

Faculty Senate Minutes #163

John Jay College of Criminal Justice

December 12, 1997

9:30 AM

Room 630T

Present (31): Michael Blitz, Effie Papatzikou Cochran, Glenn Corbett, Edward Davenport, Jane Davenport, Kojo Dei, John Donaruma, Arlene Geiger, P.J. Gibson, Edward Green, Lou Guinta, Karen Kaplowitz, Kwando Kinshasa, Sandra Lanzone, Sondra Leftoff, Gavin Lewis, Barry Luby, Ellen Marson, Mary Ann McClure, Jill Norgren, Daniel Pinello, Jacqueline Jimenez-Polanco, Charles Reid, Frederik Rusch, Adina Schwartz, Lydia Segal, Ellen Sexton, Carmen Solis, Davidson Umeh, Agnes Wieschenberg, Bessie Wright

Absent (6): C. Jama Adams, George Andreopoulos, David Brotherton, Amy Green, James Malone, Robert Rothchild

Guests: Ned Benton, Daniel Gasman, Tom Litwack, Harold Sullivan, Katherine Wylie

Invited Guests: President Gerald W. Lynch, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Louise Mirrer

AGENDA

1. Report from the chair
2. Approval of Minutes #162 of the November 25 meeting
3. Faculty participation in determining space allocation
4. Invited guest: President Gerald W. Lynch
5. Election of Senate committee members and committee chairs
6. Proposal to co-sponsor Spring Faculty Development Day
7. Invited guest: Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Louise Mirrer
8. Recommended action with reference to JJ's inequitable funding
9. Honorary Degree candidates: Prof. Daniel Gasman

1. Report from the chair

The College plans to rent one floor of office space in the BMW Building (formerly the Ford Building) at 555 West 57 Street (there is also an entrance on 58th Street). This space is the equivalent of one floor of North Hall and the plan is that staff in offices in North Hall and T Building move there by September. The newly freed areas in T Building and in North Hall are to be converted into classrooms and faculty offices.

2. Approval of Minutes #162 of the November 25 meeting

By a motion duly made and seconded, Minutes #162 of the November 25 meeting were adopted.

3. Proposal regarding faculty participation in determining allocation of space in North and T Buildings

A motion was made that the Faculty Senate join the Council of Chairs in recommending to the President of the College that he reactivate the College Space Committee, with Faculty Senate and Council of Chairs representatives, for the purpose of recommending how the newly freed-up space in North Hall and T Building will be allocated. The motion was adopted by unanimous vote.

4. Invited guest: President Gerald W. Lynch

President Lynch was welcomed and said he is pleased to meet with the Senate and would like to bring the Senate up to date on a number of things. He said we had a good year by receiving 21 new faculty positions and 17 replacement lines. Ten people have announced they are taking early retirement. Thus we will have even more new blood, he said, adding that we must bring more young people onto the faculty. The internationalization of the College has progressed further this year. The State Department has asked us to take part in training in the Caribbean and Latin America. He said he has mixed feelings about no longer having a branch campus in Puerto Rico. He said he would have liked a longer stay there and that it is a ripe tree the fruit of which everyone is now coming to pluck. The Interim Chancellor is a scholar and a teacher and he called it is a good sign that someone with those credentials was chosen by the Board of Trustees.

With reference to in-service education, he noted that in Michigan, any new police officer has to have an associate degree and a certificate before applying for a job there, thus bypassing police academies, which are insular training programs. Police academies are the last vestige of an older system of not relying on universities. A police academy poorly prepares police officers, he said.

President Lynch also reported that Vice President Robert Diaz joins us with the perspective of an 80th Street insider and that a high priority assignment given to him is the equity funding issue.

President Lynch said he hopes to have the rented space on 57th Street ready for use by September. The plan is to move administrative offices to 57th Street and to build new classrooms in the T Building. President Kaplowitz recalled the Space Committee, which worked very well, and said that the Council of Chairs two days earlier and the Senate today voted unanimously to recommend that the Space Committee, with representation from the Senate and the Chairs, be reinstated now that new space is available for allocation. President Lynch said he wants everyone to become involved in the space allocation and that he will have representatives from the Senate and from the Chairs.

President Lynch was asked to arrange for the renovation of the bathrooms in North Hall to cease during final exams because of the extreme noise which will make it very difficult for students to concentrate on their exams: it is already difficult to concentrate on classwork because of the noise. President Lynch said he will make every effort to close down the renovation during finals or to have different construction hours during finals, such as during the night.

President Lynch was also asked to use the January intersession to have North Hall properly exterminated because the rodent problem is out of control, notably on the first and second floors and to some extent on the third floor. Many of our students, faculty, and staff suffer from asthma and other ailments which are triggered or exacerbated by rodent excrement. Also hantavirus, carried by rodents, is a potentially deadly threat. Also troubling is the fact that the cafeteria's kitchen is near the loading dock which is a source of rodent problems and there is also fear that children in the day care center might pick up droppings. President Lynch said he had thought the problem had been solved and he was told that it had been ameliorated but is back in even fuller force. Various senators reported rodent droppings on their desks and in their desks, on their books, and all over the floors of their offices and said that the situation has become intolerable. Senators reported that they and others have put this in writing to the administrators directly responsible but that President Lynch is the one person who can make certain that the problem is taken care of. President Lynch said he will make certain that the rodent problem is solved.

Senator Edward Davenport asked President Lynch how we can best raise academic standards at the College. Over 40% of the entering freshmen are being admitted as associate degree students. President Lynch said this is certainly a part of the debate for the coming year. Either extreme is not the answer: we should have access but we should have standards as well. He noted that we drop about 1200 students every summer for academic failure. A member of the Counseling Department, Cathy Crew, draws up contracts which are signed by students wanting readmission after they have been dropped for academic failure. Moving the Dean's List requirement to a 3.5 GPA is the kind of thing we should be doing more of. We are attracting better master degree students. More use of the Internet is being exhibited by students applying to John Jay and we are receiving applications from students from all over the Pacific Rim and Europe.

President Lynch said that the University is polarized now. Baruch President Matthew Goldstein wants CUNY to become elitist. President Lynch said he, himself, is in the middle. So many students get their act together while attending John Jay after not having done well in high school. John Jay has been unique for some time in different ways. He hopes the faculty will be with him in trying to continue to provide opportunity and still maintain high standards. We must remember, he said, that many students do not come here for a degree but rather for just a few courses. Senator Kinshasa said the three-tier model for the University proposed by Baruch President Matthew Goldstein could be a real problem. What he is concerned about is how far our faculty will go to help students reach a certain level. He hopes we can open this up for discussion. He sees a tendency toward preferential policies which concerns him. On the other hand, Senator Kinshasa said, when he has students who are juniors tell him they are not familiar with the APA system of documentation it seems that something is going on internally that we need to look at. He wanted to know why we have so many students who have to be dismissed and why so many students seem to be unable to find material in our Library, materials which are assuredly there. President Lynch said he agrees with Senator Kinshasa.

Senator Adina Schwartz said she is surprised to hear herself make a recommendation which limits the autonomy of faculty but she

wonders if we should not require all teachers to grade on an old-fashioned bell curve because so many students are getting so many A's and B's. Senator Edward Green said that we are defeating our purposes by the way we do our testing. President Lynch said that centralized testing turned out to be a disaster whereas when we test on campus we can treat the students more individually and humanely. He thinks we need to deal with students on a contract basis such as Cathy Crew is doing with the readmits. Senator Kinshasa said he is concerned about the quality of the students whom we graduate. Professor Katherine Wylie said she thinks standards and skills should be instituted in all the 100-level courses from the very beginning of our students' college experience. She says the initiative started by Provost Wilson to have exams in 100-level courses is a good start.

Vice President Dan Pinello spoke about his students' inability to read the New York Times. It concerns him that if he grades students according to their academic performance, half or more will not be getting the C or better grade which they want. He said that students who earn low grades attack teachers on the student evaluation of faculty forms for giving accurate grades and so junior faculty pay a price for maintaining standards. Vice President Pinello linked this to John Jay's admission policy. President Lynch said we have to find a way to automatically transfer our associate students into the baccalaureate program so that they do not show up in the statistics as having failed to graduate. He said that our students did not pick the poor high schools they went to, so he thinks we have to give them a chance but he also thinks the instructors have to be rigorous. He said he also does not think we need to be embarrassed that it takes police officers eight or more years to graduate, considering they are working full time.

Senator P.J. Gibson said we need to have the support of our colleagues in order to enforce writing standards across the curriculum. Students come in poorly prepared and they need the support system throughout their college careers. She said this has been the most difficult semester she has ever taught. If we would make students accountable for their writing across the curriculum, things might start to improve, she said. We also need to raise standards for classroom decorum. Teachers should not allow eating in class or other inappropriate behavior. President Lynch said that while he thinks our adjunct faculty are wonderful he knows that we need more full-time faculty lines.

President Kaplowitz thanked President Lynch for coming, saying that time is limited because Vice Chancellor Mirrer is due shortly. She said that we would all like to continue this discussion and she invited President Lynch to return soon. He said he would be happy to return to continue the discussion. President Lynch praised the Senate for inviting Vice Chancellor Mirrer to the Senate so she can learn about John Jay from the faculty and so she can hear how underfunded we are.

5. Election of Senate committee members and committee chairs

Educational Technolosv and Computing Committee:

Lou Guinta (co-chair), Bonnie Nelson (co-chair), Yahya Affinnih, Katherine Killoran, Sandra Lanzone, Ira Bloomgarden, Margaret Leland Smith, Farouk Hakeem. Executive Committee liaison: Dan Pinello.

Adjunct Issues Committee: Edward Green (Chair), Arlene Geiger, Glenn Corbett. Executive Committee liaison: Edward Davenport.

Fiscal Advisory Committee: Tom Litwack (Chair), Karen Kaplowitz. Executive Committee liaison: Karen Kaplowitz.

Legal Advisor: Tom Litwack.

6. Proposal to co-sponsor John Jay's Spring 1998 Faculty Development Day on the topic of "Critical Issues Facing John Jay"

The Senate unanimously voted to co-sponsor the fourth faculty development day on Friday, April 3. The topic is "Critical Issues Facing John Jay" and participants will have the choice of a number of small group discussion topics.

7. Invited guest: Dr. Louise Mirrer. CUNY Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs [Attachment A, B]

President Kaplowitz: It is my pleasure to welcome and to introduce the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Dr. Louise Mirrer. I have tremendously enjoyed working with Vice Chancellor Mirrer since she arrived this summer and we are all proud to have as our Vice Chancellor such an outstanding scholar who also has such extensive teaching and administrative experience in higher education [see Attachment A]. It is also my pleasure to introduce the Faculty Senate, which comprises representatives of all the academic departments of the College as well as faculty elected by the entire faculty. The Senate is the official voice of the John Jay faculty, as stated in our Senate's Constitution, which is on file with the Board of Trustees: since the Board is looking at everything so scrupulously, I want to assure you that the Senate is official, indeed. The Senate met earlier this morning with President Lynch and he asked that his regards be sent to you.

Vice Chancellor Louise Mirrer: Thank you for your gracious welcome and please accept my apology for being so very late. I am, in fact, obsessively punctual but I was caught in a gridlock that did not move at all and finally I abandoned my car in the rain and finished the trip here on foot. I am happy to be here and I have to praise the beauty of this room. I was in an equally beautiful room, a circular room, last week at John Jay for a meeting of the Council of Faculty Governance Leaders that Karen also attended [the meeting was of all the chairs of the Faculty Senates of CUNY].

President Kaplowitz: The conference rooms are very handsome, indeed, but I must explain that most faculty offices and most classrooms and all the student services are in North Hall, which I do not believe you have yet visited, an experience the Senate is purposely sparing you from.

Vice Chancellor Mirrer: No, I have not been in North Hall but John Jay's Master Plan looks like it is moving forward and so the faculty can look forward to nicer space in the near future.

President Kaplowitz: That is critically important for all of us, especially for the students and the faculty. Would you be willing

to share your impressions of John Jay and of CUNY and then we would like to tell you about our concerns and answer your questions and ask questions of you.

Vice Chancellor Mirrer: Certainly, but first of all, let me say how very glad I am to be here today. And I want to say that Karen has been one of the nicest faces at CUNY since the two of us first met and I am really pleased that she and I have been able to establish a friendship, which is both official and unofficial. And so I am delighted to be at John Jay. I know more about John Jay than about many of the other CUNY colleges because the President and the Provost of John Jay are very strong advocates for the College, at least they have been with me, and the advocacy is very effective because they left a deep and lasting impression on me as to the all the wonderful activities John Jay is engaged in and the wonderful potential that is here: the wealth of the faculty and the plans for forging ahead, all of which sound very good. Also, I know from them and from one of the recent Board meetings about the concerns with regard to resources. I certainly intend to try to be helpful in whatever ways I can be helpful. I think we will have a happy partnership: I hope so, at least.

My impression of CUNY is that it is an interesting institution. I am from another large public institution, not, as everyone is fond of reminding me, nearly so large as this one but, in the context of the Midwest and in the national context, quite a large institution. I was also there in the central administration although I like to think of myself as a faculty member and as a serious academic. I did work in the central administration at the University of Minnesota, and I do believe that a system is the sum of its parts and is strong because of its parts.

So I would say that my impression of CUNY is that it functions and has the potential to function very well as a system but the parts of that system need to be kept as strong as possible. I think there have been some bumps and bruises clearly along the way to arriving at this nice kind of chemical balance but I think the strengthening of all the parts can be achieved and I am very optimistic. CUNY is a wonderful place and I think the intentions, however they are rolled out, are good. The priorities set by the Board of Trustees at the moment in terms of full-time faculty hires as the number one priority is excellent.

The issue of standards that has been raised not only by the Board of Trustees but elsewhere is a legitimate issue and I think that we have to confront it in a responsible way. I think it would be difficult for someone in an academic environment to oppose standards. This is a serious issue for us to work together on. I have wavered between my impressions of CUNY and my sense of things but I would confine my impressions to saying that CUNY is a terrific place, it is an exciting place, it has tremendous advantages, and those advantages to some extent have been exploited already and to some extent they have not been. So I'm looking forward to the upbeat aspect of it.

This is a period of transition and so what can anyone say? I'm one of many new people around at the moment, which is somewhat comforting. I came as a new vice chancellor in July but my earliest encounters were with a virtually new Board of Trustees and they really haven't been around much longer than I have and some of them, in fact, came after I did. And we now have a new Interim Chancellor. So I'm in a lot of good company. I would really like most to hear from you. I have a lot of things I could

say but they may not be what you are interested in discussing today. My preference is to have an informal dialogue, to the extent that is possible.

Senator Adina Schwartz: I am curious about your statement that while there are advantages that the CUNY system has exploited there are also advantages that the CUNY system has not exploited. I am interested in what you see as the unexploited advantages.

Vice Chancellor Mirrer: I am heavily in favor of collaborative efforts and there have been a number of collaborative efforts but I think that the system has the possibility within it for much greater collaboration. I'm going to try, as a matter of fact, in a serious way, to promote some of that through my Office. My Office has historically controlled what is called the Organized Research budget. When I arrived here it was right in the midst of budget processes that had already taken place with monies that had already been committed but I discovered, further, that organized research meant here an inflexible amount of money that was inflexibly distributed to centers and institutes and to some other initiatives and that was that. So here was a budget that no one had any opportunity to promote any initiatives with and one of the earliest decisions I took was to send that money back to the campuses because, in fact, all the centers and institutes have campus affiliations and campuses were actually receiving the money. I just said to the presidents of the colleges that if they want to keep the level of funding of the centers and institutes attached to their college at that amount or to change it or to do whatever they wanted that was up to them at this point.

I would like to start a new organized research budget and attempt to use it to solicit new and phenomenal ideas from faculty across the campuses for really innovative program ideas: they could be centers or institutes, they could simply be initiatives that would have a fixed shelf life of three years, would pull together really terrific people who want to do something new and startling and different. I want to just try it out. If it is something that flops that is fine: it will have been tried. If it is something that becomes terrific and successful, then after three years it is time to think about institutionalizing it. So that is a specific example of an opportunity for greater collaboration that hasn't, yet, really been exploited.

President Kaplowitz: I know you have heard from the President and the Provost about our College but we thought you might like to also hear about some of our programs from a faculty perspective. And although you have heard about the funding issue, as you mentioned, we'd like you to also hear about it from our perspective. As you may know, John Jay lost all its liberal arts majors in 1976 during the City's fiscal crisis. The price of not being closed was the relinquishing of those majors. Many of us were hired when we had those majors and many students, including those studying criminal justice majored in liberal arts disciplines. The positive result was that we then became truly focused on our mission and developed many very strong programs, programs unique to CUNY. At the same time, however, the pool of possible students has changed because we can not provide the majors that many students, including many interested in criminal justice, want.

At the same time that we gave up those liberal arts majors, we gave up \$4 million of what was then our \$13 million annual budget, which was the proximate savings if the College had been

closed and the students enrolled at other CUNY colleges. From that moment we were severely underfunded and the inequitable funding has become much more pronounced, dramatically so, in the subsequent years. But before we review the underfunding and show you our data, we'd like you to hear more about our special majors from faculty who teach in them. Tom Litwack, a member of the Forensic Psychology Department, is himself a lawyer and a clinical psychologist.

Professor Tom Litwack: We have the only undergraduate major in forensic psychology and the only master's degree in forensic psychology in the country. We know that it is an excellent program: two outside experts conducted a formal evaluation of the master's program a year ago and they gave our program very high marks and I would also add that our master's program has grown by leaps and bounds in terms of student enrollment. I think we quadrupled over the last ten years. I could go on at greater length about the excellent quality of the faculty and the students in the program but I've reported the essential facts.

Professor Ned Benton: I am chair of the Public Management Department, which includes public administration, fire science, and economics. There are two graduate programs that are different from any program in the country: one is the protection management program, which is a combination of fire protection and security management and it reflects the convergence in the field. That program was started three or four years ago and is rapidly growing and we are offering it on an extension basis at the Fire Academy at Randall's Island where about 40 students are enrolled in addition to students enrolled here.

The other program is our Master of Public Administration program which I mention in the context of your comments about collaboration: this program is one in which we try to collaborate with other campuses over a period of time and we have some history of doing so. We had an urban affairs concentration and we decided to work, instead, with the urban affairs program at Hunter and so now our students who are interested in an urban affairs concentration take courses at Hunter and students in the urban affairs program at Hunter who would like to do a concentration in public policy and public management come to John Jay. It has been a very satisfactory arrangement programmatically but to make it work operationally is an act of will of several of the faculty members and students involved. We almost have to walk the students over and remind the registrar. There are various bureaucratic impediments to making it work but the concept is wonderful and we are enthusiastic about it and programmatically it does work well.

Similarly, we have an arrangement with the Law School for our Court Administration program, whereby students in the Law School who are interested in court administration positions that require law degrees take court administration courses through our program and in fact we have some students coming back to take an MPA in an articulation arrangement that we have and similarly we have students interested in court administration who take law courses and that has worked out very, very well.

The other aspect of our MPA program, which is very unique, is the MPA Inspector General program, which looks at public management from an external perspective: when we go to conferences our slogan is that our students will investigate your students. Normally an MPA program is about preparing to manage from within

but our program prepares people to oversee, evaluate, and inspect management from outside and that means they may move on towards positions in inspection, where they are investigating, they may move on to positions with legislatures or with comptrollers where they do program evaluations and program audits or regulatory agencies or political authorities or fiscal oversight entities, such as bond rating organizations.

Just the week before last we had a meeting with the Inspector General of the Justice Department in Washington with President Lynch. The Justice Department's Inspector General is going to set up, starting in January, their policy analysis and planning unit in our Department of Public Management in a collaboration with our faculty: the three of us who will be most involved will have to receive relatively high level security clearances because of the nature of the information we are going to have access to. We are going to have information come in about corruption, and program performance, and program evaluation from all of the Justice Department agencies and one of the roles of this outfit is to consolidate program information and to issue reports about trends and profile studies of corruption. One of the focus areas, right away, is the Bureau of Prisons. We will have access to extraordinary information. We are also the directorate for the State and Local Association of Inspector Generals, which comprises all the Inspectors General in state and local government from around the country and they are very interested in collaborating as well. It is very exciting and it reflects a coming of age of John Jay's Inspector General program.

Professor Sandy Beraer: As chair of the Science Department I'd like you to know about another unique program at John Jay, one that is unique to not only CUNY but to every college in New York City and to the region, and that is our Forensic Science major, which has had increasing interest among potential students because of the public's growing knowledge of the critical role of forensic science in investigations and in trials. Forensic Science is the only physical science the College offers: it teaches laboratory analysis, evaluation of toxicological materials, evaluation of evidence found at crimes, which is called criminalistics, and DNA testing. We graduate a large number of students a year: if I say we graduate 15 to 20 students that number may seem small, but for a physical science program, even compared with more traditional senior colleges, this is an enormous achievement. Many of the senior colleges have no graduates in chemistry or physics, for example, except pre-med students. We also offer a master's degree and a track in our criminal justice doctoral program.

President Kaplowitz: Many students come to John Jay as transfer students because our unique programs are in fields that most students do not know about when they are in high school and are planning for college. And, as you know, transfer students do not count in a college's graduation rates. Do you know about our day/night schedule for in-service students?

Vice Chancellor Mirrer: No, what is that?

President Kaplowitz: I mention this because during the first year of our Senate, in 1986, when Jill Norgren was the Senate chair, we met with the then Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Carolyn Reid Wallace, who later went to Washington, to the Department of Education. The Vice Chancellor said that is widely known and remarked that John Jay faculty teach only a two-day class schedule and we disabused her of this misunderstanding of our workload and

of our commitment: we teach our courses in the morning and again at night so that our students who work rotating shifts can have the same instructor teaching the same material, whether the student comes to the morning or to the evening class. As a faculty member you can imagine the pedagogical challenges which are enormous because the same material has to be taught in the evening that was taught in the morning. It is also a twelve-hour day, twice a week.

As a result, we are available all day for our students, because we have a six-hour break between our day and evening classes. On the student satisfaction survey, we are rated very highly on the question about student access to faculty because we are here for very long hours. And so the only time we can have the time for truly substantive meetings is on Fridays, such as today. Those who teach in the graduate program usually have a three-day teaching schedule because the graduate evening courses conflict with the evening half of the day/evening schedule. There was actually a contractual waiver given to John Jay so our faculty could work what would otherwise be a violation of the contract. So if you hear such comments about our faculty, please know it is disinformation or misinformation.

Indeed, ours is a very committed faculty, we are committed to our students and to the College's mission, including those of us who teach in the non-mission departments, and we are committed to high academic standards and we want to work on that, we want to address the issue of standards, which was the topic of most of our meeting today with President Lynch. But one of the factors that is really critical and that we really must address is how poorly funded our College is because that has a tremendous impact on this issue. I'm going to call upon Tom Litwack, the chair of the Faculty Senate's Budget Advisory Committee, and Ned Benton, the chair of the College's Budget Planning Committee, both of whom have prepared charts for this part of the meeting.

Professor Tom Litwack: You know that we have argued that John Jay is very underfunded compared to the other senior colleges in CUNY, particularly the better funded senior colleges, but the point I really want to make is that we are grossly underfunded compared to every other senior college in CUNY. That can be seen very simply by looking the chart labeled "Adopted Base Budget Per Student FTE" [Attachment B-1] and you will see that we are almost \$2,000 below the average FTE funding. But more significant than even that, if you look just above John Jay, you will see that there are rather small differences between the other less well funded colleges and the ones immediately above them. John Jay is grossly underfunded compared to the next least well funded college, New York City Tech. In other words, the differences between the other colleges, apart from the very well funded colleges is perhaps 5% or 10% but John Jay is 25% below the next more poorly funded senior college.

President Kaplowitz: The column to look at is Column C, which shows the dollar funding per FTE student. The list of the colleges is not in alphabetical order but rather in descending order of funding with CCNY at the top, because CCNY is the best funded senior college, at \$7,238 per FTE. The next to the last college in funding per FTE is New York City Tech, at \$4320 per FTE, and then John Jay, which is funded at only \$3,379 per FTE. The average FTE funding is the last line: \$5,213.

Vice Chancellor Mirrer: I don't see historical figures but is it the case that at some point you had a large jump in enrollment

because I can see that in the case of some of the other colleges that look well funded they have had a precipitous enrollment drop.

President Kaplowitz: Yes, we have had significant enrollment growth but not in the form of a sudden jump but rather in the form of constant, steady growth. Let me show you Ned's chart showing the enrollment change at the senior colleges since 1992.

Professor Litwack: We have had a tremendous growth in enrollment and other colleges have had, as you termed it, a precipitous decline in enrollment, but the funding of the colleges haven't kept pace with the changes in enrollment.

Professor Benton: The colleges that have had precipitous declines are the ones that are at the very top of Chart B-1.

Vice Chancellor Mirrer: I am aware of that.

Professor Benton: The colleges whose enrollment remained relatively stable are the ones in the middle and Tom's point is that if one sets aside those cases where a precipitous drop in enrollment partly counts for the extraordinary difference in funding, the difference in funding between the stable campuses and their allocations relative to John Jay's shows how underfunded John Jay is. If we could just be brought up to the poverty level we would be satisfied.

Professor Litwack: Exactly. I would also call your attention to another chart, entitled "Grand Total Initial Budget Allocation" [Attachment B-2]. Again, I would make the same point: if you look at the grand total allocation, where we do somewhat better because we receive more money for adjunct faculty than do colleges that have more full-time faculty, looking again at Column C on this second chart, it is clear how grossly underfunded John Jay is compared to even the other least well funded colleges in CUNY, not to mention how grossly underfunded we are compared to the better funded colleges. John Jay's funding is way below that of every other senior college not only absolutely but in terms of percentage. The bottom line is not just that we are underfunded compared to the better funded colleges but that we are grossly underfunded compared to every senior college.

Vice Chancellor Mirrer: I know there was a serious attempt to redress that this year and I do think it was a serious attempt and I think that that will continue.

Professor Litwack: Of course we are very pleased that we are getting the 21 full-time faculty lines but in the spirit of open discussion I must make two points about that and hopefully you will recognize that although we are raising these questions we are still grateful for what we received ---

Vice Chancellor Mirrer: I do understand.

Professor Litwack: --- but we received only 21 faculty lines out of 175 faculty lines allocated to the senior colleges. We should have received 50 lines. Given how underfunded we are, given how under-facultied we are, we received far fewer lines out of that total allocation than we should have received. Far fewer. And, in fact, the 21 lines will do very little to improve our relative situation compared to other colleges. It's a lot better than not having the 21 lines but there is another crucial point: at least there is a mechanism in place for addressing the issue of how some

colleges have far fewer full-time faculty than other colleges but the other very serious problem is that we are grossly underfunded not just in terms of full-time faculty but in terms of everything, and that everything includes academic support services, it includes money for tutors, money for computers, money for library acquisitions, money for quality of life conditions for students, it includes everything, and there's not even any plan in place at CUNY to in any way address those inequities. And so while we are happy to get those 21 lines, it is, frankly, a very, very small step toward solving our problem.

President Kaplowitz: I would like to provide background to explain why we so well informed about this issue. We have been aware for years that we were underfunded ever since 1976 when we took that major cut to our budget and that underfunding has been becoming more and more pronounced, even when we did not increase our student enrollment. And of course we became even more underfunded when our enrollment increased and then we were pressured to increase our enrollment because of the CUNY Master Plan which mandated annual enrollment increases.

And so at the end of 1993, in December, we invited Vice Chancellor Rothbard to our Senate and we discussed with him the fact that at that time although we had approximately the same number of student FTE's as Lehman, Lehman received \$10 million more a year than we did in its base budget. We asked why and Vice Chancellor Rothbard said there were reasons and we asked if he would send us the data explaining the reasons and he said he would and he did so, at the same time explaining that there were also historical and political reasons for the difference in funding. We understood that. We did an analysis of the data that Vice Chancellor Rothbard sent us and it showed that of the \$10 million difference, only -- and we were very conservative in our analysis -- only, at the most, \$5 million was justified by differences in the size of the campuses and by programmatic differences, such as the nursing program Lehman had at that time. We wrote several letters explicating our analysis.

That summer of 1994, when Vice Chancellor Rothbard announced the college budget allocations, Base Level Equity was announced as a new initiative, which was courageous of the then Chancellor and of Vice Chancellor Rothbard. This involved moving vacant funded lines from comparatively well funded colleges to comparatively underfunded colleges. We had actually proposed in our letters that lines that became free as a result of deaths, retirements, resignations, or firings be reallocated. But the Base Level Equity initiative was an even more dramatic initiative because it reallocated funded vacant lines even if there were no newly freed lines.

But the presidents of the colleges that would be losing vacant funded lines opposed this and so the former Chancellor created an ad hoc committee of college presidents, chaired by Matthew Goldstein, and their report acknowledged the inequitable funding among colleges, including, as Tom said, inequity in the non-faculty part of the college budgets, and the ad hoc committee's recommendation was that new funds be sought from Albany and that new money be used to fund the Base Level Equity initiative rather than current vacant lines, in order to achieve the goal of 70% full-time taught course sections at senior colleges. We know that funded vacant lines are funded at 82% of the lines' value and so a college with 200 vacant funded lines, and there is one college with 200 such lines, has the legitimate

use of the those lines to do with as they chose and since they chose to not fill those lines, they have the dollars to provide their students with more academic support and other services that Tom spoke about.

Since the ad hoc committee of the presidents recommended the use of new dollars to be used instead of currently funded vacant lines, CUNY's asking budget for the last two years has included requests for new monies for full-time faculty. The Governor's Executive Budget has funded that request, using the term "Base Level Equity" and so it was a surprise to us at John Jay when that new money was not used primarily for Base Level Equity, that is for the 70% goal, and this is what Tom was referring to: that of the 175 newly funded lines, only 75 lines were earmarked by the CUNY Central Administration for that 70% goal when the inequity is so great that more than **50%** of John Jay's undergraduate course sections are taught by adjunct faculty. Although the adjunct faculty comprise many wonderful and dedicated teachers, you know that that is not a healthy situation for any college.

And so almost all of our skills courses and almost all of our 100-level freshman courses are taught by adjunct faculty and that means that the students who are most in need of guidance and advice and rigorous standards are being socialized by faculty who may not be at the College after that semester and who have no job security and who are, thus, the most vulnerable to pressures of various sorts and who rightly, therefore, worry about student evaluations and potential complaints against them for rigorous grading standards. Thus our College's gross underfunding is inextricably bound with issues of academic standards and our efforts to successfully grapple with those issues.

Professor Benton: When we look at the table that shows the growth of John Jay's enrollment the question arises as to why the growth occurred at John Jay. Looking nationally and regionally and locally, I see several factors that explain why students are voting with their feet to come to John Jay. One of those factors is that criminal justice is an expanding part of our society. The correctional population has expanded, the policing has expanded, and the courts are expanding, and so this is an area that is growing and thus is an area in which students can become involved. Furthermore, the nature of the field is changing remarkably. At the entry level, police officers now have to go to college and the NYC Fire Department has just enacted academic requirements for tenure and for promotion as a firefighter although it is a progression of steps but eventually a person can not be in the upper levels of the Fire Department or in supervisory positions without a significant number of college credits.

And so the agencies in our field are very strongly sending the signal to people inside and outside the agencies that they had better go to college. Similarly, at the upper levels, special agents in various kinds of inspection and oversight agencies are very strongly getting the sense that they have to get this kind of education. In psychology, it used to be that a regular psychologist is who would work in a correctional system and now forensic psychologists are much more common in various kinds of roles in criminal justice and so I see the nature of what our agencies and what our fields are expecting our students to learn is changing and so people are coming to study at John Jay because we offer the programs they need to take. Thus the growth in student enrollment is not a blip that is going to change all of a

sudden: the growth reflects a structural change in the kind of education our society wants a segment of our population to have in order to function in the roles they are required to function in.

At the same time, the Fire Department's promotion and tenure requirements say that eventually for one to become a battalion commander one must have a degree, but that will not be required until some time in the next century. Right away, a person has to show progress toward a degree by getting credits. They are not setting out an expectation that anyone get a degree in six, eight years and, in fact, the requirement for promotion to lieutenant in the Fire Department initially is 30 credits and eventually will be 60 credits but they do not speak of a degree at all. In terms of the next six to eight years in their implementation plan, they eventually do speak of degrees. And so we have a lot of students who come to John Jay who are not coming to get a degree. They are coming in order to take the courses.

Similarly, we are starting a program for firefighters to take courses at the Fire Academy and here at our campus but because they receive transfer credits because of their academy studies, those transfer credits make them transfer students and they persist in their studies and many eventually earn a degree but they do not show up as graduates because they are not first-time, full-time freshmen. And, thus, our situation is such that I think the measure of performance needs to be adjusted to the kinds of circumstances of our students and expectations of the agencies that are our clients.

Vice Chancellor Mirrer: In response to these concerns, which I would say do not reside exclusively in this College, there is a small group consisting of four presidents, myself, and Richard Rothbard which has been constituted to talk about appropriate performance standards and so I would certainly welcome whatever suggestions you might have. I think it is difficult to discount completely the success of our students with respect to graduation because we do want our students to graduate and I don't think we want to send out a signal that we don't. So I think we have to be a little bit careful before saying there is no point in talking about graduation at CUNY because our students don't graduate or because our students are so exceptional that we don't care whether they graduate or not. We have to be, as I said, quite careful before doing that. I agree wholeheartedly that we have to be a little bit or perhaps quite a lot broader in defining performance standards. But I think we have to come to some decision as to what they should be. It is pretty clear that not only our own Trustees but all sorts of external organizations will be evaluating us and our students based on performance criteria and I think to the extent that we share the burden of defining those criteria we will come up with better ones.

Professor Litwack: I think it's fair to say that we at John Jay are in favor of performance standards because we think we perform as well or better than any other college in CUNY, that our faculty is as good or better as teachers and as researchers and as dedicated professionals than the faculty of any other college in CUNY. Our concern is that the performance standards be fair and rational and I'd like to make several points about that. First, our concern is that graduation rates will be equated with performance because they shouldn't be for two reasons: one reason is that some colleges have student bodies that are initially a lot less well prepared than those at other colleges and, therefore, would naturally have a lower graduation rate, not because the

faculty or the College is not performing as well but because the students come in much less well prepared or better prepared, depending on the college. The other point goes back to what I noted earlier: many colleges have far more resources for students for support of performance. For example, many colleges have resources that permit them to provide much smaller classes than we do, they have resources that permit them to provide much more tutoring services than we do, and as long as there is such an incredible differentiation in the funding for support services it is a little unfair to compare graduation rates and even other performance standards when there is not a level playing field. I would like to impress those points upon you and ask what you think of those points.

Vice Chancellor Mirrer: Certainly I am not unaware that the playing field is not level for a number of reasons. In some respects, your students are better prepared than they are on some other campuses and your student profile shows that in some ways your students are more highly motivated than they may be on other campuses. It is not a level playing field but I don't think that in all cases one would want to argue that John Jay is at a disadvantage because you do have students who are here because of the special mission of the College and that is an advantage. I think it is an advantage that your students really want to be here, as you point out, and as you point out your enrollment has swelled because there's a huge hunger for what you have. Many other colleges will say: "Look at John Jay. The students want to go there but some of our students may be here because of geographical convenience or some other similar reason." So it is not all disadvantage.

I do agree wholeheartedly that it is difficult and probably inappropriate to choose one specific measurement of performance, especially in this environment. But I think that the possibility of just bracketing performance is not there and it's not there because of the reasons I mentioned before. We have a State Board of Regents which is measuring our performance. They are using the pass rates on a particular exam or on a set of particular exams of our students. It is not really up to us to say, "No, thank you, we don't want to be measured that way," because we are, in fact, being measured that way. We have the New York State Bar which is measuring the performance of our students by looking at the bar exam results. What I would certainly urge us not to do is to step back and say CUNY is different and we don't want to be measured in any of those ways and that it is inappropriate to measure us in any of those ways. I don't think that is an option.

I'm a great believer in collaboration and I also really believe that the more people who look at something, at a given proposal, the better that proposal will be in the end. That's why I suggested that since there is this small committee set up to review performance standards and measures and what they might be in the future and how they might be used in the future that you recommend some ways. You don't have to do it now: the committee hasn't met yet but it will be meeting over the course of the rest of this year and so there is time to have input. I think that whatever we come up with will be better for the suggestions that come from around the University. I'm 99.9% certain that there will be an array of performance measurements next year, rather than a single performance measure.

Senator Adina Schwartz: In the spirit of collaboration you were talking about earlier, I wonder whether the membership of the

committee looking at performance measures could be expanded so that there is a representative from each institution.

Vice Chancellor Mirrer: It is not my committee. The committee is made up of the two presidents who chair the Council of Presidents' Academic Affairs and Fiscal Affairs subcommittees and the two presidents who serve as liaisons between those committees and the Board of Trustees' respective committees on Academic Affairs and Fiscal Affairs. So they represent the presidents and they are not on the committee in their capacity as president of an individual college but rather as representatives of those committees. This small committee will have to come up with an array of performance measures that attempts to address a number of issues that have been raised. What has to be avoided is the kind of committee in which each college represents its own interests and there is not a collective interest and I think there is a tendency for that to happen when presidents are there advocating for their own colleges. Your president, were that the structure, would advocate for your College and he would do it very well, I assure you. But the Trustees see themselves as Trustees not of John Jay College but of The City University of New York and their expectations are that this committee will come up with an array of performance measures that will be applicable across all the colleges.

President Kaplowitz: The letter from President Leon Goldstein describing this committee left me unclear about an issue that is very important for John Jay. Will the array of performance measures dictate the allocation of all faculty lines henceforth or is the plan to have lines distributed according to both the new performance measures and also in accordance with the goal of moving colleges toward 70% full-time taught course sections? In other words, will this year's approach be adhered to whereby lines were distributed on both bases?

Vice Chancellor Mirrer: Yes, we would be allocating that proportion of lines that this year was reserved for distribution according to performance measures.

President Kaplowitz: Then there will still be a commitment to the goal of 70% full-time taught course sections?

Vice Chancellor Mirrer: Yes, definitely.

Senator Jill Norsren: What possible resources might 80th Street, perhaps out of your Office, be able to devote to our working with adjuncts? While we have a commitment to restore more full-time faculty lines to the community of CUNY, it is clear first of all that that is going to take time and secondly we are going to be able to achieve only so much toward that goal. We talk repeatedly about how we need to have for starters the ability to ask adjuncts to come to sessions where we can talk about the needs of our College. At the Graduate Center there have been initiatives that I know about, one that I teach in, in which have begun offering courses in which we teach graduate students how to teach. And then at the home colleges the department chairs give hiring preference to those graduate students who have taken these courses. Obviously those courses require resources and it is my feeling that we should be able to offer more such courses both at the Graduate School and at other places. Because much of the teaching and the socialization of our students takes place in the 100-level freshman courses, we need to direct more of our attention to how resources can be redirected.

Vice Chancellor Mirrer: I don't think there are any resources in my Office that can be used that way. My Office has very limited resources. And I think it would probably not be appropriate, either, because adjuncts are college based and I would be very careful about initiating any projects that interfere with a college's own decisions about the training of its instructional staff. I've been asked about this before -- why don't I give money to Lehman College so they can provide a great program for their adjuncts and I've had to say that if Lehman College wants to do that of course they can do it but 80th Street has no business telling a college here is money to provide a program for your adjuncts.

Professor Litwack: What are CUNY's plans for educating the most poorly prepared students at the University?

Vice Chancellor Mirrer: I have been doing quite a lot of thinking about this. I have met once with a small group of faculty involved in remedial programs and special programs, which Sandi Cooper put together, and I plan to meet with them again. I have been collecting data but it turns out to be quite complicated to collect all the kinds of data that I think would be necessary to support significantly different departures.

There is money in the budget request for two types of things: one is a campus-based basic skills immersion program which would probably give students a pre-collegiate experience and, this is in the context of an ongoing discussion, would probably be a pilot in any case but its contours are under discussion and so I wouldn't want to suggest there is any foregone conclusion. My guess is that if we do this kind of a pilot it would target students who are at the low end in terms of their performance on the freshman skills assessment tests and/or in terms of their academic preparation. So these would be students who the data suggest have very limited chances for success in our institution. I want to make that clear: this is really an attempt to do something with students who have not been very successful -- I want to make that clear before all the sirens go off.

Another piece of that budget request speaks to the need to do something for students at the high end, students who are borderline and who are very close to being prepared for collegiate-level work, for college-level work, but who don't perform at that level on the freshman skills assessment tests. What we will be looking to do, and what I have started to do, is to gather information. Any information you may want to pass on to me would be most welcome. I know there have been many pilot projects done but we don't have any information about how they turned out. I would like to put resources into another type of pilot which would allow us to expand what we do and what works for students who are just below the collegiate level: I am very sensitive to the argument that students are best off within a collegiate framework. But I think it is a hard argument to buy for some groups of students whose skills are so in need of help that the collegiate experience is just not appropriate at the moment. I'm going to be very careful but I'm going to be honest and say it is the case that my Office is inclined to explore some radical departure from what is currently done in terms of students who I think are not really ready for the collegiate experience.

President Kaplowitz: I see that many hands are raised but I do know that Louise must be at 80th Street in less than half an hour for a meeting, as she told me when she first arrived and as she has just

reminded me. Louise, I hope you would be willing to return in the near future. And on behalf of all of us, thank you for coming to meet with us today.

Vice Chancellor Mirrer: I hate to close off the discussion because I know there is a lot I can learn from you and you probably have all sorts of reactions to what I've just said but I really must leave in order to get to another meeting. In order to continue the discussion, I am happy to provide you with my email address [which she then did]. I thank you all and I do apologize again for arriving late: I did not count on the unbearable traffic presumably resulting from Hillary Clinton's visit today to Manhattan. And I would welcome an invitation to return. In the meantime, I am very, very concerned about making some progress on the question of students who really do need attention at this University, so whatever thoughts you do have I very seriously would like to hear about them, as soon as possible.

[The Senate applauded Vice Chancellor Mirrer.]

8. Recommendation with regard to JJ's inequitable funding:
Professor Tom Litwack, Chair, Faculty Senate Budget Committee

The Senate authorized Tom Litwack and Karen Kaplowitz, and, if he chooses to participate, Ned Benton, to communicate to the Interim Chancellor and to other appropriate persons about John Jay's budget underfunding if they determine, based on the events of the next weeks, that it would be an advisable course of action at this time.

9. Recommendation by the Faculty Senate of Honorary Degree candidates: Prof. Daniel Gasman. Chair, Honorary Degrees Committee

By the requisite 75% affirmative vote, the Senate voted to recommend to the President of the College for his recommendation to the Chancellor and to the CUNY Board of Trustees the following individuals recommended by the Committee on Honorary Degrees to receive an honorary degree at the June 4 commencement exercises: Dr. Tom Grisso, Jamaica Kincaid, and Oprah Winfrey.

10. New business

Senators suggested that we review the issues raised by Vice Chancellor Mirrer. President Kaplowitz said some trustees are saying their companies will not even interview CUNY graduates because applicants they have interviewed could not read and write at a level sufficient for employment. One Senator said that a former student of hers who works for a Federal law enforcement agency told her that this agency will no longer entertain applications from John Jay students because John Jay candidates have not been able to pass the agency's own writing test. Professor Litwack said that a performance measure is coming which is the CUNY proficiency exam which students will have to pass to move beyond 60 credits: that's a standard the public will accept, he said and he asked how we are going to be sure that our students can pass that test. Senator Blitz pointed out that the Vice Chancellor correctly noted that our students want to come to John Jay but, he said, we are committing fraud if we do not teach them

the skills they need. Senator Kinshasa said we need to deal with the process, not just the end result and that we need to conduct an internal evaluation. Senator Norgren said it is particularly important to the adjunct faculty that we do so and that we establish standards as to what standards students will be expected to meet by all faculty and what grades mean and what it will take to earn passing grades.

President Kaplowitz noted that Vice Chancellor Mirrer acknowledged that there has been a dramatic enrollment increase at John Jay. However, the argument being made by some at some of the older senior colleges, which she has heard and has seen in writing, is that some CUNY colleges have very low admissions requirements and that it is for that reason that those colleges' enrollment has been increasing and they argue that that is not sufficient justification for giving those colleges faculty lines that are needed by colleges with more rigorous standards and programs. Her fear is that this argument, which the former Board was seemingly not sympathetic to, will resonant with some if not many of the current Trustees. She said she was stunned to learn that more than 50% of the entering freshmen recently have been admitted as associate degree students. A few years ago, we had agreed that the maximum associate degree students of each entering freshmen class would be 25%. Professor Litwack said that until we improve our base budget, we are in a Catch-22.

Senator Luby said it is our responsibility to ensure that the classroom is conducive to learning, but it is not easy to do so. He asked whether many of our students are really ready for college. Senator Kinshasa said that at a workshop last year it was urged that course syllabi include statements about appropriate conduct in the classroom and that we should help our colleagues develop techniques for dealing with these problems in the classroom.

It was agreed that these topics will be the focus of Faculty Senate meetings henceforth, in addition to our efforts to improve John Jay's funding and our interactions with Trustees and with other CUNY and elected officials so that John Jay is not a mere abstraction to any of them.

By a motion duly made and carried, the meeting adjourned at 3:30 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Edward Davenport

Recording Secretary

ATTACHMENT A

Dr. Louise Mirrer Named Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

The Board of Trustees of The City University of New York today named Dr. Louise Mirrer as Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, following a national search. Her appointment is effective July 7, 1997.

Dr. Mirrer, a widely published scholar in the fields of Spanish and Sephardic language and literature and women's studies, is currently serving as Vice Provost for Art, Sciences and Engineering at the University of Minnesota-Twin Cities, a post she has held since 1995. Among her many initiatives in that position are chairing the Council on Liberal Education; the initiation and direction of a project to fund collaborative teaching assistant-faculty Web page development in large enrollment courses; development of a proposal for improvement of instruction of graduate students in teaching; development of "Education for Life and Work," a major educational component of this year's biennial request to the Minnesota state legislature; and the improvement of K-12 articulation and university-business community articulation.

Previously, Dr. Mirrer was Chair of the Humanities Division at Fordham University from 1991-94. She joined Fordham's Spanish Department in 1979 as an Assistant Professor and rose to become a full Professor of Spanish and Comparative Literature. She was a Visiting Professor of Spanish and Portuguese at the University of California-Los Angeles in 1991.

"Dr. Mirrer is an eminent scholar in her field and has held university-wide administrative positions of increasing responsibility," said Chancellor W. Ann Reynolds. "Through her work in both the public and the independent sectors, she has first-hand knowledge of the importance of maintaining academic quality in the face of today's budgetary constraints,"

Prior to serving in her capacity as Vice Provost, Dr. Mirrer was Chair of the Department of Spanish & Portuguese at Minnesota from 1994-95. She continues to chair the Department's Executive Committee, and is a member of the Graduate Faculty of the Center for Medieval Studies. Dr. Mirrer holds a double Ph.D. from Stanford University in Spanish and Humanities. She earned a Diploma in Linguistics from Cambridge University in 1975, following her 1973 graduation from the University of Pennsylvania with a B.A. magna cum laude with honors in Spanish.

She has published four books: Women, Jews, and Muslims in the Texts of Reconquest Castile (University of Michigan Press, 1996); Upon My Husband's Death: Widows in the Literature and Histories of Medieval Europe (University of Michigan Press, 1992); Prints of Power (Knoedler Publishing, 1991); and The Languase of Evaluation: A Sociolinguistic Approach to the Story of Pedro el Cruel in Ballad and Chronicle (John Benjamins, 1996). Dr. Mirrer has also written numerous articles and is the recipient of various research grants and fellowships. She has presented scholarly papers at conferences and universities in the United States and Europe.

Her professional activities include serving as a delegate to the Modern Language Association, representing the Division of Medieval Spanish Literature, 1988-91; chairing the Executive Committee of the Sephardic Studies Discussion Group of the Modern Language Association, 1989; chairing the Sephardic Studies Group of the American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese, 1989; serving as a board member of the Society for Medieval Feminist Scholarship, 1991-present, and a member of the Board of Advisors, Medieval Feminist Newsletter, 1991-present.

President Matthew Goldstein (Baruch) chaired the Search Committee.

This is the text of a press release issued by CUNY on February 10, 1997.

ATTACHMENT B-1

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

ATTACHMENT B-2

"GRAND TOTAL INITIAL BUDGET ALLOCATION"
PER FLASH STUDENT FTE 1997198

SENIOR COLLEGE	A	B	C
	1997198 FALL FLASH FTEs	1997198 "GRAND TOTAL ALLOCATION"	1997198 "GRAND TOTAL ALLOCATION" \$ PER FTE
CITY	8,700	\$66,161,100	\$7,605
LEHMAN	6,348	\$41,843,900	\$6,592
BKLYN	10,739	\$69,524,400	\$6,474
EVERS	3,693	\$21,992,300	\$5,955
COSI	8,145	\$48,218,900	\$5,920
QUEENS	11,537	\$67,183,800	\$5,823
YORK	4,463	\$25,373,100	\$5,685
HUNTER	13,297	\$73,396,100	\$5,520
NYCTC	8,470	\$43,750,400	\$5,165
BARUCH	11,116	\$56,436,200	\$5,077
JOHN JAY	8,448	\$34,252,900	\$4,055
TOTAL	94,956	\$548,133,100	\$63,871
AVERAGE	8,632	\$49,830,282	\$5,806

Data for Column A taken from CUNY Office of Institutional Research- FTEs one week after start of classes

Data for Column B taken directly from the chart entitled "1997/98 Initial Budget Allocation" appended to the memorandum entitled "1997198 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