

**Faculty Senate Minutes #588
John Jay College of Criminal Justice**

Wednesday, November 5, 2025

1:40 PM

Zoom

Present (26): Chevy (Schevaletta) Alford, Cristina Lozano Arguelles, Elton Beckett, Ned Benton, Bibi (Silvina) Calderaro, Kathleen Collins, Artem Domashevskiy, Joy Dunkley, Jennifer Dysart, Jonathan Epstein, Sergio Gallegos, Sergio Grossi, Veronica Hendrick, Karen Kaplowitz, Allison Kavey, Anru Lee, Kyoo Lee, Jamie Longazel, Alejandro Garcia Lozano, Joseph Maldonado, Brian Maule, David Munns, Amada Santiago, Francis Sheehan, Charles Stone, Violet (Sung- Suk) Yu

Absent (11): Jacob Adler, Diana Falkenbach, Heath Grant, Michelle Holder, Josh Mason, Ray Patton, Kumar Ramansenthil, Macushla Robinson, Marie Springer, Todd Stambaugh, Shilpa Viswanath

Invited Guests: Provost Allison Pease, Asst Provost for Academic Engagement Sumaya Villanueva

Agenda

- 1. Adoption of the agenda**
- 2. Approval of Minutes #587 of the October 23, 2025, meeting**
- 3. Proposed Endorsement of UFS Statement opposing the Trump Administration's "Compact for Academic Excellence in Higher Education"**
- 4. Review of a proposed administration plan to change student advisement**
- 5. Invited Guests: Provost Allison Pease & Assistant Provost for Academic Engagement Sumaya Villanueva: discussion of proposed changes to student advisement**
- 6. Discussion: Shall the Faculty Senate propose a policy that prohibits students from recording/photographing class sessions without instructor's permission:
Executive Committee**
- 7. New business**

1. Adoption of the Agenda. Adopted.

2. Approval of Minutes #586 of the October 23, 2025 meeting. Approved.

3. Proposed Endorsement of UFS Statement opposing the Trump Administration's "Compact for Academic Excellence in Higher Education," which can be found at "[Compact for Academic Excellence in Higher Education](#)."

The Senate unanimously endorsed the UFS Statement. The text of “**Not This Compact**” can be found in the Appendix at the end of these Minutes.

4. Review of a proposed administration plan to change student advisement

The Senate discussed the administration’s plan to have our current 28 professional advisors, who now advise lower class students about gen ed, also advise students about their majors, in place of faculty who have until now been major advisors. No additional advisors would be hired for our 13,000 students. In response to this proposal, several Senators reported that advisors have given students erroneous advice about gen ed and questioned, therefore, whether such advisors would make even more errors if they were to also do advisement about the more challenging topic of majors. It was noted that our professional advisors don’t know about our fields of study, don’t know which courses are needed for graduate school and for jobs, or why one version of a course is preferable to another. Faculty, on the other hand, are experts in all these areas.

A PowerPoint slide deck created by OAA was reviewed which showed the number of advisors to be assigned to each academic department. Senator Ned Benton pointed out that we have 47 majors but only 28 advisors and wondered how this would work. He noted that other campuses are surprised by the large number of professional advisors we have. The question was also raised as to what chairs and major coordinators will henceforth be expected to do if this change were to be implemented.

Senator Francis Sheehan said if professional advisors are to be a supplement to the current advisement operation, then he thinks this is great. He explained he would very much like to have two or three professional advisors assigned to the Sciences Department, in addition to faculty advisors, because the Science major is very complex. He, too, reported about students who were given wrong information by advisors, adding that in the case of Science majors such errors often put students six months behind in their studies.

5. Invited Guests: Provost Allison Pease & Assistant Provost for Academic Engagement Sumaya Villanueva: discussion of proposed changes to student advisement

The guests were welcomed and invited to review the plan. Assistant Provost Sumaya Villanueva explained that this plan is the result of our NISS work, which involved collaboration among administrators, faculty, staff, and students. This is an exploration and rethinking of how we can work together to meet student needs in a more holistic way. It is a proposal and not a done deal.

Provost Pease explained that each advisor will serve multiple majors, so that our 28 professional advisors will be able to handle our 47 majors. The advisors will provide a holistic approach, focusing on career development as well as academic studies. Since faculty are best at mentoring, they should do that instead of advising. Coordinators have a big role, and advising

is only part of that role and, indeed, not all coordinators do advisement. Eight majors currently have professional advisors assigned to them. This proposed realignment aims to allow faculty to have different types of conversations with students. Those professional advisors who have already been assigned to academic departments – CJ, Law and Society, Psych, ICJ, and CJ-LPS – were overwhelmed because of the large number of majors each has had and there were available resources to alleviate that problem and so advisors were allocated to them. The original effort was that professional advisors focused on lower-class students to tell them what entry level courses they needed to take in order to graduate on time and in order to provide “graduation checks.” The goal is for students to hit progress milestones so they can graduate on time.

AP Villanueva said the goal is that there is a reasonable case load for each advisor and that every student is able to meet with their advisor. She added that currently advisors make mistakes because they don’t know how different majors work.

Asked what will happen to the faculty advisors, the provost said we don’t have any faculty advisors; we have program coordinators, and faculty will continue in that role. What faculty do best is mentor students; she said they want everyone to do what they do best. The advisors will advise students as to which courses to take. She added that not all major coordinators advise students.

She further said that of course faculty are always advising but she is trying to take the burden off of faculty. She said she’s not criticizing the advising we’ve been doing for the past 12 years. In fact, as dean she had asked for faculty advisors. But we can now have students assigned to professional advisors throughout all their years as undergraduates.

Senator David Munns thanked our guests for attending this meeting. He said advisement is somewhat like Undergraduate Foundations in that the problem is that our college has 5 very big parts and 27 very small parts. The History faculty know every one of their students; they know every transcript; they know who will be graduating this year. He said that when their students go to the Advisement Center they come away in worse shape than before. Because History is a small major, there is a specific sequence of courses that must be followed. The proposed change may work for larger majors, but he doesn’t believe it can work for History

Senator Allison Kavey asked whether a department, such as History, could opt out of having professional advisors assigned to it. Provost Pease said she doesn’t see why not. But, she added, the critique is being made of advisors who were not previously trained or embedded in a department. With this new approach, advisors will be trained in the major(s) they are responsible for and there will be constant communication between the advisor, the chair, and the major coordinator. She added that it doesn’t have to be an either/or situation. Although faculty are the experts in their disciplines, the proposal is to provide people who will learn their major and be an ally; sometimes faculty advisors need a break or need coverage during the summer. She said the advising model was originally a split one, with the professional advisors following gen ed requirements and policies, plus how to use DegreeWorks, EAB Audit, Schedule

Builder, etc., so students could manage their academic progression. The advisors also guide students about minors, certificate programs, study abroad, etc. The plan is for students to then be directed to the major advisors at the department level to begin their majors.

Senator Benton said some of the numbers in the PowerPoint don't seem to make sense. For example, Economics is listed as getting 3 advisors although they're identified as having fewer than 400 majors while other disciplines with more than 400 majors are shown to be getting fewer advisors. Provost Pease explained that the plan is to provide equitable distribution so that each advisor has a reasonable number of advisees. Some advisors will work with more than one department. At the entry level, each advisor of freshmen and transfer students has 350-400 students. She said because of a lack of resources, advisors only focused on gen ed advising but OAA has been dreaming of building liaisons between the Advisement Center and academic departments so that advisors can learn from departments.

Senator Charles Stone said it sounds like we can keep our department structure but add on professional advisors to take the burden off faculty. He asked if the plan is that the professional advisors will take over the many bureaucratic tasks they now do so that faculty can do more meaningful mentoring. AP Villanueva said yes.

Senator Kavey said she wants to follow up about a department choosing to opt out of being assigned professional advisors, which would free more advisors for the larger majors. She said increasing the communication with advisors sounds good, but some of us have had to fix mistakes and approve course substitutes because of wrong advice by professional advisors and so we're reluctant to hand over this important work to them. She asked: what happens if a department were to decide to opt out?

AP Villanueva said the department would continue to do what it has been doing and no professional advisor would be assigned to the department. Students would continue to be assigned an advisor at their entry into the college for gen ed advisement, and the department can look at EAB Navigate to see what students are being told but, she cautioned, the administration can't ensure that students will do what they're told.

Senator Cristina Lozano Arguelles asked about double majors. AP Villanueva said the student's advisor will be whoever is assigned to the first major listed in Degree Audit but there will be internal coordination between advisors.

Senator Munns asked how the mentor role for faculty is being envisioned. AP Villanueva said faculty know their discipline intimately; they can mentor students about the area students might want to specialize in, about hidden job markets, about authors the students should read, and those kind of conversations.

Senator Bibi Calderero asked about minor programs. She noted that the Sustainability Minor is really difficult to recruit students into. AP Villanueva said building a minor takes time. Having a

new structure with a designated person advising students will allow for greater understanding as to why students would benefit from such a program. This is really a work in progress.

Senator Jamie Longazel asked what a “market ready approach” is and how and why this a guiding principle according to the PowerPoint. AP Villanueva explained that CUNY is interested in moving students into meaningful careers, not just into jobs. The idea is to think about how we’re preparing students to build skills that will enable them to get into graduate school and work in a profession. We are working to make meaningful connections between our career specialists and our academic advisors. Senator Longazel followed up by asking how this is “holistic.” AP Villanueva said it takes all of us to meet the needs of students; an advisor is not able to provide everything, so it takes coordination between the Career Learning Lab, the Student Success programs, Counseling, academic departments, and the Advisement Center.

Asked the timeline, AP Villanueva said that she and her staff are consulting with faculty during the fall and spring; they will be refining the program accordingly, deciding how to assign advisors, and will share this with the Faculty Senate, and with major and minor coordinators, and chairs so that we’re all in step. Ideally this plan will be implemented for Fall 2026. Once advisors are connected with departments, conversations can begin and advisors will be invited by departments to attend meetings when appropriate.

President Kaplowitz asked who will train the advisors about the majors they are assigned to. AP Villanueva said each department will identify faculty who will work with the advisor(s) who already have access to Degree Audit and, of course, to the web.

6. Discussion: Shall the Faculty Senate propose a policy that prohibits students from recording/photographing class sessions without instructor’s permission: Executive Committee. There was insufficient time to discuss this item.

7. New business. There was no new business.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:20 PM.

Provided by A. Kavey & K. Kaplowitz

APPENDIX

**Statement Adopted by Unanimous Vote of the
Faculty Senate of John Jay College of Criminal Justice
on November 5, 2025**

First adopted by CUNY's University Faculty Senate on October 28, 2025

Not This Compact

The compact CUNY has with its community, the City and State of New York is based on the firm belief that higher education is conducted for the common good and

- that the success of the common good depends on the production and dissemination of knowledge;
- that the accumulation of knowledge requires an environment allowing for a critical, open, unending process conducted with discipline and rigor;
- that a byproduct of knowledge is wisdom, a respect for justice, and an appreciation of civic duty; that a student-centered urban university system requires a focus on access, affordability, academic excellence, and research and innovation; and
- that only by preserving all these qualities can CUNY remain an engine of equity and upward mobility, able to advance the well-being of all residents of the City and State of New York.

Higher education has thrived in the United States and at CUNY through the protection of academic freedom, shared governance, and independent scholarship and teaching. The proposed “Compact for Academic Excellence in Higher Education” (the McMahon-Mailman compact) comprises ten conditions on federal funding that would undermine CUNY’s compact. This “compact” would:

- chillingly mandate the surveillance of personal viewpoints of faculty, students and staff;
- weaken institutional autonomy and academic freedom by demanding changes to governance structures and the closure of units deemed ideologically suspect;
- enforce specific definitions of gender contrary to New York State’s Human Rights Law;
- remove board authority over tuition control;
- coercively threaten access for student, faculty, and administration to student loans, grant programs, and federal contracts in violation of the “unconstitutional conditions” doctrine;
- weaken campus autonomy by adding limitations in admission decisions;
- restrict access by limiting international student enrollments;
- interfere with the grading mechanism between faculty and student;
- prioritize unacceptable constraints on students’ programs of study over academic excellence;
- undermine the integrity of academic research by promising to circumvent the rigorous and meritocratic awarding of federal grants;
- require that institutions commit to the use of lawful force to impose “civility” in constitutionally protected speech discordant with the Henderson Rules (Article 129-A of the Educational Law);
- commit CUNY to an annual performance review of “loyalty” in order to continue federal funding;

We call on the Board of Trustees of CUNY and the Chancellery of the City University of New York to steadfastly resist any pressures to enter into this McMahon-Mailman compact or any similar compact which would undermine the mission and values of CUNY.

Resources

[Executive Committee of the CUNY University Faculty Senate 2024 – 2025](#)

[Together we stand; statement by the UFS Executive Committee](#)

[The Compact for academic excellence in higher education](#)

[Resolution of the College of Staten Island on the “Compact for Academic Excellence in Higher Education” \(passed October 16, 2025 with 2 abstention\)](#)

[Oppose the McMahon-Mailman Compact by the SUNY University Faculty Senate Executive Committee](#)

[Henderson Rules/Rules and Regulations for the Maintenance of Public](#)

[New York States Human Rights Law](#)

[AAUP Defending our Campuses and Communities](#)

[Stand Together for Higher Ed National Statement on the Federal Compact](#)