

Faculty Senate Minutes #283

John Jay College of Criminal Justice

Tuesday, October 19, 2005

3:15 PM

Room 630 T

Present (27): Teresa Booker, Danette Brickman, Marvie Brooks, Orlanda Brugnola, James Cauthen, Edward Davenport, Robert DeLucia, Virginia Diaz, Janice Dunham, P. J. Gibson, Amy Green, Yi He, Ann Huse, Ping Ji, Karen Kaplowitz, Tom Litwack, Roderick MacGregor, James Malone, Dagoberto Orrantia, Nicholas Petraco, Valli Rajah, Rick Richardson, Raul Romero, Francis Sheehan, Shonna Trinch, Thalia Vrachopoulos, Susan Will

Absent (10): Francisco Chapman-Veloz, Roddrick Colvin, Greg Donaldson, DeeDee Falkenbach, Robert Fox, Betsy Hegeman, Evan Mandery, Mary Ann McClure, Edward Paulino, Robin Whitney

Guest: Professor Ned Benton

Invited Guest: President Jeremy Travis

Agenda

1. Announcements from the chair
2. Approval of Minutes #282 of the September 27, 2005, meeting
3. Update on the distribution of grant overhead recovery monies
4. Update on budget issues, including JJ's Financial Plan, the Chancellor's Compact, and the Graduate Investment Program: Senators Litwack, Sheehan, Kaplowitz, Prof. Benton
5. Invited guest: President Jeremy Travis
6. Proposal to endorse a Council of Chairs Resolution on the need for more full-time faculty
7. Consideration of John Jay's Draft Plan for the Chancellor's Proposed Budget Compact

1. Announcements from the chair

The results of the run-off election for two faculty at-large seats on the College P&B Committee have been transmitted by the Committee on Faculty Elections: Professors Janice Bockmeyer (Government) and Karen Terry (Law, Police Science, CJ Adm) were elected. Professor James Malone (Counseling & Student Life) had already been elected on the first ballot in May.

Faculty Senate Minutes #283 – October 19,2005 – Page 2

The election results for the two student members on the College P&B were also announced: Simon Lee and Fatima Burton, who were the only students nominated by the Student Council, received the majority of the votes of the College Council members present and voting.

The University Faculty Senate fall conference is Friday, November 11, at John Jay. Roger Bowen, General Secretary of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), will speak on “What Institutional Autonomy? Why Academic Freedom Is Imperiled and What to Do About It.” Break-out sessions will be held on: Student Bill of Rights/Academic Bill of Rights; Solomon Amendment; Privacy Policy; Political Appointees in the University; and Academic Freedom on Campus. Plus data from the University Faculty Senate’s Faculty Experience Survey pertaining to autonomy and academic freedom will be presented. All faculty are invited.

2. Approval of Minutes #282 of the September 27,2005, meeting

By a motion made and carried, Minutes #282 of the September 27 meeting were adopted.

3. Update on the distribution of grant overhead recovery monies

President Kaplowitz reported that there has been, in her opinion, and in the opinion of Senator Tom Litwack, a satisfactory resolution of the issue of the distribution of grant overhead recovery monies [see Faculty Senate Minutes #282]. Dean James Levine has responded to the objections raised by the Senate and by others and to the information provided to him that the 1/3, 1/3, 1/6, 1/6 allocation formula – 1/3 to the President, 1/3 to the Provost, 1/6 to the Principal Investigator (PI), and 1/6 to the department of the PI – had been decided 15 years ago by vote of the Budget Committee of the College P&B and not, as he had thought, by an administrator making a unilateral decision. Because of this information and because of objections to the administration’s proposed elimination of the PI’s share and the department’s share, Dean Levine then consulted with various people and made a recommendation to President Travis, which President Travis has accepted, which is that 1/6 of indirect recovery monies will continue to be allocated to the PI and 1/6 will continue to be allocated to the PI’s department.

To enable the 1/6 to the PI and the 1/6 share to the department to continue and yet provide funds to support research, President Travis has decided to reduce his share from 33% under the existing formula to 15%, and the Provost has decided to reduce his share from 33% to 7.5%. That leaves 43.8% to be used by the Office for the Advancement of Research for two purposes: 1) to pay the costs of the Office of Sponsored Programs (which, except for Jacob Marini’s salary, are paid for out of Research Foundation funds); 2) to fund a program to encourage and facilitate research, to be worked out in consultation with the Research Advisory Committee.

Dean Levine also reported that he has learned that the original formula was developed apparently with the understanding that the monies allocated to PIs and to their chairpersons were to be spent in ways that were at least indirectly related to research and he has written to President Kaplowitz to say he plans to work with the Research Advisory Committee to develop clarification about this.

President Kaplowitz commended this resolution. Senator Tom Litwack, who proposed the original 1/3, 1/3, 1/6, 1/6 formula as a member of the College Budget Committee in 1990, also commended it and said in his opinion this resolution does not need not be referred to the College Budget Committee because it really involves no change. The Senate's Resolution, adopted on September 27, was as follows:

It is the position of the Faculty Senate, as it is of the Council of Chairs, that the formula for allocating grant overhead recovery monies was established by the College Budget Committee, an official body of the College, in 1990 and remains in effect until such time as the formula may be revised by an affirmative vote of the College Budget Committee, at a meeting to which the leadership of the Faculty Senate is invited.

The original formula provided for 1/3 of the overhead recovery monies to be allocated to the President and 1/3 to be allocated to the Provost for each to spend as he or she decided was appropriate and under this new allocation both have decided to spend a specific portion of what would have been their share to support research in a systematic way. The President and the Provost have simply agreed to reallocate their funds to the Office for the Advancement of Research and, thus, the formula devised in 1990 remains intact.

The Senate agreed and praised the way this issue has been resolved.

4. Update on budget issues, including John Jay's Financial Plan, the Chancellor's Compact, and the Graduate Investment Program: Senators Litwack, Sheehan, Kaplowitz, Professor Benton [Attachment A, B, C, D, E, F]

President Kaplowitz distributed a chart [Attachment A] which she constructed for the budget meetings attended by President Travis and other senior administrators and faculty leaders which have been taking place during the past several weeks and which continue to take place. Using CUNY Fall 2005 enrollment data and Spring 2005 data about the number of full-time faculty at each senior college, this chart shows the potential teaching power of full-time faculty at the senior CUNY colleges.

The first column lists the senior colleges; the second column shows the number of full-time equivalent students (FTEs) at each college this semester; the third column gives the number of full-time faculty (including subs) during the Spring 2005 semester, which is the most recent data from the University; the fourth column gives the number of full-time faculty excluding counseling and library faculty; the fifth column is the number of student FTEs divided by the total number of full-time faculty; the sixth column is the number of student FTEs divided by the number of faculty excluding counseling and library faculty.

The chart shows that in the Spring semester, John Jay, which is outlined by a text box, had 318 full-time faculty (including subs) and has 11,219 full-time equivalent (FTE) students this semester. And, thus, at John Jay we have 35.2 FTEs per each full-time faculty or 38.1 FTEs if we exclude counselors and librarians from the calculation. If, for example, we look at Brooklyn College, because it has the closest number of full-time equivalent (FTE) students as John Jay – 10,934 FTEs, which is actually 285 fewer FTEs than John Jay – we see that despite having almost as

many student FTEs as John Jay Brooklyn has 491 full-time faculty, which is 173 more than John Jay. Brooklyn's ratio is 22.2 FTEs per each full-time faculty compared to John Jay's 35.2 FTEs per full-time faculty.

Another way of looking at this is to look at Lehman College because it has almost the same number of full-time faculty as John Jay: John Jay has 318 full-time faculty and Lehman has 314 and yet Lehman has 7,321 FTEs, which is 3,898 *fewer* FTE students than John Jay. No college is as disadvantaged as John Jay in terms of the number of full-time faculty per FTE student. And CCNY is the most advantaged. John Jay's ratio is double that of CCNY: the ratio at CCNY is 18.6 compared to 35.2 at John Jay. These data are important for our discussions today about various budget documents that the Senate will be reviewing and the data are also important for the discussion the Senate will engage in with President Travis later in our meeting.

President Kaplowitz next referred to two charts [Attachment B-1 & B-2] from John Jay's *Fact Book*, which is on our Intranet and which is prepared by the College's Office of Institutional Research (OIR). These show the Fall 2004 and Fall 2003 profile by undergraduate department, showing the percentage of course hours taught by full-time faculty by department during each of those semesters, and in each case the percentage of course hours taught by full-time faculty declined, in some cases dramatically from already very low levels. Some examples are:

	Fall 2004	Fall 2003
English	35%	40%
Government	38%	54%
Law & PS	42%	46%
Psychology	29%	41%
Science	34%	38%
Sociology	34%	40%

Senator Litwack distributed two additional OIR charts [Attachment C-1 & C-2], also from John Jay's *Fact Book*, which shows the percentage of course sections taught by full-time faculty in Fall 2004 and Fall 2003. (N.B. The charts in B-1 & B-2 show the percentage of course hours taught by full-time faculty; these charts show the percentage of course sections.) In Fall 2003, 43% of undergraduate course sections were taught by full-time faculty but in Fall 2004 the percent had dropped to 40%. As for the graduate sections, in Fall 2003, 63% of the sections were full-time taught but that dropped to 58% in Fall 2004. We don't have the data for Fall 2005, despite our numerous requests, he explained, but we expect the data will show an even greater decline in full-time taught sections this semester.

President Kaplowitz noted that the CUNY Master Plan goal is that at least 70% of all course sections should be taught by full-time faculty. Overall, in Fall 2004, as Senator Litwack has shown, we taught only 40% of our undergraduate course sections with full-time faculty. This emphasis on full-time taught sections is not meant to in any way denigrate adjuncts or minimize the crucially important work of our adjunct colleagues. It is for the benefit of all of us, including adjunct faculty, that we have sufficient numbers of full-time faculty, she said.

In addition to these charts, President Kaplowitz described and reviewed four budget documents [Attachment D, E, F].

Faculty Senate Minutes #283 – October 19, 2005 – Page 5

She explained that the State gave CUNY its budget in June and then in August the University gave each college its budget allocation for the current academic year. Each college has to decide how it will spend its allocation this year and has to codify its plan in a document called the Financial Plan. Each college's Financial Plan was due at 80th Street this past Friday, October 14 [Attachment D].

The faculty leadership – Tom Litwack, Francis Sheehan, Ned Benton and Karen Kaplowitz – have had a series of budget meetings with President Travis and other senior administrators about John Jay's Financial Plan, that is, about how the College will spend its budget allocation this year. At the last Senate meeting, on September 27, the faculty reported that at the budget meetings that had taken place thus far, it had not been clear how many additional administrative positions had been added since President Travis became President and how many more would be added this year. (The numbers depended on the budget document.) At a budget meeting the day after the September 27 Senate meeting the numbers were reconciled and it was determined that the administration's draft Financial Plan provided for a total of 30 additional, new administrative positions during the last and current year, but only 5 new faculty positions during the same time period.

It is important to keep in mind, President Kaplowitz said, that last year President Travis did decide to convert our 45 full-time substitute faculty positions into tenure-track positions at a rate of 15 positions each year over a three-year period. But the total number of faculty, the total number of faculty bodies, would not change; in other words, there would be no net gain in the number of full-time faculty. And, in fact, the previous year, we had 321 full-time faculty, including subs, but this year we have only 318, and so the number of full-time faculty has actually declined since President Travis arrived and this is despite the fact that enrollment has increased. (More faculty resigned, retired, and left for other reasons than the number of faculty who were hired.) And so last year 15 lines were converted to tenure-track positions, which are the lines being searched for now, and 15 more will be converted to tenure-track positions this year, and 15 more next year.

This year's *draft* Financial Plan [see Attachment A of Minutes #282], which the faculty reported about at the last meeting, called for 5 additional full-time faculty in addition to the sub conversions agreed to last year. The faculty leadership had thought that these 5 additional faculty positions were to be tenure track. At the last Senate meeting, the faculty leadership was authorized by the Senate to speak for the Senate at the budget meetings. The faculty leadership conferred and conveyed the united proposal that instead of only 5 additional faculty positions there should be 10 additional tenure-track positions as well as 5 additional substitute faculty positions in this year's Financial Plan. But at the subsequent budget meeting, the faculty learned that the five additional faculty in the Financial Plan were to be substitute lines, not tenure-track, and that this had always been the administration's plan. Furthermore, the faculty's proposal to revise the draft Financial Plan to include the hiring of 10 additional tenure-track faculty and 5 additional substitute faculty was rejected by the College administration.

On the other hand, as a result of these subsequent budget consultations, the draft Financial Plan was, in fact, revised by the administration to provide for 26 – instead of 30 – new administrative positions since President Travis became president through the end of this year. The draft Plan was further revised so that the 5 additional full-time faculty subs will be hired in the Spring of 2006 and also 5 more full-time subs will be hired in Fall 2006, and 4 more full-time subs will be hired in Fall 2007, with the timetable for converting the substitute positions to tenure-track positions to be determined through further consultation. In other words, the Financial Plan that was sent to 80th Street [Attachment D] provides for 14 additional substitute faculty positions over the

next three years, all to be converted to tenure-track positions according to a timetable to be determined.

President Kaplowitz explained that President Travis considers substitute faculty to be preferable to tenure-track faculty because the College can obtain more teaching power from subs for two reasons: substitute faculty are contractually required to teach 4 sections each semester rather than the 7 sections required each academic year of tenure-track faculty and because subs don't receive 12 credits of released time for research during their first three years, as the current contract requires. She suggested we talk with President Travis about the differences between tenure-track faculty and substitute faculty. She noted that substitute faculty know that they can teach a maximum of only four semesters as a sub during their entire career at CUNY. Also, substitute faculty are not permitted by CUNY to serve on any official department or college committees and so they can not share the governance responsibilities of the faculty.

Senator Tom Litwack added that the Financial Plan would lead next year and each subsequent year to a *decrease* in the percentage of tenure-track faculty at the College, which is already so low, because built into the Financial Plan is an *increase* in student enrollment each year. He noted that this will happen even though in recent his testimony before the NYS Assembly and Senate Joint Committee on Higher Education President Travis decried the lack of full-time faculty at John Jay.

Senator Litwack distributed a chart which he compiled, which shows the direction of our FTE enrollment: this is the actual and projected enrollment from FY2004 through FY2008 and it shows a large yearly enrollment increase, with a large increase overall during that 5-year period.

President Kaplowitz also reported that at the budget meetings the faculty urged that the conversion of the substitute lines to tenure-track positions take place after one year and not after two years as the administration proposed and President Travis said he would consider that proposal. She noted that another problem is that substitute faculty lines can be done away with if there's a budget problem; indeed, in 2000 when John Jay had a budget problem, 19 substitute faculty lines were wiped out. Sub lines are temporary positions in every sense of the word. A person can be appointed a sub for one semester only and has to be reappointed for the next semester and can be reappointed for a maximum of 4 semesters. Others can be put on those substitute lines and that is how sub lines can remain sub lines for so long. But it is not the purpose of sub lines to be a less expensive way of providing students with full-time faculty; the purpose of sub lines is to fill lines in a temporary manner while searches take place for faculty to be hired on the tenure-track. She added that the Financial Plan explains that the reason for hiring additional substitute faculty is because we are increasing enrollment and that the additional sub faculty is so that there is no further slippage in the ratio of full-time faculty to student FTEs, that is, their purpose is to maintain the current ratio not to improve it.

Senator James Malone asked if he is correct that the decision to add 26 administrative positions and only five substitute faculty positions over the period of President Travis' first two years is a John Jay decision rather than a CUNY decision. President Kaplowitz concurred that both the hiring decisions and the enrollment increase decisions are internal decisions rather than decisions imposed by CUNY. Senator Litwack said these are decisions made by President Travis, not by the faculty. Senator Litwack added that many times in the past CUNY has stated its extreme displeasure with our internal decisions. Senator Malone said that is the point and the distinction he was making.

Senator James Cauthen asked whether the bottom line is that to get the faculty lines that we

need we have to reduce the number of administrative positions being added. Senator Litwack replied that the reason John Jay is so under-facultied is because of CUNY, because CUNY underfunds us. But he said we are not only under-facultied but we are also understaffed. It is not that John Jay is over-administered, at least according to the CUNY average. Just as there is a need for additional faculty at John Jay, there is a need for additional administrators at John Jay, in general, just in terms of the numbers. But, he said, the faculty have argued to President Travis that it is a matter of *balance*, that it is not that the additional administrative positions President Travis has added or wants to add are not useful or important but rather that the number one job of the College is to teach our students and that when we are as under-full-time-facultied as we are, the *balance* in the Financial Plan is off and there has to be a *better balance*. He said in his mind the balance provided by the Financial Plan remains way off.

Senator Litwack said that his position is that President Travis should not add administrative positions until and unless Chancellor Goldstein's proposed Compact is funded because if the Compact is not funded we will be in an unacceptable situation regarding the number of full-time faculty we have – whether it's subs or tenure-track – relative to the number of students we have. He said he knows how terribly depressing it is for his department – Psychology – when it can not hire tenure-track faculty. He said his department loves its subs but subs are not the same as tenure-track faculty for many, many, many reasons. He added that his department attracts faculty nationally and it is not possible to attract nationally competitive faculty with sub lines.

President Kaplowitz turned to a second budget document [Attachment E] which involves a different budget process, explaining that all the budget documents and processes being reviewed today are inter-related. This second document and process result from Chancellor Goldstein's decision to ask Albany to approve and fund what he calls a "Compact" between the State, the City, the University, and the students, whereby the CUNY Master Plan would be funded with an additional \$50 million a year for the next four years, that is, with \$200 million additional dollars. The Compact proposal calls for the State to fund all of CUNY's mandatory costs, such as energy and fringe benefits, plus 20% of new programmatic costs and, in turn, the University would fund the rest of those new programmatic costs through philanthropy, through productivity savings, through increased enrollment, and through tuition increases. The proposal provides that the monies generated from increased tuition would be returned to the colleges for programmatic improvements, most especially to hire additional faculty. CUNY has given each college its allocation for next year if the full proposal were to be approved and implemented: John Jay's share would be an additional \$2.4 million next year [Attachment E].

Each college is required to consult with elected faculty and students leaders and to transmit its plan, its commitment, as to how it would expend its share. Each college is required to transmit its expenditure plan to 80th Street by October 26 and these plans will be included in the Budget Request that the Board of Trustees will vote on in November and which will be sent to Albany in December. On today's agenda is a discussion about the draft John Jay plan for expending the additional \$2.4 million next year were we to receive our full share [Attachment F].

[Please Note: Attachment F is the Compact Expenditure Plan that was *submitted* to 80th Street on October 26, *not* the draft document considered by the Senate at this meeting. The draft Plan was revised by the College administration in accordance with the recommendations of the Faculty Senate. See agenda item #7.]

The determination of the amount of money each college would get to hire additional faculty

was made by using the new Senior College Allocation Model, which means that John Jay would receive more money for new faculty than it would have received were the current allocation method used, that is, the allocation method that has always been used. Of the \$2.4 million, \$1.8 million is to be spent for the “Flagship Environment” and \$600,000 is for student services, and smaller amounts for other programmatic categories. President Kaplowitz explained that the CUNY 2004-2008 Master Plan defines the “Flagship Environment” as the CUNY goal of at least 70% course sections taught by full-time faculty.

Provost Basil Wilson prepared a draft of how the \$1.8 million for academic expenditures would be spent and Interim Vice President for Student Development and Enrollment Management Richard Saulnier prepared a draft of how the \$600k would be spent [Attachment F]. Consultation on this draft with elected faculty and students is being required by the Chancellery as stated in the transmission letter to the college presidents. Accordingly, there will be another budget meeting between President Travis and other senior administrators and the faculty leadership: Tom Litwack, Francis Sheehan, Ned Benton, Harold Sullivan, and Karen Kaplowitz. This meeting is in two days, on Friday, October 21, at 4 pm, at which time the faculty leadership is to report the faculty’s response to the draft document, as they can best determine that response. Then there will be a public meeting on the entire John Jay and CUNY budget on Monday, October 24, at 3:15, in the theater lobby, to which the entire College community is being invited. Then the John Jay part of the Compact expenditure plan will be sent to 80th Street on October 26.

If the Chancellor’s Compact were to be approved by the Legislature and the Governor, John Jay would be able to hire more full-time faculty and this is one reason President Travis may think it is not necessary to hire more than 5 additional sub faculty this year. President Kaplowitz noted that the chances for the Compact to be approved and fully funded are, of course, not at all certain.

Senator Litwack said that if the Chancellor’s Compact Plan is approved and funded by the Legislature, John Jay would certainly be able to hire more full-time tenure-track faculty but, he said, the Plan is not as favorable to John Jay as it should be. All in all we would get our FTE share of faculty but not more, although, he acknowledged, our FTE share is more than we usually get from CUNY. As for the consultative process, he asked Senators to email Karen, Francis, Ned, Harold, or him – that is, to email the faculty who will be attending the budget meeting on Friday – with any comments about the draft Compact expenditure plan they may not have time to make at today’s Senate meeting.

The third budget process is the result of the graduate tuition increase imposed by the CUNY Board in June. Because the State Legislature did not permit CUNY to increase tuition, the CUNY Board could obtain additional revenues to fill a \$30 million budget hole through a tuition increase of only graduate students, since the Legislature’s approval is not required for the Board to raise graduate tuition. To make the tuition increase more palatable to graduate students, the Board provided that \$5 million of the increased revenue from the tuition increase would be returned to those colleges that have graduate programs and those monies are to be invested in graduate education.

CUNY is requiring consultation with elected faculty and student leaders as to how this money would be expended. John Jay’s share, based on the percentage of tuition generated by our graduate students, is \$266,000 and is to be spent in ways that make a demonstrable improvement to graduate education. The monies will not be released – that is, colleges can not spend their share – until each college submits an expenditure plan which must be approved by the CUNY Central

Administration. The plans are due at 80th Street on November 7. The budget discussions have resulted in a preliminary plan for John Jay to hire 4 to 5 faculty to teach primarily in the masters program. The formal expenditure proposal will be considered by the Senate at our next meeting, on November 7. Because of this Masters Investment Program, we will be adding tenure-track faculty, but only to those departments which have masters degree programs. This ability to hire 4 to 5 full-time tenure-track faculty using the Masters Investment monies is another reason the administration rejected the faculty's proposal for more faculty in the College's Financial Plan; the Financial Plan provides how we will spend all of our budget allocation this year *except* for that \$266k.

5. Invited guest: President Jeremy Travis

President Travis was welcomed as was his chief of staff, Ms. Mayra Nieves. President Kaplowitz recalled that President Travis' last meeting with the Senate, on September 27, was devoted to his description about various College and University initiatives and it had been agreed that the discussion would continue from the faculty perspective today. Among the initiatives that President Travis had spoken about was Chancellor Goldstein's proposed Compact and other budget processes. She asked Senator Litwack to begin the discussion.

Senator Litwack reported that the Senate has been discussing the fact that enrollment has been increasing at the College over the past years without even a commensurate increase in the number of faculty much less an increase in faculty that will bring us closer to the 70/30 CUNY goal. And as President Travis knows, the College's Financial Plan calls for an increase in enrollment, but apart from converting the sub lines to tenure-track lines, which had originally been tenure-track lines, the Financial Plan does not call for an increase in the number of *any* tenure-track faculty, except for the conversion of the new subs in two years.

Senator Litwack added that even if every one of those sub lines were converted, we would be in significantly worse shape in terms of full-time faculty to student FTEs than we were in 2003 or 2004 and this is at a time when we are in the worse shape in this area compared to all the colleges of the University. He acknowledged that he had said that just as we are under-facultied we are under-administered. We need additional administrators and staff just as we need additional faculty. And he is certain that the administrative positions added and planned to be added are worthy and important. But as the faculty leadership has said to President Travis he will repeat here again: it is a matter of *balance*. He noted President Travis' own testimony to the *NY S* Assembly and Senate Joint Committee on Higher Education hearing in which he had stressed the need for full-time faculty at John Jay. Senator Litwack noted also that substitute faculty, no matter how valuable, can not be equated in any way with tenure-track faculty.

President Kaplowitz added that we are frustrated because we cannot obtain data about the percentage of course sections taught by full-time faculty by department and by program for this semester. The Provost's office says that the data needs to be "cleaned up," that there has to be reconciliation between the data. She said we've always understood that this is preliminary data but we've always received this data by the end of September. She noted that President Travis wants data-based discussions and decision-making, as do the faculty, that he is always asking for evidence for assertions, but we don't have data for this semester, which we want to compare to data about Fall 2004 and Fall 2003. President Travis acknowledged his emphasis on data, saying he used to be called "Doctor Data."

Faculty Senate Minutes #283 – October 19, 2005 – Page 10

Senator Litwack said we *do* know that between Fall 2003 and Fall 2004 the percent of undergraduate course sections taught by full-time faculty *declined* from 44% to 40% and the percent of masters course sections taught by full-time faculty *declined* from **63%** to 58% [Attachment C-1 & C-2]. And, he added, he expects that the current data will show that the percent has declined even further this semester.

President Kaplowitz explained that the expected further decline is not only because of enrollment increases but because of President Travis' emphasis on increased research and the allocation of more released time for faculty to engage in research, all of which the Senate supports. And the likelihood is, as President Travis has acknowledged, this trend will increase and, indeed, accelerate. So the possibility is that the slippage, which is President Travis' word, in the percentage of full-time taught sections may be significant and, if so, we should know it before we make these important decisions, if we are going to be data-driven or at least data-informed. President Travis asked if there are other issues in addition to the budget that the Senate would like to discuss today and President Kaplowitz said the budget is the key issue before us. She added that the Senate's concern with increasing the diversity of the faculty is tied in, of course, with the budget issues, because without more tenure-track positions to search for and to fill the less opportunity we have to increase the diversity of our faculty.

President Travis acknowledged the importance of data and acknowledged that Karen has asked for this data at every budget meeting he's been at, that is, at least on three occasions that he can recall. He does not yet understand what the problem is. The desire for perfect data should rarely crowd out the need for sometimes imperfect data to have informed discussions, he said, adding that he would look into the matter to try to ascertain what the issues might be.

President Travis reported that two days ago, on October 17, the College submitted its Financial Plan to 80th Street [Attachment D]. The document, which is available to everyone, says that this is the way we propose to the University that we will spend the money that has been allocated to us this year. There was, relative to last year, a much better discussion with the faculty leadership than last year, he said, and this is because we were able to devote more time for those discussions. The initial draft Financial Plan submitted to the faculty leadership was radically different from the final document in important ways and reflects, he believes, that input, as well as discussions he had within the administrative side of the College. That back and forth discussion was very constructive and, to him, very useful. Overall the discussions were very cordial and collegial and the process was good.

President Travis said the process will be improved both by providing more time henceforth and through improvement of data issues so we can have more evidence-based discussions. On Monday, October 24, Vice President Pignatello and [Executive Director of Financial & Business Services] Pat Ketterer – who is a wonderful addition to the College and anyone who hasn't yet met her should do so – will give a presentation about the College budget. This is part of the move toward transparency and toward College-wide discussions. He has asked that such presentations be given at least once a year. There are no secrets about the budget, he said.

President Travis explained that he will be meeting with 80th Street officials about our Financial Plan [Attachment D] and that the Plan is not final until it is final but he thinks it is a 95% completed process that will provide the foundation for the Compact discussion, which he'll get to shortly. His primary goal in creating our Financial Plan was to create a multi-year balanced budget: that was his first goal one. Coming into the College his sense was that the College had gone through

some gyrations in terms of its financial planning that had left the College somewhat spinning in terms of being able to plan, in terms of knowing where we were in terms of income and of expenditures. It all seemed to be a bit uncertain each year in part because of the way the University operates, which is unlike any other government budget process he has seen. This was also, in part, because the analytical work had not been done at the College to set out a multi-year plan. So goal one was to have a balanced budget over a longer time so we can do better-informed planning.

A second goal is related to the issue raised in meetings with the faculty leadership last spring and which he committed himself to even then, which is that we have experienced slippage and are likely to experience more slippage in our faculty hiring because of our enrollment growth. So the second goal is to be able to have a budget mechanism that addresses that slippage, to try to recover some of the lost ground. So this became, as the Senate might imagine given the advocates for the faculty's cause, item number one on the agenda of the discussions with faculty leadership. President Travis spoke of some commitments, one of which was made last year to have a conversion policy: conversion means taking substitute full-time lines and converting them to full-time tenure-track lines. Tom, our historian, always points out that this is only making up for lost ground of years ago but this is an important goal for the College. There is an aspiration that says that 70% of course sections should be taught by full-time faculty and according to any data one looks at we are a far ways from that and unless the world changes in dramatic ways we will always be a long ways from that. So he's trying to narrow a gap, a gap that is both self-created and that is also against our aspirations.

So the final Financial Plan that was submitted [Attachment D] includes a multi-year conversion program which starts with the conversion of substitute faculty and continues, at two years at the outside, to converting those sub lines to tenure-track full-time lines. He noted that we haven't agreed yet what the conversion timeline is. We could go directly to hiring tenure-track faculty. It's slightly more expensive to do it that way. The model built into the Plan is to hire substitutes and to then convert the substitutes. The number of substitutes who are to be hired and then converted are five this spring, then five next year, and then four more the following year. In a different world we could go to hiring tenure-track faculty without this intermediate step. We should talk soon about what this hiring schedule will look like. The goal embraced in the Financial Plan is a 50% hiring goal so that half of the new enrollment growth would be covered by [substitute] full-time faculty, which is better than the 40% we are looking at now. This is a slight improvement but not where we want to be, he said.

President Travis spoke about the Chancellor's Compact with its multiple funding streams, some of which have higher, some lower levels of probability of being successful. If all the parts were successful it would add \$2.4 million more to our budget. We have to get back to the Chancellery within about a week as to how we would spend the money and a lot of that would go to hiring full-time faculty. We also have a requirement to get back to 80th Street with an investment strategy for the money that will come to us by virtue of the masters students tuition increase. Every proposal for the Masters Investment Program under discussion – we don't have a final one yet – builds in additional faculty hires – 4 or 5 – from that pot of money.

If our Financial Plan is approved, we are talking about hiring 14 additional substitute faculty over the next three years; this is in addition to the 45 substitute conversions we already agreed to; we will accelerate that process by adding 5 subs in the spring; and then we add the graduate student investment faculty, who will be targeted to programs where the graduate students would see the improvement from their tuition increase; and then there is the Chancellor's Compact, which he

called “iffy.” But, he added, the political dynamics are working well in terms of the Compact proposal so that there would seem to be some movement on this that would enable us to hire additional full-time faculty. One thing we could do is to plot out against this matrix three or four scenarios with the assumption that all the scenarios happen.

Even this is not enough in his view. The larger issue we have to start addressing with the University is the limited application of the Senior College Allocation Model to address the historical imbalances in funding to John Jay. As welcome as it is to see some application of that Model – adding that he knows everyone on the Senate knows what he’s talking about – in the Chancellor’s Compact, that application is somewhat limited. We need to start the conversation with the University about what is next.

Senator Amy Green prefaced her comments by saying that she was on sabbatical during President Travis’ first year and that during her first week back from sabbatical she met him at a performance of an avant-garde play and that she is thrilled that we have a president who not only goes to the theater but to avant-garde theater. She said she agrees with Tom’s comments, adding that before the Senate meeting began she said to Karen that when she left for sabbatical we were squabbling with the administration about the need for full-time faculty and a year later she’s back and we’re still doing that. The administration and faculty are like siblings whose parents don’t give either offspring enough. President Travis called that a good analogy.

Senator Green said we need to figure out how to work together to build the College in a way that feels healthy from the faculty’s perspective as well as from the administration’s. Referring to page 5 of the October 17 cover letter from President Travis to Vice Chancellor Malave, which accompanied the Financial Plan [Attachment D], the President urges the University to support our lease payment for Westport. This is followed by the statement: “To use one simple matrix, if this money were included in our base we would be able to hire as many as ten more full-time faculty, thereby allowing us to substantially improve the percentage of full-time faculty.”

We absolutely need to shore up the faculty, Senator Green continued. Although the proposed Compact and Masters Investment plans look great, as someone who teaches in a department whose members teach only undergraduate students, students who often are in desperate need of intensive support from the faculty, students who come to us often with very, very poor skills, she thinks CUNY is trying to find solutions on the backs of the students who are the most needy and the most powerless at the College. The investment in full-time faculty who can teach such students is essential and that has to be the top commitment of the College.

Senator Susan Will said that having looked at the proposed Compact expenditure document [Attachment F], she doesn’t see justifications for the proposed expenditures. President Travis said the document is a draft for discussion purposes, a draft which had been developed in a mere 48 hours. This Senate meeting is one forum for discussion and feedback in what is a consultative process. The question arose, he explained, as to how we can jump start the conversation and Basil offered to put some thoughts on paper. Ultimately there will be more text and more justification. It’s a draft for discussion purposes. Senator Will said that to have an intelligent discussion about the draft we need to see more justification for the expenditures being proposed for our consideration. She added that she would like to see an explanation of the concept of “Flagship Environment” in terms of John Jay.

President Travis said we should, in fact, have that discussion outside the budget context,

adding that the term comes from the CUNY Master Plan. President Kaplowitz concurred about the need for such a discussion outside the budget process, adding that the Master Plan defines the Flagship Environment as one that has at least 70% course sections taught by full-time faculty. President Travis agreed, noting we are far from that goal. The role for the Faculty Senate, he said, is to identify the key issues for consultation about this document. The consultative process has to take place over the next 72 hours. He suggested that the Senate meet with Basil Wilson, with Jim Levine, with Jane Bowers and have that discussion. President Kaplowitz said she thinks what Susan Will is saying is that it is difficult to identify the areas that require discussion without knowing the thinking that went into the inclusion of any of the elements of the document. President Travis said the Senate should invite Basil to meet with the Senate since Basil drafted the document with his staff.

Professor Ned Benton said he has been at the budget meetings and he can frame some of the questions that people have already raised about the document. One question is whether the document presents John Jay to the outside world in a way that has sizzle. President Travis said “sizzle” is a good word, adding that Karen has used a comparable term in the budget meetings. Professor Benton said another question concerns balance, whether we are going to propose hiring faculty who will have an effect in the classroom in the way we constantly say we need as opposed to faculty who will have an effect outside the classroom and in other ways and whether we are proposing an appropriate balance between the two. A third question involves the balance between our investment in administrative hirings compared to faculty hirings since the Compact draft expenditure proposal calls for even more non-faculty hiring. The fourth question is to what extent there is a confluence between our draft Compact plan and our Comprehensive Action Plan. He added he is raising these questions so all of us can think about them and not for President Travis to respond.

President Travis said that he sees our discussion as rightly being about figuring out the process of discussing a document in a very short period of time despite the fact that the authors are not here. He said he didn't see the document before it went to the faculty. President Kaplowitz said that the faculty leadership received it last night and the Senate received it when they arrived for today's meeting. She added that we have a meeting with President Travis and other senior administrators about this document the day after next. So the idea of the Senate meeting with Basil is not feasible because there is simply no time to do so. President Travis said he understands, saying we are all in the same predicament.

President Travis called Ned's “sizzle” comment important because the expectation of 80th St, an expectation which he thinks is a reasonable one, is that the documents from the CUNY colleges which will be part of the Chancellor's Compact will have a lot of “sizzle” – although they haven't used that term – meaning that they will be highly persuasive in a political environment. What the Chancellor is trying to do, for which he deserves a lot of credit, is to get more money from Albany, as well as more money from the private sector and he is taking a great risk because – and this is the first time – he is proposing regular, modest student tuition increases in order to fund what we care about. President Travis said he feels very strongly that the Chancellor is going out on a lot of limbs all at once and that we have to support him even if we may disagree with parts of his proposal. The Chancellor is saying to Albany that we have to change the way we fund this University, The Chancellor's political judgment is that we have to give the Legislators something more than, “We need more money.”

The CUNY Budget Request has to sing, it has to be persuasive, President Travis said. We

have to decide what things have “sizzle” that are consistent with our Comprehensive Action Plan and that reflect existing consensus-building work that we’ve done at John Jay. We want to be able to point to the documents we created for Middle States and say that the entire College felt these are good ideas. Not that that settles the argument because within that we have to decide which of the good ideas to choose. He added that the student consultations look quite different than the faculty consultations, that the students, quite frankly, are not as interested in having more full-time faculty. They are interested in having more counselors and career advisement. So we have to settle on these decisions and do so in less than a week. In other words, the Senate has to find a way to get back to Basil with feedback.

Senator Litwack said he wants to ask what he characterized as his bottom line question: given the extent to which we obviously need additional full-time faculty, why can’t some of the proposed, and even some of the ongoing but not yet completed, administrative hiring be postponed until next year. President Travis said some of it will be postponed and some has been postponed. He said the Financial Plan was already revised to make those changes and that even though Tom and others might want more such reductions, as the President he has to answer to people who can’t clean the bathrooms. There are a lot of needs at the College and he is trying to balance those needs in ways that make sense.

President Travis said he thinks we made a lot of progress in doing just what Tom has suggested but perhaps we need better documentation to demonstrate that this is the case. He noted that a Vacancy Review Process has been instituted for all non-faculty positions that become vacant; four non-faculty positions have been deleted from the Financial Plan; we are cutting back on what has been an annual \$300,000 food expenditure; we’re cutting back on college assistants; a \$300,000 savings target has been set which is to be achieved either by downgrading the levels of positions or by eliminating other non-faculty positions. There has been a lot of progress made in these areas as a result of meetings with the faculty leadership.

President Kaplowitz said that she agrees with President Travis that the consultation on the Financial Plan has been very informative, collegial, substantive, and candid. She added that her bottom line question is whether we can have embedded in the Financial Plan, which *can* be revised by the College, some recognition of our need for tenure-track faculty by having at least some of those substitute faculty lines be identified as tenure-track. It would be so meaningful if we could have that change, both symbolically and substantively. President Travis said although it is not stated in the Financial Plan, the sub lines will be converted to tenure-track lines; it is the process and timeline that have to be determined. From a budgetary point of view, hiring a tenure-track full-time faculty member without going through this substitute half-step is almost a wash. President Kaplowitz said one problem is that substitute faculty lines are temporary positions and if there is a financial problem those are the positions that are the most easily eliminated and we do not want the faculty positions to be the most vulnerable positions.

President Travis said he is committed to developing specifications as to how we get from substitute positions to tenure-track faculty. It may be that we skip some conversion steps. We need to have that conversation, he said. The idea is to create the steady-state budget.

President Kaplowitz said that the faculty of this College have a long history of effectively fighting for a more equitable budget for our College. But it is demoralizing for us, quite frankly, quite candidly, to be conducting that fight for the College when we know that here, at the College, we can not succeed in getting what we identify over and over, without ambiguity, as *the faculty’s*

single most important priority.

President Travis responded by saying we will have this discussion and we will put on the agenda the specific issue of what the schedule is to look like. He said he won't even call it a conversion schedule because it may not require all the new faculty positions to go through that conversion process. Although it wasn't in the Financial Plan, he said, his commitment is to increase the number of full-time tenure-track faculty. How we get there is something we will talk about. President Kaplowitz thanked him and he thanked the Senate for the opportunity to have this discussion.

6. Motion to endorse a Resolution of the Council of Chairs on full-time faculty

President Kaplowitz asked whether the Senate wishes to endorse a Resolution of the Council of Chairs, adopted the previous day, about the need for additional full-time faculty. Senator Janice Dunham said that we have been talking about our bottom line issue, adding that at a minimum we ought not to be going backwards in our student/faculty ratio. Senator Litwack said there is no question whatsoever that under the current plans we will end up worse off than we were in 2003.

Senator Litwack said the bottom line is we need many, many more tenure-track professors. Senator Green asked whether fiscally that could happen this academic year and Senator Litwack said it could if the administration had this as its priority. Senator Litwack said the Senate should endorse the Chairs' resolution. President Kaplowitz said that in her opinion it is important to stand with the Council of Chairs on this.

A motion was made to adopt the following statement:

The Faculty Senate, like the Council of Chairs, can support only those budget proposals that provide: 1) a significant and continuing increase in tenure-track full-time faculty positions, beyond the planned for conversions of 15 sub-lines to tenure-bearing lines, for the Fall '06 semester (and beyond); and 2) a very significant, and continuing, increase in total full-time faculty positions (including substitutes) beginning this Spring or Fall 2006 at the latest. Like the Chairs, the Faculty Senate is greatly concerned that the Financial Plan developed by the College does not sufficiently address the critical need for additional full-time faculty, especially tenure-track faculty.

The motion carried with 26 yes votes and 1 abstention; thus it was approved without dissent.

7. Consideration of the John Jay Draft Plan for the Chancellor's Proposed Budget Compact [Attachment F]

Senator Litwack said that the term "Flagship Environment" is being used differently by CUNY than by John Jay in the proposed Compact expenditure plan. "Flagship Environment" has been used to mean the goal of at least 70% of course sections taught by full-time faculty and also to mean special programs of excellence. Senator Litwack said that the Provost's Compact draft

expenditure plan follows the Provost's understanding of the term flagship, which is programs of excellence, but that we can respond to it by thinking about the other interpretation of the phrase.

It was noted that distinguished professorships certainly do not address the Master Plan goal of 70% course sections taught by full-time faculty, although distinguished professorships do, of course, bring many other benefits. But the Faculty Senate has been emphasizing the need to increase the number and percentage of our faculty in the classroom and our response to the draft document should reflect that focus. Furthermore, the proposed expenditure plan includes additional faculty for some departments that are near or at the 70% goal.

In response to the discussion and her sense of the consensus that was developing, President Kaplowitz proposed the following language:

It is the position of the Faculty Senate that the primary objective of our College's Compact [Investment] Plan with regard to full-time faculty should be to address CUNY's definition and goal of achieving a "Flagship Environment," which is to have at least 70% of course sections taught by full-time faculty, especially by moving toward that goal for departments that are especially far from the 70% goal.

The motion was adopted by unanimous vote.

[Please Note: Attachment F is the Compact Expenditure Plan that was *submitted* to 80th Street on October 26, *not* the draft document considered by the Senate at this meeting. The draft Plan was revised by the College administration in accordance with the recommendations of the Faculty Senate.]

By a motion made and carried, the meeting was adjourned at 5:30 pm.

Submitted by

Edward Davenport
Recording Secretary

&

James Cauthen
Associate Recording Secretary

ATTACHMENT A

1	2	3	4	5	6
Baruch	12,593	451	421	27.9	29.9
Brooklyn	10,934	491	460	22.2	23.7
City	8,870	476	448	18.6	19.7
Hunter	14,792	591	561	25.0	26.3
John Jay	11,219	318	294	35.2	38.1
Lehman	7,321	314	300	23.3	24.4
Medgar	3,850	163	148	23.6	26.0
NYCCT	8,955	299	280	29.9	31.9
Queens	12,523	540	515	23.1	24.3
Staten Island	9,342	329	308	28.3	30.3
York	4,468	167	153	26.7	29.2

Column 1 = Senior CUNY Colleges

Column 2 = # of FTE students – Fall 2005 flash enrollment

Column 3 = # of full-time faculty – Spring 2005

Column 4 = # of full-time faculty minus library and counseling faculty – Spring 2005

Column 5 = Column 2 divided by Column 3

Column 6 = Column 2 divided by Column 4

N.B. All data are from the CUNY Office of Budget and the CUNY Office of Institutional Research

TABLE 7
FALL 2004 DEPARTMENT PROFILE
FOR UNDERGRADUATE COURSES

(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)
DEPARTMENT	TOTAL UG SECTIONS	% HOURS TAUGHT BY FT FACULTY	TOTAL STUDENT ENROLLMENT	TOTAL CREDITS GENERATED	STUDENT FTES	AVERAGE SECTION SIZE
AFR AM	27	59.26	923	2769	184.60	34
ANTHRO	46	50.00	1271	3813	254.25	28
ART/MUS/PHI	99	40.40	2997	8991	599.40	30
CSL/COM SKL	65	27.98	1774	4887	353.73	27
ENGLISH	251	35.25	6860	18420	1,407.85	27
FOR LANG	64	43.75	1646	4938	329.30	26
GOVT	78	38.46	2426	7278	485.20	31
HISTORY	68	72.06	2416	7248	483.20	35
LAW PS	174	42.37	4827	14481	965.50	28
MATH	171	50.29	4913	12355	983.70	29
NYPD PROG	23	16.67	561	1683	112.30	24
PHYS ED	38	42.34	1447	3291	219.40	34
PSYCH	122	29.55	3889	11876	794.50	32
PUB MGT	62	45.16	1276	3885	259.00	21
PUER RN	30	70.00	977	2931	195.40	32
SCIENCE	84	34.73	2223	9034	604.77	26
SEEK	38	43.70	1084	2955	223.47	29
SOC	115	34.38	3586	10758	717.60	31
SPE & THE	71	50.70	2024	6072	404.85	29
TSP		48.94	696	2088	139.20	
TOTAL	1626	41.49	47816	139753	9,717.22	29

Notes:

(A) Department refers to the 'teaching department' in which a course resides: e.g., if a member of the English Department is teaching a SEEK course on load, then the section is included in the count for the SEEK Department. Exceptions are undergraduate courses in the NYPD Program that are taught on load by full-time faculty: these remain in the home department of the faculty member.

(B) Sections are not calculated for the Thematic Studies Program. Independent Study is not included in Column B.

(C) For purposes of this table, chairs, full-time faculty, full-time faculty teaching on tax-levy or non-tax levy overload, and full-time counselors are considered full-time faculty. Excluded from this calculation are executive compensation employees, graduate teaching fellows, HEO's, volunteers, and all part-time teaching adjuncts.

(D,E) Independent Study is included in these columns. Moreover, master's-level students enrolled in undergraduate courses are included in these columns.

(F) The calculation for student FTEs is: for undergraduate students, (total credits + total remedial hours)/15; for master's students, (total credits)/12.

(G) Independent Study and the Thematic Studies Program are excluded from this calculation.

TABLE 7
FALL 2003 DEPARTMENT PROFILE
FOR UNDERGRADUATE COURSES

(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)
DEPARTMENT	TOTAL UG SECTIONS	% HOURS TAUGHT BY FT FACULTY	TOTAL STUDENT ENROLLMENT	TOTAL CREDITS GENERATED	STUDENT FTES	AVERAGE SECTION SIZE
AFR AM	27	59.26	974	2922	194.80	36
ANTHRO	38	52.63	1141	3423	228.20	30
ART/MUS/PHI	91	46.24	2816	8448	563.00	31
CSL/COM SKL	63	31.75	1878	5219	375.60	30
ENGLISH	232	40.73	6381	17481	1,309.85	27
FOR LANG	59	47.46	1653	4959	330.70	28
GOVT	64	54.69	1997	6057	403.80	31
HISTORY	62	70.16	2205	6615	441.00	36
LAW PS	154	46.10	4363	13089	872.60	28
MATH	165	45.45	4974	12994	995.85	30
NYPD PROG	20	24.00	399	1197	79.80	20
PHYS ED	40	50.00	1496	3328	221.88	32
PSYCH	111	41.32	3744	11441	765.78	34
PUB MGT	54	35.19	1353	4059	270.60	25
PUER RN	24	75.00	754	2263	150.87	31
SCIENCE	81	38.00	2142	8756	584.98	26
SEEK	34	67.29	779	2115	161.40	23
SOC	102	40.20	3092	9276	618.70	30
SPE & THE	78	50.00	2158	6474	431.60	28
TSP		56.52	754	2262	150.80	
TOTAL	1499	45.67	45053	132378	9,151.82	29

Notes:

(A) Department refers to the 'teaching department' in which a course resides: e.g., if a member of the English Department is teaching a SEEK course on load, then the section is included in the count for the SEEK Department. Exceptions are undergraduate courses in the NYPD program that are taught on load by full-time faculty: these remain in the home department of the faculty member.

(B) Sections are not calculated for the Thematic Studies Program. Independent Study is not included in Column B.

(C) For purposes of this table, chairs, full-time faculty, full-time faculty teaching on tax-levy or non-tax levy overload, and full-time counselors are considered full-time faculty. Excluded from this calculation are executive compensation employees, graduate teaching fellows, HEO's, volunteers, and all part-time teaching adjuncts.

(D,E) Independent Study is included in these columns. Moreover, master's-level students enrolled in undergraduate courses are included in these columns.

(F) The calculation for student FTEs is: for undergraduate students, (total credits + total remedial hours)/15; for master's students, (total credits)/12.

(G) Independent Study and the Thematic Studies Program are excluded from this calculation.

**TABLE 3
FALL 2004 ENROLLMENT AND NUMBER OF SECTIONS
BY FACULTY TEACHING STATUS**

UNDERGRADUATE COURSES

<u>FACULTY STATUS**</u>	<u>ENROLLMENT</u>	<u>SECTIONS* N (%)</u>
FT CHR	294	14 (.91)
FT FAC	17868	625 (40.53)
FT CSL	235	8 (.52)
FT SEK CSL	156	4 (.26)
FT GTF	573	16 (1.04)
PT FAC	25568	875 (56.74)
SCI	2222	84
TSP	696	
TOTAL	47612	1626

MASTER'S COURSES

<u>FACULTY STATUS**</u>	<u>ENROLLMENT</u>	<u>SECTIONS* N (%)</u>
FT CHR	227	7 (3.70)
FT FAC	2429	110 (58.20)
FT ECP	17	1 (.53)
FT HEO	45	3 (1.59)
PT FAC	1462	67 (35.45)
PT VOL	26	1 (.53)
SCI	123	9
TOTAL	4329	198

DOCTORAL COURSES

<u>FACULTY STATUS**</u>	<u>ENROLLMENT</u>	<u>SECTIONS* N (%)</u>
FT CHR	30	2 (10.00)
FT FAC	222	17 (85.00)
FT ECP	7	1 (5.00)
SCI	11	1
TOTAL	270	21

Notes:

* Partial information for the Science Department and Thematic Studies Program is included. It is not possible to differentiate faculty teaching status for sections in these two areas. Moreover, sections are not calculated for the Thematic Studies Program. Independent study, thesis preparation, and dissertation supervision are excluded.

** Faculty Status categories are defined as follows: FT CHR = full-time chair; FT FAC = full-time faculty including full-time faculty with overload teaching appointments; FT CSL = full-time counselors teaching on load; FT SEEK CSL = full-time SEEK counselors teaching on load; FT GTF = full-time graduate teaching fellows; FT ECP = full-time executive compensation plan employees teaching on load; FT HEO = full-time HEOs teaching on load; PT FAC = part-time teaching adjuncts (both tax-levy and non-tax levy) and HEO's with overload teaching appointments; VOL = any volunteer, unpaid faculty.

ATTACHMENT C-2

TABLE 3
FALL 2003 ENROLLMENT AND NUMBER OF SECTIONS
BY FACULTY TEACHING STATUS

UNDERGRADUATE COURSES

<u>FACULTY STATUS**</u>	<u>ENROLLMENT</u>	<u>SECTIONS*</u> <u>N</u> <u>(%)</u>
FT CHR	296	11 (.78)
FT FAC	18287	630 (44.43)
FT CSL	328	10 (.71)
FT SEK CSL	118	5 (.35)
FT GTF	825	22 (1.55)
FT ECP	35	1 (.07)
FT HEO	71	2 (.14)
PT FAC	21833	736 (51.90)
VOL	25	1 (.07)
SCI	2134	81
TSP	808	
TOTAL	44760	1499

MASTER'S COURSES

<u>FACULTY STATUS**</u>	<u>ENROLLMENT</u>	<u>SECTIONS*</u> <u>N</u> <u>(%)</u>
FT CHR	145	6 (3.75)
FT FAC	2300	102 (63.75)
FT HEO	43	2 (1.25)
PT FAC	1041	50 (31.25)
SCI	144	7
TOTAL	3673	167

DOCTORAL COURSES

<u>FACULTY STATUS**</u>	<u>ENROLLMENT</u>	<u>SECTIONS*</u> <u>N</u> <u>(%)</u>
FT CHR	30	2 (11.76)
FT FAC	184	14 (82.35)
PT FAC	18	1 (5.88)
SCI	7	.
TOTAL	239	17

Notes:

* Partial information for the Science Department and Thematic Studies Program is included. It is not possible to differentiate faculty teaching status for sections in these two areas. Moreover, sections are not calculated for the Thematic Studies Program. Independent study, thesis preparation, and dissertation supervision are excluded.

** Faculty Status categories are defined as follows: FT CHR = full-time chair; FT FAC = full-time faculty including full-time faculty with overload teaching appointments; FT CSL = full-time counselors teaching on load; FT SEK CSL = full-time SEEK counselors teaching on load; FT GTF = full-time graduate teaching fellows; FT ECP = full-time executive compensation plan employees teaching on load; FT HEO = full-time HEOs teaching on load; PT FAC = part-time teaching adjuncts (both tax-levy and non-tax levy) and HEO's with overload teaching appointments; VOL = any volunteer, unpaid faculty.



JOHN JAY COLLEGE OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE
The City University of New York

Office of the President

To: Vice Chancellor Ernesto Malave
Office of Budget and Finance

From: President Jeremy Travis

Date: October 17, 2005

I am pleased to submit John Jay College's Financial Plan for FY 2006. This financial plan represents the continued implementation of the programs and initiatives begun last fiscal year and several new strategic investments in areas where we can expect a significant return on those investments, either financially or in the quality of the education we provide. In addition, the plan and spending priorities are intricately linked to the College's five year Comprehensive Action Plan which was recently developed for submission to the Middle States Commission.

Achieving: a Balanced Budget

As we considered our plan, we set as an overarching goal to establish a "steady state" budget for this year and the following three years. This was a critical goal because, as you know, we have sustained the loss of revenue from the new building site and the reserves we have depended on and built up over the years are depleting. The four-year budget is balanced through a series of expense reductions and new revenues from targeted enrollment increases. With a balanced budget in place we will provide the foundation for our proposal for new investments that would be made possible through enactment of the provisions of the Master Plan Compact and future implementation of the Senior College allocation model.

To achieve the multi-year balanced budget, we have instituted several gap closing measures and actions. These measures include a vacancy review process whereby every full time administrative vacancy is evaluated to determine its contribution to the strategic direction of the College, and considers whether or not the functions of the position can be consolidated with those of another position and whether or not it can be filled at a lower rate or automated, or eliminated. In this fiscal year alone, we have already identified 4 positions that have been eliminated for a savings of \$250k. We have also begun a review of all College programs to determine whether we can redirect existing resources to higher priority activities. This has already resulted in a decision to cease publication of Law Enforcement News (LEN) and reassign those staff to the Office of Institutional Advancement where they will write and edit new publications in support of College advancement activities.

Other gap closing measures include OTPS reductions of 3% in FY '07 and '08 that will be achieved through improved procurement methods, efficiency savings, more stringent oversight of purchase requests and reduction of some elective work. We have also committed to reducing our expenditures on temporary services by 2%. The final component of the gap closing measures is very slight enrollment growth of 2% in FY '07 and 1.5% in FY '08. We plan to target enrollment growth in periods where facilities are currently under-enrolled: i.e., a winter intercession, expanded summer session, evening and weekend sessions, accelerated use of Fridays and distance learning.

We have included a faculty hiring plan that is directly related to the growth in FTE enrollment. We want to ensure that we do not slip any further on the percentage of instruction taught by full time faculty. The level of hiring (5 substitutes in Spring '06, 5 substitutes in '07 and 4 substitutes in '08) allows us to maintain the current ratio. The financial plan also incorporates a schedule to convert substitute faculty to full-time, tenure-track faculty over time.

As I mentioned above, the expenditures projected in the financial plan reflect the restructuring and priorities set forth in last year's plan that were not fully implemented and some new strategic investments. The proposed budget also reflects the priorities established under the Comprehensive Action Plan of the College, as submitted to Middle States.

We would like to call your attention to some additional specific aspects of the proposed budget:

Strategic Administrative Hiring

Several of the offices created last year were not fully staffed due to the need to have the Department heads hired before making other personnel commitments. Therefore in FY '06, we plan to fill the remaining vacancies from our FY '05 Financial Plan position allocation. A key difference though, is that we expect and will require that four new positions and one of our existing positions will generate revenues of approximately \$200k by FY 2008 that will cover at least 50% of their salaries through their core activities. The following are designated as "rainmaker" positions:

- **Director of Leadership Academy** in Professional Studies to develop leadership programs and other initiatives to engage the criminal justice, private security, fire safety and other professions.
- **Foundation and Grants Officer** and **Director of Intergovernmental Relations** - These two new positions are critical to our ability to engage government officials, foundations and private donors on projects and funding proposals and to the overall success of our fundraising program.
- **Director of International Programs** - This position will be responsible for increasing our profile internationally and strengthening relationships with various entities from foreign governments. This position will also focus on developing contractual relationships with those governments. We have already commenced contractual activities with the Dominican Republic and Puerto Rico.

- **Director of the Prisoner Reentry Institute** - This new entity, which was launched a year ago in the Office of Continuing and Professional Studies, will be responsible for developing a set of funded activities on the critical issue of prisoner reentry and reintegration. The Institute has already received some external funding and is on track to generate substantial revenues in the coming months. This position was filled last year.

Critical Programmatic Initiatives

In addition to these strategic investments in positions that are critical to the new direction of John Jay College, the budget also supports several programmatic initiatives:

- **Continuing Education.** We have launched a new, and the College's first, comprehensive continuing education program, described in the attached brochure. We have allocated some start-up funds necessary to support this.
- **Science Program.** We have made a significant investment in our Science Department including the addition of a CLT and OTPS investments for new laboratory equipment and supplies. As we strengthen our science program and move forward on our proposal for a doctoral program in forensic science, these expenditures are critical to our success.
- **Doctoral Education.** Working in close collaboration with President Kelly at the Graduate Center, we have substantially strengthened our two doctoral programs. Through a combination of tax levy and non tax levy discretionary funds, we have provided for full tuition reimbursements and stipends to all Phd students in those programs. We are also enhancing the research and teaching opportunities for these students.

Linking Resource Allocations to the College Comprehensive Action Plan

For the first time the College is making a concerted effort to link allocation decisions to the objectives of a strategic planning process. Our strategic goals as articulated in our Comprehensive Action Plan include raising the overall academic quality of the college, increasing the retention and graduation rates, maintaining or increasing the percentage of class sections taught by full time faculty and enhancing financial and management effectiveness.

Our planned hires this year include 5 new full time faculty and the conversion of 15 current substitute faculty to full time tenure lines. We plan to strengthen academic support by hiring a new Academic Director of Undergraduate Studies to provide a well organized curriculum directed towards academic and career success. Enrollment Services will be enhanced by the hiring of 2 enrollment managers in addition to the 2 that were added last year. These positions are critical to our ability to plan and manage enrollment growth and are funded through alternative revenue. To help our students better prepare for Law School, we are also creating a

new institute for law school preparation and will hire a Director of Law School Advisement in Student Services using an existing staff line. There are many other areas where budget choices support key components of the CAP.

Position Allocations and ISS Expenditures

Our overall position allocation requested for FY '06 of 610 is only a net addition of 2 positions greater than the FY '05 plan accepted by the University Budget Office last year.

The number of Institutional Support Services (ISS) positions reflected in the FY '06 plan is seven more than our September 15th payroll (the number reflected in the UBO plan guidelines), but is 20 positions less than the plan allocation submitted in FY '05. The difference is attributable to several factors. Most notably, we have reduced the number of administrative hires that we had planned for FY '05. Also some of the positions filled in FY '05 were planned in ISS but were more correctly allocated to other categories such as I&DR support and Student Services. We exceed all of the required floors for teaching, academic support and student services.

While we exceed the staffing ceilings, as we have argued last year, these ceilings were established when the college was in a period of retrenchment and do not reflect required support in several critical areas. In addition, in some cases, new full time positions were created through the conversion of college assistant funding or by under-filling HEO vacancies with 2 entry level titles to meet administrative needs.

Overall our spending plan of \$60.8 million is only 2% or \$1.3 million greater than the FY '05 plan endorsed by UBO. The ISS expenditures for FY '06 are estimated to be \$15.8 million as compared to the FY '05 actual expenditures of \$15.0 million. The increase is due to refunds of appropriations which reduced our FY '05 expenditures. In addition, as we previously mentioned, several positions were vacant for either the entire year or a significant portion of FY '05.

Laying the Foundation for the **CUNY** Compact

Although the Financial Plan assumes no investments from the Master Plan and CUNY Compact, we are positioning the College to reap the maximum benefit from any additional allocations. However, as you well know, John Jay College is still at a distinct disadvantage because of the constraints of the historical allocation levels which negatively impact our ability to grow in critical areas. Two constraints that disproportionately affect our financing (in addition to the loss of our building lease revenue) are the fringe benefit calculation and our obligation to pay a portion of the Westport lease. I would like to discuss these items with you in the context of our budget proposal.

Despite the fact that our position allocation provides for the highest ratio of FTE to full time faculty and the lowest administrative costs in the University, we were heavily penalized last year by the fringe benefit calculation. The colleges with higher position allocations than those produced by the senior allocation model were yet assessed a lower fringe factor than we were – while we stand some 40 positions under the mean generated by the new model. In order to properly finance our initiatives we urge the UBO to utilize a fringe benefit assessment methodology that more reflects the fact that John Jay College does not spend as much as other comparable senior colleges for ISS expenses. We sincerely appreciate the adjustment you made in last year's preliminary assessment, but hope that this year the calculation will take into account John Jay's unique situation.

Similarly, we are urging you to reconsider last year's decision to require John Jay to pay a substantial portion of the Westport lease. This additional charge against our budget in the amount of \$625,000, over the next two years, represents a substantial reduction in our ability to carry out the critical goals of the College. To use one simple metric, if this money were included in our base, we would be able to hire as many as 10 more full-time faculty, thereby allowing us to substantially improve the percentage of full time faculty.

I realize this might be easier to accomplish in FY '07 when presumably all mandatory costs will be covered with the adoption of the new Master Plan Compact.

Finally, I would like to offer to work with you and your staff on the application of the new Senior College Allocation Model. For John Jay College, this represents a historic opportunity to begin the process of bringing our budget in alignment with the budgets of our sister institutions in CUNY. As you know, we were particularly concerned to learn that the projected allocation for John Jay College under the proposed Compact funding had been reduced by \$300,000, without any notice or explanation. This translates into a loss of four or five badly-needed faculty positions. We appreciate your efforts to introduce the new model as part of the University's discussions on the Master Plan and Compact funding strategy, but hope that, as the budget projections are finalized, the allocations will better reflect the goal of rectifying the fiscal imbalance between the *CUNY* colleges.

In summary, my colleagues and I are pleased to present a fiscally responsible financial plan that is balanced in FY '06 and remains balanced through FY '09. We believe we have met critical needs for faculty hiring and strategic investments to advance our institution. My staff and I look forward to discussing the details of the plan and the longer term financial needs of the College.

Cc: Matthew Sapienza

ATTACHMENT D - p.6

**John Jay College
FY 2006 September Budget Presentation
Four Year Budget Forecast
10/14/2005 REVISED**

<u>BUDGET ALLOCATION AND REVENUE</u>	<u>FY 2005</u>	<u>FY 2006</u>	<u>FY 2007</u>	<u>FY 2008</u>	<u>FY 2009</u>
Enrollment	10,475 FTE	10,795 FTE	11,011 FTE	11,176 FTE	11176 FTE
Base Budget	\$ 47,149,700	\$ 47,466,000	\$ 47,466,000	\$ 47,466,000	\$ 47,455,000
Base Budget Encumbrance by CUNY (2%)	\$ (943,000)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Base Budget reduction for Fringe Benefits	\$ (794,100)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Base Budget Reduction on Discretionary Spending	\$ -	\$ (226,600)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Base Budget Reduction for Capitalization of OTPS Expenses	\$ (1,441,689)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Lump Sum Allocations	\$ 6,925,600	\$ 7,409,800	\$ 7,409,800	\$ 7,409,800	\$ 7,409,800
Additional Lump Sum Allocations	\$ 888,300	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
TOTAL BUDGET ALLOCATION:	\$ 51,784,811	\$ 54,649,200	\$ 54,875,800	\$ 54,875,800	\$ 54,875,800
Lease Revenue	\$ 3,125,000	\$ 375,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Westport Lease Payment	\$ -	\$ (625,000)	\$ (625,000)	\$ -	\$ -
Current Year Gross Tuition Revenue expected above CUNY Target	\$ 3,192,000	\$ 3,402,763	\$ 4,465,029	\$ 5,276,483	\$ 5,276,483
CUTRA Balance from Prior Fiscal Year	\$ 5,189,374	\$ 6,826,898	\$ 3,834,483	\$ 1,875,786	\$ 1,101,531
TOTAL CUTRA:	\$ 8,381,374	\$ 10,229,661	\$ 8,299,512	\$ 7,152,269	\$ 6,378,014
TOTAL ADDITIONAL REVENUE (Lease & CUTRA):	\$ 11,506,374	\$ 9,979,661	\$ 7,674,512	\$ 7,152,269	\$ 6,378,014
TOTAL OPERATING BUDGET	\$ 63,291,185	\$ 64,628,861	\$ 62,550,312	\$ 62,028,069	\$ 61,253,814
<u>EXPENDITURES</u>					
Personnel Services (PS)	\$ 37,482,538	\$ 39,175,351	\$ 39,703,540	\$ 40,137,495	\$ 40,212,495
ERI Payment	\$ 180,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Adjuncts	\$ 8,443,587	\$ 8,820,795	\$ 8,891,035	\$ 9,033,710	\$ 9,099,550
Temp Services:	\$ 5,456,315	\$ 5,646,597	\$ 5,533,666	\$ 5,420,735	\$ 5,420,735
TOTAL PS:	\$ 51,562,440	\$ 53,642,743	\$ 54,128,241	\$ 54,591,940	\$ 54,732,790
OTPS	\$ 6,343,536	\$ 7,151,634	\$ 6,546,285	\$ 6,334,598	\$ 6,334,598
UBO Adjustment	\$ (1,441,689)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
TOTAL OTPS :	\$ 4,901,847	\$ 7,151,634	\$ 6,546,285	\$ 6,334,598	\$ 6,334,598
TOTAL FINANCIAL PLAN EXPENDITURES:	\$ 56,464,287	\$ 60,794,378	\$ 60,674,526	\$ 60,926,538	\$ 61,067,388
YEAR-END BALANCE:	\$ 6,826,898	\$ 3,834,483	\$ 1,875,786	\$ 1,101,531	\$ 186,426

John Jay College

Forecast Assumptions 10/14/05

<p>Enrollment</p>	<p>Enrollment will be 10,795 FTE in 06 and will increase 2% in 07, 1.5% in 08 and 0% in 09</p>
<p>Revenue</p>	<p>Assume spending of lease revenue in FY 05/FY 07</p>
<p>PS</p>	<p>The payroll includes all on staff as of 7/25/05 and increases every year for the following: \$400k for PSC mandatory July/January steps added in 06 and 08, 07 adjustment = 200k (pending confirmation of actuals) \$150k for conversion of 15 sub faculty to tenure track status (FY 05, 06,07) total subs converted = 45 Assumes hiring all staff planned in 05 Financial Plan and current vacancies Assume replacement of every retirement or resignation CUNY will fund collective bargaining increases Assume 5 new subst faculty in 06 + 5 subst in 07 for enrollment growth + 4 subst in 08 for enrollment growth Assume \$350k ongoing savings in FY07 and out years due to vacancy review Assume 1st Q savings in FY 06 for vacant positions (\$400k) Assume 50% of salaries of 5 staff will be offset by revenue in 08 and out years. College Assistant expenditures will be reduced by 2% in 07 and 2% in 08.</p>
<p>Forecast</p>	<p>Forecast does not include an estimate for FY 06/FY 07 although surcharge is expected. Amount to be negotiated with UBO</p>
<p>PS - Adjunct</p>	<p>All add'l FTE students will be taught by adjuncts in fall 05 (FY 06) and combination of 5 Full time subs + adjuncts in spring 06. 50% of additional sections will be taught by F/T and 50% by adjuncts thereby maintaining current % of sessions taught by adjuncts</p>
<p>CUTRA/Lump Sum</p>	<p>All Full time hires must be included in base and therefore CA/OTPS base has been reduced. Grad Investment Funding was split 50% PS & 50% OTPS. This can be revised when program details are known. Any additional Lump Sum allocation will be expended 100% on the dedicated purpose and will not provide additional surplus. College NOW distribution reflects program requirement for F/T staff.</p>
<p>OTPS</p>	<p>OTPS fluctuates modestly due to deferral and rollover of one-time projects to FY 06 and 07 respectively. Reduction to FY 05 actual expenditures due to reduction for one time purchases (net savings \$214k) 3% reduction in OTPS expenditures planned for FY 07 and 08 Inflation increase of 4% included in OTPS forecast for 06 and 07</p>
<p>Other:</p>	<p>\$100k can be charged to non-tax levy programs and grants (split 50k PS and 50K OTPS)</p>

John Jay College
 Revised 10/14/05
 Proposal to Close Gap

		07 Impact	08 Impact
A	2% enrollment growth in FY07 (+ 216 FTE = 11011 FTE)	\$661,226	\$661,226
	1.5% enrollment growth in FY08 (+165 FTE = 11,176 FTE)		\$505,104
B	New Positions cost will be 50% offset by Revenue in 08:		\$197,295
	Dir of Leadership Academy	\$80,000	
	Dir of international Programs	\$85,000	
	Director of Intergovernmental Relations	\$80,000	
	Professional Studies	\$84,590	
	Foundation and Grants Officer	\$65,000	
C	Consolidate/Eliminate New Positions/Program Review	\$350,000	\$350,000
D	2% TS Reduction in 07 (avg sal 20.2k, approx 6 college assts or reduction in hours)	\$112,931	\$112,931
E	OTPS Reduction (3%)	\$196,389	
	OTPS Reduction in 08 (3%)		\$211,687
	Total Savings/Revenue	\$1,320,546	\$2,038,243
	Grand Total Savings /Revenue		\$3,358,789

Note: Revenue from Additional FTE assumes 50% of new sections will be taught by FT Subst Faculty and 50% Adjunct
 # of Substitute Faculty required: 2% growth = 5 / 1.5% growth = 4



Vice Chancellor for Budget and Finance

535 East 80th Street
New York, NY 10021
tel: 212-794-5403
fax: 212-794-5515

October 3, 2005

To: College Presidents

From: Vice Chancellor Ernesto Malave

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Ernesto Malave', written over the printed name.

Subject: FY 2006-07 University Budget Request

As outlined in the Chancellor's memo, the University is taking a different approach to the budget request this year by distributing **the** 2006-07 programmatic request by college. The University will request a total \$44.9 million for the senior colleges and \$12.0 million for the community colleges. We are asking colleges to develop an investment plan to utilize these resources as outlined in the Chancellor's call letter and in consultation with elected student and faculty representatives.

The City University's request is allocated to college base budgets in broad master plan categories. The attached 2006-07 Senior and Community College Programmatic Budget Request Summaries provide the amounts to be requested for each college. Also attached are programmatic request methodologies that explain in greater detail the distribution of the requested funds.

Please use the attached template to distribute the funds to be requested for your college to various initiatives within each master plan category. Please also provide a narrative explaining the need for and planned use of these funds. The narrative, which will be included in the University's final 2006-07 budget request book, should also include a brief introduction to the college. The write-up should be no longer than one thousand words.

Please submit the request by email to Catherine.Abata@mail.cuny.edu as soon as possible but no later than Wednesday, October 26, 2005. If you have any questions, feel free to call me or Budget Director Matthew Sapienza at 212-794-5708. Thank you for your assistance.

Cc: Chancellor Matthew Goldstein
Chancellor's Cabinet
University Budget Director Matthew Sapienza
Vice Presidents/Deans for Finance and Administration
Chief Academic Officers
Chief Student Affairs Officers
College Budget Officers
UBO Staff

THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK
2006-2007 Senior College Programmatic
Budget Request- John Jay College of Criminal Justice

Programmatic Initiatives

Flagship Environment

In Fall 2005, there were over 14,000 students enrolled at John Jay College of Criminal Justice. There are 19 undergraduate majors, 6 graduate programs and 2 Ph.D. programs, (Criminal Justice and Forensic Psychology), shared jointly with The City University Graduate Center. Graduates of the College help provide the expertise and specialists within the City and State workforce in areas such as police management & leadership, crime mapping, forensic science, forensic computing, forensic psychology, fire science and disaster preparedness. Under the new leadership of President Jeremy Travis, the College is committed to achieving pre-eminence in criminal justice and its related fields and support student success.

The College recently established two new centers, the *Center on Crime Control and Prevention* and the *Center on Race, Crime and Justice*. These will complement the work of existing centers such as the *Center of Criminal Justice Ethics*, the *Center on Terrorism and Counter-Terrorism* and the *Dispute Resolution Consortium*. With assistance from the Master Plan funding the College will be able to establish a new *Center on Emergency Preparedness*. These Centers, and the recruitment of top faculty, further advance research and help shape public policy which in turn contributes to enhancing public safety and sensitivity to issues of social justice.

A. Faculty to Strengthen Flagship Programs

1. Professor (possibly Distinguished Professor) to promote research, teach and oversee the *Center on Race, Crime and Justice*.
2. Professor (possibly Distinguished Professor) to promote research, teach and to offer courses on terrorism and counter-terrorism.
3. Professor to promote research, teach and establish the Center on Emergency Preparedness.

\$323,190

B. Improve Undergraduate Education

Increasing the number of sections taught by full-time faculty is essential to the improvement of undergraduate education. Only 40% of our undergraduate sections in Spring 2005 were taught by full-time faculty. John Jay has the highest ratio of student FTE's to full time faculty among the senior colleges and the lowest percentage of full time faculty in the classroom. There is broad consensus at the College that this request

Master Plan's emphasis on Writing Across the Curriculum requires the need to expand the capabilities of the Writing Center. The peer mentoring program for Freshmen and Sophomores and the work of the ESL Resource Center have been vital to the College's improvement in its retention and graduation rates. The new resources will be used to strengthen supervision and training in the Peer Mentoring Program.

Math and Science Lab	\$70,000
Supplementary Instruction and Tutoring in Math and Science Courses	\$48,200
ESL Resource Center (staff person including fringe benefits)	\$66,500
Peer Mentoring Program	\$45,000
Writing Center	\$70,000
Academic Support Total	\$299,700

Student Services

John Jay College of Criminal Justice defines itself as a student centered institution. In the recent study of 12 colleges and universities that had demonstrated marked improvement in retention and graduation rates, including John Jay College of Criminal Justice, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) highlighted the importance of the culture of student success. John Jay College will use the additional resources to invest in student services to further foster a student centered culture student and academic excellence.

The Counseling Department has played a critical role in the improvement of retention and graduation rates but the number of Counseling faculty has not kept pace with the enrollment growth of the College. There is a need to add three more Counseling faculty.

Student Survey Data of 2002 and 2004 indicated that Freshmen and Sophomores were pleased with the College's outreach programs and those same data revealed that Transfers, Juniors, and Seniors expected more in academic advisement and in career counseling. The needs of Disabled Students have grown and there is the need to coordinate and provide a more effective delivery of tutoring services for disabled students. The infusion of resources in student services will enhance the College's capacity for institutional effectiveness.

Three New Counseling Faculty Members	\$203,490
Advisement Coordinator	\$66,500
Career Job Developer	\$53,200
Disabled Student Coordinator	\$53,200

ATTACHMENT F - p. 4

Support for Students with Disabilities	\$34,580
Coordinator of Student Activities	\$53,200
Immunization Coordinator (Health Svc)	\$47,880
Equipment Manager (Athletics)	\$51,950
Sub-total	\$564,000
Peer Mentors Juniors and Seniors	\$20,000
Peer Mentors Transfer Students	\$20,000
Student Services Total	\$604,000

Workforce and Economic Development

John Jay College has a contract with the NY State Department of Criminal Justice Services to upgrade the workforce skills of police officers in leadership positions. Training of police executives has emerged as a serious workforce issue not just in police departments in upstate New York but throughout the nation. Under the auspices of Professional Studies, John Jay College of Criminal Justice intends to establish a Police Leadership Institute that would provide online and in person leadership training of police officers taking into consideration the changing requirements of police leadership in the new age of terrorism and disaster preparedness.

Police Leadership Institute Specialist	\$52,857
(Fringe Benefits)	\$17,443
Workforce and Economic Development Total Cost	\$70,300

Information Management Systems

Specialist in Pedagogy & Technology (Center for Teaching and Learning) **\$79,800**

Upgrading Facilities Infrastructure

The Testing Office will be expanded and their operation consolidated in one location. The office of Media Services will be relocated, consolidated and expanded to include a new screening room for faculty and students. As a result of this initiative, we will be able to renovate some of the vacated space to create additional faculty offices.

\$179,500

Total Programmatic Initiatives **\$2,453,500**

**The City University of New York
2006-07 Senior College Programmatic Budget Request (\$000)**

College: John Jay College of Criminal Justice

	Personal Svc Regular	Personal Svc Temporary	Personal Svc Total	Positions	OTPS	Total
Programmatic Initiatives						
Flagship Environment	1,168,200.0	0.0	1,168,200.0	14	52,000.0	1,220,200.0
Fulltime Faculty	323,190.0		323,190.0	3		323,190.0
Support for Fulltime Faculty			0.0			0.0
Honors College			0.0			0.0
Improving Undergraduate Education	845,010.0		845,010.0	11		845,010.0
Improving Graduate Ed/Prof Programs			0.0			0.0
Faculty Development			0.0		52,000.0	52,000.0
Expanding Technology in Teaching			0.0			0.0
Teacher Preparation			0.0			0.0
Academic Support	66,500.0	233,200.0	299,700.0	1	0.0	299,700.0
Developmental Education Initiative	66,500.0	163,200.0	229,700.0	1		229,700.0
Libraries			0.0			0.0
Writing Across the Curriculum		70,000.0	70,000.0			70,000.0
College NOW/Collaborative Programs			0.0			0.0
Student Services	564,000.0	40,000.0	604,000.0	10	0.0	604,000.0
Advising and Counseling	269,990.0	40,000.0	309,990.0	4		309,990.0
Students with Disabilities	87,780.0		87,780.0	2		87,780.0
Athletics	51,950.0		51,950.0	1		51,950.0
Career Services	53,200.0		53,200.0	1		53,200.0
Child Care			0.0			0.0
Health Services	47,880.0		47,880.0	1		47,880.0
International Students			0.0			0.0
Veterans Support			0.0			0.0
Student Activities/Leadership Development	53,200.0		53,200.0			53,200.0
Workforce and Economic Development	70,300.0		70,300.0	1		70,300.0
Information Management Systems	79,800.0		79,800.0	1		79,800.0
Upgrading Facilities Infrastructure	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	179,500.0	179,500.0
Environmental Health and Safety			0.0			0.0
Facilities Improvements			0.0		179,500.0	179,500.0
Total Programmatic Increases	1,948,800.0	273,200.0	2,222,000.0	21	231,500.0	2,453,500.0

Note Include estimated fringe benefits for Personal Service items