

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES #116

John Jay College of Criminal Justice

December 9, 1994

9:30 AM

Room 630 T

Present (32): Yahya Affinnih, Michael Blitz, Ira Bloomgarden, Orlanda Brugnola, Edward Davenport, Jane Davenport, Robert DeLucia, Janice Dunham, Pat Gary, Arlene Geiger, P.J. Gibson, Elisabeth Gitter, Lou Guinta, Diane Hartmus, Elizabeth Hegeman, Karen Kaplowitz, Richard Koehler, Gavin Lewis, Leona Lee, Tom Litwack, Barry Luby, James Malone, Peter Manuel, Jill Norgren, Dan Pinello, Charles Reid, Edward Shaughnessy, Carmen Solis, Davidson Umeh, Maurice Vodounon, Agnes Wieschenberg, Bessie Wright

Absent (6): Arvind Agarwal, Hecca Costa, Peter DeForest, Zelma Henriques, Laurence Holder, Henry Morse

Agenda

1. Announcements from the chair
2. Approval of Minutes #115 of November 22
3. Invited Guest: Freshman Year Director Patricia Sinatra
4. Invited Guest: Vice Chancellor Elsa Nunez-Wormack
5. Update on Base Level Equity reallocation of lines
6. Proposal to begin pilot satellite program in a NYPD precinct or other facility: Guests: Dean James Curran and Professor Charles Lindner
7. Proposed honorary degree candidates: Professor Robert Panzarella, Chair, Committee on Honorary Degrees
8. Report on the search for the dean of undergraduate studies
9. Proposal to endorse a designation of distinguished professor
10. Proposed ways to improve the Judicial Committee proceedings
11. Proposal to recommend that American Sign Language be offered at John Jay and that ASL be accepted as a language fulfilling the College's foreign language requirement
12. Discussion of the December 14 College Council agenda
13. Pre-registration
14. New business

1. Announcements from the chair

Two new trustees have been nominated to the Board of Trustees by Mayor Rudolph Giuliani. The Brooklyn seat now held by William Howard is to be filled, upon approval by the State Senate, by Ronald J. Marino, vice president in the public finance division of Smith Barney. Previously he was deputy commissioner for NYC's Department of Housing Preservation, Office of Policy and Government Liaison and, later, in the Office of Development. He received his undergraduate degree from Iona College and

master's in urban planning from Hunter. He lives in Brooklyn. The Manhattan seat that has been vacant since the death several years ago of Blanche Bernstein is to be filled, upon approval by the State Senate, by Richard Stone, the Wilbur H. Friedman Professor of Tax Law at Columbia University. He has also served as tax counsel with the law firm of Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen, and Hamilton, and prior to his tenure at Columbia was Assistant to the Solicitor General of the United States. Professor Stone has served on the tax committee for the City Bar of New York, was advisor to the U.S. Treasury on corporate debt-equity regulations, and was national vice president of the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America. His undergraduate and law degrees are from Harvard University.

In keeping with John Jay's tradition of having a significant novelist or poet speak at the final event of Women's History Month (the first year it was Gloria Naylor and last year Michelle Cliff), an event at which the student poetry and essay winners are also announced, the Women's Studies Committee has just chosen Toni Cade Bambara, a wonderful writer of short stories and a novelist, who will give the keynote speech at the culminating event of Women's History Month, on March 30.

2. Approval of Minutes #115 of November 22

Minutes #115 of the November 22 meeting were approved.

3. Invited Guest: Freshman Year Director Patricia Sinatra

The director of John Jay's Freshman Year program, Patricia Sinatra, was welcomed. Ms. Sinatra, who reports to Vice President Roger Witherspoon, was thanked for preparing an excellent 12-page report for the Senate [copies are available from the Senate]. She wrote the report for the Senate and is here today to help the Senate better understand our freshmen and to also help us prepare for our meeting later in the morning with Vice Chancellor Elsa Nunez-Wormack.

She explained that the freshman program is designed as an early intervention program consisting of tutoring and counseling services. At the tenth week, the students are invited by letter to come to her office so that their second semester program can be planned. (TSP freshmen go to TSP executive director Doris Torres, and SEEK freshmen go to the SEEK counselors, and the remaining 1200 students come to her.)

Asked what kinds of problems our students face that we could benefit from discussing with Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wonnack, Director Sinatra said we have a pattern of students coming into the College who pass the writing proficiency test but who fail the reading proficiency test. The pattern started two years ago and it's a reverse from the typical pattern.

Students who passed the 3 proficiency tests represent 21% of the freshmen class this academic year. This sounds low, Director Sinatra said, but it is actually a higher percentage than it has ever been. The previous year it was 15% and the year prior to that it was 11%. But of the 21% who passed the three proficiency tests, 76 of those students were placed into Math 103, which is a developmental course. Of the group of 283 students who passed the three proficiency tests, 74 had below a 75 high school average. Six of the 283 students had a high school average of 90 or higher. 24 students had a high school average between 85-89, and 86 were between 80-84. Taking the group that failed writing but passed math, which is 15% of the freshman class, 78 students had a high school average of less than 75, 89 students had 75-79, 25 had between 80-85, and 3 had

above a 90. The last category, the students who failed all three proficiency tests, which represents 24% of the freshman class, 139 had less than a 75 average, and only 3 had above a 90. She said one would expect that students with a high school average above 90 would not fail all three proficiency tests and, therefore, one has to really look beyond high school averages and instead look at the proficiency test scores and it is those scores that are the more accurate predictor of success.

For the 80% who fail one or more of the proficiency tests, we offer a basic skills program and have been doing this for the past 10 years. We had increased over last year more than 54% of the number of courses and sections that we offered in basic skills so last year there was an enrollment of 750 students in the summer basic skills immersion program --which represents 460 entering freshmen -- of that group our success rate was 60% of students who completed the program passed the writing test, 60% passed the reading test, and 80% passed the mathematics test. It appears that intensive, very structured, required attendance programs are the ones which seem to help these students. Of course this is wonderful, and it is helping them pass the proficiency tests, but the downside to this is that their rate of passing their courses is not what we would hope for. It could be that we are actually moving students ahead too quickly. She said she can not at this point document this but this is her impression. And so students may pass the proficiency test in writing and yet not do well in English 101 (the first non-remedial, non-developmental writing course). The reason they are not doing well in English 101 may be that they are not getting the continual support that they received during the summer in the immersion skills program.

We have three types of tutoring programs for basic skills and while students are referred by faculty they are not referred in large numbers: 56 faculty referred 78 students this past semester for tutoring. When tutoring is not required, students tend to not go on a consistent basis. The students who do go are the ones who succeed. Her recommendation -- what they've done with the immersion skills program and the freshman year money -- is to start to offer mini-preparatory courses for the CUNY proficiency tests and that seems to work. But a drastic intervention needs to be made in terms of tutoring and the best intervention is computerized tutoring, which we do not have because we do not have the money. President Kaplowitz asked whether the other colleges have computerized tutoring. Director Sinatra said some do and cited BMCC as an example, and said BMCC has a wonderful lab. She urged everyone to go to BMCC to look at the kinds of student support services they have in terms of tutoring services. We are working probably around the 1950s right now in terms of tutoring, she said, Senator Umeh asked where BMCC received funds for its computerized tutoring program. Director Sinatra said the funding source was a Title III grant which BMCC received before they built their new building and so the technology was built as an integral part of the new building. Since we hope to have a new building, she said, it would be wise to plan for it appropriately. President Kaplowitz said that this is something we can point out not only to Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack, as to how our gross underfunding is harming our students, but it is also part of the case we can make to Vice Chancellor Macari about our need for Phase II.

Director Sinatra said that it is not only students in need of remediation that her office focuses on. Last year she started a program called the "distinguished freshman program," which is the direction that we really need to move. These students completed their first year of college with a 3.5 GPA in non-remedial courses: more than 100 students met this criterion. Of those, 40 applied to the program and 15 were accepted. The students served as research assistants to 15 faculty members during the summer, they served as tutors in the basic skills program, and they took a computer literacy course. The goal of the program is to prepare

these students to compete for national scholarship and fellowship programs. Most students who do well learn about scholarship and fellowship programs too late and so by giving them the opportunity as freshmen to become more aware and by providing them with the opportunities to conduct research with a faculty member the students are groomed to compete for scholarships. There are 200 scholarships that her office is aware of and the plan is to encourage faculty to mentor students (not just freshmen) who have a 3.5 GPA or better. Unfortunately, she said, only 3 faculty have sent her the sign-up form volunteering to mentor these honor students. Senators reported not having seen the forms.

Asked the percentage of freshmen who drop out in light of the fact that every year 40% of the students enrolled are new to the College, Director Sinatra said that between the first and second semester, 87% of freshmen return. Between the second and third semester, in 1989, 67% returned but she is very hesitant to use five year old data because the numbers might be very different now. In response to the information that only 1 out of every 7 student who enters as a first-time freshmen graduates, Senator Umeh asked why is the percentage not higher. Director Sinatra said that we do not know. She added that of the students on probation, a third are freshmen but the term freshman has many meanings: there are first semester freshmen, second semester freshmen, and third and fourth semester freshmen (students who typically start out in remediation, have to repeat a course, and then repeat a course a second and a third time.) So those students actually spend two years at the college and have completed 27 credits. Students in this category who responded to a survey said the reasons were inadequate preparation in terms of study skills, poor time management skills (meaning that they did not study), work and family difficulties. In an attempt to address this, they held a workshop. The first month there were 20 students and by December only 5 students attended and of those 5, 3 were not even enrolled at John Jay at the time. And so it is difficult to say why students drop out.

Senator Wieschenberg reported that some of her freshmen are taking five courses which they say they need in order to maintain eligibility for financial aid. She asked whether it is reasonable to ask underprepared students to take five classes with work and family obligations. Director Sinatra said that students need only four courses to receive financial aid and she advises four courses as a maximum. The problem, she said, is that she programs the freshmen with wonderful and appropriate course programs but the students then go to late registration and completely change their courses and she and her Office have absolutely no control over this. ESL student breakdown reveals that 116 of the students (80%) scored 5 or less in writing and are in all remedial courses. Although they are in remedial courses in their first semester, this ends at the conclusion of their first semester because we do not have sequencing of programs and so typically we have ESL students taking a Government 101 course in their second semester and there is nothing we can do about it. Professor Rovira said many students often take 5 courses as a hedge in case they are failing a course at mid-term. Thus they can afford to drop one course and still keep financial aid.

Senator DeLucia said retention problems are connected to problems at registration. Students are programmed for their first semester: they get the remedial courses and a counseling course. The next semester they register first so they can get anything they want: if they've succeeded in their first semester they can move up the sequence and can take the next level courses in English, Math, and reading and they take speech or physical ed, nothing heavy. And so we don't lose them. The third semester they hit the wall: they register on the last day, because that is the way our structure is set up. If they are not eligible for English 101, because they did not pass their remedial course, then they are not eligible for many other courses because English 101 is the prerequisite for many

courses. And so the problem is what can they take. Maybe they will get into the remedial English course -- they probably will. But then there is nothing else and so they take Government 101, Economics 101, Psychology 101. Now the financial aid system is different for them. During their first year they could take four courses and be eligible for financial aid but the rules change in the third semester: if a student takes three remedial courses, each worth one or two credits, he or she has to take at least one or two more courses because full-time status is 12 credits. Then they start taking the more difficult courses but they often have not worked up the sequence in reading and writing and thus are at a strong disadvantage in terms of their chances of passing these courses. And we do not dismiss students between semesters, we only do it during the summer. So after the first year they are often able to survive but at the end of the second year they are in deep trouble. We need to look at our registration process, at whether we have guaranteed courses in their remedial sequences, no matter what, what services are in place, and how they manage to get into these courses without having passed the 101 prerequisites. Senator Gitter asked how many students are being described and Senator DeLucia and Director Sinatra said about half of the freshmen, that is 600 students.

Director Sinatra said another thing is that it is absurd to not require students in remedial courses to take tutoring as part of their class. Giving less credit does not address the issue: students need more consistent instruction throughout their first year and they do not succeed in building skills by having a class meet twice a week and our just telling students where the services are.

Senator Solis said SEEK students are required to take five classes to qualify for financial aid because their courses do not carry as much credit as do regular college courses. She said SEEK wants to have tutoring required but is having a terrible time trying to get that through. She also said students who cannot get into the courses they need will often sign up for a 300-level course which happens to be open. Her department had thought that the computers were going to check on prerequisites and block registration for courses when the prerequisite has not yet been taken. President Kaplowitz said that the computers cannot block registration because we do not have sufficiently powerful computers; it is up to the computer operator at the terminal to look at each student's prerequisite sheet, which is generated by the computer, and to honor what the printout says a student is eligible to take and to not contravene it even if the registering student implores the operator to do so. Senator Solis said her department has just learned this.

Senator Malone said that if we could ask students each semester what courses they want we could plan to offer those courses and could begin to solve the problem of offering courses that they need. He said that such pre-registration takes place at many colleges around the country. President Kaplowitz said that President Lynch asked Professor Kobilinsky to chair an ad hoc committee on pre-registration, which she has been serving on, and that Professor Kobilinsky will be coming to the Senate to report on the committee's work thus far. She noted that the issue is on today's agenda as an informational item. Senator Wieschenberg spoke in support of pre-registration because it would solve all problems at registration and asked why we do not have this. President Kaplowitz said that the issue turns out to be very complex and that the issue is still very much an open one: the committee is functioning as a fact-finding group and will be reporting to the Senate and to the Chairs.

Senator Gitter said she knows of no studies which show that tutoring helps young students although she does know one study that says tutoring is counterproductive for young students although it may help older students and she asked if there are any new studies. Director Sinatra

said the entire nation is experiencing these problems and so a lot of work in this area is being done: what has been found is that students who work cooperatively together in group tutoring that is augmented with individual tutoring in a structured manner will, in fact, succeed, provided that they are monitored. Senator Gitter agreed that the collaborative learning model works but thought that the one-on-one model is both very expensive and not successful. Director Sinatra agreed that one-on-one tutoring is very expensive and said what she is advocating is investing funds in computers and in cooperative learning environments and that one-on-one tutoring be provided when needed as a supplement. Professor Rovira said a lot of one-on-one work is being done in which the tutoring is done by peers. She said studies show that students learn much more successfully in a safe environment and that peer tutoring provides a safe environment.

Senator Guinta said we have a curriculum here that is not working. We have students taking Anthropology 101, Economics 101, Psychology 101, at the same time as remedial classes and this is not working. This is a systemic problem and we have to look at our curriculum and at our freshman year program. We have to sit down and look at this collectively as a faculty and as a faculty we have to come up with creative solutions. When one looks at what our students are asked to take and if one asks whether they are excited about learning here the answer is no. He said he would drop out also if he were taking three remedial classes and a counseling class and was told that this is college. There are other pedagogical models, there are other concepts with dealing with this problem. The only time we are going to wrestle with this problem is if students stop coming here. At this point we have so many students that we don't have to sit down and deal with the situation because next semester another 1500 students will come here.

President Kaplowitz reminded the Senate that at the last Senate meeting, when we talked about standards, Senator Litwack suggested that the Senate call a meeting of the faculty to talk as a faculty about standards. The Senate agreed that after we hear from Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack and disseminate the minutes of her meeting with us and any materials she may provide that we plan for such a meeting. She said Senator Guinta and Senator DeLucia and other faculty can lead workshops and the goal would be to have concrete actions and proposals that we would then work to implement.

President Kaplowitz said she thinks we are at the point where we must deal with these issues not only because it is educationally and morally imperative that we do so but because the new political reality will compel us to. The CUNY Board of Trustees is changing with many seats being filled by Mayor Giuliani and by Governor Pataki. The new Board will reflect the new administrations' values. The media onslaught against CUNY is continuing and shows no sign of abating (more articles attacking CUNY have recently appeared including last week's New York Post editorial, "A Welcome Shakeup Looms at CUNY," which she distributed along with a Daily News article reporting that the CUNY reading proficiency test has an 8th grade reading level as passing). She said there are those who want to downsize the University and who believe that public higher education in general, and CUNY in particular, is not what tax payers' dollars should be paying for.

Senator Pinello thanked Director Sinatra for her comprehensive written report. He said he had not known 90% of what is contained in it and said it taught him many things which he, as a new faculty member, needed to know. He reported that he attended the previous day's Better Teaching Seminar, which was an open discussion about the experience of teaching at John Jay, and later in the day, to prepare for today's meeting, he read the materials that had been circulated, including Heather MacDonald's City Journal article, about which he had heard quite a lot.

He said that although a lot of what MacDonald has to say has a mean-spirited tone some of the substance was very similar to what was said by his colleagues at the Better Teaching Seminar. He said we should take the attacks on CUNY as an opportunity to do the kinds of things that are being suggested. He said he looks forward to both hearing what the Vice Chancellor has to say (and is very glad we are having this discussion), and to a working meeting of the faculty to develop ideas and proposals for solutions.

Senator Norgren said that she, too, looks forward to having a set of workshops led by experts such as Senator Guinta and Senator DeLucia and other faculty not on the Senate. She agrees that the political climate certainly supports our doing what we know we should in any case be doing. She said that she also supports pre-registration: if students register in the spring for her fall Government 101 course, she would give them material to read over the summer (and three months is a long time) so that they could have some preparation for the course and not be slammed with all the work all at once when the semester begins. But, she said, they would have to be actually registered for the course because her department does not have a standard text and so the students have to know which section they are registered for. She said that professional schools have summer preparatory programs and that by pre-registering our students they too could have a kind of preparatory program both in the summer and during intersession by virtue of the fact that they could start doing the readings. She said she would meet with the students when they pre-register for her courses and would start to develop a relationship with them at that point.

President Kaplowitz said that she, too, sees that as a tremendous benefit: she said she would like to tell students to read David Copperfield over the summer rather than in the first weeks of a busy semester. But the pre-registration committee identified as one potential problem the fact that our enormous turnover (40%, that is, 4000 of the students each year, are new to the College) can result in courses that students signed up for at pre-registration being cancelled in the fall because of lack of enrollment and the frustration of students who read course materials before the semester began. She noted also that the committee spoke about the issue of equity: students new to the College would not have the same opportunity of preparing for a course in advance as those who pre-register. Senator Norgren said as to the first point, 100-level courses do not get cancelled for lack of enrollment. As for the second, for many reasons students come to the starting gate with various advantages and disadvantages including academic skills. She said at least a third of the programs at the College treat students differentially. Senator Malone said we should not let concerns of inequality prevent us from doing what is right for the majority of our students. President Kaplowitz said she will convey these points to the pre-registration committee and noted that Director Sinatra is on the committee as well.

Senator Gibson said she teaches at the University of California at Berkeley in the summer and that tutors are assigned to classes and the tutors have the syllabi and the texts and so when students come to be tutored everyone is on the same page. In addition, tutoring there is mandatory and is a part of their grades. And so correspondence goes on between the head of the tutoring lab, the tutor, and the instructor. The system does work and has been working for the ten years she has been involved in it and each year it gets better.

Senator Koehler said he is very impressed with what the College is doing in terms of remediation and he has been educated this morning in terms of the extraordinary effort that we expend here during our students' first year. But what he wants to know is if we are spending a full year of remediation to prepare students for college work why is it not

appropriate for them to take the courses they are registering for in their second year such as Economics, and Government, and Psychology: when do we complete the remediation process and when do we begin the college experience. He said he makes two assumptions: one, we want to give a quality education, and two, we want to have open admissions. We have done the first after a year and we work extremely hard to prepare students for college level courses. Then we talk about a wall. That wall sounds like college. He said it sounds like not an unsound process. At some point do we say that perhaps people should be ready for college. He asked what would happen if students could not take the 300-level courses, if we said no to them. A senator said they would lose their financial aid. Senator Koehler said then it sounds as if we are not giving enough 101 courses. But if these are 101 courses in Economics, and Government, and Psychology is that not what college students are supposed to take and we are talking about students who are in their second year at the College.

Senator DeLucia said he does not mean that students should not take these courses but that they are taking them with five other courses, of which three might be the content courses and two are remedial reading including remedial English and they do not have the skills for those content courses and, therefore, drop out. Senator Koehler said a year of remediation followed by the challenge of whether students can academically succeed seems a reasonable expectation.

President Kaplowitz thanked Director Sinatra and congratulated her on just having submitted her doctoral dissertation. The Senate expressed its thanks and congratulations with applause.

4. Invited Guest: Vice Chancellor Elsa Nunez-Wormack [Attachments A-C]

President Kaplowitz welcomed and introduced Vice Chancellor Elsa Nunes-Wormack. Dr. Nunez-Wormack is the CUNY Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs and the University Dean for Academic Affairs. She was associate dean of the faculty at the College of Staten Island (CUNY) from 1986 until 1992 and was associate professor of English at CSI since 1986. She was an American Council on Education Fellow in Academic Administration at CSI in 1985-86, an Hispanic Leadership Fellow in Academic Administration at the New Jersey Department of Higher Education the previous year, and a Ford Foundation Fellow for three years. From 1973 to 1986, Dr. Nunez-Wormack was a member of the English faculty at Rampapo State College of New Jersey, where she was also the director of the English as a Second Language Program there during those years. Dr. Nunes-Wormack received her Ph.D. in Linguistics from Rutgers University, her M.A. in English from Fairleigh Dickinson University and her B.A. from Montclair State College. In 1991 she was appointed to the Princeton Council on New Jersey Affairs, and has chaired the state-wide organizations, *Aspira* of New Jersey and the Hispanic Association for Higher Education. She is on the Board of the New York Civil Liberties Union and is a member of the American Council on Education Minority Task Force, the Mellon Carnegie Commission to increase the number of minority Ph.D.'s, and the National Puerto Rican Coalition. She is past chairperson of the Staten Island branch of the New York Urban League and her 1991 book, Pursuing Diversity: College Minority Student Recruitment, was published by George Washington University.

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: I am very grateful to Karen for inviting me to John Jay's Senate. It is very important to me to be able to speak to the faculty. At CUNY Central I work in an abstraction, in the absence of faculty and students, and this is my third year at 80th Street and I miss the contact with the faculty and the contact with the students that I enjoyed in my previous positions. And so while being at CUNY Central is interesting, because I am dealing with policy analysis at the macro level

and if one believes in public higher education as I do and believe that you are making a contribution it is very interesting and challenging work but the contact with faculty comes at the campus level and therefore I am grateful for this opportunity to talk about what I think are pressing issues for our faculty and for our students.

I have brought two large bosses of material and data and I will send or fax any other data that the Senate may want that I may not have brought with me. I've prepared a presentation that is not formal because I want there to be a lot of interaction, into three parts: what is the current state of affairs in terms of CUNY with regard to student preparation; then, some short-term solutions and strategies which I and my colleagues at CUNY Central with the guidance and support of the campuses are trying to implement and in some cases have implemented; and then, long-term issues and long-term proposed resolutions to those issues.

What I am distributing to you is a report on ESL, which is brand-new, just off the press, which was put together by the ESL Task Force. Most of you have probably seen this document either through your department chair or through the Provost. [Copies are available from the Senate.] This document was put together by 17 faculty members who teach ESL and their charge was to look at the issues related to learning and teaching students who are not native-speakers of English. The one caveat that they had as their charge, when I met with them, was that I strongly suggested that they not have a report that was anecdotal in nature, that is, the report was to come out of a set of recommendations and was to talk about how ESL students do, citing, perhaps, student profiles of success and being limited in that regard. The reason for that was that I knew that if I were to act as an advocate on behalf of our faculty and students I would need data because right now every legislator, every person that I meet, every trustee, every tax-payer asks the hard bottom-line questions. So I asked them to put together a document that would have substantial data so that when responding to issues as a University, as a faculty, we would have this data. And they did. The faculty worked very hard to provide what has never before been provided in CUNY and that is a database on ESL students. The reason is that we collect information at CUNY asking our students basically, what country were they born in and whether they speak another language, other than English. Those questions on the student application form limit the way that we can research our students because we didn't know if they ended up in ESL courses, we didn't know what kind of courses they took on the campuses, the sequence of courses they took, etc. So the faculty members looked at every course at every campus ESL 1, ESL 2, and ESL 3: basic, intermediary, and advanced ESL.

Please turn to Appendix A [Attachment A] because it presents data about not just ESL students but about all CUNY students in 1990, which is the latest cohort. In 1990, CUNY had 25,000 students enrolled as first-time freshmen and this data looks at only first-time freshmen. We had 1677 registered for ESL-1 (the most basic level with almost zero English): 1500 students were in the intermediate ESL-2 course; the next category shows the number of students at all 17 campuses who passed all three assessment tests: 5,325. And so of 25,000 students, 5,000 students passed all three assessment tests. Bow many were double remedial, that is, failed two of the assessment tests: 5,350. That gives you a sense of the profile of the freshman class. The other 11,000 failed one or two of the tests. I am not going to go through all the data because that would take too much time but I know that some you will go through this in great detail either at a subsequent meeting or individually. You can also look at the students' high school preparation and so I would ask you to look at the second page of the Table and look with me at the preparations the students came to the University with in mathematics. These are the medians they came with in Mathematics. So if you look at ESL-1, the lowest level of ESL, for example, those students had a 76 average: that is

the median; ESL-2 had a median average of 77 (not a big difference), and ESL-3 had a median average of 75.

Of the students who passed all three assessment tests, what was their median mathematics preparation or GPA: it was 77, which is very interesting because you would expect that students who passed all three tests would have a higher mathematics preparation. Double remedials had a median of 68, not unexpected, and it was 74 for others.

Let's look at English. Across the board, how many units of English did these students take (now you are looking at units -- a unit is two semesters OR one year of English). The ESL-1 students had one year of regular English, ESL-2 students had a half a year, ESL-3 students had a year and a half. Those students who passed all three assessment tests had about 3 years of English, and double remedial students had 2 and a half years, and others had about 3 units of English. That means they could have taken four years of English in high school but "units" for us means CPI units -- CPI (College Preparatory) units are all that count -- so if a student took "Cinema For Tomorrow" and it was counted as an English course in high school it does not count at CUNY as a year of English because it is not a CPI unit. You have to remember that across the board the colleges differ, from Hostos Community College with students who have very, very limited English proficiency to other campuses with students who are primary speakers of English and who have fewer ESL students.

If you flip over to the next page [Attachment A - page 3], you will see that what I did was to compare the colleges: what is your mix at John Jay is the question that I would ask. What is John Jay getting: is John Jay getting a lot of ESL students? If you look at the 1990 cohort and compare yourself to all the CUNY units, you had less than 1% of ESL students in ESL-1 (but you know that that is growing), you had less than 1% in ESL-2, about 6% in ESL-3. Of the students who passed all three assessment tests, what percentage were here at John Jay, in other words what percentage of your students passed all three assessment tests: only about 14%. Then you have another 20% who are double remedials and then 60% failed at least one of the other tests. That gives you somewhat of a profile of the kind of student you have at John Jay.

Senator Litwack: It is my understanding that there are three assessment tests. I see the number that passed all three, the number that passed two tests, and the number that passed one. What about the number of non-ESL students who passed none of the tests?

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: They are in the "Other" category.

Senator Litwack: So do I understand correctly that "Other" includes people who failed one test and people who failed three tests?

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: Yes. Lumped together are those who failed one test and those who failed three tests. I also have is the breakout for John Jay: the data are sensitive. The University did not want to publish the breakout of how many students at each campus failed all three tests, but I can give it to the appropriate administrator at John Jay and he can share it with you. In other words, a college might not want to show that 70% of their students failed all three tests, for example.

Senator Norcrrren: What is your definition of ESL?

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: Our working definition of ESL students is those students who are in courses that the faculty identified as ESL.

Senator Norcrrren: So the definition is not those students who say that English is not spoken at home?

Vice Chancellor Nunes-Wormack: No. Actually, that is a very good question because by the year 2000, 50% of all the students at CUNY will be non-native speakers of English but that does not mean that 50% of all students will be ESL.

Senator Norgren: Earlier in the meeting the Benate went over data that included data about students who self-identify that English is not spoken at home.

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: That information about the language spoken at home does not tell us a lot. For example, the students who were raised in this country but whose parents spoke Spanish at home put down that their primary language at home is Spanish but they are fluent in English because they were raised here. So that data is misleading. I'm distributing data about graduation and retention rates just for John Jay [Attachment B & C]. As you know, I can not release the data for all the colleges but at least you will see how your associate degree students do and how your baccalaureate students do and I'm sure you've seen this data before but it's good to have the data in front of us for the context of our discussion.

President Kaplowitz: I did give out to the Senate the data about graduation and retention rates at the colleges that were distributed to CAPPR [Committee on Academic Planning and Program Review of the Board of Trustees].

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: Fine. It is different when Karen gives out such data than when I give it out.

President Kaplowitz: You said you could release the breakout data comparing John Jay to the other colleges to the appropriate academic officer, the provost, if he asks for it: but he has to ask for it?

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: Yes: he just has to call me. If he asks for the John Jay data in comparison to the other colleges (without the other colleges being named) I can provide that.

Benator Malone: Does he know that?

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: Yes. Let's look at the graduation and retention rates of John Jay in relation to the associate degree students [Attachment B]. People may look at this and say it's old data but actually it's cohort studies and it's important for you to see yourself in the context of what happened to your students who came in 1986 and we'll go back to 1987. Let's look at 1986, at regularly admitted students who came here to get an associate degree: at the end of one year, your retention rate for the 1986 cohort was 78.3%. How does that fare with other CUNY units? It is slightly lower for other CUNY units for that cohort at the end of one year. Most of the community colleges show about an 82% retention at the end of one year. But look at what happens, look at your danger point at John Jay: you know this, it's from year one to year two. When we talk about interventions, about what the faculty can do, we look for the danger point: the danger point for this institution is between semester 2 and semester 3. You do very well with them the first year and then something happens. And then, of course, if you can intervene there, look at the difference that would make because you lose only about 10% of your students from year two to year three. You can do something there, also, but it's less urgent than your year one to year two. Then you lose very little, about 5%, with that 1986 cohort. And actually I looked at the most recent data and it's about 4% for you as you go out. So for every year the attrition gets less and that's, of course, logical since students are stronger, they're mainstreamed, they're OK.

Let's look at that same cohort and ask the question: if Heather MacDonald had been writing an article about John Jay, what is John Jay's graduation rate at the end of four years for regular associate degree students, it is 1.6%. so one would say, you've given them double the time why aren't they graduating? I would argue that you can't look at the graduation rate at the end of two years but you can look at it at the end of four years.

Senator Litwack: If we had students who were still here, who were doing OK, who were in the baccalaureate program now because they decided to not bother to get an associate's degree, would they be listed statistically as a non-graduate, even though they might have 80 credits.

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: If they transfer or if you move them from an associate degree to baccalaureate degree program, they would show up as a baccalaureate degree recipient, not as an associate degree recipient unless this institution does what the College of Staten Island does, which is to automatically award the associate degree.

Senator Litwack: But right now, since we don't do that, these data misstate to some extent the picture at John Jay.

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: Yes, that's right. That's a fair point. And that's what we're here to discuss: how do we represent John Jay in the best possible way, telling the truth but also making it the best possible way. So it may be that an automatic award of the associate degree should take place at this institution. It's a small solution but it can be done. A student would not have to even apply for the degree: you would mail it to the student. We do that at the College of Staten Island.

President Kaplowitz: If a student comes in as an associate degree student and has 80 credits but has not fulfilled some of the requirements for the associate degree....

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: That's different. That's different. There I'd be hard-pressed to argue that they are associate degree students. They may have come in as an associate degree students but were never really in the program in the strictest sense.

Senator DeLucia: Over 90% of our students enrolled in the associate degree program immediately recognize that that's not a degree that they want or that they follow in any formal way and there's no mechanism to put them into programs leading to associate degrees and so they naturally pursue bachelor degree programs. It's rare that we award associate degrees because students just naturally follow baccalaureate programs. There's no guiding of associate degree students toward a degree: once they are admitted they can follow any program they want.

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: I don't know your curriculum as well as I'd like to. I just read a very interesting article in one of the journals that said for comprehensive institutions like yours where you give the associate, the baccalaureate, and the masters, there could be the development of a generic associate degree: in other words, Karen's point is well taken: they have not fulfilled the requirements of an associate degree in, let's say, police science but is there a generic associate degree that this institution, that this faculty, feels it can award: you have to have integrity in the process, you need to require them to take x number of courses, but that might be something the faculty could look at.

Senator Malone: Could we also explain with an asterisk this information so that the 1.6% number is put in a more accurate context?

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: Yes. We could but let me tell you what my experience is and this is my opinion about asterisks. When people request

the data from CUNY Central they receive it and what they report is the number and they never report my footnote. And so, yes, I can do that. Will it solve the problem? No. Because people ignore my footnotes and not because people are mean-spirited but because sometimes a footnote means more text, more explanation than I think they would want. I'm generalizing but that's my opinion.

President Kaplowitz: The numbers are going to change in any case: when President Lynch came to the Senate last month he told us that CUNY Central has decided to permit John Jay to include the associate degree recipients at the branch campus in Gurabo, Puerto Rico, in our statistics and so the numbers for the associate degree recipients will be much higher. What will be interesting is when we turn to the data about our baccalaureate students [Attachment C] which is really much more telling data.

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: Many of you around this table have special interests and have worked very hard with your special programs students, your SEEK students. It's very important when I report data to look across to see how your regularly admitted students do, how your SEEK students do who come through the associate degree program, and then we give one rate and it's a combined rate so that you have to be concerned as a faculty about your SEEK students and how they are doing because they affect your rates. If it's not for other reasons at least we have to look at SEEK rates in terms of the effect that they have statistically on the institution's retention and graduation rates. Look at your special program students, your SEEK students: the ones who came in the 1986 cohort: if you look at the 1984 cohort, they start to graduate out in about 6 years -- they take a little bit longer than your regularly admitted students, which is fine because they still have the financial aid, but you may want, in terms of working with your faculty in the SEEK program, to consider what interventions in that case you might use to speed up their progress. Should they be required to come to the immersion program so that they start off with a requirement that would give them some college-level credit? Should they be required to go to the intercession program to speed up their graduation? So there might be interventions for special populations that you can try.

In terms of your bachelor's entrance, if you look at the 1986 cohort [Attachment C], your retention rate is excellent at the end of one year: you hold about 87% of your students. If you did 90% that would be great so you could aim for that, but 87% is very good. Then you lose, again, about 20%. I'm concerned about 20% because my national data show that a four-year institution should lose, at the most, 10%. Now you've got special circumstances because you're an urban institution: the students are working, they stop out and come back, but I would not dismiss the need for some intervention for these students at the end of one year. But if you look at your graduation rate for bachelor students at the end of four years, you have an 8% graduation rate. That's consistent: if you look at your 1980 cohort, your graduation rate has dropped a little bit. What does that mean, that you're doing worse? No, it probably means that they are taking longer to graduate, they are working, they're stopping in and out. If you look at special program [SEEK] students that came in with the 1986 cohort, at the end of four years you graduated 2%. My rule of thumb is that I want special program students to graduate at half the rate that the regular students are graduating. So I would like to see a graduation rate of 4% for special program students. It's not acceptable for me to see a 2% graduation rate for special program students. I think this institution can do better in this regard.

Senator Litwack: Since special program students require a lot of remediation, which don't generate as many credits as college-level courses, how can they possibly be expected to graduate within 4 years since during the first year they earn relatively few college credits? It

can't be, it shouldn't be, that they graduate within four years.

- Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: That's why I debated with your administration here. I've had very good discussions with the faculty members in SEEK. You should be into enrollment management: do you have to accept everybody into SEEK who is triple remedial? The answer is no. There's no law that says you have to do that. Can you manage your enrollment better, that is, you can take a percentage of triple-remedial, a percentage of double-remedial, a percentage of ESL students, a percentage of GED students. Why does SEEK have to accept everybody? In the same way, do you have to accept everybody with a lower than 80 average and go down to a 55 average? Who says you do? The law says you have to accept students with a lower than 80 average, but you can stop at students with a 75 average. You can stop at students with a 70 average. There's so much flexibility in the system and we've not looked at it in the detail that we should as a faculty to say who is it that this institution serves best, what's the profile of the SEEK student that we can do very well with, and take that profile and say, for example, it is a student with a 73 average who has had at least 3 units of English and one year of math, then let's recruit those students because those students are going to succeed here. So it is not about exclusion because the laws are very clear: SEEK must accept students with lower than 80 averages who are economically disadvantaged but beyond that the faculty -- and you have wonderful faculty in that department -- should be able to manage its enrollment. You've operated this program for 27 years. The legislators have given us many millions of dollars and they are asking why is the graduation and retention rate so low. But before we blame anybody we have to look at the match between the institution and the students that we are bringing in.

- Senator Litwack: My understanding is that students are given the three assessment tests after they've been accepted by CUNY and after they have been allocated to a college. Yet, if I heard you correctly, you said we can choose to not take students who have failed all three assessment tests.

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: You are right: once a student is accepted to CUNY, then they take the tests. When they are accepted to John Jay you test them, so you can't reject them after that. What you have to look at is their high school averages, their preparation in high school, which will probably tell you how they will perform.

Senator Litwack: Is there is correlation with their school averages?

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: Yes.

Senator Litwack: From what I've heard, and it's anecdotal, there is a big difference between students who have failed all three proficiency tests and students who have failed two proficiency tests.

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: Yes.

Senator Litwack: So my question is, what is the high school average cut off point between the students who fail three proficiency tests and the students who fail two?

- Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: The cut-off point would be in English courses and would be students who have less than a 76 high school average in their English courses. Those are the students who will probably fail one of your tests, the reading or writing test. So you want to look for students who have a high school English index -- a CAA -- of the college-level English courses that's higher than 76.

Senator Litwack: And we have the power to limit our enrollment to students who have a higher than 76 average in their high school English courses?

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: Theoretically, because if the pool of students with a 76 average or higher who select to come to John Jay is not large enough then you will have an enrollment deficit, you will not have met your enrollment target, which will present fiscal problems for the college. So, theoretically, yes you can do that.

Senator Litwack: Apart from that, we could feed into the computer that cutoff?

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: Yes.

President Kaplowitz: So, therefore, there's a greater incentive than even before for us to recruit students to John Jay, because as we recruit we would try to recruit better prepared students, rather than just accept the allocation from CUNY's central admissions office.

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: Right. But I'd like to turn that a little bit, give it a different spin. What you should do, as a faculty, is to sit down with Central Admissions and tell them what kind of students they should recruit when recruiting for John Jay. Now these are the same kinds of students that everyone asks for, of course, but still you can say that within certain variables these are the kinds of students you would like to target. What schools should we be going to as a faculty, what college fairs do you suggest we go to, so that it be not you recruiting by yourself but so that Central Admissions is also part of your enrollment management so that they are not doing anything different from what you as a faculty think this College should be doing. It's got to be organized and orchestrated but it can be done. Actually you should know that SEEK programs are into some very interesting enrollment management experiments for the SEEK programs and two of the College Discovery programs at the community colleges are going to look at students with different profiles and they're going to be looking at mathematics preparation as an indicator, as a variable, for admissions. So there's a lot going on.

One of the questions Karen asked me was this: We do things a certain way at John Jay and other colleges do things differently. At John Jay students do not have to pass the proficiency tests to get into 100-level courses, but other colleges do require it. For example, at the College of Staten Island a student has to pass the writing proficiency test but not the reading test to enroll in 100-level courses. And so I put together a chart [Available from the Executive Committee.] I only did a chart on the reading test for today. At John Jay, in order to be placed in ESL, a student has to take the SLEP test: no one in CUNY uses that test -- only John Jay. You're the only college using it. The reason I make this point is that it is, therefore, hard to measure how that instrument fares CUNY-wide and so you can't ask for comparable data. How do they exit from ESL? According to your faculty -- because faculty reported this -- it's a departmental assessment that allows students to get out. Let's look at what other colleges do. Let's look at Baruch: students get placed into ESL based on their writing test and a questionnaire that they answer about their second language because Baruch is looking at literacy in their second language. They know that the more education you have in your native language, Russian or Spanish or Italian, the more likely you are going to do better in your courses. They also want to let students go faster who are very well educated in their native language but who don't speak English because that is a very different student compared to a student who is not very well educated and does not speak English. And so they don't want to hold back students just because they can't speak English. So if a student has two years of college, for example, and is

coming from the former Yugoslavia or Russia, Baruch would take a risk and put the student into intermediate ESL when the student scores in basic ESL. It's a different approach to assessment: it takes in other variables. In order to exit from ESL they must pass the WAT [Writing Assessment Test]: that's their standard. If a student does not pass that writing assessment test the student can't get into the 100-level courses at Baruch and that poses other problems, but I'm just reporting the facts.

Senator Litwack: What courses do students get to take then, if they can't take 100-level courses?

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: There are very, very limited courses. They have a program of sheltered courses and paired courses: I'll talk more about that later. A sheltered course would be one that you, Tom, as a psychology professor, will teach, and you would have been trained in special ESL techniques.

Senator Litwack: If I may, I'd like to ask how you knew that I am a psychology professor?

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: I did my homework. [Applause from the Senate.] I was a faculty member for 20 years: I know that I have to know who I'm talking to. I would never think of meeting with a college's Faculty Senate without doing my homework. As for the sheltered courses: the psychology course would not have extra [contact] hours but would be taught with this special methodology, this special pedagogy, which you would be trained to use. Those kinds of sheltered courses are offered at Baruch on an experimental basis but they're more widespread at Hunter and at the College of Staten Island and at some of the community colleges. A paired course is one that two of us would teach: I would teach the English, the ESL course, you would teach the Psychology: as long as I was working with you as a faculty member and you knew that I kept my standard and you kept your standard we would work the course out. Paired courses, sheltered courses are very good ways to get students into the mainstream but not allow them to just go into courses where they are not supported. That they get the support is another objective.

Senator Gitter: I would like to correct the impression that is created by this document that we are out of step because we're behind the times. I think another reading is that we're out of step because we're ahead of the times in ESL. For many years we used the WAT scores and the questionnaire method which is a very, very poor approach because the WAT is not geared to identifying the ESL students. ESL students don't always self-identify as ESL students, so it turned out to be a very unsatisfactory way of identifying ESL. I'm not an ESL person and I don't know if the SLEP test is better, but I know it couldn't be worse than the WAT test. Departmental assessment -- a fancier name for that is portfolio assessment -- is certainly more generally recognized as superior.

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: You're absolutely right. That's a very fair point. Just because you are the only institution using the BLEP test doesn't mean you're out of whack, it could mean that **you're the most** forward looking faculty in that regard. To judge it in this context is not fair. However, I would add that there's a lot going on in terms of assessment CUNY-wide. BMCC is doing portfolio assessment, other institutions are working to see what kinds of mechanisms or methods we can employ to assess students' ability without just a standardized instrument. However, what we know about portfolio assessment -- and the University has looked at it for University-wide purposes -- is that it is very expensive. I don't know how far you are doing it here but that is one of the limitations that we're seeing in terms of moving assessment toward portfolio assessment. As for the reading: almost all the colleges, including John Jay, use the DTLs. In this rubric it's not used for

placement into reading courses: you may use it individually. I don't know if you use as a policy, At most of the other colleges it is used as policy to put students into reading courses. As to exiting from reading courses: in many of the colleges it is a college-based test that is used or the DTLs, which is the instrument that is designed by the Educational Testing Service.

Senator Malone: Another term for sheltered courses is bridge courses, which a group of faculty on the Senate have been talking about as something John Jay should perhaps introduce. This is something I think the Senate should take up as a possible recommendation.

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: That's the overview for the first part: where you are in the context of the University in terms of graduation and retention rates. The second part is what the University is doing as a whole, where are we going in terms of interventions. Karen asked me to also spend some time on solutions, not just problems. Part of the solution for CUNY has been to pull together three programs: the immersion program (the summer immersion program), the intersession program, and the freshman year program. The new name for these programs, which have been pulled together, is the coordinated freshman year program. The reason we've put it all together at Central is that we decided it did not make sense for campuses to write three proposals, three times a year, in response to the RFP [request for proposals] which Central was putting forward. I used to do it as the campus dean, it was difficult, it was often the case that you were writing the proposal and hearing about the funding a week before the program was to start and it was a very difficult thing to manage both locally and Centrally. Another reason we put the three programs together was that, in fact, we wanted the colleges to begin to look at the freshman year from beginning to end, from the first day of summer all the way until the end of the second semester because we know that retention is very important in that freshman year. Actually, it's worked very well: last year was the first year that this institution, and the others, put in one proposal for all three components. Another thing that I will say is that we had problems on certain campuses because we would have three administrators, each administering one of the three programs, and for the most part on many of the campuses the administrators did not talk to each other. One's territory was summer immersion, another's was the January immersion, and so forth. That did not happen at John Jay but it did at some of the other campuses. And that causes problems when you don't have an articulated, smooth transition in the freshman year.

The courses that have appeared in this year that started in the summer immersion program in 1994 we're seeing those courses offered at the colleges this year and will be offered during intersession and will be offered next semester: they are listed on the bottom of the sheet: paired courses (which I've talked about) and Hunter has really taken the lead with paired courses: a remedial course paired with a credit-bearing course. The biggest thing at CUNY right now is block programming: the leader at CUNY in block programming is Lehman College. Dr. Steven Wyckoff [Director of Freshman Year Initiative: English Composition] is a faculty member there: I urge you to bring him in and talk with him. He just had a wonderful session with Hunter to talk about how Hunter could block its courses. It was very good because Lehman has made a lot of mistakes so they've had now four years of block programming and it was very helpful for those faculty members to talk about how Lehman does it. That doesn't mean that Hunter will do it the same way but they did get a lot of insight from Lehman. One thing that Lehman now reports is better retention rates as a result of block programming, particularly from semester one to semester two. And they do all sorts of things: honors block programming, and a lot of programming across the board for certain students who are not remedial. In other words, block programming is not only for remedial

students.

Senator Litwack: Do they do it beyond the first year?

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: Yes. They do it beyond the first year and they also have an interesting sequence in which they have block programming not of full programs but rather a couple of courses are block programmed for students because they can't afford to do complete blocked programs and so they wean the students by block programming them for a few courses. And then there are learning communities at LaGuardia Community College -- I know there are faculty here who also do learning communities -- in which you bring groups of students together as a cohort and try to keep them together through the semester at least into the third semester. Repeater courses: look at your data on your courses, find where your greatest fallout is and move in the direction of those courses: you do it by attaching a precept session to those course (that is, an hour extra for no credits and as soon as the students leave that course they go into another session with an adjunct or a very good tutor and they have an additional hour of instruction. It's not tutoring: it's supplemental instruction -- someone is actually at the front of the classroom and the students get additional instruction and the person answers questions that the students have which are based on the class taught by the instructor. Also, with repeater courses: we try now to encourage the colleges to do repeater courses during intersession if they can so that students are not faced with having to take that course for a fourth or fifth time or for a third time, at some of our campuses where it is regulated during the regular semester and students can remove requirements during intersession.

Senator Norgren: That would mean doing in four and a half weeks what is usually taught over the course of 14 weeks.

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: Yes. Or, what is an interesting model: why does it have to be in four and a half weeks? Why can't you start in the summer and end sometime in the fall or why can't you start in the fall and go through January? In this way what you're doing for repeaters is giving them extended time, not within the same brick of time. But that takes very creative planning and some experimentation on your part. So, theoretically, if I was in English in the summer in your immersion program my course might start in July but I wouldn't finish until mid-September or the end of September because I needed more hours, more time for tests.

Senator Norgren: How do you schedule faculty?

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: That's an issue for the faculty. I would try it on an experimental basis and see if it works. The repeater populations are not large, generally, so you may need just a couple of sections for special accommodations for these students. Or start it in mid-semester: for example, if you have students who are very vulnerable, that is, the students who register in your last allocation -- we know they're the students with your highest attrition rates -- if they are admitted to you in August then you know that they are very vulnerable. Instead of admitting them to take regular courses, why don't you have a special immersion program during the summer and the fall so they would be in an immersion program just like the summer program but they wouldn't be registered. You have to work out the logistics to make sure they count as part of your enrollment, and all that, you can do that as we do for the summer, but they would not be hurting themselves by taking courses that they may not be prepared for or taking courses in which they are getting D's or F's. You would protect them from that until they are ready and then their first semester would be during the spring instead of the fall. They'd be enrolled in the fall but in an immersion program -- a delayed semester program.

Senator Noraren: Could we get a budget for that?

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: Yes. Under the coordinated freshman year program you can do anything. You can submit any of these proposals.

Senator Litwack: In other words, there are Central CUNY funds that we can apply for?

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: Yes: those funds are called the Coordinated Freshman Year Program. Let me show you this [8-page document distributed: available from the Executive Committee] -- I don't have time to go through all of it. What I did was to pull out four colleges for you: I called them Colleges A, B, C, D. I would like you to read the kinds of things that the four colleges are putting forward as programs: these are their coordinated freshman programs. I mixed it: one of the programs is an excellent, excellent program, reviewed by external evaluators, and it's doing very well in terms of retention. One of these programs is very weak. So what I would ask you to do is read these four profiles and talk with each other and tell me what you think. I did this as a workshop for the provosts. I asked the provosts to go through this and tell me what they thought of them. They did not know who wrote each just as you don't know. And sure enough, some provosts thought a program excellent and another provosts thought that program weak, and so forth. They were asked to rate them in terms of the academic component: how strongly are you supporting students -- of different populations -- across the freshman year in the academic area. The issue is how well are your remedial students served, how well are your better students served. We've had this whole issue at CUNY which the trustees have debated: what about your average student, the student who is not remedial but was not an honor student in high school: that's a good bet for you. Those are the students who with the right professor, the right book, can just be turned on and do beautifully at John Jay. What is this institution, what are you as a faculty doing for the average student, the C+ student from high school. I would think about that student population. Will John Jay always get honor students at the top 10% of their class. You'll get some but not enough. So you need to look at other populations that are good bets -- I call them good bets for the institution.

As for what is going on long-term in the University, I think most of you have seen this but I want to talk about it. Basically you remember academic program planning and the Goldstein Report. The Trustees debated long and hard about academic program planning and in their debate and their discussions what surfaced -- and this was long before Heather MacDonald and the Traub book -- was the issue of remediation. Trustees began to say: we've done remediation now for more than 25 years at the University: is it working? That led to a Board resolution which reads that trustees really want to know the impact of remediation at this University. I was asked to conduct the study that would answer that question. I pulled together a very small study group just of academic affairs individuals at CUNY Central and institutional research people -- no outside campus people. They were 11 of us who sat around and talked about research questions that we wanted to answer as researchers. We said we don't want to ask that question: what is the impact of remediation on the University. We want to ask the question: who benefits from remediation at the University. This is a different kind of research question. Then we said let's bring in the experts to talk to us. We talked to Dr. Karen Greenberg from Hunter College, Dr. Ricardo Orthequy from City College, Dr. Ivan Smodlaka from the College of Staten Island, people who have published extensively on either retention or remediation: reading, writing, mathematics, etc. We brought in nine faculty members and we said to them, if you were conducting this study, what research questions might you ask, how would you formulate the questions. They gave us a lot of feedback. That took one semester. And this is the product of

all that thinking. What I've done is to share this with the University Faculty Senate, with your provost, with your president, and I'm asking for comment from the faculty. Since we have to ask the question, am I asking it in the right way, am I missing any pieces, is there anything else you as a faculty would like me to look at or to ask, is there anything else you could ask this question in a sharper or a more focused way so that we can get a response that is complete. So I ask you as a faculty body to look at this and respond. The question is what do we do **when** we get back comments. We will modify the research design, we won't accept **everyone's** revision but we will modify it, we'll send copies back of the **modified** research design. In the spring I will conduct the study in conjunction with the Office of Institutional Research. In the spring Vice Chancellor Freeland, the vice chancellor for academic affairs, will put together a taskforce on remediation. The way the faculty members are selected for that is twofold: first we write a letter to your president saying we would like names of faculty members and administrators for this committee and your president submits names. So if you're interested, mention it to your president or to you provost. The second way is the University Faculty Senate: we go to the Faculty Senate and we ask for names. We compile the names and then make sure there is equal representation by sector, by ethnicity, by gender, etc., and the committee is composed. A reason we are doing it this way was that my experience at Central with the articulation taskforce and the ESL taskforce was that the committees were established and I worked along side the committees trying to answer their research questions while they were meeting. It was impossible. Generally they were asking a question that I couldn't answer because the data do not exist in the form needed to answer that particular question or the data are not compiled and it takes months to compile the data and that prevents the committee from moving ahead with its work. So we've done this so that now when the committee comes aboard they have the research design and the research questions and they can look at all the data and then issue a report to the Chancellor and then the Chancellor will issue a report to the trustees.

Senator Litwack: By what date do you want comments?

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: The comments should be in my office by January 15. The reason I'm sharing this with you is that what the University will be doing in the long term depends on the results of this study. The University now knows -- because I've already looked at some of this data -- that remediation works for some students. The population that's most vulnerable and that we're not succeeding with, and I'm saying this with some emotion and with some force, is the triple remedials. We have not figured out with triple remedials what the right answer is and this is across the board, not just at John Jay. In terms of a policy statement we will either say we will not accept another triple remedial student, which I don't think I am prepared to say, or we say let's rethink as a faculty how we educate our triple remedial students. And that's a serious question for us as a faculty. The other issue we have is experimentation: is it time for us as a faculty to say -- as City College is doing this semester -- they took students who are very close to passing the WAT and allowed them to go into regular courses without requiring them to go into remedial writing courses. We'll know how those students are doing by the end of the semester. They were advised by the professor of the course before they entered the course, their transcripts were looked at, and they were considered best bets, and the reason is that City College wants to move quickly through remediation in that context. So there's all sorts of things that we as a faculty can do depending on what kinds of issues arise from this study. I'll stop here and answer your questions.

[The Senate applauded the Vice Chancellor on her presentation.]

Senator Guinta: Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack, I want to praise your presentation which I found inspiring and from the applause of my colleagues it is clear that they feel the same way. It seems clear from your data and our own studies that the third and fourth semesters are the roadblocks for our students. As we try to address this and other issues at John Jay, can we help you and the work of the University in any way?

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: Yes. Right now what we're looking at is to find experiments college by college that would deal in very small terms -- because you know with the new Governor-elect we do not know what CUNY's budget situation will be -- on the transition between the third and fourth semester: it would probably break down in terms of credits (the number of credits a student has completed) and we want to look at different models of intervention college by college. That has happened a little bit where colleges asked us for funding for students in the freshman year who were not freshmen: they said we have students who still have problems with remediation, who still need support, will you fund our programs and we funded a certain percentage of the students on each campus and we can expand that.

Senator Norcrrren: Has anyone every considered exempting students from the current requirement of 12 credits to qualify for financial aid: in other words, we would maintain the current level of financial aid, we wouldn't engage in more intervention, but rather we would let students take, for example, only 9 credits and we would certify that the student is a parent or is working 20 hours. A lot of what we know is that a student does not necessarily need so much more in the way of tutoring or other intervention but rather the student needs the time outside the classroom. So the failure is structural rather than intellectual or a matter of skills.

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: The issue of financial aid eligibility is a legal one. The University is asking the State to give us more financial aid for part-time students because we know that if we had more part-time financial aid -- we have very little financial aid for part-time students -- then there would not be a problem: students could be part-time and get financial aid. The reason they take 12 credits is for the financial aid. But we have not been successful. Aid for part-time students has not increased very much in the last three years. The State doesn't want to give us those additional monies.

Senator Norcrrren: So instead students take more courses than they can handle and get financial aid, and then do very poorly or fail.

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: That's right. Except the State looks at it with the expectation that students will complete their studies more quickly and, therefore, get a job sooner and be productive citizens. But let me respond about controlled loads: there are at least two CUNY colleges which are now looking at student profiles and are saying that based solely on their profile certain students may not take more than 12 credits. This is non-negotiable. A student who comes in as a triple remedial can only take 12 credits. They tell the student: you came in as a double remedial and, therefore, for 3 semesters you cannot take more than 12 credits: I'm making up the specifics because I don't remember the details but this is the way controlled load works.

President Kaplowitz: We've been told at John Jay for years that we can't do this because of the limit on the number of semesters a student can receive financial aid and that controlled load would force a student to attend college for more semesters than the number of semesters the student is eligible for financial aid.

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: What you cannot do is create a rubric that prevents a student from graduating within a certain number of financial

aid semesters. You can't, therefore, limit a student to six credits a semester because the student can't graduate within the financial aid time frame. But if you say you can only take 12 credits you have to see whether the student can graduate in 10 semesters of 12 credits. That's permitted.

Senator Litwack: To follow up: isn't the requirement of 12 hours -- not 12 credits -- a federal mandate?

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wonnack: Yes: The federal governments considers that to be full-time status.

Senator Litwack: As I understand it, this is a federal mandate and so the State could not change it even if it wanted to. Is it a limit of five years?

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: The limit is 10 semesters plus one semester with a waiver.

Senator Litwack: Then we're stuck because if students complete only 12 credits during their first year when they are not getting many credits for their remedial courses, then if we add four years multiplied by 24 credits they cannot . . .

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: But the first year on financial aid is called STAP [Supplemental TAP] and it does not count. The financial aid clock does not start ticking on remediation. We negotiated years ago with the State to give us a STAP year.

Senator Litwack: This is something we did not know and it is very important so please let us make sure we understand this clearly.

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: You get a year for remediation. That year of remediation is not included in the 10 semesters (and 11th semester with waiver) that a student is eligible to receive financial aid for. We argued successfully for this with the State and we were very successful. Your financial aid people will tell you that the clock does not start ticking until after the STAP year.

Senator Litwack: And then there are five years on top of that and a possible additional semester with a waiver?

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: Yes. The STAP year is defined as no credits toward graduation. Courses that have no credits toward graduation are courses eligible for STAP and these are remedial courses. And the level of financial aid funding is the same.

Senator Litwack: Let's say during the first year a student is taking 12 hours and is getting a total of three graduation credits. In other words, some number of graduation credits but not 12. Does that count as a STAP semester or does it count as one of the 10 financial aid semesters?

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: Those three credits count toward the clock. But the student is protected in the STAP year. In other words, those three credits will not start the clock ticking. But the student can't take more college level courses and less remediation to qualify for a STAP year.

Senator Litwack: The majority of hours must be not for college credits?

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: I'll call Karen with the exact number of credits.

President Kaplowitz. We'll also speak to John Emmons, our financial aid director, and perhaps we'll invite him to come to a Senate meeting. But this leads to another question: we do not differentiate the way I know some colleges do and I was wondering how you feel about this -- some colleges give credits but not degree credits for remedial or developmental work. We give degree credits for those courses.

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: This is a big debate, a very big debate. I just issued a letter: I can't tell you in detail its content yet -- but what I said is the following: the State has conducted an audit at BMCC and audits always come through financial aid and what the State found was the following: faculty had put in its catalog that students could take developmental courses -- the definition is that there is some college-level work in that course and therefore you can give some college-level credit -- there are developmental courses at BMCC with some college-level work they will get, let's say one credit for those courses and, I'm making up the figure because I don't want to give the exact details, there are 18 of these courses. That means that a student who starts at the beginning of the sequence could end up with 18 credits toward graduation of development courses. But the catalog also said only eight of those credits can count toward graduation. The federal auditors said either they do or they don't but you can't have it both ways. It's truth in advertising: you cannot tell a student that these courses have college-level work and will count toward graduation on the one hand and then on the other hand at the time of graduation tell them they took 18 credits

but we only meant 8 credits. As a faculty you must decide is it one or is it the other. So I've issued letters to the colleges because, of course, then I had to look at all the catalogues and there are several colleges that have problems. I've asked the faculty to debate it at faculty council by April 1 and send their decision. 80th Street must have this because it is an audit so I have to respond to the State and to the Feds. Either you can keep the 18 credits in developmental courses and remove the cap or keep the cap but remove the credits from 10 of those courses. This is a very important issue because Queensborough Community College, for example, gives no college credit, that is, credit toward graduation, for developmental courses and then there are other colleges that do give credit toward graduation: that is up to the faculty.

President Kaplowitz. Another side of this are the students who do not qualify for financial aid, because they are working full-time, for example, and who take a heavy course load because financially it makes sense because they will have to attend college fewer semesters (and therefore pay for fewer semesters) if they take lots of credits each semester since the tuition is the same whether a student enrolls for 21 credits or 12 credits. Is there any thinking at the University about handling full-time tuition differently, perhaps charging by the credit. A student who takes 21 credits a semester will graduate in almost half the time as a student who takes 12 credits but because they are working full-time they can not do well in their courses.

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: I know this is a problem. I witnessed it at the College of Staten Island. But no, at this point no one has proposed any solution.

Vice President Blitz: I'd like to follow up about the idea of courses that start in the summer and continue into the fall semester or start during intersession and continue into the spring semester.

If we were to go to a tri-semester schedule students could attend two semesters but some courses could extend into the third semester and it would also allow students to take more credits in a year.

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: No one has tried it formally but two

community colleges have a lot of experience with models other than the semester model: LaGuardia and Kingsborough. The reason I find this question interesting is that we're running two programs in four colleges and the stats are best from the two colleges that do not follow the two-semester program. I'm beginning to think that for some students a different model might be better. But LaGuardia and Kingsborough are the only colleges that follow a different model, not as an experiment but as their regular system. So you might try something like that.

Senator Pinello: I'd like to ask a much more broadly-based question focusing on your role as University Dean for Academic Affairs. In many ways this has not been a good year for CUNY: there has been the Heather MacDonald article and other similar articles, and the November 8th election, both nationally and locally, are problematic for the University. Do you see a silver lining in that cloud that we might seize upon at the University and at John Jay?

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: Many of my friends would not agree with this, but I have said it to them individually and I'll say it to you as a faculty. Heather MacDonald did distort the facts, they are not the facts -- but I think she asked reasonable questions as a taxpayer and they are questions that I would ask as a taxpayer. Although she distorted the facts -- I don't agree with the data that she printed -- and I'm in a climate now, as I said before, where I'm asked the bottom line: who are you graduating and how many, etc., to me, as a faculty member, and I share this with you, I see this as an opportunity for us. We should have asked these serious questions before the Heather MacDonald's of the world asked them of us. To tell you the truth, the remediation study started in the spring before the Heather MacDonald article appeared, which is fortunate because we turn to the legislators and say we were already studying who benefits from remediation at the University. What my silver lining in all this is to turn this around and say, instead of being defensive and saying we graduate this number and have x number of Rhodes Scholars, because all that is interesting but the taxpayers and the powers that be are asking the bottom line questions, we should as a faculty be looking individually at each college as to how we're doing with our students. This is a fair question to ask and to redesign programs that need to be redesigned and I think we have data for over 20 years -- it's not as if we don't have the data at our colleges to know how our programs are faring. I see that as an opportunity. Now if we don't seize the opportunity what I'm afraid of is that the legislature will vote that we have to have a rising junior exam and they will tell me what that exam will be. If we as a faculty don't now grapple with the issue and come up with our own responses and answers somebody else will: government is like that. The elected officials that I've talked to think we are too big, that we're a bunch of welfare people sucking money out of the system, and that's the image they have of us. It's not fair but it's the image. How does one fight that? The only way, I would think, is to say look how successful we are or to say we're not successful with these students but we've tried these models and look at these other models that we're considering trying. Because they are satisfied if we say there is a problem and this is how we're addressing it but I think the clock is ticking on our opportunity.

Senator Pinello: I'd like to ask a follow-up question: This University has a mission of access which I think is a very important one. The Heather MacDonald article said that there is no impetus for changing. But part of that criticism is that we do not maintain standards at the same time. With that in mind, is it necessarily a bad thing that we do have the fall-off between the first and second years. We have provided access in the first year but for those who can't make the grade after that access has been offered, by acknowledging that and by continuing access to the students who can continue into their sophomore and junior and senior years, is that necessarily a problem?

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: There are faculty members who have argued and have argued quite articulately that this is a sign of standards: that we do have standards and that's why students are leaving. I don't buy that completely and let me tell you why. And you should look at your attriters: many of your attriters are leaving in good academic standing. If everybody left in bad academic standing I would say, all right, they couldn't cut it, and they're gone from John Jay and you're a great faculty and you have great standards. But I ask the question: why is it that 50% of the students who leave the University leave in good academic standing? Is it dissatisfaction with the institution -- that's a possibility. If so, can you change what causes the dissatisfaction? Maybe you can, maybe the way you deliver services for the students turns them off. Maybe they are going to another CUNY college because there's a program there that attracts them that you might not have or maybe they're going to another CUNY college because it's closer to their home. There are things, in terms of attrition and the literature shows you, John Jay has to figure out about your students who attrit, what kinds of things you can have control over, what kinds of things you can't and then you have to deal with the ones you can. You can't control peoples' lives, peoples' economic situations, but you can control when the registrar screams at people on the line and tells them to go away and tells them to come back tomorrow or isn't there or doesn't pick up the phone -- those kinds of things are consumer services issues that an institution can change. Now I'm using a simplistic example but they exist at some of the colleges. I get enough student complaints to tell you that they exist,

President Kaplowitz: I want to assure you that that example does not exist here,

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: I didn't mean here. I used the example of the registrar but it could have been anybody.

Senator Litwack: It is very important that you know that it is not true here, it is not true of the registrar and it is not true of the counselors. It may be true elsewhere but it is not true here.

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: There is also an issue for us at the University in terms of looking at students and their profiles and how well they do with their GPA's. In other words, if you have very well prepared students coming to John Jay, are they still doing well at John Jay? Given the variable of what high school they go to they should be doing well here and if not, why not? Maybe there is some supplemental instruction that even that middle group that we were talking about needs so that they don't leave, because we tend to think of attriters as the worst students, the ones at the bottom, and it's not necessarily true.

Senator Reid: I have a question about programed learning, a model used at City and some other colleges. I've noticed that some of my students don't do so well just reading the book and taking an exam as opposed to my teaching them.

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: There are colleges that have challenge exams: the department will give a student who did very well in high school a challenge exam and then waive that requirement if the student passes the exam. That's the only model that I know of. Several senior colleges have that particularly in the sciences if a student has a very strong background.

Senator Litwack: I'd like to go back to something you told us before, in order to get clarification. When we talk about the fact that after the first year the figure is about 85% retention and after the second year it drops 20%. And then a much lower percent registers for the third year

oven though at the end of the second year the students were in good academic standing. Is that what you're saying?

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: Yes. That's the issue that I was talking about. You don't know the reasons why those students in good academic standing are leaving: you need to do some ethnographic research.

Senator Litwack: Do you have data or do we have data about the academic standing of the attriters?

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: We're conducting another study in my Office, a retention study, but it's not a statistical study because I already have a lot of the statistics. What I'm interested in is ethnographic research. I want case studies: why are students leaving John Jay? I would be interested if any faculty members are interested in working on this with a group of research faculty members. We need more information about why students leave in good academic standing.

Senator Gitter: One aspect, perhaps a small aspect, of our attrition problem is that some of our sister colleges send a message to our best students that John Jay's upper-level division is not up to snuff. I think we know that is not, in fact, true but there is a kind of snobbery within the CUNY system, between the old colleges and the new colleges, so that, for example, I had the experience with Hunter wanting to turn down one of our Belle Zeller Scholars who applied to a master's program there, and the CUNY B.A. Program has not been completely open to our courses in the areas of concentration of our students. Do you see your Office supplying any role in educating the sister colleges in this regard or any suggestions about what we could do to improve the situation?

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: Yes. I have a somewhat different angle on this situation and that is that I'm very interested in seeing who considers John Jay a first choice and who considers John Jay a second choice and who considers John Jay a third choice [when applying to CUNY]. And then looking at who's your competition, who are those students considering as their first choice when they apply. In other words, between the first and second choices of students, who are you competing with? Is it that the competition has the same programs you do? Many of our students are not that sophisticated in the sense that they know what programs they want and are looking for a match. There is a sense, an impression, that students have about the institutions from what others have told them: that this is the best college, or that this is not such a good college, and they have those impressions. What we need to do then at the high school level is work with students about building the image of this institution. Your feeder high schools are really a key. How does one do that: it's very easy -- we have to make sure we tell them the quality of the faculty, that's number one, the kinds of jobs your students get, that's number two. That's a targeted recruitment issue to build your image. We're working on that: the provosts are going to meet with the admissions director and with the University Dean for Admissions and we're going to start working on college by college targeted admission as a recruitment effort because I think image building is very important for institutions. The other issue we're trying to work with now is in terms of the literature that we put out about John Jay. There are institutions that have put a lot of money into brochures, very spiffy brochures, and you look at some of the literature I just saw coming out the colleges -- I just saw literature from even Lehman which is now also into this and Lehman is a latecomer to this. Queens and other colleges do this as well.

Senator Litwack: Do you know how much Lehman has in its budget that we do not have that is not accounted for by any neutrally applied factors? \$4.6 million.

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: Base Level Equity.

Senator Litwack: This is not just Base Level Equity. This is much beyond Base Level Equity because it also refer8 to the non-faculty lines. Lehman has a total budget of \$10 million larger than ours with the same student body and an unaccounted for increase over us of \$4.6 million a year, that is not accounted for by the physical plant, by anything except that they are Lehman. Now how can we put out the same kind of brochure, how can we compete with Lehman in brochures when they have that of advantage over us which will not be affected one iota by Base Level Equity?

Vice Chancellor Nunes-Wormack: I understand that and it's a fair point. But perhaps we could get into a relationship where CUNY Central could help you fund a spiffy brochure. You have X dollars for publications: instead of doing it with that X number of Uollars maybe we at Central can contribute to that and see if we can upgrade the student population. Sometimes my examples are simplistic but students do pay attention to these things, they do look at a brochure that is glossy as opposed to plain paper and it makes a difference to the students.

President Kaplowitz: You can see from the reaction of everyone here that we absolutely agree: we know that what you are saying is true.

Senator Litwack: It is not simplistic. It is a perfect example, if I may say so, of how unfairly treated we are by CUNY in terms of resources: how can we even compete for good students if we are not given the money that Lehman is given to put out a good brochure?

Senator Norcrrren: It is a measure of how successful we are that we do what we do despite this.

Senator Geiger: We have very, very specialized majors and what I've heard from a number of students is that they are going elsewhere. They came here because they were able to get into here...

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: Into your associate degree program.

Senator Geiger: No. They got in, perhaps, because they applied late or they were closed out of other places. They are well prepared students. But they want to leave to pursue other majors which are more broadly based. We don't have those majors. There are a lot of different reasons for this unusually high attrition rate. This is one of them that doesn't have very much to do with how we are fulfilling our job. But why aren't they able to get into other colleges although they have decent grades and are admitted here although they are not attracted by our majors?

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: Two points. One is that you know Queens College right now has the highest admissions standards to get in: you need over a 93 high school average to get into Queens College. So, even if you had a 90 average, you wouldn't get in. It's first come, first served but they keep taking from their allocations those students with the highest averages. So if a student is rejected from Queens they may have listed John Jay as a backup school. Sometimes they don't even select you, we just give you students who don't make the school they selected. That's why you may get students who are very well qualified in your eyes but are not eligible at those other schools because the standards are so high there. Right now the standards are highest at Queens, Baruch, and Hunter.

President Kaplowitz: Not Brooklyn College?

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: No: they have an enrollment problem at Brooklyn. Once you have an enrollment problem then it's another issue. You are at a good advantage here because you don't have an enrollment

problem, so you can do enrollment management. The other point about students with higher averages is why don't we look, in terms of the data, at your students who transfer to other CUNY units and begin to report to you who is transferring out in good academic standing. They require a transcript from your college in order to transfer so you have to know that they are transferring and then put out something in your public relations materials that says John Jay students complete two years and then transfer at a rate of X. That's not an attrition statistic, that's a transfer statistic. So turn it around. But you would know that locally by the requests your students make to the Registrar's Office.

Senator DeLucia: I want to go back to what Tom was talking about with regard to the retention rate. We lose everyone after the second year. We don't dismiss in between semesters so when it all happens it happens at the end of the second year. We know how many we dismiss for academic reasons so it's not as if we're losing those students because they are going off to study business and we also know how many are on academic probation. We're talking about a sizable group of students. So we know that's where the problem is. Are there any schools that are really in the forefront of retaining students after the second year? Is this a common pattern throughout CUNY of losing students after the second year? I also want to mention that all students who leave John Jay take an exit interview with a counselor and I rarely hear that they are unhappy with the faculty: if anything they don't want to leave. Many of them have either personal or family problems and they need money or conversely, as was pointed out, they never intended to be at John Jay. They loved their time here but they didn't have the average to get into a Queens or a Baruch and they're very status oriented. They want to do their two-years here, take their 24+ credits and achieve a certain average, and then make the move to Queens or Baruch or Hunter because they want to pursue majors that we don't have. I think the time is right, by the way, to raise our admissions standards: I think we would get the same numbers.

Senator Litwack: Then what you're saying is that our attrition rate is not in any way our problem. You're saying that they leave either because they haven't made it in the second year -- it's not because they're attritting in good academic standing -- because those students are leaving because they are in bad academic standing, or they are leaving because another college has a program which they want which we don't have and can't have because of our special mission, but not because they don't like the college, not because we've done anything wrong. If that's the case, maybe there's nothing wrong with those numbers at all. Maybe they're not saying a single thing bad about John Jay or that we can do anything to change the things that are causing them to leave. I'd like to know your thoughts about this,

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: First let me respond to Bob's point. What colleges are doing very carefully and I think there's a lot of merit to this and you should think it through as a faculty is to consider the following: how do you readmit students? what kinds of prescriptions do you write for students who are readmitted? They should not be readmitted with a blank check. If they left with a problem, they're going to come back into the same set of problems they had when they left. Therefore, readmission to this institution should be monitored very closely, and faculty, either teams of faculty, counselors, etc., should be put together, to work with students who are readmitted because obviously they are motivated enough to come back but they cannot come back under the same conditions. That is something colleges are doing. Obviously if they are in bad academic standing and they leave there's not too much you can do. However, what colleges are doing is the early intervention, the early warning systems, and how they're doing this is on the basis of profiles of students who are most vulnerable. So you study your cohorts, your freshman cohorts, and say this kind of student at John Jay is very

vulnerable. Even before the student starts at the college, the student has a tag on his or her registration and that student is monitored by a counselor or by a team of counselors or faculty. At colleges doing this they don't wait for the student to come for the tutoring, they do the outreach to **those** students. Those are the early interventions and, of course, they give readmit students a prescription of programs.

Senator DeLucia: When our students are dismissed they have the option of going to only one school, which is Kingsborough Community College, so that they can continue their education and our students are the largest group to go to KCC. Kingsborough then works with these students at closer range and gives them courses and additional counseling and tutoring and then they come back to John Jay.

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: Yes. That's the key -- what happens when they come back? They should not be mainstreamed because they've been treated specially at KCC to get them ready to come back.

Senator Noraren: You said that John Jay doesn't have an enrollment problem and, therefore, we can think about enrollment management. Under the rules of the University, is it only the college president who has the power to determine the enrollment management method?

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: It's the administration of the College that manages the enrollment of the institution in consultation with the faculty.

Senator Norcrrren: I would say that the strong sentiment of the faculty for quite a while has been that we should have enrollment management in which we do not continue to expand enrollment and we should not keep our exemption of the senior college admissions standard. We asked for this exemption in terms of high school average for entrance and we suffer from the uneven financial treatment by CUNY and so we're really at loggerheads. I think this has been driven in part by the desire for a new building but I think it's an issue that seriously dispirits the faculty. We feel we have identified part of a solution that we should pursue but we are powerless under the University's guidelines.

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: Let me say something in fairness to your president and administration. The Master Plan was not created by Dr. Lynch, it was created by the Trustees and, therefore, it says "Thou Shalt Grow" [laughter]: that's the University mandate and if you are a president and "Thou Shalt Grow" is not your motto then you must take that up at a very high level. This institution is doing well because you've adopted that motto.

Senator Noraren: We had adopted it long before the Trustees created the Master Plan.

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: Yes. You are growing and you have been growing and that's why Base Level Equity is on the table, because the Chancellor and the Trustees are committed to rewarding the institutions that have said yes we will grow, we'll take students at this College. So on one hand you want to do enrollment management, on the other hand I did not use the term enrollment management to mean reducing enrollment or tampering with the patterns of growth because it's a double-edged sword. If your enrollment should stop at any moment it's going to impact on you budget, so you have to be careful that while you are managing your enrollment you are not creating a situation where your enrollment might be adversely affected.

President Kaplowitz: We conducted enrollment management recently and I think it's an example of what you're talking about and, perhaps, there are

other ways you can suggest. We used to admit 50% of our entering freshmen into the associate degree program and 50% into the baccalaureate program. Two years ago we began accepting 25% into the associate program and 75% into the baccalaureate. We've been discussing at the Senate the possibility of altering the ratio further, perhaps 20%/80% and then 15%/85% so that we would be increasing the number of better prepared students. You need to know, however, that the in-service students (law enforcement officers and other uniformed personnel) are not included in these groups because they are considered transfer students because we grant them equivalent credits for their police academy (and for other academy) studies. If we met our enrollment target, do you see the University having any problem with our changing the mix through this approach, in terms of the University's commitment to access?

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: I'm talking as a policy maker now and as a policy maker the answer is no. However, if you have a program where you're the only show in town, you cannot limit access. If you have an A.S. degree that no other institution but John Jay offers there is an issue of enrollment management. In other words you have to provide access since you are the only institution that offers the program unless you're willing to negotiate with another college. Look at what City College did: it took all of its technical 2-year programs and said that those programs are not part of its mission and gave them to NYC Technical College. Baruch just terminated its school of education, having decided it is not part of its mission and instead created a school of public policy. You can manage your enrollment and change your programs but you have to look at the context in which you are doing it.

Senator Malone: I thought that setting the college's admissions policy is the faculty's prerogative not the administration's.

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: Your enrollment is managed by your president.

President Kaplowitz: It had been the case that the faculty set the admissions criteria but the Board changed that a number of years ago and it is no longer the faculty's prerogative.

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: That is right.

Senator DeLucia: Could we not keep the same percentages but raise the average required for entrance to both the bachelor's and associate programs. There would still be access but, like Queens College, we would be pulling in students who meet higher entrance standards. Is that a decision the faculty can make?

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: As I said before, that decision is in the context of the president's role as the leader of the institution to manage the enrollment. However, I would make one small suggestion. If you want to make such a change and the administration here is a little reluctant because it might impact on enrollment, because they are being careful managers and they should be, you might want to try to make the change not across the board but in a selected program for one semester and see how that goes, then add another program and see how that goes. Do it strategically so that the president and the administration here understand that the faculty is not changing the institution radically because a year or two might adversely affect the situation. Suggest something like this as an experiment, as a pilot.

Senator Litwack: I just want to be absolutely sure that I understand something you said a moment ago. We have the only security management associate's degree program in the University. Does this mean that apart from a high school degree we may not limit enrollment at all, that there

can be no grade point average limit for enrollment into this program?

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: I'm not a lawyer but my sense of this is that the answer is yes.

Senator Litwack: So any student who says I want security management must be accepted?

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: If you're the only show in town.

President Kaplowitz: But there must be seats for those students and we must not accept those applicants if to do so would pose a health and safety issue because of the overcrowding that would result.

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: That is different. But if you have the seats then you must accept them because we are an open admissions university and to do otherwise would mean we are no longer open admissions in that program.

President Kaplowitz: The Report of the Chancellor's Task Force on the Freshman Year said that perhaps the 61 credit cut-off point by which a student must pass all three proficiency tests should be rethought and changed to 30 to 45 credits. At John Jay, our College Council, which is half faculty and half non-faculty (students, staff, administrators, alumni) last year changed the cut-off to 85 credits. In other words, we went the other way. Which way do you lean toward: having a 30 to 45 credit cut-off or letting students complete 85 credits before having to pass the three assessment tests?

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: I think you should leave this alone for now because we have just constituted a University-wide task force on assessment. Let me go into detail about this because this is very important for the faculty. I had to read so many files to understand this because it is very complicated at CUNY. The Board of Trustees passed a resolution that said "students shall be measured at this University in their movement from the lower division to the upper division." In the literature this is called the "rising junior exam." What the Board of Trustees intended and this is in Traub's book [City on a Hill] -- please read his chapter on assessment -- was a rising junior exam because the Board was afraid that with open admissions that the standards of the University might be compromised in some way and so they said that if we had some measurement we will know that everyone moving up will have the academic preparation that we feel is appropriate. The faculty then took that Board resolution and created the three assessment tests: reading, writing, and mathematics. They took it a step further and said we want to protect our students and so we will give these tests when the students enter the University. Historically what has happened is that the rising junior exam has become a placement instrument at the colleges. Further complicating matters, the faculty now uses the test for placement into remediation, for exit out of remediation, and for certification or as the rising junior. So when I post three exam scores what I'm really doing is certifying that the students are ready to move to the upper division. But the research question that I asked when I came here was is whether these are the appropriate tests for movement from the lower division to the upper division. The taskforce, which is composed of faculty, is being chaired by Dr. George Otte, a professor of English at Baruch, and has just had its first two meetings. The faculty is asking that question: is this the appropriate battery of tests to test for movement from the lower division to the upper division, is this the right rising junior exam for this University, because that is all the Board talked about. There is no Board resolution about placement tests, about exit tests. Now what I asked the taskforce and what Dr. Freeland [Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs] asked the taskforce, is if this is the right test for the rising

junior, that's fine. If it's not, what should be the right test for the rising junior for this University. And then, everybody, whether you're attending Queens, John Jay, or Hostos, will have the rising junior test (I'm talking in theory now because the taskforce will meet over a period of two years and during the second year whatever their recommendations are will come to each campus and I'm going to come to each campus to debate it with the faculty, to discuss it. Politically who knows what will happen. If we have a change the faculty will have debated it fully, because I think it is so important. But let's say, theoretically, at the end of two years, after much debate, we have a rising junior at this University, which is truly a rising junior. It will measure movement from the lower to the upper division. What you do to place students in remediation is your business at John Jay. Central should not be in the business of placing students, exiting students from remediation. We're not interested in that at Central, at least from a policy point of view I'm not. Faculty who knows its curriculum should be judging whether a student is ready to go into a course, is ready to exit from a course. I shouldn't be making those judgments at Central. However, the judgment that I have to make and the policy that is there is the Board of Trustees' resolution. The reason I say you should leave the issue alone for now is that in two years, if there is a rising junior, then there will be no debate about the three assessment tests. They will either be eliminated or they will be used as remedial tests. The mathematics faculty -- who is here from mathematics? -- the math taskforce tells me that the math test that we have presently is the worse diagnostic tool that we have, that it is not a diagnostic tool, and I asked why are we using it to place students in mathematics courses and I was told that that test is all we have. Therefore the faculty should decide either at John Jay solely or collectively as a University what should be the appropriate diagnostic instrument in mathematics. Mathematicians do not agree that there should be a rising junior in mathematics because they say most of our students don't take math after the 60th credit and so the mathematicians are having a different discussion. So in the end will it be a reading test? a writing test? a combined reading and writing test with no math? I don't know, but it will not be what it is today, I think.

Senator Litwack: I think our question is not what the rising junior test should be but what the rising freshman test or the rising sophomore test should be. As I understand it, there is a requirement of a certain proficiency in reading at other colleges before a student may take traditional freshman courses, such as Psychology 101, Government 101, the core courses. Should we have such a reading requirement here?

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: If you wait until that standard is public and the faculty see what the rising junior exam is, then you are going to have to say how we as an institution get our students at that level and that pushes the discussion here. In other words, right now what is pushing the discussion? The test is 8th grade reading -- you read that in the recent newspaper [The Daily News].

Senator Litwack: In other words, CUNY will say that by 60 credits you have to pass the rising junior test?

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: I'm not going to personally push for a policy where the test may not be taken until 60 credits. I will say that students at some level, let's say 50 credits, will be allowed to take the test. But when I publish John Jay's pass rates on the rising junior, I am going to ask this faculty why is it that you don't prepare your students, that is, why aren't your students passing the rising junior when they are passing at these rates over there, and at these rates over here. That's a different discussion -- if we've agreed as a faculty that that's a standard we all want. We are saying we have a standard: every student whether at Queens or at Hostos meets this standard and they go forward and

that's really a different kind of a discussion.

-- Senator Norgren: It certainly is different because if Queens has all these students coming in with a 93 and higher average and Queens has all the money that Tom talked about and we have students who come in with a high school average of 70, or whatever, and we have less money to bring students further, who are that much more underskilled, and all students are to meet the same rising junior standard. I can't even begin to imagine how we cope with that. What happens to those students under the Board policy if they don't pass the rising junior exam?

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: The Board resolution doesn't speak to who doesn't pass it. What we do, presently, is that some of you give waivers if some of your students don't pass the three tests.

Senator Noraren: The Board does not say?

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: No. The Board leaves that up to the faculty. The faculty on the taskforce are debating this right now: what are we going to do with students who don't pass the test. This is a very serious question.

Senator Noraren: As an educator, how do you feel about administering the same examination across the colleges of the University that have vastly different interests, skills, and resources?

-- Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: I'm going to answer that not as an educator but as a minority person. And the reason why is that I don't have a "Black Degree," and I don't have a "Puerto Rican Degree," I have a degree from a fine liberal arts college. I sit at tables with people from Harvard, from Amherst, I can debate, I can write well, I am reasonably articulate. I think the standard has to be there for all students because what happens at CUNY is that some people are saying, for example, that John Jay is not as good as Queens and what I want to say is that it is: that students at John Jay pass the rising junior, that students at Hostos pass the rising junior. So it takes the debate away from the issue.

Senator Norcrren: As an administrator will CUNY Central, knowing this vast difference in the nature of students at Queens and John Jay, give us the resources?

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: CUNY has to. It has to. You cannot develop a policy of standards at this University without the support for the students. We get these phone calls at CUNY Central from SEEK students asking whether they have a real degree. They read the Heather MacDonald stuff. Do I have a real degree? And you say, what are you talking about, of course: you have a John Jay degree, you have a degree from Hunter. But students are starting to doubt themselves and we are in trouble when the students themselves ask us that question. People say that minority students can't reach the standard and I'm the first to argue that minority students can. You put up the standard and students will reach it with the right support.

Senator Norcrren: That was not my question because I see a vast mix of folks in my classes. My question was really the relationship to resources. If you give us the standardized exam and don't give us the resources to work with the students who have been assigned to us, then it is the worst kind of educational fraud.

-- Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: I think these are the easiest kind of resources to get with a conservative government. If I walked in with a rising junior exam and said this is the standard that the faculty of this University have set for our students and look at our exam compared to the

University of Massachusetts, compared to California, look at these tests, but we need money to get our students to meet those standards, I think we will get that money. Because what they're arguing right now to us is that all our money goes into remediation but we don't know how our students are doing. But I'm saying we can come up, as a faculty, with a standard and then help our students meet the standard. So I think it's easier to get that money.

Senator Litwack: To be sure I understand what you are saying: CUNY is moving toward a CUNY-wide exam around the junior year which would mean that if a college had a high percentage of students in the junior year who did not pass the rising junior exam within CUNY then people would be able to say the juniors at that college are not real juniors. Do I understand you correctly?

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: Two points. The first point, and I want to be quoted correctly: There already is a Board resolution that there should be a rising junior exam. This faculty of the University have selected instruments that are not at that level but there is a Board resolution and so nobody is going to the Board to institute a rising junior exam because that is already on the books. I want to be clear about that because there are rumors going around that CUNY is creating a rising junior and I'm saying that the Board resolution has always been there. But the exam hasn't been there. The second point that you made is important and that is in terms of the rising junior right now the data I have -- and I have a lot of data -- show that students who transfer from x number of colleges do not do well in spite of their very good GPA's when they get to upper-division work at certain senior colleges. So I look at these data and I say, as a faculty member, how can you get a 3.4 GPA at this institution and end up on academic probation at another institution. I can understand that the student wouldn't maintain a 3.4, but how can the student instead of a 3.4 be on academic probation? And when I see that it is not one student but thousands of students I'm going to ask whether there is grade inflation at that institution, what are the standards at that institution. So this is forcing the question: yes, it may be theoretically that you may get an institution with large numbers of students who are not passing the rising junior. Let's hope we don't. But if you did, theoretically, during the first few years of implementation of any instrument you'd have to work out these issues with the colleges and with the students, but I would hope that if an institution were to get that data that the faculty would move quickly.

Senator Litwack: Based on your impressions of John Jay, and I realize that you're not working here at John Jay, what do you think we should be doing that we're not currently doing given the resources we have?

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: The first thing is that I think you as a faculty understand a wide scope of issues: you know about retention, you know your students. However I would ask you to know the details of each of the topics that we talked about today. By the details, I mean that when you talk about attrition, investigate attrition at this institution, find out who the students are who are on good academic standing who are leaving, find out the profile of the student who really succeeds at John Jay, the kind of student who really benefits from John Jay, but know your data, you need your data. Interventions have to be very well planned and resources are so scarce that you don't want to throw your money at interventions that may not be actually targeting the problem. I would say you should know your problem in much more detail and I don't know that you don't. Maybe some of you individually do.

Senator Litwack: From your perspective as Vice Chancellor, apart from getting more data, is there anything you feel, from what you've seen, heard, we should be doing in terms of teaching, in terms of standards, in terms of our admissions standards, that we are not doing?

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: I really don't know the College well enough to answer that.

President Kaplowitz: In preparing for our meeting with you, we came to the decision to call a meeting of the general faculty to work on these issues of standards and retention, a meeting at which faculty work together in workshops to identify possible solutions and methods of implementation. You are helping us articulate the questions we should be asking.

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: Take risks. Try things. I know everything is territorial, everything is political, Somebody has to stand up and say we are going to start in the summer and end in mid-semester and we will work it out with the Union: somebody has to take some risks because if you don't, you will be repeating the same kinds of interventions that failed. That's the tough part.

President Kaplowitz: In light of the ESL Taskforce Report and the Language Immersion Institute on 117th Street that is being created, I'd like to ask you about our ESL program here. We're just starting an ESL program, as you know. We had one or two adjuncts teaching ESL. We've now hired an ESL Director and we hired our first full-time ESL faculty member this semester. We have a very small ESL population, as you know. Should we be investing our very, very meager resources in hiring faculty to teach ESL courses or should we be looking to send our students to a language immersion center after which they would take courses here. ESL is very, very expensive and if we start developing an ESL program we have to go all the way for it to be meaningful.

Vice Chancellor Nunes-Wormack: There is a project at CUNY called the CUNY Student of the Future. There is going to be a conference in the spring and I am going to send Karen material about it inviting all of you to attend the conference. Basically we are going to release the report and we asked our labor economist Dr. Linda Edwards, a faculty member at CUNY to come to CUNY Central for a year as a faculty fellow and she looked at all the demographic trends internationally and nationally and she wrote one chapter. Dr. Mollenkopf of the Graduate Center, a very well known demographer, wrote a second chapter, and a third chapter basically tells who is going to be at CUNY in the year 2000 and what do we do with all of these students since the demographics are going to change. That report will be issued and there will be a conference for the faculty to talk about the report before we move to create programs and shift resources. The reason I put this in the context of your question is that I just took probably the worst political beating of my life as an administrator with something called the Language Immersion Institute. (Karen witnessed much of it and knows what I'm talking about.) The Language Immersion Institute is an experiment that the Board has voted to go forward with that will take place next fall. Basically what I asked the Board to support is an experiment of 500 students where I would not be constrained by semesters or by credits. What I found in the CUNY Student of the Future project had an interesting dimension: that is, we meet with different subgroups -- we met with Israeli students, Eastern European students, Western European students, students from the non-Spanish speaking Caribbean, students from Russia, and doctors and lawyers from those communities, and faculty members, each group separately. Across the board the students said regardless of ethnicity or race: "We want to learn English faster because we want to be philosophy majors, we want to be economics majors. Teach us English faster, Why do we have to sit in courses for so many semesters.#@ So this experiment is going forward. Students will be chosen after they are admitted to CUNY, so it's not a pre-admissions screening, it's after admission. They will have the choice of either attending the Institute or not -- it's volunteer -- and those who choose the Institute will be immersed in between 30 to 50 hours a week of English. All that the

literature says about language acquisition, particularly English, and it does with foreign language teaching also, is that it's time on tasks. The more time you put into it the more likely you are to learn more English. so this center will have no semester constraints. The students will come to the center and participate in these modules and the students will then be sent back to the campuses where they were admitted. It's not an innovative thing: language immersion takes place all over the world. Some of you probably took French or Spanish in an immersion setting and you know it works. The reason we're experimenting is we want to see if we can reduce the amount of time that students are in ESL courses. If this works we will share with the faculty at the local campuses, as we would with John Jay, and this might be a model that you would want to adopt here. The faculty that will be selected have to be faculty very much dedicated to building pronunciation and oral proficiency and then moving students quickly to a reading and writing model. Will it work? I don't know. The Board has asked that we carefully monitor the data and that we report back to them at the end of two years. The literature shows clearly that students who have extended time on task are more likely to develop their English proficiency and, therefore, would be retained at a higher rate at the college-level. So that's how we're going forward. I would say to you that you watch this experiment carefully because if you are going to build something maybe it doesn't have to be courses like the ones in philosophy and economics and political science. Maybe the model for John Jay would be a language immersion institute taught by faculty with master's degrees.

Senator Norcorren: In thinking about the institute, what were the discussions around the issues of ESL students who need to work?

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: The way the center will be structured is that it will be open from 7:30 in the morning until 3:00 in the morning because we feel that students have to come to the center, learn English, go to work, wait on tables, and then go back to the center. The center has to be accessible to them, has to be able to fit into their work schedules, and so the modules will be set up with flexibility: they would be offered so many times during the day, as you did with your day/night schedule of classes. It's going to have an incredible infrastructure of computers and innovative software which we're getting from companies because we're the big tester for software developers. ESL is a big market and so they're very interested in giving us free computers, free software, because if they can build a market through us then, of course, they are going to make millions and millions of dollars. I just reviewed some software that's wonderful: it's interactive video and the video is of four students sitting in a bar, having a drink, and they're speaking English and you can stop it at any point and repeat any sentence and have a beer or a coke. The conversation is very, very true to life. Right now, if we get the lease through, it will be at 117th Street and First Avenue.

Senator DeLucia: Is there any discussion about the possible increase in tuition and student takeovers, which we don't want to live through again?

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: We have a lot of problems. We have BMCC where today there's a disciplinary hearing: students went off to City Hall to demonstrate against the budget cut and they tried to take over the Brooklyn Bridge. At another college right now we have a racial issue between a Jewish student and blacks and Hispanics. I tell you this because any mention of a tuition rise will trigger whatever is going on at any of the campuses. As you know, all you need sometimes is a trigger. Yes, there have been discussions in Albany about raising the tuition. Will that trigger student unrest on campuses? Absolutely. I think right now you know that, in fact, we have the highest community college tuition of any public institution in the nation. And we have the poorest students. So it's not going to be an easy spring for us if we have tuition increases.

Senator Norcrrren: Are we working with the Governor's transition team not only on the dollars but on those social and political concerns about the University?

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: On the one hand, the Chancellor and the Trustees were called to a meeting in Albany on Thursday to meet with elected officials and they talked a lot about this spring: they didn't specifically say there would be a tuition increase so we don't know. However, I'm very concerned -- Bob [DeLucia] works with students directly and knows it's a different climate, and student unrest will not be tolerated in New York City. Students will be arrested. It's a different time. So I'm very concerned about our students, that they be advised about this. There are times when they should demonstrate and I support their right -- I'm the first one to do that but they have to understand the climate which we are in. So if they demonstrate it has to be orderly, it has to be within the confines of the law, because if they break the law there's a different response to that right now and we, as faculty, have an incredible responsibility to speak to the students about this.

President Kaplowitz: I remember when you were a candidate for an administrative position at John Jay and I was on the search committee -- that was the first time you came to our Faculty Senate -- and I remember vividly your telling the search committee about how as an administrator at the College of Staten Island when the students took over a building you slept in the building with the students to make sure they were safe. That was very moving and very telling.

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: I think we should talk to our students. As soon as you read about CUNY news in the papers, just say yes you should demonstrate because I think they are responsible and when you think about the tuition increase it is not fair to them. So they should protest if they want to but within the law and I would ask for your support as you talk with them. Because all it takes is a small group.

Senator Hegeman: A number of us are very interested in studying the Judicial process -- the faculty/student discipline committee process -- on campus here as it affects our students. I'm wondering how 80th Street can help us to learn what happens on other campuses, how we can be more effective, how we can really meet our students' needs.

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: That's a very important point. I get a lot of student complaints about being treated unfairly and I always send it back to the campus in writing and ask the president to respond to me as Vice Chancellor and the college has to respond. And I'll tell you in many instances I come down on the side of the student because the process, given the catalogue and everything the college has in writing, is not fair to the student. So what I would like to do is give you the different processes the different campuses follow.

Senator Litwack: Which college has the best process so we could perhaps emulate them?

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: I'm thinking about which college I get the least complaints from. Among the senior colleges, I get very few complaints from Brooklyn and Queens Colleges (off the top of my head).

President Kaplowitz: I know that the faculty members on the Faculty/Student Disciplinary Committee are very concerned about the rights of not only the student who is charged but with the complainants and the uneasy role of the faculty who serve on the committee in serving the needs of both those students and their own relationship with the larger student body as teachers. This has come up this semester and a discussion about

this is on our agenda for later today.

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: A student at the Law School was just suspended for two semesters and because the suspension was for two semesters the student has the right to appeal to the Board of Trustees (a student does not have the right to appeal to the Board about a one-semester suspension). So we sit around the table with our lawyers, the student has a lawyer, and the student will sue the University. These are not small matters because students have rights and if they take it all the way up the channels you can find yourself as an institution with a messy lawsuit because the process somehow was not fair, was not carefully thought out. In the case of the Law School, the Trustees upheld the decision of the faculty/student committee at the Law School. But I've seen enough cases, as I said before, in which either the way the process is set up or the materials that describe the process are not congruent.

President Kaplowitz: We are tremendously impressed by all that you presented in terms of your work as University Dean for Academic Affairs but I must say that I know that in your capacity as Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs you have garnered tremendous respect of the students, especially the student leaders. I have witnessed this over and over, at meetings of the various Board Committees and at other meetings. The students hold you in such esteem and respect, which is really a remarkable development in view of the recent past.

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: Oh, but I also fight with them all the time.

President Kaplowitz: You do not let them get away with anything, that's clear. But their respect and esteem seem to me to be because you treat them with tremendous respect and fairness and you obviously care about them and you hold them to the highest standard.

Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack: They are good students. And all I ask of them is to give me the opportunity to give my side because I say if you are going to be a college-educated person you have to hear both sides. I don't care what position you ultimately take because I'm going to lobby for my position the way you will lobby for yours but listen to both of us. Those of you who work with student leaders know for the most part they are a very reasonable group of students.

President Kaplowitz: On behalf of the Faculty Senate and indeed of the entire faculty of John Jay, thank you for giving us so much information and for being so incredibly generous with your time. [Sustained applause]

5. Proposal to begin a pilot satellite program: Guests: Dean James Curran and Professor Charles Lindner

President Kaplowitz explained that a few years ago she and Professor Crozier put together an ad hoc committee to study and recommend ways to increase the in-service student population, both in terms of recruitment and retention. One of the recommendations, which did not at that time receive support from the administrators to whom this was proposed but which is being favorably viewed now, is to offer courses in police precincts or at other satellite facilities for recruitment purposes. She introduced Professor Charles Lindner, deputy chair of the Department of Law, Police Science, and Criminal Justice Administration, who had been a member of the ad hoc committee, and Dean of special Programs James Curran, who had been a consultant to the ad hoc committee and who had run the first satellite program in the 1970s.

She said that she and Professor Lindner and Dean Curran hope that the Senate will endorse this recommendation which would give the proposal legitimacy in terms of faculty support. She explained that they would like to start this pilot program in February because CUNY is ending the tuition waiver program as of that date.

She gave background: in 1972, Dean Curran asked four faculty members, Harriet Pollack (Government), Scott Francher (Anthropology), Alvin Frost (Police Science), and herself (Literature) to teach in the first satellite program at the 50 Precinct in the Bronx. The four courses were offered with the idea that if police officers had an opportunity to experience college courses in what was for them a safe and comfortable, in the sense of known, environment they would most likely have a very positive experience both in terms of enjoying their studies and discovering that they can, in fact, do college work and would then decide to continue in college at which point they would have to come to our main campus, here, which they did in large numbers. She recalled that it was a wonderful experience for the faculty, for the police officers, and for the College. And then we had satellite after satellite all over the city. Now that we will have no tuition waiver program and because the number of in-service students has been on a steady decline we want to resume this program next semester as a pilot. The other ad hoc committee members were Senator Henriques, Senator Koehler, Professor Bracey, and Professor Del Castillo.

She said that although the administrators to whom this was proposed a few years ago were not supportive, she has since spoken to President Lynch who is very supportive of this proposal and Dean Curran has also received expressions of support from President Lynch.

Dean Curran said that one of the members of the ad hoc committee that proposed this had himself returned to college as a result of John Jay's satellite program and that person is Professor Vincent Del Castillo.

Professor Lindner said we are concerned about the loss of in-service students and many of the colleges nearby have very strong programs through which they try to continue to bolster their in-service population and it's often at our expense. So we find ourselves continually being drained of in-service students and this proposal is one way of attracting. Dr. Del Castillo is the perfect example: his start at college was only because the satellite program happened to be in his precinct and he went all the way through and ended up with the doctorate. That's only a single illustration but it graphically describes the possibilities. Professor Lindner said he discussed this proposal with Dr. John Kleinig, the acting chair of his department, Law and Police Science, who is supportive of the program and who feels that their department has a commitment to it.

President Kaplowitz explained that the determination about the number of sections and locations will depend on the enrollment demand. We're talking, however, about a maximum of four to eight sections at two to four locations, with two courses at each location. One of the possible locations is the Harlem Office Building, which has a lot of parking (that is one of the necessities). Other possible locations are Fort Hamilton, Fort Schulyer, the Corrections Academy in Queens. The program would not increase the college's reliance on adjunct faculty because the people recruited for the program will be full-time faculty who would volunteer to teach a satellite course as an overage, in other words, they would be paid additional salary (the adjunct rate for their rank). And, therefore, the schedule of classes for the spring, which has already been set, would not be affected in any way. After the pilot we would assess the program and decide whether to expand it, keep it at that size, etc. But in any case we would limit the number of courses a student could take at a satellite location and all the satellite courses would be open to anyone who wanted

to enroll: the courses will not be restricted to in-service students. The courses will be taught on a once-a-week basis, with day/night sections. The NYPD is going back to the rotating shift: the graduates of the last couple of police academy classes have been assigned rotating shifts. She said she had taught in four precincts and loved it: she said it was the among the best experiences she has had at the College.

Professor Lindner said that having taught in the satellite program many years ago -- at Fort Hamilton among other sites -- he considers it a great opportunity for a faculty member because it's an opportunity to do extra work, it's a wonderful learning experience because it is very, very interesting to be with professional people who are working in the field, and often his students brought him up to date because the longer he's been away from the field the more changes there have been.

Senator Koehler said the satellite program is a terrific marketing tool to get a lot more in-service people back to John Jay. They'll be exposed to the faculty, they'll begin to take courses, and then it would be logical for them, hopefully, to come here at our main campus.

Professor Lindner said we should be cautious in our optimism and in our hope of putting on six or eight courses: we don't know whether the in-service students will return. The competition among the colleges for in-service students is very strong and he said he doesn't know if we can buck some of the incentives that they offer.

Senator Norgren asked why we stopped having the satellite program. President Kaplowitz explained that when we created our program in the early 1970s it was so successful that New York Institute of Technology and St. Joseph's Colleges started their own in-service programs but their programs were diploma mills -- students attended one day a week for a few hours and received 15 credits. At that time LEEP [Law Enforcement Education Program] was in existence (until President Carter killed it) provided stipends for law enforcement people taking college courses and there was a lot of money available. John Jay officials went to the State Regents and complained about those other colleges and asked the Regents to examine those other colleges' programs and they did and said they couldn't do what they were doing anymore but they also said we couldn't do what we were doing anymore because the Regents said no college courses may be given at a location that does not have a college-level library. And so John Jay moved its satellite program onto CUNY campuses such as KCC and Lehman Colleges where we offered courses that those CUNY colleges did not give.

Dean Curran explained that we moved from neutral or public service locations, precincts and fire houses, onto college campuses and that worked out quite well for a while. But then John Jay got the tuition waiver program and we were giving away two courses each semester free of charge and so we became the best show in town and we didn't feel we had to go out and compete because no one was doing what we were doing. And that has eroded: with the imposition of higher tuition only one course was given on a tuition waiver basis and this last semester we were only able to give \$200 in tuition waiver to in-service students and now the tuition waiver program is being totally terminated and so we're back to where we were when we eliminated the satellite program.

Senator Norgren asked whether the rule that we be at a location that has a college-level library affects our ability to do what is being proposed. Dean Curran said that rule would be an issue if we were to go back to the level that we had been operating: we were offering off-campus educational programs. The rule does not apply if we offer for one semester on an experimental basis a course off-campus. If it looks like it's going to be a big success he said he would strongly suggest that we

follow the model of being on college campuses again.

President Kaplowitz explained that the kind of competition that Professor Lindner was speaking about includes colleges that offer in-service students one free course for every course they pay for, another college offers 50% tuition waiver for all courses that in-service students take. Colleges love having in-service students, partly because it makes their campuses safer and there's a perception of safety. Senator Malone moved that the Senate endorse the proposal to begin a pilot satellite in a NYPD precinct or other facility. Senator Shaughnessy seconded the motion. The motion carried by unanimous vote.

6. Proposed honorary degree candidates: Professor Robert Panzarella, Chair, Committee on Honorary Degrees

Professor Panzarella was welcomed. On behalf of the Committee on Honorary Degrees, he presented candidates recommended by the Committee for vote by the Senate. For a name to be forwarded to the President, the Senate must approve by an affirmative vote of three-quarters of the members of the Senate present and voting by secret ballot. Only the names of those candidates who are approved by the Senate are recorded in the Senate minutes because the candidates did not seek such nomination and often do not know they are nominated. For the same reason deliberation about the candidates is conducted as an off-the-record discussion. Each candidate is considered and voted upon independently and the votes are not announced until all the candidates have been voted on so that each candidate is considered on her or his merits and not as a competition. Each college may award up to four honorary degrees at commencement: the recipient must attend commencement to receive the degree. Upon affirmative vote of the Senate the names are sent to President Lynch: those candidates he approves (and he has to date approved all) are forwarded to the Chancellor and to the Board of Trustees, for their approval (and to date they have approved all candidates).

Professor Panzarella praised the other members of his committee: Professors Jane Bowers, Peter DeForest, Jannette Domingo, Daniel Gasman, Barry Latzer, and Maria Rodriguez. The Senate approved the following people nominated by the Committee on Honorary Degrees: Bill Cosby, Rita Dove, Wayne LaFave, and John Shattuck. The Senate also endorsed the Committee's recommendation that Mr. Cosby deliver the commencement address and that Ms. Dove be asked to read one (or more) of her poems.

7. Proposal to endorse a designation of distinguished professor

President Kaplowitz explained that the History Department P&B and the College P&B have voted to recommend that Professor Blanche Cook be named Distinguished Professor of History. President Lynch has endorsed this action. The proposal is that the Senate endorse this action and if it does she would write a letter on behalf of the Senate for inclusion with the packet of supporting letters that are sent to 80th Street. She explained that nominations from colleges are voted on by a subcommittee of the Council of Presidents. The COPS subcommittee reviews letters from scholars external to CUNY that the College has solicited as well as letters from scholars external to CUNY that the Chancellor's Office solicits. Not all nominations are forwarded to the Board of Trustees. Last year, the colleges nominated 19 faculty and only nine were approved by COPS and sent to the Board, which approved them. The University is permitted to have 200 distinguished professors and it currently has 178. John Jay currently has only one distinguished professor, Professor Robert

Jay Lifton.

Senator Norgren said that Professor Cook is a scholar whose brilliant research and expertise are extensive and display her creative mind. She has worked and continues to work on issues of international peace, she's an Eisenhower scholar, a Crystal Eastman scholar, an Eleanor Roosevelt scholar, and a Roosevelt family scholar. Many of us are familiar with the first volume of her book on Eleanor Roosevelt which was published two years ago and which received very, very strong reviews. She most recently was one of the experts selected for the documentary shown on Channel 13 about Franklin Delano Roosevelt and in that capacity was in the company of such people as Doris Kearns from Harvard. She is a columnist, and a radio commenuator. She is a long-time member of this faculty. Senator Norgren moved that the Senate support the College's nomination of Professor Cook for a distinguished professorship at John Jay and that a letter from the Senate be sent to President Lynch for inclusion in the packet to 80th Street. The motion was approved by unanimous vote.

8. Update on Base Level Equity reallocation of lines

Senator Litwack reviewed the letter that he and President Kaplowitz sent to the Baruch College President Xatthew Goldstein, who is chairing the Council of President's Ad Hoc Committee on base level equity, at the Senate's direction [see Attachment A of Minutes #115 for the text of the letter]. President Kaplowitz said that once again Senator Litwack is the principle author of an outstanding letter and the Senate and the College owe him a great deal of thanks. She called this a great letter, one which took many, many days to develop and write. Senator Litwack noted that President Kaplowitz, Professor Benton, and others helped him.

Senator Litwack explained that the basic points of the letter are the bold points on pages 1 and 2. The Council of Presidents' ad hoc committee is supposed to come up with a series of recommendations about base level equity which, according to their own minutes they said they would distribute to the colleges for their comments before coming up with a final set of recommendations to the Chancellor. So we will probably have to respond to the proposed set of recommendations.

Senator Litwack said that in terms of what Vice Chancellor Nunez-Wormack said to us today, if base level equity is implemented we would be able to put a cap on admissions or even cut back somewhat without losing full-time faculty because we would be given more full-time faculty lines. Not that that's the only issue, he noted, because it's also an issue, as President Lynch would argue, that if we continue growing we are in a much better position to get a new building.

President Kaplowitz explained that it looks as if the COP8 committee is going to recommend that base level equity go forward. They'll be voting a week from today, but this letter is a response to the latest set of the COPS committee minutes [available from the Senate's executive committee] which reveals the following thinking: if a college has 500 full-time faculty lines but 100 of the faculty are not actually in the classroom because they're released 50% with released time to do something else, then that college really has only 450 faculty. And, therefore, those colleges aren't as fiscally advantaged as they look on paper. Senator Gitter said that's like saying people wearing fur coats are disadvantaged because they are wearing dead animals. President Kaplowitz called that a perfect analogy. So their argument is that if a college has released time that is funded from an outside source -- a source outside the college -- that would be subtracted from its total of full-time faculty lines, which would mean that when all the lines are distributed it should get more lines or

lose fewer lines. And so the more the faculty of a college are teaching in the doctoral program and the more the faculty of a college are released through the funding of outside grants -- both of which can be audited -- the better a college will do in terms of base level equity. At John Jay, however, we are so underfunded that we can't give faculty released time to write great grant proposals which would give us a better chance at winning grants (which other colleges do). This letter that Senator Litwack has written is a very sophisticated answer to that.

She said that the letter is copied to Chancellor Reynolds and to the appropriate vice chancellors because it is Chancellor Reynolds who will ultimately make the decision about base level equity. But we're hoping that President Goldstein, who will be writing the draft report, will take our arguments into account.

Senator Pinello asked whether anyone knows how or whether the recently enacted hiring freeze affects base level equity. President Kaplowitz explained that Base Level Equity is the reallocation of vacant faculty lines so if a college gets the empty lines it can hire as soon as the freeze is lifted. In light of the election of Mr. Pataki she said she and Senator Litwack think the implementation of Base Level Equity is even more important now because the argument against Base Level Equity -- at the COPS ad hoc committee (according to their minutes) and elsewhere -- has been that an alternate approach should be adopted and that is that when additional money is allocated to CUNY a disproportionate share of that money should be given to the fiscally disadvantaged colleges. But we know that no additional monies are going to be given to CUNY in the foreseeable future. Base Level Equity is now our only hope of more lines.

Senator Litwack also answered by saying that if Base Level Equity goes through it would ensure that if there are serious cutbacks in the University, those cutbacks would come from the vacant lines at the fiscally advantaged colleges and not from a fiscally disadvantaged college such as John Jay. We might not be any better off and we still might be worse off than we are now but it would ensure -- and, therefore, it is more important now than ever -- that cuts would have to come from vacant lines at the other colleges. President Kaplowitz agreed, saying that John Jay has no vacant lines now to give up if there were a severe cut but some colleges have more than 50 vacant lines, one has almost 100 vacant lines. The Senate thanked and applauded Senator Litwack again.

11. New business

The Senate discussed President Lynches decision to remove Professor Marilyn Lutzker from her position as Chief Librarian. (She retains her position as a tenured full professor of the Library.) In light of the previous day's decision of the Council of Chairs to send a delegation to meet with President Lynch, the Senate authorized the executive committee to call a special Senate meeting if warranted.

By a motion duly made and carried, the meeting adjourned at 5 PM

Respectfully submitted,

Edward Davenport
Recording Secretary

CUNY FRESHMEN-1990

	ESL-1	ESL-2	ESL-3	PASSED	DBLREM	OTHERS
	1677	1469	1051	5325	5350	11856
AGE (MDN)	22.85	21.14	20.20	18.60	19.84	19.21
FEMALES	59.8%	54.7%	56.7%	57.6%	60.9%	57.9%
MALES	40.2%	45.3%	43.3%	42.4%	39.1%	42.1%
CITIZENSHIP						
U.S.	18.3%	18.0%	26.6%	82.7%	63.2%	80.0%
STUDENT VISA	.7%	1.6%	2.1%	.8%	.4%	.4%
PERMANENT RESIDENT	76.2%	72.9%	59.0%	13.5%	32.5%	16.7%
TEMPORARY VISA	2.0%	5.4%	9.4%	2.2%	2.2%	1.6%
UNDOCUMENTED	2.9%	2.1%	2.9%	.9%	1.6%	1.3%
ETHNICITY/RACE						
NON-HISPANIC WHITE	18.7%	17.2%	13.0%	49.0%	12.5%	31.3%
NON-HISPANIC BLACK	10.6%	14.7%	16.3%	25.2%	50.6%	36.4%
HISPANIC	49.1%	35.2%	35.8%	16.0%	27.9%	25.9%
ASIAN/PACIFIC						
ISLANDER	21.6%	32.7%	34.7%	9.6%	8.7%	6.2%
NATIVE AMERICAN	.0%	.1%	-.2%	.2%	.3%	.2%
GRADUATED FROM H.S.						
1990 HS GRAD	35.7%	48.4%	56.4%	75.7%	61.7%	62.6%
PRIOR TO 1990	64.3%	51.6%	43.6%	24.3%	38.3%	37.4%
TYPE OF HIGH SCHOOL						
NYC PUB	23.1%	40.7%	49.7%	59.6%	63.3%	57.0%
GED	26.5%	19.9%	16.8%	9.1%	19.6%	20.4%
PRIVATE	.1%	.9%	2.0%	20.9%	5.8%	13.1%
NYS	.1%	.6%	.9%	3.8%	1.4%	2.7%
FOREIGN	50.2%	37.8%	30.5%	6.6%	9.9%	6.8%
DEGREE ENROLLED FALL 90						
NON DFGREE	.0%	.4%	.0%	.1%	.2%	.3%
UNDERGRD BACC	22.3%	41.2%	38.1%	60.7%	24.5%	34.5%
OTH UNDERGRD ASSOC						
-DEGTYPE UNK	37.5%	12.4%	6.8%	8.7%	8.7%	13.2%
UNDERGRD CERT/DIP	.3%	.3%	.0%	.2%	.5%	.4%
UNDERGRD AA	6.6%	6.0%	4.6%	6.7%	11.1%	11.7%
UNDERGRD AS	3.8%	5.4%	8.1%	3.9%	9.8%	8.1%
UNDERGRD AAS	29.5%	34.4%	42.5%	19.6%	45.2%	31.8%

PASSED = PASSED ALL THREE TESTS INITIALLY

DBLREM = FAILED THE CUNY WAT [WRITING] AND CUNY RAT [READING] INITIALLY

OTHERS = FAILED CUNY MAT [MATHEMATICS] AND MAT AND EITHER WAT OR RAT TESTS

ATTACHMENT A - p.2

CUNY FRESHMEN-1990

	ESL-1	ESL-2	ESL-3	PASSED	DBLREM	OTHERS
HIGH SCHOOL AVERAGES			MEDIANS			
OVERALL	75.40	77.00	76.50	79.00	72.00	74.00
MATHEMATICS	76.00	77.00	75.00	77.00	68.00	70.00
ENGLISH	75.00	75.00	76.00	81.00	73.00	76.00
FOR. LANGUAGE	80.00	80.00	80.00	81.00	75.00	76.00
SCIENCE	75.00	76.00	75.00	77.00	71.00	72.00
SOCIAL SCIENCE	75.00	76.00	77.00	81.00	72.00	75.00
HIGH SCHOOL UNITS			MEDIANS			
ENGLISH	1.00	.50	1.50	3.00	2.50	3.00
FOREIGN LANGUAGE	3.00	2.50	2.00	3.00	1.00	2.00
SOCIAL SCIENCE	2.50	2.50	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
TOTAL ACAD. UNITS	11.25	11.00	12.50	16.33	11.50	13.50
HIGHEST MATH COMPLETED						
NO 9TH YR MATH	38.5%	33.2%	35.9%	9.3%	50.1%	34.0%
9-TH YR MATH	17.9%	21.2%	21.7%	10.58	22.8%	21.7%
INTERMEDIATE ALGEBRA	7.5%	8.6%	5.6%	12.2%	5.0%	7.6%
10TH YR MATH	20.6%	17.4%	16.8%	15.5%	12.1%	16.3%
11TH YR MATH	15.5%	19.5%	20.1%	52.4%	10.1%	20.4%
HIGHEST SCIENCE COMPLETED						
NO SCIENCE	27.4%	22.2%	19.5%	7.1%	18.9%	15.6%
GENERAL OR EARTH	18.9%	25.2%	25.3%	7.4%	33.4%	20.9%
BIOLOGY	34-28	34.0%	31.9%	27.8%	34.2%	37.5%
CHEMISTRY	16.4%	15.1%	18.1%	39.8%	11.5%	21.0%
PHYSICS	2.5%	2.9%	4.2%	11.0%	1.4%	3.0%
CHEMISTRY+PHYSICS	.8%	.6%	1.0%	6.8%	.7%	2.0%
INITIAL MATH TEST						
FAILED	67.4%	52.7%	47.5%	.0%	79.0%	70.9%
PASSED	32.6%	47.3%	52.5%	100.0%	21.0%	29.1%
MATH SCORE (MDN)	38	23	25	31	17	21
INITIAL WRITING TEST						
FAILED	100.0%	99.6%	98.5%	.0%	100.0%	54.6%
PASSED	.0%	.4%	1.5%	100.0%	.0%	45.4%
WRITING SCORE (MDN)	2	4	5	8	6	6
INITIAL READING TEST						
FAILED	92.8%	86.3%	69.9%	.0%	100.0%	13.3%
PASSED	7.2%	13.7%	30.1%	100.0%	.0%	86.7%
READING SCORE-SCALED (MDN)	3	5	9	19	8	15

ATTACHMENT A - p.3

CUNY FRESHMEN-1990

	ESL-1	ESL-2	ESL-3	PASSED	DBLREM	OTHERS

COLLEGE OF ATTENDANCE FALL 90 (PERCENT WITHIN COLLEGE)						
CITY	8.6%	9.8%	2.3%	25.2%	15.0%	39.2%
BARUCH	5.5%	2.3%	8.3%	37.6%	12.6%	33.7%
HUNTER	2.2%	3.7%	4.2%	35.7%	14.4%	39.8%
LEHMAN	4.3%	11.1%	3.9%	14.9%	20.2%	45.7%
BROOKLYN	3.4%	11.2%	3.5%	43.2%	8.4%	30.4%
QUEENS	.7%	3.2%	1.6%	38.3%	10.4%	45.8%
CSI	2.5%	1.2%	2.8%	26.3%	9.0%	58.2%
BXCC	9.4%	4.3%	2.1%	5.0%	34.5%	44.8%
QCC	2.0%	7.4%	1.5%	13.8%	23.4%	51.9%
KBCC	10.9%	3.5%	1.5%	19.6%	18.0%	46.4%
BMCC	2.9%	6.4%	8.8%	12.5%	27.0%	42.4%
NYCTC	10.0%	2.8%	.9%	11.6%	30.3%	44.2%
HOSTOS	40.9%	10.8%	3.7%	.0%	.0%	44.7%
YORK	7.2%	5.6%	1.9%	22.6%	16.1%	46.4%
JOHN JAY	.3%	.6%	6.0%	14.0%	19.1%	60.0%
LAGCC	6.3%	8.2%	8.3%	9.1%	32.3%	35.8%
EVERS	5.1%	2.6%	.9%	11.2%	32.5%	47.6%

Table 5

CUNY FRESHMEN-1986

	ESL-1	ESL-2	ESL-3	PASSED	DBLREM	OTHERS
CUMULATIVE GPAs - MEDIANS						
FALL 86	2.44	2.67	2.71	2.70	2.00	2.31
SPRING 87	2.50	2.58	2.60	2.65	2.00	2.29
FALL 87	2.47	2.58	2.55	2.69	2.10	2.33
SPRING 88	2.43	2.55	2.54	2.71	2.10	2.36
FALL 88	2.44	2.57	2.61	2.75	2.17	2.42
SPRING 89	2.42	2.54	2.61	2.77	2.18	2.45
FALL 89	2.48	2.57	2.62	2.81	2.24	2.49
SPRING 90	2.54	2.59	2.67	2.84	2.28	2.53
FALL 90	2.54	2.63	2.70	2.87	2.31	2.55
SPRING 91	2.58	2.62	2.71	2.89	2.34	2.58
FALL 91	2.61	2.67	2.70	2.91	2.38	2.59
SPRING 92	2.64	2.70	2.74	2.91	2.39	2.61
FALL 92	2.65	2.71	2.76	2.93	2.39	2.62
SPRING 93	2.64	2.73	2.75	2.93	2.40	2.63
CUMULATIVE CREDITS - MEDIANS						
FALL 86	4.00	4.00	5.00	11.50	3.00	6.00
SPRING 87	9.00	11.00	13.00	23.00	9.00	15.00
FALL 87	18.00	20.00	23.50	36.00	17.00	27.00
SPRING 88	26.00	30.00	35.00	49.00	26.00	37.00
FALL 88	35.50	41.50	47.00	62.00	37.00	49.00
SPRING 89	43.00	53.00	58.00	71.00	46.00	59.00
FALL 89	56.00	65.00	67.00	82.00	56.00	67.00
SPRING 90	68.00	74.00	76.00	92.00	64.00	72.00
FALL 90	75.50	82.00	82.00	104.25	67.25	76.00
SPRING 91	80.00	88.00	90.50	113.00	71.00	81.00
FALL 91	86.00	96.00	100.00	118.00	75.00	86.00
SPRING 92	90.25	100.75	109.00	120.50	78.00	92.00
FALL 92	92.50	107.00	113.50	122.00	81.00	95.50
SPRING 93	97.00	111.00	116.25	123.00	82.50	100.00

.....
 Includes only students enrolled in a given semester

Table 6

CUNY FRESHMEN-1990

	ESL-1	ESL-2	ESL-3	PASSED	DBLREM	OTHERS
	1677	1469	1051	5325	5350	11856

RETENTION

SPRING 91

NT ENRL	15.1%	11.4%	11.4%	11.6%	20.0%	21.2%
ENROL	84.9%	88.6%	88.6%	88.4%	80.0%	78.8%

FALL 91

NTENRL	29.6%	25.1%	22.2%	26.0%	38.2%	38.8%
ENROL	70.4%	74.9%	77.8%	74.0%	61.8%	61.2%

SPRING 92

NTENR	37.1%	32.3%	28.5%	30.8%	44.1%	44.5%
ENROL	62.8%	67.2%	71.0%	67.5%	55.6%	54.9%
GRAD	.1%	.5%	.5%	1.7%	.2%	.6%

FALL 92

NTENRL	45.9%	39.6%	36.9%	37.1%	53.7%	52.6%
ENROL	53.7%	59.0%	60.2%	58.1%	45.2%	45.0%
GRAD	.4%	1.4%	2.9%	4.8%	1.2%	2.4%

SPRING 93

NTENRL	50.3%	42.7%	40.1%	39.1%	56.6%	55.3%
ENROL	47.3%	53.7%	53.3%	52.5%	40.6%	39.4%
GRAD	2.4%	3.6%	6.7%	8.5%	2.8%	5.3%

.....

DBLREM = FAILED CWAT, CRAT INITIALLY

PASSED = ALL THREE TESTS INITIALLY

OTHERS = FAILED CMAT, AND CMAT AND EITHER CWAT
OR CRAT

Table 7

CUNY FRESHMEN-1990
RETENTION/GRADUATION BY DEGREE TYPE

	ESL-1		ESL-2		ESL-3		PASSED		DBLREM		OTHER	
	BA/S	AA/S	BA/S	AA/S	BA/S	AA/S	BA/S	AA/S	BA/S	AA/S	BA/S	AA/S
	364	1258	585	790	380	597	2932	1673	1180	3222	3428	5728
SP 91												
NTENR	7.4%	16.6%	6.5%	14.1%	6.6%	13.1%	7.1%	13.9%	11.4%	18.3%	12.0%	20.2%
ENROL	92.6%	83.4%	93.5%	85.9%	93.4%	86.9%	92.9%	86.1%	88.6%	81.7%	88.0%	79.8%
FA 91												
NTENR	17.6%	32.4%	18.1%	28.0%	18.2%	23.1%	19.4%	31.2%	26.6%	36.9%	26.5%	39.5%
ENROL	82.4%	67.6%	81.9%	72.0%	81.8%	76.9%	80.6%	68.8%	73.4%	63.1%	73.5%	60.5%
SP 92												
NTENR	21.2%	40.9%	25.6%	35.8%	18.7%	33.0%	23.0%	36.8%	30.3%	43.9%	30.5%	46.4%
ENROL	78.8%	59.0%	74.4%	63.3%	81.3%	66.2%	76.9%	58.2%	69.6%	55.8%	69.4%	52.4%
GRAD	.0%	.1%	.0%	.9%	.0%	.8%	.1%	5.0%	.1%	.3%	.0%	1.2%
FA 92												
NTENR	30.8%	49.6%	32.5%	43.8%	29.2%	40.9%	29.5%	42.8%	40.4%	54.7%	38.5%	55.5%
ENROL	69.2%	49.8%	67.4%	53.7%	70.8%	54.1%	70.3%	42.6%	59.5%	43.5%	61.3%	39.9%
GRAD	.0%	.6%	.2%	2.5%	.0%	5.0%	.2%	14.6%	.1%	1.8%	.1%	4.6%
SP 93												
NTENR	33.5%	54.4%	36.2%	46.8%	31.1%	44.7%	31.9%	44.6%	43.6%	57.4%	42.0%	57.4%
ENROL	66.5%	42.4%	63.6%	47.1%	68.9%	43.6%	67.3%	31.6%	56.4%	38.2%	57.6%	32.7%
GRAD	.0%	3.3%	.2%	6.1%	.0%	11.7%	.9%	23.8%	.1%	4.4%	.4%	9.9%

FIRST TIME FRESHMEN ENROLLED AS FULL-TIME STUDENTS IN THE FALL 1990 SEMESTR.

Retention by Year of Entry, John Jay College: Associate Entrants

ATTACHMENT B

	Regularly Admitted Associate Entrants				Associate Entrants Via Special Programs				Total Associate Entrants						
	1980	1982	1984	1986	1987	1980	1982	1984	1986	1987	1980	1982	1984	1986	1987
1 year²															
% Still Enrolled	82.5	76.1	74.1	78.3	76.7	94.1	82.5	80.5	83.6	80.3	84.6	76.8	75.2	79.0	77.2
% Graduated	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
2 years															
% Still Enrolled	49.7	52.5	43.6	39.4	44.5	63.2	57.5	50.0	52.7	46.5	52.1	53.1	44.7	41.1	44.8
% Graduated	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
3 years															
% Still Enrolled	36.3	31.4	30.2	28.8	31.7	45.6	32.5	30.5	21.8	32.4	38.0	31.6	30.3	27.9	31.8
% Graduated	1.0	0.9	1.3	0.0	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8	0.8	1.1	0.0	0.6
4 years															
% Still Enrolled	22.6	25.2	17.4	23.0		30.9	20.0	23.2	23.6		24.1	24.6	18.4	23.1	
% Graduated	2.5	2.2	4.5	1.6		2.9	0.0	0.0	0.0		2.6	2.0	3.7	1.4	
5 years															
% Still Enrolled	18.2	10.7	11.8			26.5	5.0	12.2			19.6	10.1	11.8		
% Graduated	6.7	6.9	8.3			4.4	2.5	3.7			6.3	6.4	7.5		
6 years															
% Still Enrolled	9.9	7.5	9.1			19.1	2.5	12.2			11.5	7.0	9.6		
% Graduated	10.2	9.1	10.7			5.9	2.5	3.7			9.4	8.4	9.4		
8 years															
% Still Enrolled	2.9	6.0				2.9	0.0				2.9	5.3			
% Graduated	13.1	11.9				13.2	5.0				13.1	11.2			
10 years															
% Still Enrolled	3.2					2.9					3.1				
% Graduated	15.0					13.2					14.7				

¹ Includes students who entered as first-time full-time freshmen.

² Retention is measured in the spring of the indexed year. One-year retention therefore measures the percentage still enrolled or graduated as of the spring following the fall of initial entry.

Retention by Year of Entry, John Jay College: Bachelor's Entrants

ATTACHMENT C

	Regularly Admitted Bachelor's Entrants				Bachelor's Entrants Via Special Programs				Total Bachelor's Entrants						
	1980	1982	1984	1986	1987	1980	1982	1984	1986	1987	1980	1982	1984	1986	1987
1 year²															
% Still Enrolled	88.5	86.0	83.8	87.6	84.5	87.2	86.3	88.9	90.8	84.6	88.0	86.1	85.4	88.8	84.5
% Graduated	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
2 years															
% Still Enrolled	63.0	67.5	58.1	62.1	57.3	62.6	62.1	61.1	60.9	61.3	62.9	65.6	59.1	61.6	58.7
% Graduated	0.3	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.0
3 years															
% Still Enrolled	48.2	52.7	46.1	50.5	48.6	41.9	51.6	43.9	45.9	49.6	45.8	52.4	45.4	48.9	48.9
% Graduated	1.2	0.3	1.0	0.0	0.7	1.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.1	0.2	0.7	0.4	0.5
4 years															
% Still Enrolled	32.1	31.8	35.1	40.1		33.5	34.6	33.3	37.7		32.6	32.8	34.5	39.2	
% Graduated	11.2	11.3	8.9	8.2		3.0	3.3	1.7	2.4		8.1	8.5	6.6	6.1	
5 years															
% Still Enrolled	16.7	17.1	19.9			16.7	19.0	21.1			16.7	17.8	20.3		
% Graduated	23.3	21.6	23.0			10.8	11.8	8.9			18.6	18.2	18.5		
6 years															
% Still Enrolled	7.6	11.8	11.5			10.3	8.5	13.9			8.6	10.6	12.3		
% Graduated	20.4	27.4	28.8			14.3	16.3	18.3			23.6	23.6	26.0		
8 years															
% Still Enrolled	5.8	7.5				5.4	7.8				5.6	7.6			
% Graduated	33.3	30.1				18.7	20.3				27.8	26.7			
10 years															
% Still Enrolled	4.5					4.4					4.5				
% Graduated	35.2					20.2					29.5				

¹ Includes students who entered as first-time full-time freshmen.

² Retention is measured in the spring of the indexed year. One-year retention therefore measures the percentage still enrolled or graduated as of the spring following the fall of initial entry.