. This issue is of particular interest because the high school population age is declining, and John Jay might be impacted by this demographic change. Adults will help fill that enrollment gap. Currently, John Jay has the youngest students at CUNY, and it could benefit from considering how to approach adult markets.

Professor Jama Adams asked who is looking into evening students. He felt that the shift in the schedule has implications for them. Dean Lopes said this is on the radar. The college has grave concerns about what programs are offered in the evening. Since everything cannot be offered in the evening, the college wants to clarify which programs should be offered in the evenings.

Approval of the minutes of April 20, 2012

A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes.

Page 1, line 12, a sentence was missing the preposition “of.” Page 14, line 25, the word “proposal” should read “proposing.” Dean Lopes had a few typos of that nature that she would pass along.
The minutes as amended were approved with 21 votes in favor and 3 abstentions.

Old Business

Programs (2nd readings)

New Certificate Program in Legal Interpretation

A motion was made and seconded to approve the New Certificate Program in Legal Interpretation.

Sylvia Dapia explained revisions to the proposal, made in consultation with Kathy Killoran and Vice President Richard Saulnier. She adjusted language in order to accommodate the department’s future goals to offer courses multiple times in various languages.

She then noted that the same changes had been made to the other Certificate Program proposals.

New Certificate Program in Translation
Certificate Program in Legal Interpretation and Translation

A motion was made and seconded to approve the three translation programs as a package. It was unanimously approved with 24 votes in favor.

A motion had already been made to vote on the first program, so Dean Lopes recast that language to apply to all three programs.

The new Certificate Program in Legal Interpretation, the new Certificate Program in Translation, and the new Certificate Program in Legal Interpretation and Translation were all unanimously approved with 24 votes in favor.

Courses (2nd Readings)

POL 2XX Western Political Thought (1st reading on March 23, 2012)

A motion was made and seconded to approve POL 2XX Western Political Thought.

Professor Jack Jacobs explained the changes. The title has been changed to better reflect the department’s intent with the course. Language like “such as” has been added to cast figures listed in the proposal as types of figures that might be taught rather than a list of actual study points.

POL 2XX Western Political Thought was unanimously approved with 24 votes in favor.

SPA Introduction to Interpreting

A motion was made and seconded to approve SPA 2XX (FL-INT 2XX) Interpreting I.

Professor Dapia described changes to the proposal. An adjustment was made to the prefix to allow the course to be offered in other languages. The prerequisites were adjusted to clarify the required level of student fluency.
SPA 2XX (FL-INT 2XX) to Interpreting was unanimously approved with 24 votes in favor.

CJBA 4XX (400) Criminal Justice Internship Experience I

The presenting professor was not in the room yet, so this item was held for later.

CJBA 4YY (401) Agency Analysis: Connecting Practice to Research

The presenting professor was not in the room yet, so this item was held for later.

PHI 4XX Senior Seminar in the History of Philosophy

A motion was made and seconded to approve PHI 4XX Senior Seminar in the History of Philosophy.

Professor Jonathan Jacobs described the changes. The department had consulted with History about possible overlap. Language was revised to incorporate a sentence about alternative perspectives and critical inquiry.

PHI 4XX Senior Seminar in the History of Philosophy was approved with 24 votes in favor and 1 abstention.

ENG 3XX Advanced Fiction Writing

A motion was made and seconded to approve ENG 3XX Advanced Fiction Writing.

Professor Adam Berlin was present to speak for the course. He reported no changes.

ENG 3XX Advanced Fiction Writing was unanimously approved with 25 votes in favor.

LIT 3XX Writing Nature: Literature and Ecology

Professor Alexander Schrodt was not yet present, so this item was held for later.

POL 2XX Judicial Processes and Politics

A motion was made and seconded to approve POL 2XX Judicial Processes and Politics.

Professor Maxwell Mak said that no substantive changes had been made to the course.

POL 2XX Judicial Processes and Politics was unanimously approved with 25 votes in favor.

POL 4XX Senior Seminar in Law, Courts, and Politics

A motion was made and seconded to approve POL 4XX Senior Seminar in Law, Courts, and Politics.

Professor Mak reported that there had been no substantive changes to this item either.
POL 4XX Senior Seminar in Law, Courts, and Politics was unanimously approved with 25 votes in favor.

Course Revisions

SPA 230 Theory and Practice of Written Translation

A motion was made and seconded to approve revision of SPA 230 Theory and Practice of Written Translation.

Professor Dapia explained that the prefix had been changed from FL-TRN to SPA. Also, the prerequisites were revised.

SPA 230 Theory and Practice of Written Translation was unanimously approved with 25 votes in favor.

SPA 340 Court Interpreting and Translation

A motion was made and seconded to approve SPA 340 Court Interpreting and Translation.

Professor Dapia described changes. The prefix was changed from FL-INT/TRN to SPA. Also, English was added to the prerequisites.

Professor Jay Hamilton commended Professor Dapia on the tremendous work here and expressed his hope that she would find a good partner for the program. Dean Lopes agreed and added that this set of certificates could be a great complement to other John Jay programs. This program could significantly impact students' employability.

SPA 340 Court Interpreting and Translation was unanimously approved with 25 votes in favor.

At this point, the committee revisited items that had been held earlier in the meeting.

LIT 3XX Writing Nature: Literature and Ecology

A motion was made and seconded to approve LIT 3XX Writing Nature: Literature and Ecology.

Professor Schlutz said that he had revised the attendance policy and language regarding the final exam.

LIT 3XX Writing Nature: Literature and Ecology was unanimously approved with 25 votes in favor.

CJBA 4XX (400) Criminal Justice Internship Experience I

A motion was made and seconded to approve CJBA 4XX (400) Criminal Justice Internship Experience I.

Professor Joshua Freilich was present to speak for Professor Jeff Mellow, who could not be present. Dean Lopes summarized the revision memo that Professor Mellow had submitted to the committee.
Professor Monica Varsanyi noted that Professor Mellow did change the number of hours on one part of the document, but the course description did not reflect that change. Those items should agree and should reflect the actual amount of time required by the course. Dean Lopes asked Professor Freilich to relay the needed change to Professor Mellow.

CJBA 4XX (400) Criminal Justice Experience I was unanimously approved with 25 votes in favor.

CJBA 4YY (401) Agency Analysis: Connecting Practice to Research

A motion was made and seconded to approve CJBA 4YY (401) Agency Analysis: Connecting Practice to Research.

Dean Lopes summarized the revision memo that Professor Mellow had submitted, which included an explanation of the change in title to more accurately reflect the purpose of the course.

Professor Varsanyi asked about the language in the course description, which was unclear about the sequencing and the hours required as related to the first semester’s internship. Kathy Killoran explained the rationale behind the description of hours and credits required. Professor Varsanyi asked about the difference between a prerequisite and co-requisite, and the language “year long sequence” in the rationale. Dean Lopes said that it should read that this is the “second part of a year-long sequence.”

Along those lines, Professor Edward Snajdr asked if this should be a co-requisite with the internship course. Dean Lopes explained that actually it is possible that a student might take the internship but choose not to take the analysis course. Professor Adams asked for clarification, with concern that such flexibility may allow a student to avoid any reflection component. Dean Lopes said that there is a reflective component built into the internship course as well.

Professor Virginia Moreno pointed out that the same set of outcomes are listed on both courses, but the outcomes should differ if they are two separate courses. Dean Lopes agreed, she said the progression from one course to the next needs to be apparent. She said that this document will need some more work before it can be voted on at UCASC.

A motion was made and seconded to table this course until those issues are resolved.

The motion to table the course was approved with 24 votes in favor and 1 opposed.

Dean Lopes said that she would reach out to Professor Mellow to resolve the issues discussed.

Principles, Policies and Procedures

Guidelines for Course Levels

Professor Angelique Corthals explained modifications to the proposal in response to feedback at the last meeting. The language regarding progression to high level courses was revised. The structure of the document was revised for clarity, with a new column on the left-hand side as well as visual separation between lower level and upper level courses.

Dean Lopes said that the PPP committee met with Virginia Moreno to look at the AACU guidelines. Professor Adams added that it was important to the committee to leave room in this document for each department to interpret the document. It is not meant to be rigid, but is meant to provoke
thought so that departments can articulate and rationalize course levels in a consistent manner according to their own departmental standards. The document is a guide, not a blueprint.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the Guidelines for Course Levels. Vice President Saulnier said that this is a really long time coming.

Professor Allison Pease noted some grammatical and typographical errors, and said that otherwise she was in favor of the document.

Professor Dana Tarantino asked if these guidelines are going to be published. Dean Lopes said they will be. Professor Adams wanted to reiterate that the PPP committee does not want this exact document to be adopted without thought and interpretation within each department.

Professor Kyoo Lee asked about the 200-level column’s use of the words “differentiate” and “different” in the same line. She also asked about the language about “problematizing students' perspectives.” She thought a clearer word choice might be found.

The Guidelines for Course Levels were unanimously approved with 25 votes in favor.

Dean Lopes said that this document would be posted on the UCASC website and would not need to move through further governance, since it is a guide for professors who must bring proposals to this body.

General Education Update

Dean Lopes wished to update the group on John Jay progress on this matter. She had asked chairs to work on courses, and those were coming in a timely manner. She was excited by the titles being developed. She said that she hoped early next week, she would have guidelines about pay scales for professors who are developing courses.

Next year, UCASC will likely need to have an extra meeting or two to push all of these courses through. Professor Lisandro Perez has been working with his gen ed subcommittee to finalize the learning outcomes for the Justice Core.

Professor Pease asked if the courses being developed over the summer are expected to go through departmental review. She asked how that could happen if a department’s curriculum committee does not meet over the summer. Dean Lopes suggested having meetings over the internet or meeting at the very beginning of the term.

Professor Hamilton asked what would happen if a course does not pass the department’s curriculum committee. Dean Lopes said that such courses would not be offered. All of these courses need to be passed at CUNY, so it is a difficult treadmill. She articulated how big a job this is going to be for her office, which has a small staff. If her office does not get a course on time, it may not go into Gen Ed simply because she would not be able to process it on time. In that case, she would start the Gen Ed without the course, and add the course when it is approved. Dean Lopes estimates that 6,000 students will be able to participate in Gen Ed in the fall of 2013, and John Jay needs sufficient number of courses for those students. Dean Lopes said that if departments want to meet over the summer and would like her to incentivize the faculty to do that, they could talk to her.

Professor Adams asked if Dean Lopes would consider suspending the two reading rule for these courses, since they would go through two levels of scrutiny before they reach UCASC. Dean Lopes said she thought this might be necessary, considering the timeline. She said it would be important to facilitate discussion along the way to help the departments.
Dean Lopes thanked everybody for their service. “It’s been a tough semester, a lot happening, you’ve all worked valiantly for UCASC’s work.” She wished everyone a wonderful summer.

A motion was made and seconded to adjourn the meeting. It was unanimously acclaimed.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah Hammond, Scribe
The College-wide Assessment Committee meets tomorrow at 1 pm for our organizational meeting; I still have no location so I will email everyone in the morning with that information (in a pinch we'll use my office).

I attach an incomplete draft of a college guide to assessment. One of our first tasks will be to discuss and augment this document, but it will not likely be tomorrow that we begin this.

For tomorrow, I would like us to review some basics about the Committee and some of the issues we'll need to address:

1) Charge to the committee and organization
2) Scope of Responsibilities and Cycle of Activities
3) Leadership of Committee
4) Relationship to Middle States
5) An Assessment Website—what's public and what's private
6) Relationship to Academic and Administrative Departments
7) Sources for Assessment data: PMP, NSSE, SES, etc.

Thank you all, Jim

James Llana
Associate Provost
Office of Academic Affairs

899 Tenth Avenue, Suite 634T
New York City, NY 10019
Tel. 212.237.8810
jllana@jjay.cuny.edu
Campus-Wide Assessment Committee
Meeting Notes – October 26, 2011

Present: D. Officer, M. Marrero, S. Villanueva, C. Barrett, E. Jeglic, J. Rutledge, M. Rubin, L. Farrington, V. Moreno, J. Llana
Absent: M. McBeth

After introductions, Jim recounted the events that led to the formation of the committee and reviewed the “charge” by going through the petition to the College Council to create the committee. The committee officially reports to the Strategic Planning Sub-committee, which has responsibility for assessment and accreditation. The committee consists of seven faculty, three HEO’s, the Director of Outcomes Assessment, ex officio, and Associate Provost as Chair.

We were starting out at least with a single committee with responsibilities for coordinating both assessment of student learning and assessment of non-academic units; ideally, every unit of the college has an assessment cycle. At some colleges, there are sub-committees that divide along academic/administrative lines or two separate assessment committees.

Whatever the committee structure, the aim is to promote a “culture of assessment,” meaning that people simply conduct assessment as a matter of course: faculty see assessment as part of teaching, and staff routinely use data for institutional improvement.

Jim said that he agreed to Chair the committee for the first year, but that faculty leadership would eventually be important or perhaps a co-chair arrangement with a faculty member and a HEO.

Jim observed that where possible either he or Virginia would do much of the background work in order to streamline the committee’s obligations. Work will probably by cyclic, depending on the rhythm of submissions from departments. Annual reports will come from academic departments every summer and the committee will likely review them in the fall.

Soon the committee will need to create a guide or policy statement on assessment for the college. An incomplete draft that will likely form the basis of this statement was emailed to committee members ahead of the meeting, but we will not address that specifically today.

As an example of setting campus expectations for assessment, Jim pointed to two documents that prescribed timetables for assessment activities, one for Major Coordinators and the other for Graduate Program Directors. Normally, the committee would review guidelines like these.
before dissemination, and in the case at hand, the committee may want to discuss the documents, since they are subject to change by action of the committee.

Assessment is clearly a concern for the Middle States review, and so excerpts on Standards 7 and 14 were included in the package of materials for members. We briefly reviewed those standards, pointing out that Standard 7 was all-encompassing for Institutional Assessment, but that perhaps 90% of it could be seen coming from Standard 14 on the Assessment of Student Learning. Jim also described briefly the Middle States Publication “Student Learning Assessment,” which was distributed to the committee and which provides an overview of the entire assessment process for student learning as well as ideas on the role of a campus assessment committee.

The committee will be developing ideas for an assessment website, and in the process discussing what should be public and private. At the present time there are assessment reports and plans on Blackboard but access is limited. Carla suggested that the committee could have a space on Blackboard by being an “organization.” We will pursue this as a place to store documents for the committee’s use.

Jim said that while he had not been at John Jay very long he had the impression that there was not a strong history of assessment on campus. Marilyn recounted, however, her own experiences with the promotion of assessment connected with the last Middle States review. The solid activity that was achieved at that time was not sustained, and we have to learn a lesson from that. Marilyn suggested that we think about ways of developing faculty buy-in; Jim said it would be on the next agenda.

For the next meeting Jim asked that members take a look at a few assessment websites at other campuses to get a feel for what we might do at John Jay. Scheduling meetings will probably prove difficult; the members remaining at the end of the meeting decided to meet again on November 10 at 11 am, location to be determined.
1. Review of notes from Meeting on October 26, 2011.

2. Getting buy-in from faculty. This was proposed by Marilyn at the last meeting. See next, related agenda item.

3. "Assessment Day" next year. Think about sponsoring (or co-sponsoring with CAT) a meeting of faculty to share insights into assessment.

4. Review of John Jay Guide to Assessment. This will likely be the beginning of an extended discussion to come up with the principal statement of policies and practices for assessment at the College. Latest draft will be on our "organization" space on Blackboard.

5. Assessment Websites. Discussion of assessment websites you may have looked at and thoughts for ours.

1. Approval of Minutes for October 26, 2011. Jim opened the meeting with approval of the minutes for October 26, 2011. Members suggested a formal approval process and all agreed. Minutes were approved as submitted.

2. Faculty “Buy-In.” After discussing the importance of faculty acceptance and understanding of assessment, we discussed a possible “assessment day,” probably with another name. Such events occur on other CUNY campuses and offer an opportunity to invite people from other campuses to hear faculty present assessment projects and related issues. It would be important for such an event to be accompanied with great flourish and publicity. The President and Provost should put in an appearance at least. Other ideas included
   - adding a section on assessment to new staff/faculty orientation
   - making assessment an important part of tenure review
   - sponsoring an assessment seminar for the Major Coordinators
   - creating “assessment scholars” as is done at the Univ. of Delaware

3. General Discussion. Jennifer precipitated an extended general discussion by noting that she included learning outcomes on her syllabus, evaluated student work, and gave grades but didn’t know what was supposed to happen next for her. Andrew in the same Department reported that there were assessment results and mentioned the low level of student achievement in research skills. So what’s the consequence for people who require research in major courses? Jim suggested that assessment results be discussed by everyone in the Department and those people who teach courses with research skills as a learning goal should in some way make adjustments, perhaps by requiring the submission of a draft or taking students to the library for specialized instruction or offering more instruction themselves on how to construct a research paper. The point is to respond in positive ways to the problem identified by assessment. As it turns out, the Department will require an additional course to better equip students to write a research paper, but individual faculty should also have a discussion about their own responses to the problem. Carla reported that she saw in her previous institution a marked improvement in student performance as the assessment process prompted changes in teaching and curriculum; this is of course the assessment model in action.

An important issue here is the responsibility of individual faculty to address basic issues like writing, research, critical thinking, quantitative reasoning and the like. (Carla pointed out that writing across the curriculum should be strengthened.) Is this something only for specialized or General Education courses to address? How broadly do we conceive education in the major to be? These are issues of interest to most faculty, and discussions of assessment can provide a context for dealing with them.
Jim thought some discussion of questions like these may usefully find their way into the general statement on assessment policies and practices or into the assessment website. He also suggested that discussions about the nature of assessment in the Committee (our own education in assessment) are valuable as we prepare to think about assessment in campus-wide terms.

4. Review of John Jay Guide to Assessment. Carla proposed some detailed suggestions to the document [now incorporated into the draft] and also emphasized the importance of concrete examples for understanding, for example, the Department Assessment plan. To see a “curriculum map” is to understand what it is. This we thought was a good suggestion; Virginia will make samples available, as she has with individual departments. At the next meeting we’ll have to review the assessment guide draft very broadly at first to see if we have the right topics, and then we’ll have to review the details carefully. This will take some time.

When completed, we will submit the guide for approval to the Strategic Planning Subcommittee which has responsibility for assessment under the Charter of Governance. With that approval, it will then become policy, and the Committee will have standards by which to review departmental assessment plans and results. The question came up of what the Committee can do if it identifies a problem in assessment results. We agreed that there is no problem with poor performance; the problem is a lack of response to poor performance. In such cases the Committee will signal the lack of appropriate response in its annual report to the Strategic Planning Subcommittee, along with best campus practices.

As we consider the assessment document next time, it will be helpful if we can review a couple actual assessment plans. Virginia or Jim will post a couple plans for review prior to the next meeting, and Sumaya agreed to make the assessment plan for Academic Advising available as well. We will review these plans as a group in the next meeting as a way of getting a feel for the different, and common, ways of approaching them.

Another issue is the need stated in the assessment draft to define what “meets expectations.” This is something Departments must consider and define; no matter what the performance rubric, each Department faculty should specify what level of competence and achievement “meets expectations.” We discussed this in the context of departments outside Academic Affairs. Marisol described what meets expectations in terms of student satisfaction for support services.

On the issue of what is public and what remains private—in terms of a website—our first reaction was that initial results of assessment might best remain private, but this will be discussed carefully in the future.
We will try to meet again near the end of November. Jim repeated his request that members use their Outlook calendars so he can track availability of individual members, to help with scheduling.
I'm sorry... I forgot to prepare the agenda for tomorrow's meeting until now.

College-Wide Assessment Committee
Agenda – Nov. 30, 2011
1:40 – 3 pm
L68.31, Counseling Conference Room

1. Approval of minutes for November 10, 2011. Draft minutes are in Notes folder in our Blackboard organization website.
2. Review the draft of proposed guide to assessment. It is posted online. We'll start with a broad overview and then focus on sections to see if the details make sense. There was the very good suggestion last time that we read an actual assessment plan as a way to get into this discussion, and Virginia has posted a number of them (reports too) on our Blackboard site. I've suggested to Virginia that she bring copies of one plan so we can go through one in common, but if you're reading one or more online, then please share your impressions tomorrow.
3. “Assessment Day”. Discussion of further thoughts on this event.
4. General Discussion. A lot of interesting points came up at the last meeting's general discussion. Time permitting, you may have follow-up thoughts.
College-Wide Assessment Committee
Meeting Notes – November 30, 2011

Present: J. Llana, V. Moreno, C. Barrett, E. Jeglic, D. Officer, S. Villanueva, A. Sidman, J. Rutledge

1. Approval of Minutes for November 10. Minutes were approved.
2. Review of draft guide to assessment. Virginia took the group through the Computer Science assessment plan, as an example. Such plans should be revised once every five years and as needed. Any changes should be sent to Virginia. We should keep revisions as a portfolio on Blackboard. There was further discussion of the report. We recommended that a line be added to the course approval form asking if the course was created or modified as the result of an assessment.
Virginia discussed a sample curriculum map. Sumaya will try to upload the Academic Advising Assessment plan to Blackboard.
We will meet again in January to continue work on the draft college-wide assessment plan, since we did not get very far with the document.
Meeting Agenda
College-Wide Assessment Committee
Tuesday, January 17, 2012 -- 11 am
Room L68.31 – Counseling Services Conf. Room (where we met last time)

1. Approval of Minutes for Nov. 30, 2011. Minutes are attached and in the a Blackboard folder on our organization webspace. The notes are a little sketchy so I welcome suggestions from those of you with good memories.

2. Continued Review of Draft College-Wide Guide to Assessment. You'll find the latest draft in a folder on our Blackboard site. We will try to get as much of this done as possible so the bulk of our time will be spent here.

3. Providing Incentives for Assessment work. I would like to have us talk about ways for the College to promote the importance of assessment for faculty.

3. Attending events and workshops on Assessment. There are opportunities for faculty development on assessment, and I want to preview them for you.

Sumaya provided us her department’s assessment plan. It is on our Blackboard site and serves as an example of assessment in a support unit.
College-Wide Assessment Committee
Meeting Minutes – January 17, 2012

Present: V. Moreno, M. Marrero, M. McBeth, A. Sidman, C. Barrett, J. Llana, M. Rubin (by phone)
Absent: L. Farrington, J. Rutledge, D. Officer, S. Villanueva, E. Jeglic

1. Approval of Minutes for November 30, 2011. Minutes were approved.

2. Discussion of Assessment Guidelines draft. There was an extended discussion of the draft. Several committee members thought that the discussion of learning goals should be clarified to show the relationship between program (major) and course learning goals. Jim pointed to another level of learning goals, that of the institution; learning goals should be integrated across all Divisions of the institution. We need to think of student learning in terms of the institution as a whole as well as in terms of majors, minors, and other units. He will rewrite with the aim of incorporating all three levels in one clearly marked section.

Carla proposed that the document as a whole include a very practical side that would concretely let people know what they are responsible for. The draft now leans toward a more conceptual understanding of assessment at the college. One of the more detailed questions is assessment in cross-listed courses. Should learning goals on the course syllabus in one department refer to learning goals from another department if the latter department allows their majors to use that course for degree completion? The document should address this and similar, practical issues. For General Education courses, there are similar questions of assessment jurisdiction. The challenge will be to organize the document to discuss both broad concepts and very specific questions. Carla will forward a number of issues related to wording directly to Jim.

3. Providing Incentives for Assessment Work. We discussed once again ways to engage faculty and staff in assessment work. Jim pointed to instances where one college created “Assessment Fellows” or offered $5,000 stipends for work in the summer. Most agreed that even modest stipends would be helpful, although there was some disagreement as to whether much of the assessment work should be allotted to adjuncts who would receive extra pay to do it. The concern is that the faculty as a whole would be reluctant to own assessment if much of it was somehow turned over to a few individuals. Still, there was agreement that some people in each Department should develop special expertise. Assessment needs to become recognized publically as a worthwhile, valued activity, an essential part of teaching.

4. Attending events and workshops on Assessment. Jim announced a late February Middle States workshop on becoming an assessment facilitator; Carla had agreed to attend and Jim asked if anyone else would care to go. Mark volunteered. Other opportunities such
as this will come along and Jim hopes that the committee members can be the nucleus of assessment development on campus.

As a final note, Jim asked that everyone use their Outlook calendar so scheduling meetings can be greatly simplified. It’s very easy to do, and recurring events such as classes and standing committee meetings can be inserted only once to run through the semester.
College-Wide Assessment Committee
Meeting Agenda
Feb. 6, 2012
1:40 pm – Room 620H (Provost’s Conf Room)

1. Approval of Minutes for meeting of January 17, 2012. Sent earlier to you and they are on our Blackboard organization site.

2. Continued Review of Assessment Guide. Attached is the latest version (and I’ll put it on Blackboard as well), where I have tried to respond to comments made last time. I have also noted some things in the text that we have to discuss. I'm concerned about defining Institutional Learning Goals. Normally, they coincide with General Ed learning goals, but so far I'm not sure what the GE goals are. Virginia, can you give us an update on that please? What concerns me is capturing learning goals or “dispositions” that appear in the College Mission statement. Incidentally, the College Mission is now an Appendix in the assessment guide.

Once we get clarity and completeness in the Assessment Guide we have to think about packaging and organizing the whole thing.

James Liana
Associate Provost
Office of Academic Affairs

899 Tenth Avenue, Suite 634T
New York City, NY 10019
Tel. 212.237.8810
jllana@jay.cuny.edu
College-Wide Assessment Committee
Meeting Minutes – February 6, 2012

Present: E. Jeglic, S. Villanueva, M. Rubin, C. Barrett, A. Sidman, J. Llana, V. Moreno, J. Rutledge
Absent: L. Farrington, D. Officer, M. Marrero


2. Announcements. Jim reported on a workshop opportunity at Nassau Community College on March 21, entitled “Using Benchmarks, Targets, and Dashboards” by Linda Suskie, a former Middle States Vice President with a formidable reputation in assessment. And there is another workshop run by Middle States in Philadelphia on May 3, entitled “Understanding and Using Student Learning Assessment Results.” Let Jim know if you’re interested in either. Sumaya decided to join Virginia to attend the Nassau CC event.

Prompted by a question, there was a brief discussion of the relationship between our Committee and Middle States. Middle States workgroups are writing drafts for the institutional Self-Study and as such are reading assessment plans and reports to address Standard 14 on student learning. In handling the draft for Standard 7, Institutional Assessment, Jim is addressing research questions about the Assessment Committee and how effective the College policy is. Therefore, the Committee is one subject of the Middle States self-evaluation. We will prepare for Middle States a chart summarizing all assessment activity, and the visiting Team members may ask to see detailed Departmental reports. We also have to have on hand all syllabi with the appropriate learning goals on them.

3. Discussion of Assessment Guide Draft. Jim re-wrote the section on levels of assessment based on comments from the last meeting, but he raised a new issue: the relationship between General Education learning goals and those of the institution at large. The question is whether our GE program will cover all institutional learning and personal development goals. It may be that GE will not address goals in the mission statement and if that’s the case we will have to determine exactly what those goals are and how they are ratified. He and Virginia (and Andrew who’s a member) will attend the GE Assessment Committee meeting later today with the expectation of answering this question. We hope that GE will include all institutional learning and personal development goals.

Another issue marked in the text for discussion is a possible College-wide decision on an expected level of compliance with the “meets expectations” performance level for learning goals. The question is whether we should recommend such a level; for example, should the College state as a goal a fixed percentage of students who “meet
expectations.” There was a lengthy discussion with members of the committee seeing this issue from different points of view. Everyone seemed to agree that Departments should decide which criteria define “meeting expectations,” but it was not so obvious that the College should prescribe a fixed percentage target. What would happen if the compliance level fell below the target? Wouldn’t all Departments work on improvement no matter what the level? Couldn’t anyone simply see obvious low levels of achievement and expect an energetic response from the Department? We decided to do some research on other schools to see their practices.

There was some discussion of the new section in the document on actions by individual faculty. The purpose was to provide a concrete “how-to” approach for the individual faculty member. There was some agreement that this would work better as a stand-alone appendix.

4. **Looking Ahead.** We will begin at the next meeting to review assessment plans and reports in accordance with our responsibility to provide feedback to Departments. Jim asked that we read the Assessment Report on SOC440 from Criminology. Virginia will provide a check list or rubric (report is on Blackboard website) for judging assessment reports. We will also read the assessment plan from Academic Advising, also on the Website. In both cases, we are developing a common understanding of our expectations for such assessment reports as we generate comments for Departments. Jim will prepare another draft of the report and let committee members know when it’s ready. We will meet again on Feb. 22 at 1:40, location to be announced.
For the next meeting let’s plan on the following:

1) Continue with any changes to the assessment document. I’ll do another draft reflecting ideas from today and send it to you. Of course, the latest draft is on the Blackboard site.
2) Please read the assessment report for SOC440 (degree in Criminology) in preparation for reviewing it and returning comments to the Sociology Dept. Available on our Blackboard site, and Virginia will send a check-list or rubric of some kind for evaluation.
3) Please read the assessment plan for Academic Advising in preparation for returning comments to the Department. Available on our Blackboard site.

If you weren’t here today you should know that there’s a workshop run by Linda Suskie on “Using Benchmarks, Targets and Dashboard Indicators” at Nassau Community College (Garden City, Nassau County). I think this is probably most informative for people primarily concerned with non-student learning assessment, but anyone is welcome. (The instructions say “bring curriculum maps” so there are clearly some student learning applications.) It’s on March 21 and runs from 8:30 am to 2:30 pm, and we will of course cover the $80 registration fee. At this point, Virginia and Sumaya will be going. Let me know if you’re interested by Friday please.

On May 3, 2012, there is a Middle States Workshop on “Understanding and Using Student Learning Assessment Results” in Philadelphia. This will involve travel the day or night before; typically such workshops run to 3 or 4 in the afternoon. The College will cover travel, hotel, and registration expenses. Let me know if you’re interested.

Attached are notes from today’s meeting. I am reconstructing the main points from memory so do let me know if I’ve missed something important. Thanks, Jim

James Llana
Associate Provost
Office of Academic Affairs

JOHN JAY
899 Tenth Avenue, Suite 634T
New York City, NY 10019
Tel. 212.237.8810
jllana@jjay.cuny.edu
College-Wide Assessment Committee
Meeting Minutes – February 22, 2012

Present: E. Jeglic, C. Barrett, M. Marrero, J. Rutledge, S. Villanueva, M. McBeth, V. Moreno, J. Llana, D. Officer, A. Sidman
Absent: L. Farrington, M. Rubin (we could not get the phone to work),

1. Approval of Minutes for February 6, 2012. Minutes were approved without amendment.

2. Sociology Assessment Report. The Committee discussed comments on the Sociology report prepared by J. Llana. The issue of providing a template came up, with some members saying that it is important to provide one since this is a kind of writing that is new to many. Virginia reported that she had at least on occasion run into a situation where a template was rejected because the Department felt the report had to be unique. On the issue of the length of the report, there were mixed thoughts: Jim wanted to see something shorter, but Virginia is more concerned with quality than quantity. We will not dictate a length but encourage them in various ways to be succinct. There was a substantial discussion of sample size. Andrew stated that we should see a sample of 30 for statistical reasons, and Virginia concurred. Departments should confer with Virginia about sample size. We noted the importance of correlating learning goals with the rubrics.

3. Academic Advisement Center. The Committee began a discussion of the assessment report from Academic Advising, to be continued at the next meeting.
1. Approval of Minutes for February 22, 2012. This may be a little tricky since I’ve misplaced my notes from the meeting. I saw them today, however, and so will make an effort to find them and produce some minutes.

2. Brief Report from Carla and Mark on Assessment Facilitation Workshop.

3. Continue review of Criminology Assessment Report. Today I’ve attached a condensed version that comes close at least to the kind of report we might send to the Department. We can discuss it along with my earlier, more personal take on the report, but only if that seems useful.

4. Discussion of Assessment Report from Academic Advising Center. I attach draft comments on this report, which we briefly touched on at the last meeting and which is available in our Blackboard site. We need to have a broader discussion of reports from admin/support units as well as this one in particular.

5. Assessment Summit? I have been hearing in a scattered way about activities and discussions in departments that indicate assessment is beginning to yield some real benefits. It occurred to me that a luncheon or wine/cheese event would be a nice background for a sharing experience on assessment. This would be a chance for people involved in assessment and for those curious about it to share informally their experiences, good or bad. I’m hoping for some consciousness-raising as individuals come to understand they are part of something larger on campus. An event like this would be a precursor to the event we’ve discussed before, a more formal program where we invite people from other campuses; it seems to me the latter won’t happen this semester, but we can think about it for the fall. At any rate, let’s discuss a JJ assessment affair.

6. More assessment reports. If time permits, let’s talk about possible Committee feedback to Humanities and Justice and Forensic Psychology. I have worked up some comments on Humanities and Justice (attached), and Virginia will do something on Forensic Psychology. As usual, we’re establishing expectations concerning our feedback to departments and units, and these drafts are to get the discussion started. So the purpose here is to see if the draft reports Virginia and I have prepared seem to make sense as appropriate feedback. Virginia, are the HJ and Psychology reports available on Blackboard? I assume so.

James Llana
Associate Provost
Office of Academic Affairs

John Jay
899 Tenth Avenue, Suite 634T
New York City, NY 10019
Tel. 212.237.8810
jllana@jjay.cuny.edu
College-Wide Assessment Committee
Meeting Minutes – March 7, 2012

Present: V. Moreno, S. Villanueva, D. Officer, J. Rutledge, M. Marrero, J. Llana, A. Sidman, M. McBeth, E. Jeglic, M. Rubin, L. Farrington
Absent: C. Barrett

1. Approval of Minutes for Feb. 22, 2012. We approved the minutes.
2. Report on Assessment Meeting. Mark reported on the Middle States workshop in Philadelphia on facilitation of assessment. It was “good.” They broke into small groups and role-played for various facilitation situations. Some in attendance were very knowledgeable, and they passed on what they knew. Mark reviewed some brief notes from Carla, who could not attend today. There was some discussion of the claim that “assessment is research.”
3. Feedback on Sociology Report. Jim had written a short trial response to the report on the assessment in Criminology. There was general agreement on the content, but some suggestions concerning organization and emphasis. Marilyn agreed to re-work it, perhaps in consultation with Mark, and to circulate it for the next meeting. There was a discussion on membership succession in the committee, and all thought that the terms should be staggered to insure the continuity of experienced people. There is a steep learning curve on assessment. Jim mentioned that there were no formal terms specified when the committee was conceived, but people will naturally rotate in and out for various reasons. The Committee may want to recommend something formal after our first year.
4. Academic Advising Center Report. We discussed the assessment report from the AAC. Jim had written up a trial report to discuss. Most readers found that the long report of the survey with no conclusions was a problem. We soon got into a substantive discussion of the workings of the Center, because the Director is on the committee to answer questions. Jim tried to no avail to focus on our response to the report in the interest of time.
   The issue arose of how much we can ask of departments by way of changes to their reports. There were mixed views but everyone understood that there are limits to what our expectations could be. Lisa was very clear about the reaction of Chairs to requests for changes: it would not be favorable given the piles of paper that accumulate on a typical Chair’s desk. The Assessment Committee makes recommendations only, but we should expect that the next year’s report should be responsive to the recommendations from the Committee. To expect an immediate re-writing of a report would not be reasonable.
The idea did come up of running a workshop for those learning to do assessment.

5. **Sharing Session on Assessment.** Jim had proposed an informal meeting of people involved with assessment with the idea of discovering what is going on in other departments. He has heard about scattered but very positive experiences in different departments. Andrew suggested a session at what is now the annual Faculty Development Day, and there was no enthusiasm for anything else. Jim will try out the idea on the Major Coordinators.

Marisol asked that the next meeting be on a Monday, due to a conflict that also affects Sumaya. Jim was agreeable.
From: James Llana
Sent: Thursday, March 15, 2012 2:00 PM
To: Andrew Sidman; Carla Barrett; Danielle Officer; Elizabeth Jeglic; James Llana; Jennifer Rutledge; Lisa Farrington; Marilyn Rubin; Marisol Marrero; Mark McBeth-External; Sumaya Villanueva; Virginia Moreno
Subject: Meeting on Monday
Attachments: notes for meeting 3-7-12.docx

College-Wide Assessment Committee
Agenda – Monday, March 19, 2012
1:40 – 2:50 pm – Room 620H

1. Approval of Minutes for March 7, 2012. (attached)
2. Discussion and decision on feedback to Sociology on Crim Assessment Report. Marilyn agreed to restructure the report that Jim had prepared. We will discuss and decide if it is ready to go to the Department and how to send it, i.e. what the cover memo looks like and who it comes from. It’s important that it come from the committee, which should be identified in the communication. We were looking for a template for such reports. Marilyn will either bring or send her suggestions to the committee in advance.
3. Discussion and decision, if possible, on feedback to the Advising Center. (trial report sent to committee for last meeting)
4. Discussion and decision, if possible, on feedback to Humanities and Justice. (trial report sent to committee for last meeting)
5. Discussion and decision, if possible, on feedback to Forensic Psychology. (Virginia will send to committee)
6. Discussion of how to proceed with other feedback.

Carla has agreed to chair the meeting in my absence, and she may raise some issues for consideration. Jim

James Llana
Associate Provost
Office of Academic Affairs

899 Tenth Avenue, Suite 634T
New York City, NY 10019
Tel. 212.237.8810
jllana@jjay.cuny.edu
1. Approval of Minutes for March 7, 2012. We approved the minutes.

2. Discussion and decision on feedback to Sociology on Crim Assessment Report. Marilyn was not able to supply the re-structured feedback report at this time so discussion of feedback to Sociology on Crim Assessment Report was put over to the next meeting.

3. Discussion of feedback mechanisms: we discussed a 3 part template for responding which would include a section providing (1)a brief summary of the report, (2)a section on the strengths of the report and (3) a section containing recommendations. We also discussed the process of producing feedback – if we all came in with our feedback prepared one person could be the assigned “scribe” who would then turn all of the comments in to a feedback response and prepare the document for sending to the department. We discussed how this responsibility could be passed around among us and how one or two others might be assigned to edit, proofread, review the feedback document prepared for accuracy and clarity before sending to departments. Nothing was really decided here – we were a small group so it was more a discussion of possibilities.

4. Feedback on reports: After deciding that there was nothing more to talk about regarding feedback to the Advising Center report we moved on to a discussion of the feedback on the report prepared by Humanities and Justice. We focused mainly on the recommendations section as prepared by Jim and discussed how much of what was currently in those paragraphs was not so much recommendations as they were critiques. We agreed that we should pay close attention to make sure that any recommendations were stated as usable recommendations. There was some discussion, and disagreement, as to whether or not the critiques Jim articulated were as serious as he had stated. We decided that rewording into actual recommendations could solve this issue.

5. Feedback to Forensic Psychology: there was largely agreement on this report – that is, we thought it was pretty good except that we needed to recommend that more concrete information be provided regarding the when and how of addressing the issues the report raises (e.g. recommending that FS supply time lines for planned department discussions) and provide more detail as to “how” they plan to address the issues they state they plan to address.

No decisions were made as to the next meeting time.
College-Wide Assessment Committee
Agenda – April 4, 2012
1:40 pm – 2:50 pm
Rm. 620H

We have a number of items in mid-air, and I’m hoping we can give them final shape and begin to respond to assessment plans before the spring break.

2. Final Discussion of Feedback to Sociology on Criminology Assessment Report. At the last meeting this was put off since Marilyn had not made some changes she had proposed. We need to move ahead with this.
3. Continue Discussion of Feedback Mechanism. We should move beyond possibilities to a proposal for the full committee—I’m anticipating less than complete attendance at this meeting—to consider and approve perhaps by email.
4. Feedback to Advising Center. Let’s see where we stand with this and move it out if we can.
5. Continuation of discussion of feedback for Humanities and Justice. Let’s try to resolve what we will say here.
6. Continuation of discussion of feedback for Forensic Psychology. Given that there was “largely agreement” on this last week, we should be able to wrap this up. Virginia, can you respond to the comments from the Committee last time and propose changes to the Committee report?

James Llana
Associate Provost
Office of Academic Affairs

899 Tenth Avenue, Suite 634T
New York City, NY 10019
Tel. 212.237.8810
jllana@jjay.cuny.edu
College-Wide Assessment Committee
Meeting Minutes – April 4, 2012

Present:  A. Sidman, V. Moreno, S. Villanueva, L. Farrington, M. Rubin, J. Llana, E. Jeglic

Absent:  C. Barrett, D. Officer, M. Marrero, J. Rutledge, M. McBeth

1. Approval of Minutes for March 19, 2012. Minutes were approved without amendment.
2. Division of Labor. The group continued the discussion of the division of labor with regard to preparing feedback to departments on assessment reports and plans. The thinking now is that small groups within the committee will divide up the reports; within each small group a first reader would take responsibility for preparing a draft, although everyone in the group would review all the reports assigned to the group. [we also talked about a second reader, but I’m not sure now what that role is. Jim] We will get a committee email address from which feedback reports would be sent to Departments. We also discussed some rubrics developed at other schools for evaluating assessment reports and plans. Everyone thought it a good idea to have at least a rubric-like form for this purpose and we will develop or adapt one. In the meantime, we decided to send out the reports that we already discussed.
3. Report to Sociology Dept. on Criminology Assessment. This seemed all right so it will go out. Marilyn will send it out after Jim prepares an introductory paragraph explaining to the Dept. Chairs what we are doing.
4. Academic Advising. This too seemed fine and Jim will send it to Sumaya formally.
5. Humanities and Justice. This is ready to go as well when we convert the observation about the misalignment of learning objectives in the program and in the seminar into a recommendation and when we remove the reference to a “serious problem.” Once the changes are made, this will go out from Marilyn.
6. Meeting days. After a brief discussion we decided to continue meetings on Wednesdays. Jim will see if Richard can schedule his committee meetings later on Wednesdays to avoid conflicts.
College-Wide Assessment Committee
Meeting Agenda
April 25, 2012 – 1:40 pm
Room 620H

1. Approval of Minutes for April 4, 2012 (attached).
2. Responding to Reports and Plans from Departments. We are left with 14 plans and reports to which we should respond, although there are others outstanding. They are CIS, Corrections, Criminal Justice Management, Criminal Justice BS, Culture and Deviance, Economics, English, Forensic Science, Gender Studies, Global History, ICI, Police Studies, Political Science, and Public Administration. Virginia will bring hardcopies. We need to divide them up in small groups and plan how to prepare our reports.
3. Discussion of Rubric for Evaluating Plans and Reports. Virginia distributed a few samples at the last meeting and we should decide on a model for us.
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College-Wide Assessment Committee
Meeting Minutes – April 25, 2012

Present: Marisol Marrero, Jim Llana, Carla Barrett, Elizabeth Jeglic, Sumaya Villanueva, Andrew Sidman, Virginia Moreno, Jennifer Rutledge, Marilyn Rubin
Absent: Lisa Farrington, Mark McBeth, Daniele Officer

1. Approval of Minutes for April 4, 2012. Minutes were approved.
2. Responding to Reports and Plans from Departments. We spent much of the meeting dividing up the 14 assessment reports and talking about how to evaluate them. We formed four groups of three:

   Llana, Rubin, Villanueva
   Rutledge, Jeglic, Marrero
   Sidman, Moreno, Barrett
   Farrington, McBeth, Officer (in absentia)

   We took a careful look at the rubric Marilyn constructed to evaluate assessment reports; she had inserted the comments we had made on the Criminology degree assessment so we could see how we could use the rubric to communicate with a department. Everyone liked the general approach, but we decided to remove the number ratings on the right. We will send the rubric with the performance descriptions to the department but also a blank rubric in which we will insert checks under the appropriate performance level. In addition, we will add comments and recommendations in the boxes provided. An introductory narrative will lead with the positive news and summarize our assessment. Jim will notify the missing group that they are indeed a group.

   Each person in a group will write up one assessment; the others will provide a “back-up” review of it and raise questions if need be. Two groups have four assessments.

   There were a few minor changes in the rubric that we wanted to see, and Marilyn agreed to make them. Jim asked that Virginia take a look and make any final adjustments she thought important, before sending it out to everyone for use with the assigned assessment reports. Jim will see all the reports before they go out to departments to insure a rough consistency in presentation. If groups try different approaches to this process, we will discuss them in the interest of finding the best ones.

   We resolved to finish the assessments by May 16.

3. Next Meeting. We agreed to meet in two weeks.
College-Wide Assessment Committee
Meeting Agenda – May 9, 2012
1:40 pm – 2:50 pm - Room 620 H

2. Discussion of Group-Based Assessments. These are due May 16, but we should see how things are going. The modified rubric will be sent out by noon or close to it on Tuesday, May 8.
3. Discussion of Neglected Policy Statement on Assessment. We need to get back to this and wrap it up, if we can. I’ve made some updates, added the template for assessment reports, and attached latest version, which is not too different from earlier ones. I will take us through the live issues at the meeting, as I understand them, to catch us up and see where we stand with this important project.
4. Assessment Status Reports. Virginia will provide an overview of academic assessment, progress and challenges. I’ll do the same for administrative and support offices. This will lead to planning our work for future.
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College-Wide Assessment Committee
Meeting Minutes – May 9, 2012

Present:  Mark McBeth, Sumaya Villanueva, Jim Llana, Marilyn Rubin, Virginia Moreno, Jennifer Rutledge, Andrew Sidman, Carla Barrett
Absent: Lisa Farrington, Marisol Marrero, Daniele Officer, Elizabeth Jeglic

1. **Approval of Minutes for April 25, 2012.** Minutes were approved.

2. **Discussion of Group-Based Assessments.** There was a general discussion of the experiences so far of groups with the rubric. Mark shared his long report on Corrections. Most members thought that there should be three levels of performance in the rubric—meeting, nearly meeting, and not yet meeting standards—and Virginia will make the adjustment.

   There was a discussion of the extent to which we want to standardize the format of the reports beyond the rubric, and we decided to allow for variability, at least initially. Eventually, we might converge on a more set pattern.

   There was discussion of to what extent the Committee should comment on the content of the assessment plans we review. We concluded that we could make suggestions about reformulating the learning goals in some circumstances.

3. **Assessment Policy Document.** With little time remaining, Jim distributed an excerpt from the broad policy and practices document that we last discussed some time earlier. He said he would remove the reference to a college-wide standard regarding the proportion of students who “meet expectations.” Virginia distributed the list of institutional learning goals proposed by the Gen Ed assessment committee. Jim will add those goals to the assessment document.

4. **Assessment Status Reports.** Virginia distributed a chart showing where Departments are in their path to assessment, but there was no time to discuss. Jim wanted to present assessment progress in administrative and support units, but there was no time. He did say he has been working with about 20 such units to prepare assessment plans.