Faculty Senate Minutes #369

March 10, 2010   **3:20 PM**   **Room 630 T**

Present (34): Andrea Balis, Spiros Bakiras, Elton Beckett, Elise Champeil, Kathleen Collins, Lyell Davies, Edgardo Diaz Diaz, Virginia Diaz-Mendoza, James DiGiovanna, Jennifer Dysart, DeeDee Falkenbach, Beverly Frazier, Terry Furst, Robert Garot, Jay Gates, Katie Gentile, Lior Gideon, Demis Glasford, Norman Groner, Maki Haberfeld, Jay Hamilton, Veronica Hendrick, Olivera Jokic, Karen Kaplowitz, Vincent Maiorino, Nivedita Majumdar, Xerxes Malki, Evan Mandery, Gerald Markowitz, Isabel Martinez, Paul Narkunas, Richard Perez, Rick Richardson, Richard Schwester, Pat Tovar, Valerie West

Absent (12): William Allen, Ben Bierman, Erica Burleigh, Sergei Cheloukhine, Demi Cheng, Sara Mcdougall, Richard Ocejo, Frank Pezzella, Raul Rubio, Francis Sheehan, Staci Strobl, Monica Varsanyi

Invited Guest: President Jeremy Travis

Agenda

1. Announcements
2. Adoption of the Agenda
3. Approval of Minutes #368 of the February 23, 2011, meeting]
4. Review of the agenda of the March 24 meeting of the College Council: Part I
5. Review of the agenda of the March 24 meeting of the College Council: Part II
6. Proposal to Co-Sponsor a Faculty Telethon, with the Office of Enrollment Management, to reach out to students accepted to JJ: Executive Committee
7. Proposal to pilot electronic balloting in the adjunct at-large Faculty Senate election
8. Gen Ed Revision Update: Professor Amy Green, Chair, Gen Ed Steering Committee
9. 80th Street Gen Ed Initiative
10. Invited Guest: Jeremy Travis
11. Declaration of a vacancy on the Senate and action to take, if any
12. Discussion, continued, of the Strategies for JJ's 5-Year Master Plan

1. Announcements

President Travis has appointed all eight faculty members nominated by the Faculty Senate to serve on the Planning Committee for the 2012 International Criminal Justice Conference. Two of those faculty members, Josh Freilich and Michele Galietta, who are the executive officers of the two doctoral programs housed at John Jay, have agreed to serve as co-chairs of the committee.

2. Adoption of the Agenda

The agenda was amended by the addition of an agenda item: declaration of a vacancy on the Faculty Senate and a decision as to what action, if any, to take. The amended agenda was approved.

3. Approval of Minutes # 368 of the February 23, 2011. Approved.

4. Review of the agenda of the March 24th meeting of College Council: Part I

Policy Proposal Regarding Change of Grade after Final Grades are Submitted

This proposal from UCASC states that course grades are not to be changed after final grades are submitted to the Registrar's Office except to correct computational errors. It also requires that if the department chair approves a grade change, then the Dean of Undergraduate Studies must as well.

The Senate discussed whether to clearly define computational error/miscalculation of grade; the consensus was that to not define it provides wider discretion for faculty members. Several members of the Senate criticized this proposed policy because it would remove discretion from the faculty members and would create an unnecessarily complicated process. Some concerns were also raised about giving a dean the final say about grade change requests. Some senators suggested that this proposed process will force faculty to dissemble in order to change the grades of their students; they asserted that assigning grades as well as changing grades should be at the discretion of the faculty member. Senators discussed the fact that a grade change form already exists and that it asks for an explanation of the computational error that is the reason for the requested change, implying that only computational errors are grounds for the change. It was explained that some faculty members now bypass the form and email the request directly to their chair who simply forwards it to the registrar. The Senate stated that it should be College policy that the form must be used. Senate members questioned whether this is a big problem and asked for data as to how many grade change requests are made each

semester and how many grade changes are actually made as well. If it is a serious problem, then we can revisit the issue, they said; if it is not, then no further policy is needed. It was noted that VP Eanes has reported at the College Council that students come to her Office to complain about other students who receive a chance to do extra work after the grade is submitted and are able to get their grades changed and that this is unfair to the rest of the class. It was questioned how often this was actually happening and whether it is anecdotal reports by a few vocal students.

5. <u>Review of the agenda of the March 24th meeting of College Council: Part II</u>

Proposal to change the criteria for Latin Honors

Senators supported this proposed policy and suggested further amending the proposal by increasing the criteria so that Magna Cum Laude would require a 3.75 gpa, instead of a 3.7 gpa, so that that honor would also meet the national criteria. This proposal was adopted.

6. <u>Proposal to Co-Sponsor a Telethon with the Office of Enrollment Management</u>

The Faculty Senate has been invited to co-sponsor a telethon with the Office of Enrollment Management. The telethon would involve two evenings in April during which faculty and staff would telephone students who have been accepted to John Jay but who have not yet decided to enroll at John Jay.

Some senators said they do not wish to participate in this endeavor nor have the Senate co-sponsor it because it is not appropriate for the faculty and that the faculty already has too much work. Others supported the proposal by saying that this would create a sense of connectedness to the College for prospective students.

Some Senators supported this proposal by noting that the College's finances should be of concern to all members of our community, including the faculty and that the enrollment of students is a key to our financial health. Others supported it saying that this activity could serve to provide information to students and answer questions that they may have about the College. Some felt that the Admissions Office should undertake this activity and that it is inappropriate for faculty to do so this kind of activity. Also, some expressed concern that we would be lumped together with other telemarketing activities that take place in the evening hours and would not be received favorably by prospective students.

Several senators suggested that students would be more apt to respond positively if the College were to use more technologically modern methods for communicating with them and that telephoning is obsolete. Some senators felt that this is a disrespectful use of faculty members'

time. The vote as to whether the Faculty Senate shall co-sponsor the telethon was 15 yes, 14 no, and 5 abstentions.   The motion carried.

7.   Proposal to pilot electronic balloting in the adjunct at-large Faculty Election

The Senate voted unanimously to pilot the use of Ballotbin.com for the adjunct representative election to the 2011-12 Faculty Senate.   To address the privacy issue identified at a past Senate meeting, Senator Kathleen Collins, the Chair of the Faculty Elections Committee, will choose the first four characters of the password, and Karen Kaplowitz will choose the second four characters; thus both will have to enter their half of the password for either to access the program, ensuring privacy. They will report to the Senate the experience of the electronic ballot program.

8.   John Jay Gen Ed Revision Update

The Chair of John Jay's Gen Ed Steering Committee, Professor Amy Green, reports that the Committee has not finished the current stage of its work and therefore is not ready to meet with the Senate; the Committee has scheduled another meeting on March 14.

9.   80th Street Gen Ed Initiative   [Attachment C, D]

CUNY Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and University Provost Lexa Logue has proposed a CUNY-wide policy on General Education and student transfer. The proposal was originally to have been voted on by the CUNY Board of Trustees in January. The University Faculty Senate Executive Committee persuaded VC Logue to postpone the vote until the June meeting of the Board so that the University community can respond. The proposal called for a maximum of 36 gen ed credits at the community colleges, which the senior colleges would have to accept, and a maximum of another 6 credits decided by the senior colleges, for a total maximum gen ed curriculum of 42 credits.   On March 2, VC Logue issued a document repeating the original proposal and offering two possible alternate proposals, in response to faculty comments [Attachment C]. Both alternate proposals still call for a maximum of 42 credits but provide different divisions of those 42 credits.   On February 28, VC Logue issued a FAQ document [Attachment D].

10.   Invited Guest: Jeremy Travis

President Travis gave the Senate his take on the very fluid situation budget situation. The budget depends on what happens in Albany. By April 1st we expect to see the final State budget. There are proposed cuts and we should expect that the budget will be adopted as proposed. The analytical assumption is that we will experience a cut of 4%. The proposed tuition increase had been expected to serve as a cushion.

The number of faculty members and staff at the College has gone down drastically. The early retirement initiative also added to the number of vacancies. President Travis stated that there are well over 100 vacancies at the College. Decisions to not reappoint part-time personnel and to reduce the number of hours of other part-time personnel have negatively affected the core functioning of the College.

Our enrollment projection suggests a flat enrollment. There are initiatives to increase our yield including the Telethon and an increased level of outreach and engagement by departments at the College. President Travis will continue his lobbying efforts. He hopes to continue to participate in initiatives that will increase revenues at the College. He looks forward to catapulting our efforts to a next level by investing in activities to generate revenues. The University will decide how they will allocate funds. He spoke about moving toward being a year round College and offering more on-line course offerings.

11. Declaration of a vacancy on the Senate and action to take, if any

Adjunct at-large representative Roz Myers is unable to attend meetings because she teaches when the Senate meets and so has resigned her seat. The Senate declared the seat vacant and then decided to take no action because of the lateness of the academic year.

12. Discussion, continued, of the Strategies for JJ's 5-Year Master Plan [Attachment E]

This item was postponed because of lack of sufficient time.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 PM.

Submitted by

Virginia Diaz-Mendoza
Recording Secretary

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

To: Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee

From: The Academic Standards Subcommittee

Date: February 17, 2011

Re: Proposal Regarding Change of Grade After Final Grades are Filed

N.B. This item was approved by UCASC in the of Spring 2010 and was referred back to Committee by the College Council during the Fall 2010 semester for clarification. It was subsequently revised by the Academic Standards Committee.

Current Policy:
After final grades for a course have been submitted to the Registrar, a faculty member who decides to change a grade completes a Change of Grade form and submits it to her/his department chair who emails the request to the Registrar.

Proposed Policy:
Grades, once submitted to the Registrar, shall not be changed unless there has been a computational error resulting in an incorrect grade having been submitted. Faculty requests for a change in a final grade shall be submitted to the department chair and, if approved, submitted by the chair to the Dean of Undergraduate Studies. If the Dean of Undergraduate Studies approves the grade change request because a computational error was made, the Dean shall forward the change of grade request to the Registrar.

Given this policy, faculty shall not permit students to submit supplemental/extra-credit work in an attempt to try to improve their final course grade after grades have been submitted to the Registrar.

(Implementation date: Fall 2011)

Rationale:
Grades are universally recognized as a means of showing student achievement within a

particular course. Grades are not a negotiation. Rather, they are based on the same work required of all students within the course of the semester. This is sound fairness policy. It is also institutional integrity policy. The acceptance by faculty of additional student work after the final grade is recorded is not fair to those students who have completed the course and have been given a course grade without the opportunity to do extra work and without the extra time to do such extra work. Appeals of grades and grade changes should not be influenced by extra work that other students are not afforded the opportunity to do. This policy also ensures integrity of the grading system which is essential for the reputation of the College, which is essential for our students and our graduates. Furthermore, the Incomplete Grade exists for those students unable to complete their work during the course of the semester. Similarly, an Administrative Withdrawal from a course is possible, with documentation, after the course withdrawal date and a Retroactive Withdrawal is available, with documentation, even after the completion of a course and the submission of the final grade.

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

To: The Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee

From: The Academic Standards Subcommittee

Date: February 17, 2011

Re: Proposal to revise the eligibility criteria for Latin Honors

Background:
Our current eligibility requirements for Latin Honors are as follows:

Summa Cum Laude: 3.8 cum GPA
Magna Cum Laude: 3.5 cum GPA
Cum Laude: 3.2 cum GPA

Feedback from officials outside John Jay, including from Law Schools, have alerted us that our criteria for Latin Honors eligibility is low, implying low academic standards at our College. We have learned that this is negatively affecting the academic reputation of John Jay and this, in turn, negatively affects the chances for admission of our students into Law School and graduate school and in their employment goals. A review of the criteria at other CUNY senior colleges shows that John Jay's requirements are substantially lower than those at Baruch, Brooklyn, Hunter, and Queens, with whom our students compete for law school and graduate school admission, for internships, and for jobs.

Proposal:
This proposal is to raise the eligibility requirements to the following criteria:

Summa Cum Laude: 3.90 cum GPA
Magna Cum Laude: 3.7 cum GPA
Cum Laude: 3.5 cum GPA

(Implementation date: Summer 2012)

Rationale:

Approved by UCASC, Feb 25, prepared for College Council, March 24, 2011

This proposal helps ensure the integrity of our academic standards as a College and better communicates the actual academic achievement of our students. It is in the best interests of our students and of our graduates that their achievements be respected by outside entities, institutions, and officials.

ATTACHMENT C

Three General Education Models

36 + 6 Model

- Community colleges and senior colleges would have 36 credits of general education, with courses distributed across disciplinary or interdisciplinary categories in an agreed-upon general education framework.

- Faculty members at the CUNY undergraduate colleges would select the courses that would fulfill the requirements in the different areas of the framework.

- Senior colleges would have an extra 6 credits for additional lower- or upper-division courses. Faculty members would decide on these courses.

30 + 6 + 6 Model

- The general education framework would consist of courses in specified disciplinary or interdisciplinary areas that would total 30 credits, with the courses chosen by the faculty members of the different colleges.

- All undergraduate colleges, whether community colleges or senior colleges, would also have six credits (outside the general education framework) to create their own college-specific forms of general education according to their preferences. College faculty could, for example, choose to use the 6 general education credits to meet the particular needs of students in STEM and non-STEM programs. The courses in the general education framework and the six credits outside it would total 36 credits.

- Senior colleges would also receive an additional 6 credits for lower- or upper-division general education courses (for a total of 42 gen ed credits).

30 + 12 Model

- All undergraduate colleges would have 30-credit general education frameworks. In addition, senior colleges would receive an additional 12 credits to use for additional lower- or upper-division courses. All courses would be chosen by the faculty members of the individual colleges.

This document was issued by the CUNY Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Lexa Logue on February 28, 2011

Frequently Asked Questions

What's wrong with our transfer system as it stands?

- The curricula of CUNY's colleges often do not align well. There is inconsistency in how colleges accept transfer credits and some courses transfer only as electives, which are not always helpful to students. The colleges differ in the number of credits they require for general education and in how credits are distributed across disciplinary areas. These differences make it hard for students to plan their paths toward their degrees, and to graduate within the number of credits specified for their degrees. Further, under the current system, a student who transfers within CUNY with an AA or AS degree will sometimes get credit for the exact same course that a student who is one course short of an AA or AS will not.

- The current system does not support our principle of allowing students to move freely within the system according to their needs and interests, subject to the admissions standards of the colleges.

Why can't we solve transfer problems through creating more articulation agreements or joint degree programs?

- Articulation agreements and joint degree programs each have their place but also have limitations. Articulation agreements are hard to maintain and often become outdated. Joint degree programs (such as those found in the Justice Academy established by John Jay and CUNY's community colleges) can be very successful. They work best, however, in fields where students identify with a major from the time they start college and especially where majors are predominantly found at one college. They do not work as well in fields that draw students at a later point. CUNY has 700 registered undergraduate degree programs at the different colleges. To maintain articulation agreements for each of them with every similar program at another college is not feasible.

Why can't we solve transfer problems by addressing the specific courses that don't transfer?

- The issue transcends individual courses. CUNY's students would benefit from greater curricular clarity and alignment across colleges. It is not only a matter of whether credits are awarded, but in what form. Elective credits do not always help students as they may not have enough flexibility in their programs to use these credits.

- CUNY has 23,000 different credit-bearing undergraduate courses. To ensure on a one-by-one basis that each of these courses transfers appropriately to each of the other colleges is not feasible.

- Currently, courses transfer if they substantially match courses at the receiving institution. As CUNY develops and the campuses continue to differentiate, courses are increasingly less likely to match.

When students graduate with excess credits, isn't that usually due to the students changing their majors, sometimes more than once?

- There are many reasons that students graduate with excess credits. However, the evidence indicates that a frequent reason is students not receiving usable credits (those that can be applied to their degrees) when they transfer from one CUNY college to another. Analyses show that CUNY transfer students are disadvantaged in this way.

We get tuition for the excess credits that students take, so why is there a problem with students accumulating them?

- Tuition covers only about half of the cost of offering each credit. The other half comes from New York State and New York City. These entities, and the taxpayers who ultimately supply the funds, do not expect to have to pay for students taking more than 120 credits.

- Students do not receive financial aid for credits in excess of the number required for their degrees.

- If students graduate with fewer excess credits, we will be able to admit and accommodate more students within the same physical facilities.

Given that we want our students to be well educated, isn't taking more than 120 credits good for them?

- The New York State Education Department, Middle States, all of our other regulatory bodies, and the taxpayers of New York State expect that we will be able to teach our students what they need to know within the forty 3-credit

courses (or the equivalent) that they take for their baccalaureate degrees. Of course, we want our students to continue their learning, but those seeking further education would be better served by entering graduate programs than by accumulating credits beyond those required for their baccalaureate degrees.

Shouldn't each college have its own general education curriculum that all of its students must take?

- The difficulty with this at CUNY is that, possibly due partly to the geographical proximity of our campuses, a very large proportion of our students transfer. At every senior college over 50% of the graduates entered that college as a transfer student. Therefore it is not possible to have a single general education curriculum for every CUNY student that is also specific to each individual college.

Isn't the problem one of advising? If we had better advising wouldn't students take the correct courses—ones that would transfer?

- Undoubtedly our advising could be improved. However, even with greatly improved advising, there would still be difficulties. One reason is that, especially with the increased admission standards of our senior colleges, prospective transfer students cannot be sure to which senior college they will gain admission. Another reason is that some of our colleges' current requirements are so complex that it can be difficult for even an experienced, skilled advisor to understand them.

Why should we create a general education framework?

- Students would benefit from a standard framework that would ensure transfer of general education credits from one CUNY college to another, thus making academic planning easier for students (and advisors), reducing the likelihood of excess credit accumulation, and keeping transfer options open.

- Such a framework would also assist our student recruitment efforts; recruiters could tell prospective applicants about a single general education framework whose credits students would carry with them as their needs and interests changed and they moved throughout the system.

- College Now for-credit courses could be aligned with a CUNY-wide general education framework so that College Now students would be guaranteed credit for their College Now courses at any CUNY college to which they are admitted.

- The large majority of states have already created a general education framework or core curriculum for the public colleges in that state. New York State's

3

legislative leadership has indicated their strong interest in CUNY's addressing this issue expeditiously (SUNY has already done so).

What size general education do we want at CUNY?

- States and systems across the country have implemented various models that establish standard general education frameworks generally ranging from 30-42 credits.

- An important part of the work of the proposed Task Force will be to consider a variety of models and recommend a general education framework of a size that enhances transfer students' progress, reflects existing general education requirements, and maintains the institutional integrity of the colleges.

- The New York State Education Department expects general education requirements to comprise 30 credits.

Why propose 36 credits of general education for all colleges, plus an option up to 6 additional credits for baccalaureate programs?

- 36 credits is the maximum number of credits that can fit within an AA or an AS program plus still allow students to complete their majors.

- Current board policy permits baccalaureate programs to require up to one course (the number of credits is not specified) of students who transfer in with CUNY AS or AA degrees. Under the assumption that a course can be up to 6 credits, 6 credits is the maximum that could be required in the proposed general education framework that would not impose more requirements on transfer students than are currently in place.

Don't we need general education to be close to 60 credits in order to expose our students to all of the disciplines? They get exposed to very little in their high schools.

- We need to ensure that students achieve certain learning outcomes. These outcomes can be achieved in a variety of ways. Communication skills or knowledge of global perspectives, for example, can be achieved in general education but also in majors and electives.

Why can't all of students' lower division courses, including at the community colleges, consist of general education? Why do community college students need to have majors?

- New York State TAP (Tuition Assistance Program) regulations require both associate and baccalaureate students to declare a major by halfway through their programs in order to continue receiving financial aid.

- Offering associate degrees with majors is standard nationwide.

Would faculty members still control the curriculum?

- The faculty of the CUNY colleges would determine the specifics of the general education framework, would specify its learning outcomes, and would select all courses for the general education framework, including their content.

Isn't control over the curriculum the right of each college's faculty, not the CUNY Board of Trustees?

- The applicable Board of Trustees policy states: "The faculty shall be responsible, subject to guidelines, if any, as established by the board, for the formulation of policy relating to the admission and retention of students including health and scholarship standards therefore, student attendance including leaves of absence, curriculum, awarding of college credit, granting of degrees." (See http://policy.cuny.edu/text/toc/btb/Article%20VIII/Section%208.6./.)

Would colleges all have the same general education courses?

- The framework would establish the broad disciplinary or interdisciplinary areas in which students would fulfill requirements but would not specify individual courses. It would be up to the colleges to identify the courses that would fulfill the requirements of each disciplinary area.

How will the colleges maintain institutional integrity and distinctiveness as reflected in their general education programs?

- Senior colleges, which have more room in their curriculum than community colleges, would have additional credits to develop their own distinctive upper- or lower-division courses.

- Colleges would also choose their own specific courses for the categories in the general education framework.

How will this process affect general education reform underway?

- General education reform is often underway in a large system like CUNY, with its 17 (soon to be 18) undergraduate colleges. The work and thought put into general education reform would inform the Task Force's deliberations. In addition, individual colleges' reform efforts would be reflected in their particular choices of courses for the framework (see the previous item).

- A recent AAC&U survey revealed that 89% of colleges were working on their general education requirements. General education reform at our colleges, just as at most other colleges, is a continuous process that would go on during, and after, the establishment of a general education framework at CUNY.

How would disciplinary committees agree on common entry courses into majors across the CUNY colleges?

- Disciplinary committees with representatives from CUNY's senior, comprehensive, and community colleges would meet to review existing patterns of course-taking in CUNY's large transfer majors. They would then decide on up to six courses in the major and in cognate fields that would be available to students at the different colleges and would provide a solid initial grounding in the field. The committees would develop their own modes of operation, but would be likely to identify a set of introductory courses across the colleges in a given major and then compare/ contrast sample syllabi for those courses. They could then come to an agreement on entry-level course content.

Does this plan create incentives for students to leave the community colleges prior to earning degrees?

- It could be argued that a standard framework would do the opposite, that is, that it would encourage community college students to complete as many general education requirements and courses leading into the major as possible at the community college prior to transfer.

Would this plan lower standards at the senior colleges?

- No. Instead, it would help insure that transfer students were well prepared for entry into baccalaureate colleges. Transfer students would have taken courses that have met CUNY-wide standards in an agreed-upon general education framework, and would have taken entry courses in the major that had been approved by disciplinary committees with faculty members from both the senior and community colleges. According to current board policy, students with CUNY AA and AS degrees who transfer to baccalaureate programs receive credit for all

of their general education coursework with no input whatsoever into the content of that coursework from the senior colleges.

How would we deal with problems such as CSI having many 4-credit courses and the other colleges mainly having 3-credit courses?

- The Task Force would take up this and other similar issues (e.g., whether there should be different general education courses for STEM majors, whether general education courses could also count towards a major, whether a freshman/success seminar should be a required part of the general education framework and how many credits it should receive, whether a student would need to receive a certain minimum grade in a course in order for it to transfer, etc.).

What about AAS degrees?

- Many AAS students transfer to baccalaureate programs, even though the AAS was originally intended for students who would enter their careers after receiving their degrees. These students often must take additional general education courses when they transfer. AAS programs should be reviewed as part of the work of the Task Force to consider whether more liberal arts courses could be included and/or whether some of the AAS degree programs could be changed to AS or AA degree programs.

The draft resolution says that the proposed Task Force would develop learning outcomes. What role would learning outcomes play in the process? How will the process affect general education learning outcomes already defined or being defined by the colleges?

- The Task Force would articulate desired learning outcomes for the broad disciplinary areas identified; these learning outcomes would serve as the basis for the colleges specifying which courses meet the requirements of each disciplinary area.

- Just as is the case with the framework itself, learning outcomes would be defined in a way that reflects existing general education requirements at the colleges. Colleges would develop their own learning outcomes for courses and groups of courses within the general education framework.

- Institutions and systems across the country have identified general education learning outcomes, many in relation to AACU's Liberal Education and America's Promise (LEAP) project—including several CUNY colleges. There are many models from which to build.

How would students benefit?

- Students would be able to meet the vast majority of general education requirements at their initial colleges. They would also know exactly what to take for their introductory courses within a major. And finally, a reasonably sized and more clearly specified set of general education courses would lead to greater curricular flexibility, would enable students to make full use of elective courses and credits, and would enable more students the opportunity to pursue double majors.

- When students transfer within CUNY they would not need to undergo a lengthy evaluation of their courses, as the sending college could certify the students' completion of general education requirements (or of specified categories of general education requirements) and also the completion of the agreed-upon initial courses in the major. The current evaluation process can take more than a semester, during which time a student may not be eligible for TAP.

- Much research has established that the more quickly and efficiently students can progress through the college curriculum the fewer the opportunities for other aspects of their lives to interfere and prevent them from continuing to degree completion.

- If students could progress through their requirements more efficiently, they will enter the workforce with their degrees sooner, with greater earning potential.

How can I learn more?

- There is much additional information on the Pathways website: www.cuny.edu/pathways.

How can I make sure that my voice is heard?

- You can send in your comments about the proposed general education framework by completing the feedback form on the Pathways website: www.cuny.edu/pathways.

Goal 1 Student Success: Establish an institutional culture that fosters intellectual and personal transformation in order that students achieve their goals.

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.	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.	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**
Facilitate adaptation and transition to both	1. Develop a distinctive strategy and orientation program for each

undergraduate and graduate programs for all entering and transfer students.	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.	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.	1. Create increased opportunities for peer mentoring. 2. Strengthen the *Peer Ambassador Program*; expand the opportunity to include peer mentoring. 3. Incentivize students to participate in campus events; this could be part of *CLIQUE* – 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.	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.	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.	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.	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.	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.	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.	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.	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.	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	1. Develop a vision statement on strategic partnerships. 2. Identify a decision matrix for embracing opportunities for strategic

and professional opportunities, and prepare for lifelong learning.	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.	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.	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.	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.	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.	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.	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.	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
	    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
	    o Program-specific meetings with faculty for targeted groups of students prior to the admission date.

	○ 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.	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.	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.	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	1. Improve Risk Management and compliance with required internal policies and procedures as well as external regulations. 2. Improve and enhance facilities.

successful experience.	

Prepared by Office of Associate Provost for Institutional Effectiveness