

Faculty Senate Minutes #266

John Jay College of Criminal Justice

Thursday, October 7, 2004

3:15 PM

Room 630 T

Present (24): Teresa Booker, Marvie Brooks, Orlanda Brugnola, Effie Cochran, Edward Davenport, Robert DeLucia, Kirk Dombrowski, Janice Dunham, Joshua Freilich, P. J. Gibson, Heath Grant, Carol Groneman, Jennifer Jackiw, Karen Kaplowitz, Tom Litwack, Vincent Maiorino, James Malone, Evan Mandery, John Matteson, Francis Sheehan, Liliana Soto-Fernandez, Thalia Vrachopoulos, Alisse Waterston, Kathryn Wylie-Marques

Absent (12): James Cauthen, Konstantinos Georgatos, Elisabeth Gitter, Jennifer Groscup, Judith Hawkins, Kwando Kinshasa, Edward Paulino, Rick Richardson, Jodie Roure, Marilyn Rubin, Robin Whitney, Susan Will

Guests: Professors Gerald Markowitz, Jose Luis Morin, Timothy Stevens

Invited Guest: Dean for Enrollment Services Richard Saulnier

Agenda

1. Announcements from the chair
2. Approval of Minutes #265 of the September 22, 2004, meeting
3. Discussion and vote on a candidate recommended for an Honorary Degree
4. Election of members to the Faculty Senate Committees
5. Proposal that the Senate co-sponsor the March Women's History Literary Lecture
6. Election of 5 Senators to serve on the College Comprehensive Planning Committee
7. Report and discussion about a faculty hiring issue
8. Invited guest: Dean for Registration & Admissions Richard Saulnier

1. Announcements from the chair

Professor Heath Grant was introduced and welcomed as a newly elected, returning, at-large Senator: he was elected by the full-time faculty to fill a vacant seat on this year's Senate.

2. Approval of Minutes #265 of the September 22, 2004, meeting

By a motion made and carried, Minutes #265 of the September 22 meeting were approved.

3. Discussion and vote on a candidate recommended for an Honorary Degree by the Committee on Honorary Degrees: Invited Guest: Professor Gerald Markowitz, Chair

The Senate went into executive session to consider, in accordance with the procedures of John Jay and the regulations of the CUNY Board of Trustees, a recommendation by the Committee on Honorary Degrees for an individual to receive an honorary degree at the December 14 academic convocation marking the 40th anniversary of the founding of John Jay.

Professor Gerald Markowitz presented the credentials of the individual, on behalf of the Committee on Honorary Degrees, whose other members are Professors Valerie Allen, Peter DeForest, Jannette Domingo, Lotte Feinberg, Betsy Hegeman, and Jose Luis Morin. As required by the College's procedure, the members of the Committee (other than the Chair) did not know the identity of the nominator(s) nor was the Senate given this information.

By at least the requisite 75% affirmative vote of those Senators present and voting, the Senate voted to authorize the awarding of an honorary degree to:

Supreme Court Justice Ruth Bader Ginsberg.

Professor Markowitz said that although the nominator is known when she or he accompanies the recipient to the lectern at the time of the hooding ceremony, he would like to take the prerogative as Chair of the Committee to reveal now what only he and the co-nominators know: the nomination was a joint nomination by President Travis and Professor Kaplowitz. Karen Kaplowitz said that she and President Travis were enthusiastic about jointly making the nomination of Justice Ginsberg and considered the joint nomination to be an important statement about the relationship between the faculty and the President.

4. Election of members to Faculty Senate Committees

Nominations had been made at the September 22 meeting and were open for further nominations: Senator Liliana Soto-Fernandez was nominated to the Technology Committee and Senator Alisse Waterston to the Committee on Concerns of Untenured Faculty. The Senate elected the following faculty to the Senate Committees:

Technology Committee: Bonnie Nelson and Lou Guinta (Co-Chairs), Anthony Carpi, Robert Hong, Karen Kaplowitz, Kathy Killoran, Richard Lovely, Keith Markus, Peter Shenkin, Maggie Smith, Liliana Soto-Fernandez, and Carl Williams

Adjunct Faculty Issues Committee: Heath Grant (Chair), Orlanda Brugnola, Rick Richardson, Thalia Vrachopoulos, Robin Whitney

Fiscal Advisory Committee: Tom Litwack (Chair), Kirk Dombrowski, Karen Kaplowitz

Concerns of Untenured Faculty Committee: Desmond Arias (Chair), Edward Davenport, Joshua Freilich, Michelle Galietta, Betsy Gitter, Norman Groner, Ellen Sexton, Sung Ha Suh, Alisse Waterston, Patty Zapf

Security Committee: Francis Sheehan (Chair), Adrian Bordoni, Marvie Brooks, Orlanda Brugnola, P. J. Gibson, Robert Hair, Karen Kaplowitz, Rick Richardson, Thalia Vrachopoulos, Susan Will

The Senate voted to approve the proposed slates for Senate Committees.

5. Proposal that the Senate co-sponsor the March Women's History Literary Lecture by Dr. Kay Redfield Jamison

The Literary Lecture, on March 23, 2005, which culminates Women's History Month, is being co-sponsored by the Women's Studies Committee and the Department of Psychology. The Senate has been invited to also co-sponsor. The Senate voted to co-sponsor this event. The speaker, Dr. Kay Redfield Jamison, received an honorary degree from John Jay in 2002.

6. Election of 5 Senators to serve on the College Comprehensive Planning Committee

Ballots had been sent to Senators, as had been agreed to at the September 9th Senate meeting, but in the interim a ruling was issued by the CUNY Legal Office that, under *Roberts Rules*, when the electorate is the same as the membership of a body, mail ballots are not permitted. *Roberts Rules* requires balloting at the meeting of the body so that those casting ballots do so in an informed way and so that non-attendees of meetings are not afforded the same voting rights as those who attend meetings. Thus, secret ballots were distributed at the meeting to elect five from among the following seven candidates: Senators Robert DeLucia, Kirk Dombrowski, P. J. Gibson, Karen Kaplowitz, Tom Litwack, Rick Richardson, and Francis Sheehan.

Those elected to represent the Senate on the Comprehensive Planning Committee are Senators Robert DeLucia, Kirk Dombrowski, Karen Kaplowitz, Tom Litwack, and Francis Sheehan.

7. Report and discussion about a faculty hiring issue

Because rumors are already rampant and, already, like so many rumors, reflect varying

degrees of accuracy and inaccuracy and because this is an issue of governance, President Kaplowitz briefed the Senate on an impending faculty appointment with tenure and at the rank of full professor proffered by President Travis. The individual has a baccalaureate degree and does not hold tenure at another university. The offer was made to this individual even though the academic department in which the person was to be tenured had not yet voted on the candidate and some in the department are opposing the appointment; a different academic department has today decided to meet to consider the individual for a tenured position with the rank of full professor in that department. The issue came up at yesterday's meeting of the Council of Chairs; when President Travis arrived for his first meeting with the Chairs, he was asked about the situation and explained that the individual would make an outstanding addition to our faculty, calling the person a "star."

Secretary Edward Davenport asked whether an offer which had been made seemingly prematurely and without departmental approval is binding. Senator Effie Cochran said she has questions about what seems to be an irregular process.

Professors Heath Grant and Kirk Dombrowski said they are familiar with the work of this individual and stated that although he is not necessarily known outside his field, he is, indeed, a major figure in his field, and that he is, in fact, a "star" in that field. Senator P. J. Gibson said she is concerned about precedents that may be set here, even when a person may, indeed, be a "star." She asked whether this means there are two tracks toward tenure and promotion. Senator Francis Sheehan called this situation one that is likely to demoralize the current faculty.

President Kaplowitz noted that Article I. Section 10f of the Charter of the College includes the following language about the College Committee on Faculty Personnel and Budget:

Policy recommendations of the committee shall be made to the College Council for action. Recommendations and actions with respect to appointments, promotions, and other matters specified in paragraphs (1) and (2) below shall be reported to the President and shall not be considered by the Council except at the discretion of the President.

(1) The committee shall receive from the departments and other appropriate units of the College all recommendations for appointments to the instructional staff in the following ranks: Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, Instructor, Lecturer, Senior Laboratory Technician, and College Laboratory Technician. It shall also receive recommendations for promotions and reappointments with or without tenure, together with compensation, in the aforementioned ranks of the instructional staff and shall recommend to the President actions on these matters. It may also recommend to the President special salary increments. The President shall consider such recommendations in making his or her recommendations on such matters to the Board of Trustees.

But, she added, even though the Charter requires such appointments be voted on by the College Personnel Committee, this has never happened, at least not in the last 30 years or so. This is another way, she noted, that we do not abide by our Charter and, she said, we should either amend

the Charter or abide by it.

Senator Evan Mandery moved that the Senate ask President Travis to provide an explanation of his decision to make this offer and of the process that was followed and to advise us whether this action is to be a precedent for future faculty hirings.

The Senate voted to table Senator Mandery's motion because the Senate's invited guest, Dean Richard Saulnier, had just arrived to explain the College's enrollment expansion. President Kaplowitz said she is certain there will be meetings of the faculty leadership with President Travis about this situation and that she will keep the faculty informed, to the extent that confidentiality requirements permit her doing so.

8. Invited guest: Dean for Enrollment Services Richard Saulnier [Attachment A-1 – A-4 & B-1 – B-2]

Dean for Enrollment Services Richard Saulnier was welcomed. Asked about the change in his title, Dean Saulnier explained that President Travis and Vice President Witherspoon had decided that the most recent previous version of his title, Dean for Admissions, Registration, and Student Financial Services, was too unwieldy and had changed it to Dean for Enrollment Services. He distributed four pages of charts [Attachment A-1 – A-4] and explained that the "show" file had just been frozen for the University and so although some of these statistics are somewhat preliminary they should remain fairly accurate.

Reviewing the first chart [Attachment A-1], Dean Saunlier noted that enrollment is up once again and is up across the board. Enrollment was hovering around 14,000 but when the College Now students were added, the number grew to 14,104. Our strongest growth this semester was in the graduate programs, which was deliberate, and we will continue to grow the graduate programs. Our gender distribution is about the same as previous years; compared to the national data, which is 59% female, our population is slightly more female at 61%.

31% of our undergraduate students are new to John Jay this semester in that they weren't here last semester. Some stopped out and returned to us this semester. This has been a John Jay phenomenon for quite some time: students stop out and then return. Almost 60% of all our undergraduates are in four majors: the two Criminal Justice majors, Forensic Psychology, and Forensic Science. And more than 90% are *NYS* residents. The last three charts [Attachment A-2, A-3, A-4] are a history of enrollment at John Jay over the past 33 years.

Senator Effie Cochran asked the rationale for increasing enrollment this semester. She said that even though we have Westport, North Hall seems just as crowded as it had been. Dean Saulnier said that North Hall could not be as crowded because at least 15 classrooms had been removed across the grid from North Hall. He said we did not try to grow undergraduate enrollment although we did try to grow graduate enrollment. We wanted to make sure undergraduate enrollment didn't shrink and more of our students came back than in prior Fall semesters and so our Freshman class is up much more than we would have liked it to have been.

When it was asked how we could have had a target of 9,995 and yet enroll more than 14,000

it was explained that 9,995 is the number of full-time equivalent students (FTEs) but 14,000 is the number of actual individuals who enrolled.

The number of FTEs is calculated by dividing all the credits that all the enrolled students are taking by 15. Thus, a part-time student taking a single 3-credit course is not counted the same as a full-time student taking 15 credits. In other words, five students each taking a single 3-credit course equals one FTE and one student taking 15 credits equals one FTE.

This semester we had a 7.36% increase in FTEs, an increase of 740.5 FTEs compared to fall 2004. The enrollment this semester is 10,798 FTEs. In terms of the number of actual students, we have 14,104 students, which is an increase of 1,027 students and a 7.85% increase compared to fall 2004.

Dean Saulnier added that the Chancellor sets enrollment targets for the University and for each college and our target was set at 9,995 average FTEs *for the year*. Traditionally, Fall to Spring we lose about 3% of our student population and so we needed to have about 10,200 FTEs to meet our enrollment target for the year. In addition to giving us an FTE target, the Chancellor's Office establishes our revenue collection target for the year. In order to make our revenue target we have to make our average tuition collections and we have to make our FTEs for the year. So we were shooting for 10,200 to 10,300 FTEs for the Fall, with the assumption that we would go down for the Spring, because we always do. Although we are trying to make that average number established by the Chancellor's Office, that average number for the academic year is higher than the FTEs for Phase II, which is being designed for 9,995 FTEs.

President Kaplowitz asked what percent of our freshman class is baccalaureate degree students. Dean Saulnier said 46 percent. In other words, President Kaplowitz said, 54% admitted were associate degree students. Dean Saulnier said that is correct and explained that as the class was registered, the percent of baccalaureate students was about 50 percent. Each semester about 400 students are conditional baccalaureate degree students; that is, based on admissions measures such as high school average and the number of academic units completed, they look like baccalaureate degree students.

But students have to pass all three of the skills tests to be admitted to any baccalaureate program and so students are admitted through the CUNY admission process and are given the three tests in reading, writing, and mathematics. Only those who pass all three are admitted to a baccalaureate program. Students are also skills certified if they have attained certain scores on Regents exams or on SAT exams. John Jay converts about 250 of those students who are not skills certified into associate degree students because, after taking the summer Basic Skills program or after obtaining revised SAT scores, they are still not skills certified. That, therefore, changes the mix after registration is completed.

Senator Litwack explained that the corollary is also true: a number of students come in as associate degree students because even though they have passed all their skills tests, their high school averages are not high enough to qualify for our BA program. In fact, under a somewhat more flexible baccalaureate admissions standard, if we were to revise that standard, these students could be admitted to our BA program, which would improve the ratio of baccalaureate/associate students.

The admissions standards for the College, Dean Saulnier explained, is a mix of four things: first, SAT scores; second, high school average; third, the number of college academic units

completed, such as English, History, Science, Math; and fourth, a combination of the high school average and the number of academic units. Although we require a high school average of 80 for our baccalaureate program, a student who attended a high school that is academically more rigorous and who took many academic courses could be admitted to our baccalaureate program with a high school average lower than 80. Also, an extraordinarily well qualified student who hasn't taken the SAT is not permitted to be admitted to any baccalaureate program, under CUNY policy. And, indeed, we have students with a 90 high school average who, for one reason or another, did not take the SAT and are, thus, associate degree students. He added that the SAT score need not be high but the SAT must have been taken. We have 10 to 15 students who fall into this category each year.

Senator John Matteson asked for a clarification about the allocation assumptions. He said his understanding is that there is some statistical expectation of the yield that will be produced by a certain number of admitted students and that, generally, it is better for the College to err a little on the high side than on the low side and that when there is enrollment rising above anticipated levels, it is not the result of affirmative planning. Dean Saulnier said students are admitted through a phase process provided by the University; for a typical fall semester, we'll get 14 allocations of students beginning in the previous December and continuing through the spring semester, with the last phase in July or August. We know what our yield rate is from each allocation. But we never know what the *number* will be in each allocation. So if we make an assumption that the University's allocation to us is going to be the same and we calculate our yield rate, Senator Matteson's statement is exactly correct. The University admitted more students to us overall and our yield rate did predict our freshman class; the trouble is that at that point we had decided to take all the University phases and once the college is in that cycle you can't stop – it's a decision that each college must make in the October for the following fall semester.

The only way to control that is by changing admissions requirements or by having selective admissions requirements for certain degree programs: you decide which program you're going to take through the 14 phases. For example, we could decide to take all baccalaureate students, no matter how late they're admitted, and we can decide sometime in June to not take any more associate degree students. Last fall semester, we decided to take all 14 phases because of projections that we would grow slightly. More than 6,000 students were admitted to John Jay which yielded a freshman class of 2,700. Based on our prior yields per phase, our projections were fine; it's the number of total students admitted by the University that we can't project. And admissions to the University is pretty much up across the board.

President Kaplowitz said that she just received the University's data [Attachment B-1 – B-2] and few colleges experienced as great an enrollment increase as John Jay. Dean Saulnier said that it depends on how the numbers are used: Medgar Evers and Hostos are up a much greater percentage but that is because they are working off a much smaller base and so their percentage of growth is much higher than ours although their increase in the number of students is much less.

Vice President Kirk Dombrowski asked whether his memory about a decision that had been made to take fewer allocations than all 14 is accurate and whether we had indeed gone to 12 allocations and this year returned to accepting all 14. Dean Saulnier said that is accurate. Vice President Dombrowski asked how that decision was made. Dean Saulnier said it was a decision made in conjunction with spring enrollment targets. We had missed our enrollment target for the previous year: we came in slightly under our FTE target for the year because historically our enrollment from fall to spring is down 3% but last year it was down 6%. So looking at our yield from our various allocations, in order to make our target for this year, the decision was made to take

all 14 allocations. Vice President Dombrowski asked who makes that decision and was told that the decision was made by the Vice Presidents.

Senator Litwack asked how many FTEs are accommodated by Westport. Dean Saulnier said he does not know but can obtain that information. Senator Litwack said he is asking to ascertain to what extent the overcrowding of North Hall is relieved by Westport. Senator Litwack said that most faculty feel that our current enrollment is too high and one reason for feeling this way is because North Hall was a fire hazard because of how overcrowded it was. He said that, assuming no one gets hurt as a result of our high enrollment, our increased enrollment is actually a blessing in disguise because of two reasons: first, we need the extra money because our CUTRA account is low and, second, the fact that we have this high enrollment actually gives us another option for reducing our FTEs while still satisfying CUNY's demands and our own fiscal needs and that option is to raise our admissions standards. If we're taking in these many students with our current standards, we can raise admissions standards without suffering extraordinary fiscal damage, he added.

Dean Saulnier said significant enrollment planning has been going on and this partially is an interim step in the process. As we move to next year the way we go about admissions will be a lot more directive than it has been. Because the admissions cycle is an 18-month cycle, what we decide to do this year will affect not the class of Fall 2005 but rather the class of Fall 2006. The admissions recruiters are already recruiting the class of Fall 2005 and it would be a public relations nightmare for the College to change admissions requirements while recruiting is taking place. A second issue is that the demographics show that the college-age population is going to grow through 2010 and will start to level off in 2011 and 2012 and then will decline for a period of time. As we look at admissions requirements into the future, we have to keep that in mind.

Senator Groneman asked about the data showing that for a four-year period, beginning 1993, we had an annual enrollment increase of about 8% and then for the next 4-year period we had an annual decrease of 1% to 3% and then for the last four years we again had an annual increase of 6% to 10%. Why was there an increase, then a decrease, and then an increase, she asked. Dean Saulnier explained that we last raised our admissions requirements in Fall 1998: we raised our baccalaureate requirements to an 80 high school average and to a variety of combinations of college academic courses and high school average. We also changed the requirements for admission to a 72 average for the associate degree program and in doing so we ended the associate degree program as Open Admissions programs and stopped being an Open Admissions institution. We also stopped accepting students with GEDs into the baccalaureate degree program. When we did the planning for this in the Fall of 1997, the University predicted that we'd lose enrollment as a result but that the longer term effect of raising admissions requirements would be an enrollment increase and that proved true. At the same time, our College-age population has been increasing and our graduate programs have been growing. For the first time, this semester, we exceeded 1,000 FTEs in our graduate program.

Senator P. J. Gibson asked whether the enrollment increase in 2001 and in the years subsequent to 2001 are a direct result of our having raised our admissions requirements. Dean Saulnier said that when you raise your admissions criteria you present a different picture to the academic community and to the high school students and their parents who are looking at the requirements and that these groups then receive a different picture of the college than previously. We looked at the data at the time and we'll look at the data again this year based on demographics and projections. When we decided to raise our admissions requirements we knew that enrollment would go down slightly for a short period of time but the truism in enrollment is that once you

increase your admissions standards, at some point you start attracting better students and more students. And, at the same time, the high school graduation population increased. So it's a number of factors; it's over-simplistic to say that raising admission standards automatically yields more students, because if you raise standards but fewer students are available in the college-going population, that's not going to work. Or if you raise standards on the undergraduate level but can't make up the difference in the graduate level, then enrollment could decline. And so there are many different factors.

Senator Gibson asked if, in fact, raising admission requirements led to an enrollment increase, what would the rationale be for further raising admission standards if we risked excessive growth by doing so. Dean Saulnier said we can grow enrollment in a variety of ways: we can say we can eliminate our associate degree programs and we can put a lot of effort into increasing our transfer student population, for example. He explained that although this is an idea that is being discussed and although he is mentioning this idea here, it is not something he is necessarily in support of. We can also do what we've been doing the last couple of years which is to grow the graduate programs but there are trade-offs there, too because as the graduate programs grow, and as more and more full-time faculty teach in the graduate program, there are fewer and fewer full-time faculty to teach the undergraduate students and so there's an educational quality trade-off there. Enrollment involves a multitude of factors; choices have to be made about what we want to do; we have to create the predictive tables; and we have to decide whether to take the risk. In 1998 that's what we decided to do.

Senator Groneman asked about transfer students: how many are from CUNY schools and how many are from outside CUNY. Dean Saulnier said he will check but he believes it to be about 50% from each segment.

Senator Kathryn Wylie-Marques said she understands how we overenrolled this semester but doesn't understand how 54% of the admitted freshmen could be associate degree students since the College had made a commitment to have an entering class that had a maximum of 25% associate degree students. She asked whether there were too few applicants with an 80 average. Dean Saulnier explained there were slightly more than 6,000 students accepted to the College who listed John Jay as one of their three choices; the University permits a student to be allocated to up to three colleges and some of the 6,000 students list John Jay as first choice, some list us as their second choice, and some as their third choice. Indeed, John Jay could be their sixth choice in their allocation spectrum and they would be allocated to us if they didn't get admitted anywhere else or if they were admitted to only their last three choices.

Within that population of 6,000 there are probably lots of baccalaureate degree students who didn't come to John Jay for a variety of reasons. Better prepared students have more choices than lesser prepared students and when we look at our allocations from the University, we see that the first three allocations are largely baccalaureate degree students. Baccalaureate degree students traditionally apply early and are looking for early acceptance from the University. As we get later in the allocations, we're less likely to get baccalaureate applicants. There are probably things we could do to enroll more of the students who apply early: we're going to have to invest money to do those things and we are going to have to have a well orchestrated plan that involves *everybody* at the College. Yield rates can be changed but that requires effort, time, people, and money.

Senator Robert DeLucia asked if any work has been done regarding the retention rates of baccalaureate degree students compared to associate degree students. Dean Saulnier said that Gail

Hauss, Director of our Office of Institutional Research (OIR), is running a series of data about retention and graduation rates with a variety of scenarios in preparation for the discussions that are going to take place.

To indicate how complicated and how numerous the variables are, Dean Saulnier spoke about having been shocked by a student's record. He saw the record because the student is an athlete and, as the NCAA compliance officer he had to certify the student as eligible, in this case, to play women's volleyball. The student had a 74 high school average and less than a 1000 on the SATs but and yet she qualified for our baccalaureate degree program; the student had attended a high school at which she took a ton of college-prep courses, 18 or 19 such units. Based on that she was a conditional baccalaureate degree student and was skills certified in both reading and writing because of her Regents scores and then she took the CUNY math placement test which she passed.

Senator Matteson said that looking at Dean Saulnier's charts he sees something that he never would have guessed, and that is that our freshman class is bigger than our sophomore and junior classes combined. What is going on and is that a phenomenon that we are happy with, he asked. Dean Saulnier said that the number of freshmen we have this year is a bit of an aberration; it's a result of our having had two extraordinarily large freshman classes in a row. Over the last two fall semesters we've taken in 5,000 freshmen. The cut-off point for being a freshman, as we measure it, is the completion of 29.9 credits. Our students tend to take more than two semesters to move beyond their freshman class. It is a ratio that is of concern; it is out of whack. But the freshman class is always going to be bigger than the sophomore class, than the junior class, than the senior class but probably not bigger than the size of two of them combined.

President Kaplowitz said that she has downloaded the admissions requirements of every CUNY senior college and noticed that it is only John Jay's bulletin and website that list specific high school averages for admission – the 72 and 80 high school averages – whereas the other CUNY senior colleges' bulletins and websites have extremely vague language with no specified high school average listed. The other colleges state that admissions is based on a formula that involves a series of measures which are calculated when the student applies. At least one college even says that the formula may be different from year to year. She asked whether there had been any discussion about changing our published admission requirements to conform with those of the other colleges for purposes of recruitment.

For example, she said, some might not even apply to a college that has what potential students may consider to be an extremely low admissions requirement, such as 74 or 80. Or we may have some wonderfully prepared potential students who know they don't have an 80 average but, as has been explained, there are more factors than just the 80, and those students, who might very well be baccalaureate-eligible students, may not even apply. She said that our website and bulletin are really providing misleading information which might also be a disincentive to potential students and their parents. Dean Saulnier said he had not been aware of this discrepancy and that he would look at the other colleges' websites and bulletins.

President Kaplowitz said she had learned from two vice chancellors that the colleges are being required to have enrollment management committees. She added that Vice Chancellor Selma Botman is defining enrollment management very broadly: the number of students a college should have, the number of undergraduate and graduate students, retention and graduation rates; in other words, all the things we are so concerned about here. She asked if John Jay is going to have such a committee and, if so, how its membership will be chosen. Dean Saulnier said he has seen various

memos and he thinks President Travis intends to form a committee for enrollment management but that he cannot speak for the President.

President Kaplowitz said that a faculty member had told her of having already been asked to be a member of an enrollment management committee at John Jay. She asked whether that means that such a committee exists? Dean Saulnier said that this is a question better asked of President Travis. President Kaplowitz said she will do so.

Senator Litwack said that when we argue for better funding for John Jay we sometimes are told by other colleges that John Jay is not really a senior college because we have such a large proportion of associate degree students. He said we could easily change that perception without cost by no longer having more rigorous admissions criteria for our baccalaureate program than those of some of the other senior colleges. Dean Saulnier explained that what is being referred to can be seen in the fact that 54% of the entering freshman class is skills certified – that is, 54% passed all three skills placement tests – but only 46% were admitted to our baccalaureate degree students because of our other admissions requirements. He added that these students can't transfer to a baccalaureate program until they've completed 12 credits at John Jay with more than a 2.0 GPA.

Senator Cochran spoke about students angered by the fact that although they had passed the writing skills test, but not the reading skills test, they are in remedial writing courses. Dean Saulnier explained that CUNY policy is that a student must pass *both* the reading and writing skills tests before they are permitted to register for a freshman composition course, that is, for a non-remedial composition course. He said writing used to be the stumbling block but more and more it is reading that is the stumbling block for students.

In answer to a question about skills levels of transfer students, he explained that a course at one college, such as English composition, is not always the same as that course at another college. But to facilitate transfers, English 101 is treated as if it's the same at all colleges. And a variety of patterns of student academic success and academic failure do emerge over a long period of time with regard to transfers from the various colleges. He added that one of his unhappy jobs is the academic review process. Asked whether this is the committee which determines whether students are to be placed on academic probation, he said no, that students are automatically placed on academic probation by a computer, based on CUNY standards; the Academic Review Committee decides whether students should be dismissed and whether they should be placed on a restricted course load.

Senator Brugnola asked whether we know the ethnic breakdown of the 2,000 students we lose between the freshman and sophomore years. She said she is very concerned about retention issues and wants to see who is leaving. Dean Saulnier said that OIR Director Gail Hauss publishes an annual report, called the *Fact Book*, about non-returning students; the reports are on our Intranet.

Senator P. J. Gibson asked why our students can not automatically get an associate degree when they have earned a certain number of credits while en route to a baccalaureate degree. She said that this might be to our advantage and that her concern has to do with access. She said that she is known as a very hard grader and as someone who wants to teach good students and that she is not arguing for lower standards but, rather, she is concerned about access.

Dean Saulnier said that the program to try to automatically grant associate degrees has not worked. The College of Staten Island has been doing this successfully but they have a much more structured program leading to their associate degree and they are primarily an associate degree

granting college that also offers baccalaureate and masters degrees whereas we're primarily a baccalaureate granting college that also offers associate and masters degrees. He added that as the college has grown, the amount of work that the staff has to do has also increased and yet it is a staff that hasn't grown; we don't have the staff to also do such labor intensive tasks as conducting degree audits to determine who is eligible for an associate degree. That being said, President Travis has arranged for us to be involved in a new University initiative called Degree Works, which is software that provides advising, degree audits, and so forth. He said he is not going to guarantee that he has the staff to do the associate degree audits with this software but this software has more capacity to enable us to do it.

Dean Saulnier was thanked for accepting the Senate's invitation and for providing important data and information to the Senate.

By a motion made and adopted, the meeting was adjourned at 5 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Edward Davenport
Recording Secretary

&

Kirk Dombrowski
Vice President

&

Francis Sheehan
Corresponding Secretary

Fall 2004 Compared to Fall 2003

Category of Student	Fall 2003	Fall 2004	Difference	% Change
	Frozen File 10/7/2003	Frozen File 10/4/2004		
Total Show Reg Out	13077	14104	1027	7.85%
Total Freshmen	4627	5130	503	10.87%
Total Sophomores	2679	2691	12	0.45%
Total Juniors	2076	2284	208	10.02%
Total Seniors	1877	1880	3	0.16%
Under Grad Second Degrees	73	94	21	28.77%
Total Undergraduate Degree	11332	12079	747	6.59%
Undergrad Non-degree	189	185	-4	-2.12%
Permits In	27	8	-19	-70.37%
Total Undergraduate	11548	12272	724	6.27%
Total Degree Grad	1428	1578	150	10.50%
Total Non-Degree Grad	101	254	153	151.49%
Total Graduates	1529	1832	303	19.82%
Total all Students	13077	14104	1027	7.85%
Entering Freshmen	2305	2707	402	17.44%
Part-time Undergraduate	3082	3199	117	3.80%
Full-time Undergraduate	8466	9073	607	7.17%
Part-time Graduate	1179	1432	253	21.46%
Full-time Graduate	350	400	50	14.29%
Total FTE's	10057.6	10798.1	740.5	7.36%
Graduate FTE	912.3	1084.8	172.5	18.91%
Gender	% Female	% Male		
Total Student Population	60.70%	39.30%		
Undergraduate	60.57%	39.43%		
Graduate	61.60%	38.40%		
Undergraduate Matriculated	#	%		
Baccalaureate	8822	73.50%		
Associate	3180	26.50%		
Total	12002	100.00%		
Total Matriculated	Total	%		
Undergraduate	12002	87.1%		
Graduate	1776	12.89%		
Total Matriculated	13778	100.00%		

TABLE
FALL ENROLLMENT TRENDS 1971 - 2004

TOTAL ENROLLMENT

<u>Semester</u>	<u>Full-time</u>	<u>Part-time</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Credits</u>	<u>F.T.E.</u>	<u>F.T.E.</u> <u>Change</u>
Fall 1971	2346	3208	5554	52308	3540.6	
Fall 1972	3948	3711	7659	74787	5046.9	42.54%
Fall 1973	3888	5951	9839	90545	6109.3	21.05%
Fall 1974	4930	4799	9729	101427	6872.7	12.49%
Fall 1975	5953	3859	9812	106078	7169.4	4.32%
Fall 1976	4496	2733	7229	80469	5446.0	-24.04%
Fall 1977	4643	2394	7037	79159	5354.9	-1.67%
Fall 1978	4445	2334	6779	75039	5076.3	-5.20%
Fall 1979	4304	2090	6394	72209	4886.0	-3.75%
Fall 1980	3995	2177	6172	68504	4625.6	-5.33%
Fall 1981	3828	2102	5930	66211	4465.1	-3.47%
Fall 1982	3582	2299	5881	63954	4315.8	-3.34%
Fall 1983	3900	2469	6369	69093	4658.6	7.94%
Fall 1984	3921	2597	6518	70229	4735.0	1.64%
Fall 1985	3846	2491	6337	68762	4630.8	-2.20%
Fall 1986	3801	2878	6679	70279	4728.6	2.11%
Fall 1987	4014	2830	6844	71569	4818.9	1.91%
Fall 1988	4110	3202	7312	75342	5073.5	5.28%
Fall 1989	4261	3866	8127	79810	5372.4	5.89%
Fall 1990	4731	3941	8672	87214	5871.6	9.29%
Fall 1991	5010	3512	8522	88866	5990.6	2.03%
Fall 1992	5318	3286	8604	91252	6153.7	2.72%
Fall 1993	5948	3050	8998	98378	6628.1	7.71%
Fall 1994	6365	3234	9599	105391	7107.7	7.24%
Fall 1995	6991	3039	10030	113774	7667.5	7.88%
Fall 1996	7607	3117	10724	122116	8242.3	7.50%
Fall 1997	7573	3274	10847	122909	8304.1	0.75%
Fall 1998	7306	3522	10828	120615	8170.3	-1.61%
Fall 1999	7147	3314	10461	118615	8041.7	-1.57%
Fall 2000	6857	3755	10612	116859	7911.7	-1.62%
Fall 2001	7331	4184	11515	126257	8540.7	7.95%
Fall 2002	8189	4261	12450	139441	9451.0	10.66%
Fall 2003	8815	4181	12996	148127	10057.6	6.42%
Fall 2004	9473	4631	14104	158717	10798.1	7.36%

TABLE
FALL ENROLLMENT TRENDS 1971 - 2004

UNDERGRADUATE ENROLLMENT

<u>Semester</u>	<u>Full-time</u>	<u>Part-time</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Credits</u>	<u>F.T.E.</u>	<u>F.T.E. Change</u>
Fall 1971	2315	2431	4746	49104	3273.6	
Fall 1972	3925	2772	6697	71124	4741.6	44.84%
Fall 1973	3862	4784	8646	86165	5744.3	21.15%
Fall 1974	4862	3716	8578	94776	6318.4	9.99%
Fall 1975	5865	2931	8796	100224	6681.6	5.75%
Fall 1976	4403	1987	6390	75587	5039.1	-24.58%
Fall 1977	4557	1679	6236	74499	4966.6	-1.44%
Fall 1978	4311	1676	5987	70615	4707.7	-5.21%
Fall 1979	4176	1458	5634	67883	4525.5	-3.87%
Fall 1980	3904	1629	5533	64982	4332.1	-4.27%
Fall 1981	3752	1634	5386	63148	4209.9	-2.82%
Fall 1982	3506	1855	5361	60822	4054.8	-3.68%
Fall 1983	3829	2035	5864	65952	4396.8	8.43%
Fall 1984	3867	2108	5975	67046	4469.7	1.66%
Fall 1985	3799	2059	5858	65960	4397.3	-1.62%
Fall 1986	3748	2486	6234	67678	4511.9	2.60%
Fall 1987	3967	2372	6339	68712	4580.8	1.53%
Fall 1988	4062	2708	6770	72302	4820.1	5.22%
Fall 1989	4215	3346	7561	76708	5113.9	6.09%
Fall 1990	4679	3388	8067	83774	5584.9	9.21%
Fall 1991	4926	2942	7868	84896	5659.7	1.34%
Fall 1992	5232	2686	7918	87038	5802.5	2.52%
Fall 1993	5868	2430	8298	94207	6280.5	8.24%
Fall 1994	6250	2584	8834	100494	6699.6	6.67%
Fall 1995	6863	2406	9269	108821	7254.7	8.29%
Fall 1996	7445	2345	9790	116040	7736.0	6.63%
Fall 1997	7415	2412	9827	116299	7753.3	0.22%
Fall 1998	7054	2649	9703	112859	7523.9	-2.96%
Fall 1999	6892	2426	9318	110572	7371.5	-2.03%
Fall 2000	6617	2942	9559	109596	7306.4	-0.88%
Fall 2001	7095	3372	10467	118842	7922.8	8.44%
Fall 2002	7874	3289	11163	130147	8676.5	9.51%
Fall 2003	8465	3006	11471	137179	9145.3	5.40%
Fall 2004	9073	3199	12272	145699	9713.3	6.21%

ATTACHMENT A-4
TABLE
FALL ENROLLMENT TRENDS 1971 - 2004

GRADUATE ENROLLMENT

<u>Semester</u>	<u>Full-time</u>	<u>Part-time</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Credits</u>	<u>F.T.E.</u>	<u>F.T.E. Change</u>
Fall 1971	31	777	808	3204	267.0	
Fall 1972	23	939	962	3663	305.3	14.33%
Fall 1973	26	1167	1193	4380	365.0	19.57%
Fall 1974	68	1083	1151	6651	554.3	51.85%
Fall 1975	88	928	1016	5854	487.8	-11.98%
Fall 1976	93	746	839	4882	406.8	-16.60%
Fall 1977	86	715	801	4660	388.3	-4.55%
Fall 1978	134	658	792	4424	368.7	-5.06%
Fall 1979	128	632	760	4326	360.5	-2.22%
Fall 1980	91	548	639	3522	293.5	-18.59%
Fall 1981	76	468	544	3063	255.3	-13.03%
Fall 1982	76	444	520	3132	261.0	2.25%
Fall 1983	71	434	505	3141	261.8	0.29%
Fall 1984	54	489	543	3183	265.3	1.34%
Fall 1985	47	432	479	2802	233.5	-11.97%
Fall 1986	53	392	445	2601	216.8	-7.17%
Fall 1987	47	458	505	2857	238.1	9.84%
Fall 1988	48	494	542	3040	253.3	6.41%
Fall 1989	46	520	566	3102	258.5	2.04%
Fall 1990	52	553	605	3440	286.7	10.90%
Fall 1991	84	570	654	3970	330.8	15.41%
Fall 1992	86	600	686	4214	351.2	6.15%
Fall 1993	80	620	700	4171	347.6	-1.02%
Fall 1994	115	650	765	4897	408.1	17.41%
Fall 1995	128	633	761	4953	412.8	1.14%
Fall 1996	162	772	934	6076	506.3	22.67%
Fall 1997	158	862	1020	6610	550.8	8.79%
Fall 1998	252	873	1125	7756	646.3	17.34%
Fall 1999	255	888	1143	8043	670.3	3.70%
Fall 2000	240	813	1053	7263	605.3	-9.70%
Fall 2001	236	812	1048	7415	617.9	2.09%
Fall 2002	315	972	1287	9294	774.5	25.34%
Fall 2003	350	1175	1525	10948	912.3	17.80%
Fall 2004	400	1432	1832	13018	1084.8	18.91%

Table 7. Total Full-time Equivalent (FTE) Student Enrollment*

	2004 Preliminary**	2003 Actual	Percentage Change
Senior Colleges			
Baruch	12,318	11,753	4.8
Brooklyn	10,802	10,768	0.3
City	8,294	8,513	-2.6
Hunter	14,707	14,348	2.5
John Jay	11,070	10,064	10.0
Lehman	7,158	6,461	10.8
Medgar Evers	3,667	3,159	16.1
New York City College of Technology	8,869	8,554	3.7
Queens	12,198	11,809	3.3
Staten Island	9,595	9,033	6.2
York	4,273	4,105	4.1
Graduate School	3,217	3,176	1.3
Law School	551	595	-7.4
Total Senior	106,719	102,338	4.3
Community Colleges			
Borough of Manhattan	13,314	13,411	-0.7
Bronx	6,198	5,860	5.8
Hostos	3,425	3,092	10.8
Kingsborough	11,163	10,474	6.6
LaGuardia	10,252	9,772	4.9
Queensborough	8,118	7,912	2.6
Total Community	52,470	50,521	3.9
TOTAL UNIVERSITY	159,189	152,859	4.1

* Includes students enrolled in Regular and Special Programs. Kingsborough includes Winter module. LaGuardia includes Fall I and Fall II semesters. Full-time graduate students are enrolled for 12 or more credits.

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



**The City University of New York
Preliminary Total Headcount Enrollment***

	Enrollment		Fall 2004 Percent ^{***}	Fall 2003 Actual	Fall 2004 Actual	Percentage Change: Fall 2004 Preliminary Compared With Fall 2003 Actual
	Fall 2004 Percent ^{***}	Fall 2003 Actual				
Senior Colleges** *						
Baruch	15,569	15,163				2.7
Brooklyn	15,703	15,546				1.0
City	12,231	12,522				-2.3
Hunter	20,324	20,856				-2.6
John Jay	14,253	13,026				9.4
Lehman	10,525	9,729				8.2
Medgar Evers	5,306	4,722				12.4
New York City College of Technology	11,801	11,380				3.7
Queens	17,150	16,999				0.9
Staten Island	12,894	12,422				3.8
York	5,948	5,815				2.3
Total Senior	141,704	138,180				2.6
Community Colleges						
Borough of Manhattan	18,632	18,341				1.6
Bronx	8,369	7,937				5.4
Hostos	4,220	3,705				13.9
Kingsborough	15,506	14,910				4.0
LaGuardia	13,576	12,731				6.6
Queensborough	12,388	12,321				0.5
Total Community	72,691	69,945				3.9
Graduate/Law School						
Graduate School	4,182	4,108				1.8
Law School	446	478				-6.7
Total Graduate/Law School	4,628	4,586				0.9
TOTAL UNIVERSITY	219,023	212,711				3.0

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

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

*** Prerequisite to Success headcounts are here reported in the senior colleges only. Prerequisite to Success FTEs continue to be reported in the community colleges.