1. Approval of Minutes for March 5, 2015. Proposed minutes are attached.
2. Space Planning Update by CannonDesign.
3. Policy on Assignment of Space to Part-Time Faculty. Ned proposed a “first draft of a policy” that might be considered for adjunct space assignment in his email to the subcommittees of March 16, 2015. We can discuss and if possible make a recommendation.
4. Review Status of Recommendations on the FY2015 Financial Plan. Recommendations from subcommittees to BPC are attached. These recommendations were subsequently forwarded to the President after BPC approval. Status report from Budget Office is attached (the PDF).
5. Middle States Progress Report. There are still open issues, as we noted at the last meeting, but attached is the latest draft (still without appendices). Barring financial news from CUNY or surprising developments on other planning fronts in the next week, this draft or something close to it will go to Middle States by April 1. Comments appreciated.
Joint Meeting: SPS – FPS
Minutes
March 24, 2015

Present: Jane Bowers, James Llana (SPS Chair), Robert Pignatello (FPS Chair), Schevaletta Alford, Ricardo Anzaldua, Ned Benton, Kinya Chandler, Sandrine Dikambi, Janice Dunham, Mark Flower, Jay Hamilton, Karen Kaplowitz, Pat Ketterer, Tom Kucharski, Anthony Marcus, Virginia Moreno, Robert Troy, Alison Orlando (Recorder)

1. Approval of Minutes from March 5, 2015. Minutes were approved as proposed.

2. Space Planning Update by CannonDesign. Rob set the stage for the presentation by CannonDesign by providing a space update. The College is trying to accelerate the Haaren Hall completion but there is no definite date for when the anticipated phased move from North Hall into Haaren Hall will begin; we anticipate mid-summer. There will be no CUNY support for new rental space, so the College for the time being will have to accommodate all functions within the current space. Steve from CannonDesign started by explaining that their present focus is relocating the programs from North Hall. To achieve this, the proposed recommendations from CannonDesign include: recapturing space from oversized departments, recapturing adjunct space, and leveraging the Westport and BMW buildings. Challenges include costs, the timing of the phased project and user acceptance of the consolidation and reallocation. The department relocation will occur in five phases, concluding with Financial Aid and the Registrar moving from North Hall; this will essentially vacate North Hall. Tom asked if the classroom allocation will be changed at Westport, and Scott Paige explained that they will not be losing classroom space at Westport. Scott went on to say that the current need for academic and support space is 121,000 gross square feet. Rob explained that this is a complicated calculation and does not necessarily mean we are short 121,000 gross square feet. Scott added that the classroom usage for post-Haaren occupancy anticipates a higher utilization for both Haaren Hall and Westport. Also, online enrollment is expected to help with classroom utilization. He explained that this plan will only involve modest adjustments to classroom usage. Rob noted that for fall 2015 there will be two schedules, and the College will implement one or the other depending on the stage we are in with moving out of North Hall. Scott went on to discuss the surpluses and deficits of space within the academic departments after the occupation of Haaren Hall. There is a total surplus of 10,000 square feet that can be recaptured and reallocated to places where there are critical deficits. Scott clarified that not all deficits can be solved with this surplus, and the College needs to be strategic on what deficits it wants to address. Scott then spoke about recalculating adjunct space for greater efficiency. If the College puts 6 adjuncts per office the surplus of space grows from 10,000 square feet to 12-13,000 square feet and if all adjunct space is eliminated the recoverable space grows to 14,000 square feet. Scott wanted to make clear that the College is not adding space just by changing the adjunct policy; it is redirecting space. Rob then went over the appendices to the Powerpoint. He explained how the Westport landlord is putting $1 million towards the renovations and will be using his own contractors; this should speed up construction.

Ned asked what we can tell adjuncts this summer about their space allocation. Rob explained that we do not have information at this time to tell them. There are other issues that need solving before adjunct space can be addressed. Scott explained how this cannot be an across the board policy; space will have to be worked out one department at a time.
Ned stated the importance of having an adjunct policy and asked how we will prioritize space needs. Rob explained that the president will make the final decision, but it would be helpful to hear from the committee on what can and should be done. Tom argued the importance of space for research and explained his concern about the process and stated that issues need to be prioritized with input from the committee. Jim asked about a time table and the possibility of inserting a process into the time table. Rob said it would have to be before at the end of the semester. Scott added that it depends on what the committee decides in terms of policy on how the space can be recaptured. CannonDesign concluded the question and answer section of their presentation.

3. **Policy on Assignment of Space to Part-Time Faculty.** Kim felt that this discussion is based on what is decided on recapturing space. Jim stated that the committee could have a discussion about policy and having values assigned to the space process. Tom felt the conversation on adjunct space was premature and that everything should be prioritized in a comprehensive discussion. It was decided to conduct a pre-meeting to structure the full committee discussion aimed at producing guidelines on space allocation. Given the time constraints, such a meeting will have to occur quickly. Rob explained that the actual process of assigning space is largely an administrative matter and that many decisions will necessarily fall to Academic Affairs.

4. **Review Status of Recommendations on the FY2015 Financial Plan.** Rob spoke about the current financial situation. He explained that the meeting with CUNY on Feb. 25 asking for financial assistance was constructive. CUNY is waiting to see what the state budget will look like, which should be soon after April 1. Following adoption of the budget, the College will meet with Matt Sapienza to see how CUNY can help us. There was discussion on the Online Program Revenue Reinvestment Model. Ned asked if this is the model that will be used in the future. Rob said that the budget office is ok with the model. Jane explained how Ned’s current online program predated John Jay Online and is under control of the department because it was grandfathered in. Any further programs would be run under John Jay Online. Ned responded that he is not interested in a new program being administered under John Jay Online.

5. **Middle States Progress Report.** The committee decided to e-mail or meet with Jim about their comments on the draft.

6. **New Business.** There was no new business.
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Near Term Space Needs
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Need to Relocate Departments from North Hall

Long Term Space Needs

Space Needs Analysis Study
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department Relocation - Phase II</th>
<th>Department Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Funded Required</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Currently Labeled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department A</td>
<td>HH - 2nd / Sth</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Undergraduate Research</td>
<td>HH - 2nd</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department B</td>
<td>HH - 2nd / Sth</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Undergraduate Studies</td>
<td>HH - 2nd</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department C</td>
<td>HH - 2nd / Sth</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Teacher Certification</td>
<td>HH - 2nd</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department D</td>
<td>HH - 2nd / Sth</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Teacher Education</td>
<td>HH - 2nd</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department E</td>
<td>HH - 2nd / Sth</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Teacher Performance</td>
<td>HH - 2nd</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department F</td>
<td>HH - 2nd / Sth</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Teacher Development</td>
<td>HH - 2nd</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department G</td>
<td>HH - 2nd / Sth</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Teacher Evaluation</td>
<td>HH - 2nd</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department H</td>
<td>HH - 2nd / Sth</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Teacher Assessment</td>
<td>HH - 2nd</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department I</td>
<td>HH - 2nd / Sth</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Teacher Support</td>
<td>HH - 2nd</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department J</td>
<td>HH - 2nd / Sth</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Teacher Leadership</td>
<td>HH - 2nd</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department K</td>
<td>HH - 2nd / Sth</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Teacher Collaboration</td>
<td>HH - 2nd</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department L</td>
<td>HH - 2nd / Sth</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Teacher Professional Development</td>
<td>HH - 2nd</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department M</td>
<td>HH - 2nd / Sth</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Teacher Reflective Practice</td>
<td>HH - 2nd</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department N</td>
<td>HH - 2nd / Sth</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Teacher Mentorship</td>
<td>HH - 2nd</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department O</td>
<td>HH - 2nd / Sth</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Teacher Networking</td>
<td>HH - 2nd</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department P</td>
<td>HH - 2nd / Sth</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Teacher Innovation</td>
<td>HH - 2nd</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Q</td>
<td>HH - 2nd / Sth</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Teacher Research</td>
<td>HH - 2nd</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department R</td>
<td>HH - 2nd / Sth</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Teacher Literacy</td>
<td>HH - 2nd</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department S</td>
<td>HH - 2nd / Sth</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Teacher Technology</td>
<td>HH - 2nd</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department T</td>
<td>HH - 2nd / Sth</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Teacher Science</td>
<td>HH - 2nd</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department U</td>
<td>HH - 2nd / Sth</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Teacher Social Studies</td>
<td>HH - 2nd</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department V</td>
<td>HH - 2nd / Sth</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Teacher Math</td>
<td>HH - 2nd</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department W</td>
<td>HH - 2nd / Sth</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Teacher English</td>
<td>HH - 2nd</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department X</td>
<td>HH - 2nd / Sth</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Teacher Foreign Language</td>
<td>HH - 2nd</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Y</td>
<td>HH - 2nd / Sth</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Teacher Special Education</td>
<td>HH - 2nd</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Z</td>
<td>HH - 2nd / Sth</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Teacher Physical Education</td>
<td>HH - 2nd</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Need Based on Fall 2014 Enrollment

approximately 121,000 gross square feet.

65,000 net assignable square feet or

The current need is slightly more than

Near Term: Academic & Support Space Need
above the Fall 2014 usage.

- The utilization for Westport will be raised slightly.
- Currently.

For Haaren Hall, though very similar to North Hall,

- The proposed usage anticipates a higher utilization.
- Approximately 30%.

- The New Building currently exceeds that standard.
- The orange represents the CUNY standard.
- 2014.

- The slides utilize the actual scheduling from Fall.

**Classroom Utilization: Current and Proposed**

---

**Classroom Analysis**

Westport Building
North Hall
New Building
Haaren Hall
Space Surplus or Deficit Within Academic Departments

Departmental Analysis: Current Surpluses & Deficits
CANDIDATE:

- Future initiatives to resolve a modest amount of space deficiency within the College with "opportunity bars." The last bar represents the current need.
- The third bar is the total of the first two resolving current deficits. The second bar is based on NOT departments.
- The first bar represents recaptured surplus space within academic departmental savings.

Possible Savings

Academic Space Possible Savings

DO NOT resolve current deficits

Recaptured space

Current Need Subtotal
The third bar is eliminating adjunct space.

The second bar is based on reducing the

Adjoint space allocation 20 sf per

department.

The first bar represents capture of current

surplus space within academic

Efficiency

Recalculating Adjunct Space for Greater

Academic Space & Reduction in Adjunct Space
The need is slightly more than 80,000 assignable square feet or approximately 150,000 building square feet. The numbers are based on current enrollment projections by the College.
Westport: Assigned Space for Future Projects
New Building 9th Floor: Assigned Space

Proposed Area for the ACE Program

(Psychology Initiative)
Small Psychology Research Labs
Class Room to be converted into Z-8: 918 SF
918 SF
Recommendations
from the Planning Sub-Committees of the Budget and Planning Committee

Adopted August 27, 2014

The following recommendations were formally approved at the August 27, 2014, joint meeting of the Sub-Committees on Financial Planning and Strategic Planning, as reflected in the minutes of that meeting.

1. Workload Mitigation: Endorsement of “Joint Statement of the Faculty Senate and the Council of Chairs,” as follows: “The Faculty Senate and Council of Chairs congratulate and thank Provost Bowers for implementing a workload mitigation program this year. To do so, Provost Bowers and the College Administration allocated $120,000, which was derived from funds obtained by not filling two full-time faculty lines. Workload mitigation as been identified as the top priority of the John Jay faculty and of the Faculty Senate, which represents it, and of the Council of Chairs.
The Faculty Senate and the Council of Chairs accordingly call upon the John Jay Administration:
➢ To double that amount for next year – FY 15 – so that the second year of the workload mitigation program shall be in the amount of at least $240,000.
➢ To allocate yearly incremental increases of at least $120,000 for the program.
➢ To derive monies from stable and renewable sources of funding, even if doing so requires temporarily reallocating funds from unfilled full-time faculty lines.
➢ To develop the principles and methods of allocating all course reductions in consultation with elected faculty leaders of the Faculty Senate and the Council of Chairs and other appropriate elected faculty government bodies.”

The motion to endorse passed with a vote of:
Y – 6, N – 0, A – 3

2. Online Revenue Reinvestment. Offered by Provost Bowers: “The College should reinvest 5% of the gross revenue from the three fully online programs back into the programs. The 5% reinvestment would be in addition to the funds the College already invests in John Jay Online.”

The motion passed with a vote of:
Y – 7, N – 2, A – 0

3. Filling vacant faculty replacement lines. Offered by Provost Bowers: “The College should fund up to 14 faculty replacement lines once the College has reached its savings goal.”

The motion passed with a vote of:
Y – 8, N – 0, A – 1

balancing the FY2015 budget are on page 3. We will get a report on how the financial picture has changed since the vote.

The motion passed with a vote of:
Y – 8, N – 0, A – 1
Progress Report to the
Middle States Commission on Higher Education
from

JOHN JAY COLLEGE OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE
New York, New York 10019

Jeremy Travis, President
James Llana, Associate Provost for Institutional Effectiveness
Accreditation Liaison Officer

April 1, 2015

Subject of the Follow-Up Report:

To request a progress report, due April 1, 2015, documenting evidence of (1) a mission statement that clearly defines the institution’s purpose within the context of higher education and indicates who the institution serves and what it intends to accomplish (Standard 1); (2) further implementation of an integrated strategic planning process linked to budgeting and resource allocation (Standard 2); and (3) sufficient numbers of appropriately prepared and qualified faculty with roles and responsibilities clearly defined (Standard 10).

Date of the Evaluation: April 21-24, 2013
Introduction [“To orient readers who may be unfamiliar with the institution or the situation at hand, provide a few paragraphs that offer a very brief overview of the institution and relevant background or context on the issues or topics that will be addressed in the report. Also note in this section any relevant changes or developments at the institution, such as changes in institutional leadership or major changes in curriculum, enrollment, or institutional financial health.”]

John Jay College of Criminal Justice, part of the City University of New York (CUNY), was established in 1965 for educating police officers and, shortly thereafter, other in-service personnel from the Fire Department and Department of Corrections. Initially a small, specialized college, John Jay grew quickly as a general liberal arts college after the CUNY decision to implement in 1970 an open admissions policy for undergraduates across the university. Today 13,000 undergraduates and nearly 2,000 graduate students pursue a range of liberal arts and professional degrees at John Jay.

While still offering some signature programs designed to prepare students for criminal justice and public service agencies, the College has adopted a much broader approach to the issue of justice—captured by the motto “Educating for Justice”—which addresses the large, timeless questions of fairness, equality, and the rule of law, framed as they are by the broad liberal arts tradition. The new approach was made explicit in 2005 with two transformative decisions: to resume development of baccalaureate liberal arts degrees and to have only baccalaureate admissions, beginning in fall 2010. The result was new baccalaureate degrees in Economics, English, Gender Studies, Global History, Philosophy, Law and Society, Anthropology, Latin American and Latina/o Studies, and Sociology; others are under development.

The recent embrace of liberal arts programs was actually a renaissance for the College as it recovered its original mission for the first time since 1976 when a New York City financial crisis offered the choice of shutting down entirely or radically altering the mix of programs. At that point the College shed most of its liberal arts programs in order to ensure its survival. With both Associate and Baccalaureate programs on offer, John Jay was then in CUNY parlance a “Comprehensive College.” The path set in 2005 marked the way to becoming a “Senior College” by virtue of having only baccalaureate programs and a full array of liberal arts degrees. Our 2013 Self-Study was framed in terms of that transformation, achieved formally in fall 2010 but very much continuing today.

Along with the new degrees came a need for many more faculty. Initially the University supported the required hiring with additional funding, but as the recession took hold it proved impossible to make sustained progress with the ambitious faculty targets. The special help from the University that John Jay received at the beginning gave way prematurely to business as usual in tough financial times, and planning for more full-time faculty has proved difficult since then. Engaging sufficient full-time faculty to reduce our reliance on adjuncts, along with the general planning and budgeting process that supports this and other goals, are two of the topics of this Progress Report.

The third topic is also connected to the changes at the College just described, namely the shift that placed criminal justice within a broader understanding of justice. John Jay is now a liberal
arts college with an emphasis on “educating for justice.” As the consequent changes in admissions and curriculum occurred, there was no reconsideration of the Mission Statement, even as a new Master Plan was developed for 2010-2014. The College gave itself the Self-Study recommendation to look at the Mission Statement in light of the institutional transformation, and the Middle States Commission echoed the thought in the request for a Progress Letter.

**Progress to Date and Current Status**  
[“For each of the matters addressed in the report, provide a substantive summary, discussion, and analysis of actions that have been taken or implemented and the institution’s current status. If appropriate, provide specific details on next steps to be taken to sustain compliance.”]

**New Mission Statement.** Prior to the development of a new Strategic Plan for 2015-2020, it was important to review the Mission Statement since the adoption of “Educating for Justice” had effectively become the shorthand for what many regarded as the new mission of the College. Moreover, at least 20 years had passed without any serious review of the statement.

In February, 2014, the Ad Hoc Mission Statement Review Committee sent a letter (Appendix 1) to the campus community soliciting ideas on the existing statement and for a new one. The letter outlined a process that would unfold over the course of the spring semester with website postings of two successive drafts and comment periods for responses from the campus community. To get the conversation going, the Ad Hoc Committee circulated the first draft. A wiki was one means for supporting the campus conversation around the mission, and the committee also accepted comments directly by email. At the conclusion of the process the College Council (John Jay’s governance body) approved on May 15, 2014, a new Mission Statement (Appendix 2, original statement) shaped by suggestions from individuals and groups over the course of a semester:

John Jay College of Criminal Justice is a community of motivated and intellectually committed individuals who explore justice in its many dimensions. The College’s liberal arts curriculum equips students to pursue advanced study and meaningful, rewarding careers in the public, private, and non-profit sectors. Our professional programs introduce students to foundational and newly emerging fields and prepare them for advancement within their chosen professions.

Our students are eager to engage in original research and experiential learning, excited to study in one of the world’s most dynamic cities, and passionate about shaping the future. Through their studies our students prepare for ethical leadership, global citizenship, and engaged service. Our faculty members are exceptional teachers who encourage students to join them in pursuing transformative scholarship and creative activities. Through their research our faculty advances knowledge and informs professional practices that build and sustain just societies.

We foster an inclusive and diverse community drawn from our city, our country, and the world. We are dedicated to educating traditionally underrepresented groups and committed to increasing diversity in the workforce. The breadth of our community motivates us to question our assumptions, to consider multiple
perspectives, to think critically, and to develop the humility that comes with global understanding. We educate fierce advocates for justice.

The new statement reflects the important changes of the previous ten years or so. Justice is now multi-dimensional, not just criminal justice. John Jay is a liberal arts institution with professional programs. We want to serve students who have a passion for justice and for making a difference in the world through action and service informed by original research and experiential learning. At the same time, we want to provide the means for social mobility to our many students who belong to the first generation in their families to attend college. It is a statement that describes for the foreseeable future our purpose, our values, and whom we expect to serve. Moreover, the Mission Statement is aligned explicitly with the Strategic Goals currently under development and discussion. (Appendix 3, Strategic Plan Proposal)

Further implementation of an integrated strategic planning process linked to budgeting and resource allocation.

Annual Financial Plan. The College has continued to integrate planning and budgeting along the lines spelled out in the Self-Study. The activities that led to the adoption of our annual financial plan—displayed on page 14 of the Self-Study (Appendix 4)—have continued to define the rhythm of the planning/budgeting cycle at John Jay, which normally begins in February and continues into August or September. Performance data of various kinds (student surveys, Master Plan Report Card, the Year-End Report of the University’s Performance Management Process (PMP), and, most importantly, enrollment data) comes into the planning subcommittees¹ of the Budget and Planning Committee (BPC). The Office of the Budget presents updates and proposals for the financial plan throughout the spring, and the Vice Presidents sometimes review their plans (Appendices 5 and 6, samples) for the upcoming year with the subcommittees. In the summer, after we see the allocation from CUNY, the subcommittees make a recommendation to the Budget and Planning Committee. Discussion at the BPC, which includes every academic department chair, leads to a vote on a recommendation to the President. Committee recommendations for the Fiscal Years 2014 and 2015 are included as Appendices 7 and 8. See Appendix 9 for the President’s response to the 2014 recommendations. Minutes for planning committee meetings are available on the public budgeting and planning website at http://www.jjay.cuny.edu/budget-and-planning. Selected minutes for the last two planning cycles are included here as Appendices 10-15: BPC, September 10, 2014 and August 26, 2013. Planning Subcommittees of BPC: June 17, 2014; August 13, 2014; July 25, 2013; August 12, 2013.

Performance Management Process (PMP). We described in the Self-Study the important role of the PMP, which anchors much of our institutional planning, assessment, and related budgeting. The University made significant changes to the PMP beginning with the 2014-15 year. Many of the metrics were removed, leaving only about a dozen key ones. However, there was a new

¹ The planning subcommittees of the Budget and Planning Committee are the Strategic Planning Subcommittee and the Financial Planning Subcommittee. Although formally distinct in the College Charter of Governance, those subcommittees have met as one since 2011 in the interest of integrated financial and strategic planning.
requirement for three to five additional metrics put forward by the colleges themselves, which are intended to focus on areas that require campus attention. In spring 2014, the Budget and Planning Committee made recommendations concerning those goals, and they were adopted in their entirety by the College (Appendix 16, Committee vote in minutes and Appendix 17, PMP Goals and Targets for 2014-15). A number of them specifically address planning and budgeting with a sense of urgency stemming from the difficulty of balancing the budget for FY2013-14. Thus, we aim this year to minimize mid-year budget cuts and to develop a plan to better align expenses and revenues for the coming years. In addition, by way of reaching some of the goals, the BPC recommended several steps for revenue generation and student retention: support for the new online programs and development of additional ones; increasing enrollment in summer and winter sessions, both for revenue enhancement and student momentum; increasing the proportion of graduate students and decreasing the freshman population while gradually raising admissions standards; and fostering student-faculty engagement.

Expenditures followed those planning recommendations in the form of the following actions:

- Hired a Director of Special Sessions to promote enrollment and work with faculty on summer/winter offerings
- Provided funding to support new marketing, faculty development, instructional technology, new programs, and student support services, all for John Jay Online, the distance education program. Investments toward a robust distance education program have been ongoing for several years, and we are beginning to see results in the form of new online degree programs supported by faculty development and staff infrastructure.
- Hired a new Director of Marketing to support, among other things, graduate student recruitment; development of brochures for all graduate programs; recruitment of better prepared freshmen to reduce costs for initial summer remediation and to enhance retention
- Continued student-faculty engagement funding to support out-of-class activities

Space planning has been a large issue in the last year. It is complicated by the fact that we are in mid-town Manhattan where space, if it exists at all, is very expensive, and by the fact that the CUNY central administration effectively manages our space, from securing funds for new building to renting office and classroom space. With the completion of our new building in 2011, plans called for giving up the space, North Hall, it was intended to replace. However, the College had grown considerably since the new building was planned a dozen years earlier, and it seemed impossible to live without North Hall, but live without it we must, since CUNY has insisted that we vacate it by the end of this year. Although we were not sure when the North Hall option would end, we knew eventually we would have to make other arrangements.

To help identify those other arrangements the planning subcommittees of BPC recommended hiring a consultant; we budgeted $125,000 for and hired CannonDesign, a firm with a track record working with CUNY. The consultant’s final report is due sometime in April, but they provided an update for the planning subcommittees on March 24, 2015. By that time it was evident that CUNY was unable to acquire additional space, and thus the challenge facing us by the end of December this year is for all offices to be accommodated within our existing space but
without the use of North Hall. This very complicated shuffle and compression involving well over 250,000 square feet will require money for office retrofits, construction, furniture, movers, IT wiring, and other items. Fortunately, in this case the linkage between planning and budgeting is clear: our planning partner CUNY will cover costs associated with the whole process.

The consultants acknowledge that we will still be short of space after we leave North Hall, but the situation will be manageable. To gain any significant additional space beyond what the current plan affords, we will have to undertake the long-term project of applying for capital funds.

**Strategic Planning.** The College is currently constructing a new Strategic Plan for 2015-2020. The Ad Hoc Committee for the Strategic Plan circulated ten potential strategic goals and conducted a campus-wide conversation around them between November and March, with the idea of setting priorities and reducing that number. After assessing feedback from the first comment period, we made adjustments to the goals and proceeded to a second online campus consultation that occurred between February 4 and February 23, followed by a Town Hall Meeting dedicated to a discussion of the Strategic Plan (*Appendix 18*, strategic planning website discussion). The Ad Hoc Committee for the Strategic Plan also consulted on two occasions with the Budget and Planning subcommittees. (*Appendices 19 and 20*, minutes)

As the campus converged on a set of seven goals, we developed rough, five-year price-tags for each one. A much better sense of costs will occur when we enter the implementation phase later this semester, but it is clear enough now that the goals will cost at least several million dollars over the next five years. Given our financial position, it is equally clear that unless we engage in a major effort at reallocation of resources, we will not make the kind of progress we would like toward the new Strategic Plan. Therefore, within the next two years we plan to initiate a major review of all programs on campus with the aim of assigning priorities and using reallocations to fund strategic initiatives and other critical needs. We are overdue for a major realignment of programs and expenditures.

**Figure 1.**

*Current Situation.* The integrated planning/budgeting process described in our Self-Study has worked fairly well, but an overestimation of anticipated enrollment and revenue for 2012-13, and for the following two years, created the potential for a large deficit, especially in the out years. We have now corrected our vision of enrollment possibilities. Guided by that clearer vision and because of a deliberate decision to reduce the number of freshmen to better match incoming students to the institutional Mission, we have lowered
dramatically the enrollment expectations going forward, as shown in Figure 1. We now face the challenge of re-establishing financial equilibrium at a new level, driven by lower revenues for the next several years.

We made mid-year cuts to address the deficits for FY2013 and 2014, and we will have to do the same for this year, but it became evident that with new challenges ahead—like the State’s apparent decision not to fund costs of any new collective bargaining agreement for CUNY—we needed to enlist the help of CUNY. On February 25, the President and other members of the executive staff met with senior CUNY administrators to outline the College’s financial situation and to propose various options for CUNY assistance. The importance of continuing to develop as a Senior College—a journey first undertaken in 2005 with critical support from CUNY—was paramount for both sides in the discussion. We left the meeting with a firm commitment from CUNY to help, and we now await word on what form that assistance will take.

Although we have turned to CUNY to help address our financial challenges—not by any means unusual within the CUNY system—our strategic planning process continues firmly linked to budgeting and resource allocation.

**Faculty Numbers.** Increasing the number of full-time faculty has been a priority each year since the College embarked on its plans to become a Senior College in the CUNY system, which meant in part that we would expand greatly the number of liberal arts degree programs. The withdrawal of CUNY financial support—due to the recession—aftersome robust early funding slowed the hiring dramatically, and since that point the College has struggled to build faculty numbers consistently, although it is a perennial high-priority goal. Hiring new faculty is thus a chapter in the story of budgeting and planning.

**Commitments to Hire Full-Time Faculty**

By 2013, the year of the decennial review, many new faculty had been hired to meet the challenge of becoming a senior college with a larger array of liberal arts baccalaureate degrees, but we did not reach the original target of covering 50% of undergraduate FTE’s with full-time faculty. In 2010, we were at 37.1% and near the low end for CUNY Senior Colleges, and although we have a dedicated and loyal cadre of adjunct faculty we very much wanted to rely less on them for the usual reasons: they are not obligated to work with students outside of class, to serve on committees, or to participate in departmental activities generally.

At the time of the Middle States Team visit, the full-time faculty numbered 414, down from a high of 431 in 2009. It was against that decline and in light of expectations for higher enrollment that we expressed concern in the Self-Study for the speedy resumption of full-time faculty hiring; indeed, out stated target in 2013 was 50 new full-time faculty over the next three years. Thus, our commitment to faculty hiring continued in fiscal years 2014 and 2015, as evidenced by recommendations from the Budget and Planning Committee. With very little room for new spending, the following recommendation was adopted in August, 2013:

“The College will recruit and appoint 14 or 15 full-time faculty for fall, 2014 with an overall salary limitation of $1,134,000.”
About a year later, in September, 2014, the Budget and Planning Committee offered the following conditional recommendation in the face of what had become a difficult budget situation:

“The College should fund up to 14 faculty replacement lines once the College has reached its savings goal.”

Financial Challenges to Hiring Commitments

The 14 new faculty slated for fall, 2014, were hired, but the College was not able to replace all the faculty who left in 2013-14 so we experienced a net loss of faculty. While the College met the FTE enrollment target in fall 2013, for several reasons we fell well short of the revenue target for the whole year, and again for the following two years, setting up the need for mid-year cuts to avoid a deficit at year end. Enrollment failed to match even reduced expectations in FY2015, but we will probably manage to add one line (net) for fall 2015. (See Figure 3 for past enrollment trends, in terms of planned and actual.)

Progress

Despite our inability to hit the hiring targets, we can point to some incremental progress. By fall 2014, the faculty roster had increased to 415, compared with 391 three years earlier, a 6% increase. See Figure 2.

The silver lining in the cloud of missed enrollment targets is progress in the student/faculty ratio, which stood at 17.6 in FY2011. In the following year, as the full-time faculty increased, the ratio fell to just .3 points above the Senior College Average of 15.2. Given the FTE declines anticipated above (Figure 1 above), the ratio should not change or it may well improve over the next few years before enrollment returns to 2015 levels, sometime after 2019.

Figure 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full-time Faculty</th>
<th>Enrollment (AAFTE)</th>
<th>Student/Faculty Ratio (PMP)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>FY2012 - 11,159</td>
<td>17.6 (2011-2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>FY2013 - 11,378</td>
<td>15.5 (2012-2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>FY2014 - 11,390</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>FY2015 - 11,258</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
<td>Projected</td>
<td>FY2016 - 11,103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the issue of full-time faculty coverage of undergraduate instructional FTE’s, John Jay has ranked next to last among CUNY Senior Colleges over the past several years, but there was an improvement in the coverage between the 2011-12 and 2012-13 academic years, from 33.9% to 35.8%. The gap between John Jay and the Senior College Average narrowed to 6 percentage points from 8.4 points in the same time period.

While John Jay compares unfavorably with most other Senior Colleges, it is not because our faculty teach less. John Jay full-time faculty spend the same number of hours in the classroom
as their Senior College colleagues, and the student/faculty ratio is very close to the average. A reasonable conclusion is that the other colleges achieve their higher ratio by putting more students in front of full-time faculty in the form of larger classes. This strategy has its drawbacks, especially for students who may get lost in large classes, and we are not inclined to expand the number of large lecture sections at John Jay. In the Self-Study we discussed the decreases in average class size that took place in the 2011-2012 academic year.

With declining enrollments, the case for increased hiring of full-time faculty is less urgent than it once was, although we will aggressively take opportunities where we find them to increase the full-time faculty coverage rate. Our Academic Plan calls for reallocation to staff new initiatives, such as health-related programs, and to augment faculty selectively in high-need areas.

In the final analysis, we unquestionably have a sufficient number of qualified faculty to sustain and develop our academic programs. We would always like to have more, of course, and when our financial position permits, we will make progress at a faster rate.
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