

Faculty Senate Minutes #179

John Jay College of Criminal Justice

February 10, 1999

3:20 PM

Room 630 T

Present (27): C. Jama Adams, Dorothy Brace, Anthony Carpi, Enrique Chavez-Arviso, Effie Papatzikou Cochran, Edward Davenport, Janice Dunham, Nancy Egan, P.J. Gibson, Amy Green, Edward Green, Lou Guinta, Karen Kaplowitz, Jane Katz, Kwando Kinshasa, Stuart Kirschner, Thurai Kugendran, Sandra Lanzzone, Tom Litwack, James Malone, Patrick O'Hara, Jacqueline Polanco, Lydia Segal, Carmen Solis, Martin Wallenstein, Agnes Wieschenberg, Bessie Wright

Absent (9): David Brotherton, James Cauthen, Holly Clarke, Glenn Corbett, Sondra Leftoff, Gavin Lewis, Mythili Mantharam, Dagoberto Orrantia, Marny Tabb

Guest: Professor Haig Bohigian

AGENDA

1. Announcements from the chair
2. Adoption of Minutes #178 of the December 11 meeting
3. Ratification of University Faculty Senate delegate election
4. Election to fill a vacancy on the Senate executive committee
5. Discussion of the February 11 College Council agenda
6. Procedure for cases of plagiarism according to the JJ Bulletin
7. Writing across the disciplines
8. New business

1. Announcements from the chair [Attachments A - E]

Thurai Kugendran, a new member, was introduced, and returning members Agnes Wieschenberg and Sandra Lanzzone were welcomed.

The Mayor's Task Force on CUNY, chaired by Benno Schmidt, held hearings on January 5 and 6 at Hunter and on February 3 at NYCTech. Two members of our Faculty Senate provided oral and written testimony: both of the written testimonies are included as attachments: Tom Litwack testified in his capacity as Chair of the Faculty Senate's Budget Committee on January 5 [Attachment A] and Karen Kaplowitz testified on February 3 [Attachment B]. Other John Jay faculty who testified or who provided written testimony are Professors Blanche Wiesen Cook, Jane Davenport, Betsy Hegeman, Barry Latzer, and Antony Simpson. (Others may have sent written testimony and still others may be testifying today at the hearing at Queens College.) Student Laura Piil also testified. Among faculty who attended the hearings are Professors Jerry Markowitz, Bonnie Nelson, and Mike Wallace.

The following documents were also provided for information:

- > The Governor's Executive Budget proposal for CUNY [Attachment C]
- > The CUNY Board of Trustees January 25, 1999, Resolution phasing out remedial courses in baccalaureate programs [Attachment D]
- > The CUNY Board of Trustees January 25, 1999, Resolution on Writing Across the Disciplines [Attachment E]
- > Trustee Calandra's newly proposed resolution to restrict courses that remedial students may take [available from the Senate Office]
- > CUNY Performance Excellence Award Program implementation guidelines [available from the Senate Office]

President Kaplowitz reported that she received a letter from Vice President Witherspoon and Dean Saulnier thanking the faculty for getting the fall final grades in on time. Grades were missing for only four course sections, even with the very short turnaround time. This can be ascribed to the faculty having become aware, through the explanations by Dean Saulnier as reported in the Senate Minutes, of the relationship between on-time grades and both prerequisite checking and telephone registration.

2. Adoption of Minutes #178 of the December 11 meeting

By a motion duly made and carried, Minutes #178 of the December 11, 1998, meeting were adopted.

3. Ratification of John Jay's election of delegates to the University Faculty Senate

The Senate's Executive Committee recommended that henceforth the Senate ratify election results of delegates to the University Faculty Senate. The call letter for nominations for 4 delegate positions was sent to all faculty eligible to serve and was published in "The Week of." None of the four elections was contested.

The Senate ratified the election results:

- > Diane Hartmus: elected to a 3-year term
- > Maria Rodriguez: re-elected to a 3-year term
- > Ned Benton: re-elected to a 1-year term as alternate delegate
- > Ed Davenport: re-elected to a 1-year term as alternate delegate

The other members of John Jay's delegation are Haig Bohigian, Holly Clarke, Jane Davenport, and Karen Kaplowitz: the 3-year terms are staggered.

4. Election to fill a vacancy on the Senate Executive Committee

James Cauthen was nominated to run for the vacant position on the six-person executive committee of the Faculty Senate. The

other members of the executive committee are Karen Kaplowitz, Amy Green, Kwando Kinshasa, Carmen Solis, and Edward Davenport. A secret ballot was taken and James Cauthen was elected unanimously and was applauded. The vote was 27 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions.

5. Discussion of the February 11 College Council agenda

Senator Tom Litwack raised the issue of an item on the College Council agenda, a copy of which he received two days earlier: the nomination on February 11 at the College Council of candidates for 3 at-large faculty positions on the College's Personnel & Budget (P&B) Committee for the next academic year. He said that this was the first he had learned of this deadline for nominations and noted the absence of any notice in "The Week Of." He characterized the College Council agenda as insufficient notice to the College community of nominations for an election to a committee that has a very important influence over all members of the College community, especially faculty. He criticized a process of nominations without adequate notice.

Because he is not a member of the College Council, he asked that Senate members who are Council members see to it that nominations are delayed to the next Council meeting, in March, and that in the interim every issue of "The Week Of" contain a notice that there will be nominations to the P&B at the March meeting of the College Council and that to be on the ballot a person has to be nominated by a faculty member of the College Council. (Ballots are then mailed to all full-time faculty.)

Senator Janice Dunham noted that the executive committee of the College Council usually makes nominations and additional nominations are then made at the Council. Senator James Malone, a member of the College Council Executive Committee, was asked whether such nominations had been made. He said they had been, but added that the Council's executive committee had been unaware of the absence of a notice in "The Week Of." Senator Malone added that nominations can also be made from the floor at the College Council meeting. Senator Litwack said that even though more nominations can be made from the floor, most faculty do not **know** that tomorrow is the last day for nominations. Senator Malone said that Senator Litwack's point is well taken.

President Kaplowitz explained that most members of the College Community do not receive the College Council agenda, and so for most there has been no notice at all. Only members of the College Council and the at-large members of the Senate receive the agenda. Senator Litwack added that even if everyone in the College received the agenda, two days is inadequate notice. A motion authorizing President Kaplowitz to request the College Council to postpone nominations until the March Council meeting was adopted without objection.

Senator C. Jama Adams asked whether notice in "The Week Of" would have been adequate. Senator Martin Wallenstein replied that publication in "The Week Of" is considered official notice to the College community. Senator Litwack said that advance notice of nominations for all College-wide elections should be published in "The Week Of." The Senate voted to authorize the Senate president to make this recommendation on its behalf to President Lynch and to Patricia Maull, the Secretary of the College Council.

Various senators asked about courses of action if our request for a postponement of nominations were denied. President Kaplowitz said she doubts that would happen, but if it did she would raise the fact that the meeting of the College Council Executive Committee lacked a quorum, and so nominations made at that meeting lack validity, and this, necessarily, requires a postponement.

6. Discussion of the procedure to be followed in cases of plagiarism according to the JJ Undergraduate & Graduate Bulletins

The text of John Jay's policy on plagiarism as well as the College's policy on cheating are printed in John Jay's Undergraduate and Graduate Bulletins. Immediately following that text is a new statement under the heading of "Resolving Allegations of Cheating and Plagiarism":

"Allegations of cheating should be referred to the Vice President for Student Development to be handled under the Student Disciplinary Procedures in Article 15 of the [CUNY Board of Trustees] Bylaws. Allegations of plasiarism should be referred to the Vice President for Student Development to determine whether the matter involves an academic question (i.e., because it is based on the expertise of scholars in the field) or a disciplinary matter (i.e., because it involves a factual question as to whether the student complied with rules of conduct.) In the event that the Vice President determines that the matter is academic, the College's regular procedures in terms of grading and appeals should be followed. If the Vice President determines that the matter is disciplinary, the matter should be handled as a disciplinary violation under Article 15 of the Bylaws.

"It should be stressed that issues of cheating and plagiarism cannot be treated as both 'academic' and 'disciplinary' at the same time because it raises the potential for inconsistent judgments."

(John Jay Bulletin, p. 39)

President Kaplowitz noted that this text, which represents a change from longstanding practice, was never approved by the College Council, nor ever considered by that body: yet it is the College Council that sets College policy. Similarly, neither the Undergraduate Standards Committee nor the Graduate Studies Committees ever considered this issue. President Kaplowitz reported that when she asked Vice President for Student Development Roger Witherspoon whether he knew the origin of this new policy, he gave her a copy of a June 1995 "Advisory Memorandum" from the then CUNY Vice Chancellor for Legal Affairs Robert Diaz,

This "Advisory Memorandum," which was never approved by a Board of Trustees Committee, concludes with the same statement that now appears in the John Jay bulletins except that the Memorandum names the "chief academic officer" and not the vice president for student development as the person from whom faculty are to learn whether the plagiarism is "academic" or "disciplinary." She said that after discussing the issue with VP Witherspoon, he said he has no objection to returning to the previous procedure whereby faculty have the option of responding to plagiarism with an appropriate course grade, if that is what the faculty decide.

She reported that when she asked the Dean of Graduate Studies, James Levine, whether the Graduate Studies Committee had approved the policy, which now also appears in the Graduate Bulletin, he told her that the Committee had not done so and that upon seeing the new policy in the Graduate Bulletin, the Committee on Graduate Studies unanimously passed a resolution on December 14, 1998, recommending that "each syllabus for a graduate course contain the following warning: Students in this course are reminded that plagiarism -- defined in the 1998-2000 graduate bulletin (at p. 34) as 'the representation of someone's ideas, words, artistic, scientific, or technical work as one's own' is prohibited. If a student in the course is found to have engaged in plagiarism, that student will receive a grade of 'F' for the semester."

President Kaplowitz noted that the definition of plagiarism that appears in both bulletins was developed and approved by the Standards Committee and was then approved by the College Council. But the process to be followed in cases of plagiarism is new and it is this that has not been approved by the College Council.

Senator Edward Davenport praised the decision of the Committee on Graduate Studies, noting that every academic department has a grades appeals committee. A student who questions a final grade can file an appeal: the department committee reviews the appeal and the evidence and makes a determination. Senator Davenport characterized that process as good and as much less cumbersome than having to go to an administrator before giving a grade.

Senator Patrick O'Hara said grade appeals on the graduate level are conducted in an analogous way: a student who wishes to appeal a grade files an appeal with the Graduate Studies Committee, which consists of faculty teaching in the graduate program.

Senator Edward Green asked whether it is not true that if a policy is in the bulletin that policy is in effect. He questioned whether it could be changed by the faculty or by the Committee on Graduate Studies without going through a formal process.

President Kaplowitz noted that the process itself is, indeed, an important part of the issue, because the statement in the bulletins has never been submitted to the College Council for approval. She said the faculty must object to this violation of process: it is not acceptable that an unknown person or group can make policy simply by submitting a text for inclusion in the bulletins. Senator Wallenstein asked when the policy first appeared. President Kaplowitz said it first appears in the 1996-98 bulletins and now, again, in the current 1998-2000 bulletins.

She said one problem is that if faculty now give students a course grade of F for plagiarism those faculty have technically violated the policy because they failed to go to the Vice President for Student Development to be instructed whether theirs is an "academic" or a "disciplinary" matter.

She noted that it is only the faculty who have the authority to determine course grades. President Kaplowitz noted that contrary to this fact, this bulletin statement requires faculty to **submerge their professional opinion to that of a vice president** in deciding whether the penalty should be academic or disciplinary.

Senator P. J. Gibson spoke also of the impractical aspect of this process: she noted we have more than 11,000 students and asked how this is to work when plagiarism occurs at the end of the

semester -- especially in the Fall when grades have to be turned in quickly and there is no time for an "official" determination.

Senator James Malone said he supports the process that was in place before this new statement appeared. He noted that faculty would give the grade they thought appropriate, and then the student could appeal to the Department Appeals Committee, where it was settled. Senator Wallenstein added that faculty also had an option of taking the infraction to the College disciplinary committee. President Kaplowitz noted that the "Advisory Memorandum" states that faculty can only choose one of these paths, not both, and this is also stated in the bulletins. She said this is a different issue, which we should, perhaps, take up at a different time.

Senator Wallenstein said we should assume that this change was inadvertent. He moved that the Senate request a return to the previous policy because the current procedure has not been voted on by an appropriate College body and is, therefore, invalid. The motion was seconded.

Senator Malone added that we must delete the new statement from the bulletins. President Kaplowitz suggested that the motion be amended to also state that the previous policy should be printed each semester in the course schedule, so that everyone is properly informed. The amendment was accepted. There was discussion about whether this needed to be taken to the College Council. It was suggested that this should not be necessary because the new bulletin statement had never been approved by the College Council.

Senator Wallenstein called the bulletin a contract with students and said we cannot simply ignore its statements. Senator Lou Guinta explained there is a caveat at the beginning of every bulletin that allows for policy changes. Senator Wallenstein suggested we bring this issue to the Associate Provost if that Office still generates the bulletins. President Kaplowitz agreed with that suggestion, noting that the Associate Provost chairs the Standards Committee, to which this issue could also be reported.

The question was called: Resolved, that the Faculty Senate recommends and requests a return to the previous and long-standing policy and procedures with reference to plagiarism because the current statement has not been voted on by an appropriate College body and, therefore, lacks validity; and be it further resolved, that the Faculty Senate requests that the recently added statement be deleted from the College's Undergraduate and Graduate Bulletins and, additionally, that a corrective statement be included in each semester's course schedule booklet and, further, that this issue be referred to the Office of the Associate Provost. The motion was adopted by unanimous vote.

7. Discussion: Writing Across the Disciplines [Attachment E & F]

The Senate was referred to the Board of Trustees' new policy, which it approved on January 25, 1999, on Writing Across the Disciplines [Attachment E] which requires that a plan for writing across the disciplines be sent by each college to 80th Street by May and that an implementation report be sent by each college in September. Attention was also directed to John Jay's longstanding policy on writing across the curriculum [Attachment F].

The question was raised as to whether John Jay's policy is

sufficient in scope or whether it should be revisited in light of the new CUNY Proficiency Exam. Senator Guinta said this is being discussed by the Curriculum Committee and suggested that we consult members of that Committee before proceeding.

Senator Patrick O'Hara said that he agrees that we should consult with the Curriculum Committee but said he also believes that the Faculty Senate should affirm its support for John Jay's existing writing requirements. Senator Janice Dunham noted that there **is** wide variation among the faculty with regard to support for writing across the curriculum. Senator O'Hara said he can not support the idea that students are to receive only the amount of writing assignments and feedback which certain instructors may volunteer to include in their courses. Senator Kinshasa agreed, saying this is an issue of how we can best raise the bar of expectation for our students.

Senator Martin Wallenstein moved the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Faculty Senate endorses the College's Writing Across the Curriculum policy and urges faculty to incorporate it into their syllabi according to the College rules already passed and published; and, be it further resolved, that the Senate will invite the Associate Provost, who chairs the Curriculum Committee and any other relevant members of that Committee, to speak with the Senate about what is taking place at the College with regard to writing by our students.

A quorum being present, the motion passed by a vote of 10 yes, 2 no, and 6 abstentions.

Senator Litwack said that he wished the question had not been called because he would have liked to have had further discussion. He said he had wanted to raise the issue of in-class writing, such as the mid-term essay exams he gives, which he corrects and grades for content, writing, and grammar, and which he returns to his students but which, according to his understanding, do not count toward fulfilling the College's writing across the curriculum requirements. Other senators said that they, too, had voted as they did or had not voted because the discussion was insufficient and said they welcome the opportunity for future discussions.

8. New business [Attachment G-1 & G-2]

President Kaplowitz distributed two charts, which she had just obtained: one shows the preliminary enrollment for all the colleges [Attachment G-1] and the second shows the preliminary enrollment of regular (not SEEK or College Discovery) freshmen for the Fall 1998 compared to the actual enrollment in Fall 1997 [Attachment G-2]. The steep decline of freshmen at many of the colleges was noted.

Upon a motion duly adopted, the meeting was adjourned at 5 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Edward Davenport
Amy Green

Recording Secretaries

ATTACHMENT A

January 5, 1999

Members of the Task Force:

My name is Tom Litwack. I **am** a member of the Psychology Department of John Jay College of Criminal Justice. I **am** also the Chairperson of the Fiscal Affairs Committee of the John Jay College Faculty Senate. In that capacity, I have arrived at some understandings and ideas about the funding of CUNY colleges which I would like to share with you.

On the last page of these remarks you will find a chart **that** exhibits the current "Adjusted Base Budget" funding per **full-time** equivalent ["FTE"] student for each of the 14 CUNY Senior Colleges. As *can readily be seen from that* chart, there are extreme disparities in **the** Base Budget **funding** of the various CUNY Senior Colleges. For example, the best funded Senior college has over twice the Base Budget funding per FTE student as the *worst* funded college (John Jay). **And** John Jay's Base Budget per FTE student is **only** 2/3 of the CUNY Senior College average without John Jay.

It should be noted, before proceeding **further**, that some percentage of these **disparities are justified** by objective, rational factors, such as differences in physical plants and academic programs **amongst the Senior Colleges**. However, based on **analyses that we have** done at John Jay I believe that it can be stated with confidence that no more than a quarter to a third of **these** funding **differences** -- and **certainly no more than 50%** of these **disparities** -- can be attributed to objective factors. Moreover, clearly there is no objective, stated CUNY **formula for** funding the Base Budgets of the Senior Colleges. By contrast, there **is** such a formula for **establishing the Base Budgets of the CUNY Community-Colleges**. **Thus**, to begin with, we hope **you** will support the proposition **that** an objective, **public formula** should be put in place by CUNY to **determine** what percentage of the total CUNY Senior College **Base Budget** each Senior College would receive if Base Budget Funds were distributed objectively.

It is especially important to note that the differences in Base Budget funding represent, in particular, **gross differences** amongst Senior Colleges in **their** ratios of Full-time Faculty lines to students **and, therefore**, colleges' ability to teach **their** course with Full-time Faculty-members. Thus, although it is the stated goal of CUNY that 70% of courses be taught by Full-time Faculty, less well funded

colleges like John Jay are ~~allocated too few Full-time Faculty~~ lines to teach even **50% of their courses with Full-time Faculty**, whereas the better funded CUNY Senior Colleges are allocated sufficient ~~Full-time Faculty~~ lines to teach well **over 70% of their courses with Full-time Faculty**. This disparity is particularly disturbing at a time when CUNY is **considering allocating** funds, to some degree, according to measures of ~~Senior College "performance"~~. How can colleges be fairly compared in terms of their **"performance" when they are given greatly different degrees** of resources -- especially in terms of ~~Full-time Faculty lines~~ -- with which to perform?

In fairness, it should also be noted (as I assume you already know) that CUNY Senior Colleges receive funds from the CUNY central office beyond their ~~Base Budgets which~~ lead to a "Grand Total Allocation" for each of the Senior Colleges, and that, traditionally, ~~these additional funds~~ are distributed somewhat more to colleges with relatively low Base Budgets per FTE students than to colleges with relatively high Base Budgets per FTE's. (In particular, Senior Colleges with ~~fewer Full-Time Faculty members~~ are give relatively more funds for hiring Adjunct Faculty via the ~~funds contributing to the Grand Total Allocation~~.) However, although, regrettably, I do not have ~~the~~ most current **data** regarding the Grand Total Allocations to provide you with now, I can assure you that, even in terms of **Grand Total Allocations**, the disparities in funding among CUNY Senior Colleges is nearly as great (although not quite as great) as it is in term of Base Budget Allocations. **And Grand Total Allocation additions** do absolutely **nothing** to remedy the gross disparities among Senior Colleges in ~~their~~ ratios of ~~Full-time Faculty~~ lines to FTE's.

What do I ask you to recommend in order to alleviate the gross disparities in ~~the funding of various~~ CUNY Senior Colleges? Two things. First, I hope you will recognize that ~~the primary source of this problem~~ is **not** that the relatively better ~~funded CUNY Senior Colleges are overfunded~~. Indeed, in terms of meeting the needs of their students, and being maximally productive, they are underfunded too. Rather, the primary cause of this problem is that CUNY as a whole is underfunded by the State of New York and therefore I hope you will recommend that the State substantially **augment** the overall Base Budget of CUNY ~~or~~ the purpose, amongst others, of enabling CUNY to **achieve reasonable equity amongst** its Senior Colleges **in terms of their overall funding** and, in particular, to substantially enhance the ability of the more poorly funded colleges to teach their courses with full-time faculty.

Second, I hope you will recommend to CUNY (a) that, subject to public debate, it establish a rational, objective formula for determining what percentage of the overall Senior College Base Budget each college should have to achieve reasonable resource equity amongst the Senior Colleges; (b) that, if such equity cannot be achieved simply by greater funding from the State, as full-time Senior College lines *become available* through retirements and the like, such lines should be shifted ~~from~~ the better funded colleges to the less well funded colleges to achieve equity; and (c) that funds for "other ~~than~~ personal services" also be gradually reallocated to achieve reasonable overall funding equity amongst CUNY Senior Colleges.

Thank you very much for your consideration of these ideas and recommendations.

Thomas R. Litwack, Ph. D., J. D.
Professor of Psychology
John Jay College

**1998/99 ADJUSTED BASE BUDGET
PER FALL 1998 FTE ENROLLMENT**

SENIOR COLLEGE	FALL 1998 STUDENT FTEs	1998/99 "ADJUSTED BASE BUDGET"	1998/99 \$ PER FTE
CITY	8,315	\$68,465,800	\$8,234
LEHMAN	6,061	\$41,615,800	\$6,866
BROOKLYN	10,178	\$69,602,400	\$6,839
MEDGER EVERS	3,277	\$21,828,200	\$6,661
YORK	4,074	\$24,918,300	\$6,116
QUEENS	11,128	\$67,746,100	\$6,088
STATEN ISLAND	8,491	\$46,812,100	\$5,513
HUNTER	13,460	\$72,153,400	\$5,361
BARUCH	11,244	\$55,419,300	\$4,929
NYC TECHNICAL	8,728	\$40,800,800	\$4,675
JOHN JAY	8,172	\$33,183,500	\$4,061
TOTAL	93,128	\$542,545,700	
AVERAGE	8,466	\$49,322,336	\$5,940
JJC % of AVERAGE	96.53%	67.28%	68.36%
AVG W/O W T JJC	8,496	\$50,936,220	\$6,128
JJC % OF OTHER AVG	96.19%	65.15%	66.26%

Base Budget adjusted for collective bargaining as presented in the 1999-2000 Budget Request
FTEs as reported 11/23/98 by CUNY's Office of Institutional Research and Analysis

ATTACHMENT B



JOHN JAY COLLEGE OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE

The City University of New York

445 West 59th Street, New York, N.Y. 10019

212 237-8000 / 8724

kmkjj@cunyvm.cuny.edu

The Mayor's Advisory Task Force
on The City University of New York

Public Forum

February 3, 1999

Testimony by Professor Karen Kaplowitz
President, John Jay Faculty Senate
and
Treasurer, University Faculty Senate

Dear Members of The Mayor's Advisory Task Force on The City University of New York:

I am a Professor of English at John Jay College of Criminal Justice and the President of John Jay's Faculty Senate. I am also the Treasurer of the University Faculty Senate, the governance body which represents all the faculty of The City University of New York.

The most important role this Task Force can play is to call upon our elected officials to fund CUNY adequately. New York State ranks 41st in State appropriation of tax funds for operating expenses per capita. New York State ranks 46th in operating expense support for every thousand dollars of personal income. In other words, CUNY receives less support from New York State per student than universities in virtually every other state in the nation. Even more shocking is the fact that during the past 10 years, New York State's appropriations for operating expenses for higher education have declined. New York is the only state in the United States that funds its colleges and universities less today than it did ten years ago in 1988!

One way to demonstrate the dire consequences of CUNY's inadequate funding is to look at the historic trend of budget cuts. In 1974, before tuition was imposed, CUNY had 11,268 full-time faculty. Ten years later, in 1984, CUNY had 6,867

full-time faculty. And now the number of full-time faculty has declined to only 5,211.

Although the student body did decline by approximately 21% during this time period, from a high of 252,956 in 1974 before tuition was imposed to 201,000 this year, the number of full-time faculty declined by 64%. Another way to look at the change is that in Fall 1984, the ratio of students to full-time faculty was 22 but the ratio has increased now to 39 students to each full-time faculty.

During this time period, the percent of CUNY's senior college revenue that derived from tuition has increased from 18.8% ten years ago to 39% this year.

And so although the tuition burden on CUNY's students has increased dramatically, the chances of a student being in the classroom with or being mentored by full-time faculty have decreased dramatically.

Another way to demonstrate the dire consequences of CUNY's inadequate and increasingly starvation funding is to look at a specific college: John Jay College of Criminal Justice.

John Jay College has a very clearly defined and focused mission with majors in only those areas that are related to our criminal justice and public service mission. Our majors exist at no other CUNY college and, in many cases, at no other college in New York City or in New York State.

At John Jay, we specialize in the education of the current and future public servants who help our society in its struggle for justice: social justice and criminal justice. Police chiefs, criminologists, forensic psychologists, forensic scientists, correction experts, dispute resolution specialists, and security experts all over the country have studied and graduated from John Jay. Many of these graduates live in New York State and work as public servants, contributing to a safer and more just society. Our faculty conduct research about the causes, prevention, punishment, and societal consequences of crime.

The vital role of criminal justice education that John Jay provides is attested to by John Jay's dramatic and persistent increase in enrollment. We now have 11,000 students. Over the past 10 years, John Jay's enrollment has increased by 70%. Yet the number of full-time faculty at John Jay is approximately the same as it was when the budget cuts began in 1988-89. Ten years ago our annual budget for part-time (adjunct) faculty was \$700,000. It is now \$4 million because we do not have the budget nor the lines for full-time faculty that we need to teach our courses.

As a result, only 50% of John Jay's undergraduate course sections are now taught by full-time faculty and only 45% of

all course sections -- undergraduate and graduate -- are taught by full-time faculty. Because we have a number of graduate teaching fellows, the percent of full-time taught sections is even less than the 50% figure that would otherwise pertain. Almost all accrediting agencies and councils of higher education require or recommend that 75% of course sections be taught by full-time faculty.

With regard to the writing courses offered at John Jay, only 34% of the course sections are now taught by full-time faculty, as are only 42% of the Mathematics course sections.

John Jay offers the **only** Forensic Psychology major in CUNY and one of the only such undergraduate programs in the United States and the only Master's of Forensic Psychology program in the nation. This program is very highly rated and is in great demand. It has a national reputation for excellence and yet only 26% of the Forensic Psychology course sections last semester were taught by full-time faculty because of a dearth of full-time faculty. In other words, 74% of course sections were taught by part-time faculty.

John Jay offers the **only** Forensic Science major in CUNY and this program is one of only a few such programs in the United States and yet only 45% of the Forensic Science course sections are taught by full-time faculty because of the lack of full-time faculty. Only 49% of our Law course sections and only 40% of the Sociology course sections are taught by full-time faculty despite the fact that both are central to the special mission majors offered by John Jay.

And John Jay is the **only** CUNY college to offer majors and a graduate program in fire science and yet only 20% of those courses are taught by full-time faculty: in other words, 80% of our fire science courses are taught by part-time faculty.

Of course, adjunct faculty are often excellent teachers and dedicated members of the college community but by definition they are not able to provide the continuity, the curricular development, the research and scholarship, the advisement and mentoring, and the service on college committees and task forces required of full-time faculty.

Our current and future public servants deserve better. Police officers and fire fighters who put their lives on the line every day deserve an adequately funded institution of higher education, including full-time faculty to teach and mentor them, sufficient support services, and state of the art equipment and laboratories. So, too, do our students who are studying to be public servants for the betterment of our society.

CUNY is being starved by budget cuts and yet the need and demand exist: the New York City public schools had an enrollment increase of 25,000 students last year.

Not only do such cuts sever the lifeline of public higher education for the people of our City, but such policies are short-sighted because CUNY contributes to the economy of New York State:

- * The economic contribution of CUNY to New York State's economy is nearly \$13 billion each year. This is more than 10 times the current CUNY budget.
- * CUNY graduates stay in New York and support New York's economy: ten years after graduation, 80% of CUNY alumni are still in New York. Approximately 425,000 of CUNY's 1970 to 1995 graduates live and pay taxes in New York, along with previous CUNY graduates, 201,000 current students, and 150,000 adult and continuing education students.
- * Each year, New York State and New York City derive approximately \$646 million annually more in taxes from CUNY's 1970-1995 graduates than if these taxpayers had not received a college education.
- * CUNY students spend \$810 million each year while in college and CUNY's graduates spend \$4.3 billion more in New York each year than they would have spent had they not gone to college: thus the CUNY student and alumni expenditures in New York State in 1993 alone, as an example, was \$5.1 billion.
- * A college education is an investment: the average bachelor's degree recipient earns over \$690,000 more than a high school graduate over a 40-year career.
- * Indeed, the current population survey reveals that associate degree recipients have a 30% mean annual earnings increase compared to high school graduates: baccalaureate degree recipients have a 84% increase; master's degree recipients have a 129% increase; and doctoral recipients have a 234% mean annual earnings increase.

By not providing sufficient funds to CUNY, the legislators and the Mayor and the Governor are making not fiscal policy but de facto educational policy and, as a result, the very nature and mission of this University is being threatened in a most fundamental way.

The strongest service this Task Force can provide to the City of New York and to the State of New York and to the nation is to urge that the Governor, the Mayor, and the Legislative bodies provide sufficient funding for CUNY.

On a personal note: I grew up in desperate poverty in Bedford-Stuyvesant and then in Long Island City. But I always

knew that the one ladder out of poverty for me would be CUNY and it was: I received my undergraduate education and degree from Queens College. You can make the formal recommendation that the rungs on the ladder that have been broken one by one by these unconscionable budget cuts should be and must be repaired.

Public higher education is not only a fundamental good for the people of New York who study at CUNY but for the people of the City and State of New York who benefit from CUNY. Thank you for providing a forum for this testimony.

Sincerely,

Karen Kaplowitz, Ph.D.
President, John Jay Faculty Senate
and
Treasurer, University Faculty Senate

Attachment C
THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK
1999-2000 STATE EXECUTIVE BUDGET
PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS – JANUARY 28,1999

NEW YORK STATE OVERVIEW

- Spending on Ail Funds (includes federal as well as State funds) basis increases 1.8% to \$72.7 billion in 1999-2000.
- Recommended State Fund (tax and other revenues - and the source of CUNY's budget) spending is increased by 1.8% to \$49.3 billion in 1999-2000.
- State General Fund (State tax revenues) spending is increased by 1.3% to \$37.1 billion in 1998-99.
- Projected budget surplus in 1998-99 of \$1.79 billion. The surplus is being reserved for enacted tax cuts that take effect in future years.

SENIOR COLLEGE HIGHLIGHTS

- Total appropriation of \$974.0 million, a \$5 million reduction from 1998-99. The reduction consists of a transfer to the New York City Board of Education of CUNY funds earmarked for CUNY/ Board of Education collaborative programs.
- State aid recommendation of \$558.5 million, a \$5 million reduction from the 1998-99 level.
- Tuition revenues remain at the 1998-99 level of \$383.2 million.
- The Executive Budget does not include new funding for 1999-2000 collective bargaining costs or other mandatory cost increases.
- The Executive Budget does not include funding for maintenance and other costs associated with the new building for the Graduate School and University Center.
- The City University Tuition Reimbursable Account (CUTRA), which permits revenue collections in excess of the University's revenue target to be used in subsequent years, is increased from \$5 million to \$10 million.
- The Income Fund Reimbursable (IFR) account, which funds senior college continuing education and other self-supporting programs, is increased by \$3 million to \$35 million.

Attachment C - p.2
THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK
1999-2000 STATE EXECUTIVE BUDGET
PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS – JANUARY 28,1999

SENIOR COLLEGE HIGHLIGHTS CONTINUED

- The City University Stabilization Account, which provides for the rollover of unexpended funds from the current fiscal year, is increased from \$5 million to \$10 million.
- State-wide funding for Centers for Advanced Technology (CATs) remains at the 1998-99 level of \$13 million, while an additional center has been added bringing the total number of centers to 14.

COMMUNITY COLLEGE HIGHLIGHTS

- State base aid recommendation of \$117.8 million, reflecting a slight increase over the 1998-99 level due to the recognition of a modest increase in FTEs.
- State support per FTE is maintained at \$2,050.
- Categorical programs - Child Care and College Discovery - remain at the 1998-99 level of \$1.4 million.
- Funding for contract courses, child care, and workforce development remains at \$1 million.
- Local sponsor maintenance of effort requirement is extended through 1998-99.

FINANCIAL AID HIGHLIGHTS

- The Executive Budget recommends a decrease of \$133 million for the Tuition Assistance Program to \$501.1 million.
- The maximum TAP award remains at \$4,125.
- TAP awards are being reduced from 90% to 75% of tuition. The difference between the 75% and total tuition will be reimbursed to students who graduate “on time” in the form of Achievement Incentive Dividends. The \$200 upper division reduction (currently applied automatically after the 4th semester of study) will also be reimbursed to students who graduate on time. “On time” is defined as 4 years for baccalaureate degree programs and 2 years for associate degree programs.

Attachment C - p.3
THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK
1999-2000 STATE EXECUTIVE BUDGET
PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS – JANUARY 28,1999

FINANCIAL AID HIGHLIGHTS CONTINUED

- e Student Achievement Incentive Dividend Payments would be made to students in special associate programs upon graduation after 2.5 years and after 5 years for those students in baccalaureate programs.
- e The number of credits required for full-time study is increased from 12 to 15. If a student completes only 12 of an attempted 15 credits, the student's TAP award will be reduced to 80% of the TAP award in the subsequent semester. The 15 credit requirement does not apply to students in special programs.
- e The Executive Budget recommends reducing the eligibility of associate degree participants to 4 semesters of TAP assistance from the current level of 6 semesters. For students in special programs, the limit is 5 semesters.
- e The Executive Budget recommends using the Federal adjusted gross income in place of the New York State Net Taxable Income in determining the income level used to calculate a student's TAP award.
- Aid to Part-time Study (APTS) Program is funded at the same level as 1998-99, \$14.6 million.
- e Higher Education Opportunity Program funded at \$16.4 million, same as 1999-2000 level.
- e Liberty Partnerships funded at \$11 million, same as 1999-2000 level.
- e Science and Technology Entry Program (STEP) and Collegiate Science and Technology Entry Program (CSTEP) funded at \$7.5 million, same as 1999-2000 level.
- e Scholarship for Academic Excellence funded at \$10.5 million, an increase of \$3.5 million over the 1998-99 amount. 2,000 of New York's top scholars will be eligible for annual awards of \$1,500, and 6,000 academically distinguished high school students will be eligible for annual awards of \$500 for 4 years.
- The College Choice Tuition Savings Program, initiated in September 1998, has more than 43,000 accounts established with contributions exceeding \$146 million.

At the request of Chairwoman Paolucci and Vice Chairman Badillo, the following resolution is being placed on the Calendar:

NO. 9. THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK - REMEDIATION PHASE-OUT:

RESOLVED, That all remedial course instruction shall be phased-out of all baccalaureate degree programs at the CUNY senior colleges as of the following dates: January 2000 for Baruch, Brooklyn, Queens, and Hunter Colleges; September 2000 for Lehman, John Jay, City, The College of Staten Island, and New York City Technical Colleges; and September 2001 for York and Medgar Evers Colleges. Following a college's discontinuation of remediation, no student who has not passed all three Freshman Skills Assessment Tests, and any other admissions criteria which may exist, shall be allowed to enroll and/or transfer into that college's baccalaureate degree programs. Students seeking admission to CUNY senior college baccalaureate degree programs who are in need of remediation shall be able to obtain such remediation services at a CUNY community college, at a senior college only during its summer sessions, or elsewhere as may be made available. This resolution does not apply to ESL students who received a secondary education abroad and who otherwise are not in need of remediation; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Interim Chancellor and the senior college presidents shall, after consultation with the faculty, present a detailed plan for implementation of this resolution at the respective colleges to the Board of Trustees by May 15, 1999; and be it further

RESOLVED, That this Resolution supersedes Calendar Item No. 10 adopted by the Board of Trustees on May 26, 1998.

EXPLANATION: On May 26, 1998, the Board of Trustees adopted Calendar Item No. 10 (the "1998 Remediation Resolution"), which was substantively identical to the present resolution (other than with respect to the various dates). In June 1998, plaintiffs in the case of Crain v. Reynolds filed a motion for a preliminary injunction, seeking to prevent the University from implementing the 1998 Remediation Resolution, on the ground that the May 26, 1998 Board meeting was held in violation of the State's Open Meetings Law. State Supreme Court Justice Elliott Wilk issued a decision, granting plaintiffs' motion for a preliminary injunction. Justice Wilk barred the University from taking any steps to eliminate or reduce the availability of remedial education at the senior colleges, except to the extent possible before the adoption of the 1998 Remediation Resolution. The University has appealed Justice Wilk's decision to the Appellate Division, First Department.

Justice Wilk's decision found that the Board Room at the University's Central Office is too small to convene its public meetings. The Board believes this ruling will present an unworkable obstacle to the orderly operation of University business, is uncalled for under the letter and spirit of the Open Meetings Law, and will be reversed on appeal. However, given that the Board wishes to move forward to implement this important academic policy without further undue delay, it has arranged to hold this one particular Board meeting in a special and accessible location, away from the Board headquarters, in order to preclude any claim that the size of the meeting room violates the Open Meetings Law. The Board expects and intends to return to its regular Board Room for future meetings.

ATTACHMENT E

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

CALENDAR

JANUARY 25, 1999

NO. 5. COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC AFFAIRS AND SPECIAL PROGRAMS:
RESOLVED, That the following items be approved:

**B. THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK - THE ENHANCEMENT OF
STUDENT WRITING SKILLS:**

WHEREAS, The attainment of advanced writing ability represents the hallmark of a comprehensive college education and a skill that can only be developed through extensive writing practice that is promoted across all the degree program requirements: therefore be it

RESOLVED, That henceforth each college intensify and expand its programmatic efforts to strength the teaching of writing in courses across the curriculum and that such efforts ensure that quality writing skills are fostered in all disciplinary areas and be it further

RESOLVED, That the colleges' commitment to Writing-Across-the-Curriculum requirements be supported by faculty development initiatives and by University initiatives such as the **CUNY** Writing Fellows Program that will sponsor specially trained CUNY doctoral students who will assist in the delivery of intensive writing instruction; and be it further

RESOLVED, That a report on implementation plans be provided to the [Board of Trustees] Committee on Academic Policy, Program, and Research at its May 1999 meeting, and that by September 1999, and periodically thereafter, each college provide the Chancellor's Office with a report detailing their implementation of these initiatives.

EXPLANATION: A wide range of assessments and student performance indicators has established the need to enhance the opportunities for students to strengthen their writing skills. Such opportunities are especially important for students whose native language is not English and whose writing skills require further development.

This resolution serves to ensure that writing instruction is regarded as a common responsibility and that the development of writing proficiency becomes a focus of the entire undergraduate curriculum.

JOHN JAY COLLEGE OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE

The City University of New York
100 Tenth Avenue, New York, NY 10010

Office of the Associate Provost

Memorandum

TO: All Faculty

FROM: The Academic Standards Committee

RE: Writing - Across-the-Curriculum

As you know, the College Council has established guidelines for minimum writing requirements in all courses.

100-level courses - 4 pages (1000 words) during the semester
200-level courses - 6 pages (1500 words) during the semester
300- and 400-level courses - 10 pages (2500 words) during the semester

The Academic Standards Committee strongly supports the minimal writing requirements described above and, therefore, expects all faculty to include the writing requirement in their syllabi, as well as in their courses. Faculty are encouraged to assign more than the minimum writing requirements. All assignments should be commented upon and returned to students promptly.

The Academic Standards Committee has requested that Department Chairs oversee their department's compliance with the writing - across - the - curriculum requirement.

Attachment F

Guidelines for Implementation

100-Level Courses

Written work in 100-level-course may be done in or out of class and can include, but is not limited to, any of the following forms:

- Short term papers
- Summaries of lecture: reading assignments, films, field trips
- Responses to any of the above (e.g., I agree/disagree with...)
- Journals recording observations, ideas, thoughts about course material
- Descriptions of personal experiences relevant to the course
- Traditional essay assignments
- Full sentence outlines

Assignments of the type listed above do not require grades beyond pass/fail or good/satisfactory/poor. Students who need help with grammar should be directed to the Writing Center.

200-Level Courses

In addition to the types listed above, the following are also suitable writing assignments for students in 200-level courses:

- Annotated bibliographies
- Case summaries for law courses
- Summaries and critiques of class or text material

In a 200-level course the writing assignments should count for a significant portion of a student's final grade.

300- and 400-Level Courses

While most faculty prefer the traditional term paper to fulfill this requirement, a combination of shorter assignments can frequently be more effective in fostering writing skills. If 10-page papers are assigned, due dates should be structured so that instructors can comment accordingly.

In 300- and 400-level courses, written work should account for an even more significant portion of a student's final grade.

Table 2. Total Headcount Enrollment*

	Fall 1998 Preliminary**	Fall 1997 Actual	Percentage Change
Senior Colleges			
Baruch	14,922	15,071	
Brooklyn	15,060	14,964	
City	11,650	12,083	
Hunter	20,040	19,689	
John Jay	10,860	10,834	
Lehman	9,053	9,283	
Medgar Evers	4,392	5,063	
New York City Technical	11,496	11,124	
Queens	16,195	16,381	
Staten Island	11,922	12,023	
York	5,650	6,030	
Graduate School	3,773	3,813	
Law School	377	467	
Total Senior	135,390	136,825	
Community Colleges			
Borough of Manhattan	15,891	16,141	-1.5
Bronx	7,250	7,600	-4.6
Hostos	3,710	4,177	-11.2
Kingsborough	14,932	15,218	-1.9
LaGuardia	10,900	10,925	-0.2
Queensborough	10,713	10,289	4.0
Total Community	63,396	64,360	-1.5
TOTAL UNIVERSITY	198,786	201,185	-1.2

* Includes students enrolled in Regular and Special Programs. Kingsborough includes Winter module. LaGuardia includes Fall I and Fall II semesters.

** Data reported by colleges within one week following the first day of classes.

Table 10B. First-time Freshmen - Regular*

	Fall 1998 Preliminary**	Fall 1997 Actual	Percentage Change
Senior Colleges			
Baruch	903	1,113	
Brooklyn	890	1,126	
City	665	736	
Hunter	1,501	1,563	
John Jay	1,445	1,437	
Lehman	450	524	
Medgar Evers	425	480	
New York City Technical	2,530	2,103	
Queens	1,012	1,135	
Staten Island	1,694	1,627	
York	300	398	
Total Senior	11,915	12,242	
Community Colleges			
Borough of Manhattan	2,186	2,703	-19.1
Bronx	1,050	1,016	3.3
Hostos	482	582	-17.2
Kingsborough	1,881	1,863	1.0
LaGuardia	1,700	1,844	-7.8
Queensborough	2,065	1,632	26.5
Total Community	9,364	9,640	-2.9
TOTAL UNIVERSITY	21,179	21,882	-3.2

* Kingsborough includes Winter module. LaGuardia includes Fall I and Fall II semesters.

** Reported by college within one week following the first day of classes.