

Faculty Senate Minutes #368

February 23, 2011

3:20 PM

Room 630 T

Present (32): William Allen, Andrea Balis, Spiros Bakiras, Ben Bierman, Erica Burleigh, Elise Champeil, Sergei Cheloukhine, Demi Cheng, Lyell Davies, James DiGiovanna, Jennifer Dysart, DeeDee Falkenbach, Beverly Frazier, Robert Garot, Jay Gates, Katie Gentile, Lior Gideon, Norman Groner, Maki Haberfeld, Jay Hamilton, Olivera Jokic, Karen Kaplowitz, Vincent Maiorino, Nivedita Majumdar, Gerald Markowitz, Sara Mcdougall, Paul Narkunas, Richard Ocejio, Raul Rubio, Rick Richardson, Francis Sheehan, Pat Tovar

Absent (15): Elton Beckett, Kathleen Collins, Edgardo Diaz Diaz, Virginia Diaz-Mendoza, Terry Furst, Xerxes Malki, Evan Mandery, Isabel Martinez, Roz Myers, Richard Perez, Frank Pezzella, Richard Schwester, Staci Strobl, Monica Varsanyi, Valerie West

Invited Guest: President Jeremy

Agenda

1. Announcements
2. Approval of the Agenda
3. Approval of Minutes #367 of the February 10, 2011, meeting
4. Election by secret ballot by the Senate to fill 2 vacant at-large seats on the Senate
5. Election by secret ballot to fill 1 vacant seat on the College Council from among the newly elected Senators
6. Selection of an additional faculty member to serve on the International CJ 2012 Conference Planning Committee
7. Selection of the Commencement Poem Judging Committee
8. Review of the agenda of the February 24 College Council meeting
9. Consideration of a candidate for an Honorary Degree: Professor Amy Green, Member, Committee on Honorary Degrees
10. Gen Ed Revision Update: Professor Amy Green, Chair, Gen Ed Steering Committee
11. Proposed Strategies for JJ's 5-Year Master Plan
12. Budget Update
13. 80th Street "Draft Resolution on Creating an Efficient Transfer System"
14. Invited Guest: Provost Bowers

1. **Announcement & Reports [Attachment A]**

2. **Adoption of the Agenda**

The Senate approved a change in the agenda to add consideration of a candidate for an honorary degree. With that change, adoption of the agenda was approved.

3. **Adoption of Minutes #367 of the February 10, 2011, meeting.** Approved.

4. **Election by the Senate to fill to 2 vacant at-large seats on the Faculty Senate**

A call for nominations was sent to the full-time faculty for candidates to fill the two vacant seats on the Faculty Senate occasioned by the retirements from the College of Professors Marvie Brooks and Tom Litwack. By written secret ballot, the Senate elected Professors Demis Glasford (Psychology) and Veronica Hendrick (English).

5. **Election to fill 1 vacant seat on the College Council from among the newly elected Senators**

By written secret ballot, the Senate then elected Veronica Hendrick to fill the vacant seat on the College Council, occasioned by the retirement of Professor Brooks.

6. **Election of an additional faculty member to serve on the International Criminal Justice 2012 Planning Committee**

At the recommendation of the Senate Executive Committee, the Senate elected Professor Veronica Hendrick to serve as the eighth faculty member on the International Criminal Justice 2012 Conference Planning Committee. The other seven members had been elected at the Senate's previous meeting.

7. **Selection of the Commencement Poem Judging Committee**

The following Senators volunteered to serve on the Senate ad hoc committee that will blind judge the poems written and submitted by faculty and will recommend to the Senate the poem

that is to be read by the author at the June 3 commencement exercises. The three are Senators Ben Bierman, Elise Champeil, and James DiGiovanna.

8. Review of the agenda of the February 24 College Council meeting [Attachment B]

The Senate reviewed the proposal from the Faculty Senate [Attachment B] to amend the College's Charter so that the procedure we have followed for more than 40 years of considering candidates for promotion to full professor, beginning at the department P&B committee level, can continue to be the procedure we follow. This will be a first reading at the College Council without a vote as required by the process for amending the Charter; a second reading and a vote will take place at the March meeting of the College Council.

Other agenda items are a proposal to revise the B.A. in Forensic Psychology; a resolution on the Honors Program; a proposal to revise the College's Incomplete Grade Policy; a proposal on the eligibility of transfer students for graduation awards; proposals for nine new undergraduate courses and for revisions of three undergraduate courses; and a proposal to change the admissions requirements for the Forensic Computing Program.

9. Consideration of a candidate for an Honorary Degree: Professor Amy Green, Member, Committee on Honorary Degrees

The Senate went into executive session to consider a candidate for an honorary degree. Professor Amy Green, a member of the Committee on Honorary Degrees, presented the candidate, Pulitzer Prize-winning playwright Tony Kushner, author of *Angels in America*, among many other works. By secret ballot, the Faculty Senate voted to recommend to President Travis that Tony Kushner receive an honorary degree from our College; the nomination received the requisite affirmative vote of at least 75% of those Senators present and voting.

10. Gen Ed Revision: Professor Amy Green, Chair, Gen Ed Steering Committee [Attachment C]

Professor Amy Green, Chair, Gen Ed Steering Committee provided the Senate with an update on the Steering Committee's work and distributed to the Senate the comments posted on the Gen Ed Steering Committee's website: the deadline for comments about the Gen Ed revision proposal was February 14 [Attachment C].

11. Strategies for JJ's 5-Year Master Plan [Attachment D, E]

The Council of Chairs the previous day discussed the draft strategies for John Jay's 5-year Master Plan [Attachment D]. The Chairs then issued a statement adopted by unanimous vote [Attachment E]. After discussion and deliberation, the Senate passed the following motion by unanimous vote: The Faculty Senate supports the Master Plan and recognizes the important points and concerns raised by the Council of Chairs in its document of February 22, 2011. The Senate recommends that actions be developed to accompany the strategies because without those actions the strategies are not clearly defined. The Senate also recommends that those who will have to implement the actions and, thus, the strategies, be consulted in the development of those actions.

12. Budget Update [Attachments F & G]

The budget situation was reviewed.

13. 80th Street "Draft Resolution on Creating an Efficient Transfer System" [Attachment H]

CUNY Executive Vice Chancellor Lexa Logue has issued a "Draft Resolution on Creating an Efficient Transfer System" [Attachment H]. This resolution was originally scheduled for a vote by the CUNY Board of Trustees (BoT) in January but the University Faculty Senate Executive Committee persuaded VC Logue to postpone the vote until the June meeting of the BoT so that the faculties of the various colleges can comment.

14. Invited Guest: Provost Jane Bowers [Attachment I]

Provost Bowers was welcomed. President Kaplowitz drew the Senate's attention to a memo from the Provost, dated December 2, which was included in the agenda packet [Attachment I] and explained that today's is a preliminary discussion to hear the Provost's concerns and proposals and that the Senate would further discuss the issues at a subsequent meeting.

Provost Bowers proposed that the College have a policy of regular office hours for faculty, noting that there are no policies at the University, the College, or in the collective bargaining agreement about office hours. Several senators suggested virtual hours, noting that a faculty member's accessibility to her/his students is more important than that faculty member's presence in an office at a given time, a time during which none of the students might be free.

Provost Bowers said she would rethink this and submit a revised proposal to the Senate. She then spoke about the need for early intervention and the idea of mid-semester grades. It was noted that mid-semester grades would work if the drop date were much earlier in the semester; other campuses that have tried mid-term grades have reported mass dropping of courses by students because the mid-term grades were issued prior to the drop-without-penalty date. But the drop date cannot be made earlier because of financial aid regulations. Provost Bowers said the most important part of her proposal is early intervention because students really take seriously a call from an official of the College about the student's academic performance in a course.

Because of lack of time, the Provost was not able to discuss her concerns about the need for transparency of grading criteria on syllabi. She offered to discuss this with President Kaplowitz, who can then report to the Senate.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:15 pm.

ATTACHMENT A

Announcements

CUNY Pre-Tenure Year Review Policy to be voted by the Board of Trustees on February 28:

The following policy, upon being approved by the Board of Trustees on February 28, will become effective March 1, 2011:

"In order to ensure that each tenure-track faculty member has adequate guidance on the progress he/she is making towards meeting the standards for tenure, the school, divisional or other appropriate dean or academic administrator designated by the President (hereinafter the "Dean") shall review each such faculty member at the end of his or her third year of service.

"The Dean shall review the personal personnel file of each untenured tenure-track faculty member in the spring of his/her third year of service, following the annual evaluation conducted pursuant to the PSC/CUNY collective bargaining agreement. Thereafter, the Dean shall meet with the chairperson of the faculty member's department to discuss the faculty member's progress. After that meeting, the Dean shall prepare a memorandum to the department chairperson regarding the faculty member's progress toward tenure and setting forth recommendations for any additional guidance to be provided to the faculty member.

"The Dean's memorandum shall be provided to the faculty member and discussed with him/her by the department chairperson and/or the Dean. Following the meeting, the Dean may, where appropriate, attach an addendum to the memorandum based on the Dean's participation in the meeting or the department chairperson's report of the meeting to the Dean. In accordance with the procedures set forth in the collective bargaining agreement between the University and the Professional Staff Congress, the faculty member shall be asked to initial the Dean's memorandum and addendum, if any, before it is placed in his/her file, and the faculty member shall have the right to include in his/her personnel file any comments he or she has concerning the Dean's memorandum.

"The appropriate body at each college may adopt implementation procedures that are consistent with this policy. Such procedures may provide, for example, whether the discussion of the Dean's memorandum with the faculty member will be conducted by the department chairperson, the Dean or both and whether the faculty member may have a choice in the matter. In addition, notwithstanding the provision as to the timing of the review set forth above, a college governance body may chose [sic] to provide for this review more than once prior to the year of tenure decision, in which case the review shall occur at appropriate intervals and not necessarily at the end of the third year."

"EXPLANATION: In recognition of the fact that faculty candidates for tenure consideration often benefit from additional feedback concerning their candidacy, this policy requires that academic deans review the progress of untenured tenure-track faculty members toward the end of their third year of service, in order to make sure that the candidates have adequate guidance concerning their progress toward tenure. A similar policy has been in effect at several CUNY campuses for a number of years and has proved useful in providing timely guidance to faculty members."

Middle States Self-Study Committees formed for JJ's 10-Year Reaccreditation Review

Workgroup 1: Measuring Up to our Mission

Standards: (1) Mission & Goals (7) Institutional Assessment

1. Allison Pease* (Co-Chair) English
2. James Llana (Co-Chair) Associate Provost for Institutional Effectiveness
3. Vivien Hoexter Office of Marketing and Development
4. Reggie Grayson Office of the President
5. Karen Rambharose Testing
6. Jamie Bridgewater, Student
7. Shy-Yuan (Demi) Cheng* Science
8. Gregory Umbach* History
9. James Cauthen* Political Science
10. Gerald Markowitz* History
11. Stephen Handelman Center on Media, Crime & Justice
- *Strategic Planning Subcommittee Liaison to the group is Professor Jay Hamilton*

Workgroup 2: Linking Planning and Resources on an Ongoing Basis

Standards: (2) Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal (3) Resources

1. Thomas Kucharski* (Co-chair) Psychology
2. Robert Pignatello (Co-Chair) Senior VP for Finance and Administration
3. Patricia Ketterer Business Office
4. Ben Rohdin Academic Affairs
5. Elizabeth McCabe Marketing and Development
6. James Sheridan Marketing and Development
7. Nayanny Bello, Student
8. Anthony Carpi* Science
9. Lisandro Perez* Latin American & Latina/o Studies
10. Bonnie Nelson* Library
11. Geert Dhondt* Economics
12. William Gottdiener* Psychology
- *Strategic Planning Subcommittee Liaison to the group is Professor Ned Benton.*

Workgroup 3: Governance and Integrity

Standards: (4) Leadership and Governance (5) Administration (6) Integrity

1. Angela Crossman* Psychology
 2. Rose Marie Maldonado (Co-chair) Office of President
 2. Wayne Edwards Student Development
 4. Jerylle Kemp Marketing and Development
 5. Marisol Marrero One Stop Services
 6. Adam McKible* Invited 05/12/10 English
 7. Mayra Nieves Office of the President
 8. Dasheen Evans, Student
 9. Gloria Browne-Marshall* Law and Police Science
 10. Amie Macdonald* Philosophy
 11. Erica King-Toler* SEEK
 12. John Staines* English
- *Strategic Planning Subcommittee Liaison to the group is Professor Karen Kaplowitz.*

Workgroup 4: Serving Students, On and Off Campus

Standards: (8) Admissions & Retention (9) Student Support Services (13) Related Educational Activities

1. Bettina Carbonell* (Co-chair) English
 2. Richard Saulnier (Co-chair) VP for Enrollment Management
 3. Lisa Farrington* (Co-chair) Art & Music
 4. Berenecea Johnson-Eanes Student Development
 5. Sumaya Villanueva Academic Advisement Center
 6. Vielka Holness Pre Law Institute
 7. Ma'at Lewis* Counseling
 8. Domenick Brucculeri, Student
 9. Dara Byrne* Communication and Theater Arts
 10. Adam Scott Wandt* Public Management
 11. Jennifer Dysart* Psychology
 12. Gail Garfield* Sociology
- *Strategic Planning Subcommittee Liaison to the group is Professor Karen Kaplowitz.*

Workgroup 5: The John Jay Faculty

Standards: (10) Faculty

1. Avram Bornstein* (Co-chair) Anthropology
2. Jannette Domingo (Co-chair) Dean, Graduate & Professional Studies
3. Karen Terry Academic Affairs
4. Meghan Duffy Center for the Advancement of Teaching
5. Kevin Nesbitt Academic Affairs
6. William Pangburn Instructional Technology Support Services
7. Vipul Rana, Student

8. Katie Gentile* Women's Center
 9. Carmen Solis* SEEK
 10. Lucia Trimbur* Sociology
 11. Raul Rubio* Foreign Languages
 12. Arkee Hodges* - Invited 08/10/10 African American Studies
- *Strategic Planning Subcommittee Liaison to the group is Professor Harold Sullivan.*

Workgroup 6: The Educational Program and Student Learning

Standards: (11) Educational Offerings (12) General Education (14) Assessment

1. Anne Lopes (Co-chair) Undergraduate Studies
 2. Michael Lieppe* (Co-chair) Psychology
 3. Larry Sullivan* Library
 4. Katalin Szur First Year Experience
 5. Kathy Killoran Undergraduate Studies
 6. David Barnett Undergraduate Studies
 7. Ammarah Karim, Student
 8. Nathan Lents* Science
 9. Amy Green* Communication & Theater Arts
 10. Diana Falkenbach* Psychology
 11. John Bryk* Email request for mat. 5/19/10 Mathematics & Computer Science
 12. Tara Pauliny* English
- *Strategic Planning Subcommittee Liaison to the group is Professor Francis Sheehan.*

April 7 Town Meeting to be devoted to Phase II issues:

The April 7 Town Meeting, which is from 4:40-6 pm, will be devoted to questions and comments about the new building.

Faculty Development Day has been rescheduled

Faculty Development Day, which was cancelled because of the blizzard that led to the shutdown of the College, has been rescheduled for August 26, from 10 am-4 pm. Annual leave contractually ends on Tuesday, August 24; the first day that faculty are contractually required to be available for meetings and teaching is August 26. The first day of classes is Friday, August 27.

John Jay invited to participate in the CUNY McCauley Honors Program

John Jay has been invited to participate in the CUNY McCauley Honors Program. There are 7 senior colleges that participate and when John Jay's participation is begun there will be 8.

Commencement is on June 3

Commencement is on June 3 at Jacob Javits North, a new facility at 40 St. and 11 Ave.

Faculty who do not own academic robes will have to rent or buy prior to commencement; Josten's will not permit rented or purchases academic robes and caps to be picked up on the day of Commencement this year.



The City University of New York

Fall 2010 Enrollment Report

ATTACHMENT A A

Office of Institutional Research and Assessment

November 18, 2010

The City University of New York
Office of Institutional Research and Assessment

Fall 2010 Enrollment Report

Table of Contents

Table 1.	Total University Summary	1
Table 2.	Total Headcount Enrollment	2
Table 3.	Undergraduate Headcount Enrollment	3
Table 4.	Graduate Headcount Enrollment	4
Table 5A.	Undergraduate Headcount Enrollment - Full-time Status	5
Table 5B.	Undergraduate Headcount Enrollment - Part-time Status	6
Table 6A.	Graduate Headcount Enrollment - Full-time Status	7
Table 6B.	Graduate Headcount Enrollment - Part-time Status	8
Table 7.	Total Full-time Equivalent (FTE) Student Enrollment	9
Table 8.	Undergraduate Full-time Equivalent (FTE) Student Enrollment	10
Table 9.	Graduate Full-time Equivalent (FTE) Student Enrollment	11
Table 10A.	First-time Freshmen - Total	12
Table 10B.	First-time Freshmen - Regular	13
Table 10C.	First-time Freshmen - SEEK/CD	14
Table 11.	Advanced Standing Transfers	15
Table 12.	First-time Graduate Matriculants	16
Table 13A.	Undergraduate Headcount Enrollment - Total Degree	17
Table 13B.	Undergraduate Headcount Enrollment - Regular Degree	18
Table 13C.	Undergraduate Headcount Enrollment - SEEK/CD Degree	19
Table 13D.	Undergraduate Headcount Enrollment - Total Nondegree	20
Table 13E.	Undergraduate Headcount Enrollment - Nondegree (Excluding High School Students)	21
Table 13F.	Undergraduate Headcount Enrollment - High School (Nondegree)	22
Table 14A.	Graduate Headcount Enrollment - Degree	23
Table 14B.	Graduate Headcount Enrollment - Nondegree	24

Table 1. Total University Summary

	Enrollment			Percentage Change:	
	Fall 2010 Actual	Fall 2010 Preliminary	Fall 2009 Actual	Fall 2010 Preliminary	Fall 2009 Actual
Senior Colleges					
Undergraduate					
Headcount	137,220	138,067	137,502	-0.6	-0.2
FTE's	106,277	107,157	106,247	-0.8	0.0
Freshmen	17,322	17,457	20,019	-0.8	-13.5
Transfers	13,853	13,896	15,218	-0.3	-9.0
Graduate					
Headcount	33,837	33,729	33,243	0.3	1.8
FTE's	21,178	21,179	20,659	0.0	2.5
Total Senior					
Headcount	171,057	171,796	170,745	-0.4	0.2
FTE's	127,455	128,336	126,906	-0.7	0.4
Freshmen	17,322	17,457	20,019	-0.8	-13.5
Transfers	13,853	13,896	15,218	-0.3	-9.0
Community Colleges					
Headcount	91,333	91,340	88,770	0.0	2.9
FTE's	68,549	68,364	66,023	0.3	3.8
Freshmen	17,546	17,135	17,222	2.4	1.9
Transfers	4,828	5,582	7,312	-13.5	-34.0
TOTAL UNIVERSITY					
Headcount	262,390	263,136	259,515	-0.3	1.1
FTE's	196,004	196,700	192,929	-0.4	1.6
Freshmen	34,868	34,592	37,241	0.8	-6.4
Transfers	18,681	19,478	22,530	-4.1	-17.1

Table 2. Total Headcount Enrollment

	Enrollment			Percentage Change: Fall 2010 Actual Compared With	
	Fall 2010 Actual	Fall 2010 Preliminary	Fall 2009 Actual	Fall 2010 Preliminary	Fall 2009 Actual
Senior Colleges					
Baruch	17,063	16,795	16,195	1.6	5.4
Brooklyn	16,912	16,749	17,094	1.0	-1.1
City	15,416	15,675	16,212	-1.7	-4.9
Hunter	22,407	22,459	22,168	-0.2	1.1
John Jay	15,206	15,514	15,330	-2.0	-0.8
Lehman	12,115	12,077	12,195	0.3	-0.7
Medgar Evers	6,920	7,124	7,080	-2.9	-2.3
New York City College of Technology	15,366	15,409	15,399	-0.3	-0.2
Queens	20,906	20,966	20,711	-0.3	0.9
Staten Island	13,894	14,100	13,858	-1.5	0.3
York	7,821	7,756	7,780	0.8	0.5
Graduate School	4,642	4,742	4,625	-2.1	0.4
School of Journalism	169	168	144	0.6	17.4
School of Professional Studies	1,779	1,819	1,547	-2.2	15.0
Law School	441	443	407	-0.5	8.4
Total Senior	171,057	171,796	170,745	-0.4	0.2
Community Colleges					
Borough of Manhattan	22,534	22,580	21,424	-0.2	5.2
Bronx	10,740	10,896	10,420	-1.4	3.1
Hostos	6,499	6,405	6,187	1.5	5.0
Kingsborough*	18,809	18,409	18,204	2.2	3.3
LaGuardia**	17,435	17,750	17,028	-1.8	2.4
Queensborough	15,316	15,300	15,507	0.1	-1.2
Total Community	91,333	91,340	88,770	0.0	2.9
TOTAL UNIVERSITY	262,390	263,136	259,515	-0.3	1.1

* Actual Fall and estimated Winter.

** Preliminary Fall I and Fall II.

Table 3. Undergraduate Headcount Enrollment

	Enrollment			Percentage Change: Fall 2010 Actual Compared With	
	Fall 2010 Actual	Fall 2010 Preliminary	Fall 2009 Actual	Fall 2010 Preliminary	Fall 2009 Actual
Senior Colleges					
Baruch	13,120	12,937	12,332	1.4	6.4
Brooklyn	12,804	12,843	13,069	-0.3	-2.0
City	12,263	12,463	12,878	-1.6	-4.8
Hunter	15,684	15,826	15,884	-0.9	-1.3
John Jay	13,278	13,551	13,346	-2.0	-0.5
Lehman	9,841	9,800	9,720	0.4	1.2
Medgar Evers	6,920	7,124	7,080	-2.9	-2.3
New York City College of Technology	15,366	15,409	15,399	-0.3	-0.2
Queens	16,195	16,229	16,059	-0.2	0.8
Staten Island	12,829	13,018	12,886	-1.5	-0.4
York	7,784	7,721	7,732	0.8	0.7
School of Professional Studies	1,136	1,146	1,117	-0.9	1.7
Total Senior	137,220	138,067	137,502	-0.6	-0.2
Community Colleges					
Borough of Manhattan	22,534	22,580	21,424	-0.2	5.2
Bronx	10,740	10,896	10,420	-1.4	3.1
Hostos	6,499	6,405	6,187	1.5	5.0
Kingsborough*	18,809	18,409	18,204	2.2	3.3
LaGuardia**	17,435	17,750	17,028	-1.8	2.4
Queensborough	15,316	15,300	15,507	0.1	-1.2
Total Community	91,333	91,340	88,770	0.0	2.9
TOTAL UNIVERSITY	228,553	229,407	226,272	-0.4	1.0

*Actual Fall and estimated Winter.

**Preliminary Fall I and Fall II.

Table 4. Graduate Headcount Enrollment

	Enrollment			Percentage Change: Fall 2010 Actual Compared With	
	Fall 2010 Actual	Fall 2010 Preliminary	Fall 2009 Actual	Fall 2010 Preliminary	Fall 2009 Actual
Senior Colleges					
Baruch	3,943	3,858	3,863	2.2	2.1
Brooklyn	4,108	3,906	4,025	5.2	2.1
City	3,153	3,212	3,334	-1.8	-5.4
Hunter	6,723	6,633	6,284	1.4	7.0
John Jay	1,928	1,963	1,984	-1.8	-2.8
Lehman	2,274	2,277	2,475	-0.1	-8.1
Queens	4,711	4,737	4,652	-0.5	1.3
Staten Island	1,065	1,082	972	-1.6	9.6
York	37	35	48	5.7	-22.9
Graduate School	4,642	4,742	4,625	-2.1	0.4
School of Journalism	169	168	144	0.6	17.4
School of Professional Studies	643	673	430	-4.5	49.5
Law School	441	443	407	-0.5	8.4
TOTAL GRADUATE	33,837	33,729	33,243	0.3	1.8

Table 5A. Undergraduate Headcount Enrollment - Full-time Status

	Percentage Change:				
	Fall 2010 Actual Compared With				
	Fall 2010 Actual	Enrollment Fall 2010 Preliminary	Fall 2009 Actual	Fall 2010 Preliminary	Fall 2009 Actual
Senior Colleges					
Baruch	10,018	9,871	9,473	1.5	5.8
Brooklyn	9,054	9,162	9,268	-1.2	-2.3
City	9,313	9,420	9,636	-1.1	-3.4
Hunter	11,023	11,067	11,171	-0.4	-1.3
John Jay	10,035	10,183	10,383	-1.5	-3.4
Lehman	5,841	5,923	5,986	-1.4	-2.4
Medgar Evers	4,542	4,549	4,651	-0.2	-2.3
New York City College of Technology	9,297	9,466	9,130	-1.8	1.8
Queens	11,866	11,877	11,762	-0.1	0.9
Staten Island	9,502	9,717	9,231	-2.2	2.9
York	4,885	4,856	4,886	0.6	0.0
School of Professional Studies	284	284	206	0.0	37.9
Total Senior	95,660	96,375	95,783	-0.7	-0.1
Community Colleges					
Borough of Manhattan	14,658	15,009	14,009	-2.3	4.6
Bronx	6,192	6,324	6,016	-2.1	2.9
Hostos	3,768	3,730	3,504	1.0	7.5
Kingsborough*	11,311	10,761	10,621	5.1	6.5
LaGuardia**	10,095	9,965	9,623	1.3	4.9
Queensborough	9,276	9,401	8,927	-1.3	3.9
Total Community	55,300	55,190	52,700	0.2	4.9
TOTAL UNIVERSITY	150,960	151,565	148,483	-0.4	1.7

*Actual Fall and estimated Winter.

**Preliminary Fall I and Fall II.

Table 5B. Undergraduate Headcount Enrollment - Part-time Status

	Percentage Change:				
	Enrollment			Fall 2010 Actual Compared With	
	Fall 2010 Actual	Fall 2010 Preliminary	Fall 2009 Actual	Fall 2010 Preliminary	Fall 2009 Actual
Senior Colleges					
Baruch	3,102	3,066	2,859	1.2	8.5
Brooklyn	3,750	3,681	3,801	1.9	-1.3
City	2,950	3,043	3,242	-3.1	-9.0
Hunter	4,661	4,759	4,713	-2.1	-1.1
John Jay	3,243	3,368	2,963	-3.7	9.4
Lehman	4,000	3,877	3,734	3.2	7.1
Medgar Evers	2,378	2,575	2,429	-7.7	-2.1
New York City College of Technology	6,069	5,943	6,269	2.1	-3.2
Queens	4,329	4,352	4,297	-0.5	0.7
Staten Island	3,327	3,301	3,655	0.8	-9.0
York	2,899	2,865	2,846	1.2	1.9
School of Professional Studies	852	862	911	-1.2	-6.5
Total Senior	41,560	41,692	41,719	-0.3	-0.4
Community Colleges					
Borough of Manhattan	7,876	7,571	7,415	4.0	6.2
Bronx	4,548	4,572	4,404	-0.5	3.3
Hostos	2,731	2,675	2,683	2.1	1.8
Kingsborough*	7,498	7,648	7,583	-2.0	-1.1
LaGuardia**	7,340	7,785	7,405	-5.7	-0.9
Queensborough	6,040	5,899	6,580	2.4	-8.2
Total Community	36,033	36,150	36,070	-0.3	-0.1
TOTAL UNIVERSITY	77,593	77,842	77,789	-0.3	-0.3

*Actual Fall and estimated Winter.

**Preliminary Fall I and Fall II.

Table 6A. Graduate Headcount Enrollment - Full-time Status

	Enrollment			Percentage Change: Fall 2010 Actual Compared With	
	Fall 2010 Actual	Fall 2010 Preliminary	Fall 2009 Actual	Fall 2010 Preliminary	Fall 2009 Actual
Senior Colleges					
Baruch	1,032	987	906	4.6	13.9
Brooklyn	601	610	607	-1.5	-1.0
City	450	458	373	-1.7	20.6
Hunter	1,380	1,384	1,442	-0.3	-4.3
John Jay	417	434	442	-3.9	-5.7
Lehman	298	301	271	-1.0	10.0
Queens	533	531	510	0.4	4.5
Staten Island	124	131	95	-5.3	30.5
York	37	35	44	5.7	-15.9
Graduate School	4,191	4,262	4,202	-1.7	-0.3
School of Journalism	162	158	141	2.5	14.9
School of Professional Studies	24	24	14	0.0	71.4
Law School	439	440	407	-0.2	7.9
TOTAL GRADUATE	9,688	9,755	9,454	-0.7	2.5

Table 6B. Graduate Headcount Enrollment - Part-time Status

	Enrollment			Percentage Change: Fall 2010 Actual Compared With	
	Fall 2010	Fall 2010	Fall 2009	Fall 2010	Fall 2009
	Actual	Preliminary	Actual	Preliminary	Actual
Senior Colleges					
Baruch	2,911	2,871	2,957	1.4	-1.6
Brooklyn	3,507	3,296	3,418	6.4	2.6
City	2,703	2,754	2,961	-1.9	-8.7
Hunter	5,343	5,249	4,842	1.8	10.3
John Jay	1,511	1,529	1,542	-1.2	-2.0
Lehman	1,976	1,976	2,204	0.0	-10.3
Queens	4,178	4,206	4,142	-0.7	0.9
Staten Island	941	951	877	-1.1	7.3
York	0	0	4	0.0	-100.0
Graduate School	451	480	423	-6.0	6.6
School of Journalism	7	10	3	-30.0	133.3
School of Professional Studies	619	649	416	-4.6	48.8
Law School	2	3	0	-33.3	...
TOTAL GRADUATE	24,149	23,974	23,789	0.7	1.5

Table 7. Total Full-time Equivalent (FTE) Student Enrollment

	Enrollment		Percentage Change:	
	Fall 2010 Actual	Fall 2010 Preliminary	Fall 2010 Actual Compared With Preliminary	Fall 2009 Actual
Senior Colleges				
Baruch	13,489	13,292	1.5	5.5
Brooklyn	12,385	12,431	-0.4	-1.3
City	11,647	11,844	-1.7	-1.9
Hunter	16,120	16,261	-0.9	0.0
John Jay	11,686	11,900	-1.8	-3.0
Lehman	8,357	8,466	-1.3	-0.8
Medgar Evers	5,279	5,345	-1.2	-1.4
New York City College of Technology	11,218	11,281	-0.6	0.6
Queens	15,639	15,790	-1.0	1.5
Staten Island	10,829	10,909	-0.7	1.7
York	5,604	5,596	0.1	0.8
Graduate School	3,671	3,692	-0.6	0.1
School of Journalism	208	195	6.7	15.6
School of Professional Studies	790	797	-0.9	22.5
Law School	533	537	-0.7	4.1
Total Senior	127,455	128,336	-0.7	0.4
Community Colleges				
Borough of Manhattan	16,955	17,028	-0.4	3.7
Bronx	7,794	8,038	-3.0	3.4
Hostos	4,653	4,595	1.3	6.8
Kingsborough*	14,414	14,087	2.3	3.6
LaGuardia**	13,726	13,445	2.1	5.1
Queensborough	11,007	11,171	-1.5	1.9
Total Community	68,549	68,364	0.3	3.8
TOTAL UNIVERSITY	196,004	196,700	-0.4	1.6

*Actual Fall and estimated Winter.

**Preliminary Fall I and Fall II.

Table 8. Undergraduate Full-time Equivalent (FTE) Student Enrollment

	Enrollment			Percentage Change: Fall 2010 Actual Compared With	
	Fall 2010	Fall 2010	Fall 2009	Fall 2010	Fall 2009
	Actual	Preliminary	Actual	Preliminary	Actual
Senior Colleges					
Baruch	10,856	10,723	10,294	1.2	5.5
Brooklyn	10,116	10,152	10,260	-0.4	-1.4
City	9,809	9,956	10,082	-1.5	-2.7
Hunter	12,006	12,176	12,126	-1.4	-1.0
John Jay	10,483	10,697	10,813	-2.0	-3.1
Lehman	7,051	7,134	7,078	-1.2	-0.4
Medgar Evers	5,279	5,345	5,355	-1.2	-1.4
New York City College of Technology	11,218	11,281	11,146	-0.6	0.6
Queens	13,081	13,207	12,930	-1.0	1.2
Staten Island	10,236	10,367	10,136	-1.3	1.0
York	5,589	5,577	5,539	0.2	0.9
School of Professional Studies	553	542	488	2.0	13.3
Total Senior	106,277	107,157	106,247	-0.8	0.0
Community Colleges					
Borough of Manhattan	16,955	17,028	16,350	-0.4	3.7
Bronx	7,794	8,038	7,539	-3.0	3.4
Hostos	4,653	4,595	4,356	1.3	6.8
Kingsborough*	14,414	14,087	13,910	2.3	3.6
LaGuardia**	13,726	13,445	13,064	2.1	5.1
Queensborough	11,007	11,171	10,804	-1.5	1.9
Total Community	68,549	68,364	66,023	0.3	3.8
TOTAL UNIVERSITY	174,826	175,521	172,270	-0.4	1.5

*Actual Fall and estimated Winter.

**Preliminary Fall I and Fall II.

Table 9. Graduate Full-time Equivalent (FTE) Student Enrollment

	Fall 2010 Actual	Enrollment Fall 2010 Preliminary	Fall 2009 Actual	Percentage Change: Fall 2010 Actual Compared With	
				Fall 2010 Preliminary	Fall 2009 Actual
Senior Colleges					
Baruch	2,633	2,569	2,490	2.5	5.7
Brooklyn	2,269	2,279	2,289	-0.4	-0.9
City	1,838	1,888	1,787	-2.6	2.9
Hunter	4,114	4,085	3,989	0.7	3.1
John Jay	1,203	1,203	1,229	0.0	-2.1
Lehman	1,306	1,332	1,345	-2.0	-2.9
Queens	2,558	2,583	2,480	-1.0	3.1
Staten Island	593	542	512	9.4	15.8
York	15	19	22	-21.1	-31.8
Graduate School	3,671	3,692	3,667	-0.6	0.1
School of Journalism	208	195	180	6.7	15.6
School of Professional Studies	237	255	157	-7.1	51.0
Law School	533	537	512	-0.7	4.1
TOTAL GRADUATE	21,178	21,179	20,659	0.0	2.5

Table 10A. First-time Freshmen - Total

	Enrollment			Percentage Change: Fall 2010 Actual Compared With	
	Fall 2010 Actual	Fall 2010 Preliminary	Fall 2009 Actual	Fall 2010 Preliminary	Fall 2009 Actual
Senior Colleges					
Baruch	1,260	1,279	1,442	-1.5	-12.6
Brooklyn	1,157	1,170	977	-1.1	18.4
City	1,389	1,408	1,773	-1.3	-21.7
Hunter	1,788	1,795	2,028	-0.4	-11.8
John Jay	2,015	2,002	2,872	0.6	-29.8
Lehman	641	642	773	-0.2	-17.1
Medgar Evers	1,188	1,226	1,378	-3.1	-13.8
New York City College of Technology	2,930	2,930	3,251	0.0	-9.9
Queens	1,491	1,493	1,712	-0.1	-12.9
Staten Island	2,342	2,381	2,688	-1.6	-12.9
York	1,103	1,117	1,045	-1.3	5.6
School of Professional Studies	18	14	80	28.6	-77.5
Total Senior	17,322	17,457	20,019	-0.8	-13.5
Community Colleges					
Borough of Manhattan	5,176	5,141	4,301	0.7	20.3
Bronx	1,911	1,931	2,056	-1.0	-7.1
Hostos	1,073	1,079	1,178	-0.6	-8.9
Kingsborough*	2,939	2,860	3,111	2.8	-5.5
LaGuardia**	3,238	2,800	2,871	15.6	12.8
Queensborough	3,209	3,324	3,705	-3.5	-13.4
Total Community	17,546	17,135	17,222	2.4	1.9
TOTAL UNIVERSITY	34,868	34,592	37,241	0.8	-6.4

* Actual Fall and estimated Winter.

** Preliminary Fall I and Fall II.

Table 10B. First-time Freshmen - Regular

	Enrollment			Percentage Change: Fall 2010 Actual Compared With	
	Fall 2010 Actual	Fall 2010 Preliminary	Fall 2009 Actual	Fall 2010 Preliminary	Fall 2009 Actual
Senior Colleges					
Baruch	1,105	1,124	1,330	-1.7	-16.9
Brooklyn	909	920	756	-1.2	20.2
City	1,230	1,256	1,609	-2.1	-23.6
Hunter	1,706	1,714	1,938	-0.5	-12.0
John Jay	1,622	1,606	2,544	1.0	-36.2
Lehman	440	441	607	-0.2	-27.5
Medgar Evers	1,013	1,052	1,251	-3.7	-19.0
New York City College of Technology	2,523	2,480	2,840	1.7	-11.2
Queens	1,252	1,256	1,493	-0.3	-16.1
Staten Island	2,166	2,201	2,499	-1.6	-13.3
York	905	919	829	-1.5	9.2
School of Professional Studies	18	14	80	28.6	-77.5
Total Senior	14,889	14,983	17,776	-0.6	-16.2
Community Colleges					
Borough of Manhattan	4,793	4,761	4,025	0.7	19.1
Bronx	1,674	1,679	1,878	-0.3	-10.9
Hostos	1,020	1,032	1,124	-1.2	-9.3
Kingsborough*	2,766	2,642	2,873	4.7	-3.7
LaGuardia**	2,897	2,590	2,651	11.9	9.3
Queensborough	3,042	3,110	3,534	-2.2	-13.9
Total Community	16,192	15,814	16,085	2.4	0.7
TOTAL UNIVERSITY	31,081	30,797	33,861	0.9	-8.2

*Actual Fall and estimated Winter.

**Preliminary Fall I and Fall II.

Table 10C. First-time Freshmen - SEEK/CD

	Enrollment			Percentage Change: Fall 2010 Actual Compared With	
	Fall 2010 Actual	Fall 2010 Preliminary	Fall 2009 Actual	Fall 2010 Preliminary	Fall 2009 Actual
Senior Colleges					
Baruch	155	155	112	0.0	38.4
Brooklyn	248	250	221	-0.8	12.2
City	159	152	164	4.6	-3.0
Hunter	82	81	90	1.2	-8.9
John Jay	393	396	328	-0.8	19.8
Lehman	201	201	166	0.0	21.1
Medgar Evers	175	174	127	0.6	37.8
New York City College of Technology	407	450	411	-9.6	-1.0
Queens	239	237	219	0.8	9.1
Staten Island	176	180	189	-2.2	-6.9
York	198	198	216	0.0	-8.3
School of Professional Studies	0	0	0	0.0	0.0
Total Senior	2,433	2,474	2,243	-1.7	8.5
Community Colleges					
Borough of Manhattan	383	380	276	-0.8	38.8
Bronx	237	252	178	-6.0	33.1
Hostos	53	47	54	12.8	-1.9
Kingsborough*	173	218	238	-20.6	-27.3
LaGuardia**	341	210	220	62.4	55.0
Queensborough	167	214	171	-22.0	-2.3
Total Community	1,354	1,321	1,137	2.5	19.1
TOTAL UNIVERSITY	3,787	3,795	3,380	-0.2	12.0

* Actual Fall and estimated Winter.

** Preliminary Fall I and Fall II.

Table 11. Advanced Standing Transfers

	Enrollment			Percentage Change: Fall 2010 Actual Compared With	
	Fall 2010 Actual	Fall 2010 Preliminary	Fall 2009 Actual	Fall 2010 Preliminary	Fall 2009 Actual
Senior Colleges					
Baruch	1,595	1,610	1,260	-0.9	26.6
Brooklyn	1,449	1,481	1,759	-2.2	-17.6
City	970	1,030	1,517	-5.8	-36.1
Hunter	1,663	1,675	1,540	-0.7	8.0
John Jay	1,167	1,176	1,193	-0.8	-2.2
Lehman	1,169	1,181	1,255	-1.0	-6.9
Medgar Evers	389	405	779	-4.0	-50.1
New York City College of Technology	1,055	1,050	1,045	0.5	1.0
Queens	1,896	1,902	2,305	-0.3	-17.7
Staten Island	1,537	1,389	1,489	10.7	3.2
York	633	647	833	-2.2	-24.0
School of Professional Studies	330	350	243	-5.7	35.8
Total Senior	13,853	13,896	15,218	-0.3	-9.0
Community Colleges					
Borough of Manhattan	621	600	1,013	3.5	-38.7
Bronx	586	595	975	-1.5	-39.9
Hostos	374	370	620	1.1	-39.7
Kingsborough*	1,568	1,907	2,129	-17.8	-26.4
LaGuardia**	1,069	1,500	1,473	-28.7	-27.4
Queensborough	610	610	1,102	0.0	-44.6
Total Community	4,828	5,582	7,312	-13.5	-34.0
TOTAL UNIVERSITY	18,681	19,478	22,530	-4.1	-17.1

* Actual Fall and estimated Winter.

** Preliminary Fall I and Fall II.

Table 12. First-time Graduate Matriculants

	Enrollment			Percentage Change: Fall 2010 Actual Compared With	
	Fall 2010 Actual	Fall 2010 Preliminary	Fall 2009 Actual	Fall 2010 Preliminary	Fall 2009 Actual
Senior Colleges					
Baruch	1,229	1,240	1,245	-0.9	-1.3
Brooklyn	1,155	1,086	1,249	6.4	-7.5
City	806	822	838	-1.9	-3.8
Hunter	1,548	1,449	1,406	6.8	10.1
John Jay	495	496	582	-0.2	-14.9
Lehman	624	633	613	-1.4	1.8
Queens	1,440	1,449	1,437	-0.6	0.2
Staten Island	309	315	302	-1.9	2.3
York	0	0	0	0.0	0.0
Graduate School	721	729	698	-1.1	3.3
School of Journalism	90	90	83	0.0	8.4
School of Professional Studies	264	320	210	-17.5	25.7
Law School	164	164	161	0.0	1.9
TOTAL GRADUATE	8,845	8,793	8,824	0.6	0.2

Table 13A. Undergraduate Headcount Enrollment - Total Degree

	Enrollment			Percentage Change: Fall 2010 Actual Compared With	
	Fall 2010 Actual	Fall 2010 Preliminary	Fall 2009 Actual	Fall 2010 Preliminary	Fall 2009 Actual
Senior Colleges					
Baruch	12,802	12,680	12,080	1.0	6.0
Brooklyn	11,740	11,848	12,021	-0.9	-2.3
City	11,682	11,990	12,273	-2.6	-4.8
Hunter	14,609	14,687	14,685	-0.5	-0.5
John Jay	12,821	13,082	13,170	-2.0	-2.6
Lehman	8,810	9,012	8,821	-2.2	-0.1
Medgar Evers	6,514	6,723	6,755	-3.1	-3.6
New York City College of Technology	14,503	14,600	14,366	-0.7	1.0
Queens	15,337	15,408	15,270	-0.5	0.4
Staten Island	12,454	12,702	12,578	-2.0	-1.0
York	7,022	7,078	6,918	-0.8	1.5
School of Professional Studies	1,002	1,014	904	-1.2	10.8
Total Senior	129,296	130,824	129,841	-1.2	-0.4
Community Colleges					
Borough of Manhattan	22,026	21,992	20,871	0.2	5.5
Bronx	10,347	10,558	10,131	-2.0	2.1
Hostos	5,850	5,863	5,502	-0.2	6.3
Kingsborough*	14,936	14,658	14,217	1.9	5.1
LaGuardia**	15,526	15,620	14,912	-0.6	4.1
Queensborough	13,771	13,935	13,776	-1.2	0.0
Total Community	82,456	82,626	79,409	-0.2	3.8
TOTAL UNIVERSITY	211,752	213,450	209,250	-0.8	1.2

* Actual Fall and estimated Winter.

** Preliminary Fall I and Fall II.

Table 13B. Undergraduate Headcount Enrollment - Regular Degree

	Enrollment			Percentage Change: Fall 2010 Actual Compared With	
	Fall 2010 Actual	Fall 2010 Preliminary	Fall 2009 Actual	Fall 2010 Preliminary	Fall 2009 Actual
Senior Colleges					
Baruch	12,131	12,019	11,491	0.9	5.6
Brooklyn	10,828	10,925	11,167	-0.9	-3.0
City	10,879	11,195	11,397	-2.8	-4.5
Hunter	14,081	14,166	14,141	-0.6	-0.4
John Jay	11,633	11,883	12,098	-2.1	-3.8
Lehman	7,882	8,077	7,870	-2.4	0.2
Medgar Evers	6,055	6,269	6,357	-3.4	-4.8
New York City College of Technology	13,446	13,500	13,316	-0.4	1.0
Queens	14,260	14,351	14,300	-0.6	-0.3
Staten Island	11,879	12,114	12,039	-1.9	-1.3
York	6,303	6,351	6,191	-0.8	1.8
School of Professional Studies	1,002	1,014	904	-1.2	10.8
Total Senior	120,379	121,864	121,271	-1.2	-0.7
Community Colleges					
Borough of Manhattan	21,271	21,232	20,248	0.2	5.1
Bronx	9,875	10,048	9,684	-1.7	2.0
Hostos	5,690	5,700	5,334	-0.2	6.7
Kingsborough*	14,454	14,177	13,740	2.0	5.2
LaGuardia**	14,772	15,000	14,332	-1.5	3.1
Queensborough	13,379	13,476	13,389	-0.7	-0.1
Total Community	79,441	79,633	76,727	-0.2	3.5
TOTAL UNIVERSITY	199,820	201,497	197,998	-0.8	0.9

* Actual Fall and estimated Winter.

** Preliminary Fall I and Fall II.

Table 13C. Undergraduate Headcount Enrollment - SEEK/CD Degree

	Enrollment			Percentage Change: Fall 2010 Actual Compared With	
	Fall 2010 Actual	Fall 2010 Preliminary	Fall 2009 Actual	Fall 2010 Preliminary	Fall 2009 Actual
Senior Colleges					
Baruch	671	661	589	1.5	13.9
Brooklyn	912	923	854	-1.2	6.8
City	803	795	876	1.0	-8.3
Hunter	528	521	544	1.3	-2.9
John Jay	1,188	1,199	1,072	-0.9	10.8
Lehman	928	935	951	-0.7	-2.4
Medgar Evers	459	454	398	1.1	15.3
New York City College of Technology	1,057	1,100	1,050	-3.9	0.7
Queens	1,077	1,057	970	1.9	11.0
Staten Island	575	588	539	-2.2	6.7
York	719	727	727	-1.1	-1.1
School of Professional Studies	0	0	0	0.0	0.0
Total Senior	8,917	8,960	8,570	-0.5	4.0
Community Colleges					
Borough of Manhattan	755	760	623	-0.7	21.2
Bronx	472	510	447	-7.5	5.6
Hostos	160	163	168	-1.8	-4.8
Kingsborough*	482	481	477	0.2	1.0
LaGuardia**	754	620	580	21.6	30.0
Queensborough	392	459	387	-14.6	1.3
Total Community	3,015	2,993	2,682	0.7	12.4
TOTAL UNIVERSITY	11,932	11,953	11,252	-0.2	6.0

* Actual Fall and estimated Winter.

** Preliminary Fall I and Fall II.

Table 13D. Undergraduate Headcount Enrollment - Total Nondegree

	Enrollment			Percentage Change: Fall 2010 Actual Compared With	
	Fall 2010 Actual	Fall 2010 Preliminary	Fall 2009 Actual	Fall 2010 Preliminary	Fall 2009 Actual
Senior Colleges					
Baruch	318	257	252	23.7	26.2
Brooklyn	1,064	995	1,048	6.9	1.5
City	581	473	605	22.8	-4.0
Hunter	1,075	1,139	1,199	-5.6	-10.3
John Jay	457	469	176	-2.6	159.7
Lehman	1,031	788	899	30.8	14.7
Medgar Evers	406	401	325	1.2	24.9
New York City College of Technology	863	809	1,033	6.7	-16.5
Queens	858	821	789	4.5	8.7
Staten Island	375	316	308	18.7	21.8
York	762	643	814	18.5	-6.4
School of Professional Studies	134	132	213	1.5	-37.1
Total Senior	7,924	7,243	7,661	9.4	3.4
Community Colleges					
Borough of Manhattan	508	588	553	-13.6	-8.1
Bronx	393	338	289	16.3	36.0
Hostos	649	542	685	19.7	-5.3
Kingsborough*	3,873	3,751	3,987	3.3	-2.9
LaGuardia**	1,909	2,130	2,116	-10.4	-9.8
Queensborough	1,545	1,365	1,731	13.2	-10.7
Total Community	8,877	8,714	9,361	1.9	-5.2
TOTAL UNIVERSITY	16,801	15,957	17,022	5.3	-1.3

* Actual Fall and estimated Winter.

** Preliminary Fall I and Fall II.

Table 13E. Undergraduate Headcount Enrollment - Nondegree (Excluding High School Students)

	Enrollment			Percentage Change: Fall 2010 Actual Compared With	
	Fall 2010 Actual	Fall 2010 Preliminary	Fall 2009 Actual	Fall 2010 Preliminary	Fall 2009 Actual
Senior Colleges					
Baruch	171	160	144	6.9	18.8
Brooklyn	443	435	467	1.8	-5.1
City	291	308	225	-5.5	29.3
Hunter	750	800	900	-6.3	-16.7
John Jay	110	69	97	59.4	13.4
Lehman	575	388	526	48.2	9.3
Medgar Evers	112	130	90	-13.8	24.4
New York City College of Technology	408	400	608	2.0	-32.9
Queens	236	224	228	5.4	3.5
Staten Island	82	76	128	-7.9	-35.9
York	118	123	105	-4.1	12.4
School of Professional Studies	134	132	213	1.5	-37.1
Total Senior	3,430	3,245	3,731	5.7	-8.1
Community Colleges					
Borough of Manhattan	249	288	232	-13.5	7.3
Bronx	86	88	80	-2.3	7.5
Hostos	82	42	55	95.2	49.1
Kingsborough*	618	535	770	15.5	-19.7
LaGuardia**	189	230	268	-17.8	-29.5
Queensborough	376	365	585	3.0	-35.7
Total Community	1,600	1,548	1,990	3.4	-19.6
TOTAL UNIVERSITY	5,030	4,793	5,721	4.9	-12.1

* Actual Fall and estimated Winter.

** Preliminary Fall I and Fall II.

Table 13F. Undergraduate Headcount Enrollment - High School (Nondegree)

	Enrollment			Percentage Change: Fall 2010 Actual Compared With	
	Fall 2010 Actual	Fall 2010 Preliminary	Fall 2009 Actual	Fall 2010 Preliminary	Fall 2009 Actual
Senior Colleges					
Baruch	147	97	108	51.5	36.1
Brooklyn	621	560	581	10.9	6.9
City	290	165	380	75.8	-23.7
Hunter	325	339	299	-4.1	8.7
John Jay	347	400	79	-13.3	339.2
Lehman	456	400	373	14.0	22.3
Medgar Evers	294	271	235	8.5	25.1
New York City College of Technology	455	409	425	11.2	7.1
Queens	622	597	561	4.2	10.9
Staten Island	293	240	180	22.1	62.8
York	644	520	709	23.8	-9.2
School of Professional Studies	0	0	0	0.0	0.0
Total Senior	4,494	3,998	3,930	12.4	14.4
Community Colleges					
Borough of Manhattan	259	300	321	-13.7	-19.3
Bronx	307	250	209	22.8	46.9
Hostos	567	500	630	13.4	-10.0
Kingsborough*	3,255	3,216	3,217	1.2	1.2
LaGuardia**	1,720	1,900	1,848	-9.5	-6.9
Queensborough	1,169	1,000	1,146	16.9	2.0
Total Community	7,277	7,166	7,371	1.5	-1.3
TOTAL UNIVERSITY	11,771	11,164	11,301	5.4	4.2

* Actual Fall and estimated Winter.

** Preliminary Fall I and Fall II.

Table 14A. Graduate Headcount Enrollment - Degree

	Enrollment			Percentage Change: Fall 2010 Actual Compared With	
	Fall 2010 Actual	Fall 2010 Preliminary	Fall 2009 Actual	Fall 2010 Preliminary	Fall 2009 Actual
Senior Colleges					
Baruch	3,934	3,850	3,853	2.2	2.1
Brooklyn	3,505	3,511	3,504	-0.2	0.0
City	2,856	2,901	2,954	-1.6	-3.3
Hunter	5,760	5,699	5,133	1.1	12.2
John Jay	1,815	1,840	1,873	-1.4	-3.1
Lehman	2,030	2,051	2,171	-1.0	-6.5
Queens	4,372	4,399	4,191	-0.6	4.3
Staten Island	978	999	897	-2.1	9.0
York	37	35	48	5.7	-22.9
Graduate School	4,524	4,608	4,493	-1.8	0.7
School of Journalism	167	167	142	0.0	17.6
School of Professional Studies	572	603	384	-5.1	-49.0
Law School	431	432	406	-0.2	6.2
TOTAL GRADUATE	30,981	31,095	30,049	-0.4	3.1

Table 14B. Graduate Headcount Enrollment - Nondegree

	Enrollment			Percentage Change: Fall 2010 Actual Compared With	
	Fall 2010 Actual	Fall 2010 Preliminary	Fall 2009 Actual	Fall 2010 Preliminary	Fall 2009 Actual
Senior Colleges					
Baruch	9	8	10	12.5	-10.0
Brooklyn	603	395	521	52.7	15.7
City	297	311	380	-4.5	-21.8
Hunter	963	934	1,151	3.1	-16.3
John Jay	113	123	111	-8.1	1.8
Lehman	244	226	304	8.0	-19.7
Queens	339	338	461	0.3	-26.5
Staten Island	87	83	75	4.8	16.0
York	0	0	0	0.0	0.0
Graduate School	118	134	132	-11.9	-10.6
School of Journalism	2	1	2	100.0	0.0
School of Professional Studies	71	70	46	1.4	54.3
Law School	10	11	1	-9.1	900.0
TOTAL GRADUATE	2,856	2,634	3,194	8.4	-10.6

ATTACHMENT B

To: The College Council

From: The Faculty Senate

Date: February 1, 2011

Re: Proposal to Amend the John Jay Charter of Governance

Proposal:

The Faculty Senate proposes that John Jay's Charter be amended by the addition of the underlined words:

John Jay Charter. Article I. Section 9.e. Committee on Faculty Personnel:

There shall be a Committee on Faculty Personnel which shall review from the departments and other appropriate units of the College all recommendations for appointments to the instructional staff in the following ranks: Distinguished Professor, Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, Instructor, Distinguished Lecturer, Lecturer, Chief College Laboratory Technician, Senior College Laboratory Technician, and College Laboratory Technician, and make recommendations to the President. It shall also receive from departmental Personnel & Budget Committees recommendations for promotions and reappointments with or without tenure, together with compensation, in the aforementioned ranks of the instructional staff and shall recommend to the President actions on these matters. It may also recommend to the President special salary increments. The President shall consider such recommendations in making his or her recommendations on such matters to the CUNY Board of Trustees.

Explanation:

As the result of a 1994 arbitration decision involving a faculty member at Lehman College, John Jay may no longer follow its longstanding procedure for promotion of a faculty member to full professor. The Faculty Senate, after due consideration and discussion, decided on December 10, 2010, by a vote of that body, that it wishes the College to be able to continue to follow that procedure. For this to be possible, our Charter would have to be amended.

Until now, at John Jay, a candidate for full professor was considered by her/his Department Personnel & Budget Committee, which voted by secret ballot on the merits of this promotion; the results of this vote were then forwarded to the Review Committee of the College Faculty Personnel Committee and then to the full membership of the Faculty Personnel Committee.

The candidate could choose to have the promotion go forward even if the department=s vote was split or negative; on the other hand, the candidate could choose to withdraw his/her candidacy for promotion if the department=s vote was split or negative. In other words, our procedure for promotion to full professor was exactly the same as our procedure for promotion to associate professor. But based on the Lehman College arbitration decision, it has been determined that at John Jay, promotion to full professor may not be considered by the Department Personnel & Budget Committee at all but rather must be considered by only the College Faculty Personnel Committee (and its appropriate Review Committee).

Therefore, in order to continue following the procedure for promotion to full professor that we have been using for more than 40 years, a procedure which the Faculty Senate considers to have been satisfactory, effective, and superior to the one we must now follow, John Jay must amend its Charter to specifically state that promotions to full professor must be considered by Departmental Personnel & Budget Committees. If the Board of Trustees approves our amendment, then our Charter supersedes the CUNY Bylaws.

The reason this Charter amendment is required is to be found in the CUNY Board of Trustees Bylaws:

“CUNY Board of Trustees Bylaws: Section 9.8. Promotions:

a. PLAN NO. ONE. Promotions of tenured instructors to the rank of assistant professor shall be recommended to the college committee on faculty personnel and budget by the chairperson of the department only after an affirmative vote of a majority of all members of the department who have professorial rank. Promotions to the rank of associate professor shall be recommended only after an affirmative vote of a majority of all associate professors and professors in the department. In departments where every professorial rank is not represented, recommendations for promotion shall be initiated by the committee on appointments of the department. This plan shall not apply in the case of promotion to a professorship.

“PLAN NO. TWO. All promotions in the instructional staff, except promotion to professor, shall be recommended to the college committee on faculty personnel and budget by the chairperson of the department only after a majority affirmative vote of the departmental committee on personnel and budget; provided, however, that no member of such committee shall vote on his/her own promotion. “A minority of any departmental committee on personnel and budget or any committee under plan no. one of this section shall have the power to submit a minority recommendation to the college committee on faculty personnel and budget.

“Promotion to the rank of professor shall be recommended by the faculty committee on personnel and budget only after an affirmative vote of a majority of all associate professors and professors on the committee. The president, however, shall have the power to make an independent recommendation for promotion in any rank to the board, after consultation with the appropriate departmental committee and with the faculty committee on personnel and budget. In all instances no final action of departmental committees with regard to promotions shall be taken without consultation with the president.”

It is noteworthy that the "John Jay Personnel Process Guidelines," which were approved by the John Jay College Council two years ago, describes the procedure that has been practiced at John Jay for 40 years and that the "Guidelines" were fully vetted and approved by CUNY's Office of Legal Affairs at that time.

"John Jay Personnel Process Guidelines"

III. THE PERSONNEL PROCESS: COMMITTEES

"B. Department Personnel Committees

"1. For full-time faculty members in professorial titles, and for full-time lecturers, instructors, and college laboratory technicians, reappointment, tenure, appointment, appointment with a Certificate of Continuous Employment, and promotion are considered by a series of committees. Since the committees - beginning with Department Personnel Committees - meet in early September, the candidate should start organizing his/her material the previous Spring. Promotion candidates are required to have their complete file in the Provost's Office by June 1; reappointment and tenure candidates by September 1. The procedures for obtaining outside letters of evaluation have a separate timetable. (See Section II of this document.)

"2. Department Personnel Committees meet in early September (usually in the Provost's Conference Room) to vote on a candidate's reappointment, certification, tenure, or promotion, based on a review and discussion of the candidate's file. The CUNY Bylaws require that no faculty member who does not hold the rank of associate professor or professor shall vote on any promotion to full professor. Each member of the Department Personnel Committee is obligated to review the entire official file of the candidate. The official file is in the Provost's Office.

"3. The department Chair will notify the candidate of the decision of the Department Personnel Committee as soon as possible after the vote is officially recorded. The Department vote becomes incorporated into the candidate's file for the next committee level, the Review Committee. It is therefore imperative that Department Personnel Committees meet according to schedule so that the business of the Review Committee will not be held up."

ATTACHMENT C

Digest of Feedback to the Education for Justice Draft Proposal

November 15, 2010-February 14, 2011

Relationship of general education to the mission of the College:

- In particular I want to commend the Justice Core as answering directly to our mission and providing a strong, tiered foundation for learning throughout a student's academic career.
- [T]he common Justice Core is unnecessary and not adaptable enough to the needs and interests of students in many different majors.

Size of the gen ed program:

- The upper end – 69 credits – is too big
- What will be the impact of a limit of 42 credits imposed by CUNY Central?

Core Sequence:

- In particular I want to commend the Justice Core as answering directly to our mission and providing a strong, tiered foundation for learning throughout a student's academic career.
- The Justice Core is an excellent idea. It will create a unique educational experience for our students and will help in branding the college's identity. However, I think this core should be added to the current general education requirement rather than offered as substitutions.

Division of Learning Outcomes into six clusters:

- In general, this whole GE model privileges Reasoning and Communication, even though the Justice Core, The Natural World, The Creative Dimension, etc. could all fit into the Reasoning and Communication Box. Why is everything but Reasoning and Communication and the Justice Core so vaguely defined? Perhaps this model would benefit from getting rid of Justice and Reasoning and Communication boxes all together and integrating those learning objectives in the 4 other categories, for the skills defined under Justice and Reasoning and Communication could easily be incorporated into everything in the far right column.
- . . . we need something more specific, and I think it's important that we do not put off thinking about the specifics of this model until a later stage. That would be a huge mistake. Developing an excellent curriculum rests in the execution of details not in general ideas organized into arbitrary divisions. If we accept this model without thinking more specifically about its execution, we will risk wasting an enormous amount of time trying to cater courses to a flawed design and trying to make a flawed design work. Instead we need to address the specific needs of our students in a more specific way. We need to work harder to develop an excellent model not just a new model.

Academic Skills:

- . . . missing is 'reading' or, more broadly, 'literacy'. . . how to see and understand rhetorical patterning before they can do anything further.
- Is there adequate emphasis given to developing academic skills?

- Will the Gen Ed require Writing Intensive courses?
- [with such a strong emphasis on skills] will [students] acquire the broad knowledge about the world, past, present, and future, in courses focused on professors' specialties?

Distribution governed by learning outcomes rather than disciplines:

- I applaud the fact that students will have the opportunity to be an active learner and steer their educational journey, while staying on course.
- I wish my Gen Ed was as flexible yet guided as the new John Jay's.
- Research shows that students do better when they have a choice.
- We should avoid imposing "hard rules" up front but rather give the program a chance and add restrictions as required once we see how it goes.
- Why not formulate a "Foundational Documents" class? Magna Carta, primary documents from French Rev, US Constitution, etc. Could be offered by history/political science, philo, even lit. It would suit our mission and might garner media attention for its return to basics; also, it would encourage students to perform close readings on relatively brief texts and to place them in their historical contexts....perfect for an introductory class to liberal studies.
- The Faculty Senate voted at its February 10, 2011, meeting, the following resolution:
"It is the position of the Faculty Senate of John Jay College that there be a disciplinary distribution overlay on the proposed General Education Curriculum."
- [Students] can evade too many of the disciplines that they consider irrelevant to their career goals . . . these disciplines cannot be taught by just anyone. We have specialists who are trained in them and those are the people who should teach in those fields and teach the skills in them.
- I would particularly like to see a heavy emphasis on the Humanities in the gen ed curriculum.
- Gen ed courses should expose students to majors they might not consider on their own.
- Gen ed should facilitate shopping for a major.
- There is too much freedom of choice for the students.
- The market-model will lead to students opting for the easiest courses and dis-incentivize faculty rigor
- The current proposal relies of competition to create better courses, but the reality is that it may also create a "race to the bottom" once those courses are implemented.
- I am in favor of a model that includes *some* distribution requirement in the disciplines while at the same time leaving a few courses open to any discipline that can meet the learning outcome in a course.
- I urge you to consider adding a disciplinary overlay that specifies as least 12 credits for the humanities.
- . . . not confident that many students will elect to take history—or other humanities subjects—without requirements. . . . In the case of history, students must be encouraged to take not only "modern" courses but also those in ancient and medieval societies, which educate them about the origins of world civilizations and world religions, including Islam, Hinduism, and Buddhism. This global perspective is certainly essential for a college with a criminal justice mission.
- . . . the new Gen. Ed. should possess an appropriate balance of freedom for students to pursue the passions they know with our (the faculty's) responsibility to compel (a euphemism for "force") students to take the courses they never would have know they will love and need.

- Absence of disciplinary requirements threatens faculty jobs.
- a stipulation that students cannot take more than two GenEd courses from a single department. Or that students must take courses from at least six departments in satisfying GenEd. While such a solution would not be perfect, it would at least ensure that students expose themselves to a range of disciplinary methodologies.
- fostering interdepartmental competition for student enrollment could potentially create a climate in which the sharing of pedagogical strategies is discouraged. Why would you share best practices or good teaching methods with people in other departments who are competing with you for students? Though this might seem an unlikely development, education scholar Diane Ravitch has recently shown how the competitive model now in use in many public school systems has weakened the culture of collaboration for precisely this reason, and in some cases it has destroyed the sense of community that so essential to an educational institution. Adding a disciplinary breadth requirement would resolve these issues but maintain the innovative structure of the current model.
- While I applaud the idea of encouraging our students to explore creative self-expression, I worry that the phrase "Creative Dimension" has the potential to be seriously confusing for our students, since it suggests that some disciplines/courses require creativity and draw upon individual experience (fine arts and creative writing) while others (the humanities and social sciences/"Learning from the Past" and "Self, Society..") do not. Our students already struggle with academic discourse's many conflicting and counterproductive messages about objectivity, argumentation, and the role of opinion, and we need not complicate teaching and learning further with this kind of phrasing.
- this diagram is too vague and does not present a practical view of the ways in which students may navigate their way through the GE system.
- this model leaves very little room for the social sciences, while giving several individual disciplines of the humanities prominence
- Students will gravitate to the easiest classes [and that] could act against departments that actually require student effort.
- I have frequently heard from students that they didn't even know they could--and do!--like literature until they were made to take an English class at John Jay. Even more compelling, I have repeatedly witnessed the excitement and satisfaction that is experienced by students when, as they read a work of literature, they see present a historical context they've learned about in history class or an ethical question they've explored in philosophy class. Suddenly they realize that these ideas, histories, and peoples interconnect. They learn, essentially, what liberal arts education offers and what we must succor: critical thinking and writing skills that are broadly developed and deeply ingrained.
- The English Department proposes:
15 credits in the Humanities, one each in Lit, History, Philosophy. For their final six Humanities credits, students may choose a course from one of these disciplines or from Art or Music or Communication and Theatre Arts. The Humanities faculty can develop courses as part of The Justice Core, The Creative Dimension, Learning from the Past, and Self, Culture and Society. Humanities courses will alert [students to] recent developments in major / minor opportunities. A robust Humanities general education curriculum is an essential adjunct to the school's focus on law.

- too often faculty may find it expedient to state that a student has met the outcome criteria because they won't want their department, or their own classes to be avoided for having too demanding of standards.
- [Studies show that] students seek out easy courses (or oblige faculty to make courses less demanding).

Pedagogy:

- I fear that profs will be assigned new courses they have no idea how to teach.
- How will our faculty, many of whom are now young and narrowly focused on their own fields, be trained to teach gen ed?
-
- In this skills-based model, how will courses be designed? In particular, are there core skills that will be taught at each level so that a student can be assumed to have learned them before advancing to the next level? Will all 100-level courses fulfilling, say, writing skills be required to cover a minimum set of skills? How will this be regulated? . . . What assurance is there that a student will have learned how to formulate an argument in, say, a Speech 101 course when they advance on to an English 201 course or a Literature 200 course?

Articulation with the majors:

- How does the gen ed relate to the majors?

Relationship to John Jay's diverse student body:

- . . . we must also include the population that we too can belong to at any moment, the disabled.

Administrative considerations:

- My first misgiving has to do with the tremendous number of new courses that will have to be developed to fulfill these requirements. . . .
- I can see how some current courses would fit into the skills portion of the proposal, but I cannot see how any of our current sophomore courses fit into the rest of the scheme.
- Total lack of advising to guide students through the program.
- The Registrar's Office will not be able to keep up with an evolving curriculum in which eligible courses may change from year to year
- the Gen Ed proposal seems to suggest that faculty should design new courses to meet the Gen Ed areas. This is unworkable because of the length of time (not to mention energy) it takes to get courses approved by the curriculum committee, and also fails to account for the reluctance of chairs to allow faculty to teach courses that do not directly contribute to their major(s).
- The proposal gives the impression that the whole gen ed curriculum will have to be written from scratch. Is this the case?
- How will students be helped through it, especially in terms of creating a coherent curriculum?
- Will courses count double to fulfill requirements in both the major and gen ed, as courses in minors do now?

January, 2011

Master Plan Linked to Institutional Strategies – Review Template

Goal 1 Student Success: Establish an institutional culture that fosters intellectual and personal transformation in order that students achieve their goals.		Comments and Concerns
Goal 1 Objective 1	Strategies	
Guide and support students as they master foundational intellectual skills, discover and construct knowledge for themselves, attain degrees and certificates, and develop themselves personally and shape their relationships to others, both locally and globally.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reform and implement Gen Ed to reflect development of the whole person, with links to majors and a plan for faculty development. 2. Embrace a campus commitment to cultural competency that informs the development of Gen Ed and other academic programs, guides professional development of faculty and staff, and creates a campus climate of inclusiveness. 3. Expand opportunities for personal transformation through internships, study abroad, and campus activities. 4. Create learning goals for personal transformation. 	
Goal 1 Objective 2	Strategies	
Provide easily accessible, competent, and effective personal and academic support services, including academic advisement, financial aid advice, systematic career and employment counseling, and health and wellness services, for all students.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Launch comprehensive advisement plan in the major and enhance auxiliary advising programs for transfers and sophomores. 2. Develop a Health-and-Wellness Five-Year Action Plan that focuses on health education, disease prevention, smoking cessation, and on mental health counseling. 3. Develop and implement a three-year schedule process in conjunction with Academic Affairs, Department Chairs and Program Directors. 4. Ensure the quality of Financial Aid services to all students who are eligible. 5. Develop a five-year plan for Career Services that leverages our access to external entities. 6. Improve communications with students in key offices through web and text messaging. 	
Goal 1 Objective 3	Strategies	

ATTACHMENT D

Facilitate adaptation and transition to both undergraduate and graduate programs for all entering and transfer students.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Develop a distinctive strategy and orientation program for each category of incoming student—international, graduate students, in-service students, veterans, etc--but especially transfer students. 2. Develop a transfer orientation program specifically for the Criminal Justice Academy. 3. Develop an online capacity to assist students in their transition. 4. Use technology to manage ongoing relationships—not just in transition—with transfer students. 	
Goal 1 Objective 4	Strategies	
Encourage the development of strong mentoring relationships among students and faculty and staff, and facilitate faculty-student interaction both inside and outside the classroom.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Create a fund to support and reward interaction between faculty and students. 2. Create professional development opportunities around mentoring. 3. Develop a program of strong faculty advisement for student clubs and organizations; formalize this role for staff (who often do this now). 4. Create a unique mentoring program for student athletes. 5. Launch Office of Undergraduate Research. 	
Goal 1 Objective 5	Strategies	
Recognizing and responding to the diverse needs of our student community, promote a more vibrant, engaged campus life, and strengthen the sense of community, civility, social and environmental consciousness, and mutual respect in the College.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Create increased opportunities for peer mentoring. 2. Strengthen the <i>Peer Ambassador Program</i>; expand the opportunity to include peer mentoring. 3. Incentivize students to participate in campus events; this could be part of <i>CLIQUE</i> – a point incentive program. 4. Implement a community hour and starting with the freshman class, have students develop schedules that incorporate the community hour in order to transform the culture. 5. Develop student honor code that promotes civility, social and environmental consciousness, and mutual respect. 6. Develop opportunities for campus life centered around the new building; create calendar of activities. 	
Goal 1 Objective 6	Strategies	

improve student year-to-year retention and overall graduation rates while holding students to high expectations and academic standards.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Develop a system for setting retention goals, and a method to assess annual progress. 2. Explore the development of a Sophomore Year Experience Program. 3. Disaggregate students to identify sub-groups and identify strategies if they are below average in terms of retention. 4. Develop feasibility study to create online communities for entering students. 5. Create retention workgroup to implement our Strategic Retention Plan. 	
Goal 2 Teaching: Make lifelong learning possible through effective pedagogy.		
Goal 2 Objective 1	Strategies	
Promote and sustain academic standards and learning goals that foster appropriate student learning and achievement at all levels.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify learning goals for all programs. 2. Map the learning goals to the courses in the respective programs. 3. Insure that all syllabi include the learning goals. 4. Support a continuous process of program review to improve academic quality. 	
Goal 2 Objective 2	Strategies	
Practice continuous assessment of teaching and learning and provide frequent feedback to inform teaching and learning.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Develop a new peer-observation protocol to promote reflection on teaching effectiveness. 2. Develop accelerated timetable for assessment of student learning outcomes. 	
Goal 2 Objective 3	Strategies	
Implement consistent, fair standards, policies and processes for supporting, evaluating, recognizing, and rewarding excellent scholarship, research, and creative work.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Revise the Form C and the faculty personnel process to make teaching more visible and valued. 2. Develop a parallel system for adjuncts (to make teaching more visible and valued). 3. Complete and implement the new student evaluation form, and commit ourselves to continuous review of the process. 	
Goal 2 Objective 4	Strategies	

Develop institutional structures that foster integrative learning and link individual course learning goals and syllabi to overall curricula and learning goals.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify learning goals for each degree program (majors and minors) and map goals to all courses in them. 2. Apply relevant institutional learning goals (based on General Education, college mission and master plan) and program learning goals across all out-of-class learning activities. 3. Design any new out-of-class learning activities to reflect relevant institutional and learning goals, to provide more intentional opportunities for students to learn and to demonstrate learning. 	
Goal 2 Objective 5	Strategies	
Provide the resources and professional development necessary for faculty to be successful teachers.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Increase resources for the Center for the Advancement of Teaching (CAT). 2. Create incentives for all faculty to improve teaching. 3. Support professional development for creation of hybrid courses. 4. Foster a culture that embraces the use of technology as a learning tool. 5. Link the Technology Advisory Committee (TAC) and the Technology Fee Committee, to support use of technology in the classroom. 6. Encourage experienced faculty to mentor colleagues. 	
Goal 3 Research and Scholarship: Foster and sustain excellence in research, scholarship, and creative work.		
Goal 3 Objective 1	Strategies	
Establish the infrastructure needed to support high quality research, scholarship and creative work.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Plan for strategic investment of external funds to support and reward scholarly activity. 2. Provide resources to departments for conferences and external activities tied to research. 	
Goal 3 Objective 2	Strategies	
Develop and implement College-wide strategies to focus and guide efforts to strengthen research, scholarship, and creative work.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Strengthen the Office of Sponsored Programs and IRB . 2. Create opportunities for faculty to collaborate and share information on research opportunities. 3. Leverage centers in support of faculty research. 4. Promote interests of research faculty among funding agencies. 	
Goal 3 Objective 3	Strategies	

Implement consistent, fair standards, policies and processes for supporting, evaluating, recognizing, and rewarding excellent scholarship, research, and creative work.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Issue report of the Faculty Personnel Committee Task Force on Faculty Scholarship and discuss adoption of recommendations. 2. Enhance the research capacity and effectiveness of faculty, students, and center directors by making improvements to the tenure and promotion process and to the infrastructure that supports research and center activities. 	
Goal 4 Strategic Partnerships: Forge relationships and partnerships that enhance student success, support faculty excellence, and advance the College's capacity to promote the public good.		
Goal 4 Objective 1	Strategies	
Build local, national, and international partnerships that allow students to participate in research, enhance career and professional opportunities, and prepare for lifelong learning.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Develop a vision statement on strategic partnerships. 2. Identify a decision matrix for embracing opportunities for strategic partnerships. Ensure that the matrix reflects the College mission. 	
Goal 4 Objective 2	Strategies	
Help members of the College community link their existing community and intellectual partnerships to the College, and create opportunities for all students, faculty, staff, and alumni to benefit from new or established partnerships.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Explore opportunities for Departmental advisory boards 2. Foster faculty engagement in creation of corporate partnerships. 3. Inventory existing relationships between faculty and organizations, and between departments and organizations, in order to promote opportunities for faculty and students. 	
Goal 4 Objective 3	Strategies	
Through partnerships with other institutions, organizations, and groups in this country and abroad, support projects and activities that are consistent with the College's mission.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Develop arts projects and events that involve multiple partners, external and internal. Partner with CUNY Performing Arts Centers for shared events. 	
Goal 4 Objective 4	Strategies	
Leverage the unique mission, capacity, and stature of the College to provide leadership and experience that advance justice and the public good.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Develop a business model to leverage partnerships to advance justice and the public good. 2. Assess the College's capacity to participate in substantive projects to advance justice and the public good. 3. Enhance our capability to offer continuing studies in our areas of expertise. 	

Goal 5 Institutional Effectiveness: Advance Systematic, continuous process of self-study that fosters reflection, improvement, and accountability in support of the College's mission and goals.		
Goal 5 Objective 1	Strategies	
Strengthen the engagement and effectiveness of the College's workforce to improve the quality of programs and services.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Improve staff and management effectiveness through development of systems and processes of integration, review, and accountability. 2. Develop a systematic approach to the development and tenuring of professional staff. 3. Create in-service expectations for staff. 4. Create an atmosphere of customer service and civility; reward such behavior. 	
Goal 5 Objective 2	Strategies	
Align resource allocation with strategic priorities through a process of assessment and continuous improvement.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Develop an assessment plan that includes institutional assessment. 2. Develop Master Plan report card. 3. Develop multi-year revenue and enrollment plan. 4. Align unit-level and individual activities with goals of College. 5. Reflect a continuing commitment to communication and transparency. 6. Establish an all-funds budget and integrate with planning. 7. Define better the role of the Strategic Planning Subcommittee (SPS) in the planning process. 	
Goal 5 Objective 3	Strategies	
Invest in the recruitment and retention of excellent, diverse faculty and staff.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Develop a five-year faculty hiring plan that brings the total number of full-time faculty back to the fall 2009 level, with every faculty line filled. 2. Identify a number of faculty lines for targeted recruitment to increase diversity in departments with underutilization and to bring in senior faculty with significant grant funding. 3. Develop a plan for adjunct recruitment and identify funds to invest in adjunct development. 4. Address the concerns of untenured faculty, particularly faculty of color and female faculty, expressed in the COACHE survey. 5. Identify and dedicate resources to reward and retain the excellent faculty and staff recruited in the past five years. 	
Goal 5 Objective 4	Strategies	

Invest in the recruitment of students from diverse backgrounds who have the potential for academic success.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Expand the overall applicant pool for the College's graduate programs while at the same time maintaining and expanding the diversity of its programs and increasing the academic standards 2. Provide for an ongoing evaluation of the undergraduate admissions criteria which seeks to accomplish the dual goals of improving the academic preparedness of both transfer and freshman students and achieving reasonable enrollment targets <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Increase incrementally freshman admission criteria where possible given budget driven enrollment targets. o Develop program-specific admission criteria for transfer students. 3. Develop new initiatives to increase the conversion rates of newly admitted undergraduate students to include <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Program-specific meetings with faculty for targeted groups of students prior to the admission date. o Targeting conditionally admitted student early in the admission cycle to enhance their enrollment in and success in the summer academy. 	
Goal 5 Objective 5	Strategies	
Effectively communicate the College's programs, successes, progress, and needs.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Assess the College's branding; make changes to reflect our transformation to a senior college. 2. Implement branding consistently across all areas of the College and across all media. 3. Build and strengthen the College's relationships with important journalists across the country at top-tier media outlets. 4. Enhance the reputation of our faculty and administration among the wide range of audiences we serve. 5. Produce publications that are timely and well received outside and inside John Jay College. 	
Goal 5 Objective 6	Strategies	

Engage in sound, effective fund-raising and development to secure robust external support.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Develop and implement a multi-year fund raising plan that achieves the goal of raising \$15 million from private sources and \$4 million from government sources by 2014. 2. Build a culture of philanthropy at the College through engagement and education of students, faculty and professional staff. 3. Engage alumni more deeply in supporting the College and its students. 4. Continue to build and engage the Board of Trustees in promoting and fund raising for the College. 	
Goal 5, Objective 7	Strategies	
Raise awareness and invest resources in programs, academic endeavors, contracts, and facilities that promote a 'green' campus and embrace the necessity for a sustainable planet.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Create and mobilize a College Sustainability Council consisting of faculty, staff and students, to develop a sustainability plan that promotes environmental stewardship. 2. Reduce energy and water consumption, improve recycling. 3. Increase utilization of green supplies and products. 	
Goal 5 Objective 8	Strategies	
Provide a welcoming, safe, and attractive campus that is in compliance with all applicable laws, regulations, and policies, and that helps make studying and teaching at John Jay a physically, psychologically, and socially successful experience.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Improve Risk Management and compliance with required internal policies and procedures as well as external regulations. 2. Improve and enhance facilities. 	

ATTACHMENT E

To: President Travis and Associate Provost James Llana

From: Harold Sullivan, Chair, Council of Chairs

Dear Jeremy and Jim,

At its meeting, Tuesday, February 22 the Council of Chairs had a discussion of the strategies associated with the Goals & Objectives of the Master plan. A summary of that discussion follows. Although I was out of town until later in the day and unable to participate in the discussion, I fully endorse the suggestions summarized below. Once consensus was achieved about the list, there was discussion and a vote on a general motion endorsing the draft.

General Observations

1. Many of the strategies are, in scope and concept, new objectives or goals. These should be reformulated as strategies.
2. The meaning of some of the strategies depends on the definitions of key terms such as "cultural competency" or "CLIQUE" or "honor code." There should be a glossary or appendix that explains such terms to clarify the intent of the strategies involved.
3. Goal 5 Objective 2 calls for a prioritization process. However, the document lacks indicators of the relative priority of the various strategies. There is a need for a few broad indicators or benchmarks of priority that can guide resource allocation decisions. Therefore in the specific recommendations four important strategies are proposed to guide prioritization:
 - Goal 5 Objective 2: Add the following strategy: "Augment departmental and academic program resources, including professional and support staff, reassigned time for faculty, and OTPS funds, to support current functions and to support implementation of the Master Plan strategies that are specifically assigned to them or that involve their functions and areas of responsibility." The intent is to assure that departments and academic programs are appropriately resourced to carry out their core functions and to implement the master plan.
 - Goal 5 Objective 3: Replace Strategy 1 to read: "Develop a faculty hiring plan to first bring the total number of full-time faculty back to the Fall 2009 level, and then to achieve the target of 60% coverage of course sections with full-time faculty." The intent is to expand the faculty hiring target beyond restoration of existing lines and to provide for a performance target as well as a resource restoration target.

- Goal 5 Objective 3: Add a new Strategy 2 (and renumber the subsequent ones) to read: "For each year of the plan, seventy-five percent of college-wide positions planned, funded or filled, whether existing vacancies or new positions, shall be reserved for the appointment of new full-time tenure-track faculty." The intent is to provide a clear and objective indicator for faculty hiring that would apply for each year of the plan, and that could adapt to the available level of resources for each year. In effect, the 75% faculty hiring strategy defines a floor and the 60% course coverage strategy defines an aspiration.
- Goal 5 Objective 3: Add a new Strategy 3 (and renumber the subsequent ones) to read: "Improve the ratio of library faculty to instructional faculty." The intent is to set up an objective benchmark for investment in library lines that is proportional to investment in instructional lines.

Specific Recommendations

Goal 2: All strategies should recognize and prioritize the role of faculty and their departments in planning and implementing curricular and instructional initiatives. Many of the strategies do not have any assigned responsibility.

Goal 2 Objective 1: This section should include one or more strategies that entail ways to improve academic standards. The strategies in this section do not propose ways to improve academic standards.

Goal 2 Objective 3: The goal refers to teaching, yet the objective refers to the documentation of scholarship, research and creative work.

Goal 2 Objective 5: The objective is to provide resources and professional development to support successful teaching. This is an essential function of the academic departments. However, none of the strategies support the departments in this essential function. They assign no responsibility ("create incentives" or "encourage experienced faculty...") or assign responsibility to entities outside of departments such as CAT and TAC. The list of strategies should recognize and support (with resources) the essential function of departments to develop and support successful teaching.

Goal 3: All strategies should recognize and prioritize the role of faculty and their departments in supporting research and scholarship.

Goal 3 Objective 1: This section should include a strategy to support the essential role of the library in research and scholarship.

Goal 3 Objective 2: A strategy should be included to support research activities of tenured faculty in fields where grant funds are generally unavailable.

Goal 4 Objective 1: Include strategies that propose other types of initiatives in addition to arts programs.

Goal 5 Objective 2: Add the following strategy: "Augment departmental and academic program resources, including professional and support staff, reassigned time for faculty, and OTPS funds, to support current functions and to support implementation of the Master Plan strategies that are specifically assigned to them or that involve their functions and areas of responsibility."

Goal 5 Objective 3: Replace Strategy 1 to read: "Develop a faculty hiring plan to first bring the total number of full-time faculty back to the Fall 2009 level, and then to achieve the target of 60% coverage of course sections with full-time faculty."

Goal 5 Objective 3: Add a new Strategy 2 (and renumber the subsequent ones) to read: "For each year of the plan, seventy-five percent of college-wide positions planned, funded or filled, whether existing vacancies or new positions, shall be reserved for the appointment of new full-time tenure-track faculty."

Goal 5 Objective 3: Add a new Strategy 3 (and renumber the subsequent ones) to read: "Improve the ratio of library faculty to instructional faculty." The intent is to set up an objective benchmark for investment in library lines that is proportional to investment in instructional lines.

Goal 5 Objective 3: Delete "recruited in the past five years" from Strategy 5. This should be a priority for all faculty members, not just those recently hired.

Goal 5 Objective 7: Add a strategy that encourages sustainability as a substantive focus of academic courses and programs.

Resolution

At the end of the meeting, Professor Tabb moved and Professor Green seconded the following motion: "The Council of Chairs supports the Master Plan Strategies document, as distributed to the Strategic Planning Subcommittee in late January 2011, and the Council of Chairs supports the process of development of the strategies included in the document."

There were no "Yes" votes and no abstentions. The vote was unanimously "No."

We hope you will consider the suggestions for revisions as constructive.

Thank you.

Best,

Harold

Harold J. Sullivan, Ph. D.
Professor and Chair
Department of Political Science
John Jay College/ The City University of New York
445 W 59 Street
New York, NY 10019

(212)237-8194
hsullivan@jjay.cuny.edu



JOHN JAY COLLEGE
THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK
OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE

Update on the Fiscal Year 2011 Financial Plan and a Look Ahead at FY 2012

A Report to the John Jay College
Budget & Planning Committee

February 17, 2011

Office of Finance & Administration

ATTACHMENT F

Review of Developments Leading Up to FY 2011 Financial Plan

- ❑ Consequences of NYS Budget Reductions for John Jay –
\$3.2 million reduction in allocation
- ❑ Lower than projected enrollment in Fall 2010 - \$2.230 million revenue shortfall in FY11 when compared to preliminary financial plan estimates
- ❑ Due to the combined impact of budget reductions, lower enrollment and year end surplus, we were facing a projected FY 2011 shortfall of \$3.8 million
- ❑ Hiring Pause and spending restraint resulted in FY 2010 year end surplus of \$2 million

Action Plan to Balance FY 2011 Budget

Spending Reductions (\$2.7M)	Revenue Increases (\$923k)	Other Funds Offsets (\$650k)
OTPS (15%) - \$928k achieved	Increase Transfers / Spring Retention - \$537k partially achieved 137k	Offset FT Theater Costs with Auxiliary Revenues - \$150k achieved
Temporary Services (CA & NTA) (15%) - \$1.1M achieved	Increase Wintersession Enrollment - \$60k Achieved and exceeded by 130k	Increase RF Offsets by Reducing Travel and Start-Up - \$200k achieved
Further Delay Exempted Positions for Remainder of Fiscal Year - \$188k achieved	Summer Revenue Increase - \$325k tbd	Leverage Tech Fee / IFR Funding - \$50k Not achieved
Attrition / ERI - \$200k Achieved and exceeded		Assess Fee/Recover Admin Costs on JJC Foundation Accounts - \$50k Not achieved
Additional Adjunct Savings - \$250k partially achieved/offset by ERI		Philanthropic Support - \$200k partially achieved \$100k

Total Potential Adjustments: \$4.3 million

FY 2011 Financial Plan and FY 2012-13 Estimate

	<u>FY 2011 FIN PLAN SUBMISSION</u>	<u>FY 2012</u>	<u>FY 2013</u>
BUDGET ALLOCATION AND REVENUE			
CUNY Revenue Target	\$69,012,000	\$69,012,000	\$69,012,000
Actual Enrollment / FY10-11 Projection	11,478	11,718	12,037
Base Allocation	\$75,466,417	\$75,466,417	\$75,466,417
Lump Sum Allocations	\$2,143,832	\$2,143,832	\$2,143,832
Additional Allocations	\$4,190,268	\$4,190,268	\$4,190,268
Current Year Gross Tuition Revenue above CUNY Target	\$1,083,395	\$2,443,868	\$4,255,379
TOTAL BASE BUDGET ALLOCATION	\$82,883,912	\$84,244,386	\$86,055,897
Prior Year Cutra Balance	\$1,569,230	\$167,985	\$0
Lease Revenue	\$488,754	\$488,754	\$0
TOTAL ADDITIONAL REVENUES	\$2,057,984	\$656,739	\$0
TOTAL BUDGET ALLOCATION	\$84,941,897	\$84,901,125	\$86,055,897
EXPENDITURES			
Personnel Services (PS)	\$60,843,897	\$60,983,668	\$60,983,668
Faculty	\$34,751,781	\$35,031,847	\$35,031,847
Administrative Staff	\$23,108,462	\$23,200,173	\$23,200,173
ECP	\$2,983,654	\$2,751,648	\$2,751,648
Adjuncts	\$12,034,123	\$12,353,456	\$12,779,456
Teaching Adjuncts / CLTs	\$11,854,978	\$12,174,311	\$12,600,311
CETs	\$179,145	\$179,145	\$179,145
Temp Services	\$6,409,875	\$6,409,875	\$6,409,875
College Assistants	\$5,502,459	\$5,502,459	\$5,502,459
Non-Teaching Adjuncts	\$907,416	\$907,416	\$907,416
TOTAL PS:	\$79,287,894	\$79,746,999	\$80,172,999
OTPS	\$5,266,703	\$5,566,703	\$5,266,703
ETI Transfer to Tech Fee	(\$269,440)	(\$269,440)	(\$269,440)
TOTAL OTPS :	\$4,997,263	\$5,297,263	\$4,997,263
TOTAL FINANCIAL PLAN EXPENDITURES	\$84,285,158	\$85,044,263	\$85,170,263
YEAR-END BALANCE	\$656,739	(\$143,138)	\$885,634

Post Financial Plan Developments

- ❑ Continued to engage CUNY for assistance:
CUNY increased our allocations by \$1.2 million
- ❑ Continued consultation with FPS on full-time hiring decisions, OTPS and College Assistant reduction plans and review of monthly expenditures
- ❑ Maintained hiring pause
 - ❑ Faculty Vacancies – 46 (55 with 9 filled by subs)
 - ❑ Administrative Vacancies – 63 (70 with 7 filled by subs) 5 other vacancies exempt and 58 are paused.

FY 2011 Financial Plan 2nd Quarter Final Expenditure and Projection

	FY 2011 FIN PLAN SUBMISSION	YTD Actuals (as of 12/31/10)	2nd Qtr Final Projection	Projection Variance - FIN PLAN
BUDGET ALLOCATION AND REVENUE				
CUNY Revenue Target	\$69,012,000	-	\$69,012,000	\$0
Actual Enrollment / FY10-11 Projection	11,478	-	11,478	-
Base Allocation	\$75,466,417	-	\$74,999,187	(\$467,230)
Lump Sum Allocations	\$2,143,832	-	\$3,021,727	\$877,895
Additional Allocations	\$4,190,268	-	\$4,191,113	\$845
Current Year Gross Tuition Revenue above CUNY Target	\$1,083,395	-	\$1,083,395	\$0
TOTAL BASE BUDGET ALLOCATION	\$82,883,912	-	\$83,295,422	\$411,510
Prior Year Cutra Balance	\$1,569,230	-	\$1,995,920	\$426,689
Lease Revenue	\$488,754	-	\$488,754	\$0
TOTAL ADDITIONAL REVENUES	\$2,057,984	-	\$2,484,674	\$426,689
TOTAL BUDGET ALLOCATION	\$84,941,897	-	\$85,780,096	\$838,199
EXPENDITURES				
Personnel Services (PS)	\$60,843,897	\$32,063,891	\$60,657,554	\$186,342
Faculty	\$34,751,781	\$18,565,566	\$34,058,344	\$693,437
Administrative Staff	\$23,108,462	\$12,066,312	\$23,515,866	(\$407,404)
ECP	\$2,983,654	\$1,432,013	\$3,083,344	(\$99,690)
Adjuncts	\$12,034,123	\$6,018,442	\$12,351,910	(\$317,788)
Teaching Adjuncts / CLTs	\$11,854,978	\$6,008,861	\$12,172,765	(\$317,788)
CETs	\$179,145	\$9,581	\$179,145	\$0
Temp Services	\$6,409,875	\$2,975,046	\$6,415,667	(\$5,792)
College Assistants	\$5,502,459	\$2,472,534	\$5,323,217	\$179,242
Non-Teaching Adjuncts	\$907,416	\$502,513	\$1,092,450	(\$185,034)
TOTAL PS:	\$79,287,894	\$41,057,379	\$79,425,132	(\$137,237)
OTPS	\$5,266,703	2,301,004	4,978,927	\$287,776
ETI Transfer to Tech Fee	(\$269,440)	\$0	(\$269,440)	\$0
TOTAL OTPS :	\$4,997,263	\$2,301,004	\$4,709,487	\$287,776
TOTAL FINANCIAL PLAN EXPENDITURES	\$84,285,158	\$43,358,384	\$84,134,619	\$150,539
YEAR-END BALANCE	\$656,739	-	\$1,645,477	\$988,738

Key Changes in Year To Date Allocations and Expenditures

☐ Increase in Allocations

- ☐ University increased FY 2011 Budget Allocation by \$1.2 million
- ☐ Projection assumed a decrease in Base Allocations for ERI (assuming 50% of savings was returned to the University) to be updated in revised projections

☐ Enrollment

- ☐ 2nd Quarter projections do not reflect:
 - ☐ lower than estimated Spring enrollment (140 FTE's less than planned/ \$400k revenue loss)
 - ☐ Increased Winter Session enrollment (\$130k revenue increase)
 - ☐ 5% tuition increase in Spring Semester

☐ Expenditures/Costs:

- ☐ ERI savings greater than planned - 19 Faculty/15 Staff
- ☐ Exemptions from Hiring Pause (reviewed by FPS)
- ☐ Increased Spring Adjunct costs due to ERI

Exemptions From Hiring Pause

- ☐ Director of SEEK
- ☐ Director of Counseling
- ☐ Director of Student Life
- ☐ Director of Public Safety/Risk Management
- ☐ Academic Advisor- Transfer Students
- ☐ Chair, Protection Management
- ☐ Benefits Manager
- ☐ Director of Institutional Research
- ☐ Substitute Faculty for Spring 2011 (2)

All of these positions became vacant or resulted from vacancies this FY.

FY 2012 Budget Developments

❑ FY 2011-12 Executive Budget includes:

- ❑ 10% reduction to CUNY - \$83.2 million
- ❑ Reduction in State Aid (carried over from FY 11) - \$11.9 m
- ❑ 5% Tuition Increase (implemented in Spring, no additional increase)
- ❑ \$284.2 million capital funding for critical maintenance projects

❑ CUNY Policies in Response to Executive Budget

- ❑ Colleges will retain all savings from ERI
- ❑ College revenue targets will not be increased in FY 11 to allow additional Cutra to offset FY 12 reductions
- ❑ FY 12 allocations will be reduced by 4% (John Jay impact = est. \$3.5 - \$4.0 million)

Proposed Financial Planning Process

- ❑ VP's/College Budget Office Consultation and Data Preparation
 - ❑ Revise FY 11- 13 projections to incorporate changes in tuition, ERI policy, FY 12 reductions, exemptions from pause, and revised enrollment projections
 - ❑ Evaluate current spending patterns, actual expenses and identify areas that can be reduced
 - ❑ Review, prioritize and categorize faculty and administrative vacancies
 - ❑ Cost out strategies for multi year implementation of the Master Plan goals
 - ❑ Identify Master Plan goals that can be accomplished with minimal funding and implementation plan for all goals
 - ❑ Create investment categories for vacancies, strategies and initiatives
 - ❑ Resource Acquisition/Revenue Generation
 - ❑ Master Plan Priorities
 - ❑ Maintenance of Critical Operations

Financial Planning Process (continued)

- ❑ FPS/SPS Consultation as a joint committee
 - ❑ Multiple meetings to review revised outcomes of VP/Budget Office Consultation and provide input and recommendations on priorities, investment categories and potential reductions
- ❑ ESM
 - ❑ Review outputs of VP's , FPS, SPS consultations
 - ❑ Review reports from the On-Line Learning and Year Round College Task Forces and consider possible investment needs
 - ❑ Establish Recruitment/ Marketing Plan
 - ❑ Evaluate budget needs for New Building
 - ❑ Follow up Consultation with FPS/SPS
 - ❑ Mid April finalize Draft Financial Plan
 - ❑ Present to Budget and Planning Committee

New Building Budget Request

Department	Pos	Start-up	Recurring
Facilities	44	\$309,485	\$4,145,569
Information Tech	9	\$597,400	\$ 788,301
Public Safety	35	\$226,205	\$ 1,228,665
Campus Office Svc	2	\$145,000	\$ 54,072
Black Box Theatre	2	\$ 78,610	\$ 120,400
Science Staff/Supplies	8	\$ 250,000	\$ 395,000
Total	100	\$ 1,606,696	\$ 6,732,017

Note: Request does not include supplemental request for start up Science Lab equipment and supplies (\$2.5 million)



ATTACHMENT G

The Chancellor

February 4, 2011

To: Board of Trustees
College Presidents
Cabinet

From: Matthew Goldstein *MG*

Re: Fiscal Year 2011-12 State Executive Budget

Governor Cuomo released the Fiscal Year 2011-12 State Executive Budget on February 1. The governor is proposing a 10 percent cut to state agencies, including CUNY. Below is a summary of the impact on the University.

On the operating side, for the senior colleges the executive proposal provides \$64.7 for the University's mandatory needs. It also includes a reduction in state aid of \$83.2 million. In addition, the executive budget further reduces state aid to the senior colleges by \$11.9 million to help cover a FY2011 shortfall of over \$300 million that is rolled forward into FY2012.

The State Executive Budget increases the University's revenue appropriation by \$40 million to recognize the 5 percent spring tuition increase approved by the Board of Trustees. However, the 2 percent increase approved as part of the FY2012 budget request is not recognized.

For the community colleges, the executive budget recommends an overall decrease of \$15.6 million, resulting from a 10 percent base-aid reduction of \$226 per FTE (\$17.5 million), offset by a \$1.8 million increase from projected enrollment growth and a building rental aid increase of \$0.1 million.

Regarding financial aid, the executive budget continues all of the changes made to the Tuition Assistance Program (TAP) in FY2011 except for the \$75 reduction of all TAP awards. The governor proposes to restore the maximum TAP award to \$5,000.

With respect to capital needs, the state budget recommends \$284.2 million in appropriations for the senior colleges for critical maintenance projects and \$31.2 million in appropriations for community college projects that have received city funding.

Attached is a preliminary analysis of the FY 2011-12 State Executive Budget, which provides further details. Please let me know if you have any questions or need any additional information. Thank you.

Enclosure

This Resolution on gen ed and transfer has been proposed by the CUNY Central Administration for vote by the CUNY Board of Trustees in June.

Draft Resolution on

Creating an Efficient Transfer System

ATTACHMENT H

1-6-2011

Rationale

CUNY has large student transfer flows among its colleges, with students needing remediation starting at community colleges and then transferring to pursue baccalaureate degrees, and other students transferring to meet their academic interests. To enhance these students' progress, CUNY must insure that its transfer system operates smoothly and efficiently. The majority of CUNY students who transfer within the University from an associate degree program to a baccalaureate program do so without having completed the associate degree and thus do not benefit from current transfer guarantees extended to students who hold AA or AS degrees, including, in particular, the provision that they will be considered to have completed lower-division general education requirements.

Many of the colleges have long-standing general education requirements that reflect a time when our students were less mobile and were expected to complete their degree requirements at the College they first entered. However, while recognizing that each of these general education distributions has merit, as a system we have a responsibility to our students to ensure that our general education requirements are structured in a manner that facilitates the movement of students among the Colleges without the loss of credit.

CUNY colleges should be consistent in their evaluation of transfer credits so that students can plan their academic paths. If CUNY set the number of general education credits required at its undergraduate colleges, students would know exactly what requirements they would have to meet at any CUNY college. This would reduce the number of students acquiring more credits than they need to graduate, which would save resources for them and for the larger community. Similarly, students in associate programs would benefit from faculty agreement across the senior and community colleges about appropriate lower-division courses for entry into the major.

Now be it

Resolved, that the Chancellor, in consultation with the Council of Presidents, the University Faculty Senate, and the University Student Senate, will convene a task force of faculty, students, and academic administrators and charge it with creating a common general education framework for the undergraduate colleges of the University. The framework will set credit requirements in general education across broad disciplinary areas and will consist of a maximum of 36 credits of lower-division general education courses, with baccalaureate programs able to add up to six credits of lower- or upper-division credits at their option. This framework will apply to all A.A., A.S., and baccalaureate degrees. In addition, for A.A.S. degrees, which may contain less than 36 general education credits, all liberal arts courses for those degrees will be drawn from the courses approved for the general education

framework, such that A.A.S. students will receive partial certification for completion of the general education framework

a) The Task Force shall recommend the number of credits to be allocated to each broad disciplinary or interdisciplinary area such as: written and oral communication; natural sciences; math/quantitative reasoning; social science; and humanities, global perspectives, and languages other than English. The framework will adhere as closely as possible to existing general education requirements at CUNY senior colleges. Within the broad disciplinary areas of the framework, all undergraduate CUNY colleges will specify individual required courses as they choose, but all colleges must accept all validated courses in those areas from any other CUNY college as meeting area requirements. Students who satisfactorily complete courses in these areas, or complete all general education requirements, will be certified as having achieved partial or full completion of the general education requirements from the colleges where they took the courses. If a student transfers to another CUNY college, all certified general education course credits will be accepted without further evaluation of those credits.

b) The Task Force will also specify the criteria by which courses will qualify as having satisfied the requirements of a disciplinary area, and those criteria will be based on learning outcomes.

c) The Task Force will complete its deliberations and present its recommended framework, including the necessary learning outcomes, to the Chancellor in a report by November 1, 2011, and be it further

RESOLVED, that all liberal arts and science courses taken for credit at a CUNY college be accepted for credit at other CUNY colleges, regardless of whether a specific equivalency exists at the transfer college, to an extent consistent with the student meeting grade requirements and residency rules at the transfer college, and be it further

RESOLVED, that clear pathways be created for the largest transfer majors. The Chancellor, in consultation with the Council of Presidents, the University Faculty Senate, and the University Student Senate, will convene relevant disciplinary committees of faculty, students, and academic administrators. By March 1, 2012, each disciplinary committee will specify no fewer than three and no more than six courses in the major or cognate fields that will be accepted as entry-level major courses or as prerequisites for such courses by all colleges offering those majors.

EXPLANATION. The Board has affirmed the rights of transfer students in a number of resolutions and the current resolutions are intended not to preempt them but to strengthen the protections they offer. Most recently, a 1999 resolution guaranteed students who completed the AA or AS degree at CUNY automatic fulfillment of lower division liberal arts and science distribution requirements toward a baccalaureate degree, with the exception that students could be asked to complete an additional course toward a college's baccalaureate distribution requirements. However, nearly two-thirds of transfer students from CUNY associate programs enroll in their new colleges before completing a degree and

consequently do not benefit from these policies. Additionally, increasing numbers of students from CUNY Associate in Applied Science (AAS) degree programs are transferring to baccalaureate programs.

Transfer guarantees have also been undercut by inconsistencies in how CUNY colleges have evaluated transfer credits and, in particular, by the granting of only elective credit in many cases, rather than credits that apply to general education or major requirements. These practices lead to delays and uncertainties for transfer students and, ultimately, to taking excess credits. Given increasing restrictions on financial aid and the growing fiscal constraints on the University, it is essential that prospective transfer students be able to plan and pursue their academic careers efficiently.

A standard general education framework is necessary if the City University is to fulfill its mission as an integrated system. Community colleges are a vital entry point to higher education for many students, but the system only functions well if transfer is seamless. Moreover, consistent with greater integration, the University's colleges have developed increasingly specialized curricula—a positive trend that will and should continue, but one that renders a transfer system based on narrow course equivalencies impractical and inefficient. Credit should be awarded on the basis of academic learning and not on the basis of a curricular match.

Finally, the number of credits required to satisfy general education requirements varies widely across the CUNY senior colleges. The disciplines covered at the individual colleges also vary. A common general education framework with credits that fit within 60-credit associate-degree programs would enable students to complete lower-division requirements whether in community colleges or in baccalaureate colleges. Moreover, by specifying a common set of entry-level courses, including prerequisites and cognates, to be offered and accepted universally within the major transfer pathways, prospective students will be able to prepare for transfer more effectively and receive the maximum amount of credit for their course work.

ATTACHMENT I

From: Jane Bowers
Sent: Thursday, December 02, 2010 8:25 PM
To: Karen Kaplowitz
Subject: Meeting with Faculty Senate

Dear Karen,

As we discussed, I would like to come to the Faculty Senate at its first meeting of the spring semester to discuss some actions the College would like to take to support student success. These actions would involve the faculty therefore advice and feedback from the senators would be very helpful to me. These are the issues I would like to discuss:

1. We would like to work toward a system of early intervention for students at risk of dropping out. Early intervention is only possible when the faculty engage in early assessment in their courses and give mid-term grades based on this early assessment. So, I would like to hear the Senate's views on requiring early assessment of student work and on instituting a system of mid-term grades.
2. Research shows that student engagement and interaction with faculty outside the classroom is key to retention and success. Student/faculty interaction outside the classroom is most easily accomplished when faculty keep regular office hours, which are posted publicly outside their doors and in departmental offices and included on their syllabi. At the present, we have no official policy about faculty office hours, though some other CUNY schools do. For example, Brooklyn College asks all full-time faculty to schedule 2 to 3 office hours each week. A statement to this effect appears in the Brooklyn Faculty Handbook under the section on counseling responsibilities. The Dean of Undergraduate Studies at Brooklyn also sends out an email in advance of the start of each semester indicating what information instructors should provide their students. This prompts faculty to include on their syllabi their office hours. I would like to institute such a policy at John Jay and would appreciate hearing the Senate's view on this as well.
3. Two other matters are perhaps more properly left to the UCASC to deal with, but it might be useful for me to discuss incomplete contracts and the inclusion of transparent grading criteria on syllabi with the Senate.

If you wish, you can initiate a discussion of these topics at your all day meeting next week, and then we can continue the conversation when I come to the Senate in February. Thank you for your consideration.

Jane

Jane P. Bowers
Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs



JOHN JAY COLLEGE
THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK
OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE

899 Tenth Avenue, Suite 621
New York, NY 10019