

Faculty Senate Minutes #161

John Jay College of Criminal Justice

November 12, 1997

3:15 PM

Room 630T

Present (30): C. Jama Adams, George Andreopoulos, Michael Blitz, David Brotherton, Effie Papatzikou Cochran, Glenn Corbett, Edward Davenport, Jane Davenport, John Donaruma, P.J. Gibson, Edward Green, Lou Guinta, Karen Kaplowitz, Kwando Kinshasa, Sandra Lanzone, Sondra Leftoff, Barry Luby, James Malone, Ellen Marson, Mary Ann McClure, Jill Norgren, Daniel Pinello, Charles Reid, Frederik Rusch, Adina Schwartz, Lydia Segal, Ellen Sexton, Carmen Solis, Davidson Umeh, Bessie Wright

Absent (7): Kojo Dei, Arlene Geiger, Gavin Lewis, Amy Green, Jacqueline Jimenez-Polanco, Robert Rothchild, Agnes Wieschenberg

Guests: Ned Benton (Chair, Budget Planning Committee), Sandy Berger (Chair, Science Department), Tom Litwack (Chair, Faculty Senate Budget Committee), Harold Sullivan (Chair, Council of Chairs), Jack Zlotnick (Chair, Psychology Department)

Invited guest: CUNY Trustee John Morning

AGENDA

1. Announcements
2. Report on the allocation of 200 faculty lines by CUNY Trustees
3. Invited Guest: CUNY Trustee John Morning

1. Announcements [Attachment A]

2. Report on the allocation of 200 faculty lines by CUNY Trustees [Attachment A & B]

3. Invited Guest: CUNY Trustee John Morning [Attachment C & D]

CUNY Trustee John Morning was welcomed and introduced [see Attachment C]. President Kaplowitz described Trustee Morning as someone who plays a critical role on the Board of Trustees and on the two crucial committees of the Board: Academic Affairs and Fiscal Affairs. She said that as someone who has been witnessing his contributions, she is thrilled that he is a member of the Board and she invited Trustee Morning to share his impressions of the Board

after having served his first two months of his term.

Trustee Mornins: Thank you, Karen. First, and very importantly, I do not feel entirely a stranger at John Jay because I have already visited the College at the invitation of President Lynch: it was a good meeting and I enjoyed it. I consider John Jay to be an exciting institution. I was excited by the student body, first of all: that was insightful for me. I was excited by what I saw of the administration and I thought the President was an extraordinary exponent of certain things that I believe are very important about the University and about this kind of college. I'm sure we will cover that in our discussion together today. I am a newcomer to CUNY. One of the things that has been so exciting to me about becoming a part of this institution is the great amount of potential that I see. I keep seeing tremendous people, tremendous resources.

I think there is an enormous gap between the perception of this institution, and the media representation of this institution, and what I am finding out to be the reality, and so I think that the challenge for all of us in this system is to find the way to bridge the gap between the truth and what the media sees. That truth on the other side of that gap, to me, is very exciting. The reason I was very happy about Karen's invitation is that it gives me a chance to hear from you. I am trying to find out as much as I can about CUNY, and its components, and I see this as an opportunity to learn from you what your concerns are. There are a couple of issues that seem to me to be very important but I don't want to start by telling you what I think. I really want to listen to what you think.

President Kaplowitz: There are three areas we would like to tell you about. One is our history, which is rather unique, and our programs, and the wonderful things we are doing here and the wonderful things our students are doing. The second is our analysis, based on hard data, which we will share with you, of the inequitable funding of John Jay, which causes us to not be able to serve our students as well as they deserve and as well as we want to serve them. The third is our desperate need for Phase II of the building plan and our request for support for our efforts to obtain it: since most of us in this room teach in the other building and have our offices there -- 75% of the classrooms and 75% of the faculty offices and all of the student support services are in the other building -- we meet here, quite frankly, not only to get away from North Hall but also so as not to subject you, our guest, to that other building, which is lacking in space, in aesthetics, in safety, and in appropriateness of facilities.

We'd like to start by telling you some things about the College about which you may not be aware. Until 1976, John Jay offered majors in all the academic disciplines, such as English and history. In fact, NYS Senator Larry Seabrook, an alumnus, was a history major as was the former first deputy commissioner of the NYPD, John Timoney. When the fiscal crisis of 1976 occurred, we were one of the colleges the Board of Trustees targeted for closing and we were able to successfully fight that but the cost was giving up all our arts and sciences majors, except for forensic science.

Trustee Mornins: You became more specialized.

President Kaplowitz: Yes, we retained the right to offer courses in all academic disciplines, but students were no longer permitted to major in those disciplines. And we also took a \$3 million cut in our \$14 million annual budget because that was the amount of money estimated to be saved if John Jay were closed (after our students

registered at other CUNY colleges). So we now have a college that is very specialized, with a clearly defined mission, which is one of the things that many at CUNY are proposing with reference to other colleges, but our focused mission -- which is wonderful in some ways -- has led us to be discriminated against either willfully or inadvertently. And we lose many students who take our required humanities courses and who then decide to major in one of those disciplines which means they must transfer to another college.

Secretary Edward Davenport: Just today two of my students told me they are transferring, one to Hunter and the other to NYU, to major in English.

Trustee Mornins: But that **is** not all bad, is it?

President Kaplowitz: Not at all, except that it negatively affects our retention and graduation rates, and we are being budgeted, in part, on that basis.

Trustee Mornins: Oh, I see.

Senator Carmen Solis: Five of my students just left John Jay to attend the Police Academy, which is a wonderful opportunity for them, but the action of those students will also negatively affect our retention and graduation rates.

Trustee Mornina: But don't you offer a superior kind of training compared with that of the academies?

Senator Solis: I certainly believe we do.

Trustee Mornina: I'm trying to understand how the students view it. Why would they leave a superior kind of education here at John Jay to go to the Academy?

Senator Solis: Because when they graduate from the Academy they have a job as a police officer, in this case, or as a correction officer, or as a fire fighter, etc.

President Kaplowitz: It is a requirement of the Police Academy, as well as of the other training academies such as Corrections, that recruits attend their academy full-time and not be otherwise engaged in academic coursework and so, even if they wanted to continue here, even on a part-time basis, they are not permitted to because of the regulations of the agencies. They can return to the College after they graduate from the academy and many do so on a part-time basis in order to complete their degree and often to continue for advanced degrees. But that means they will not graduate in 6 or 8 years. Until now, the Board has counted 8-year graduation rates for baccalaureate degree students but I've just heard, although I'm not certain that this is definite, that 6-year graduation rates are going to be used instead of 8-year rates. Furthermore, every time a police officer is promoted, he or she must be reassigned to a different precinct and often needs to stop out to make that adjustment and then comes back again. But this delays their graduation. We have students who graduate after 12 years, 14 years. I had a student recently, a police officer, who graduated after attending John Jay for 18 years, taking a course or two each semester, which is heroic. But we are penalized in terms of our graduation rate and we do not look comparable to the other colleges and we believe we are.

Trustee Morning: I don't think there has been a final determination

as to how we are going to establish the criteria. I am hearing more and more concern that graduation rates alone is not sufficient, that we can't have a single standard, and I think that's valid. I don't think, as I've said, that we are at a final definition yet. We have to determine a way to establish a number of criteria, and graduation rates would be one of those, but I think there have to be other factors that have to be considered. And I think that over time we are going to move to that. So I think the belief that graduation rates alone will be the whole ball game is erroneous.

Professor Ned Benton: Another interesting aspect is that we are working with the Fire Department, which has just enacted promotion requirements which include college coursework. An escalating set of requirements has been established whereby every two years the requirement is being increased and so firefighters are very interested in coming to college.

Trustee Mornins: That's a plus!

Professor Benton: Yes, it is wonderful. The Fire Academy is very interested in using John Jay's faculty to teach John Jay courses at the Academy so as to do the training but to do it better than they themselves used to do. But the result of this approach, which is an excellent one, is that when the students register for our courses they become included in our number of enrolled students but our firefighters are not focused on graduating. The Fire Academy would love if firefighters graduate but they are not requiring a degree: rather they are interested in the firefighters taking certain courses and in progressing in their studies. They will promote them if they have 30 credits, and to a higher rank if they have 60 credits or 70 credits but a degree is not required. We need to refine all the criteria.

Trustee Mornins: I agree. What you've said suggests that one of the indicators might be employability. That's an area in which you might do very well and I can imagine some campuses that would think that is a terrible barometer. That is the challenge for CUNY: there is so much to balance. I'd like to go back to something Professor Davenport spoke of: frankly, I am a little ambivalent about the case history you shared with us. On the one hand I am sympathetic with your loss of students who will not contribute to your graduation rates but, on the other hand, it seems to me in a broader sense, this is what I see the University being about: having someone come to John Jay or to any of the other colleges who perhaps wouldn't be in college at all otherwise and if they decide that literature is the big thing in life for them rather than criminal justice, I don't think that's so terrible. But the fact they are going to move on to higher education and to graduation some place is what really matters and, to me, this is the real excitement of what we are doing.

Senator Frederik Rusch: I agree with what you are saying but our worry is stated in yesterday's New York Times editorial which suggests that we will be penalized by the actions of these students. It is great that students suddenly become interested in literature and they go to colleges where they can pursue that major -- as an English teacher I certainly think it is great -- but we are worried about being penalized.

President Kaplowitz: And we are concerned about the reputation that ensues when people see just two faculty lines allocated for what is characterized as a low graduation rate especially since this graduation rate only reflects those first-time, full-time, entering freshmen who graduate within eight years. And so none of what we

call our in-service students -- our students who are employed by law enforcement and criminal justice agencies -- are counted in our graduation rate because all those students come with transfer credits from their law enforcement academy studies and so, even if they never attended a college before coming to John Jay, they are characterized, in the data reports, as "**transfer**" students and, therefore, are not first-time freshmen.

Yesterday a telling phenomenon was reported in this very room. The Faculty **Senate** sponsors Better Teaching Seminars -- faculty development workshops presented by John Jay faculty for other John Jay faculty -- it is all voluntary -- and we also offer one for students about how they can be successful applicants to law school: this started out as a faculty development seminar but because so many students attended we transformed this event, which we present every semester, into one designed for our students. At yesterday's event, the panelists were four John Jay law faculty and four John Jay graduates, three of whom are now in law school and one, a law school graduate, who is working in the U.S. Attorney General's Office. The John Jay graduates reported that when they identified themselves as graduates of John Jay there were snickers or groans among their law school classmates and yet they did better than the other students: in one case the John Jay graduate's assigned partner on a writing project, who was a Yale graduate, received a C- while our alumnus received an A. Our reputation is harmed by policies that pit one CUNY college against another, policies that are then misrepresented by the media. Of course, you and your colleagues on the Board are not responsible for the actions of the media, but we have to be sensitive to this phenomenon.

Trustee Mornins: Is there a certain amount of bias? And it would seem there is snobbism, too? That's human nature, to some extent, and I don't know how you can change all that. But again I think it goes back to the idea that there has to be a broader set of criteria than just graduation rates and I think you are agreeable that if we can move to that we can have a situation that is more equitable. I think we have a challenge of making it valid in the eyes of the public: that is the only way you will stop laughter about CUNY.

President Kaplowitz: We are, indeed, agreeable to a broader set of criteria than just graduation rates and it is reassuring to hear you say this. Before we continue, I also want to say that we all applaud you and the leadership of the Trustees in recognizing the absolutely critical need for full-time faculty at CUNY and for committing yourselves to allocating more full-time faculty lines and to finding a way to leverage the allocation for new full-time faculty lines from 100 lines to 200 new lines at the senior colleges and 100 new lines at the community colleges. I think that this is such a tremendous recognition of the most immediate need at CUNY and such a dramatic action in recognition of that need that we should all applaud you. [The Senate applauded.]

Trustee Mornins: Thank you. I accept your thanks and your applause on behalf of my colleagues. But I want to also point out something else that also goes to that, I believe. I think we have been helped in going in this direction, which is the right direction, because we are getting more support from the presidents. The presidents have helped to raise our sensitivity to this need, and I also sense that the presidents -- and again I am a new comer -- but from what I hear the past situation has changed. The presidents are now getting more of an opportunity to express their views as to what is needed in the system. The presidents are an enormous resource for us. We are happy to hear from them and we will continue to have that grow. Let

me just say one other thing about the Board, if I may. You were very generous to us. I think we are challenged -- there are 17 of us, as you know, and 12 of us have come on the Board within the last year. We have a challenge just to come together and to work together **as** a group and at the same time we are trying to simply get to know one another and work with one another. We've been hit: the Chancellor leaves, the Deputy Chancellor leaves, there's a contract to be negotiated. We've got a lot of pans on the fire at the same time that we are trying to come together. I don't mean this **as** a cop out but I do think we just need some time to come together and I think we can deal more effectively with the concerns that you have.

President Kaplowitz: And I would like to ask that you consider us, also, as a resource. The faculty are able to provide information and assistance and a perspective that complements the presidents'.

Trustee Mornins: I agree.

President Kaplowitz: I would like to call on Tom Litwack, a member of the Forensic Psychology Department. He is both a lawyer and a clinical psychologist. We have the only forensic psychology major in NYC and in NYS and it is the best program in the country. And until recently we had the only master's program in forensic psychology -- there is now a second, outside the state.

Trustee Morning: They should know about all that at Yale.

President Kaplowitz: Yes. And we should have a forensic psychology doctoral program, which our underfunding is hampering us in developing. There would be a tremendous student demand for it.

Professor Tom Litwack: Karen's description is entirely accurate. I'd like to pick up on a comment you made earlier, Karen. The crisis in 1976 which forced us to specialize was not all bad because one of the things that came out of it was that we developed very unique, in some cases totally unique, programs. Perhaps the chair of the forensic psychology department, Jack Zlotnick, would comment.

Trustee Morning: I would first like to pick up on a point you made earlier. I agree entirely: you were forced to do something but it seems to me it has benefitted not only the City but the nation and even internationally as you move overseas. There have been a lot of positives.

Professor Jack Zlotnick: Our program has grown dramatically: on the undergraduate level, five years ago we had 400 students majoring in forensic psychology and now we have 900 students, and on the graduate level, five years ago we had between 75 and 100 students in our forensic psychology master's program and we now have 300 students. We have students attending our program from virtually every state in the country as well as many international students who have come here to enroll in our programs. Basically I think the reason is our outstanding faculty who are forensic psychologists themselves and who are engaged in extensive research in the field. The faculty are really extraordinary and many work in the field: both our full-time faculty and many of our adjunct faculty work in the field and many have come from this field and so they make that fertilization between practice and theory. We have is a very, very good faculty who are for the most part the innovators in the field. There is the saying that if it is going to happen it will happen in New York first. And so our faculty have worked around the City, and in New York State, and have developed an enormous background. Probably half of our senior faculty could be department chairs

anywhere, in terms of the area of forensic psychology. And my other sense of it is that the students get a great deal out of the program because many of our master's students go on to doctoral programs and write to us and come back to us and tell us what they are doing. A couple of them just submitted, for example, through our Forensic Psychology Institute, a proposal to the American Psychological Association. There are a tremendous number of exciting things going on: I've just mentioned a very few of them.

Trustee Mornins: I can't resist asking you this because I seem to hear so often about this: do you have the right balance between full-time and adjuncts in the program you've just spoken very glowingly about? I wondered what your adjuncts contribute?

Professor Zlotnick: The adjuncts do contribute. We have about 40 adjuncts and about 20 full-time faculty. That is not the right balance, not for us and not for Middle-States, nor for anybody else. Consequently we do need lines. Thankfully we have been getting lines but other departments suffer from that condition, as well.

Trustee Mornins: Can one ratio of full-time faculty to adjuncts apply pretty much across all schools and all departments or do you have an optimal ratio in forensic psychology as opposed to, say, English, or any other discipline that is taught here?

Professor Zlotnick: The proper ratio should really be driven by the students: what I mean by that is that full-time faculty, by contract, work with our students in a very ongoing way; adjuncts are not contracted to do that.

Trustee Mornina: Of course.

Professor Zlotnick: As a consequence, the burden of that work with the students falls on the 20 full-timers with regard to the 1200 students in the undergraduate and graduate forensic psychology programs. That's a problem. The students would benefit more if they could have more full-time faculty.

Trustee Mornins: I guess what I was asking you is what would be ideal for your department in terms of full-time faculty to adjunct ratio: 50/50? 60/40?

Professor Litwack: As the former chair of the Forensic Psychology Department, I'd like to say that in any professional program, such as our Master's program, it is always good to have some adjuncts because you can get some people from the community who have special expertise that your own faculty doesn't have. I would want to have the ability to hire adjuncts, especially for our master's program. May I just add in passing, by the way, that although I don't know this for a fact, in terms of national reputation, I'll bet that our master's program gets more students from out of state and from out of city than any master's program in CUNY. But on the undergraduate level we need full-time faculty as much as any psychology program needs full-time faculty: the fact that we are a forensic psychology program makes no difference on the undergraduate level because you need full-time faculty to mentor students, to advise students, to be there for students. Also, I might add, it is only full-time faculty who do research and we are a major research institution, not just in psychology but throughout John Jay. It is the full-time faculty who do research.

Trustee Morning: Your field is new, for the most part, and so there are tremendous research opportunities and demands, I would think?

Professor Litwack: Absolutely. I don't want to bore you with details now but I could tell you about research that is very, very interesting, indeed.

Trustee Mornins: Your argument is very sound and I have no problem with that. I guess my question is more whether one size fits all when one engages in this debate about adjuncts versus full-time faculty or is it a variable depending on school and discipline?

Senator James Malone: I think the 70% full-time faculty that the Board is seeking is a very solid ratio. In addition to the responsibilities mentioned, full-time faculty are required to hold office hours, to work on committees, to develop curriculum, and to be available to students. Adjuncts do not have to do that. Students need a lot more than just classroom work. Students need faculty who are available to them, faculty who run the college.

President Kaplowitz: When Jack Zlotnick said there are 20 full-time faculty and 40 adjuncts, those are the number of people, in other words headcount. But those 40 adjuncts might teach one course each or they might teach three courses each. So you really have to look at the percentage of the course sections taught by full-time faculty compared to the percentage of course sections taught by adjunct faculty. The Board of Trustees mandate of 70%, which Jim Malone rightly praised, calls for 70% of course sections taught by full-time faculty. This can not translate into any one number of people, either full-time or adjunct, because 40 adjuncts teaching one course each equals 40 adjunct-taught sections but 40 adjuncts teaching three courses each equals 120 adjunct-taught sections. My recollection is that the forensic psychology department has only 42% of its course sections taught by full-time faculty this semester.

Professor Zlotnick: That is correct.

Professor Kaplowitz: And instead of 42% it should be 70%. In the English Department, only 10% of all our writing course sections, from remedial to college composition to writing electives, are taught by full-time faculty and 90% of the course sections are taught by adjuncts! Far fewer than 50% of all our undergraduate course sections overall are taught by full-time faculty instead of the Board's Master Plan goal of 70%.

Trustee Mornins: That's a very, very important distinction that you have just explained.

President Kaplowitz: Yes, the distinction between the absolute number of full-time faculty and the percent of the total course sections that those full-time faculty teach is of critical importance. I'd also like to follow up on Jack Zlotnick's crucial comment that it is actually student demand that determines the ratio of full-time to adjunct faculty. This is because student demand determines the number of course sections we need to offer and if we do not have enough full-time faculty to teach those course sections, and John Jay's inadequate budget does not enable us to have a sufficient number of full-time faculty to teach those course sections, we turn to adjunct faculty, the number of whom is determined by the number of sections we need to offer.

Professor Litwack: Following up on your question, Trustee Morning, there is nothing about John Jay -- there is nothing about our students or our programs -- that would lead us to need full-time faculty less than any other CUNY college.

Trustee Mornins: I wasn't implying that. And that was not where I was headed, but I guess I could say there is also no need for you to have a hiaher rate than any other CUNY college.

Professor Benton: CUNY does have an Instructional Staffing Model (ISM) which takes into consideration different ideas about class size for different disciplines and also distinctions between class size at the graduate level, where classes are smaller, and at the undergraduate level, where they are larger. And so when you run the ISM it does modulate the number of lines for a campus based upon the profile of the courses that it offers. There is some criticism about the ISM, that it could be updated and refined and that it doesn't take into consideration everything that it should. There is a growing consensus within CUNY that the ISM needs to be updated.

Trustee Morning: Is it essentially right? Or is it deeply flawed?

Professor Benton: I think it is essentially right. It just needs to be fine-tuned and other factors need to be considered in it. I don't know that there would be any major winners or losers after a fine tuning but it does answer the question that you raise: if you run the ISM it could show campuses that need fewer faculty.

Trustee Morning: Don't you think it is fair, though, to ask that rather than see this become simply a numbers game we try to strike those refinements that you described and move toward fulfilling the mission better rather than establish numerical tables that seem to be better by someone's judgment?

President Kaplowitz: Jama Adams is a graduate of John Jay and is a member of the African-American Studies Department.

Senator C. Jama Adams: It is reassuring to hear your openness to the importance of rejecting the idea that one model should fit all. Listening to the debate and the experiences that many of us have had in the classroom one realizes there are many different CUNY's, and there are many different John Jay's. I teach an introductory course and it is not unusual to have 40% to 50% of the students fail that course and that is happening in many classes where the students coming in are not very well prepared. The other most stubborn problem, I see it as a problem -- depending on how one looks at it, it is a refreshing aspect of American life -- is pragmatism: "I come to school to get a degree to get a job." Some of us want the "university on the hill," want to be removed from society, to be a place to be reflective and thoughtful. The people "down at the bottom" want something else, to be taught fire science programs, etc., etc. I'm not sure I've heard what models of a system with a quarter of a million students can encompass all three of those pieces -- to teach, to train, to do research -- in a way that makes people feel that they are doing very fine work. And I'm not for a minute suggesting that any one of those three is more important than the other but oftentimes we feel that the loudest voices are the "university on the hill."

There was a time when the University was the "university on the hill" and one of the issues that I think hasn't been brought up yet, which is very important to us, is the race and class dimensions of this attitude. Many of the students coming in now are students of color, many of them do not meet the standards, and I don't think we have a place or maybe a safety in talking about concerns around the frequent confusion of race and class, the assumption that everybody who comes here can't write, or the assumption that because they are

black you cannot say that they can't write. I'm very concerned about those issues because I think what we are going to see happening, something which is happening in universities throughout the country, in which forensic science will do well and Latino and Black Studies will exist for political purposes, not they are not doing good work, but there's the perception of: "well, we need to have them here."

Hopefully, out of all this complexity around the numbers and the lines and the model and the statistical profiles we will be able to step back and ask what sort of University should we be talking about. Should we be talking about multiple modules or is the sentiment for that not strong? I think that is what we should address because there are many institutions within something called a university, with one not talking with the other, and that has very serious race and class overtones, especially for CUNY.

Trustee Mornins: There is so much to respond to and to wrestle with! You started out talking about the need to teach, to train, to do research -- that is absolutely right. I thought that you, out of your discussions here, would come to an answer to that and I want to hear that answer and take it with me. That is the challenge, without a doubt. I can tell you what my personal reactions are to some of those issues but they are not necessarily the sentiments of the Board. You know my personal reactions don't have any official weight. But let me try to respond to a couple of the points you made. Trying to define what we are supposed to do within those three areas is something we have to do. **As** I said before, we have a Board that has finally been formed and named and is coming together now and that is an important discussion we have to have. I do think that the formal mission statement of the University is very good. I think it is the best I have ever seen, and I've struggled with a number of these in various institutions and have seen others. It's one of the toughest things, I think, for a Board to do. We start off with a very good mission statement and it is sensitive to many concerns that you expressed. But you have to go beyond the words in the document to the spirit that is pervasive on the Board and throughout the institution. We have to have a discussion that moves us toward greater cohesion toward that, as well.

You spoke about the idea of the "university on the hill." I think that concept has gotten some currency lately because we hear President Goldstein of Baruch and others sort of harking back to a golden age of CUNY and I think, again, that is not the final shot. I think there is going to be a long discussion along those lines. I don't presume that President Goldstein's views on this are definitive or, again, the final word, by any means. I think all of our presidents have to be a part of that dialogue, of that conversation. Division of the University is not likely to come from any one president, given 20 who are equally talented and articulate.

But I do think we are going to have not only a meaningful but a dynamic discussion about this and if that discussion is at all real it is going to address those aspects of race and class that you spoke about. We have to address that. President Goldstein spoke about changes that are coming to the system and you, also, spoke about changes that are coming. I don't really share that. I feel the changes have already happened and they are here. We have a population that is very much of color, very much working, very much of families, very much of birth outside this country. That's not coming; that's here. The challenge is for us to respond to that and to deal with it. My bias, personally, is to see this as a single institution rather than three tiers or five tiers. It seems to me there is a greater strength for us in being perceived, first of all,

as a single institution. [The Senate applauded.]

I'm delighted to have some support in that [the Senate laughed in response] because people ask why can't we be like California and have a three-tier system. Well, that is California and this is New York. There are highly significant differences between the two places and we in New York are accustomed to deal with big numbers and big sizes and I think we can deal with a big system. I don't think we have to cut it in pieces to make it more manageable. By being a unitary system rather than a tri-partite or a six-part system we can better bring the advantages of unity and size to all the campuses. For instance, it seems to me that you have a very specialized mission at John Jay and I believe you have been able to develop your national prominence in this field because you are not a single standing institution. I would bet you that if John Jay were a college on its own, public or private, you would not be nearly as far down the road as you are today. So it seems to me that we want to have a unitary system that allows us to develop John Jay's in 20 different places or in 10 different places. I think that is to be determined yet but I think that's what we ought to be looking to do and if we can do that, and I believe this, we can be the best public system in the country. That should be our goal. We shouldn't settle for anything less because we have the people and the resources to achieve that.

President Kaplowitz: Everyone here has read President Matt Goldstein's speech, not just the newspaper reports, so that we could know for ourselves precisely what he said.

Trustee Mornins: I thought they might have. [Senate laughter.]

President Kaplowitz: Professor Jim Levine is the executive officer of the doctoral program. We go from the associate degree to the Ph.D. and so we give the associate, the baccalaureate, the master's and the doctorate degrees. We are the only college in CUNY that does that.

Trustee Mornins: I hadn't known that.

Professor James Levine: Thank you Karen, for inviting me, and thank you, Trustee Morning, for joining us. I'm delighted that you are skeptical about the wisdom of a multi-tiered university but even should the Goldstein plan succeed, I don't have a shadow of a doubt that John Jay College would be in the top tier. That is a foregone conclusion. And I might add that I say that having had 21 years of experience at another institution in CUNY. I'm here to speak very briefly about the doctoral program. I certainly consider the program a jewel of John Jay. We've been in existence 18 years. All CUNY doctoral programs, as you know, are actually under the auspices of the Graduate School but a handful of programs are physically located at one of the senior colleges, for a variety of reasons, and we are one of them. I would like to echo Jack Zlotnick's comments: during those 18 years the doctoral program has been engaged in a continual drive toward excellence. We have overhauled our curriculum, it is tough, is demanding, it is up to date, it is providing our students with skills not only to continue in their very prominent positions in law enforcement, which some of them come from, but also to go into the field of higher education. The field of criminal justice higher education is booming across the nation.

President Kaplowitz: Jim, would you report about the study just done by Professor Dean Savage of Queens College.

professor Levine: Certainly. A very sophisticated report was done on the graduates of CUNY's doctoral programs. The highest percent of people with full-time positions in the field of higher education are the graduates of our criminal justice doctoral program, higher than any of the other 30 CUNY doctoral programs. So our doctoral recipients are not driving taxi cabs, that is for sure. Our standards for admissions have been raised and the quality of our education is improving. Our faculty, such as Professor Benton, are doing work with computing and the Internet that is so state of the art that it is razzle dazzle. We are having a review, mandated by the CUNY Graduate School, of all the doctoral programs. All 30 of the doctoral programs are to be reviewed over the next five years, a very intensive, probing examination in which outside reviewers are brought in, and we have agreed to have two of the top criminologists in the nation review us. In fact, we volunteered to be among the first cohort -- the review is this February -- because we are confident and we are confident because of the faculty, we are confident because of our program and because of our students. Much focus has been made about the need for faculty but it takes more than faculty to run a college: it takes support services, it takes equipment, it takes space.

Speaking of space: I was looking around the room we are in and I realized that the doctoral program, together with the office of graduate studies, which administers the five master's programs at John Jay which have 1000 students -- our doctoral program has close to 100 students -- is housed in a space that is approximately the size of this room, broken up into little parts. We have a room with ancient computers, on which our students are supposed to learn state of the art techniques. So when our reviewers come we are going to try to put our best face forward but we are going to have to honestly tell them that we desperately need help, help from the College within but help from people like you, to understand that our funding level in comparison with other CUNY colleges has been so abysmal that every time that someone asks for something we must play a "robbing Peter to pay Paul" kind of game and I ask as vociferously as anyone, about my own turf, but I know full well that that can cause problems to other critical programs and services within the College. So we are doing very well on the basis of very slim resources. We are hurting very, very badly. We are doing incredibly well at various levels but we need help.

Trustee Mornins: Your testament of the power and value of your program is very compelling and I certainly understand and applaud it. In my understanding of a system where there are separate operating and capital budgets are you saying that it wasn't bad enough that in 1976 you got clobbered on the operating side but that the same thing happened in terms of capital funding as well? Is that your position?

President Kaplowitz: There has been a tremendous student demand for our programs, none of which exist at other CUNY colleges. And so our enrollment has increased 70% during the past 10 years. We are in a physical plant that is designed for **4900** students but we have 11,000 students. Vice Chancellor Emma Macari's figures are that we have only **48%** of the space that we need for our current student body. At the last Board of Trustees meeting, Vice Chancellor Macari described us as having the most serious space deficit of the senior colleges. Furthermore, North Hall, which Phase II would replace, according to an outside review of the Fire Science program, which is located in North Hall, is a disaster waiting to happen in terms of overcrowding and safety, which is, of course, a terrible irony. The report also cited the aesthetic unpleasantness of the building.

There is a good reason why we are not holding our meeting with you in North Hall: we want you to leave here having a good impression of the College. The students, many of whom put their lives on the line, and those who make sacrifices of other sorts to come here deserve better than North Hall. We would also like to present our view of the inequitable underfunding of John Jay, which has been alluded to at various times today. Tom Litwack is the chair of the Faculty Senate's budget committee.

Professor Litwack: We have several charts [Attachment D] which we have just created using the most recent data available from the CUNY Central Administration and the charts really speak for themselves. The first page [Attachment D-1] was prepared by Professor Benton, who is the chair of the College's budget planning committee: this page contains three charts, one of which shows the total allocation per FTE and the next shows the ISM lines we should get compared with the number that we, in fact, have, and the last is the percent of our revenue target that we are allocated. The second page [Attachment D-2] shows the base budgets for all the senior colleges and the dollar base budget allocation per FTE student at each college. A third document we will give you shows John Jay's funding in comparison with the that of the community colleges.

Professor Benton: I'd like us to start with the sheet containing three charts [Attachment D-1]. The first table looks at the overall budget across CUNY -- these are Vice Chancellor Richard Rothbard's figures -- and I've taken the August 1997 allocation, which is the money received for faculty as well as for adjuncts as well as for freshman programs as well as for library acquisitions -- it is all lumped together. I divided that allocation by the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) students each campus had at the end of last year. **As you can, see the allocation per student ranges from \$8,900 down to \$4,169 and we are at the bottom. John Jay receives \$4,169 per FTE student.** The best explanation as to why we are in this situation is that CUNY has had a budget model, the first term of which is the allocation a college received the previous year. There are a variety of allocations that happen after that but many of them counterbalance each other: some colleges get an allocation for Base Level Equity but other colleges get an allocation for Academic Program Planning and these cancel each other out. Over the past ten years we can see a tendency for budgets to remain relatively constant: there are lots of adjustments and initiatives but when everything is weighed the relative differences tend to remain the same and they don't tend to take into consideration students' choices as to which college they decide to attend.

The second chart [middle of Attachment D-1] focuses on faculty: ISM lines are the number of faculty lines a campus should have to reach 70% full-time taught course sections, based on the college's profile of graduate and undergraduate courses, and the types of courses it offers. We know there should be 5,599 lines to fully staff the model and that today the senior colleges have 3,564 lines. But there are campuses, such as City College, which is at 93% of the model, and then you go down the list and see Baruch at 62%, and the College of Staten Island at 52%, and finally you get to John Jay: we are at 44.5% of the Instructional Staffing Model, which is the University's official model. These are CUNY Central Administration data that are used to make the allocations to the colleges.

Finally, the last chart [bottom of Attachment D-1] looks at the allocation from a student's point of view: the chart shows the amount of money that is allocated to each campus in the August allocation of the budget from the Legislature and introduces a

number, a number which is new this year, which is the campus' revenue target: the CUNY Central Office established a revenue target for each campus based upon the tuition collections of each campus in the last three years. The revenue target represents what the students who come to John Jay are expected to deliver to the bursar in their own money or in the money they've received from loans or from financial aid. If you look at CCNY, 55 cents at the bursar brings a dollar's worth of education. At John Jay, the students must pay **89** cents in order to get that dollar's worth of education. Our students don't get as many professors, they don't get as many services, but they are expected to pay **89** cents on the dollar for the privilege. It is incomprehensible to me how this can be. I know how we got this way, but the University has to focus on rationalizing its resource allocation so the funds follow the students and their needs rather than follow history.

Trustee Mornina: I gather once this order has been established, it is difficult to break out of it. And so I assume that this is the way it was five years ago? 10 years ago?

Professor Benton: It has become worse during the past 10 years.

Trustee Mornina: It couldn't have become worse for John Jay because you've been at the bottom of the list.

Professor Benton: But we didn't use to be at only **44%** of the Instructional Staffing Model.

Trustee Mornina: So **it's** not only that you are in last place but there has been a decline in the share as well?

President Kaplowitz: Yes, that's right, because our enrollment has increased. Three years ago we were at 61% of the Instructional Staffing Model and now we are at 44%.

Professor Litwack: And the situation has certainly gotten worse in terms of the non-teaching resources and the situation could be even worse in terms of teaching lines if it were not for Base Level Equity because our enrollment growth has outpaced Base Level Equity. Were it not for Base Level Equity we would be in an even worse situation than these charts reveal.

President Kaplowitz: I'd like to show you a chart that Professor Benton has done which shows the enrollment changes at the senior colleges between 1992 and 1996 [see Attachment B-2 of Minutes #155]. John Jay's enrollment increased dramatically, other colleges' enrollment increased to a lesser degree, and other colleges experienced a decline in their enrollment. But the base budgets of the colleges remained the same, regardless of a continuous increase or continuous decrease in enrollment. So as the base budget remains the same, the colleges that lose students are actually in better shape because they retain their base budget but have fewer students to serve with that same amount of money.

Trustee Mornina: That is right: they are not losing any income.

President Kaplowitz: Exactly: they are not losing any income but they have lower expenditures because they have fewer numbers of students to serve. We have the same income but we have increased expenditures and so we are in very worse shape than we were five or ten years ago.

Professor Benton: This is not a problem which can't be solved. It

is solved at campuses all around the country. But CUNY actually has an allocation model for the community colleges that considers enrollment, that considers the different characters of the different programs, and that also considers a campus that has a more complex set of buildings but it is driven by the actual enrollment situation at each community college. If you ran the same kinds of statistics on the community colleges you'd find that it is fairly well-tuned, adjusted year to year to year. It's just that we have not been tuning it with respect to the senior colleges so I think we know how to do this and we probably know that it has to be done.

Trustee Mornins: I was going to ask you what are the recourses. Is it to move to the model that we have for the community colleges?

Professor Benton: Not to literally use the community college model but if we use the community college model for allocating the administrative and support resources -- there shouldn't be a difference between the number of janitors for similar buildings in a community college and a senior college -- then the Instructional Staffing Model applied to the senior colleges may need refinements that reflect a more sophisticated range of programs and needs but that is something that can be formulated.

Trustee Mornins: Why is there not a single standard for both senior colleges and community colleges? If there isn't, how politically feasible or possible is it to turn this around? Does it have to do with the difference in State funding as opposed to City funding?

Senator James Malone: Yes, because the county system by law requires that community colleges receive budgets that are enrollment driven. That is not true of the senior colleges. That is not to say that across the country almost every public system of higher education has a student driven per/student per/capita model so that there is equity. CUNY has been allocating the budgets of the senior colleges based purely on politics, purely on politics. I've been a CUNY-wide member for 27 years and I **know** that to be a fact.

Trustee Mornins: I don't think it is politically feasible that we are going to change this model or maybe it will happen but I think what you have to have is some other way of addressing your needs, either through the Board of Trustees' Fiscal Affairs Committee or some other way. I certainly hear what you are saying.

Professor Benton: There was an effort to deal with this a few years ago: that was the Base Level Equity initiative. The idea was to gradually, incrementally move from the current situation to a more fair situation by using increases in resources disproportionately to try to help the fiscally disadvantaged campuses without taking resources directly from the more advantaged campuses.

Trustee Mornins: But Base Level Equity is **not** working, in your view, or is it working too slowly?

President Kaplowitz: It is working too slowly.

Professor Benton: That is correct: it is working too slowly. Those campuses that have unfilled professorships -- and Vice Chancellor Rothbard will tell you that this is true but other people will tell you that it is not true but it **is** true -- when a college has an unfilled professorship, the State gives the college **82** cents on the dollar for that line and there are campuses that have substantial numbers of unfilled professorships. We certainly don't think that any campus that has professors on their staff should have professors

taken away from them or redeployed. We certainly think that the rate at which Base Level Equity -- or any other kind of fairness model -- could be implemented could be accelerated if there was a look at the unfilled professorships that campuses are not using. It also creates a disincentive where you are trying to build up the faculty but the Board permits the State funding model to, on the one hand, claim that they need new lines in order to cover their classes and, on the other hand, be able to have lines they are not using and keep the 82 cents on the dollar. It seems to me that if the Board knew that they would be bewildered.

Trustee Mornins: I think you may find it small solace given the depth of your concerns, but I think Base Level Equity is coming up for some reexamination, fine tuning, and, hopefully, it can move to address some of your concerns here. I don't get the sense that it's going to give you everything you'd like out of it but you'd at least be encouraged that it moved toward a fairer distribution than we have now.

Professor Benton: Whether it's base Level Equity or anything else that moves toward fairness, anything that is fair will help us! [The Senate laughed.]

Trustee Mornins: [Laughing] I like your spirit! That's the right way to look at it! It was either at the last Fiscal Affairs meeting or at a special Fiscal meeting that Trustee Marino called to examine the Base Level Equity issue that I had a sense we are looking to, maybe not entirely recast it, but I think there will be some changes.

President Kaplowitz: At the last special meeting of the Board's Fiscal Affairs Committee meeting I took notes which I would like to quote from. President Leon Goldstein of Kingsborough Community College said, "It is important that Trustees know that the model used by each community college is known by all the community colleges and is open for view and review. Not everyone is happy but it is not an unhealthy situation because it permits community college presidents to fight for their colleges, to make presentations. The openness of the community college process is what I praise." That is not true of the senior college model.

Trustee Mornins: I remember him saying that.

President Kaplowitz: It was very telling.

Trustee Mornins: I agree: it was very telling.

Professor Litwack: There is no senior college model for distributing non-teaching resources. There is a model for determining how many faculty a college needs and for giving adjuncts to make up for the shortfall in full-time faculty and at least we have a Base Level Equity model that says where colleges should be at if they were at Base Level Equity. But there is no model for distributing all the other resources: library resources, computer resources, building cleaning resources and everything else you can imagine the funding for which is purely determined by history and politics. And if I may focus your attention on the base budgets [Attachment D-2] I think you will see the unbelievable differences in the base budgets that the different senior college receive, again not because of a model but purely because of history and politics. I want us, however, to be absolutely clear about this: in all our presentations with CUNY for more resources we have always recognized, as was said before but I want to say it again, that differences in the physical

nature of different campuses and the nature of different programs will certainly mean some difference in funding, which we totally accept. As Ned said, any model that would be fair would be greatly beneficial to us. But I think you can see from this table [Attachment D-2] that the distinctions are just grotesque.

Trustee Mornins: Given your tables and your figures, I can see how you feel terribly abused. Now I know if this table were drawn up by York College there might be a different conclusion but that would not lessen your pain.

Senator James Malone: No, York would not disagree. York is very underfunded. It's just that we are even more underfunded than York.

Professor Litwack: We should add for the record, to make sure you are not misled, the base budget is not the only budget. Colleges get additional monies added to the base. But this is the base and it is what we can count on. This is not a matter of dispute: these are the figures that are taken from the University's own reports.

Trustee Mornins: But are you faring better in the additional monies that come to you beyond the base?

Professor Litwack: We fare somewhat better. But, again, all we ask for is that there be some model, some articulated model that would apply to every college for distributing all resources because that would give us, frankly, much more money. At the very least as a public university resources shouldn't be distributed based on history or power, but rather they should be distributed based on a fair model which all can see and debate.

President Kaplowitz: The political factor is important. Unlike most of the other colleges which draw students primarily from the borough that the college is located in, John Jay draws students equally from the five boroughs, and so we do not have elected officials who have as great a personal stake in the way our College is treated. And so, unlike, for example, the Brooklyn delegation which fights for the Brooklyn-based colleges, we don't have officials fighting for our capital projects or for member items or generally lobbying on our behalf.

Trustee Mornins: That's a good point. I wasn't aware of that.

Professor Harold Sullivan: It is refreshing listening to you because you are listening to us and that is very important to us. With regard to issues of equity, one of the arguments that is made is that John Jay receives less money because it really doesn't need more money because the other colleges have graduate programs. But it is important to know that our faculty are teaching in the graduate programs. The department which I chair, Government, comprises 12 full-time faculty and twice that number of part-time faculty. This semester, as has been the case during the last several semesters, approximately 65% of our undergraduate course sections are taught by adjunct faculty: this includes from 30% to 60% of the course sections of our senior level capstone course. These adjuncts are graduate students, not professionals in the field, because most of the courses are given during the day. My department of 12 faculty comprises five faculty who also teach in the Graduate School of CUNY, either the doctoral program in criminal justice here at John Jay or in the doctoral program in political science at 42 Street. So we do support doctoral programs throughout the University. The faculty in my department also teach in the various master's degree programs here. So we are not different from

Hunter or City.

Trustee Mornins: But it is also a matter as to whether 80th Street sees you as being different.

Professor Sullivan: To be blunt, the administration at 80th Street historically responds to pressure and many of the members of the Central Administration came from the older senior colleges of CUNY and so their sympathies are with those colleges. We are relatively young, relatively new, we are rapidly expanding while some of those colleges are rapidly decreasing in size, and yet we are not getting the resources commensurate with our size nor with our programs nor with our participation in the important programs of the University.

The Government Department just had an outside evaluation, as part of the systematic evaluation of each undergraduate and graduate program that is mandated by the CUNY Board of Trustees. The Government Major was very highly rated by outside evaluators, who praised its uniqueness and its special role within this criminal justice college. We deal with the intersection of law, society, politics, and criminal justice. And many of the students at John Jay who come here thinking criminal justice is just police work realize through their studies once they are here that there are broader issues, including the fact that politics determine distribution of resources.

Most programs at John Jay are interdisciplinary. And so the Criminal Justice major, for example, has faculty from throughout the College, although it is governed by the Law and Police Science Department, the Government Department, and the Sociology Department. The Legal Studies Major is interdisciplinary: Government Department and the Law and Police Science Department. These are the most important majors in the College and we have twelve full-time faculty members to play all these roles: doctoral programs, master's programs, three or four different undergraduate majors, and we have excellent graduate students who are teaching as adjuncts but they can not cover everything. So I would like to emphasize that it is critical that one receives a picture of the College as an educational institution and the important thing about Ned's figures and Tom's figures is how the University cheats our students by taking their tuition, which is the same amount as that of all the senior colleges, yet our students receive, in some cases, half the resources. It simply is not just. We do an excellent job with what we get but if we had more we'd do much better.

Trustee Mornins: I think your description of not only your department but of what you are doing throughout the College is a very powerful one. I have to admire that. I also have to gather that the interdisciplinary quality of what you are doing would seem to me to make this a very rich program to be a part of, that this is a great strength. I understand, on the other hand, how you may be understaffed, as you put it, but I guess from a broader perspective how is this system going to move to the level of full-time faculty that everyone here is convinced that we need? I just don't see our budgets growing significantly over the next several years. In fact we may be relatively fortunate if the budgets don't decline and only go up by only a few percentage points. This year we had a slight increase, about 4%, and we were thinking of that as something of a victory because it wasn't a cut, in contrast to recent years. That's not a trick question: I'm really interested. **As** you said yourself, allocation and politics are all intertwined and when you get to the final analysis in this question of full-time faculty it is one of allocation and where are we going to find the money? In

my view, either we are going to have to have our overall budget increased or we are going to have to take the money out of something else. I know there are other things you are equally concerned about and are not prepared to give up to support full-time faculty.

Professor Sullivan: I really don't think the amount of money needed to bring some equity is very great because of the vacant funded lines that the better funded colleges are using for activities that we simply can not afford to do. You can take some money from the vacant funded lines. Karen can explain vacant funded lines to you. But I'd like to note that John Jay's ratio of administrative staff to students is the lowest among the CUNY senior colleges and perhaps money can be taken from the administrative budget of those better funded colleges and give it to us.

Trustee Morning: That's an answer to what I was asking.

Professor Benton: I work with state prison systems with regard to that very issue in which there are rising prison populations and yet one must manage within a budget. What I see states do is to first develop a model as to what the staffing ouaht to be and what the resources ouaht to be. I would think if you develop a reference model, particularly in the non-academic areas of CUNY, as to what administrative and support resources should be at each campus you would discover that there are campuses that relative to any fair reference model have resources that they can't explain. There may be other campuses that are the same size, same function, that are doing the same task more efficiently and that's an area that you can look to for savings. Similarly, as Harold said, if you have campuses that are given lines but they are using the 82 cents for something else then that is another area where you really should be looking to redeploy resources.

President Kaplowitz: All of this can best be understood, I think, if we provide an historical context for what we are describing and proposing. In 1993 we invited Vice Chancellor Rothbard to our Senate meeting: he was sitting exactly where you are sitting now. We have tremendous respect for Vice Chancellor Rothbard: we had and we continue to have tremendous respect for him. He is very sensitive to the needs of the University and its students and we think he is doing a very good job. We presented Vice Chancellor Rothbard with our sense of John Jay's inequitable funding and we requested from him data to explain why, at that time, we received \$10 million less in our annual base budget than Lehman -- we picked Lehman because at that time Lehman and John Jay had the same number of student FTE's and so we picked Lehman just for a point of comparison. Vice Chancellor Rothbard sent us the data and we did an analysis of that data and we wrote to Vice Chancellor Rothbard detailing our analysis which showed that at least \$5 million of the \$10 million annual difference could not be accounted for in any way (such as physical plant and programmatic differences) and we were very conservative in our analysis.

Shortly after that, when the next budget allocation was made by 80th Street to the colleges, in the summer of 1994, Vice Chancellor Rothbard, with Chancellor Reynolds' support, of course, did something very brave and that was to announce an initiative which Vice Chancellor Rothbard called Base Level Equity. It was based on the following principle: when faculty or staff retire or die or resign or are fired, the college keeps that line. So if a college is an historically old college, such as Brooklyn, for example, over the years lots of people retire, relocate, die, the college keeps those peoples' lines.

Trustee Mornina: Even if enrollment at that college is declining?

President Kaplowitz: Yes, even if enrollment is declining.

Professor Litwack: Exactly.

President Kaplowitz: But not only that. The college then has the choice of filling the line, by hiring someone, or keeping it vacant. If the college chooses to keep the line vacant, the college collects the money for the vacant line: **82%** of the funding for that line remains in the college's budget. The reason it is **82%** is because 18% of the funding for each position is for fringe benefits and **82%** is the actual salary that the person receives: fringe benefits are not paid, of course, to a non-existent person, and so the funding to the college is 82% of the worth of the line. So if a college has, for example, 200 vacant lines, and at a conservative figure each line is funded at \$50,000 -- it is usually higher at the older colleges because usually people leave after many years at which point they have achieved a higher salary -- but let's be conservative -- then 200 vacant lines multiplied by \$50,000 dollars each provides \$10 million annually in tax levy money for that college to spend on computers, library books, tutors, for reassigned time for faculty. And then, in contrast, there are colleges, such as ours, which have no vacant lines.

And so what Vice Chancellor Rothbard created was an initiative whereby when lines are vacant at the more advantageously funded senior colleges some of those vacant lines would be moved to the less well funded senior colleges: under this initiative no one would be fired and no one would be transferred. Only the line would be redistributed. But the presidents of those colleges that would have lost vacant lines -- along with the funding for those lines (the **82%** funding) did not like the initiative and there was a lot of protest. That is why I said that it was very courageous of Vice Chancellor Rothbard and of Chancellor Reynolds to create the initiative.

In response to the protest by some of the presidents (those with vacant lines or those that could afford to keep newly vacant lines unfilled because enrollment had declined), Chancellor Reynolds formed a committee called the Ad Hoc Committee of College Presidents on Base Level Equity, which was chaired by President Matt Goldstein. A copy of that committee's report was distributed for informational purposes at the most recent meeting of the Fiscal Affairs Committee. The ad hoc committee's report contained both short term and long term proposals. The main recommendation was that Base Level Equity should not take place by moving vacant funded lines from college to college, but rather that the University should seek new funding for full-time lines from Albany and any new dollars given by the State Legislature to CUNY should be used to redress the funding inequity by allocating new funded lines to the underfunded colleges.

In response to that recommendation from the presidents, the following year Chancellor Reynolds included in the asking budget a request for lines and dollars for Base Level Equity for new faculty positions and the Board of Trustees approved that asking budget and the Governor acquiesced: the Executive Budget provided money and lines specifically for Base Level Equity and the Legislature approved it. The same was true for this year: the State Legislature allocated \$4.25 million for new faculty lines. Yet only 75 of the 300 lines are being allocated to the senior colleges for what we have been calling Base Level Equity but which is now being called "the 70% initiative." Our argument is that more of this new money

should be allocated for lines to colleges that have a desperate need for full-time faculty. This would not hurt the other colleges but it would help the extremely underfunded colleges.

In other words, we are suggesting that the presidents' recommendation be followed. The report of the ad hoc committee of presidents three years ago provided charts which showed John Jay at 61% of the model for full-time faculty, which was then the lowest among the senior college -- we are now at **44.5%** of the model -- and showed John Jay as having a ratio of 26 administrative staff to each student which was the highest ratio among the senior colleges.

Trustee Mornins: All of the lines are not being allocated to those colleges that you feel need them the most?

President Kaplowitz: Yes, and our recommendation and request is that each year there be an attempt to obtain new funding for additional lines and that an even larger percent of any such funding be allocated to the most inequitably funded colleges to help them move toward the 70% goal.

Senator Kwando Kinshasa: I'd like to change the focus somewhat. We've been speaking about numbers and they are extremely important, obviously. But then there is the other side: the qualitative aspects in terms of the abilities of the students who graduate. Certainly our doctoral program is doing excellently. We are also concerned about the numbers of students who drop out, those who drop out not because of their commitment to professional services or because they are becoming police officers but rather who drop out because there are not enough faculty to work with those students so they can succeed academically and receive their degree. With that reality we are concerned also about the type of student who comes to John Jay: when I say "type" I want to be clear as to what I mean. One would think that there would be a relationship between the CUNY Board of Trustees and the Board of Education of NYC. Is there discussion about innovative possibilities of developing a stronger link between the CUNY Board of Trustees and the Board of Education of NYC? I know that there are already certain programs but we feel there should be a stronger relationship. It is almost ridiculous to think that you would have CUNY in NYC and you have the Board of Education and you have no operating, ongoing paradigms by which they are working together.

Trustee Mornins: I think that is an exciting initiative. I have never heard that discussed. That is something that could be looked into. I agree with you that there has to be cooperation. I've been told that we have the College Preparatory Initiative (CPI) which is working and which is helping. But I had not thought until you just raised it now that there is a need for the two Boards to be related to each other as much as for the two administrations to be related to one another. I gather there is something going on in terms of cooperation between the two administrations. I think we need to expand on that and what you have raised is an interesting point. I don't know how much we can realistically impact on the public school system but it seems to me that we can't wait for the public schools to do the job. What we have to do is make the system viable for the students who come to us, wherever they come from and however they come. If we are all very lucky, high school graduates in New York City will be much better in five years or in two years but I don't think you want to bet your mortgage on that because I doubt that it's going to happen. And so we have to look at ways in which we can make our students viable, even if there is not significant change in high schools. Maybe I'm being idealistic about that but I

think that's the reality.

Senator Kinshasa: The internal concern here is the question about the University's commitment to open admissions.

Trustee Morning: I agree.

Senator Kinshasa: One can almost see how individuals would feed into this because there is not a connectiveness and, therefore, it becomes almost a self-fulfilling prophecy that if you have a failing elementary and high school system while you have a guaranteed open admissions policy at CUNY a certain number of students will fail. A certain number of students will have to be brought up to speed within a year and they are bound to have problems dealing with the proficiency examinations. So there has to be a better way.

Trustee Morning: I don't think that's the only way to look at it. I'm not prepared to say that because we have a failing high school system we have to have a failing higher education system. On the contrary, I think we have to prove -- and, again, I think the burden of proof is on our shoulders -- we've got to convince the Daily News and other parties to this discussion that we can do it -- but I keep hearing as I talk to people in this system about the successes that are going on in terms of remediation and retention. So I think we can do more and I think we can do a better job. To the extent that we are successful I think it is going to help our cause and win some converts for us but I see this as a major challenge to us. I don't think that the solution is to renounce open admissions. That would be a cop out and not a way of dealing with the problem. I just saw something interesting about Oklahoma -- I know there are probably some significant differences -- but the chancellor of the system there saw as the first order of business the need to improve the retention rate and accomplished dramatic increases. We ought to be looking at ways in which we improve our retention. I think we can do better in terms of remediation. When we talk about a broader range of criteria I think the retention rate of a college should be among those criteria.

Senator Effie Cochran: With reference to the College Preparatory Initiative (CPI): I was on the original taskforce five years ago. The meetings and workshops between public school and CUNY administrators and faculty worked beautifully. I have not heard much about CPI since then and wonder if it has been abandoned.

Trustee Morning: A Trustee earlier today was telling me how effective he thinks CPI is. It is certainly very much in operation but perhaps it is one of the things that should be expanded.

Professor Sandy Berser: Our Forensic Science program graduates between 15 and 20 students each year, which is enormous for a physical science program. I'm talking about physics, chemistry, earth science and so forth. There are certain programs in CUNY, such as physics, where no students are graduating with that major. Programs such as chemistry graduate two or three students, with the rest being pre-med. We are graduating true, legitimate physical science majors in our program.

President Kaplowitz: Our forensic science program is the only such major in CUNY and the only such major in all of New York City. One of the compelling reasons we need Phase II is that the forensic science labs are in North Hall: these are the labs for not only the undergraduate majors but for graduate students who are following a forensic science track in their criminal justice doctorate. We need

state of the art labs not only for our students but in order to recruit faculty.

Professor Beraer: That is correct. And as a result of the media coverage of the Willie Kennedy Smith trial and of the O.J. Simpson trial the world has seen the crucial importance of the scientific analysis of forensic evidence. The other thing I want to say is that CUNY can demand a better high school graduate and I don't think we have been doing that. CPI was ~~initiated~~ but I wonder to what extent it has gotten **off** the ground. We have to make our demands of the Board of Education. We have to say that they have to give us better prepared students. Let them do the remediation.

Trustee Mornina: I'm sympathetic to that but what troubles me a little and I don't think you are coming from this place in saying what you are but when some people say that it is kind of throwing in the towel on open admissions. It's a way of saying we are not going to continue to serve the people who we've been serving.

Professor Beraer: It has nothing to do with open admissions.

Trustee Mornina: I think it can.

President Kaplowitz: Most of us at John Jay are absolutely committed to access and open admissions. We believe that we are transforming lives and that we are transforming society. As someone who grew up desperately poor in Bedford Stuyvesant and whose family waited for years on the list to get into a housing project and who was able to climb the ladder out of poverty because I was able to go to Queens College, which was then tuition free (and perhaps I would have gone to John Jay had it existed) [laughter]....

Trustee Mornina: And you would have become a cop [laughter]

President Kaplowitz: A deputy commissioner, at least, I would hope by now [laughter]....I see myself in my students and it breaks my heart when they can not get the support services they need or when they can not get the classes they need. Just today I received an internal John Jay College report of a **survey** of our students conducted by our College's office of institutional research: the overwhelmingly prevalent complaint of our students is that there are not enough course sections offered and not enough sections are offered at the times that they need them. Our students lead the most incredible lives, going to classes, working, sometimes at several jobs, raising children.

Senator Kinshasa: It is devastating.

President Kaplowitz: Yes, devastating. And the structure of CUNY's tuition system and of TAP and other financial aid programs is that it is economically sound for students to take as many credits as they can each semester because in that way they can reduce the number of semesters they have to pay for and so students are taking heavier courseloads than they should. It is incredible what they are able to accomplish and it is heartbreaking that we can't do more for them, at the least offer them courses they need at the times they need them in order to enable them to juggle their complex lives.

Trustee Mornina: That is all true but how does that square with the statement of wanting better prepared students.

President Kaplowitz: It doesn't necessarily.

Trustee Mornins: [Laughing] Oh, I understand.

Senator James Malone: All ideas are acceptable in the academy.

Senator Lou Guinta: I applaud you, Trustee Morning. It's been wonderful listening to you. I'm very happy that you came to meet with us.

Trustee Morning: I am, too,

Senator Guinta: One of the things I'd like us to keep in mind is that John Jay has the kind of students that Karen is talking about. The vocational aspect of this college has really been the main impetus for many of our students. I think that one of the problems with our College and with my colleagues -- whom I applaud -- is that we have been so good at what we do: we are so used to living in poverty, so to speak, institutional poverty, that we are able to do well within it. If you look at the individuals within this room and within this faculty there are projects going on that people don't even know about because everyone is working so hard. One of the ways this faculty is so unique is that everyone wears two or three hats at the same time. I know it may sound self-serving but it is absolutely true. There are programs that faculty are running and new ones that faculty are starting because they know our students need jobs and want to help our students accomplish their goals. Our students come to our college and to our University mainly because they want to enter the middle class and I think that we must never keep that out of our mind. Lastly, when people talk about the good old days: my father grew up during the Depression and as he got older the Depression got better!

Trustee Mornins: [Laughing] That's the first time I heard that.

Senator Guinta: I remember my father reminiscing about the good old days and I said, "Dad, these are the good old days." As you said before, which was very heartening to hear, we are what we are and we have to go forward.

Trustee Mornins: I agree with everything that you say. I'm glad that you said it because it touches on something else that I'd like to speak about. It seems to me that being the kind of institution this is, where students can come in as a candidate for an associate degree and go all the way to a Ph. D., you are, thus, in many ways a microcosm of the system. But I think you are also in an ideal position to look at what, to me, is so key about what you are doing here: that is, how do you make a college education viable for the widest possible number of people? It has to do with quality, as you've just reflected on, and dedication, but there are a lot of barriers to this: political and economic. I'm committed to that notion but it is getting tougher and tougher. In some ways when we hear this talk about the "university on the hill," as Professor Adams was talking about, how do you view that here? It seems to me that a key component of that is to take the students who are coming here and make them viable by which I mean making it possible for them to stay here. If two years gets them a job, that's okay. But if they have the desire and the smarts to get a four year degree or a doctorate then that's what we should enable them to do.

Senator James Malone: This College grew up with open admissions. Large numbers of the faculty came here when open admissions began. So we know and understand our students and we are here to do our best for them.

Senator Kinshasa: With reference to helping make doctoral education possible for our students: one of our most successful programs here is the Ronald P. McNair Program in which our students are prepared for both master's and doctoral studies. The program has been operating since 1991 and we have quite a few students who were in the program who have received their doctorate. It is a fantastic program. There are so many fantastic programs here. But the facilities are so terrible and the lack of resources is so profound!

Professor Litwack: And despite that John Jay received the highest student satisfaction rating of the CUNY senior colleges.

Trustee Morning: Yes, I know about that. You didn't have any John Jay faculty voting in that did you? [laughter]

Professor Litwack: No, nor did we have the money to pay students to rate us so highly [laughter].

President Kaplowitz: The internal student survey just done at John Jay reveals that the students rate the faculty as the best aspect of the college. We are a very dedicated faculty. Because you have been hearing so much about the problems with our facilities, I'd like to show you two charts that demonstrate how overcrowded we are. Professor Benton prepared both charts using data from CUNY Central Administration: one shows the internal space per FTE student at each senior college and the other shows the space we have and what we need. These copies of the charts are for you to keep for your information. [N.B.: the charts are Attachments C-7 and C-8 of Minutes #148.] Despite the overcrowding, which the charts demonstrate and which we all attest to, our students seem to be happy but we want to make them happier and safer.

Thank you, Trustee Morning, so much for accepting our invitation and for being so generous with your time, for listening to us so graciously, and for sharing your perspectives and concerns. [The Senate applauded Trustee Morning enthusiastically.]

Trustee Mornina: Thank you, Karen, and thanks to all of you. It's been very helpful to me. I hope we can continue our discussion.

Professor Litwack: We wish we had more time to talk about your ideas and all the things you raised.

Trustee Mornina: I'd be happy if we could have a return visit.

President Kaplowitz: That would be wonderful. Thank you, again.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 PM. [Trustee Morning remained to talk informally with faculty until 5:45 PM.]

Respectfully submitted,

Edward Davenport
Recording Secretary

ATTACHMENT A

Report on the CUNY Board of Trustees October 27 meeting

The new student trustee was introduced: Mr. Mizenor Biswas, a graduate of Queens College and a graduate student in economics at CCNY. He is also a teaching assistant at York. A resolution of appreciation for Vice Chancellor Robert Diaz was unanimously adopted. College honors were noted: John Jay's President and faculty for being invited to join the curriculum committee of an international law enforcement initiative and CUNY Law School for being ranked by the National Jurist as second in the nation **for** public service, preceded only by Harvard and beating out Yale, Stanford and other law schools.

Deputy Chancellor Mucciolo: 150 CUNY faculty and staff joined public high school teachers at a College Preparatory Initiative (CPI) conference the previous Friday. Assemblyman Ed Sullivan is holding hearings on the financing of community colleges. Trustee Marino will report on a plan to hire 300 faculty and to ask for more faculty lines for next year. The priority is to hire more faculty and the second priority of the University is teacher education. With regard to a question about substitutes, especially a question raised about the 150 substitute appointments in this month's University and Chancellor's Reports, the Board's Committee on Faculty, Staff, and Administration should review the 4-semester limit and other issues.

Trustee Babbar: The ad hoc committee's proposed revisions of the guidelines for presidential searches is not yet ready for consideration by the full Board.

Chair Anne Paolucci: The Board does not need the guideline revisions in order to establish search committees for the president of Queensborough Community College and for the Chancellor. The Board is going into high gear for its search for an interim chancellor, who will be named either at the November 24 Board meeting or, at the latest, by the end of November. Deputy Mucciolo has agreed to stay until the end of November if he is needed. [Responding to questions about the timetable for naming a search committee for the position of chancellor]: There will be interviews by the ad hoc committee for an interim chancellor and then interviews by Trustees, but guidelines for the chancellor search need to be completed after guidelines are established for presidential searches. [Asked about the search for president of NYC Technical College]: The search for president of NYC Tech is the first search and then a search will take place for a president of QCC.

Trustee Ronald Marino [Chair of the Fiscal Affairs Committee]: 48% of course sections at the senior colleges are taught by adjunct faculty. The operating budget request of NYS for next year asks for \$1.3 billion, an increase of \$55.6 million or 4.4% over the 1997-98 allocation. This request represents \$25.9 million for mandatory cost increases and \$29.6 million for critical program improvements. For the senior colleges, the request is \$962.9 million, which is an increase of \$39 million or 4.2%. For the community colleges, the request is \$348.7 million, an increase of \$16.6 million or 5.0%.

Vice Chancellor Rothbard: The request is for the top priorities set by the Board of Trustees and CUNY is making a commitment of self help to Albany and to City Hall. The major request is to increase the number of full-time faculty. The priorities are to strengthen the liberal arts, foster a seamless transition between high school and college, teacher education and engineering and computer science, and to increase faculty competency in technology.

Report on the CUNY Board of Trustees October 27 meeting (cont)

Vice Chancellor Macari: The capital budget request is for \$359 million, which includes \$337 million for major projects and \$22 million for rehabilitation work. The proposal in the printed agenda lists the top nine projects;

1. Baruch - site B \$22 M
2. Hunter - North Building Renovation \$5.275 M
3. KCC - Academic Village/Academic Complex \$11.4 M
4. Queens - Center for Molecular and Cellular Biology \$15 M
5. CUNYwide Condition Assessment \$48 M
6. CUNYwide Energy Conservation \$63 M
7. CUNYwide Educational Technology Equipment \$5 M
8. CUNYwide Condition Assessment \$11.5 M
9. CUNYwide Energy Conservation \$2 M

Vice Chancellor Macari: In terms of space needs, John Jay needs space the most among the senior colleges. Medgar Evers needs the most space among the community colleges; although Medgar Evers is a senior college, it is funded 50% by the City and 50% by the State.

Trustee Marino: I want to report about the implementation of last year's budget request. The Governor funded 86 full-time faculty lines in the 1997-98 fiscal budget. Until now, implementation of the budget was made solely by the CUNY Central Administration. This year this was changed to include Trustees and Presidents. A methodology was developed. I want to thank several trustees, especially John Morning and Richard Curtis as being especially helpful.

The attempt was made to leverage funds from adjunct faculty and bring into consideration performance indicators to raise standards. The result is imperfect. It is clearly rough justice. Clearly for the first time performance by colleges will be taken into account. We must review Base Level Equity and performance. Some colleges have been really unfairly treated. We received an excellent letter from the faculty of John Jay College that raises many excellent criticisms which we will take into consideration. By leveraging adjunct lines and full-time faculty lines we created 145 lines [from the 86]. 75 lines are to bring colleges toward the 70%/30% full-time faculty taught sections. 70 lines (40 at senior colleges and 30 at community colleges) are being allocated according to graduation rates, to reward performance standards and to motivate colleges to raise standards.

Another 40 lines are to be matched by 40 lines from the CUNY Central Administration. Presidents can reduce the number of non-faculty lines and convert them into faculty lines and this puts the responsibility back to the presidents. CUNY Central Administration will match the lines as a reward to colleges that do this.

Another 35 lines are for targeted programs, not just teacher education. We are asking the presidents to give us a plan as to how to use these lines in teacher education or in new technological fields.

In doing this, the Board is saying to the faculty that if the Board provides full-time faculty lines, the faculty will have to be more responsible, and this means that faculty will have to be in the classroom. And Presidents will have to take responsibility for performance. And Trustees will have to address inequities that have existed until now and that continue to exist and the Trustees will work with Presidents and with faculty to address these inequities.

Report on the CUNY Board of Trustees October 27 meeting (cont)

Vice Chancellor Mirrer: This is a happy coincidence of views to give high priority to full-time faculty. Targeted positions will be used to shore up liberal arts cores across the campuses: 14 or 15 lines will be allocated for that. The rest of the lines will be used to annualize last year's lines. The Council of Presidents' Committee on Academic Affairs has adopted a motion asking that that group have significant input. I suggest that these issues also be discussed at the Board committee on academic affairs [CAPPR].

Deputy Chancellor Mucciolo: The lines may be filled with substitutes unless searches have already been under way and a tenure track appointment can be made. But additional issues remain, such as what kind of performance measures should be used and what areas should be strengthened.

Trustee John Mornins: Trustee Marino has set in motion several important things: (1) presidents are being given an opportunity to reconfirm their commitment to quality; (2) the question of performance standards has been opened; and (3) presidents can show what kind of resource they can be to the University, that they are ready to respond creatively and responsibly.

President Caputo (Hunter): [Asked to convey the reaction of the Council of Presidents' Committee on Academic Affairs]: The committee did not have sufficient time to review the allocation but agreed that although it is not a perfect proposal, it is acceptable at least for this year.

President Perez (BMCC): Why is the goal of 70% full-time faculty taught sections not also the goal for the community colleges [where the goal is 60%]?

Vice Chancellor Rothbard: Community colleges are different from senior colleges.

An action item, the purchase of library books by the university contracting office, was criticized by President Schmeller (QCC) who suggested that some money be discretionary at each college. Trustee Sandi Cooper reported that librarians on the UFS Library Committee are also not happy with the purchasing method.

Several degree programs were approved: an A.A.S. in Graphic Design and Illustration at KCC; an A.S. in Biology Transfer at BCC; and a M.P.H. in Community Health at Brooklyn. Dr. Luc Montagnier was voted distinguished professor of biology at Queens, effective October 1. Chair Paolucci announced that Mr. Roy Moskowitz was approved, by the Board's approval of the University and Chancellor's Reports at the beginning of the meeting, as the Acting Vice Chancellor for Legal Affairs and Acting Counsel to the Board of Trustees.

**Faculty Hiring Initiative
Senior Colleges**

College	70% Goal		Targeted		Graduation Rates		Total	
	Positions	1998-99 Cost	Positions	1998-99 Cost	Positions	1998-99 Cost	Positions	1998-99 Cost
Baruch	7	196,000	1	45,000	7	315,000	15	556,000
Brooklyn	0	0	4	180,000	5	225,000	9	405,000
City	0	0	3	135,000	5	225,000	8	360,000
Hunter	11	308,000	4	180,000	4	180,000	19	668,000
John Jay	19	532,000	0	0	2	90,000	21	622,000
Lehman	4	112,000	4	180,000	5	225,000	13	517,000
Medgar Evers	6	168,000	2	90,000	2	90,000	10	348,000
NYCTC	9	252,000	0	0	4	180,000	13	432,000
Queens	0	0	3	135,000	7	315,000	10	450,000
CSI	13	364,000	5	225,000	5	225,000	23	814,000
York	6	168,000	2	90,000	2	90,000	10	348,000
Total	75	2,100,000	28	1,260,000	48	2,160,000	151	5,520,000

Remaining Positions	
Matching	25
Targeted	11
Total	36

Grand Total	187	7,240,000
--------------------	------------	------------------

Graduation rate position distribution: [under 30% = 2]; [30 to 39% = 4]; [40 to 44% = 5]; [45% & above = 7]

N.B. The CUNY Board of Trustees released this document showing the full-time faculty allocations to the senior colleges at its October 27, 1997

ATTACHMENT C

TRUSTEE JOHN MORNING

"The New York State Senate confirmed John Morning, a nominee of Gov. George E. Pataki, as the most recent new member of The City University Board of Trustees on Aug. 2. Morning replaces **Trustee** Robert Price, and his term will expire on June 30, 2002.

"Morning, who brings to the Board more than 35 years of experience as a graphic designer in New York City, has specialized in the supervision of publications that communicate the identity and programs of several leading arts, cultural, and philanthropic institutions. Among these have been the Henry Luce Foundation, the Metropolitan Museum of Art, the Museum for African Art, and Harlem's Schomburg Center of the New York Public Library.

"He has also served as a director or trustee for a wide variety of important constituents of the city's banking, visual arts, theater, education, and preservation scene.

"For nearly 20 years he has been a director of Dime Savings Bank, and he has served since 1990 as a director for the Charles E. Culpepper Foundation. He has also served on the boards of the Henry Street Settlement (chairing it from 1979 to 1986), the Landmarks Conservancy, the Brooklyn Academy of Music, and the Lincoln Center Institute, which extends arts education outreach to metropolitan schools. Since 1994 Morning has been the Director and Board Secretary of the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges in Washington, D.C.

"Morning will soon celebrate his silver anniversary as a trustee of the Pratt Institute; he was a trustee chair there from 1988 to 1992. He received his B.F.A. from Pratt and has also attended Wayne State University and Harvard Business School's Institute of Arts Management."

from "CUNY Matters: A Newsletter for The City University
of New York" (Fall 1997, p. 1)

ATTACHMENT D-1

Campus	FY '97FTE	Aug 97 Allocation	Allocation per FTE
City	7,366	\$66,161,000	\$8,982
Lehman	6,014	\$41,844,000	\$6,958
Brooklyn	10,016	\$69,524,000	\$6,941
Queens	11,167	\$67,184,000	\$6,016
Hunter	12,493	\$73,396,000	\$5,875
Medgar	3,748	\$21,992,000	\$5,868
CSI	8,317	\$48,319,000	\$5,810
York	4,564	\$25,373,000	\$5,559
NYCTC	8,258	\$43,750,000	\$5,298
Baruch	10,884	\$56,436,000	\$5,185
John Jay	8,217	\$34,253,000	\$4,169
Total	91,044	\$548,232,000	\$6,022

Campus	ISM Lines	Budgeted Lines	Percent
City	511	476	93.2%
Brooklyn	659	486	73.7%
Queens	672	477	71.0%
Lehman	386	251	65.0%
Baruch	627	390	62.2%
Hunter	805	487	60.5%
NYCTC	461	260	56.4%
York	261	139	53.3%
CSI	510	267	52.4%
Medgar	213	111	52.1%
John Jay	494	220	44.5%
Total	5,599	3,564	63.7%

Campus			
City	\$66,161,000	\$36,097,000	55%
Lehman	\$41,844,000	\$23,394,000	56%
Brooklyn	\$69,524,000	\$38,946,000	56%
Medgar	\$21,992,000	\$14,397,000	65%
York	\$25,373,000	\$16,783,000	66%
CSI	\$48,319,000	\$32,439,000	67%
NYCTC	\$43,750,000	\$30,197,000	69%
Hunter	\$73,396,000	\$51,374,000	70%
Queens	\$67,184,000	\$47,159,000	70%
Baruch	\$56,436,000	\$46,775,000	83%
John Jay	\$34,253,000	\$30,524,000	89%
Total			

ATTACHMENT D-2

ADOPTED BASE BUDGET PER STUDENT FTE 1997/98

	A	B	C
	1997/98	1997/98	1997/98
	FALL	ADOPTED	ADOPTED
SENIOR COLLEGE	FLASH FTEs	BASE BUDGET	BASE \$ PER FTE
CITY	8,700	\$62,967,000	\$7,238
LEHMAN	6,348	\$38,226,300	\$6,022
BKLYN	10,739	\$64,142,800	\$5,973
QUEENS	11,537	\$61,496,100	\$5,330
COSI	8,145	\$43,127,300	\$5,295
EVERS	3,693	\$19,294,000	\$5,224
YORK	4,463	\$22,423,900	\$5,024
HUNTER	13,297	\$66,071,400	\$4,969
BARUCH	11,116	\$50,843,100	\$4,574
NYCTC	8,470	\$36,590,000	\$4,320
JOHN JAY	8,448	\$28,543,100	\$3,379
TOTAL	94,956	\$493,725,000	\$57,348
AVERAGE	8,632	\$44,884,091	\$5,213

Data for Column A taken from CUNY Office of Institutional Research and Analysis Table 7 - Total Full-time FTEs (Flash =one week following first day of classes)

Data for Column B taken directly from the chart entitled "1997/98 Initial Budget Allocation" appended to the memorandum entitled "1997/98 Allocation Information" issued by University Budget Director Malave on 9/2/97

Column C = Col B/Col A

Prepared by: John Jay College 11/05/97