

Faculty Senate Minutes #150

John Jay College of Criminal Justice

February 19, 1997

3:15 PM

Room 630T

Present (25): Yahya Affinnih, Michael Blitz, Dorothy Bracey, Elizabeth Crespo, Edward Davenport, Jane Davenport, Kojo Dei, Janice Dunham, P.J. Gibson, Elisabeth Gitter, Lou Guinta, Karen Kaplowitz, Kwando Kinshasa, Sondra Lanzone, Tom Litwack, Ellen Marson, Mary Ann McClure, Daniel Pinello, Marilyn Rubin, Frederik Rusch, Carmen Solis, William Stahl, Davidson Umeh, Maurice Vodounon, Daniel Yalisove

Absent (13): Effie Papatzikou Cochran, John Donaruma, Arlene Geiger, Amy Green, Edward Green, Andrew Karmen, Gavin Lewis, Barry Luby, James Malone, Robert McCrie, Jill Norgren, Adina Schwartz, Agnes Wieschenberg

Invited Guest: Business Manager Robert Sermier

Agenda

1. Announcements from the chair
2. Approval of Minutes #149
3. Report on John Jay's budget: Invited Guest: Business Manager Robert Sermier
4. University Course Guides (formerly Course Equivalency Guides)
5. Discussion of the schedule of Personnel Committee actions

1. Announcements from the chair [Attachment A]

President Kaplowitz said that she would report about the extraordinary February 10 Board of Trustees meeting, at which a kind of revolution by several Trustees took place, including the postponement of the ACE (the "rising junior" exam) after Mr. Sermier's presentation because he must leave by 4 PM to teach a graduate course. [See p. 9 for the report about the meeting.]

The Board of Trustees also voted on February 10, in executive session, to appoint Dr. Louise Mirrer to be the new Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs. Dr. Mirrer, who will begin in July, is a scholar of Hispanic literature and is associate provost for academic affairs at the University of Minnesota.

President Kaplowitz distributed a chart [Attachment A] that had just been developed by the University Faculty Senate's Budget Advisory Committee, which both she and Professor Ned Benton participate on. The chart shows that there has been a tremendous decline in the number of full-time faculty from 1974, when CUNY had 11,268 full-time faculty, to 1995 when the number of full-time faculty was 5,342. (As of Fall 1966, the number of full-time faculty has further declined to 5211). Although the student

enrollment declined by 18 percent between 1974 and 1995, the size of the full-time faculty declined during the same period by more than 50 percent. She said that UFS delegates who went to Albany this past weekend for the Black, Puerto Rican, and Hispanic Association Weekend gave copies of this chart to legislators who were shocked by the tremendous decline in the size of the CUNY full-time faculty [Attachment A].

The Chancellor has approved John Jay's nominations for recipients of honorary degrees. President Lynch announced at the College Council that he has invited Puerto Rico's Governor, Pedro Rosello, to be our June 4 commencement speaker and that he is awaiting his reply.

The March 10 Town Hall Meeting will be on the Governor's proposed budget for CUNY. The resource panelists are Business Manager Robert Sermier, Public Relations Director Robert Pignatello, Faculty Senate President Karen Kaplowitz, and 80th Street's University Dean for Admissions and Financial Aid Angelo Proto. The event is from 4:30 to 6 PM in the Faculty Dining Room.

2. Approval of Minutes #149

Upon a motion duly made and seconded, Minutes #149 of the February 6, 1997, meeting were adopted.

3. Report on John Jay's budget: Invited Guest: Business Manager Robert Sermier [Attachment B]

Business Manager Robert Sermier was welcomed to the Senate and said that he is pleased to have been invited. He distributed a handout which he had prepared [Attachment B]. He explained that his goal is to provide the Senate with basic information about how the budget functions, where John Jay has stood in terms of the budget situation before this year, and what the outlook is with regard to the proposed budget of the Governor. He explained that the handout is adapted from a briefing that he gives the student leaders each spring, adding that he assumes that most Senators already know most if not all that is covered by the handout but, he said, in preparation for the upcoming days in which faculty and others will be speaking at various public forums about the budget, it is important that all of us at John Jay fully understand the fundamentals.

President Kaplowitz said she has heard the briefing that Mr. Sermier gives the student leaders and reported that the students, who have disparate interests, constituencies, and agendas, are uniformly enthralled by the presentation.

Mr. Sermier said that as the Senate undoubtedly knows, The City University is not part of New York City government. This happened as a result of the fiscal crisis in 1976, when the State assumed almost all the responsibility for the senior colleges. He added that the State now financially has the vast majority of the responsibility for CUNY's community colleges, as well, because the City has almost completely abandoned its role. So CUNY is this odd, political subdivision, much like the Board of Education and other similar entities listed on the handout. The City does give us some money for our associate degree program, approximately \$1

million. This is a fluid issue that comes up once in a while: right now it is unlikely to be problematic any longer because the City has reached a statutory limit in terms of how little money the City can provide to CUNY, and when it goes below that statutory limit the University raises the issue.

The Governor and the Legislature decide what CUNY's budget will be and the Chancellor decides what John Jay's budget and the budgets of the other colleges will be. It is important to note, he explained, that only the Board of Trustees can raise tuition: the Governor cannot do so. When the Governor puts a \$400 tuition increase in his budget proposal, that is only a suggestion and a signal that he will not veto a tuition increase. The Governor does have veto authority over the Board of Trustees -- he can set aside (in other words veto) increases in tuition -- and so the Governor is signaling the Board of Trustees that if the Trustees raise tuition by \$400 he will not veto the increase. Of course, in realpolitik terms, the University, because it is not a State agency, can do anything it wants, but the realpolitik factor is that the following year the Governor decides the budget. If one angers the Governor there are possible ramifications, but next year is an election year.

Senator Marilyn Rubin asked about the budget process: she asked who proposes the budget that the Governor bases his budget proposal on. Mr. Sermier explained that CUNY submits a budget request. The amount of the budget requested by CUNY that the Governor decides to put into his budget proposal varies from year to year. But the process begins, as with any State agency, with a budget request from CUNY to Albany. He said that when he came to John Jay 10 years ago, the overwhelming portion of the CUNY budget was derived from the budget that CUNY submitted in its budget request. Previously, CUNY's budget had a lot more detail in it than it does now: there is a term called a "line": a line is a set of words accompanied by a number. When the budget passes, every line in it by law has the amount of money that is supposed to be spent for that item. He said when he came to John Jay, we had three or four John Jay College lines -- one for full-time staff, one for part-time staff, one for the purchase of goods and services.

Now, there is only one line for John Jay College, called the base budget, and everything else is given to the University. This means that the remainder of the budget is in the Chancellor's discretion in what are known as "lump sums." This began happening five or six years ago. Until the present budget proposal, the Governors and their budget directors have adhered to that approach. Until this very last proposal, they have always made all the changes in the University's part of the budget.

This year, for the first time, the Governor has proposed to reduce each of the individual college lines, including ours, by 5%, which, as Professor Rubin, who is an expert in this area **knows**, is just a meat-ax approach. There is no rationale: someone decides how much money the total budget is going to be and then looks for rationales so that individual components add up to that total budget figure. There are no formulae, there are no enrollment-driven formulae that are driving the budget. The bottom line is determined first by political factors and then the technicians put the pieces together.

Turning to page 2 of Attachment B, Mr. Sermier pointed out what he called the astounding \$68.2 million figure. He noted that

we spend approximately between \$32 million and \$36 million here at the College: the rest is spent by the University on our behalf. He suggested looking (on page 2) first at the sources of this money, at where it comes from. What is interesting to him, he said, is how much of the money comes directly from the taxpayer. One of the points that various University documents emphasize is that the proportion paid by tuition is going up: however, most of tuition, as can be seen by the chart, at least for John Jay, is paid for by the taxpayer. In fact the only line here (except for small numbers at the bottom) that is not coming from the taxpayer is revenue from student loans and tuition paid out of pocket by students. The loans represent several million dollars but most of the loans are Federally subsidized loans that, again, involve the taxpayer. The point is that, in reality, the taxpayer is funding more than 90 percent of the cost of at least John Jay College and most of it is from the New York State taxpayer.

The revenue includes a couple hundred thousand (the last two rows) from training contracts and research grants: that is the money that grants director Jacob Marini administers and the \$200,000 is last year's overhead. The Auxiliary Services Corporation is worth about \$150,000 from the bookstore and from the cafeteria. That all adds up to \$68 million. Students last year received \$7 million more from the Federal taxpayer for their educational costs: that is, they received that money as a check.

Senator Tom Litwack noted that the third line says, "Federal Taxpayer's (Pell for Tuition, Veterans, and Other Programs)," which is then again mentioned at the bottom of the same page. Mr. Sermier explained that the Pell Grant can be as much as \$1275 a semester; TAP [Tuition Assistance Program] is a New York State program for tuition and it is for only tuition. The way John Jay, and he assumes this is true of other colleges, sets priorities for use of financial aid is that the TAP program always goes first: in other words, if a student receives TAP, the TAP is used for the student's tuition and then whatever has to be paid is taken from Pell. A significant amount of Pell money does go to pay tuition. This, as Professor Kaplowitz will tell you, he said, is one of the Governor's main proposals -- which is to say that if a student is eligible for TAP and Pell, then Pell has to come into play sooner and that is going to have a devastating effect. The students who received \$7 million in their hand last year will receive less money in their hand next year. Asked about the amount represented by loans, Mr. Sermier said that John Jay students receive at least \$2 million to \$3 million in loans. The amount, he noted, could be as much as \$4 million.

Senator Betsy Gitter asked if the Gurabo campus is included in these budget numbers. Mr. Sermier said it is not. He noted that the Gurabo campus is entirely self-funded and is in its own accounting world, one that is specifically for revenue-generating programs. The money that is brought in by the Gurabo campus is put into a separate account, even a separate bank account, from tax-levy money, and the expenses are paid out of that. Those figures are not shown on the handout at all.

Mr. Sermier explained that page 3 of Attachment B shows where the money goes. The first four rows total a little more than \$37 million and that is what we control here at the campus. The \$31.1 million that the University controls pays for fringe benefits for all of us, and it pays for heat, light, electric power, and for rent, lease costs, and for parts of the University's overhead that can be directly attributable to us and which is accounted for.

The \$22.5 million for teaching includes the salary for adjunct faculty as well as for full-time faculty. Academic support, \$5.1 million, are those units that report to the Provost and that are most directly involved in supporting classroom activities. The \$9.6 million for administrative services includes the President's Office, the Business Office, Vice President Mary Rothlein's Office, and Vice President John Smith's areas. \$4.9 million is for student services.

Senator Lou Guinta asked how we compare to other colleges in the University in terms of the percentages spent for these categories. President Kaplowitz said that she and Professor Ned Benton, as participants on the UFS Budget Committee, have received the budgets for each category at all the colleges but that neither the Senate's budget committee nor the budget committee that Professor Benton chairs has yet conducted an analysis of the data. She said that her memory of the data, which were provided by the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Budget, is that the percentages at John Jay and at other colleges are roughly similar but that, of course, the absolute dollar figures are very, very much lower at John Jay. She suggested that an analysis of these data is the next project that the two budget committees should engage in.

Mr. Sermier said he, too, remembers that the numbers show that John Jay is not significantly out of line in any of the categories: where we are, by statistical orders of magnitude, disadvantaged is in how much money we have to work with per student.

Page 4 of Attachment B shows the last seven years. Mr. Sermier explained he picked this time period because that is when the serious State budget cuts began and when tuition was increased. He noted that our budget has been reduced proportionally by the same percentage as every other college's budget has been reduced. That, of course, is one of our objections, that we keep being treated, with somewhat minor exceptions, the same as all the other colleges even though our enrollment growth is much, much greater than that of the other colleges. As with the other colleges, we have had our budget reduced. In order to provide the same level of services as next year, we always need more money because of inflation and also because of the salary increments for some people (although we have not had a cost of living increase for some while). Even if we tried to stay in the same place in terms of enrollment and didn't make any improvements, didn't do anything differently, we would have to spend more money next year in order to provide the same level of services. Thus that 30% figure is a number that Vice Chancellor Rothbard's Office is comfortable with.

Mr. Sermier said that we are different from other schools: while he does not know if any of the colleges capped enrollment, they certainly did reduce class sections, as reported, for example, in the PSC newspaper. He pointed to the second bullet from the bottom, because it is quite extraordinary, something of which all of us should be proud: during the past seven years, class size has been increased by only two students. Given the budget cuts that we've endured, of course more of those classes, proportionately, have been taught by adjunct faculty. He explained that when he is talking about class size he is not talking about the enrollment caps, he is talking about dividing the number of course sections by the number of students. President Kaplowitz asked whether the number of sections and students are of the undergraduate program only or if they include

graduate students and graduate course sections. Mr. Sermier said that the numbers do include graduate students and graduate course sections.

President Kaplowitz noted that John Jay's enrollment grew by 32% during this 7-year period but that our budget was cut during that same period by 30%. Mr. Sermier said that is what puts us in such a difficult position.

Mr. Sermier noted that the next page, page 5 of Attachment B, shows how we have managed to accomplish this. From the middle of 1990 to 1992 we did not hire anyone who was not a teacher. Of course, now we have to hire some people who are not teachers. But the key in the first bullet is the study done by the President of Baruch College -- and there was a factor included in the study for size and complexity of the physical facility -- that showed how many students each senior college has for each non-teacher and, of course, as the Senate knows from the Base Level Equity initiative (for which that study was done), John Jay has the most students per non-teachers of any of the senior colleges. We do have the Base Level Equity program thanks to Vice Chancellor Rothbard's personal initiative and at some considerable risk to himself, bureaucratic risk, that is.

By implementing Base Level Equity, Vice Chancellor Rothbard enabled us to get some additional faculty on the basis of increased enrollment, he noted. That is the one program for full-time staff that has helped us, based on our enrollment growth, to obtain a greater number of resources. Mr. Sermier said that even since the study by President Matthew Goldstein of Baruch, John Jay's enrollment has been increasing by about 7% a year, although this year it may be a little less. He noted that most of the other senior colleges have had declining student enrollments.

How were we able to do all this, Mr. Sermier asked. One way, he explained, is that we have relied more and more on adjunct faculty: there is no question about that. As you all know, he said, we do not spend much money on goods and services. Of the \$37 million that was in our budget last year, almost \$3 million of it came from the fact that we were able to increase our enrollment. The last sentence on page 5 states, "This [enrollment] growth has also enabled the College to earn 'extra' revenue in amounts which now exceed more than \$1 Million a year,!" but now, he explained, that amount is closer to \$3 million.

Mr. Sermier explained that it is not that Vice Chancellor Rothbard has treated us in a way that would favor us for subjective reasons: but he has on an objective basis provided us with the ability to earn more revenue per student than we enrolled. That is, until this year the formulas for allowing us to keep our revenue took into account the fact that we were the only college that not only achieved but exceeded the Chancellor's goal of growing by 2.5% each year. And so Vice Chancellor Rothbard has assisted us.

But, Mr. Sermier explained, our budget is \$3 million short even if there are no cuts next year. Right now, we will either have to overenroll next year or get some assistance from the Chancellor and Vice Chancellor Rothbard. Otherwise we are going to be almost \$3 million short for next year even if CUNY's budget is not reduced. This all goes back to the unbalancing that has taken place during the past seven years whereby we continue to

grow and for most years our base budget -- the biggest part of our budget -- is reduced by the same fraction that every other senior college's budget is reduced. So just to live at the standard of living we have now, which is not luxurious by any sense, and if there were no cuts at all next year, we need \$3 million.

Senator Litwack asked why would we be \$3 million worse next year than this year. Mr. Sermier explained that we are \$3 million short this year. Senator Litwack asked whether we had to go into our reserve this year as a result. Mr. Sermier said we did not because we received some additional help from Vice Chancellor Rothbard's staff. President Kaplowitz explained that John Jay was given \$800,000 this year to assist us as a one-time only allocation.

Mr. Sermier recalled that five or six years ago the Chancellor went public with her five-year plan in which there was only one quantifiable goal: that the University would grow by 2.5% each year. The Governor seized upon that goal and his staff raised the amount that the University has to contribute to the budget in the form of tuition revenue in the amount of an increase of 2.5% each year. Only one college has achieved the 2.5% goal: John Jay. And, in fact, we exceeded the goal. And for a number of years, John Jay was carrying a large part of the University and Vice Chancellor Rothbard, to his credit, used technical adjustments, in making the budget allocations. This is the last year of the formal 2.5% enrollment-growth plan. Senator Litwack asked about the difference between the \$3 million shortfall and the \$800,000 we received. It was explained that in addition to the \$800,000, we were able to keep \$2 million derived from overenrollments. Senator Litwack asked whether it is expected that next year we will not get similar additional funding. Mr. Sermier said we will simply have to get the additional funding.

In 1989, Mr. Sermier recalled, John Jay's budget shortfall problem was not \$3 million, but only a couple hundred thousand dollars a year and that was when the effort was begun by John Jay to receive a larger budget. That is when the Chancellor set out her five-year plan which gave us the opportunity to earn money.

Mr. Sermier explained that John Jay's budget should be between \$5 million to \$10 million more a year on a base budget of \$30 million a year. As of this fall, we have 200 student FTE's fewer than City College, which has had 10% student enrollment decreases in each of the last two years. We have 8200 FTE's and City has 8400 FTE's and yet our adjusted base budget is \$30 million while City College's adjusted base budget is \$60 million, twice ours. Mr. Sermier noted that at the maximum, only \$10 million of that \$30 million difference can be accounted for by such objective factors as City College's physical plant and programs, such as engineering, that are taught at CCNY.

It was explained that the State gives CUNY a revenue target in terms of enrollment and then 80th Street parcels out that enrollment target to each of the colleges which must make its target. President Kaplowitz reported the enrollment figures that are in her recent written announcements [Attachment A of Minutes #149]: CCNY is 24% down in terms of undergraduate headcount compared to its budgeted target, which means that City College's revenue target must have been left at the level of two years ago and so they are 24% below. And City College is 19.9% down in FTE's compared to its target.

Mr. Sermier explained page 7 of Attachment B shows the impact on John Jay of the Governor's proposed budget. If the proposed \$57 million cut takes place -- in other words, if the \$33 million cut takes place and if tuition is not raised to generate an additional \$24 million -- the result would be a \$3 million cut for John Jay. He said he will give Professor Kaplowitz a copy of the impact statement that every college President has been required to submit to 80th Street showing the impact on the college of the Governor's proposed budget [Attachment C]. In the impact statement, every category gets reduced by approximately the same percent, which for us is an 8% reduction. If we had to absorb all the cuts the Governor proposes, the result would be 114 fewer sections, 29 fewer teachers and HEO's, 38 fewer adjuncts, 13 fewer other full-time staff (executives, Gittelsons, and blue collar workers), 35 fewer college assistants: each number represents an 8% reduction. If the \$400 tuition increase went into play and these numbers were reduced, the cuts would be a little more than half the size.

Page 8 of Attachment B shows the impact on John Jay of the Governor's proposed cuts in TAP [Tuition Assistance Program]: if all the proposed TAP changes were to go into effect, and there were no changes in the current proposals about AFDC (Aid to Families with Dependent Children) recipients and other public assistance recipients attending senior colleges -- if all that happens then John Jay can lose another \$3 million dollars.

Mr. Sermier said the situation has to be better than this doomsday scenario. One of the priorities the Governor is seeming to focus on is implementing the tax cuts, and one result is his proposed budget for CUNY. If all of the Governor's proposals were implemented, John Jay would be \$6 million short and that is in addition to our current \$3 million deficit. Mr. Sermier said that to stay the size we are now we would need to become instantly equitable with all the other colleges, that is, we would need that \$5 million to \$10 million dollars that is owed us transferred immediately to us. And then we could stay our size. He said this is the kind of thing at which President Lynch is masterful: we will work our way through it. But right now this is the bottom line in terms of what the worse case scenario could be. But, he said, it will not happen: there is no chance that all these things will happen.

Senator Marilyn Rubin asked about the recruiting of faculty that is taking place now: will we go forward with that? Mr. Sermier said that those are the 14 faculty lines we received from Base Level Equity and that we will, indeed, fill them. President Kaplowitz explained that Vice Chancellor Rothbard told Professor Ned Benton and her at the UFS Budget Committee, and thus has without doubt told President Lynch, that we must fill those Base Level Equity lines: we cannot make the case for our critical need for full-time faculty, receive full-time faculty lines, and then not fill them in order to use the money for something else.

President Kaplowitz explained that Mr. Sermier must leave to teach his graduate course. She praised Mr. Sermier as a tremendously skilled business manager and administrator, who is unfailingly professional and collegial, and who is a man of unparalleled integrity. She said we are extraordinarily fortunate to be his colleague and that he is working with us and on our behalf. The Senate applauded him with great warmth and enthusiasm.

After Mr. Sermier left, he was also praised by Senator Marilyn Rubin as an excellent teacher, who teaches two graduate courses each semester on a pro bono basis, at his insistence. President Kaplowitz noted that Mr. Sermier teaches two different graduate courses each semester and that in using the case method, and because he creates hypothetical cases, as he explained at a recent Better Teaching Seminar that he participated in, he must do tremendous preparation for each course.

1. Announcements from the chair (continued from p. 1)

President Kaplowitz resumed the report she began before Mr. Sermier's budget briefing.

On February 10, the Board held its January meeting. Each month the Board votes on the "Chancellor's Report" and the "University Report," which comprise all personnel actions and curriculum modifications from all the colleges as well as small expenditures that are not deemed sufficiently major to require approval by a Board Committee: these action items exist in a foot-high pile of documents and are invariably approved in a pro forma manner by approving the entire "Chancellor's Report" and "University Report" by one motion and one vote.

This time, however, Trustee Anne Paolucci moved to remove from the University and Chancellor Reports a single line item: \$56,000 to purchase the ETS exam that is needed as a control for the spring pilot of CUNY's rising junior exam. Trustee Paolucci said she is not necessarily against the Academic Certification Exam (ACE) but wants the ACE to be sent back to CAPPR (Committee on Academic Programs, Planning, and Review) because the ACE exam was reported to CAPPR as an "information item" and, thus, the Board never voted on it. She said the Board has not even seen the ACE exam yet. Her motion was supported by the Board and the line item for the ETS was excluded and was not voted on. It was stated that the pilot of the ACE, therefore, would be scheduled for next fall instead of this spring.

President Kaplowitz reported that one of the triggers of the Board's action is believed to be a January 23, 1997, memorandum sent by Vice Chancellor Elsa Nunez, in her capacity as University Dean for Academic Affairs, to the provosts of all the colleges about the pilot of the ACE, a copy of which several provosts forwarded to various Trustees because they were displeased by the memorandum. Copies of the memorandum were distributed to the Faculty Senate [copies are available from the Senate office]. The memorandum provides part of the text of a letter that the provosts are to send to all of the college's students who have completed between 40 and 90 credits: the memorandum states that the text of the letter may not be changed in any other way than to add the college's own incentives. The provided text states that the University will offer students who take the ACE pilot two incentives described as follows: "If your performance is in the top 108, you will receive a check for \$100"; "If your performance is in the top half, you will be exempted from any present or future CUNY certification requirements."

Each provost is instructed to develop additional incentives which are to be offered by the provost's own college, in addition to the University's incentives. The college's incentives are to be paid for by the college itself ("As agreed upon in our December

visit with you, the Office of Academic Affairs will support the incentives offered at all the colleges, and you will assume the cost for the incentives for your students") and those incentives are to be named in the letter to the students of that college. This section of the letter to the students is to begin with the following statement: "Your college has decided to thank you for your participation by offering the following incentives to all those students who attend and complete the required testing session:"

President Kaplowitz noted that Trustee Paolucci wrote a letter which she entered into the minutes of the October meeting of the Board of Trustees questioning the ACE because its guidelines permit a second and even a third attempt by students and assumes remedial coursework taking place in CUNY. [The letter is Attachment E of Faculty Senate Minutes #146] It was noted that it may be that Trustee Paolucci, and other Trustees, are opposed to the ACE because it assumes students should have at least 60 credits of college work before having to pass the ACE exam rather than having to pass it in order to be accepted into college.

Also at the Board meeting, Trustee Marino proposed a resolution calling for the Board to henceforth develop its own budget proposal, rather than consider only the budget developed by the Chancellory.

Trustee Paolucci then read into the minutes seven proposals that she asked the Board to consider at a subsequent Board meeting calling for, among other things, the end of "information" items: thus the Board would vote on everything. Examples of recent "information" items are the ICAM report and the ACE. In the past, a Board policy has been followed by an implementation report by a taskforce and that implementation report has been presented as an "information" item to a Board Committee without requiring a vote.

Trustee Robert Price raised the issue of the ongoing discrimination suit against CUNY by approximately 12 Italian-American faculty which he claimed has cost CUNY \$2 million to date and said he wants the suit settled. Vice Chancellor for Legal Affairs Robert Diaz explained that it is not CUNY that is paying to defend itself in the suit but rather the New York State Attorney General's Office. Trustee Price said that in either case it is tax payers' money that is being spent and he asked how much has, in fact, been spent. Vice Chancellor Diaz said that the first phase of the suit cost \$600,000 and because the bills are not sent to him he does not know the cost of the second phase to date. Trustee Price complained of the barrage of mail about the suit he receives and said he does not want to receive any more mail about this issue because he wants the lawsuit settled.

Trustee Paolucci's seven points includes a proposal that the Board create a committee on legal affairs and that the Board have its own legal counsel (currently the Board's legal counsel is also the Vice Chancellor for Legal Affairs).

The Board decided that the scheduled March 3 meetings of the Academic Affairs Committee and of the Fiscal Affairs Committees of the Board would be combined into one large meeting, to which all the Trustees would be invited and that all the college presidents would be asked to attend in order to answer questions about the fiscal impact of the Governor's budget proposal on their colleges. At that meeting, the ACE exam is also scheduled to be discussed.

Senator Pinello said some of the other Trustees who are supporting what seems to, indeed, be a revolution by the Board of Trustees may have other agendas, so it is not clear whether these changes will hurt or help the University nor what the fall-out will be. President Kaplowitz agreed, noting that the Trustees are working in the context of the Adelphi decision, in which the New York State Regents removed 18 of the 19 Adelphi trustees, which had just been rendered the afternoon of the Board meeting, They are also working in the context of the new SUNY Board of Trustees, which is trying to impose on all the SUNY colleges a curriculum devised by the National Association of Scholars (NAS), a group that questions the value and validity of multiculturalism, affirmative action, and similar programs.

It was agreed that it is important that John Jay faculty educate the new Trustees about our College, about our special mission and about our unique programs and majors: the visit to the Faculty Senate on April 3 by Trustee Jerome Berg is, thus, timely. Trustee Berg chairs the Board's Academic Affairs Committee and also serves on the Board's Fiscal Committee. It is also important to educate the legislators about the impact that the Governor's proposed budget would have on John Jay and on CUNY.

4. University Course Guides (formerly Course Equivalency Guides)

President Kaplowitz explained that in June 1995, the Board of Trustees passed 37 resolutions, one of which calls for a common calendar, common course numbering, and other ways to enhance the ability of students to take advantage of the permit system. Subsequently, a taskforce was named which issued a report, in which it proposed that the permit system be replaced by a new system called ICAM (Intra-CUNY Academic Mobility). [For a discussion of the ICAM Report, see Faculty Senate Minutes #141. A copy of the ICAM report is available from the Faculty Senate office.]

The first step is a review of the "University Course Guides," which were formerly called "Course Equivalency Guides." There are six such guides, one for each community college. Within each guide, all the community college's courses are listed along with the equivalent courses at each senior college, so that students could know which courses they will receive transfer credit for should they transfer to a particular senior college. These guides must now be reviewed by the senior colleges for accuracy because they are being transformed into both transfer guides and ICAM (i.e. permit) guides. Thus the course equivalencies must be accurate because a student who, based on these guides, takes an ICAM course at another college and then resumes studying at his or her home college must take the equivalent course so that he or she can have proper preparation to take the next courses in the sequence.

John Jay's listings need to be reviewed by all the faculty, by looking at not only course descriptions in college bulletins but by looking at the syllabi of the courses at the various colleges. President Kaplowitz reported that at the UFS Conference on ICAM at John Jay on December 10, she and Professor Harold Sullivan were stunned to see that 300-level and 400-level John Jay courses are listed by John Jay as the equivalent of 100-level and 200-level courses at community colleges. By definition, community colleges offer only 100-level and 200-level courses. For example,

John Jay's Government 430, which requires senior-level status, is listed as the equivalent of a course with the same name offered at Bronx Community College. She said that unless we review and correct the guides, we are saying that our most advanced courses for juniors and seniors are freshman and sophomore level courses.

5. Discussion of the schedule of Personnel Committee actions

The issue of the scheduling of Personnel decisions was discussed. It was noted that under John Jay's current schedule, a faculty member who is not reappointed or who does not receive tenure learns this at the end of November and, thus, has only a semester to find another position elsewhere. Furthermore, many professional organizations hold their annual meeting in early fall, before the Personnel Committee has completed its work. One suggestion was that John Jay follow the model of City College by conducting the reappointment and tenure cases during the previous spring. Senator Litwack spoke against that approach, saying that by having the Personnel Committee's deliberations during the fall, candidates have an additional semester and summer in which to be productive. It was noted that the issue is not which semester, but rather the drawn-out calendar in the fall and that if the Personnel Committee could conduct its reappointment and tenure decisions early in the fall, candidates could know the results much earlier than they do now. But it was noted that it is not always possible for the Personnel Committee to achieve a quorum, which delays its work further into the semester.

Senators spoke about their wish to know who attends and who is absent from the Personnel Committee meetings, so as to know whether their chair is attending and to also know whether the at-large members are fulfilling their responsibility, which is useful to know when voting for both chairs and at-large representatives. President Kaplowitz reported that a few years ago she wrote to the Provost asking for Personnel Committee minutes, limited to only attendance and policy actions, and excluding individual personnel actions. Unfortunately, the request was not acted upon.

She noted that an official advisory opinion rendered by Robert J. Freeman, the Director of the New York State Office on Open Meetings, in response to a query by a faculty member at another CUNY college, states that the Open Meetings Law requires that Personnel & Budget Committees issue minutes reporting such information as attendance and policy decisions, but not personnel decisions about specific individuals. She said that she had not referred to that document when she last wrote to the Provost about the issue.

Senator Betsy Gitter moved that President Kaplowitz write once again, citing the advisory opinion, and asking on behalf of the Senate that action minutes of the Personnel Committee reporting attendance be issued after each meeting. The Senate approved the motion by unanimous vote.

By a motion duly made and seconded, the meeting was adjourned at 5:00 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Edward Davenport
Recording Secretary

ATTACHMENT A

**CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK STAFFING
1974, 1984, AND 1995**

Category	1974	1984	1995
Faculty ¹	11,268	6,867	5,342
Administration ²	305	296	347
Support, Instructional Staff ³	2,571	2,800	2,457
Support, Classified Staff ⁴	6,156	4,628	4,625
TOTAL FULL TIME STAFF	20,300	14,591	12,771
Part time faculty	4,924	6,405	6,340
Part time other Inst. Staff	631	324	1,143
Clerical, hourly	1,777	2,080	4,109
TOTAL PART TIME STAFF	7,332	9,271	11,592
Total full time/Total Part time	2.8	1.6	1.1
Full time/Part time Faculty	2.3	1.1	0.8
Full time Faculty/total full time	0.56	0.47	0.42
Number of students ⁵ per FT Faculty	22.4	26.5	38.5

¹. Includes those Full time in the *titles* of Distinguished Professor, Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, Instructor, and Lecturer. It does not include those in "Visiting" titles.

². Includes all in Executive Officers Series, Dean Series, and Administrator Series.

³. Includes all others Full time in Instructional Staff titles including Higher Education Officer Series, Registrar Series, Laboratory Technician Series.

⁴. Includes all Full time in Classified Titles series including Clerical, Custodial, Skilled Trades, Security, and Other B & G. Values taken for 1973, 1983, and 1995.

⁵. Total number of students is 252,956 in Fall, 1974; 180,949 in fall 1984; and 205,835 in Fall, 1995.

SOURCE: Staffing numbers: Office of Affirmative Action, WNY. Enrollment: Office of Student Services. Prepared by the University Faculty Senate Budget Advisory Committee, 11 Feb. 1997.

FINANCIAL PRIMER ON JOHN JAY COLLEGE
SPRING 1997

Are John Jay College And CUNY Part Of New York City Government?

No. John Jay College, as a Senior College (i.e. one which **grants** four year degrees) within the City University of New York (CUNY) is neither a City nor a State agency. However, because John Jay receives the overwhelming majority of its funding **from** New York **State**, John Jay and other Senior Colleges **must** follow the **administrative**, personnel management, and financial management **rules** of New York State. John Jay is **treated like** a State agency for **funding** and **management** purposes.

Legally, CUNY is an "independent political sub-division" of New York State **similar** to the **Board** of Education, the Transit Authority, the **Port** Authority, and the Health and Hospitals Corporation.

What Is The City's Role?

John Jay receives a small **amount** of funding **from** New York City to support its Associate Degree programs (about \$1 million a year).

Who Decides What The Budget of John Jay College Will Be?

The Governor and the Legislature of the State of New York decide how much **money** **CUNY** as a whole will get; the Chancellor **decides** how much John Jay College gets. The Mayor and the City Council of New York play **essentially** no role in the **funding** of CUNY's Senior Colleges.

The Mayor **and** the City Council play a **small** role **in** **funding** the cost of CUNY's **Community** Colleges (about **25%**). In **this** role, the City does fund a small **part** of the costs of the **Associate** Degree programs at John Jay, N.Y. Technical College, and the College of Staten **Island**.

Who Decides What the Tuition Rates Will Be At CUNY?

Only CUNY's Board of Higher Education has the authority to establish **tuition** rates for **CUNY** students. The Governor **has** the authority to veto any changes **in** rates the Board proposes, but the **Governor** does not really have the authority to set the tuition rate. In reality, because CUNY is so dependent upon the State for **funding**, the Governor plays **the** most **important** role in the process of determining what the tuition rate **will** be in any given year.

How Much Money Did John Jay Spend Last Year (1995/96)?

\$68.2 Million

Where Did This Money Come From?

	Amount in Millions	Percent
New York State Taxpayers (including \$11.3 Million in TAP to pay for student tuition)	54.1	79.3
New York City Taxpayers	1.2	1.8
Federal Taxpayers (PELL for tuition , Veterans and other programs, see also below)	5.1	7.5
Students (out of pocket and loans)	7.4	10.9
Training Contracts/ Research Grants Overhead (overhead= difference between revenues and direct costs)	.2	.3
Auxiliary Services Corporation	.2	3
TOTAL	68.2	100.1

Plus, Federal Taxpayer, through **PELL** provided John Jay students, **in-hand**, with additional \$7.1 Million for their educational costs.

On What Was This Money Spent?

	Amount In Millions	Percent
Teaching	17.5	25.7
Academic Support	5.1	7.5
Student Services	4.9	7.2
Administrative Services	9.6	14.1
University Charges	<u>31.1</u>	45.6
TOTAL	68.2	100.1

Teaching-	Full and part-time teachers
Academic Support-	Library , Academic Computing Lab, AV services, writing Center, Tutors, Internships
Student Services-	Counselors and all units the Office of Student Development, Registrars/Admissions, and the Bursar
Administrative Services-	Buildings and Grounds , Security, Print Shop, Mail Room, Telephones, and all other College management units
University Charges-	Heat , Light, Power, Fringe Benefits for all College personnel, and other overhead charges.

Why Are The University Charges So High ?

Because, under the University's budgeting system, the University's **Central** Office **pays for all** of the **rent/lease** costs for College buildings and for the cost of electricity, steam, and **water**, plus **all** the costs of the **fringe** benefits of College faculty and staff.

What Has Happened Over the Last Seven Years?

Beginning in the Fall of 1989, the State has been in deep financial difficulties, and, as a result over the past seven years:

- o All **CUNY** students incurred **tuition** increases in 1992 and in 1995 (for a **first** time, full-time, New York State resident Undergraduate, the increase per semester in 1992 **was** \$600 and in 1995 it **was** \$375 with the result that tuition rates have increased by more than 150% since 1989.
- o John Jay's budget **has** been reduced "effectively" by more than 30% since 1989. That is, in budget speak, for the **part** of the budget which John Jay controls (the operating budget of about **\$35Million**), if John Jay had received only those increases needed to keep up with inflation and with other mandatory cost increases, and if no actual budgetary reductions had been imposed, John Jay's "operating budget" would be about **\$11Million** higher *than* it is today.
- o Also, John Jay's **full-time** positions have decreased by nearly 15%.

How Did John Jay Respond?

- o John Jay did not cap enrollment, in fact, enrollment (in "head count") **increased 32% from** the Fall of 1989 **through** the Fall of 1996 and was at 10,724 compared to 8,127 in the Fall of 1989.
- o John Jay did not reduce the number of class sections, in fact, since the **Fall** of 1989, John Jay **has** opened more **sections** every semester, (1,361 for the Fall of 1996 **as** compared to 967 for the Fall of 1989 - a 41% growth **in** the number of class sections) **so that**, despite an enrollment **growth** of **32%** and budget cuts of 30%, the average class size **today** is **only** about 1.7 students or **6%** larger than the average class size was in the **Fall** of 1989.
- o John Jay did not reduce the hours of operation of the Library, Academic Computing Center, and other Student Support Services, in fact, in 1990, John Jay increased the hours of operation for these **services** and has maintained them constant since then.

How Was John Jay Able to Accomplish This?

- o Massive reductions in non-teaching positions -- for 2 and a half years, the College **did** not hire a single full-time person who was not a teacher. **As** illustrated most dramatically by a formal University study two years ago, John Jay had, by **far**, the **greatest** number of students per non-teaching staff member - a ratio of **26 students** for each non-teacher. The next highest college, **Baruch**, had 21.6 and the average Senior College had 19.0 **students** per non-teacher. Since **the** time of the study two years ago, John Jay's **enrollment has grown** by an average of **7%** per year; the rest of the Senior Colleges have **actually seen** declining enrollments. **Thus**, John Jay's ratio of students to non-teachers is even higher today **than** it was at the **time** of the study..
- o Only partial replacement of departing full-time teachers with replacements who **are** also full-time teachers.

Note: The College always replaces departing full-time teachers. However, the vast majority of replacements have been Adjuncts in recent years. John Jay **has** also hired many new teachers over the past seven years to teach the greatly increased number of class sections the College offers. Again, the vast majority of these new hires have been Adjuncts.

- o Massive decreases in spending for goods and services used to support **administrative** functions.
- o Massive decreases **in** part-time staff hours available to support **administrative** functions.
- o Some decreases in spending to purchase Library books and academic equipment.

AND

- o Over the last few years, John Jay has been able to balance its operating budget only by "**over-enrolling**". That **is**, John Jay seeks to enroll students at a higher rate **than** the Chancellor's goal of an **annual** increase of **2.5%** at each Senior College each year. By growing at a rate of about **7%** in each of the past three years, the College **has** been able to lead all of the Senior Colleges by a wide **margin** towards the University's goal of providing access. **This** growth **has** also enabled the College to earn "**extra**" revenue in **amounts** which now exceed **more** than \$1 Million a year.

How Does the Remainder of This Year Look?

We will make it through this fiscal year:

- o* without **an** increase in **tuition**
- o* without **further** reductions to services
- o* without **an** increase in average class size, despite **our** increased enrollment

BUT

- o* we **still** have to rely **on** over-enrollment revenue to balance our operating budget
- o* we **still** rely **on** Adjuncts to teach about 50% of **our** classes
- o* we **still** have the **highest ratio** of full-time non-teaching **staff** to students (despite **hiring** full-time **staff** in the Academic Computing Center, Counseling, **and** Admissions this **fiscal** year. The pace of full-time **hiring** can never match the rate of **growth** of student enrollment, because **our** operating budget is far too "*small*" in comparison to **our** enrollment level.)
- o* we still have only one counselor for every 1100 **students**
- o* we have cut **our** administrative support funds **so much** over the years that **now** simply maintaining **an** adequate physical environment is a constant struggle

What Is the Outlook for Next Year?

- o **As** of 2/1/97, the Governor's **initial** version of the budget **he** will propose for next **year** contains significant reductions for the City University.
- o With no tuition increase, the reduction to the University's budget **would** be about **\$57 Million**. John Jay's proportional share, **as calculated** by the University, would be about **\$3.0 Million**, which is about 10% of the College's "**base**" operating budget.
- o If the **maximum** tuition increase "authorized" in the Governor's initial budget **proposal** (for a Full Time Resident UG - \$400 **per** year or \$200 per semester) **is** actually put in place, the University's budget "cut" **would** change to "only" \$33 **Million**, of which John Jay's proportional share would be \$1.4 Million.
- o If all the proposed reductions were to actually come to pass, and if the President decided to apply the same philosophy which he **has** applied in the past **when** he was required to plan for worst case scenarios (i.e., a philosophy *that* all parts of the JJC community should share the **cuts** in equal proportion), then **our** Budget Office projects that, if no tuition increase is implemented, each **part** of the JJC Community would have to decrease by about 8%. **In** real world terms, there would be:
 - 114 fewer class sections offered each semester (assuming that average class *size* would not be allowed to increase, this means about 1000 fewer students would **attend** John Jay)
 - 29 fewer **PSC** full time teachers and staff
 - 38 fewer Adjuncts
 - 13 fewer other College full time staff
 - 35 fewer other part time staff (College **Assistants**, most of whom are students)
 - \$260,000 (15%) less in spending on goods **and** services (eg, *library* books, computers, building maintenance, etc.)
- If the State enacts the **full** cuts proposed by the Governor, and the Board of Higher Education imposes the \$400 tuition increase, then the numbers above would be reduced to "only" about **55%** of the **amounts** shown above. That is, JJC would eliminate 62 class sections a semester; there would be about 550 fewer **students** attending; there would be 16 fewer full time teachers and staff; etc..

NOTE I: One of the particularly **unfortunate** side effects of implementing the Governor's proposed **cuts** is that it would **undo much** of the efforts that the College **has** undertaken **over** the past decade to recruit **female** and **minority full-time teachers**. The **rules of tenure and seniority require that**, in **times** of exigency, the last people hired must be the **first** to lose their jobs.

Note 11: Beyond the actual budget **reductions** proposed by **the** governor, he **has also proposed** major **changes** to the **tap program**. **If all** these changes **are** enacted into **law**, and if other public assistance related **changes are** not rescinded, **John Jay** and other **senior** colleges could **see** major **drops in** enrollment. **This** would **mean** lost **revenue** to the state. If the **state** did not 'forgive' **this** lost revenue, then colleges would have to 'make up' the **money from** their operating budgets (i.e., take additional **cuts** in the amount **equal** to the lost revenue). By some estimates, the **losses** for **John Jay** in this kind of **scenario** would approach another \$3 **million**.

JOHN JAY COLLEGE OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE

ATTACHMENT C

The City University of New York

John Jay Square

899 Tenth Avenue


New York, N.Y. 10019

(212) 237-8600

Office of the President

February 18, 1997

TO: Richard F. Rothbard
Vice Chancellor for Budget, Finance, and Information
Services

From: Gerald W. Lynch 
President

Subject: 1997-98 Executive Budget (Your Memorandum of 1/31/97
To Senior College Presidents)

As You requested, attached please find in chart and summary narrative form, our assessment of the impact upon John Jay College of applying the estimated reductions you provided in the subject memorandum. Simply stated, the results would be calamitous.

Our most immediate financial concern, however, is NOT reflected in the attached estimates. That concern, as you know, is our annually recurring budgetary shortfall. That shortfall recurs because we are markedly underfunded in comparison to the other Senior Colleges. A formal study by the University's Council of Presidents, and several analyses by the University's Budget Office, confirm that John Jay operates with far fewer dollars per Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) student than does any other Senior College. Today, a John Jay student receives between \$1000 and \$4000 less in annually budgeted resources than does any other student on any other Senior College campus. If one presumes that funding levels affect a student's opportunity to succeed academically, then the current differences in relative magnitude of funding go beyond being simply "unfair" to John Jay's students; such differences are unjust.

John Jay's students are so relatively disadvantaged because, unlike most universities and unlike our own Community Colleges, no mechanism exists for redistributing Senior College base budget resources in proportion to relative levels of enrollment. There is one relatively new program - Base Level Equity (BLE) - which does allocate Full-Time Teaching positions to the

underfunded Senior Colleges. **We remain most** grateful to the Chancellor for supporting, and to you for your personal initiative in establishing, the BLE program. However, John Jay's annual enrollment growth has been so robust (5.5% on average over the past 11 years; 7% two years ago; 8.5% last year; 5% estimated this year) that the BLE allocations are inadequate. More critically, there is no University program comparable to BLE which redistributes non-teaching resources in proportion to relative enrollment levels.

Because of the above factors, even without any **State-**imposed reductions, our recurring budgetary deficit for next year will be approximately \$3.0 Million -- the same amount we faced this year. This year, as we have in every recent year, we will balance our operating budget by retaining the extra revenue which corresponds to the number of students by which we have exceeded our enrollment goals. However, for next year, the subject memorandum predicts that enrollments will shrink. If we cannot earn revenue by overenrolling next year, we will have to rely upon you and the Chancellor to make alternative arrangements to assist us with our \$3.0 Million shortfall. Without such assistance, the impact would be to increase the projected, State-imposed reductions in each of the categories shown on the attached Table ■ by approximately 25%. That is, each John Jay student, who already receives far less in State and University funding than does any of his/her colleagues at any other Senior College, will receive comparatively even less next year -- the funding gap between John Jay students and the other Senior College students will actually grow larger!

Beyond our most immediate financial concern as described above, the attached materials and narrative show the impact of applying the planning estimates in the subject memorandum. Using your terminology, the "Operating Budget Impact" would be \$3.04 Million. The "TAP/HRA Revenue Impact" would mean another \$2.77 Million reduction. Either "Impact" would reduce the size of our College by about 8%. In combination, both "Impacts" would reduce our student body by more than 15%, equivalent to 2/3rds of our entire Freshman class. Again, this does not include the impact, of the \$3.0 Million recurring deficit we face next year,

As you asked, the attached documents have been shared with consultative groups of student representatives, faculty and staff. Also, as you recognized in the subject memorandum, our attached response is "preliminary and could change substantially by the time of actual implementation."

Thank you, as always, for your ongoing assistance in **these** matters.

c.c. The Chancellor
Mr. Malave

**Table I
Impact of the 1997-98 Executive Budget Recommendations**

College: JOHN JAY
 Prepared by: A.M. MARTIN as of 2/11/97
 SUBJECT TO REVISION

NOTE: Figures below do NOT include recurring shortfall estimated at \$3.0 million for FY 97-98: caused by sustained enrollment growth unaccompanied by a meaningful redistribution of available base budget resources as described in the President's covering memorandum.

	Part A Operating Budget Impact		Part B TAP/HRA Revenue Impact		Total	
	Position Reductions	Savings	Position Reductions	Savings	Position Reductions	Savings
Full-time Positions Eliminated						
1. PSC Full-time	-29	-1218.0	-26	-1096.2	-55	-2314.2
2. Classified Staff Full-time	-10	-350.0	-9	-315.0	-19	-665.0
3. Executive	-3	-135.0	-2	-90.0	-5	-225.0
4. Total (1+2+3)	-42	-1703.0	-37	-1501.2	-79	-3204.2
5. Fringe Benefits Estimate @28%		-476.8		-420.3		-897.2
6. Subtotal Personal Service Regular (4+5)	-42	-2179.8	-37	-1921.5	-79	-4101.4
7. Adjuncts	-38	-340.5	-35	-313.6	-73	-654.1
8. Temporary Services	-35	-203.0	-32	-185.6	-67	-388.6
9. Total (7+8)	-73	-543.5	-67	-499.2	-140	-1042.7
10. Fringe Benefits Estimate @10%		-54.3		-49.9		-104.2
11. Subtotal Adjuncts/Temp Service (9+10)	-73	-597.8	-67	-549.1	-140	-1146.9
12. Total Personal Service (6+11)	-115	-2777.7	-104	-2470.7	-219	-5248.3
13. OTPS		-260.3		-301.3		-561.7
14. Grand Total (12+13)	-115	-3038.0	-104	-2772.0	-219	-5810.0
15. Total Full-time Position Allocation 1996-97	498		498		498	
16. Percent Reduction (4/15)	-8.43%		-7.45%		-15.88%	
17. # of class sections 1996-97 (Fall & Spring)	2718		2718		2718	
18. # of class sections cut in 1997-98	-228		-201		-429	
19. Percent Reduction (18/17)	-8.39%		-7.40%		-15.78%	

ATTACHMENT C (cont)

ATTACHMENT C (cont)
Impact Of An Operating Budget Reduction Of \$3,038,000

29 PSC non-reappointments (approximately 8% of professorial and non-teaching instructional staff) will fall primarily upon substitutes -- those most recently hired faculty and staff, predominantly minority and female, who have filled Base Level Equity and Academic Program Planning positions.

10 classified staff reductions (approximately 9% of the current staff) will fall primarily upon junior custodial, trades, and secretarial staff with demographics similar to the recently hired PSC members.

3 Executive/Rem positions would be eliminated (approximately 14% of the executive pay plan and rem positions).

Loss of funding for 38 adjuncts (approximately 8% of the current adjunct staff complement) which would mean a reduction of **228** class sections and the resultant loss of classes for approximately 685 FTEs (about 8% of the college's current 8,200 FTEs).

Loss of funding for 35 college assistants (approximately 9% of the current college assistant complement) which would translate into the approximate loss of 38,000 service hours. Because 30% of the College's Temporary Services budget is devoted to Security Guards, and safety must remain a priority, the loss in hours would be applied disproportionately to other units in the College. Although Administrative Services would always be reduced proportionately more than Student or Academic Support Services, nevertheless, the result could still be a 25% to 50% reduction in service hours in various Academic and Student Support Services (Library, Academic Computing Lab, Tutoring, etc).

Approximately 90% of the College Assistants are John Jay students who will be enormously impacted by these proposed cuts -- loss of class sections, loss of Academic and Student Support Services provided by full-time staff, loss of student services provided by peers, and possibly, loss of their own jobs.

OTPS reductions of nearly 15% (coming after nearly a decade of steady annual reductions to this category of spending), and when combined with the loss of Classified Staff described above, intensify the College's downward spiral of deferred maintenance. Such reductions also deny the College the funds necessary to purchase state-of-the-art technology which would improve the College's future productivity (fully automated business systems, fully automated registration, full access to the Internet for faculty and students).

Impact Of Absorbing A TAP/HRA-Related Revenue Loss Of \$2,772 ,000

Based upon an assumed loss of 1,000 students = 770 FTE @ \$3,600 per FTE in revenue

1000 student loss estimated as follows:

- Table II estimates 963 TAP and 944 HRA affected students, with an unknown degree of overlap between the two groups
- Chancellor's initial estimate of the effect of the above two factors, combined with the proposed \$400 tuition increase, was 20,000 students for the University as a whole.
- John Jay is approximately 6% of the University's enrollment
- John Jay's proportional share of 20,000 is 1200 students.
- The 1200 estimate includes the impact of the tuition increase. Because the Operating Budget Reduction (Part A of Table I) includes a factor for the proposed tuition increase, we must remove the impact of the tuition factor from this estimate. This will decrease the estimate of 1200. We also have to take into account that John Jay students have somewhat lower income levels than other students. When we adjust for these two factors, we arrive at a range of estimates centered approximately around 1000.

IMPACT OF TAP/HRA REVENUE LOSS OF \$2,772,000
BECAUSE OF ABOVE LOSS OF 1000 STUDENTS

An additional 26 PSC position reduction will further impact on the number of class sections available and on services of full-time staff available to students and peers.

An additional 9 classified staff reductions will make the College's facilities certainly less clean and probably less safe.

An additional reduction of 2 Executive positions would impact on the provision of student and academic support and administrative services.

An additional reduction of 35 adjuncts would result in a loss of 201 additional class sections per year, or 7.4% fewer sections offered..

An additional loss of 32 college assistants (36,000 service hours) would curtail part time services in most administrative departments creating the options of: 1) Not doing these tasks at all; and/or, 2) Contracting out some of the tasks; and/or, 3) Full time staff doing some of the work..

An additional \$301,300 (15%) reduction in OTPS spending would result in an overall decrease of almost 30% in this category. The balance would have to be earmarked for safety, security, and basic facility operations functions, with some likely outcomes being that faculty/staff would have to perform some basic maintenance tasks (e.g., doing some cleaning of their offices), and purchase some of their own teaching and office supplies.