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Executive Summary

Our Self-Study tells a story of institutional transformation. It is not a story driven by accidental circumstances, historical necessity, external forces, or the will of an individual—though each has played a role—but by collective and deliberate analysis of the College’s position in 2005, followed by thoughtful consideration of the future. Institutional change is often, if not always, difficult, but we have learned to pay constant attention to the ever-changing environment and the fixed destination. We have taken advantage of the opportunity offered by the Self-Study to reflect on the past and look toward the future.

Institutional Effectiveness: Standards One through Seven. We found it useful to engage the accreditation standards in numerical order. The first seven standards document the institutional dimensions of our transformation, from the decision to forego associate degree admissions and add more liberal arts majors to the related planning, goals, and allocation of resources that followed. The new plan and vision required changes in administrative structure and governance processes and a reaffirmation of our basic values, as explained in Standards Four, Five, and Six. Finally, we test our institutional mettle in Standard Seven to determine if we have the capacity to carry the new educational vision forward through evidence-based planning and assessment.

The College transformation is embodied in what we call the “Critical Choices Agenda.” The lynchpin of the agenda was the decision in 2005 to become an all-baccalaureate institution with Senior College status within the City University of New York (CUNY). Based on an in-depth 2005 study by the President’s Advisory Committee on Critical Choices, the decision to eliminate associate degree programs stemmed from a realization that the College was not effectively serving nearly a third of the undergraduate student population. The first all-baccalaureate class entered in fall 2010, and by that time a whole suite of new, related goals was beginning to shape College activities, budget proposals, and planning in general.

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 liberal arts programs in order to ensure its survival. In the end, a good number of the original faculty have remained to witness the rebirth of the liberal arts at John Jay under the banner of “Educating for Justice,” a manifestly interdisciplinary approach. Of course, many faculty at the College today were comfortable with the relative importance of the criminal justice programs in the period after 1976, and some of them, along with many alumni, are now concerned about the potential loss of an exclusive emphasis on traditional criminal justice education. The choice, however, is not simply criminal justice or liberal arts: suffice it to say for the moment that criminal justice education itself has not stood still in recent years; like the College, it has evolved away from a practitioner focus in favor of a more interdisciplinary, liberal arts approach.

As the College restored and enhanced its emphasis on liberal education, it has looked outward and viewed its mission and vision in global terms. Like many colleges in recent years, John Jay wants to make its students citizens of the world. With many faculty already doing research around the world and with a student body with close family ties to more than 100 countries, the global perspective comes naturally.
The John Jay transformation has posed challenges for planning, and we have met those challenges by constructing a new Charter of Governance in 2008, a new College Master Plan in 2010, and a new way of developing annual financial plans in 2012. We needed new structures and processes to pursue our agenda for change if we were to be inclusive, purposeful, and nimble.

The only way a fast-moving institution can stay on course is through enhanced assessment, and several years ago the College began to strengthen its capacity for institutional self-awareness by creating positions in outcomes assessment and institutional effectiveness and by expanding the Office of Institutional Research. The work on Standard Seven allowed us to take stock of that capacity and consider whether it is adequate. The need to meet CUNY metrics for institutional performance and our own Master Plan “Report Card” are constant reminders of where we stand relative to our goals.

Educational Effectiveness: Standards Eight through Fourteen. As the standards suggest, educational effectiveness begins with attracting the right students for our mission and academic programs. It depends on getting the right faculty in the classrooms, and it depends on providing the right support for both faculty and students. Finally, we cannot expect to achieve our educational goals without first-rate, rigorous curricula, continuously examined. We have been, and continue to be, transformative in all these areas, and we seek to demonstrate the consequences through assessment of student learning in Standard 14.

We have profoundly affected admissions policies by redirecting all associate degree students to our community colleges. The Critical Choices agenda speaks as well to the mix and academic preparation of students we want to admit. We will not, in the process of change, compromise the strengths gained by the diversity of the student body. The challenge to retain students is now greater than ever for many reasons. We confront all the challenges of admissions and retention through a robust emphasis on targeted recruitment, conversion, messaging, and on new approaches to student services and engagement.

Our findings on faculty in Standard 10 reinforced what we knew: there are not enough full-time faculty. Hitting our targets for full-time faculty has proved a challenge due, until recently, to unpredictable budgets. We have also recently discovered the depth of dissatisfaction on the part of the faculty with a relatively large teaching load on top of perceived high expectations with regard to scholarship and sometimes high demands for service. There are plans and ideas for addressing faculty concerns and a new, more formal approach to bringing part-time faculty into the College community.

The challenge in a period of curricular transformation is to maintain quality and rigor while serving the Mission. Standard 11 evaluates the structures and processes in place to ensure integrity of the curriculum and makes the case for a continued expansion of the degrees in liberal arts. The construction of a new General Education program over the past five years reflects fundamentally the new vision for the College and stands as a model for participatory and rational planning. The challenge there came from CUNY in the form of “Pathways,” the University’s version of general education that has refracted the John Jay plan through a different lens, changing it to be sure but preserving its distinctive characteristics.

In Standard 13 we can observe some transformative initiatives such as John Jay Online, but just as easily some very traditional programs in Adult and Continuing Education, which have been basically unaffected by the deep changes at the College. This is an area in transition, awaiting new leadership and development.
We conclude the assessment of our educational goals by looking at our collective ability to gauge student learning and to act on what we learn. Student learning assessment is strong and systematic for most programs. Faculty are in the lead, and results are commonly used for continuous improvement. Not all programs are using assessment as effectively as they could, but systematic, comprehensive assessment of student learning is the norm.

John Jay College History and Profile

Named after the first Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, John Jay College of Criminal Justice is one of nine baccalaureate-granting colleges within CUNY, the largest urban university in America. The campus is on the west side of mid-town Manhattan and serves an ever-expanding area that extends well beyond New York City. Our 15,000 students, who reflect the City population generally, trace their origins to well over 100 countries.

John Jay had its beginnings literally in the Police Academy of the City of New York in 1965, at a time of urban turmoil and profound social change when the role and actions of police in American society came under increased scrutiny; education was at least a partial answer to the new challenges confronted by police officers. The police officers were soon joined by fire fighters, and corrections officers, all of whom shared the early John Jay College and gave it a distinctive profile in higher education, one that endures in important ways today. There was only one major, Police Science, but from the beginning the liberal arts component of the curriculum was intentionally important; at the first convocation, Dean of Faculty Donald Riddle cited the contribution of the liberal arts “to the development of thinking, critical, creative beings with an awareness of their relations to the whole of mankind” (quoted in Gerald Markowitz, Educating for Justice, 11). Instead of academic departments, the faculty outside of Police Science was organized into a Division of the Humanities and a Division of Social Science and Correction. The absence of departments naturally promoted interdisciplinary inquiry and exchange among the faculty, and to this day interdisciplinary study remains vibrant—embodied most prominently in the Interdisciplinary Studies Program—despite the move to standard departments in the early years of the school.

The College initially served only in-service students. Very soon after its founding “civilian” students joined in small numbers, but it was CUNY open admissions in 1970 that transformed John Jay from a small specialized school for in-service personnel to a general college serving large numbers of students new to higher education, most of whom needed preparatory work in order to be successful in college courses. Student numbers grew from 1,000 originally to 4,400 in 1970 and to more than 8,600 in 1973. More than half of the new students did not come to John Jay with criminal justice in mind; they were much younger than the in-service personnel and about one-third were African-Americans and Hispanics. The College still serves a highly diverse student body of undergraduate and graduate students but very few in-service students.

While still offering some signature programs that are 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. John Jay now has an all-baccalaureate undergraduate program with a large array of criminal justice degrees. To its few extant liberal arts degrees in Political Science, Humanities and Justice, Forensic Psychology, and Forensic Science, the College has recently
added majors in English, Global History, Gender Studies, Philosophy, Law and Society, and Economics, with other liberal arts majors in line awaiting CUNY approval. Nine master’s degrees and a number of minors and certificates round out the offerings to students at John Jay. (Ph.D. programs in Forensic Psychology and Criminal Justice, while exclusively staffed by John Jay faculty and housed at and partially supported by the College, are formally offered by the CUNY Graduate Center.)

The student body today is even more diverse than it was in the days following the advent of open admissions. Women comprise 56% of the undergraduate student body. Ethnically, 22% are African-Americans; 12% are Asian/Pacific Islander; 40% are Hispanic; and 25% are white. Students are of course much younger than in the days when in-service police officers dominated the College, and while they have aged somewhat as a group over the past four years, they are among the youngest in CUNY. The College consistently draws students from a dozen or so states other than New York, but the proportion of New York City residents among undergraduates has increased over the past four years from 77% to 80% (“Fall 2011 Fact Book” 16).

The Self-Study Process

The College formally kicked off the reaccreditation process with a ceremony in November 2010. The Co-Chairs of the Self-Study Steering Committee presented an overview of the entire process, including a timeline. Six workgroups would conduct the research and writing for the Self-Study. The Co-Chairs of each workgroup, one drawn from the faculty and the other from the administration, plus the Provost and Faculty Senate President, constituted the Self-Study Steering Committee. Co-Chairing the Steering Committee itself were Provost Jane Bowers, Faculty Senate President Karen Kaplowitz, and Associate Provost James Llana. Each workgroup consisted of faculty, staff and administration, and at least one student.

The Workgroups are as follows with the names of all who participated at one time or another:

Workgroup 1: Standard 1 and 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allison Pease* (Co-Chair)</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>James Llana (Co-Chair)</td>
<td>Office of Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vivien Hoexter</td>
<td>Office of Marketing and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reggie Grayson</td>
<td>Office of the President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Rambharose</td>
<td>Testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie Bridgewater</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shu-Yuan (Demi) Cheng*</td>
<td>Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory Umbach*</td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Cauthen*</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerald Markowitz*</td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Handelman</td>
<td>Center on Media, Crime &amp; Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janice Johnson-Dias*</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Workgroup 2: Standards 2 and 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thomas Kucharski* (Co-chair)</th>
<th>Psychology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Robert Pignatello (Co-Chair)</td>
<td>Finance and Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Ketterer</td>
<td>Business Office</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ben Rohdin       Academic Affairs
Allison MacDonald       Marketing and Development
Ratko Rakocevic       Student
Anthony Carpi*        Science
Lisandro Perez*       Latin American & Latina/o Studies
Bonnie Nelson*        Library
Geert Dhondt*         Economics
William Gotttdiener*    Psychology
Serguei Cheloukhine*  Law and Police Science
Dana Trimboli         Student Development
Carina Quintian       Institutional Review Board (IRB)
Thomas Kubic*         Science
Ned Benton*           Public Management
Kinya Chandler        Academic Affairs
Gina Galligan         Finance & Business Services
William Pangburn      Information Technology
Donald Gray           Office of Legal Counsel
Nivedita Majumdar*     English
Elizabeth McCabe      Governmental Relations
James Sheridan        Marketing and Development
Nayanny Bello         Student

Workgroup 3: Standards 4, 5, and 6

Angela Crossman* (Co-chair)    Psychology
Rose Marie Maldonado (Co-chair)    Office of Legal Counsel
Wayne Edwards       Student Development
Jerylle Kemp         Marketing and Development
Marisol Marrero      One Stop Services
Adam McKible*       English
Mayra Nieves         Office of the President
Desheen Evans       Student
Gloria Browne-Marshall*    Law and Police Science
Amie Macdonald*   Philosophy
Erica King-Toler*      SEEK
John Staines*       English

Workgroup 4: Standards 8 and 9

Bettina Carbonell* (Co-chair)    English
Richard Saulnier (Co-chair)       Enrollment Management
Berenecea Johnson-Eanes       Student Development
Sumaya Villanueva         Academic Advisement Center
Vielka Holness            Pre-Law Institute
Domenick Bruccoleri       Student
Adam Scott Wandt*         Public Management
Jennifer Dysart*         Psychology
Gail Garfield*          Sociology
Robert Garot*           Sociology
Lisa Farrington*        Art & Music
Nancy Velazquez-Torres* SEEK
Calvin Chin Counseling
Ma’at Lewis* Counseling
Dara Byrne Communication and Theater Arts

Workgroup 5: Standards 10 and 13

Avram Bornstein* (Co-chair) Anthropology
Jannette Domingo (Co-chair) Graduate & Professional Studies
Karen Terry Academic Affairs
Meghan Duffy Center for the Advancement of Teaching
Kevin Nesbitt Academic Affairs
William Pangburn Instructional Technology Support Services
Vipul Rana Student
Andrea Balis* History
Katie Gentile* Women’s Center
Carmen Solis* SEEK
Lucia Trimbur* Sociology
Raul Rubio* Foreign Languages & Literatures
Feng Wang Director, John Jay Online
Kimora* Law and Police Science
Arkee Hodges* Africana Studies

Workgroup 6: Standards 11, 12, and 14

Michael Leippe* (Co-chair) Psychology
Anne Lopes (Co-chair) Undergraduate Studies
Larry Sullivan Library
Katalin Szur* First Year Experience
Katherine Killoran Undergraduate Studies
David Barnet Undergraduate Studies
Ammarah Karim Student
Nathan Lents* Science
Amy Green* Communication & Theater Arts
Diana Falkenbach* Psychology
John Bryk* Mathematics & Computer Science
Tara Pauliny* English
Will Simpkins Career Development Services
Les Hansen* English
Daniel Auld Undergraduate Studies
Raul Rubio* Foreign Languages & Literatures
Bettina Carbonell* English

* Denotes faculty

The Steering Committee met regularly throughout the research and writing period to share updates on progress and to address questions. A Middle States webpage with various documents and a list of activities was created in 2011 on the College website. Beginning in summer 2012 the Steering Committee Co-Chairs re-drafted the reports, consulting with the co-chairs as necessary. We posted chapter drafts on our intranet for faculty, staff, and students, along with a wiki for comments. One of the co-chairs met with the Student Council and HEO
(Higher Education Officer=professional staff) Council to explain the reaccreditation process and to solicit comments on the drafts; another co-chair conducted reviews of chapters at meetings of the Faculty Senate. There was a general and successful effort through campus media to draw members of the College community into the process or at least to make them aware of the process.

The Steering Committee Co-Chairs produced a second draft, and on January 3, 2013, shared it with the Middle States Team Chair, who visited campus for the preliminary visit on January 30, 2013. On February 14, 2013, the College Council, our principal governance body, discussed the proposed Self-Study. Several changes were proposed and approved for language in the sections on strengths, concerns, and recommendations. The Council then unanimously approved the Self-Study as a whole.
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Chapter One
Standard 1: Mission and Goals

Introduction

The Mission Statement, Master Plan, and Vision Statement provide the inspiration and guiding ideas for program and curriculum development across the College. While distinct in terms of scope, origin, and timeframe, they provide a coherent vision that effectively binds the John Jay community together in action and purpose. As in any evolving and vibrant institution, there are tensions and significant challenges, but a broad consensus about our mission, goals, and values easily supports constructive dialogue and purposeful advancement.

John Jay College is one of 24 campuses that comprise the City University of New York (CUNY); thus planning at John Jay takes place in the context of the CUNY Bylaws, CUNY Master Plan and related CUNY Performance Management Process (PMP) Goals and Targets which annually define broad targets and goals for all campuses. Each campus must specify how and to what extent it will achieve those targets, and there is an annual assessment of campus performance. Certainly, John Jay must be responsive in very particular ways to the PMP targets, described in the next chapter, but it is the College Mission that frames most deeply and distinctively who we are and what we aspire to be.

The Mission

John Jay’s Mission Statement signals to internal and external communities the College’s reason for being. The mission makes several clear and important points: 1) We offer education in criminal justice and related fields; 2) We educate in the liberal arts tradition; 3) We value scholarship and research; 4) We inspire students to create a more just world through active citizenship and service. One can see the expression of the Mission literally on the walls of the campus buildings but more tellingly in the curriculum, faculty hiring and orientation programs, strategic planning, the budget allocation process, strategic partnerships, meeting minutes, and in the professional lives of our alumni. As this chapter—and, indeed, the entire Self-Study—makes evident, we aspire to live the mission, not just talk about it.

But of course we do talk about it, quite intentionally so, since we want to attract students, faculty, and strategic partners who will be a good fit for the institution. In 2011, we worked with Siegel and Gale, a prominent branding firm co-owned until recently by one of our Foundation Board members, Alan Siegel, to sharpen our message and image. Out of that study, based on many meetings with staff, faculty, and students came language, voice, and “positioning and promise” that express the Mission and clarify our identity for our target constituencies, especially prospective students.

If the work with Siegel led to an “institutional narrative,” we have more recently developed a complementary academic narrative. Written by the Provost, the academic narrative defines our mission of external engagement through the justice-centered research, teaching, and curriculum development of the faculty. The message explains who we are by defining roles and expectations of faculty and students. Thus, at the broad institutional and more focused academic levels, we are highly intentional in projecting our identity to the world at large. Further analysis is provided in the discussion of Standard Eight, in the context of admissions and recruitment.
The Mission of John Jay College of Criminal Justice

John Jay College of Criminal Justice of The City University of New York is a liberal arts college dedicated to education, research and service in the fields of criminal justice, fire science and related areas of public safety and public service. It strives to endow students with the skills of critical thinking and effective communication; the perspective and moral judgment that result from liberal studies; the capacity for personal and social growth and creative problem solving that results from the ability to acquire and evaluate information; the ability to navigate advanced technological systems; and the awareness of the diverse cultural, historical, economic and political forces that shape our society.

The College is dedicated to fostering an academic environment, to promoting the highest quality of undergraduate and graduate study, to promoting and protecting academic freedom, to promoting scholarship and encouraging research, especially in areas related to criminal justice and public service. The breadth and diversity of scholarship at the College reflect our continuing commitment to innovative analyses, interdisciplinary approaches and global perspectives. The College offers its students a curriculum that balances the arts, sciences and humanities with professional studies. It serves the community by developing graduates who have the intellectual acuity, moral commitment and professional competence to confront the challenges of crime, justice and public safety in a free society. It seeks to inspire both students and faculty to the highest ideals of citizenship and public service.

Another way to understand the lived Mission is in historical context. In the beginning, John Jay was perhaps unique in insisting on the value of a liberal education for police and fire personnel, and during the early years of the College the students were overwhelmingly in-service students. Indeed, when it opened in 1965 John Jay was housed in the New York City Police Academy. With the arrival of open admissions at CUNY in 1970, the population of John Jay changed dramatically from a largely white, male, and older student body to an ethnically diverse and much younger group of students. In the budget crisis six years later the College avoided closing only through an agreement that reduced the size of the school and removed the baccalaureate liberal arts programs unrelated to criminal justice and public service. For decades afterwards most of the liberal arts departments served exclusively the General Education curriculum.

According to Prof. Gerald Markowitz, author of a history of the College entitled Educating for Justice, the basic goals of John Jay in the 1960’s were: 1) educating police personnel; 2) defining and developing “police science and criminal justice into coherent and recognized academic disciplines”; and 3) offering a strong liberal arts curriculum. He argues that each represented “distinct approaches and emphases” rather than a unified whole. Over time each was ascendant at some point. In the first few years until open admissions, it was the education of police that was primary; between 1970 and 1976, liberal education “held sway”; and since the near closing in 1976 “education in criminal justice has been most important.” (12)

Looking back from 2013 at Professor Markowitz’s assessment, it seems at least arguable that 2005 marked the beginning of a new phase at John Jay, one in which the liberal arts had once again assumed greater importance, but not to displace criminal justice education. Rather, the
line between the liberal arts and criminal justice education began to blur. While the mission did not change throughout this period, certainly for many the understanding of the mission shifted somewhat. The mission statement asserts: “The College offers its students a curriculum that balances [emphasis added] the arts, sciences and humanities with professional studies.” By the time the College Council incorporated the Vision Statement into the Master Plan in 2010, the language had changed in a subtle but important way: “…the John Jay College curriculum integrates [emphasis added] the liberal arts and sciences and professional education…” The liberal arts and professional studies were now, in principle at any rate, an integrated whole, not two parts of a curriculum in tension, and “educating for justice” was the unifying conceptual framework. The phrase “educating for justice” has permeated the discourse to the extent that it has become a stand-in for the formal mission. In most curricular, hiring, and strategic planning discussions, “justice” has replaced “criminal justice” as the College’s educational focus. This shift is even mirrored in the interior design of our new campus, where the phrases “educating for justice” and “fierce advocates for justice” are painted on our walls; in one rendition “criminal” is but one modifier of “justice”:

Critical Choices Agenda: Baccalaureate Students and a Liberal Arts Renaissance

Beginning in 2005 the College thus began in earnest to explore an enhanced relationship with the liberal arts, and the result would ultimately be a transformation of the curriculum, one inspired more by the original mission than by any new thinking. The initiatives that define that transformation constitute what we call the Critical Choices agenda, named after the “President’s Advisory Committee on Critical Choices.” The agenda rolled out in a succession of reports and plans which mark a consistent line of planning and action up to the present time:

- “Report on Associate Degree Programs at John Jay College of Criminal Justice,” December, 2005
- “Plan for Investment in Academic Excellence At John Jay College,” September, 2006
- “Creating the New John Jay College—Phase Two of the Plan to Invest in Academic
In 2005, with the approval of the CUNY Chancellor and with a Faculty Senate Resolution in favor, the President called for a study on the status of associate degrees at the College. Shortly thereafter the “Report on Associate Degree Programs at John Jay College of Criminal Justice” offered a number of options ranging from continuing the associate programs to moving to an all-baccalaureate college. There followed a month later another data-driven report specifically on liberal arts programs; the “Report on Liberal Arts Majors at John Jay College of Criminal Justice” also laid out a number of options that ranged from maintaining the status quo to pursuing new liberal arts programs.

While withholding any judgment, the first report observed that the John Jay associate degrees had been designed with transfer in mind and not as stand-alone degrees. In one sense, this was fortunate since almost all applicants wanted, and had applied for, baccalaureate programs, but their test scores placed most of them involuntarily on one of the associate degree tracks. Due to weaker academic preparation, students in those programs often had poorer outcomes compared to students in the baccalaureate programs with whom they shared classes. To some significant extent, the associate degree students were for practical purposes in baccalaureate programs but without the academic resources to succeed very well, and the compelling data in the report presented two very different pictures of academic success, one for students admitted as baccalaureate degree students and one for students admitted to the associate degrees. The report tapped deeper arguments as well: liberal arts degrees were “strong preparation for a variety of careers, indeed for citizenship itself.” The absence of such degrees was a barrier to John Jay’s ambition of becoming a “world class educational institution.”

The mere possibility of discontinuing associate programs prompted a broad discussion about liberal arts degrees, since Senior Colleges in CUNY all had liberal arts options, and a John Jay without associate programs would automatically become a Senior College. Other perspectives surfaced as well: the lack of liberal arts degrees tended to marginalize the faculty in those departments and make recruitment and retention of faculty more difficult; liberal arts degrees would provide alternatives to students who decide after entry that criminal justice is no longer an abiding interest; finally, liberal arts options were important in the original mission and had been removed only as a result of financial circumstances and an externally imposed mandate. The second Critical Choices committee report reviewed options for the pursuit of new liberal arts majors, which would require approval by the CUNY Board of Trustees, since such degrees were not allowed under the 1976 Board Resolution.

After an inclusive and open discussion across the campus and unanimous approval by the College Council on May 15, 2006, President Travis presented a plan to the CUNY Chancellor on September 18. It signaled a “historic opportunity” and called for a number of significant achievements over the subsequent four years, all built on the consensus to attain all-baccalaureate admissions by fall 2010:

- Transformation to a liberal arts college
• Creation of what came to be called the CUNY Justice Academy, a program that would send the associate students formerly admitted to John Jay to CUNY community college partners before entry into John Jay upon completion of the associate degree in one of several justice-related joint, two-plus-two, degrees
• Hiring 166 new full-time, tenure-track faculty, primarily to support the new liberal arts majors that were envisioned, an increase of 48% over the fall 2006 number
• Improving the undergraduate educational experience generally and in particular at the lower-division level; one specific goal was to improve full-time faculty coverage of the instructional program from 40% to 62%
• New support for the faculty, especially in the Library
• Expanded degree options and enrollment in Graduate Studies
• New recruitment and marketing campaigns

In an early sign of the renewed role for the liberal arts, the proposal pointed to John Jay’s aspiration to one day be “a world-class liberal arts college.”

The Critical Choices agenda ultimately established a number of liberal arts degrees alongside the traditional majors. Of course, in 2006 the College was serving a very diverse population, certainly different than the one that walked through the doors in 1965. The renewed commitment to a liberal education for a student body with very few in-service students prompted a different understanding of what John Jay was all about, captured in the phrase “educating for justice.” The phrase at once tied past to present and offered an expansive view of the future. For many at John Jay today, it encapsulates the Mission.

The agenda was extremely ambitious and needed considerable financial support, and CUNY enthusiastically partnered with John Jay to realize the potential described by the President in 2006. In his six-month progress report, the President could point to the following: a faculty hiring program underway; intentionally decreased admissions to associate programs; cooperation with community colleges in what was initially termed the Educational Partnerships initiative (now called the CUNY Justice Academy); development of new liberal arts majors; planned growth in graduate programs; strengthening programs for student success and use of technology; and creation of new approaches to marketing and recruitment, to bring in more and better-prepared baccalaureate students.

In line with the agenda, since 2006 the College has:

• replaced admitted associate degree students entirely with baccalaureate and graduate students
• added 83 full-time faculty, peaking in 2009 at 431
• registered six liberal arts degrees (English, Economics, Global History, Gender Studies, Philosophy, Law and Society)
• registered two new graduate degrees (Forensic Mental Health Counseling and International Crime & Justice)
• created the CUNY Justice Academy, now with more than 7,000 students enrolled in the community colleges
• added 11 full-time academic advisors and an Academic Advising Center
• created a First Year Experience program
• re-branded the College and developed language to capture recent changes and project them to the public
The Critical Choices agenda continues to guide development at the College as we pursue every one of the initiatives in the 2006 plan proposed to the Chancellor. Change has been truly transformative in places—as promised—yet uneven. We have not come close to achieving the targeted full-time faculty coverage rate, mainly because of the recession and the attendant budget challenges within CUNY. In December 2009, due to a budget shortfall, searches in progress were halted and 34 full-time substitute faculty members were not reappointed for spring. This was followed by an early retirement initiative that further reduced the number of full-time faculty. Budget demands led to the need for higher enrollment targets than first anticipated—to generate revenue that would not be coming from CUNY—and greater enrollment put pressure on the full-time faculty coverage metrics. We have not yet developed a robust capacity for marketing and recruitment needed to attract students, especially graduate students, with significantly better academic preparation, although that effort is proceeding aggressively now. We have, however, taken an important step to attract some highly qualified students by creating an Honors Program, and recently John Jay was successful in its bid to become part of the CUNY Macaulay Honors College; starting in fall 2013, we will accept the first Macaulay students, which will put us in select CUNY company with Baruch, Brooklyn, CCNY, Hunter, Lehman, Staten Island, and Queens Colleges. Most dramatically, we have presided over the on-schedule conversion to an all-baccalaureate admissions program, and John Jay is now a Senior College in CUNY. The CUNY Justice Academy is on target, serving thousands of community college students, and they have started to enter John Jay in significant numbers. In addition, we have added both undergraduate and graduate degree programs. If not complete, the achievement is still remarkable.

Next to creating an all-baccalaureate college, perhaps the most significant change has been the development of liberal arts degrees. While the College was calling for new liberal arts majors in general, it offered only guidelines and conditions, and left it to individual departments to propose new degrees or not. The result is a collection of degrees based more on particular circumstances than design, and in this sense and others the agenda is unfinished. And after the initial development and approval by CUNY of six liberal arts degrees, there are three others, submitted later on, that are still waiting for CUNY approval. We frequently say that John Jay is a liberal arts college or is in transition to a liberal arts college (see Appendix 1.1). The range of statements is impressive, suggesting the importance of being a liberal arts institution, but some uncertainty remains about whether we are there or not. The Critical Choices Committee on the liberal arts pointed to one fundamental question: “What does it mean for a college to represent itself as a liberal arts institution?” If as the President noted, “we are on our way to becoming a full liberal arts college,” what does that look like as a destination in terms of curriculum choices (understood broadly), facilities, faculty, marketing, recruitment, student services, and student aspirations?

Just as we have raised the question of what it means to represent ourselves as a liberal arts college, we have questioned recently what it means to “educate for justice.” Do liberal arts degree options make us a liberal arts institution? Do courses or degrees on criminal justice make us an institution that “educates for justice”? Surely the answer to both questions is “no.” The Siegel and Gale report headlined the following quote from one of the administrators they interviewed: “We don’t know how to talk about John Jay because we can never decide on who we really are.” Doubtless this overstates the case, but there are unresolved tensions that have become more prominent with the Critical Choices agenda.

Rather than pose the “educating for justice” question straight on in terms of the institution as a whole, the Provost invited faculty to think about what it means to them as they teach, as they do research, and as they interact in general with students and colleagues.
interested in what it means to faculty who teach in areas apparently not linked to justice, for if educating for justice is our mission then everyone—professors of English and physics and mathematics not excepted—is responsible in one way or another to contribute to it. By extension, we must include career counselors, athletic coaches, academic advisors, and all others who educate students.

**Strategic Planning: JohnJay@50**

The Mission Statement and the related action plan embodied in the Critical Choices agenda provide the framework for the priorities articulated in the College’s current Master Plan, “John Jay @50,” which describes the priorities of the institution under five interrelated “domains of excellence”: Student Success; Teaching; Research and Scholarship; Strategic Partnerships; and Institutional Effectiveness. These five goals and 26 subordinate objectives provide the College community with the focus necessary to further the College mission and to conduct much of the College’s daily business.

The Master Plan was developed over nine months in 2010 with broad community collaboration. President Travis appointed 32 members of the College community to the Master Plan Advisory Committee (MPAC). MPAC comprised faculty, professional staff, alumni, undergraduate and graduate students, the Chair of the John Jay College Foundation, as well as representatives of the New York Police Department, the New York Fire Department, and the New York City Department of Juvenile Justice—three agencies with which the College has a long history of cooperation. MPAC was charged with reviewing and synthesizing data and points of view collected from various sources and then drafting proposed master plan goals and objectives for the entire College community to consider.

The College took many other steps to solicit input from the community, as described in the appendix to the Master Plan. A consultant, hired to help collect and manage data, met with key stakeholders, reviewed extant data, and performed three custom online surveys, each targeted toward different constituencies: faculty, students, and staff. The consultant also hosted three community forums and mounted two idea walls, which allowed passersby at the College to post their thoughts about the future direction of the College. The College used posters, flyers, email, and its website to get the word out about the Master Plan process and how everyone could get involved. The entire effort culminated in governance approval on October 14, 2010.

**The Vision Statement**

The Mission statement is powerfully articulated, amplified, and projected into the future by the Vision Statement, written in 2009 as a component of the Master Plan. We live the mission and pursue the Vision. The Vision asserts the importance of our original mission and wraps it explicitly in “educating for justice” as we seek a future built increasingly on student-centered learning and personal development. We will help students achieve their academic goals but also “their personal and social development and maturation.” Looking outward, we will educate our students and encourage our faculty to “translate ideas into social justice and action on a global scale.” More recently, we have begun to speak of “building and sustaining just societies” as a global call to action; the education we offer enables students to respond.

Asking our students to contribute to building and sustaining just societies is to ask a lot of them. Fortunately, many come to John Jay with instincts for just that, but any education worthy of the name should help students clarify their personal values and give meaning and direction to their lives, which is why the appeal for holistic learning is an integral, explicit part of our Vision Statement and Master Plan (and implied in the Mission). We may exhort students and faculty to
change the world, but ultimately the call has to come from within to be heard. Above all else, education must be personal: it concerns the relationship between each student and the world in which he or she lives, and understanding that relationship must continue throughout a lifetime. We must attempt to instill in students the capacity for life-long learning in general coursework, but particularly through the institutional learning goals in General Education and in Student Affairs programming.

The Vision Statement reinforces the Master Plan Goal of “Institutional Effectiveness” by stating the importance of using assessment, because we want the institution to have—like our students—the capacity to learn and to improve continuously. Creating the position of Associate Provost for Institutional Effectiveness was one tangible outcome of the call for greater effectiveness; an accelerated program of assessment was another, along with a greater awareness of and reliance on data for planning.

Underlying the call for assessment in the Vision Statement is a plea to re-center the institution: to “…shift our focus from transmitting knowledge to producing learning…” Students must be at the center, and we will measure our success by their learning, not by what the faculty or administration do. The idea was simply stated on a widely distributed lapel button at the kick-off ceremonies for JohnJay@50: “Student Success = Our Success.”

Collectively, the Mission and Vision Statements and Master Plan form the foundation and provide the supporting processes for the College’s primary and overarching focus on student success. This will become clear in the remaining chapters.

**John Jay and CUNY**

John Jay’s relationship with the City University of New York is a defining element of our mission and planning. The Master Plan aligns with the historic mission and strategic directions of CUNY: insistence on academic rigor, accountability, and assessment, and the provision of equal access and opportunity. The College has benefited considerably from system-wide initiatives over the last twelve years, articulated via the two previous and current CUNY Master Plans that affirm the importance of high standards in the University’s fundamental mission of teaching, research, and service.

As a constituent college, John Jay participates in and is subject to the University’s Performance Management Process (PMP), which “allows CUNY to function as an Integrated University, to focus on outcomes as opposed to activities [and] to be clear about priorities” and aligns in very specific ways all essential campus activities with the CUNY Master Plan. As a result of system-wide priorities, the College is accountable for its annually stated goals and targets in relation to the PMP main goals of raising academic quality, improving student success, and enhancing financial and management effectiveness. In addition to the annual PMP cycle, John Jay must be responsive to CUNY across a range of day-to-day activities. Thus, planning and management at John Jay take place very much under the guiding hand of the system.

**The Mission and the John Jay Community**

Living the mission requires knowledge of it and support for it; broadly considered, the John Jay community is indeed very much aware of the College’s special mission and supports it. More than students at any other CUNY college, John Jay applicants self-select for the mission. Sixty-seven percent of the fall class of 2012 identified John Jay as their first choice CUNY college, compared with an average 42% for the other CUNY colleges. We often hear informally from students and their families during orientation that they “always wanted to attend John Jay.”
On occasion we ask the faculty and staff directly about the mission, and the responses confirm that there is awareness and wide acceptance of it. In one recent survey of employee engagement, 95% of all employees agree that they have a good understanding of the mission and the goals of the college (Employee Engagement Survey, 2010). For our Self-Study review, we initiated another poll specifically on the mission for faculty and staff. We asked whether the College’s mission accurately reflects their perceptions of and aspirations for the College, and what changes, if any, they would recommend to the mission. Of the 174 responses, 77% of the faculty and staff believe that the College’s mission accurately reflects their perception of the College and 81% see the mission as embodying their aspirations for the College. In the open comments section where faculty and staff were asked to recommend changes to the mission, a significant minority (19%) advocated that the statement define the mission more broadly in terms of justice rather than criminal justice and recognize the College’s new liberal arts majors and emphasis. Thus there is general consensus that the College’s mission accurately represents the College, but with a significant minority desiring an explicit shift that embraces “educating for justice” as a broader mission under which liberal arts studies fit more comfortably.

The Mission Beyond the Campus

Support and interest in the mission is hardly confined to the West Side of Manhattan. It extends around the world in part because of what we do to project the mission but primarily because issues of justice—from the particulars of policing to the debates on human rights—are universal. Our faculty has an international and comparative justice focus and has studied globally issues such as the rule of law, genocide, gangs, rape, drugs and drug violence, domestic violence, the death penalty, and terrorism.

The accomplished faculty and staff at John Jay are involved in various international projects that are the natural outgrowth of the College’s mission to cultivate strategic partnerships on issues of justice to ensure the broadest impact of work done at John Jay. Such projects include the design and development of international academic programs in Uruguay, China, India, Ukraine, Russia, and Senegal; study abroad opportunities in Greece, Dominican Republic, Indonesia and other places; and a biennial international conference on crime and justice hosted by John Jay in such places as Ireland, Hungary, Italy, England, Romania, Morocco and Puerto Rico. Every week we hear from various organizations, educational institutions, and governments from around the world, each hoping to join us as a partner or enlist us as a teacher or consultant on issues of justice. We are of course pleased with the affirmation, since the pursuit of strategic partnerships is one of our Master Plan goals, but we cannot engage with everyone, and the challenge is to respond strategically to the many calls for cooperation in order to benefit our students and faculty and to advance our vision of having an impact on the world.

In the remaining chapters, we will demonstrate in much greater detail how the Mission, Master Plan, and Vision guide development at John Jay College.

Strengths:

1. John Jay has a well-defined Mission and niche in higher education, which allows us to focus our efforts.
2. The Critical Choices agenda, carefully thought out in 2005 and 2006, and approved by governance, provides a coherent set of objectives that guide planning along with the Master Plan.
3. The research interests, knowledge, and skills of the faculty make John Jay an
attractive partner to many organizations and governments around the world.

Concerns:

1. There is no plan yet for completing the liberal arts component of the Critical Choices agenda.
2. Majors and programs are developed and proposed according to the interests of academic departments and not as the result of College-wide planning.
3. CUNY support for the John Jay liberal arts agenda, while strong and explicit in the early years of Critical Choices, may not now be as enthusiastic.

Recommendations:

1. Given the many changes the College has gone through in recent years, the College community should formally re-examine the Mission statement in advance of the next Master Plan discussion.
2. The Undergraduate Curriculum & Academic Standards Committee and the Graduate Studies Committee should attend more to comprehensive academic planning, including needs assessment.

---

3 Senior Colleges in CUNY are those not offering associate degrees. “Comprehensive” colleges offer both baccalaureate and associate degrees.
4 “...[w]e will be in a position to continue to expand the number of majors in the years following the Investment Plan, as faculty interest, student demand, and market forces would warrant.” P20, 9/2006 first report
5 The split between liberal arts degrees and criminal justice is far from absolute. The English major has a Literature and Law track, and the Economics major features a Forensic Financial Analysis track. A few other liberal arts degrees have similar tracks. Moreover, some of the criminal justice-related degrees—the B.A. in Criminal Justice is one prime example—draw content and approaches freely from liberal arts disciplines.
6 In general we live by the current mission although as the College has evolved, some of the specifics in the mission statement may no longer hold, certainly not for everyone.
Chapter Two
Standard 2: Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal
Standard 3: Institutional Resources

Introduction

The College uses its Master Plan to guide activities and related resource allocations, and it relies on assessment to improve performance and planning. The College is part of the CUNY system and, therefore, planning takes place as well within the framework of the CUNY Master Plan and priorities (expressed in the Performance Management Process or PMP), but John Jay and CUNY goals often overlap. Finally, the Critical Choices agenda continues with its particular emphases, most of which have been incorporated into the Master Plan. In each context, goals, objectives, and performance targets are clearly stated and evaluated on an annual basis.

Recently, the College has begun to plan in a more integrated way than it has in the past. We have also seen significant improvements in connecting planning and budgeting; communicating budget and planning information to the campus community; using assessment data to inform planning; and drawing more stakeholders into the process of building a financial plan.

Planning in a System Environment

As one member of a highly integrated University, John Jay does not have all the options available to an independent college, but neither does it have some of the challenges. It would not make sense for every campus to have every type of degree program, and CUNY does not hesitate to foreclose and encourage different lines of development at the 24 campuses. For example, John Jay offers neither an education major nor a business program, and the likelihood of pursuing either is very low. As one of the more recently established CUNY colleges, John Jay was created with a particular mission, namely the liberal study of criminal justice for in-service personnel. The in-service population is now quite small, and the College has changed dramatically in some basic ways, but it is still constrained broadly, and happily so, within that original mission. On balance, John Jay benefits in critical ways from its CUNY affiliation.

Aside from being broadly mission-bound, John Jay and all other CUNY campuses respond to targets and goals of the University in the PMP. There is considerable leeway in how we adapt our local goals and activities to fit in the CUNY framework, but adapt we must. We naturally share many of the goals of the PMP, which are straightforward indices of any successful institution of higher education, but there is no doubt that planning and activities at John Jay would be somewhat different without the PMP. Nonetheless, the PMP cycle is a highly effective means of communicating and monitoring the effectiveness of planning and resource allocation at the College; planning and management at John Jay take place in a very structured way within the system.

Planning and Budgeting Processes

Once the Master Plan is set the most important planning is, first, its translation into annual objectives, strategies, and targets by division and, second, the related allocation of resources—expressed in the Financial Plan—to support the divisional plans. In November 2010, after the final approval of the latest five-year Master Plan by the College Council, the Executive Staff met in a day-long retreat to devise strategies for achieving the Master Plan goals and objectives. The
first order of business was an environmental scan (SWOT analysis) which aided in the selection of strategies. The group then developed a long list of strategies which, after further editing and additions by other groups, was subsequently distributed across the next four years, by Division. Each year those strategies, explicitly linked to both the Master Plan and PMP, are the basis for annual evaluations of the Vice Presidents, while the prospective strategies form the basis for planning the following year’s activities. Thus the VP performance appraisal templates provide a road-map of planning based on the Mission, Master Plan, and PMP.

Of course even the best plans have to mesh with the budget to mean very much and, as is the case for many institutions, linking planning and budgeting has proved a challenge at John Jay, but it is a challenge that we have met successfully in the last year or so. Starting with the changes made in governance structures in 2008 (see Chapter 3), the College has strengthened the connections between planning and budgeting. In 2011, we took another important step by effectively combining for most purposes the Strategic Planning and Financial Planning Subcommittees (SPS and FPS) of the Budget and Planning Committee (BPC). Procedurally and structurally, the two functions are now tightly linked and, of course, are responsive to guidelines and procedures from CUNY.

In the wake of the Charter changes, all the elements for rational planning seemed to be in place, and the split between financial and strategic planning was reversed, but to many it seemed as if the structural changes had not led to process change; the administration read in a survey (2009 University Faculty Senate Survey) and heard personally (2011 Council of Chairs meeting) from faculty in unmistakable terms that the budget and planning process was insufficiently open and consultative. There was simply no meaningful engagement of the committees, especially of the large Budget and Planning Committee, in the construction of the financial plan. As a response to these concerns, the President announced a new way of doing business at the Budget and Planning Committee meeting in February 2012. The SPS/FPS engagement with the financial plan would henceforth begin well ahead of its submission to CUNY, so there would be time—approximately six months—to develop recommendations based on receiving relevant information and proposals. The subcommittees essentially doubled their meeting schedule to ensure sufficient and meaningful discussion. The extended cycle of activities leading to the FY2013 Financial Plan is now the model going forward for the sequence and timing of planning activities (See Table 1 below). In addition, a public website devoted to Planning and Budgeting makes the process more open and transparent by providing a place to post significant steps along the way to the recommendation of a financial plan, along with relevant documents, and so we fully expect to see more improvements in the FY2014 Financial Plan process.

New York State and the John Jay Budget

CUNY and the State set the stage and the timing for campus planning and budgeting activities. The Governor presents the executive budget in January of each year, and at that point we have the earliest indication of whether we may be facing cuts or not. After the State legislature adopts the budget, there is an allocation to CUNY, which then assigns the “tax levy” budget to the 24 campuses and, of course, to the CUNY system administration itself. Typically the University releases the operating budget allocation in the early summer (June or July) and financial plans are due to the University in the later part of the summer (August or September).

Recent tuition increases at CUNY have created an influx of new dollars that arrive each summer in the form of the “CUNY Compact.” In 2011 CUNY negotiated an agreement with New York State for using the five years of tuition increases to fund improvements at the campuses, including hiring additional full-time faculty, increasing student services, and enhancing student financial support.\(^1\) As part of the Compact, CUNY agreed to self-fund a portion of the planned investments by increasing both enrollment and philanthropic support and by creating savings...
through restructuring and efficiencies; in part the Compact operates by forcing campuses to save money or raise money, and those funds are then “given” to the campus to use for approved purposes. Even though part of the Compact is self-funded, there are real additional dollars that come to the campuses as part of the base budget, and it makes a big difference in terms of advancing the Master Plan. Although CUNY unveils the Compact in the summer, discussion of its allocation is a prime activity for SPS/FPS and the Vice Presidents throughout the spring planning process.

Planning and Budgeting at the Campus Level

On campus, the beginning of the budget planning cycle is the first spring semester meeting of SPS/FPS, the joint working subcommittees of the BPC. The end point of this activity is a set of recommendations about the financial plan that is forwarded to the President late in the summer, after consideration by the Budget and Planning Committee. But in February the joint subcommittees start with the financial plan created in the previous year as the second year in the required three-year submission to CUNY. In addition, the planning subcommittees have data that show progress within the Master Plan (including the Master Plan Report Card and planning guide), and they have the PMP Year-End results along with other reports that may have appeared since the last financial plan, such as NSSE or COACHE. One of the co-chairs presents as a framework for starting the discussion a set of possible “strategic priorities” based on the data provided. Mindful of the need to produce recommendations for the larger BPC, the SPS/FPS will meet seven or eight times in the course of the spring and summer. During that time the group will hear from proponents of various programs. For example, in spring 2012, the Director of John Jay Online presented a plan for the development of online programs and certificates, something that occasioned a great deal of discussion. In spring 2012 the Provost gave a presentation to the BPC on the College’s new Strategic Positioning and Enrollment Management Initiative, since funding for the program was included in the budget request along with many other items. In early summer, the subcommittees will hear proposals from the Vice Presidents, and typically the faculty committee members will collectively present a proposal. The cost of all the proposals combined will almost certainly exceed the available funding, even with the newly announced Compact funding, and so recommendations generated within the committees often take the form of subtractions, substitutions, or calls for slowing down the implementation of a new program or initiative. Sometime in the summer, well ahead of the University’s call for the plan, the SPS/FPS will approve by vote the recommendations to be considered by the BPC. The larger committee will discuss the entire plan and make a recommendation to the President, who serves as Chair of the BPC. The process is charted in Table 2.1.

Once the financial plan is implemented, spending and enrollment is monitored quarterly by the College and CUNY. At the end of each quarter, we compare our actual enrollment, revenue, university allocation, and expenditures to the estimates in the Financial Plan. We then reforecast and update projections and end-of-year expectations; the College executive staff reviews this information at a quarterly meeting dedicated to budget matters. The University monitors College expenditures at mid-year (January), after the 3rd Quarter of the fiscal year (April) and after the end of the fiscal year (August/September). The College Budget Office reconciles to the University estimates, and any discrepancies are resolved. Quarterly financial reports are distributed and posted to the intranet. Throughout the year the reports are discussed at the SPS/FPS and Budget Planning Committee meetings. The current year’s actual condition becomes the baseline for the following year’s budget cycle. The cycle then repeats itself each January.
Table 2.1: Activities that lead to Adoption of Recommendations for the Annual Financial Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Line</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Information</th>
<th>CUNY/State Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| January/February| SPS/FPS begins meeting twice monthly to shape recommendations             | • Progress reports from John Jay and CUNY Master Plans  
• When available, reports such as NSSE, COACHE, Student Experience Surveys  
• Early version of financial plan, submitted previous year  
• Changes to financial plan that occurred subsequent to previous submission | Governor releases executive budget                      |
| March           | Discussions continue and presentations are made to SPS/FPS               |                                                                                                                                                                                                             |                                                        |
| April           | SPS/FPS                                                                  |                                                                                                                                                                                                             | State Adopts Budget                                    |
| May             | Compact requirements from CUNY                                            | CUNY announces Compact guidelines and amount                                                                                 |                                                        |
| June            | Vice Presidents develop strategies based on Master Plan and present to SPS/FPS. Budget Office presents | --List of priorities from Vice Presidents presented  
--PMP Preliminary Year-End report from CUNY appears  
--PMP Targets and Goals set by JJ for following year | CUNY sends allocation letter                           |
| July            | SPS/FPS votes on a set of recommendations                                | --PMP ranking determined  
--PMP Final Year-End Report from CUNY appears  
--feedback for improvement from CUNY                                                                    | CUNY issues guidelines and call letter for financial plan |
| August          | SPS/FPS presents recommendations to BPC for discussion and vote          |                                                                                                                                                                                                             |                                                        |
| September       | President submits Plan to CUNY                                           | Approves or asks for changes                                                                                                   |                                                        |

Financial Resources Trends

Planning can affect our fiscal resources, of course, but more fundamentally our resources fluctuate with the State economy, changes in enrollment, and the infusion of funding for
mandatory collective bargaining and revenues related to tuition increases. The Five Year Summary of Tax Levy Operating Funds (see Table 2.2 below) reflects the overall growth in allocations and expenditures. Throughout the last five years, the College has always taken measures to ensure there is a substantial surplus to carry forward each year to maintain fiscal stability. A PMP target requires campuses to have a reserve of between 1% and 3%; in difficult years this has been achieved only with some sacrifice.

In Table 2 below, the CUNY Revenue Target is what the CUNY central administration expects us to achieve, but we fully expect to exceed the target each year with the projected excess going into the “Total Base Budget Allocation” line. The “Total Additional Revenues” are basically the carry-over figures year to year.

### Table 2.2: Budget and Spending Trends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUDGET ALLOCATION AND REVENUE</th>
<th>FY 2009 Actual</th>
<th>FY 2010 Actual</th>
<th>FY 2011 Actual</th>
<th>FY 2012 Actual</th>
<th>FY 2013 Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CUNY Revenue Target</td>
<td>$59,093,000</td>
<td>$68,798,000</td>
<td>$69,012,000</td>
<td>$76,442,000</td>
<td>$80,168,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Enrollment / FY12-15 Projection</td>
<td>10,999</td>
<td>11,673</td>
<td>11,352</td>
<td>11,172</td>
<td>11,553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL BASE BUDGET ALLOCATION</td>
<td>$80,095,110</td>
<td>$87,472,000</td>
<td>$85,034,006</td>
<td>$88,237,967</td>
<td>$91,660,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ADDITIONAL REVENUES</td>
<td>$3,601,168</td>
<td>$1,882,568</td>
<td>$2,484,654</td>
<td>$3,720,433</td>
<td>$2,684,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL BUDGET ALLOCATION</td>
<td>$84,496,278</td>
<td>$89,354,568</td>
<td>$87,518,690</td>
<td>$91,958,400</td>
<td>$94,345,076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPENDITURES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time Personnel Services (PS)</td>
<td>$57,409,708</td>
<td>$61,662,589</td>
<td>$60,742,252</td>
<td>$60,875,700</td>
<td>$67,514,573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjuncts</td>
<td>$10,624,534</td>
<td>$12,101,581</td>
<td>$11,821,816</td>
<td>$13,132,644</td>
<td>$12,342,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temp Services</td>
<td>$7,904,465</td>
<td>$7,726,833</td>
<td>$6,523,337</td>
<td>$8,739,643</td>
<td>$5,968,003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL Personnel Services:</td>
<td>$75,938,707</td>
<td>$81,491,003</td>
<td>$79,087,404</td>
<td>$82,747,986</td>
<td>$85,824,811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL Other Than Personnel Services :</td>
<td>$6,861,156</td>
<td>6,084,273</td>
<td>$4,526,481</td>
<td>$6,525,613</td>
<td>$7,269,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL FINANCIAL PLAN EXPENDITURES</td>
<td>$82,799,863</td>
<td>$87,575,276</td>
<td>$83,613,885</td>
<td>$89,273,600</td>
<td>$93,093,959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEAR-END BALANCE</td>
<td>$1,696,415</td>
<td>$2,033,499</td>
<td>$3,904,804</td>
<td>$2,684,800</td>
<td>$1,251,117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The financial plan filed with CUNY for the next three years is available [here](#).

**Institutional Resources: Hiring/Recruitment of Faculty, Staff, and Administration**

While the College would like to have more financial resources to support additional programs and scholarships, our financial planning, often with significant support from CUNY, has permitted us to support the Mission and make progress with the Master Plan. However, the recession gave us a couple of especially difficult years with the budget, but thanks to the new “rational” tuition plan, we have predictable financial support and the renewed ability to plan with greater certainty.

Our plan for expanding the full-time faculty was disrupted severely by the recession budgets, but we have gotten back on track and are now hiring aggressively again. The related metric that concerns us most—full-time coverage of the instructional program—is at the bottom of the CUNY senior colleges: 36.8% of instructional FTEs are delivered by our full-time faculty. Our long-term target is 50% coverage. We have a sufficient number of faculty to offer all our academic programs, but we rely much too heavily on part-time faculty, and a key goal is to
increase our students’ instruction by full-time faculty, especially within each major’s required courses and in general education courses.

In 2012 the Provost developed a robust plan to restore faculty lines and go beyond the peak number reached in 2009. If there was one point of agreement among planning subcommittee members as they discussed the FY2013 financial plan, it was to increase significantly the number of new full-time faculty lines. The plan underway will see the faculty grow as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall Semester</th>
<th>Number of Full-Time Faculty*</th>
<th>actual or targeted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>456</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>436</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>401</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>374</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>394</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>431</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>398</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>378</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>348</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The two difficult budget years meant that many staff and administrative vacancies remained unfilled. A vacancy control plan during the worst of the budget difficulties from 2009 to 2011 required a SPS/FPS recommendation and Presidential approval for all proposed hires to fill vacancies. As fiscal stability has returned, we are filling remaining vacancies selectively in the FY2013 financial plan based on demonstrable need in terms of the Master Plan.

Space and Facilities: Existing Resources and Planning

Addressing space needs has historically been a challenge and especially so over the last ten years as the College has grown rapidly in mid-town Manhattan where options for expansion are limited and, where they exist, expensive. In fall 2011, the College began to move into its long awaited New Building that had been in the planning and construction stages since 1999. One year after initial occupancy, the final piece of construction was completed with the opening of the “Jay Walk,” the beautifully landscaped greenspace five floors above the surrounding streets.

The New Building has profoundly and wonderfully transformed the campus, but the space needs of the College have evolved significantly in the twelve years it took to bring the building to completion. The student headcount has grown from 10,460 in 1999 to 15,030 today, and the new campus was meant to serve approximately 9,767 FTE students, but the College now has 11,750. Naturally the faculty has grown as well, and new departments and majors have been added. Support programs like the Academic Advising Center, Honors Program, Office for Undergraduate Research, and the Pre-Law Institute grew along with their attendant space needs. Beginning in 2006, the Critical Choices agenda invited changes that were entirely unanticipated just a few years earlier. Space needs expanded dramatically overall, but the basic budget and planning for the New Building did not.

While the New Building was in the planning and construction stage, the College was housed ultimately in five different neighborhood buildings:

- Haaren Hall, a former high school which was renovated and occupied in 1988
- North Hall, a well-worn former factory building across Tenth Avenue that became home to the College in 1973
- BMW Building at 555 West 57th St (6th Floor), leased by CUNY for the College in 1998
- Westport Building at 56th Street and 10th Avenue, (two floors) leased by CUNY in 2004
- 619 West 54th Street, (7th Floor), leased by CUNY in 2004
Today we occupy all five sites plus the New Building, but in two years we will have to vacate North Hall, which is slated for demolition in anticipation of a new campus for CUNY’s New Community College.

Though indispensable, the leased space cannot for the most part be used for classrooms since office building owners will typically not allow it; Westport is the exception. Another restriction of such space is the limited renovation and reconfiguration that is permissible. Moreover, any leases must be approved and paid for by CUNY, so while we can make the case for additional space with CUNY support, that option is constrained by the reluctance of the University to give the College more space immediately after opening a new building. The College’s quest for room to grow, like many planning functions, occurs very much in the context of the CUNY system.

There is substantial interest in decisions on space, since they affect people in very personal ways, and it is important that the College engage stakeholders in the planning process. The College’s Strategic Planning Subcommittee—charged in the Charter with strategic space planning—is undertaking a broad review of future space requirements, with the idea of retaining a consultant to assist with a formal plan. Meetings began in fall 2012 and are continuing into the spring to examine current utilization by space type and location and a variety of other factors about which a space consultant will need to develop recommendations. The processes for planning are working properly: the SPS is taking it up (with data provided by John Jay’s Office of Space Planning and Capital Projects), as it is obliged to do, and the budget process produced funding needed for a consultant. The College will continue to explore its options with CUNY as the planning proceeds, and at a Faculty Senate meeting in December 2012, Iris Weinshall, the Vice Chancellor for Facilities Planning, Construction, and Management, gave assurances that CUNY would provide for the space needs of the College after North Hall reverts to the University and our leases in nearby buildings expire. She endorsed the campus plan to retain a space consultant and added that a consulting architect would be appropriate as well. Everything is aligned—needs, data, staff, and funding—to produce a long-term space plan by summer 2013. In the meantime, we are following existing plans for the reconfiguration and renovation of Haaren Hall (2013-2014) and returning to Haaren Hall in 2014.

There are other aspects of our quest to acquire and improve space and facilities. A major capital request to the State seeks $15 million to renovate the College Library which was designed to accommodate far fewer students than it does today; during Community Hour, students can often be found sitting on the Library floor. Finally, student housing has emerged recently as a key objective to support a recruitment effort—especially for graduate students—beyond the immediate region. The College is examining several residential life opportunities with a goal of having one in place by 2015 and perhaps an interim solution up to that point.

**Capital Planning and Funding**

Capital funding for new construction, building repairs, upgrades and major maintenance projects is secured through the University, mainly from the State or City of New York. The City finances smaller capital requests and sometimes the City Council and the Borough President do as well.

The campus capital requests are informed by the discussions and priorities that emerge from the Budget and Planning Committee through its working subcommittees. Over the last 12 years the major capital requests to the State were intended to complete the construction of the New Building which cost in excess of $700 million. Requests for this coming year covered parts of the New Building that were not included in the original scope of the project and, in addition, many projects in Haaren Hall.
For the past three years CUNY has been able to secure funds for the campuses for “Critical Maintenance/State of Good Repair.” These funds cover in part what many institutions call deferred maintenance. John Jay has been allocated $36,976,000 (from August 2009 to December, 2013), which is being used for various improvements to Haaren Hall.

Belonging to the CUNY system affords enormous advantages in terms of covering the costs of our physical plant and facilities, but it does mean loss of some control over the planning process.

**Promoting Fiscal Stability through Planning**

For many years, the College did not concern itself with long-term fiscal stability since there was a ready supply of associate students who could be poured into any enrollment gap. Those students were not served very well which was one of the most important reasons why the decision was made to stop admitting them. With the shift to all baccalaureate admissions in 2010, the pool of qualified students shrank considerably, making enrollment and revenue targets much more difficult to meet. Enrollment peaked in fall 2009 and fell back each subsequent semester, fall to fall and spring to spring, to a post-2009 low in spring 2012. Clearly this was a trend that had to be arrested, and we responded decisively in fall 2011 by beginning to work with a consultant on enrollment management. Our successful turn-around is an example of the institution’s capacity to steer back on course when we miss a turn.

Four goals emerged from the work with the consultant:

- **a higher *yield*** for the fall 2012 freshman and transfer classes, especially among students with stronger academic preparation (Given the late start date relative to fall 2012 admissions, this was an effort in conversion rather than recruitment.)
- identification and active engagement with “communities of practice” for the purposes of aligning curriculum and marking career pathways for students
- development of long-term strategies for targeted enrollment growth
- creation of a more visible and clearly defined College profile which would position us appropriately among our competitors

We developed a plan of communication and engagement targeted at applicants for fall 2012, segmented into “channels” by type: skills-certified freshmen; transfer students; and CUNY Justice Academy students (community college students in select dual admissions and articulated programs in criminal justice areas). The goal was not only to see an increase in fall 2012 enrollment compared with the previous fall but also to develop a strategic enrollment management plan for the future. One initial and enduring outcome of this engagement was the development of a College-wide, cross-divisional Strategic Positioning and Enrollment Management Group (SPG).

The projects undertaken by SPG have included rewriting all the materials sent to applicants; designing a series of programs and events for applicants and admitted students; communicating with applicants much earlier than in previous years; tracking “yields” on all contacts and events to determine the effectiveness of our planning; and using what our assessment told us to re-engineer the subsequent year’s efforts. At the same time we set out to better understand our applicants and our competition.

With a new program of communication and early engagement for the best applicants, we met both targets and then some. The freshmen class was 8.1% larger than in the previous fall, and new transfer enrollment rose 18.3%. Some of the latter increase was the result of very specific outreach to students in the CUNY Justice Academy. We saw a solid increase in the high school average (82.9>83.3) of entering students and a slight increase in SAT scores (951>953).
Going forward we need to be aware of our position among the constellation of schools that interest our applicants, and we need to create a list of aspirational peers as we seek to compete for the kinds of students who can take maximal advantage of what we have to offer. To do the latter we received information from the National Student Clearinghouse and we administered the Admitted Students Questionnaire for the first time. In fall 2012 we embarked on an ambitious marketing initiative that is still underway. All of the efforts just described are designed to control enrollment as a means both of achieving fiscal stability and of attracting better-prepared students.

**Resource Planning for Technology**

With a mission to advance the application of technology in support of student success, teaching, research, and public service, the Technology Advisory Committee (TAC) plays the key role in the development of policy and in the support of programs related to computer usage. The goal is to provide a mechanism for College-wide communication, input, and broad deliberation regarding technology planning, use, and implementation. An important initial effort was to assist in the development of a multi-year technology plan, the Strategic Plan for Information Technology, which ran from 2007 to 2010.

Working alongside TAC is the Student Technology Fee Committee (STF) which allocates the proceeds from the Student Technology Fee ($100 per semester, set by CUNY) to support computer infrastructure, both directly for student labs and for hardware and software purchases for classroom use. Over $17 million has been spent on information technology projects since the inception of the Student Technology Fee in 2002. The chief CUNY criteria for evaluating proposals are that all initiatives are information technology specific, that they reach the greatest number of students whenever possible, that they allow for faculty development, and that adequate support is provided. John Jay also requires that proposal submissions provide an explanation as to how the proposed allocation relates to the College mission. To judge from the results of recent student satisfaction surveys, the planning for student information technology support has been extremely successful. 6

John Jay College has made considerable strides to provide the College community with adequate technology capabilities, but it is also clear that there are units, most notably the principal providers of technology for students, which have been strained due to budgetary shortfalls during the recent financial challenges. Indeed, the available funds for new projects have declined steadily over the years due to recurring expenses. In particular, the reliance upon the Student Technology Fee to fund recurring personnel expenses, including fringe benefits which are not in that case absorbed by the University, has greatly reduced the value of the technology budget. This is a recognized problem and has been discussed at length in relevant committees, and the College is prepared to present a comprehensive plan of action for the transition of employees’ salaries from the Student Technology Fee to tax levy funding, in which case the University will pay for fringe benefits.

With the help of a consultant, the Technology Advisory Committee is now planning for a new strategic plan for technology. This continued attention to the development of adequate technological capacities is increasingly important to the functioning of the College and to its continued growth in the future.

**Expanding Institutional Resources: Fundraising and Grant Activity**

For the first time, the College is engaged in a major capital campaign which will play an important role in the direction of our financial future. Begun officially in 2006, the Campaign for the Future of Justice emerged from its silent phase in 2012. To date the Campaign has been
highly successful with $43.2 million secured out of the $50 million goal. At our public opening of the fund drive on May 8, 2012, gifts of $2 and $5 million were announced. The College is extraordinarily fortunate to have Jules Kroll as the head of the John Jay College Foundation Board; his leadership and hard work have accounted for much of the success of the Campaign.

The Division of Marketing and Development raises funds strategically where possible, although gifts often come earmarked for purposes that do not align with the top priorities of scholarships and faculty research. Still, from 2009 to 2012 the amount raised for scholarships increased 93% to $1.173 million.

With a pronounced emphasis on faculty scholarship beginning in 2004 with the arrival of President Travis, the faculty has done extremely well in generating grant awards. The five-year trend shows strength if not continuous growth. As reported in the PMP, the three-year weighted rolling average of grants and contracts awarded for the last five years is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data on Funds Generated by Grants, Annual Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$12,896,015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The grants/contracts figure in the PMP Year-End Report for any given year can change dramatically based on a single large grant or contract. For example, the large increase we saw in 2010 was due in good part to a $5 million contract for prisoner reentry work. The following years look much smaller of course by comparison. Next year’s PMP will show a rebound due to another $5 million contract which we know is coming very soon for our Prisoner Reentry Institute. The PMP three-year rolling average tends to flatten the highs and lows, but they can still stand out. What continues steadily, however, are our efforts to broaden the base of faculty who submit grants, to communicate effectively with faculty about grant opportunities, and to shape a supportive environment for the pursuit of grants and contracts.

The College raises funds for strategic purposes in other ways as well; the Auxiliary Services Corporation (ASC) provides an important source of non-tax levy funds. The ASC is a separately incorporated entity with an unpaid Board of Directors comprised of faculty, staff and students. Created to support educational, social, cultural, and recreational activities among students, faculty and staff, the ASC generates revenue from vendor contracts for the bookstore, food service, cell towers, space and theatre rentals, and other auxiliary services. The funds are used to provide scholarships to students and to support major student events such as Open House, Orientation, Commencement, and awards dinners. We also use the funds to support strategic initiatives to advance the implementation of the Master Plan. These initiatives include strategic positioning and enrollment, branding and recruitment initiatives, and consultants to advise on these matters.

Audits and Institutional Controls

The College is subject to several audits and uses them as opportunities for improvement. Following the annual independent audits of the University’s combined financial statements and of compliance with laws and regulations, the College receives a management letter and internal control report. The following are the most recent audits conducted at the College:

- KPMG FY2011 Audit of the University Financial Statements and A-133, September 2011
- NYS Comptroller’s Office Audit of CUNY Compliance with the Clery Act, April 2009
The KPMG report for the year that ended on June 30, 2011, included recommendations and status updates on three prior-year recommendations. The College has taken actions (Appendix 2.1) in response to the report. The NYS Comptroller’s audit of the University’s compliance with the Clery Act found several instances of non-compliance. At a return audit in July 2010, the auditor confirmed that the prior year deficiencies were corrected.

The US Department of Education (DOE) conducted a program review of Financial Aid at the College in September 2008. The follow-up report included eight findings of non-compliance. The College responded and provided additional information and corrective action plans. The DOE issued a Final Program Review and Determination in February 2011, accepting John Jay’s corrective action plan for all of the findings but further determined that a small amount of aid was due back to the Federal government. The College returned $7,263 out of more than $55 million disbursed. The VP of Enrollment Management has confirmed that staff have been trained as a result of the findings.

Further evidence of institutional controls in place at the College is our participation in and compliance with CUNY’s Internal Control Program. Each year we conduct a self-assessment through a survey questionnaire and analysis and testing of controls in key areas including Financial Aid, Institutional Advancement, Continuing Education, Bursar, Human Resources, Information Technology, Payroll, Public Safety, Purchasing, and Accounts Payable. The self-assessment allows us to identify potential weaknesses before a problem arises. Results are reported to the University and follow-up action plans are required. The most recent self-assessment of FY 2012 operations revealed potential weaknesses in the registration and collection processes of our Adult and Continuing Education (ACE) programs. A corrective action plan was developed and is being monitored by the President and his Executive Staff. Our pro-active internal control review enabled us to strengthen procedures before any damage was incurred.

Institutional Controls: Finances and Administration

The College has adequate controls in place to cover cash management (collection of tuition, fees, accounts payable), the management of student records, the procurement process (approval and administration of purchases and contracts), and various Board operations (Auxiliary Services Corp, Student Activities Association, and Children’s Center). Audit and management reports confirm the effectiveness of the controls. Documents that define policies related to controls are readily available from the University at: http://www.cuny.edu/about/administration/offices/bf/jams.html.

The Role of Integrated Planning

As we confront the challenges of adding full-time faculty; providing classrooms, labs, offices and other facilities; improving retention and student success generally; improving the quality and size of the graduate programs; and expanding our programs in the liberal arts—in short, as we pursue the Master Plan Goals and Critical Choices agenda—the key to success will be an integrated planning environment. More than anything else, planning holistically impresses on everyone the limits inherent in any organization as the interconnections among units and goals are laid bare. The pursuit of even one goal imposes demands on other parts of the organization which in turn inhibit the pursuit of others; the challenge is to achieve a dynamic balance. If the goal is addition, it will often require subtraction at the same time. Overall growth is possible of course, but it must occur with consideration of the whole.
Our integrated planning effort is less than fully developed. We have linked together discussions of the budget, enrollment, academic planning, student affairs, space, and facilities. There is a conceptual framework for tying everything together which has allowed us to focus on space limitations and, as a consequence, on enrollment, which in turn impacts the budgets for academic planning and everything else, but we are still in the process of putting all the pieces together. We know that the academic program is at the heart of the enterprise, but enrollment drives the budget so we are facing squarely the issue of how large the College can or should be in the near term, and the answer to that question is imbricated in a host of other questions and answers having to do with space, the nature of academic programs, the delivery mode of instruction, student success, the academic profile of the students who come to John Jay, academic support services, and so on. Concerted planning is not easy, but it is a habit we must acquire.

As John Jay embraces the future through a more sophisticated and challenging approach to planning, we are encouraged by our successes in the past. Our effectiveness is evidenced by the deliberate transformations of the College from one

- ...that was largely a lower-division institution at the undergraduate level, in terms of the number of students and curriculum structure, to an all-baccalaureate institution with a much more even distribution of students across the four years and with a curriculum that is much more balanced in terms of lower and upper-division courses.
- ...that had very little research going on to one that generates $15 million to $20 million annually in grant funding
- ...with no history of fund-raising to one with a $50 million capital campaign and a Foundation Board, headed by Jules Kroll, ready to set an example of giving generously to the College.
- ...with a reputation for vocational training to one with a growing reputation for liberal learning
- ...where most of the classes were housed in a converted factory to one with a 620,000 square-foot complex overlooking the Hudson, designed by Skidmore, Owings, and Merrill.
- ...with 12,470 students in 2005 to one with more than 15,000 students in 2012.

Such transformations do not occur by accident, especially when one considers that most of the changes took place in fewer than seven years. The challenges were significant, especially the financial ones. Much of the money came from CUNY, but the planning had to justify the investment before CUNY would commit. The CUNY Chancellor placed a bet on the quality of the vision and on the determination to see it through, and the results have proved the wisdom of that decision.

Strengths:

1. Student satisfaction with access to computer technology is the highest in CUNY.
2. We have a very fine new academic building.
3. We enjoy the financial support of CUNY and the State for most capital projects.
4. Given the legislature’s decision to return the revenues from the tuition increases to CUNY, we have a predictable and positive financial planning environment for the next several years.
Concerns:

1. Personnel funded by the Student Technology Fees absorb much of the buying power of that funding stream, and as a result the technology fee budget may not be able to keep up with demands on it.
2. There is great pressure on our space facilities, and we will lose North Hall in two years.
3. The College is good at adding initiatives but less inclined to delete them in the name of institutional renewal.

Recommendations:

1. The College should follow through with plans to remove tech personnel from student technology fee funding in order to free up funding for additional tech projects and to save the cost of fringe benefits.
2. The College should more aggressively pursue integrated planning across all divisions.

---

1 The Compact program began in 2008 with State funds—not tuition— but it lapsed before the recent tuition increases.
2 For fall 2011. The average for CUNY senior colleges was 46.2% that semester.
3 Includes temporary faculty, lecturers, counseling faculty, and librarians, as well as tenured and tenure-track faculty. Excludes faculty on leave.
4 Even without growth the new building would have left the College in a space deficit compared to the other CUNY colleges.
5 The group leading the effort consists of two vice presidents, deans, an associate provost, and directors; it has met weekly since it was established in October 2011.
6 John Jay is rated number one among all senior, comprehensive, and community colleges on “Student satisfaction with access to computer technology” in the 2011-12 University Performance Management Process, p. 57.
7 See Chapter 9 for further details on ACE.
Chapter Three

CUNY and College Governance

John Jay College of Criminal Justice operates within a multilayered framework which encompasses State requirements, a University-wide governing board, as well as an internal governance system. As with all colleges and universities in New York State, our governance structure is dictated by the New York State Education Law, the Regents Rules, and the Regulations of the Commissioner of Education. Within this statutory structure, John Jay College of Criminal Justice is a member institution of the City University of New York (CUNY). CUNY is governed by the policies and procedures established by its 17-member Board of Trustees. The Chancellor is the chief executive, educational, and administrative officer of CUNY. The primary governance documents for the University are the Bylaws of the Board of Trustees and the CUNY Manual of General Policies. CUNY Bylaws establish a University Faculty Senate “for the formulation of policy relating to the academic status, role, rights, and freedoms of the faculty, university level educational and instructional matters, and research and scholarly activities of university-wide import,” subject to guidelines, if any, established by the CUNY Board of Trustees. John Jay has eight elected representatives on the University Faculty Senate (UFS). John Jay’s student body also has elected representation on the University Student Senate. In addition, CUNY colleges are subject to the collective bargaining agreements entered into between CUNY and the various unions.

In line with the CUNY Bylaws, each member college has a president who reports directly to the Chancellor. Among the duties of college presidents listed in CUNY Bylaws are the responsibility for the “general superintendence over the facilities, concerns, officers, employees, and students of his/her college” and for “conserving and enhancing the educational standards and general academic excellence of the college.” The Board of Trustees further recognizes “the historic tradition which vests both the privileges and responsibilities of academic governance in the faculty of a college.” The CUNY Bylaws delegate to each campus the responsibility to develop a governance plan consistent with the principle of shared governance. All college governance plans are subject to adoption by the CUNY Board of Trustees.

Governance at John Jay

The local governing body at John Jay is the College Council. In 2006, under Presidential leadership, the College community met to discuss whether the Charter, which had been adopted in 1972 and amended in 1992, reflected the College’s then current view of shared governance and whether its structure enabled the College to realize its strategic goals. Over the course of two years, faculty, staff, students, and administrators debated and worked together to build a stronger governance structure that reaffirmed the core values of the College, established a strong structural foundation, and promoted greater efficiency, accountability and transparency. Robust discussions, debates, productive consultation, and negotiations took place among shareholder groups including the Faculty Senate, Council of Chairs, Higher Education Officers (HEO) Council, Student Council, and executive staff, that led to a restructuring of College governance.

In May 2008, the College Council ratified a revised Charter of Governance that aligns more closely with our aspirations for good governance at John Jay and at the same time adopted for
the first time a set of Bylaws. Vital partners within the governance structure were formally recognized in the new Charter, including the Faculty Senate, Council of Chairs, Student Government, and HEO Council.

Set forth below is a summary of other significant Charter changes adopted in 2008:

- The composition of the College Council was changed to reflect the importance of faculty in the development of academic policies. The 1992 governance plan allocated 28 out of 56 seats to faculty. The 2008 amendments allocated 42 out of 69 College Council seats to faculty.
- The Provost’s Advisory Council was established to formalize a stronger relationship between the Provost and the chairs of academic departments and the President and Vice President of the Faculty Senate.
- A formalized governance structure for graduate programs was established, including a process for the selection of faculty teaching in these programs and an election process for directors.
- Previously, the College Personnel and Budget Committee permitted faculty, students, and administrators to vote on faculty personnel decisions and to review the College budget. The new Charter separated the faculty personnel review process from the budget process and connected the allocation of resources to planning with the creation of the Budget and Planning Committee. It also established two subcommittees of the BPC meant to serve as working groups: the Financial Planning Subcommittee and the Strategic Planning Subcommittee.
- The new Committee on Faculty Personnel included for the first time the Dean of Research and six elected at-large full-time tenure track faculty members, three of whom serve as regular members and three as alternates and also excluded student members.
- The former College Undergraduate Curriculum Committee and the Undergraduate Academic Standards Committee were merged into one to strengthen the connection between undergraduate curriculum and academic standards.
- The Council of Undergraduate Major Coordinators was established to review programs and facilitate the work of the Office of Undergraduate Studies in areas such as assessment of learning and faculty advisement in majors.
- Department bylaws and graduate program bylaws were required.
- A rational and workable method was established for academic departments to be created, divided, or merged.

The structural changes required by the 2008 Charter of Governance have been, for the most part, successfully implemented over the past three years. Some reforms have taken longer than others. For example, it was only in May 2011, after over two years of concerted effort that all academic departments and graduate programs submitted bylaws that were approved by the Executive Committee of the College Council. However, the process of reviewing, debating, and voting on these bylaws had the beneficial effect of expanding awareness of and participation in the College governance process.

We believe that the new Charter structure has helped to promote greater transparency and has facilitated the decision-making process at the College. By realigning targeted governance functions, the new structure brings the right group of constituents to the table to address common issues of concern. The Provost’s Advisory Council and the Council of Undergraduate Major Coordinators are good examples of Charter-mandated structural changes that have supported more open communication and input into the governance process. The success of
the Charter revision that provides a process for the creation, merger, division, and termination of departments was demonstrated by the

- creation of a Department of Philosophy from the previous Department of Art, Music, and Philosophy;
- creation of a Department of Criminal Justice with faculty from six academic departments;
- creation of a Department of Communication and Theater Arts through the merger of the Department of Communication Skills with the Department of Speech and Theater; and

Data from the spring 2009 survey by the UFS suggested at the time that we were moving in the right direction in terms of transparency and participation. According to that survey, 58% of John Jay faculty agreed or strongly agreed that they had influence on College policies. Although there was certainly room for improvement in this regard, the John Jay rate of agreement was much higher than the average for faculty at CUNY Senior Colleges – only 41%.

John Jay’s approach to General Education reform demonstrates how a commitment to inclusiveness and transparency in governance enhances educational outcomes. The General Education Task Force began its review process with an open invitation to faculty to attend workshops about the goals and practices of General Education. Faculty volunteers then attended workshops at which they shared experiences as teachers of General Education and were given an opportunity to work in small, interdisciplinary groups to plan a hypothetical General Education course. Altogether, almost 200 faculty members representing all 20 academic departments existing at that time participated in this consultative process. The General Education Task Force used this broad-based conversation about the purpose, goal, and strategies of our General Education program to develop its recommendations and to work through our governance bodies to enact reforms. We believe that this wide-ranging level of consultation was reflected in our faculty’s responses to the 2009 survey by the UFS which reported that 69% of John Jay faculty agreed that they have influence on the direction and development of curriculum as compared to 66% CUNY-wide.1

Our governance structure has also served the College’s academic goals well through the work of the newly created Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee (UCASC). Prior to the Charter amendments, the College had an Undergraduate Curriculum Committee and a separate Undergraduate Committee on Academic Standards. Under the old structure, the Undergraduate Committee on Academic Standards was unwieldy and ineffective. Attendance at meetings was so low that the committee often failed to reach a quorum, making it difficult to carry out critical business. Merging the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee and the Standards Committee into UCASC has increased efficiency. The larger committee is now comprised of several smaller, more agile and active subcommittees that are working productively, including a subcommittee on academic standards. As a result, the faculty has been very engaged in generating new policies on academic standards, new courses, course revisions, programs, and majors. The newly constituted Committee has been able to produce a voluminous amount of work2 both effectively and expeditiously.

As a result of the Charter change, with an increase in membership from 37 to 48, the Faculty Senate has provided more opportunity for faculty engagement. Even prior to 2008 the Senate has always provided a valuable forum for deliberation on a huge range of subjects, from class
size to prerequisite checking and enforcement, to our Master Plan and Middle States. The body has communicated on behalf of the faculty to the Chancellor and Board of Trustees about our budget allocation, space needs, sexual harassment policies, and a host of other issues. Created in 1986, the Senate is approaching its 400th meeting and has always garnered a quorum.

The Charter of Governance also promotes communication, consultation, and transparency by requiring that the President meet with the Faculty Senate and the Council of Chairs at least once a semester to discuss issues of mutual concern. The President complies with these requirements and in addition attempts to attend a regularly scheduled Faculty Senate meeting once a month, regularly meets with the President of the Faculty Senate, meets with the HEO Council and non-instructional staff on a yearly basis and schedules regular meetings and lunches with student groups and leaders.

**Governance and its Challenges**

A recent governance issue that has been the source of conflict between the faculty and the administration exemplifies the complicated governance structure of CUNY which requires local governance to be subject to mandates of a centralized university administration. The CUNY Pathways initiative is a Board of Trustees policy which was adopted in June 2011 and which addresses CUNY-wide student transfer and the General Education curriculum. The opposition of faculty to Pathways on a CUNY-wide basis has played out on John Jay’s campus just as it has on the other CUNY campuses; the presidents are mandated to implement the Board of Trustees policy, but the faculty had resisted approving the requisite curriculum design and courses. When the John Jay Curriculum Committee failed to obtain sufficient votes to approve the Pathways “College-option,” fashioned by its General Education Subcommittee in spring 2012, the College President conferred with the Provost’s Advisory Council, and following that consultation sent the Subcommittee’s proposal directly to the Chancellor, even though no governance body other than the subcommittee had approved it. The Faculty Senate passed a resolution condemning the President’s action in doing so, and the Council of Chairs passed a resolution criticizing the actions of the Chancellor, which necessitated the President’s decision.

Another example of friction between CUNY and College governance was the selection of an Honorary Degree recipient, an incident that further illustrates the complexity of the governance structure of CUNY. In accordance with the CUNY Bylaws and Board of Trustee guidelines, the College’s procedure for the selection of degree recipients is the responsibility of the faculty. At John Jay, selected nominees are submitted by the Faculty Senate for approval to the College President, then to the CUNY Chancellor and finally to the CUNY Board of Trustees. Although the CUNY Board of Trustees initially declined to approve John Jay’s selection of a 2011 degree recipient (the Pulitzer prize-winning playwright Tony Kushner), who was perceived by some as a controversial figure because of his political views, immense pressure from the faculty of the College (as well as other CUNY campuses and well-known individuals internationally) led to the Board’s reversal, and the College conferred the degree on Mr. Kushner.

Maintaining communication, enhancing consultation, and increasing the transparency of governance structures is part of a continuing process. The first step in that process is to disseminate the work of the College Council. To that end, the Secretary and the Executive Committee of the College Council are intent to ensure that all College Council policies, and their implementation dates, are made public. These policies, as well as the agendas and minutes of the body and its committees, can now be accessed on our website, although dissemination of new and revised policies has not yet been implemented.
Governance of Academic Departments

The primary governance role of a department chairperson is the “chief executive officer” of his/her department. Chairpersons are pivotal to the effective administration of departments, the development of the faculty, the advisement of students, and in department and college-level personnel actions related to reappointment, tenure, and promotion. Departmental chairpersons are expected to carry out their executive officer role in a manner consistent with the Charter of Governance, CUNY Bylaws, and their department’s bylaws.

Departmental Chairpersons annually prepare a written assessment of their department’s progress during the previous year under their leadership and meet during the summer with the Provost for a performance review. Topics are discussed, and progress is tracked on a variety of issues including faculty evaluations, supervision of adjuncts, resource allocation, academic programs, post-graduate outcomes, assessment, and student progress. Afterwards, the Provost sends each Chair a written account of the meeting, including strategic goals and plans for the Department established at the meeting. Chairs are strongly encouraged to share these letters with the faculty in their departments. Chairs who have received negative performance reviews are asked to submit a mid-year report in January and to meet again with the Provost to review progress in addressing performance deficiencies. This annual chair review process holds Departmental Chairpersons responsible for carrying out their department’s strategic goals and plans. To judge from a sampling of the letters, Chairs have done an excellent job overall, but exceptions are noted, and the annual reviews have contributed decisively to changes in departmental leadership in a few instances.

Each department schedules regular meetings to discuss a proposed agenda. According to the spring 2009 survey by the UFS, 80% of John Jay faculty agreed that department meetings allow for all participants to share their views and 72% agree that they are full and equal participants in department problem-solving and decision-making. This is slightly higher than the CUNY average. Only 58%, however, agree that they have a voice in how resources are allocated. Each department holds elections to select its chairperson, its department personnel and budget committee, as well as representatives to the College Council, Faculty Senate and, where applicable, UCASC.

Chairpersons have expressed concern that their effectiveness can be hampered by limited information and limited control over budget allocations and the distribution of administrative staff. The Council of Chairs has also expressed concern about insufficient consultation before decisions are made by the administration. The 2006 Report of the Task Force on the Role of Chairs acknowledged that chairs “face a significant number of hurdles (administrative, fiscal, policy, and status) that interfere with their abilities to carry out critical functions.” The College has made certain changes to enhance the effectiveness of chairs and their departments and to increase the impact of the chairs on decision-making. For example, academic departments now administer individual budgets and have undertaken multi-semester class schedules. The funding for academic travel to conferences, previously controlled and administered by the Office of the Provost, has been moved entirely under the control of departments, with annual reports to permit oversight. In collaboration with a small group of chairs and the President of the Faculty Senate, the Provost developed and now follows a formula for the allocation of reassigned time for departmental administration that ensures a fair distribution of reassigned time among the departments based on factors like size and number of majors. Finally, the Provost is developing a staffing plan for increasing the administrative staff in departments that are currently understaffed. To improve the level of consultation with chairs, the Provost has added a standing item to the agenda of the Provost’s Advisory Council: Faculty/Chair Matters.
budget and planning process has also been revised to allow more time to consult the chairs through the Budget and Planning Committee before decisions are made.

Administration

The College executive leadership team is comprised of the President and his vice presidents: the Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs, the Senior Vice President for Finance and Administration, the Vice President for Student Affairs, the Vice President for Enrollment Management, the Vice President for Marketing and Development, and the Assistant Vice President and Counsel. Each was hired following search procedures that included consultation with faculty, staff, and students, where appropriate. As evidenced by their resumes, the executive staff members bring strong leadership qualities and the qualifications necessary to enable them to carry out their responsibilities at the College. Although the executive roles of the vice presidents are clearly defined, as are their lines of authority, significant collaboration across divisions is frequently required to achieve our organizational goals.

The President reports to the CUNY Chancellor, who conducts a formal evaluation of him annually. The President meets weekly throughout the year with his executive team and schedules regular one-on-one sessions with each member. Agendas for these meetings are derived from the Master Plan, strategic priorities, budget planning, action items requiring cross-divisional support, as well as required informational updates. The President also meets regularly with his Cabinet, which includes academic deans, all members of the Executive Compensation Plan, and a number of program directors. These meetings are a useful forum to disseminate important information and to elicit staff input and collaboration.

In response to the need to increase and broaden our channels of communication and insure transparency in our business practices, in 2008 the College instituted an electronic Compendium of Policies and Procedures that can be accessed from the intranet webpage entitled Inside John Jay. The Compendium provides faculty and staff with ready access to important information, and it enhances efficiency and supports the College’s compliance with laws and regulations. The need to revise this information is critical, and it has not always been clear who is accountable for its maintenance. The Compendium is presently being updated through the collective efforts of the vice presidents and revised to capture the most recent changes in administrative and academic policies. We expect that the revisions will be completed by spring 2013, and that updates will be made on a timely basis going forward; the Office of Legal Counsel has responsibility for ensuring compliance with that expectation.

Vice Presidents are required to establish annual strategic priorities (see performance appraisal templates) that align with the Master Plan and the PMP. By using year-end results from the PMP, the Master Plan Report Card, and other data, annual evaluations keep divisions on target for meeting College objectives. These tools detect areas of strength and weakness in each area. In interviews conducted for the purposes of the Self-Study, the executive leadership identified numerous obstacles in carrying out their strategic priorities. The most common concern they noted was understaffing within their divisions. Given the enormous transformation the College has been undergoing during a time of budget austerity, their divisions are required to do much more with much less. It is not uncommon for staff to be doing more than one job at a time, as positions are not searched or go unfilled, increasing the burden and workload on existing staff. Challenges are exacerbated by an over-reliance on part-time staff, less funding for administrative support than at other CUNY campuses, and minimal opportunities for staff professional development. As a result, we frequently lose talented individuals (e.g., tech staff). In spite of the obstacles, the College has made remarkable progress toward its goals.
The academic administrative structure of the College is somewhat unusual for its size. There are no “schools” of related disciplines; there is a dean of graduate studies and a dean of undergraduate studies, but all department chairs and graduate program directors report to the provost. Thus the chairs and directors work on some matters with the provost and on other matters with their dean, and on yet other matters there may be joint efforts with the provost and deans; faculty hiring is controlled in the provost’s office, but academic advising of students and retention efforts, to cite just two examples, are handled through the deans’ offices. On the undergraduate level, the major coordinators (normally not the chair) work closely with the dean on various matters pertaining to the administration of the major, while the chairs work more often with the provost. We think it is time to review the structure of Academic Affairs.

Institutional Integrity

John Jay College strives as a community to act with integrity and maintain the respect of the public and the constituencies it serves through consistent, equitable, and ethical action. The College adheres to its own (and CUNY) policies and seeks to act in accordance with ethical standards, to uphold the principles of academic honesty, to nurture and protect the academic and intellectual freedom, diversity, and dignity of all members of the College community.

The policies that govern the actions of the College are published on the College and CUNY websites (e.g., Student Complaints about Faculty Conduct in Academic Settings Policy; Statement of Non-Discrimination) and appear in the annual College Bulletins (print and online; e.g., CUNY and John Jay Policies on Academic Integrity). Policies are reviewed and assessed individually. For instance, in June 2011, the CUNY Board of Trustees adopted a revised Policy on Academic Integrity, as described below, which revises the 2004 policy “to reflect evolving legal requirements, practical considerations and technological advances.”

To monitor and coordinate College policies we created in 2004 an Office of Legal Counsel, which oversees labor relations (e.g., grievances, contract issues), affirmative action in relation to hiring (e.g., charging search committees with requirements), sexual harassment complaints (e.g., training, addressing complaints), compliance with state and federal regulations (e.g., financial disclosure), contracts (e.g., use of John Jay facilities by outside groups), and other legal matters. This has increased the efficiency and professionalism of the College in dealing with legal concerns, as two attorneys work at the College full-time to address all legal matters in a timely fashion. The Office of Legal Counsel has a web presence on the intranet with links to legal policies and procedures, and the office is creating a public website that will in the near future provide greater information on staff and responsibilities.

Academic Freedom

John Jay is committed to a culture of academic freedom, as elaborated in the CUNY Academic Freedom Policy. The CUNY Chancellor’s 2005 Statement on Academic Freedom asserts: “At CUNY, our commitment to academic freedom is well established and firmly held. As a university that prides itself on diversity and access to opportunity, we hold in the highest regard policies and principles that guarantee an open and tolerant academic exchange. That exchange is vigorously protected and defended.”

Evidence of the College community’s commitment to academic freedom is revealed by the 2010 COACHE survey of John Jay pre-tenure faculty which found that newer faculty were satisfied, on average, with the degree of influence they have over the focus of their research/creative work
and in the discretion they have over the content of their courses, and were comparable to peer institutions on these items, while 92% of John Jay faculty agree that they have authority to decide content and method of instruction in their courses. Most recently, the 2012 COACHE survey of tenured faculty found that academic freedom was rated as one of the best aspects of working at John Jay.

**Research Integrity**

John Jay adheres strictly to the [CUNY policy on Research Misconduct](#) directed toward integrity in the conduct of research activities and the disposition of allegations of such misconduct. The policy defines research misconduct as well as steps to be followed when such allegations are raised. The College’s Office of Sponsored Programs reports that no such cases have been forwarded in the past two years, during the tenure of the Interim Associate Provost and Dean of Research.

In addition, the College complies with federal laws and procedures regarding the ethical treatment of human subjects through the [CUNY Institutional Review Boards (IRB)](#) . Research that requires full board ethics review is handled by one of five CUNY-wide review boards. Exempt and expedited review protocols are reviewed locally by the College’s IRB Chair.

All individuals who conduct research with human subjects complete web-based ethics training every three years. In addition, the College provides [Responsible Conduct of Research (RCR)](##) and Conflict of Interest (COI) training for students, trainees, and faculty engaged in research, which is required for federally-funded research, and documents individual researchers’ RCR efforts.

**Conflicts of Interest**

Faculty members and staff also comply with the [CUNY Conflict of Interest Policy](##) and the New York State Public Officer’s Law that detail explicit policies and procedures to address potential conflicts of interest. The goal of the policy is to ensure that all CUNY “activities shall be conducted in accordance with the highest standards of integrity and ethics and in a manner that will not reflect or appear to reflect adversely on the University’s credibility, objectivity, or fairness.” To facilitate this aim, qualifying faculty and staff complete Multiple Position Forms (MPF), Honoraria Reports, and the Annual Statement of Financial Disclosure (ASFD) issued by the [New York State Joint Commission on Public Ethics](##) , to ensure academic and fiscal integrity. These forms are collected and monitored by the Office of Legal Counsel (ASFD by the Ethics Officer) and the Provost (MPF) to ensure full compliance. In addition, to qualify for federal funding, conflict of interest training is overseen by the College’s Conflict of Interest Officer, through the Office for the Advancement of Research.

**Student Disciplinary Action**

Policies and procedures for addressing matters of student conduct are readily available on the College website. The [Student Disciplinary Procedure](##) is governed by the [CUNY Bylaws](##). The procedure can be initiated by a public safety incident, by a faculty, staff, or student written complaint or allegation (e.g., alleged Academic Integrity violation), or directly by the Dean of Students (DOS). Complaints are investigated by the Office of the DOS and, if warranted, are referred for a disciplinary hearing before the Faculty-Student Disciplinary Committee. In spring and fall 2012, there were 82 disciplinary incidents ([Appendix 3.1](##)) addressed by the Office of the DOS. Of these complaints, most were resolved by means other than going to the Faculty-Student Disciplinary Committee.
**Academic Integrity**

CUNY’s revised Policy on Academic Integrity (AI) provides additional due process protections to students, clarifies appropriate procedures and sanctions for violations, further guarantees “a collaborative process between faculty members and each college’s Academic Integrity Officer,” notes the importance of online resources for promoting academic integrity, and seeks to improve cross-campus consistency and to address the issue of students enrolled in multiple CUNY campuses.

In compliance with the AI policy, the College attempts to inform and educate the community about academic integrity during new faculty and student orientations, via maintenance of an electronic plagiarism prevention service, and by publishing the policies in the Undergraduate Bulletin, Graduate Bulletin, Student Handbook, Faculty e-Handbook, Orientation Packet for New Full-time Faculty, and Orientation Packet for New Adjunct Faculty. The policy also appears on course syllabi (as required by the College’s model syllabus). In addition, the College maintains a web page that provides the policy summary as well as information about student, faculty, and administrative responsibilities under the policy, along with reporting forms and documents.

Under the current system, from spring 2008 to spring 2011, nearly 200 cases of alleged academic integrity violations were reported to the Academic Integrity Officer. Informal sanctions (e.g., an agreement between the faculty member and student) were used to address the overwhelming majority of cases and included: reduced grades, memoranda of understanding, referrals to resources on campus, and retaking of courses. From among these cases, 12 that were more severe in nature were referred to the Dean of Students for either formal or informal adjudication. (Cases in which a faculty member seeks a disciplinary sanction, versus an academic sanction only, are referred to the College’s AI officer, to be adjudicated by the college Faculty-Student Disciplinary Committee.) Matters included offenses such as forgery, theft of faculty property, and repeated offenses. Of the 12 AI hearings, 8 (66%) resulted in suspension, 3 (25%) resulted in warnings, and 1 (8%) resulted in expulsion. In fall 2012, after the placement of the Academic Integrity Officer in the Office of Academic Affairs, 42 cases were reported between June 2012 and January 2013, a much higher rate than in the past, which suggests that the move to Academic Affairs was a good one. Most cases do not reach the Faculty-Student Disciplinary Committee, but faculty handle them informally.

**Student Complaints about Faculty Conduct in Academic Settings**

While the College protects faculty members’ academic freedom, CUNY provides a procedure for students to lodge complaints against faculty for issues not covered by academic freedom (or other policies). The procedure, detailed on the website and in the Bulletins, suggests informal resolution if possible. If not, formal complaints are investigated by a fact-finder who produces a written report with findings and recommendations, and either party may appeal the findings. Since its adoption in February 2007, the College has been able to address student complaints about faculty in academic settings in a more formal and systematic manner. Since 2007, only three cases have been heard by the College appeals committee for these matters. Most complaints are resolved informally at the department level with the assistance of the department chair. Cases requiring more serious intervention are handled through alternative mechanisms.

**Student Safety**
As a means of addressing student mental health needs and ensuring the safety of the campus community, the College has implemented a “Behavioral Intervention Team.” Activities of the team include wide and frequent dissemination of resources to faculty, including a “Quick Guide to Reporting,” “Mental & Behavioral Health Concerns or Risks,” and an extensive “Emergency Response Guide.” In addition, these resources can be reached on the College website through numerous links, making them more accessible should a crisis arise.

**Facilitating Student Degree Progress**

John Jay is dedicated to the goal of graduating students in a timely fashion. Students are provided with the information they need to meet their degree requirements. Requirements for all majors and programs are provided in *College Bulletins* (print and online) and can be accessed via major/minor/program web pages. Students also can access academic advisement for general requirements, and they can access major/minor advising by visiting the appropriate departments. Students also have access to degree planning software that allows them to track their progress toward completion of their degree, as well as explore other options (e.g., “What if I changed from criminal justice to a forensic psychology major?”) Only 12% of students indicated dissatisfaction with this online advisement. Similarly, students express satisfaction with most of the services needed for timely degree completion (e.g., library services (84%), tutoring services (59%), and computing resources (72%)). Nevertheless, many students report insufficient academic support for degree planning; plans to enhance advising are discussed in Chapter 5.

Second to academic support, about 18% of students indicate that course availability is the most important factor the College can address to help them graduate. However, 67%, the highest level among Senior Colleges, indicated in the 2012 CUNY Student Experience Survey that the College generally offered courses when students could take them (compared to 61% Senior College Average). Students indicated that they would like the College to offer more fully online courses (44%) and more weekend classes (32%). Challenges for the College, however, arise in having sufficient faculty to staff—and students to fill—such sections, especially for the newer and smaller programs and for interdisciplinary programs, whose faculty serve multiple departments. There is also a distinction to be made between courses students want (i.e., scheduling is flexible) versus those that they need (i.e., not taking them slows student progress)—and between not being able to register and choosing not to register because the time is not preferred. Faculty members note some “consumeristic” quality to student schedule wants, some of which cannot be accommodated given institutional constraints.

The College has made significant efforts to streamline the scheduling of courses to maximize enrollment in scheduled sections. For students, this results in fewer under-enrolled sections, with fewer choices for scheduling. But it results in significant savings to the College, in terms of fewer sections needing to be staffed and fewer sections cancelled due to low enrollments, which is disruptive for faculty and students.

It does not seem that course availability or scheduling necessarily play any role in retarding graduation. John Jay first-time freshmen graduate with a mere three excess credits, on average (five credits for all graduates), compared to the CUNY senior college average of seven excess credits for first-time freshmen (nine for all graduates).

**Fairness**
The College strives to maintain fairness and diversity in personnel actions. CUNY has developed a uniform set of policies and procedures for all of its campuses to ensure that the colleges comply with all legal requirements, including the policy on Equal Opportunity, Non-Discrimination and Against Sexual Harassment. These policies can be found on the John Jay website and are included in the Graduate and Undergraduate Bulletins. In addition, each member of the faculty and staff receives a copy of the President’s yearly letter which emphasizes this area as a College priority.

Efforts to comply with these policies and to promote a culture of inclusivity were reenergized with the hiring of a new Affirmative Action Officer whose professionalism has encouraged a new era of compliance, discretion, and integrity. For example, a new sexual harassment awareness campaign has resulted in a record number of John Jay employees taking an online training course on the topic. Only 166 employees completed the course in the 2009-2010 academic year. That number increased to 683 in the 2010-2011 academic year.

Before an interview process begins, the Affirmative Action Officer reviews the candidate pool to be certain that it is inclusive of female and minority representation proportionate to the available labor pool. In addition, a recruitment plan must be filed by administrative directors, department heads, and other personnel responsible for hiring, prior to the start of the search. This standardized protocol encourages recruitment of a diverse and appropriately qualified faculty and staff.

The College also aspires to fairness and diversity in promotion and tenure determinations. Yearly evaluations are conducted for faculty and HEOs, which underscore areas of strength and weakness. Labor agreements also set out procedural mechanisms that allow employees to challenge negative personnel decisions consistent with due process guarantees. In response to concerns about transparency with respect to standards for tenure and promotion, the College Council issued a set of guidelines for faculty. Nevertheless, this area continues to be a concern. In the 2010 Employee Engagement Survey, only 42% of respondents indicated that the College’s policies for promotion and advancement are clearly communicated and only 38% indicated that these policies are fair. In addition, the 2012 COACHE survey of tenured faculty suggested that tenured faculty (particularly at the rank of associate professor) felt there was insufficient clarity and guidance on nearly every aspect of the promotion process. Further efforts are being made to clarify standards for both junior and tenured faculty members, with the latter particularly in need of mentoring and guidance toward promotion.

Dissemination and Integrity of Institutional Information

John Jay posts its Self-Studies (past and present) and all other reports and materials for Middle States accreditation on its intranet for members of the College community. Similarly, all Institutional Research reports, PMP management reviews, strategic planning reports, and other plans and reports of interest to the College community are available through the intranet or the College website. New policies passed by the College Council should be disseminated in a timely fashion to the College community; however, as mentioned above, there is work to do before we can claim success in this practice.

Student Communication

John Jay is committed to maintaining an atmosphere and culture that is maximally conducive to student learning, growth, and success. To this end, we seek to ensure students are aware of their
rights and responsibilities as members of the College community, including providing them with an extensive list of College and University policies in the College Bulletin, which is updated annually and available on the College website.

The College needs to develop ways, including the use of social media, to better disseminate policy information. Nevertheless, 82% of student respondents indicated that they often or very often learned about events at John Jay via email (50% via the website; 37% via flyers). Minutes from all College-wide committee meetings are posted online, allowing transparent access to information for all interested students.

Public Relations Information

Several departments at the College create and distribute recruiting, advertising, and other public relations information (e.g., departmental newsletters), and others work in concert with the Marketing and Communications Department. Often publications are updated on an as-needed basis. Content reflects the latest information, such as news, events, programs, etc. To create adherence to branding standards, such as the College's logo and typeface, and to provide assistance to departments, there are templates available on the internal faculty and staff accessible web link on the John Jay website. Templates provide layouts for stationery, postcards, newsletters, and other materials. Distribution methods of materials vary among departments; some offices have hard copies of their publications but do not post the updated materials on the website, while others do the reverse. There is a formal structure to vet online content for brand compliance and accuracy through one of the web management functions of the Marketing Department. However, there is not a formal ongoing structure in place for monitoring and assessing all of the print materials created and distributed by all the departments, other than periodic reviews. Assessment of how well John Jay is represented or communicates by both print and online materials is difficult since there are no surveys measuring this direct association. However, we are trying to create more opportunities to make the connections among content, distribution, and action. For instance, when the last reunion invitation was distributed to alumni, we received rsvp responses within two hours of the post. Departments are also working with each other on targeted recruiting mailings, which will provide an opportunity for greater assessment when we see results on which mailings yielded responses and which did not.

Strengths:

1. The President and members of the executive team are highly qualified for their positions, and the individuals meet often and work well together.
2. The faculty fully and effectively engage in shared governance.
3. The administration and faculty work well together and, in cases where there are disagreements, both sides willingly meet to discuss the issues.
4. There is strong administrative support for monitoring and coordinating policies and issues of fairness and ethical behavior.

Concerns:

1. Student participation in governance bodies is often uneven.
2. The current structures for academic departments and administrators do not foster communication and do not identify and focus resources on faculty and departments.
3. Information of all kinds, especially the Compendium of Policies and Procedures, is not disseminated effectively and consistently.
4. The policies on Academic Integrity are not known, or widely adhered to, among faculty and students.

Recommendations:

1. The College should promote greater clarity in communicating and facilitating access to College and CUNY policies and procedures, particularly for students and faculty.
2. The College should explore possible ways to realign the academic departments and administrators, for the purposes of improving communication and of better identifying and focusing resources on faculty, departments, and programs.
3. The College should ensure integrity of the website through administrative accountability as well as timely dissemination of College governance decisions and other important notices.
4. The College should increase education on academic integrity; specifically, it should train faculty in how to teach and monitor academic integrity, require accountability from administrators responsible for implementing policies, and raise the prominence of the issue in the consciousness of the community.
5. The resources needed by Departments and by Department Chairs and by academic programs should be reexamined.

---

2 For example, in 2007-2008, the prior curriculum committee reviewed only 16 action items, including new course proposals, proposed majors, letters of intent and program revisions. The newly established UCASC reviewed 56 action items in 2008-2009; 28 action items in 2009-2010; and 57 action items in 2010-2011. The rate of attendance at UCASC meetings is also encouraging. Faculty attendance was over 90% for 4 of the 9 meetings during 2010-2011, while 100% of student representatives attended 6 of the 9 meetings.
3 For a more complete analysis of the Pathways controversy, see Chapter Six on Faculty.
4 But since that survey departments have adopted bylaws which may address this.
5 It is all the more remarkable that student satisfaction levels with administrative and support services are the highest in CUNY.
6 http://www.jjay.cuny.edu/2646.php
7 Minor revisions to the Complaint policy were adopted in May 2010, following review by the CUNY Office of the General Counsel, through consultation with administrators and faculty (as per the original policy). The most significant changes allow Chairs to recuse themselves from investigations, and clarify that only students in a faculty member's class or other academic setting may file complaints against the faculty member.
8 http://inside.jjay.cuny.edu/docs/research/TAB11_50.pdf
9 JJC adheres to all applicable Federal, state and city laws and regulations regarding non-discrimination and affirmative action in employment including Titles VI and VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972; the Equal Pay Act of 1963; Sections 503 and 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990; The Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967; Section 402 of the Vietnam Veterans Readjustment Act of 1974; the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986; Executive Order 111246 as amended; New York Executive Law, Article 15, Section 296; and the New York City Human Rights Law, Chapter 1, Section 8-107.
Chapter Four
Standard 7: Institutional Assessment

Institutional Assessment at John Jay College

John Jay College is effectively fulfilling its Mission and achieving its goals and objectives. Previous Middle States evaluations (Appendix 4.1) faulted the College for both failing to plan strategically and to assess systematically, but the College has developed a much greater capacity to define and assess its goals comprehensively in the last few years. With the Critical Choices agenda in 2006 and the development of our most recent strategic plan in 2010, the College set clear, manageable, and measurable goals. At the same time, we have fully embraced institutional effectiveness through assessment to stay focused on our goals.

Institutional assessment has always occurred, but over the last ten years it has moved from episodic to systematic. There has always been a great deal of data about the institution, but we are now using it more intentionally in the service of assessment and program effectiveness:

- There was no assessment committee until 2011, but we now have an active one, led by faculty.
- The PMP was until very recently just an acronym for most people outside the higher levels of the administration. Even most members of the planning committees had never heard of it until two years ago, but it is now the subject of at least one major annual discussion in those groups, and key metrics drive actions.
- Data sets for the Chairs’ annual evaluations have each year become more strategically oriented and important in the discussions with the Provost.
- A Master Plan Report Card was created for the first time in 2012, and it is now available for everyone to see on the Planning and Budgeting website.
- The arrival of the latest NSSE results has prompted one of the “spring themes” in the Center for the Advancement of Teaching and discussion in the planning committees.
- The first administration of the Admitted Students Questionnaire in 2012 and use of the National Student Clearinghouse have allowed us to gauge our competitive position in student recruitment.
- We have defined and are now measuring the “critical functions” of the institution to serve as additional performance measures.
- When we joined the ranks of the CUNY Senior Colleges in 2010 we adopted them as competitive peers, and we now rate our performance against the Senior College Average on many metrics of the PMP.

In short, a new awareness of institutional effectiveness has taken hold at the College. There are more initiatives in the wings, but the changes in practice already in place need time to yield their full potential, as individuals become accustomed to thinking and operating in new ways. A robust culture of assessment is in the making.

The Assessment Environment: Structures, Processes, Data

Structures. The formal infrastructure for assessment includes the following elements.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Structure</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>Office of Outcomes Assessment</td>
<td>Created in 2007, the OOA has a director and an associate director (position approved in late 2012 and now being searched).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College-Wide Assessment Committee</td>
<td>Chaired by a member of the faculty, the Assessment Committee includes professional staff, but seven of the ten members come from the faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subcommittee for Assessment of Gen Ed</td>
<td>Comprised of faculty with the Director of Outcomes Assessment serving ex officio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Studies</td>
<td>Council of Undergraduate Major Coordinators</td>
<td>Each undergraduate major program has a coordinator for assessment, advising, and other matters related to the operation of the degree program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council of Minor Coordinators</td>
<td>With some overlap with the major coordinators, the minor coordinators play a parallel role for minors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Studies</td>
<td>Committee on Graduate Studies</td>
<td>This group is made up of the directors of graduate programs in addition to a few others; it effectively functions as an assessment committee for Graduate Studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Department Assessment Committees</td>
<td>At least 15 departments or programs have their own assessment committees.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Processes.** Assessment, formal and otherwise, takes place across the organization, but some nodes of activity stand out:

- Nearly all academic departments have assessment plans and file annual assessment reports with the Director of Outcomes Assessment and the College-Wide Assessment Committee.
- Every five years or so each program undertakes a comprehensive Academic Program Review with an external evaluation. An action plan is developed, and there are follow-up discussions with the Dean and Provost. (see Standard 11 for further discussion and documentation)
- The undergraduate Dean meets with Departments annually to review progress on assessment.
- The Director of Outcomes Assessment provides guidance and feedback on a routine basis to all academic departments.
- Major Coordinators organize assessment for degree programs, and the Council is the principal forum of discussion of assessment matters for most of the academic departments.
- Each summer, the Provost has individual evaluation meetings with the Chairs, and assessment is a standard topic built into the template for such meetings.
- The College-Wide Assessment Committee prepares written feedback on assessment reports to departments, both academic and administrative.
- Assessment occurs routinely in the context of administrative personnel evaluations.

The last two points require further explanation. The Assessment Committee coordinates efforts for both student learning and administrative performance, although to date the emphasis has been on academic assessment. A single group with oversight and reporting responsibilities allows for the efficient sharing of information, plans, and best practices, and promotes greater
campus awareness about the benefits of systematic and comprehensive assessment. The committee has broad responsibilities within the College.

The Assessment Committee has been effective in raising expectations regarding assessment across the campus, in part by writing a statement of guidelines and practices for assessment. The efforts of the Committee and the adoption of a more active stance on assessment by the College has resulted in much more systematic assessment efforts. Written plans and documented discussions of improvements are now the norm if not present everywhere. The Committee is fairly new and will need time to develop and balance its many functions. It has concentrated its efforts so far on responding to departmental assessment reports and developing the assessment guidelines and website.

Personnel evaluations are especially important for assessment purposes within administrative units. For example, the alignment of vice presidential strategies with the Master Plan and PMP is evident in their performance appraisal templates, against which they are evaluated by the President each year. The Vice Presidents in turn evaluate those who report to them using templates aligned with Master Plan and PMP goals (see, for example, those from Finance and Administration and Academic Affairs). A number of administrative units have developed systems of assessment (available in the assessment committee organization site in Blackboard), although we rely heavily on performance evaluations as the main drivers of assessment in administrative units.
**Data.** The principal sources of data (and alignment of goals) used for institution-related assessment are listed in the following table. Other reports and data are also used on an ad hoc basis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals for Institutional Effectiveness</th>
<th>Data Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fulfiling Mission and Achieving Goals (Standard 1)</td>
<td>Principal Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle States</td>
<td>John Jay College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master Plan Goals</td>
<td>PMP Objectives for Goal 1: Raise Academic Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Statement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision Statement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Evidence-Based Planning and Budgeting (Standard 2) | Principal Measures |
| Middle States | John Jay College | CUNY |
| Master Plan Goal 5: Institutional Effectiveness | PMP Objectives for Goal 3: Enhance Financial and Management Effectiveness | • PMP Year End results |
| | | • Master Plan Report Card |
| | | • Master Plan Analysis (internal use) |
| | | • Academic Program Reviews |
| | | • Critical Functions Measures |
| | | • NSSE |
| | | • Multi Institutional Survey of Leadership |
| | | • Enrollment Reports |

| Using resources efficiently (Standard 3) | Principal Measures |
| Middle States | John Jay College | CUNY |
| Master Plan Goal 5: Institutional Effectiveness | PMP Objectives for Goal 3: Enhance Financial and Management Effectiveness | • PMP Year End results |
| | | • Feedback from audits |
| | | • Quarterly budget reports |
| | | • CUNY Budget reports |
| | | • Annual Audits (A133) |

| Providing effective governance (Standard 4) | Principal Measures |
| Middle States | John Jay College | CUNY |
| | | |
| | | • College Council Minutes |
| | | • Faculty Senate Minutes |

| Delivery of administrative services (Standard 5) | Principal Measures |
| Middle States | John Jay College | CUNY |
| Master Plan Goal 5: Institutional Effectiveness | PMP Objectives for Goal 3: Enhance Financial and Management Effectiveness | • CUNY and John Jay Student Experience Surveys |
| | | • Finance and Administration Employee Survey |
| | | • Finance and Administration KPI’s |
| | | • Mid-Year Reviews |
| | | • Administrative Unit assessment reports |
| | | • VP Performance Appraisal Templates |
| | | • PMP Year-End Report |

| Institutional Assessment (Standard 7) | Principal Measures |
| Middle States | John Jay College | CUNY |
| Master Plan Goal 5: Institutional Effectiveness | PMP Objectives Goals 1 and 3 | • Assessment reports on student learning |
| | | • Academic Program Reviews |
| | | • Survey of graduates |
| | | • PMP Year-End Report |
| | | • NSSE |
| | | • CUNY and John Jay Student Experience Surveys |
| | | • NCAA Compliance Analysis |
| | | • Assessment Committee Annual Report |
| | | • Mid-Year Reviews |
| | | • General Education Assessment |
Of the titles listed, there are six major reports that inform most of the assessment activity on campus: Performance Management Process Reports, Master Plan Report Card, Assessment of Student Learning, Critical Functions Measures, Administrative and Support Unit Assessment Reports, Academic Program Reviews. They overlap to some extent but each answers to a different set of concerns and questions. Brief descriptions are in Appendix 4.2.

Examples of Institutional Assessment in Action

The Master Plan, Critical Choices agenda, and PMP Goals and Targets provide the interrelated performance goals against which we measure our progress as an institution. What follows are some examples of key goals and assessment-driven strategies used to pursue them.

Our Critical Choices included the following goals:
- Shift our undergraduate programs to an all-baccalaureate population while maintaining enrollment, with an emphasis on transfer and graduate students
- Attract significant numbers of students to new undergraduate liberal arts programs (See Appendix 4.3 for discussion)
- Attract undergraduate students with a stronger academic preparation (and the flip side: end reliance on students in need of summer remediation—“conditional admits”—to meet enrollment targets) (See Appendix 4.3 for discussion)

Become for Undergraduates an All-Baccalaureate Institution. Steering through such a large change in the composition of the undergraduate student body has required nearly constant attention to the enrollment environment and to recruitment practices. The first graph in the next chapter illustrates the rapidly changing relationship between freshmen and the rest of the College as we moved to all baccalaureate admissions and maintained enrollment at a roughly constant level.

When the decision was made to become an all-baccalaureate institution in 2006, the Enrollment Management staff consulted with Institutional Research to determine the factors that shaped academic success for John Jay students. Working with the data generated from the model and with the Academic Standards Committee, the admissions staff recommended a sequence of stepped-up admission standards leading to all-baccalaureate admissions in fall 2010, with the provision that the standards would be reviewed each semester. As Enrollment Management followed the numbers they made the adjustments to the admissions targets based on decisions about the required SAT scores or high school CAA. Admissions targets in turn drove strategies such as the decision to introduce an Early Decision program for the entering class of 2009 in an effort to convert more applicants in the semester before the end of associate admissions. At the same time, new strategies were developed to communicate and interact with students much earlier than in the past. The overall effort anticipated the SPG initiatives that have become so important starting in fall 2011 (see Chapters 2 and 8). The result for fall 2009 was the largest freshman class in John Jay history. Other new strategies followed for the entering class in 2010. Particular high schools became recruiting targets, new promotional materials were
developed, and students were targeted in New Jersey and Connecticut. The series of decisions made between 2006 and 2010 that brought the associate admissions down to zero and replaced them with baccalaureate and transfer students was evidenced-based and goal-directed every step of the way. There was simply no precedent to guide the College somewhere it had never been before. In the final analysis, the transformation to senior College status has been a noteworthy success; enrollment at the College is roughly equivalent to the enrollment when the process began in 2006.

Among the objectives under Goal 1 of the Master Plan, Student Success, we are committed to

- Greater credit accumulation for freshmen and transfers in their first year
- Updated curricula and advising to support post-graduate success
- Better student services (See Appendix 4.3 for discussion)

**Credit Accumulation.** We watch metrics for academic momentum, especially for freshmen, and here is one area needing attention, since the consequences for retention can be significant. Credit accumulation in the first year of study lags behind the Senior College average (See graph 4.1). John Jay students on average earn only 23.1 credits through the summer after their first year. We responded by hiring more academic advisors and promoting the summer and winter sessions as opportunities to catch up on credits or to get ahead with credits. In addition, we have looked carefully at the foundation courses in mathematics since data show that students have difficulty there. We have hired lecturers—full-time faculty—to staff the key course that has proved to be a stumbling block, MAT104, and we have hired a coordinator solely for the basic courses in math (more fully described under Standard 11, Chapter 7). Success rates in MAT104 are up, and we are hopeful that will translate into a greater first-year credit accumulation. Finally, we have begun to pilot an “Early Start” program for some students which invites them to begin some coursework in the summer before their first fall matriculation. Initial results indicate a dramatic improvement in terms of first-year credit accumulation (Appendix 4.4).

**Align Curricula and Provide Advising for Post-Graduate Success.** Academic program reviews take place every five years; they include external evaluations which we use for program improvement. As valuable as such reviews are, we seek a more aggressive schedule and a deeper interaction with outside expert opinion. We have therefore just begun to cultivate “communities of practice” especially as they pertain to our graduate programs. The idea is to establish relationships with organizations whose interests align with our academic programs, and to that end we have met with representatives from the FBI, Homeland Security, the Department of State, the Department of Justice, and from the community of fraud investigators in the New York area. We came away with knowledge of what these organizations are looking for in prospective employees in terms of coursework, cognitive skills, and experience, and we will adjust our curricula to develop those qualifications in our students as
PMP and Master Plan Goals call for:

- Increased full-time faculty coverage of classes (PMP Objective 2)
- Strengthened institutional effectiveness: Mid-Year Reviews (Master Plan Goal 5)
- Enhanced financial and management effectiveness (PMP Goal 3) (See Appendix 4.3 for discussion)

*Increase Full-Time Faculty Coverage.* We want as many students as possible, especially in the lower division, to see our full-time faculty in the classrooms. This has been a challenge, and we know exactly how much of a challenge because we rely on data to show us where we are. The PMP (Graph 4.2) tells us that relative to the Senior Colleges we are dead last in terms of instructional FTEs delivered by full-time faculty, and the gap has never been larger since at least 2006.

To understand the issue in terms of particular programs, we have developed a standard report that tells us to what extent full-time faculty teach in lower-division courses and in core major courses. For the first time in summer 2012 the Provost was able to discuss the deployment of faculty with data in hand during the annual evaluations of Chairs, who received the data in advance. Where appropriate, that discussion item along with a commendation or recommendation appeared in the follow-up letters from the Provost to Chairs.³

The PMP informs us that our veteran faculty now teach only slightly fewer hours on average than those at the other senior colleges (Graph 4.3), but the full-time faculty coverage metrics are still disappointing.⁴ The practical solution is to increase the number of full-time faculty, and we have a plan to do exactly that (see page 16)
Mid-Year Reviews for Institutional Effectiveness. Another means of assessing administrative performance are the annual “mid-year reviews” which offer the President and executive staff the chance “to take a closer look at key operational areas, to share that information with colleagues in relevant areas, and to develop a set of action items that will improve service delivery for the students, faculty, staff and alumni of John Jay College.” The reviews, scheduled during the winter break, last about 90 minutes and feature Powerpoint presentations; they reflect the work typically of two to five offices selected each year by the President. The presenters are mid-level staff who do not normally interact with the President. During the presentation the President and others raise issues, and at the conclusion the President reviews a list of questions for follow-up, which are put in a letter to the relevant Vice President. The responses from the Vice Presidents are lengthy, analytical, and often buttressed with data. We include examples of letters by the President and responses from Vice Presidents for 2011, when five units made presentations. Feedback from the President to the Vice Presidential responses occurs at Executive Staff Meetings.

The mid-year reviews are very effective exercises in assessment. For example, in the presentation by the Office of Affirmative Action, Compliance & Diversity on February 10, 2011, the rather high under-utilization data for Asians within the faculty, administration, and classified service became a point of discussion. As a result, Human Resources added two major listings to its standardized posting places to reach potential applicants who identify as Asian. This no doubt contributed to the dramatic increase in Asian applicants, from 272 in 2011-2012 to 982 since July 1, 2012. In general, the mid-year reviews provide opportunities for sharing information and ideas across divisions, and they bring to the surface issues that need attention, in the presence of the senior staff who are in a position to respond effectively.

Institutional Effectiveness and the PMP

We have just presented a few examples from the PMP, but it is worth looking at the process as a whole since the largest single institutional effectiveness exercise for John Jay is participation in the PMP. Based on CUNY PMP Goals and Targets which are announced each spring, the College prepares its own goals and targets for the coming year and submits them for review to the CUNY PMP office in mid-June. The central office will often have a comment or two about our report, and we make adjustments for a final submission at the end of August. In mid-June we submit an evaluation of our performance against the goals and targets that we specified a year earlier. Both the goal-setting and the performance evaluation for the previous year involve offices across the campus. In July the CUNY Office of Institutional Research and Assessment (OIRA) produces the PMP Year-End University Report for the previous academic year with data for all Senior Colleges, Comprehensive Colleges, and Community Colleges, so it is possible to benchmark performance within CUNY. The Year-End report tracks about 135 metrics, and although not all of them apply to all colleges it is, nonetheless, quite a substantial performance profile of institutional effectiveness and one that leads to action.  

John Jay receives a personalized PMP evaluation from CUNY in the early fall; CUNY literally scores each campus PMP performance and assigns it to a quintile ranking, a rating that carries a great deal of weight in the Chancellor’s evaluation of the President. A follow-up letter from the Chancellor summarizes the evaluation and often raises questions about our PMP performance for the past year, and the Chancellor may have advice concerning the PMP goals for the following year. The President broadly conveys the results of the evaluation meeting to his executive staff and others, since there are always areas for improvement along with the good news. As a result of recent evaluations, it became clear that we needed to step up our efforts to
understand and improve post-graduate outcomes for our students, and we are now tracking graduate and professional school test scores and taking extra care in conducting surveys of graduates. Another action area to emerge from the last Chancellor’s PMP review was retention and graduation rates for master’s students. We were certainly aware of, and addressing, the gap between our metrics and those of the other Senior Colleges, but the issue has become more urgent, to the point that in fall 2012 we set up, in effect, a separate retention workgroup for Graduate Studies. The new relationships with “communities of practice” described above are also a response to enrollment stagnation and poor student outcomes in Graduate Studies. Of course, many offices respond to the PMP Year-End Report and to the goals and targets without an annual prompt from the President or Chancellor. With the VP performance appraisal templates explicitly aligned with PMP metrics, there is a built-in incentive to pay attention every day of the year. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness provides frequent internal analyses and presentations of our PMP performance for discussion in planning groups.

Periodic review of the assessment process itself is also important. The role and definition of PMP metrics are reviewed from time to time, most recently in fall 2012, when a number of changes were proposed by the CUNY PMP director and discussed by IR staff and PMP campus liaisons. The recent formal announcement by CUNY of changes for both the 2012-2013 process and 2013-2014 Goals and Targets demonstrates a serious commitment to review and improve the assessment process itself. At the campus level, the feedback loops that tie departments to both the Director of Outcomes Assessment and the Assessment Committee improve our processes of assessment as well as prompting departments to think about the substantive uses of assessment. As a result of our first year’s experience with the template for assessment reports, the Assessment Committee revised the template for 2012-2013.

As a summary evaluation of PMP performance, Table 4.1 below lists key indicators that are part of the annual campus presentation of PMP results in the fall.6 Where appropriate, all indicators are scored as a Win or a Loss against the Senior College Average. The arrow in the right-hand column indicates the movement for John Jay relative to the previous year. The results show that John Jay comes up short in many respects compared to the “average” Senior College; the benchmarking is a valuable exercise that highlights areas for improvement, although no individual item is a surprise. While most of the indicators are losses relative to the Senior College Average, John Jay has moved up in eight categories from the previous year and down in half as many, indicating substantial progress since we joined the ranks of Senior Colleges.

**Student Learning Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness**

Student learning is the prime dimension of institutional effectiveness. Our narrative for Standard 14 analyzes our assessment efforts and results from a programmatic point of view. From the larger, institutional perspective, we have taken appropriate steps to promote assessment and its use for program improvement. The College-Wide Assessment Committee identifies and promotes best practices across the College and individually addresses academic programs with constructive advice. The Office of Outcomes Assessment and more broadly the Office for Institutional Effectiveness provide administrative support to the Assessment Committee, and both work directly with academic departments and administrative units. A subcommittee of the General Education Committee focuses on institutional learning goals. Major and minor coordinators guide academic programs in constructing plans and analyzing assessment data. The Provost and deans work with chairs and graduate program directors to reinforce the use of assessment results. Assessment in practice is still far from perfect, but the institution possesses the infrastructure, know-how, and the will to achieve continuous improvement in terms of both assessment processes and results.
The administration actively supports assessment activities. While a robust program of assessment cannot and should not be achieved solely through administrative activity, there will always be a need for some significant administrative support, especially at the beginning; the following are examples of such:

- Creation of position of Director of Outcomes Assessment in 2007
- Creation of new position of Associate Provost for Institutional Effectiveness in 2010
- Creation of “Major Coordinators” with release time to coordinate assessment and advising for each degree program
- Authorization of new position of Associate Director of Outcomes Assessment in 2012
- Support for faculty and administrator attendance at assessment workshops
- Approval in principle of “Faculty Fellows in Assessment”

**Creating a Culture of Assessment**

We are building a culture of assessment—the Master Plan calls for it explicitly—and it is taking root across the college, not everywhere at once but in enough places that eventually the bare spots will fill in. Assessment is both systematic and comprehensive in all degree programs; assessment is less well developed among minors, certificates, and continuing education, but it does take place everywhere. Within administrative units, assessment is built into the personnel evaluation process and into formal assessment plans, although the degree to which assessment is used explicitly for program improvement varies. The University builds assessment into the PMP, and we have constructed a Master Plan Report Card to supplement and reinforce the PMP; we rely on both to help with planning. An assessment website will be a repository of information, best practices, and assessment results, available to everyone in the College community and a constant reminder of what systematic and comprehensive assessment can achieve. The College has made substantial progress in the past few years, and through
continued concerted action, we will achieve systematic and comprehensive assessment practices in all parts of the institution.

**Office of Institutional Research**

The Office of Institutional Research (OIR) is a key component of the assessment environment at John Jay. Like all IR offices, it provides the College with statistical information and analyses on enrollment, student characteristics, faculty and staff, and academic programs. It maintains a comprehensive survey research program through which it identifies trends, areas of growth and concern, and issues affecting the John Jay student experience. In addition, OIR provides data and serves as a liaison to a variety of College constituencies and outside agencies. The Office of Outcomes Assessment is a close partner with OIR.

To make it much more effective in these roles, the Office of Institutional Effectiveness has taken advantage of a nearly complete turnover in OIR staff to remake the information environment. (Though outside OIR, a full-time research analyst has been added to Enrollment Management to give that Division direct support for its specialized data needs.) The goals are to generate only information that has a clear use, and just as importantly to educate the campus on the types and uses of information that are available.

An updated website will soon introduce the office and staff along with an inventory of available reports and surveys; in each case there is a description, purpose, and possible uses. The website is an invitation to consult information and to ask for assistance with information needs.

As the recent activity report makes clear, offices across the campus rely routinely on IR for data and analysis. (An important exception seems to be the Division of Student Affairs.) Institutional Research has enabled the institution to understand and make key decisions on deployment of faculty by course level, on retention strategies, on entry requirements for degree programs, and on marketing, to name a few areas.

**Strengths:**

1. There is a serious commitment to institutional effectiveness at John Jay that has shaped planning and assessment throughout much of the institution.
2. We have constructed metrics specific to John Jay to measure performance (Master Plan Report Card and Critical Functions Measures) and we use them for institutional improvement.
3. The CUNY PMP process is a strong and established set of institutional metrics that guides policies and practices toward institutional effectiveness.

**Concerns:**

1. Not all units at the College have yet developed, to the degree expected, planning and program improvement that are tied to assessment.
2. The Division of Student Affairs does not routinely consult Institutional Research for specific data needs.

**Recommendations:**

1. The College should continue to work with all units in order to tie planning and program improvement to assessment.
2. Institutional Research should develop an effective and ongoing working relationship with the Vice President and Directors in Student Affairs to inform them of available data resources.

2 Those reports are available at the Assessment Committee Blackboard Organization Site.
3 See for example the 2012 letters to Haberfeld, Curtis, Hamilton, Pease, Sullivan and Kobilinsky, referenced on page 28 (letters).
4 Our junior faculty (eligible for 24 hours of release time in their first five years) are at the senior college average for teaching hours (7.2) for the fall semester 2011.
5 Campus data on student learning assessment is not tracked in the PMP.
6 CUNY identifies the collection of key indicators, but we produce the scorecard version locally.
Chapter Five

Standard 8: Student Admissions and Retention • Standard 9: Student Support Services

Managing Enrollment within the Critical Choices Agenda

The Critical Choices agenda had important consequences for admissions and enrollment, including of course the phase-out of associate degree admissions, but it also means that we are recruiting graduate students more aggressively as well as students interested in liberal arts majors. In addition to reshaping the mix by level, we want students with stronger academic preparation overall who can take better advantage of the academic programs, special opportunities, and support services we offer. The challenge has been formidable—especially in terms of maintaining diversity and enrollment—as we pared away one-third of the freshman class, but we are meeting the challenge, and in terms of the student class distribution (Graph 5.1) the College is a very different one than six years ago.

One strategy to make up for the loss of associate students at the front end was to create opportunities for those students at the CUNY community colleges and then to take them in as transfer students upon completion of their associate degrees. With the creation of the CUNY Justice Academy, the CUNY community colleges—with active support from John Jay—were able for the first time to offer associate degrees related to criminal justice: Criminal Justice, Science for Forensics, and Forensic Financial Analysis. Students entering the Justice Academy, either directly into a community college or because they are denied admission to John Jay as a baccalaureate student, are in a dual admission program that guarantees seamless entry to John Jay upon successful completion of one of the specified degrees. Students are just now coming through the Justice Academy in significant numbers, and there are about 7,000 more in the six community colleges. Justice Academy students play an important role in our admissions strategies, providing a significant stream of students but also complicating the effort to strengthen liberal arts programs, since nearly all Justice Academy students enter our B.S. degree in Criminal Justice.

Graph 5.1: Undergraduate Class Distribution by Percent

![Graph 5.1: Undergraduate Class Distribution by Percent](image)
Another feature of the original plan that would cushion the loss of so many associate students was to decrease overall enrollment for a time and then gradually return to a higher level through the admission of better-prepared baccalaureate students. The Preliminary Enrollment Projections of the time reflected that approach. FTEs were projected to decline from 11,260 in fall 2007 to 10,553 in fall 2012. However, budget cuts occurred as a result of the recession, and to mitigate their impact we decided on higher enrollments. Instead of shrinking, enrollment has actually grown since fall 2007 and it is currently at 11,752 FTEs (Table 5.1 below). Although growing FTE enrollment while foregoing a substantial part of the traditional student population is a significant accomplishment, it has tempered expectations regarding the levels of preparedness of the freshman cohorts. The College still accepts conditional students who are included in our “regular” admits but who need academic preparation during the summer months. Thus there has been a trade-off between budgetary exigencies and the strategic goal of raising academic preparation. Nonetheless, as Table 5.2 shows, average SAT scores and CAA have increased since 2007. We are again pursuing academically better-prepared students but at a higher overall enrollment than originally anticipated, and fortunately the budget support has been bolstered by a series of CUNY tuition increases.

Table 5.1: Admissions and Enrollment Trends, 2007 to 2012, Fall Semesters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Enrollment</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular Full-Time Freshmen</td>
<td>2,582</td>
<td>2,164</td>
<td>2,544</td>
<td>1,622</td>
<td>1,483</td>
<td>1,703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEEK/CD First-Time Freshmen</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total First-Time Freshmen</td>
<td>2,813</td>
<td>2,442</td>
<td>2,872</td>
<td>2,015</td>
<td>1,766</td>
<td>1,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Students</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Students</td>
<td>997</td>
<td>1207</td>
<td>1193</td>
<td>1167</td>
<td>1371</td>
<td>1621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headcount Total</td>
<td>14,841</td>
<td>14,844</td>
<td>15,330</td>
<td>15,206</td>
<td>14,788</td>
<td>14,996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE Total</td>
<td>11,468</td>
<td>11,348</td>
<td>12,042</td>
<td>11,686</td>
<td>11,430</td>
<td>11,752</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CUNY Office of Institutional Research and Assessment

Table 5.2: SAT and CAA Trends, 2007 to 2012, Fall Semester Admissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean SAT (math + verbal)</td>
<td>931</td>
<td>943</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>939</td>
<td>951</td>
<td>953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean CAA</td>
<td>81.6</td>
<td>81.1</td>
<td>81.2</td>
<td>82.2</td>
<td>82.9</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


A New Emphasis on Retention

Another strategy to support enrollment and to permit greater selectivity is a renewed emphasis on retention. Because the days when we could count on a seemingly unlimited supply of associate degree students to generate the FTEs needed to meet enrollment targets are gone, and because better retention takes pressure off recruitment, we now follow a strategic retention plan developed by Keeling and Associates in 2009. One-year retention has improved steadily over the last several years (Graph 5.2), but we are still below the CUNY Senior College average by
about six percentage points; transfer student retention is, however, better than the Senior College average (Graph 5.3).

Another measure of the College’s improvement in the area of retention and graduation is the fact that four-year graduation rates for first-time freshmen have increased by 4.3 percentage points from 2010 to 2011, and the four-year rate of 25.3% is the second highest among the Senior Colleges in CUNY. When adjusted for the demographics of our incoming students, John Jay ranks first for the freshman cohorts entering in 2006 and 2007. The same adjustment places John Jay fifth among the senior colleges for retention of the 2010 entering cohort. Beginning in 2012-13 CUNY will routinely calculate expected outcomes for retention and graduation rates in the PMP.

With a completely commuter student population, John Jay must pay particular attention to student engagement, a critically important factor in retention and student success. We have taken some significant steps since the Critical Choices decisions, but indicators suggest we have more work to do. Despite some fine programs that engage students, the data from NSSE and the CUNY Student Experience Survey suggest that much of the student population is not engaged or at least is not engaged consistently. Data on freshmen show very little participation in co-curricular activities relative to comparison groups (see Graph 5.4). It is true that John Jay students often spend a lot of time traveling to and from campus, but other CUNY schools where students spend about as much time commuting have higher levels of student participation in co-curricular activities, as evidenced by data from the 2012 CUNY Student Experience Survey. The Community Outreach and Service Learning office involves many students, but the NSSE data suggest that its impact on the
population at large is limited, since community engagement is significantly higher at other institutions (see Graph 5.5). We see the same weak participation rate within CUNY when we consider internships. According to the CUNY Student Experience Survey, John Jay students participate in internships at half the average rate of the CUNY Senior Colleges. And under the NSSE benchmark for “Active and Collaborative Learning,” seniors (and perhaps sophomores and juniors as well, who are not part of a standard NSSE sample) do poorly relative to comparison groups.

John Jay students do show real strength relative to comparison institutions in some areas of engagement, especially with regard to interactions with others from different backgrounds. However, it is clear that in other areas and for seniors especially we need to build deeper engagement into the John Jay student experience. Unless we intentionally and systematically embrace student engagement as a College priority, our efforts at retention will fall short, the pressure on admissions will continue, and our students will miss out on a valuable part of their education.

**Integrated Planning and Enrollment Management**

Enrollment management demands an integrated approach. Limitations on space will force the College to cap growth and make decisions on the mix of students by level and on the allocation of resources to the various segments of the student population. We must not only think about admission numbers, but we need to define much more carefully than we have in the past those students whom we want to serve and to match marketing, programming, and support services to them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.3: Enrollment Targets through Fiscal Year 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total First Time Freshmen</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2013 (actual)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Undergraduates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Transfers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Justice Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Graduate Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total College Headcount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total FTEs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The enrollment management targets developed in the context of our integrated planning are as follows:

- Stabilize the freshman class at 1700 students with increasing numbers of out-of-state students.
- Gradually raise the SAT scores of admitted freshmen to 1100 by fall 2015.
- Gradually raise the high school CAA for the freshman class to 83.7 by fall 2015.
- Gradually raise the number of transfer students to 1,935 by fall 2015, to include 650 from the Justice Academy and 230 from out-of-state.
- Double the number of students, to 700 freshmen and transfers, compared to fall 2012, who come to John Jay in fall 2014 with the intention of majoring in the liberal arts.
- Decrease the number of conditional admits needing summer remediation.
- Increase FTEs from 11,572 in fall 2012 to 12,200 in fall 2015.
- Increase proportion of graduate students significantly by fall 2016.

As it brings a more sophisticated approach, our integrated planning effort is very much aligned with the completion of the Critical Choices agenda.

**Graduate Programs and Enrollment Management**

Although one of the Critical Choice decisions was to raise the proportion of master’s students at the College to 18%, there was no serious effort to do so. There is now more emphasis on graduate programs, but they remain a source of concern since some of them require updating, and graduation rates are significantly below where they should be. While the four-year graduation rate for the nine master’s programs increased from 54.6% for the class which entered in 2003 to 58.9% for the class which entered in 2007, this rate is still significantly below the CUNY average of 70.8%. The most recent data from CUNY indicate that our one-year retention rates have declined. There is much to be done. Building on the success of the SPG process in attaining fall 2012 undergraduate enrollment targets, our focus in 2012-13 has turned to the graduate programs. The same strategic enrollment planning consultant who was engaged in the undergraduate effort recently engaged the faculty of three of the graduate programs (Forensic Science; Digital Forensics and Cyber Security; and International Crime and Justice) exploring strategies to raise the profile of their programs and attract a larger applicant pool. The communities of practice strategy will be employed to inform the development of curriculum and enhance applicant pools. The College’s goal is to raise both retention and graduation rates to the CUNY Senior College average by the end of the 2014-2015 academic year. Given that all of our strategies are in their nascent stages, it will be challenging to reach our growth target for graduate student enrollment, but we are proceeding deliberately and energetically to do it.
The New Enrollment Management

The Critical Choices agenda is still an open one, but it has so far yielded significant changes in the admissions program, retention strategies, student support infrastructure, and student populations at the undergraduate level. With a rapidly dwindling number of associate degree students, the distribution of students across the four years has evened out considerably, and we are no longer a bottom-heavy, basically lower-division college. This has meant an increase in upper-division courses to serve the new liberal arts majors, which now account for about 10% of our student population (about 51% of all students major in one of the liberal arts degrees, old and new). For the now fewer lower-division students, there are major new support units such as the Academic Advising Center and the First-Year Experience program, which came into being in the wake of the Critical Choices decisions. Managing enrollment now means much more than bringing students into the College as freshmen; sustaining them through graduation and attracting greater numbers of transfer and graduate students have assumed far greater importance than in the past.

Fortunately, what has not changed significantly is the diversity of the student population (See Table 5.4). As we pursued the Critical Choices agenda, we were concerned about the consequences for racial, ethnic, and gender diversity of phasing out associate degree programs.

Table 5.4: Trends in Diversity in Student Population from Critical Choices to 2011: Gender, Ethnic and Racial Composition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>58.9%</td>
<td>56.2%</td>
<td>55.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Critical Choices agenda is a demanding one in terms of enrollment planning. It involves multiple moving targets and a great deal of intentionality as we position the College to attract a somewhat different mix of student populations. We must gauge our position along the way and be prepared to change strategies when we see trouble ahead, a lesson learned in 2011 as we engaged the Strategic Positioning and Enrollment Management initiative in the face of falling enrollments. Since then, the College has taken a much more active stance with regard to enrollment planning. We have brought in three more admissions recruiters and have developed a greater capacity for the recruitment of transfer students. We have hired an analyst in Enrollment Management so we rely to a much greater extent on strategies informed by data. Each week since September 2011, the SPG has met for two hours to review progress and plan every aspect of the enrollment plan. We gained greater clarity of vision in 2012 with information for the first time from the Admitted Students Questionnaire and the National Student Clearinghouse, which allow us to understand more precisely our competitive admissions environment. We now have targets for all basic categories of admission populations, not just extrapolations based on historical performance. We reach out earlier than ever before to engage applicants with new programming and with opportunities to learn more about John Jay. Perhaps more importantly, enrollment planning links with other kinds of planning: academic, budget, marketing, space and facilities, student services, and co-curricular planning. In short, we have become highly goal-directed in enrollment management and have the data and staff necessary to stay on course through continuous assessment.
Student Support Services

As we make adjustments to the student body we are mindful of the role that student services play in supporting and educating our students for success; in our integrated planning efforts one of the first questions we ask is how best to support the needs of the students we seek to attract. The College does a generally excellent job of supporting students by continuously evaluating performance and student need. Assessment has played an important role in keeping performance at demonstrably high levels. We will review a number of student support services to illustrate our commitment to them.

Student support is the business of all divisions at the College, but none more so than Enrollment Management which oversees Financial Aid, Admissions, Office of the Registrar, Testing and Evaluation, and “Jay Express,” our consolidated services unit. Since we opened the “Jay Express” and a Call Center in 2005, students no longer wait on multiple lines to manage their business, and data have been collected to monitor and improve student wait time and the scheduling of service delivery. We continuously monitor the performance of the “Jay Express” and Call Center and make adjustments to improve service. For example, the average wait time for phone help has dropped considerably—from 16 minutes to about nine minutes—and so has the number of abandoned calls, this despite a 20% increase in call volume in 2012 compared to the year before. Performance data is tracked extensively and becomes the basis for assessment.

In addition to phone and face-to-face access for Enrollment Management services, we created a webpage for basic student services—the “Jay Stop”—where students can learn about what is happening on campus as well as conduct specific tasks such as registration. We post electronic versions of the most popular forms, and at this point we have digitized a great deal of paperwork and made it available to students on the “Jay Stop.”

The launch of the “Jay Express” and the Enrollment Management Call Center, and the creation of the “Jay Stop” have fundamentally changed the way operations are handled and the manner in which students interact with Enrollment Management. Students have an easier time managing bureaucratic demands, and as a result we see a high level of student satisfaction as evidenced in the latest CUNY Student Experience Survey which shows John Jay number one (tied with Brooklyn College) among CUNY Senior Colleges:

Table 5.5: 2012 CUNY Student Experience Survey—“Student Satisfaction with Administrative Services” – Comparative Results for CUNY Senior Colleges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Jay College</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn College</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehman College</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York College</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter College</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baruch College</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens College</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City College</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Supporting Academically Underprepared Students: Conditional Admits and SEEK

Given current enrollment realities, the College continues to accept and support students who are underprepared. Although a Senior College should be spending more of its resources on non-remedial programming, we need to support our weaker admits, whom we still need to achieve
our enrollment targets. In this respect, the College has had great success with its summer programs for conditionally admitted students and SEEK+ students.

All incoming John Jay freshmen students must demonstrate that they meet the University's skills proficiency requirements based on their SAT, ACT, or New York State Regents test scores. Lacking such evidence, students may take the appropriate CUNY Assessment Test (CAT) offered by the Testing and Evaluation Office. Some students are only conditionally admitted to John Jay because they have not passed one or two of the CUNY Assessment Tests (CATs). Under the First Year Experience Program, conditional students are required to attend the Summer Academy and must pass the CATs at the end of the program in order to start classes at John Jay in the fall. This tuition-free program provides intensive test preparation for re-taking a CAT before the fall semester starts. In summer 2010, 91% of all students who attended the program became skills certified. The rate dropped to 86% and 84% in the next two summers, respectively, but because the CUNY cut score for math increased from 30 to 40 a true comparison is not possible. Still, this is a very successful program.

In addition to the Summer Academy for conditionally admitted students there is a parallel program for SEEK students. There has been significant improvement between summer 2011 and 2012. The summer pass rates on exit from remediation increased 9 percentage points for Math 1 and 15 points for Math 2. Similarly, the results in Reading and Writing also improved, 9 and 6 points respectively. This summer success was followed by an increase in pass rates for first semester general education courses.

Although all students admitted to SEEK are considered “at risk,” their progress toward degree completion is higher than regular admits. This success is attributable to the special support services provided by NYS funding, including the Academic Support Center which provides tutoring, supplemental instruction, individual counseling, and financial aid services. The six-year graduation rate for the SEEK freshman cohort which entered in 2005 was 46.2%, which is higher than the John Jay College six-year rate (39.1%) and the CUNY-wide SEEK rate (40.2%).

**Supporting Students in Transition**

One of the objectives of the Master Plan is to “facilitate adaptation and transition to both undergraduate and graduate programs for all entering and transfer students.” With the goal of improving its services in this regard, the College has undertaken a thorough review of its orientation programs for freshmen, transfer students, and new graduate students. A comprehensive plan for new student orientation has been the focus of the College’s overall efforts to share information about the campus, curriculum, academic requirements, community standards, cultural competency, and leadership activities, and thus facilitate each student’s successful transition to college life. Key ingredients of orientation include: the peer-to-peer experience via small-group orientation leaders; panel presentations; library and faculty research workshops; campus tours; interactive social media platforms (Facebook, etc.); and advising/registration sessions.

The Orientation Plan has been assessed for fall 2011 and fall 2012. A review of outcomes for 2011 led to changes in 2012, which are summarized in the executive summary for the 2012 assessment report. The results of the assessment for both years were generally positive, but three of the workshops in the graduate orientation program drew fewer than half of the students attending that day, a result that will lead to adjustments next year. Following drops in attendance for fall 2011 among freshmen and graduate students, participation rebounded in both categories in 2012. Survey results indicated that students were generally satisfied. Of the
1,740 new students who attended orientation in fall 2011, 92% reported feeling more prepared for college. In fall 2012, 93% of the students agreed or strongly agreed with the statement: “After attending Orientation, I feel confident in my decision to attend John Jay College.” Nearly 90% agreed with this statement: “After attending orientation, I feel prepared and ready to start College.”

While formal orientation programs are important, the College also provides other ways to support the transition to college. The First Year Experience program is itself an extended orientation for freshmen. SEEK’s summer program serves in part as an orientation program. Advisors, both professional and peers, work with new students to inform them concerning degree options and requirements.

Academic Support Services

There are four distinct tutoring centers at the College: the Center for English Language Support (CELS), the Foreign Language Lab (FLL), the Math and Science Resource Center (MSRC), and the Writing Center (WC). The College also funds a center dedicated to Tutoring Services for Students with Disabilities, and New York State funds the SEEK Department, which includes its Academic Support Center. While each Center has its unique mandate, areas of expertise, and learning goals, the College has found that effective coordination, supervision, and budgeting of tutoring resources is essential to their overall effectiveness. CELS, FLL, MSRC, the SEEK Academic Support Center, and WC now report directly to the Office of Undergraduate Studies.

The assignment of tutoring resources to the Office of Undergraduate Studies has greatly improved oversight and coordination. Activity and assessment reports and plans are now more comprehensive, more analytical, and more frequently produced. Before the consolidation, each center was developing its own materials or individually purchasing software and books. There are now monthly meetings that lead to sharing best practices and materials. All centers now use TutorTrac, but each center can still extract information suitable to its own purposes. Building on the existing structure that centers had previously established with tutor training programs (such as the MSRC and WC) or extensive hiring requirements such as a related master’s degree in the field (such as CELS), the new administrative coordination has allowed for cross-training and the sharing of best practices so that training does not end with certification. With uniform standards for training and pay, the centers no longer compete for the best tutors. In general, consolidation of the oversight function has led to greater efficiency in the delivery of services.

Both utilization of services as demonstrated by the number of tutoring visits and student ratings of satisfaction with services delivered demonstrate that tutor offerings meet the needs of our students. In fact, in the 2012 CUNY Student Experience Survey, John Jay students rated their academic support services higher than students at any other CUNY campus.

Continuing efforts to improve all tutoring services include the identification of new funding sources for the tutoring centers; the provision of better services to graduate students; the promotion of expanded collaboration between tutoring services and faculty; and the continuous training and professionalization of the staff. In most centers, there is extensive assessment which guides program improvement.

In the spring 2012 CUNY Student Experience Survey, John Jay’s student support services ranked highest in CUNY, but of all these services the one that students expressed the most satisfaction with was the Library. In the John Jay IR survey of student satisfaction, 84% of respondents were satisfied or very satisfied with the John Jay Library. In that same survey, 65% of students reported visiting the Library in person at least once a week and 69% reported...
visiting the Library website at least once a week. Recent surveys also tell us that John Jay students have the highest rates in CUNY of using online services.

**Community Life and Engagement**

As we discussed above, NSSE data demonstrate there is room for significant improvement in terms of student engagement. A cohesive College community strengthens engagement, and we have a number of fine offices and programs designed to build community.

The First Year Experience program (discussed more fully in Standard 11) itself defines a large community and has a number of features that support student engagement, such as a speaker series; a program in which faculty and students have lunch together; faculty-student field trips; peer mentors; a program to showcase first-year student research; various social events; and social networking with formal interactive activities.

The Community Outreach and Service Learning Program sponsors a number of programs aimed at civic engagement through practical action: field experience, community service, and volunteerism both on and off campus. In 2011-12 more than 5,000 students participated in some way. **Assessments** guide development of individual programs within the unit, but a frame for unit-wide assessment only began to take place in late 2012.

The Office of Student Activities and Campus Life is also an important contributor to student engagement. It oversees more than 40 student clubs and organizations on campus and supports the John Jay Student Council. One important initiative is a series of professional development workshops that help students discover their leadership style, build valuable relationships with others, and incorporate that learning into their everyday lives. The move into the New Building and the introduction of the Community Hour (see below) allow for the development of a vibrant and involved student community. This Office will seek to capitalize on these two developments as it continues to work on engaging more students in organizations.

Prior to fall 2011, John Jay was one of only two colleges within CUNY without a period in the day when classes were not scheduled. After two years of planning and consultation the Community Hour went into effect for fall 2011 from 1:40 pm to 2:40 pm on a daily basis; no undergraduate classes are scheduled during this time. This open period allows the College community to gather more easily for events, activities, and talks across campus. In its first year, in conjunction with the opening of the New Building, Community Hour has resulted in a new energy on campus as students, faculty, and staff spend the hour gathering in the common spaces. Many activities are scheduled during this period, and the overall effectiveness of Community Hour has been assessed through student surveys and monitoring of student activities. The 2012 **Multi-Institutional Survey of Leadership** shows that students engage in a wide range of campus activities during the hour, and that about two-thirds of students can take advantage of the hour. Data from the Office of Student Life show directly the impact of community hour: in the first year the number of student events and activities increased 72% in the community hour time block and by more than one-third overall.

Student engagement must, of course, encompass academic activities, including independent research. Following the recommendations of a faculty task force on increasing undergraduate participation in research and in response to NSSE data from 2009, the Office of Undergraduate Research (OUR) was created with support from a CUNY grant. Guided by the principles of the Council on Undergraduate Research (CUR), OUR links students with faculty for guided research, and provides funding on a competitive basis for research and for travel to present research. OUR monitors basic data on program performance. Since fall 2010 the Office has had
80 individual meetings with students; has awarded 39 scholarships or stipends; and has sponsored 11 summer internships. About 120 OUR-affiliated students participated in the 2012 Research and Creativity Week programs. By following the data, the office has learned that the best way to reach students is through faculty, a realization that has led to a more focused recruitment effort.

**Services for Advising Students**

Academic advisement changed rapidly in the last four years as we moved away from a decentralized and uncoordinated approach to one located principally in the Academic Advisement Center (ACC). Created in 2008 and now with a staff of 31 advisors (11 full-time, 6 part-time, 14 part-time peer advisors), the AAC has responsibility for the following students:

- Freshmen (students who have 0-29 credits)
- Continuing Students in the B.A. or B.S. degree programs who need advising regarding general education requirements
- New Transfer Students
- Readmitted Students
- B.A. or B.S. students on academic probation

Students with more than 30 credits who have declared a major are encouraged but not required to see an advisor within their major department. Starting in fall 2011, a pilot program for systematically advising students in the majors began in three academic departments, and the program has been expanded each semester since. Working with participating departments, Undergraduate Studies identified faculty, published schedules, and notified students of the need to be advised prior to pre-registration for the next semester. In those cases of planned advisement, students were required to see an advisor prior to registration. Assessment results show that the program reached between 41% and 52% of the targeted student population for the fall 2011 and spring 2012 semesters. A comprehensive advisement program for majors based on the collective assessments will be developed after year two of the pilot.

For the 2013 fiscal year, we have added three additional professional advisors to the AAC, although they will not be in place until April of 2013. For the 2012-2013 academic year, we are targeting advisement increases of

- 2% (to 89%) for first-time freshmen
- 2% (to 65%) for transfers
- 2% (to 53%) for second-semester freshmen and
- 4% (to 45%) for the targeted cohort of students on probation

We will continue to advise 100% of all Honors Program students and SEEK students. By the end of our three-year plan (Appendix 5.1) we should have 21 full-time professional advisors and 20 peer advisors, and we expect all departments will provide advisement by faculty for their majors. At that point we will have 100% coverage for freshmen, 100% for transfers (with major advisement by faculty), 75% for continuing students, and 100% for students on probation and in the SEEK and Honors programs. For graduate students, at least 90% will be advised across all programs and all early warning advising will take place. Each year we set targets for advisement coverage, and collect data on performance.
The Academic Advisement Center has an assessment plan which shows that the unit exceeded targets for advising coverage of all categories except for students on probation. In addition, the AAC recently assessed the quality and effectiveness of the peer advisor program. Assessment results showed that peer training is effective and that peer advisors are knowledgeable and well prepared to work with students.

The 2012 CUNY Student Experience Survey reveals that John Jay students are near the top in the combined categories of “satisfied” and “very satisfied” (59%; only Brooklyn College was better at 60%) with regard to advising. NSSE data show that our freshmen rate advising more highly than our comparison groups, while our seniors are about the same as the closest comparison group. From the student satisfaction perspective, John Jay does a good job with advising.

Student surveys notwithstanding, we recognize the need to do a much better job by providing greater coverage across all segments of the student population and by providing more comprehensive services to each student. As the College faces the challenges of retaining and graduating students, an ample and professional advising infrastructure must be in place and must include a larger professional staff and much greater engagement of faculty.

**Counseling Services**

Counseling services are another key part of the retention equation. The Department of Counseling provides psychological assessment and counseling support services to meet the mental health and developmental needs of students and mental health consultation requests of faculty, staff, and campus organizations. To help foster student success it offers a wide range of individual, group, outreach, crisis-response, peer training, and referral services. The service is staffed by 13 full-time counselors (nine of whom are faculty), five part-time faculty, and two support staff.

Counseling Services has performance goals, and it conducts assessment. For 2011-12 the goals were 1) to increase use of counseling services by students for personal counseling and by faculty and staff for consultations and 2) to achieve symptom improvement and learning goals. The number of students increased 34% in 2011-12, compared with 2010-2011, and the number of consultations by faculty and administrators increased during the same period from 11 to 101. Using the Counseling Center Assessment of Psychological Symptoms (CCAPS), which is administered at intake and then again one month later, the unit demonstrated significant improvement across all symptom dimensions. The office also looked at whether students who had received services achieved certain learning outcomes, including “having healthier relationships with others,” being “better able to handle my feelings and behavior,” being able to more “effectively work on my personal problems,” and “being more sensitive to and appreciative of differences in others.” Of the 92 students who completed the survey, over 60% agreed that they had accomplished these and other learning outcomes. Fifty-four percent of students said that they were “satisfied” or “very satisfied” with personal counseling in the CUNY Student Experience Survey for 2012; this was eight points higher than the Senior College average.

**Career Services**

Due to lackluster ratings from students in earlier years, the Center for Career and Professional Development (CCPD) received considerable scrutiny since the College’s last Middle States review. The responses to the 2010 CUNY Student Experience Survey indicated that student satisfaction was at best moderate. By that time the College had responded to the poor ratings and had hired a new Director. The 2012 survey by CUNY showed considerable improvement, with John Jay having a combined satisfied/very satisfied rating of 46%, 3 points above the
Senior College average. Unfortunately, at the same time we had the highest “very dissatisfied” rating (12%), compared with the Senior College average rating for that response (8%).

There are, however, significant changes in the provision and management of our career services that point to continued improvement. The CCPD has taken the important step of moving away from the outdated model of providing “placement” services to students and alumni to the now best practice of providing a “holistic level of career planning” as well as offering assistance with career exploration, development of professional skills, and the building of networks. In the wake of criticism via the PMP process for not following up on post-graduate outcomes, the CCPD worked with Institutional Research to develop a survey for the graduating class of 2012, and we look forward to reporting much more robust outcome information on the PMP year-end reports in the future. In addition, the CCPD has become increasingly successful in engaging students.7

The CCPD assessment plan for 2012-2013 has three initiatives, and a new set of performance indicators will be used to track the assessment targets and general unit performance. All of these recent efforts are aimed at creating student and alumni success in college, on the job, and throughout a career.

**Keeping Student Information Secure**

In addition to providing essential services to students, the safety and security of student records and compliance with the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) are primary responsibilities of the College. The Student Records Access Policy of the Board of Trustees of The City University of New York (January 26, 1998 Minutes) provides that the University and its colleges shall be in full compliance with FERPA and its regulations. Moreover, all vice presidents and key personnel are required twice a year to sign and attest to their division’s responsibility to maintain compliance in accordance with these policies and procedures. CUNY has also established protocols requiring the College to have and identify an “Internet Security Officer.”8

Both CUNY and John Jay have sufficient procedures in place to ensure the safe and secure maintenance of student records and compliance with FERPA. Student records are tightly controlled by Enrollment Management. Policies and procedures for maintaining the security of student data by IT departments and other college personnel can be found at [http://security.cuny.edu](http://security.cuny.edu).

The Office of the Registrar maintains the permanent educational records for all enrolled students. All policies and procedures relating to the maintenance of student records are based on the principles of confidentiality and the student’s right to privacy consistent with FERPA.9 All policies and procedure information is available online in the Electronic Policies and Procedures Compendium on the College’s intranet.

Student financial aid records are organized and readily available for review by auditors. The Financial Aid Office follows the Federal Records Retention Requirements for Title IV Programs. Employees of the Office of Financial Aid receive intensive FERPA training to ensure that information is only released as required by law. The Office of the Bursar maintains paper records, stored and protected in a secure location, which is accessible only by trained and authorized personnel. Digital files are stored in access-controlled and protected systems in accordance with the CUNY and College policy. Electronic records are maintained indefinitely. Paper records are disposed annually per CUNY records retention and disposition schedule and the John Jay College records retention schedule.
Student Complaints and Grievances

Grade Appeals. The undergraduate student grade appeals process is flawed in two primary aspects. First, there is no timeframe attached to the completion of the process; this means that students and faculty are unconstrained by the process and it can go on interminably. The student has until one year after the completion of the semester to submit the appeal but the final decision-making process is often protracted. Second, the process is not clearly delineated for either students or faculty. In the case of interdisciplinary programs there is some confusion as to which department, chairperson, or major coordinator should be receiving/processing the relevant forms. In contrast to the situation with undergraduates, graduate students express very few problems with grade appeals.

General Complaints. The College’s Division of Student Affairs, specifically the Office of the Dean of Students, fields complaints of all types coming from students. The process was informal until fall 2012 when an intake form was created so that complaints could be tracked and persistent problems identified. In fall 2012 the Office handled only 27 complaints.

Communicating with Students

The College communicates its admissions policies and programs of study in several ways. The Office of Admissions maintains a comprehensive website with constantly updated information, publishes catalogs and brochures describing John Jay and the process of admission, sponsors an Open House for prospective students, advertises in periodicals targeted toward prospective students and their high school counselors, and has representatives who travel to different college fairs. Materials sent to students were revised in 2012 to reflect the College’s new branding initiative and logo and to better communicate the breadth of liberal arts offerings. Although it is difficult to measure the effectiveness of these strategies directly, we can assess whether each of the strategies is accessible, attractive, and engaging. However, there are qualitative means of assessment. For example, a distinctive piece—a jigsaw puzzle that was sent to potential honor students featuring an inspiring quote on social justice—generated chatter on Twitter. In another example, the Marketing Department, in conjunction with Admissions, ran a focus group with first-year students on potential designs and messages for brochures for prospective students to ensure that the key audience would be engaged with the materials. All these materials are periodically reviewed and revised.

Strengths:

1. The College manages admissions effectively through continuous cooperation with Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, and Marketing and Development.
2. Student satisfaction ratings of administrative services, access to computer technology, academic support services, and student support services rank first among CUNY Senior Colleges in the first three categories and third in the fourth (PMP 2011-2012 Year-End Report).

Concerns:

1. Student engagement is weak in some areas, especially for seniors, as indicated by NSSE results.
2. Retention and graduation rates among the graduate programs are well below the Senior College average.
3. Advising coverage by the Academic Advising Center reaches only about half of second semester freshmen and fewer than half of the targeted cohort of students on probation.
4. The student grade appeal process is flawed and not disseminated well.
5. Tutoring services for graduate students are weak, compared with those for undergraduates.

**Recommendations:**

1. There should be a concerted effort by Academic Affairs and Student Affairs to promote student engagement.
2. The recent attention to retention and graduation rates by Graduate Studies should continue and intensify.
3. The College should construct a fairer and more effective student grade appeal process, and one that would set a clear and reasonable timetable.
4. Dedicated tutoring services should be provided for graduate students.
5. Academic advising should be expanded.

---

1. John Jay in effect gave up its monopoly on criminal justice degrees within CUNY to enable the creation of the CUNY Justice Academy.
3. Source: Performance Management Report, 2011-2012 Year-End University Report, Final, p. 75. Data based on Likert scale from 1 to 4 and included questions on registration, financial aid, testing, billing and payment.
4. SEEK is the higher education opportunity program for CUNY's Senior Colleges: Search for Education, Elevation, and Knowledge
6. Although advisement was required initially, in the end that requirement was lifted.
7. The Job and Internship Fair attracted 400 students and 60 employers in 2010, and the following year there were 1100 students and 75 employers.
8. For Internet Security Officer Policy see: [http://www.cuny.edu/about/administration/offices/CIS/security/pnp/Policy4.pdf](http://www.cuny.edu/about/administration/offices/CIS/security/pnp/Policy4.pdf)
Chapter Six
Standard Ten: Faculty

Introduction

The John Jay College faculty consists of 401 full-time and 759 adjunct members. Almost all of the full-time faculty are tenure track, including librarians and counselors; 215 of the faculty are tenured. John Jay has eight Distinguished Professors, the highest title and greatest distinction the CUNY Board of Trustees bestows on its faculty after a rigorous review by a University-wide committee. (In total, there are 142 Distinguished Professors at the University.) Among its full-time faculty, John Jay employs 34 Lecturers, primarily in mathematics and composition; at CUNY, Lecturers are hired exclusively to teach and provide service and have no research expectations. After five years of successive reappointments and based on the quality of their teaching, Lecturers can earn a form of tenure, called a Certificate of Continuous Employment (CCE). The full-time faculty has seen tremendous turnover in the last decade. Approximately 50% of the full-time faculty has been hired since 2004. Though few faculty members were hired in 2010 and 2011, the College is once again pursuing a robust hiring plan that will add 50 net new lines in the next three years.

Many John Jay faculty members have earned national and international recognition for their work. For example, Assistant Professor Shamik Sengupta, of the Department of Mathematics and Computer Science, won the Early Career Research Award from the National Science Foundation in 2012; Distinguished Professor Jock Young, a doctoral faculty member in Criminal Justice and Sociology, won the 2012 British Society of Criminology Outstanding Achievement Award; Professor Anthony Carpi won the 2011 United States Presidential Award for Excellence in Science, Mathematics and Engineering Mentoring; Assistant Professor Jana Arsovska received the 2012 W.E.B. Du Bois Fellowship from the National Institute of Justice; and Distinguished Professor John Matteson, of the English Department, was awarded the 2008 Pulitzer Prize in biography, the second Pulitzer for a John Jay faculty member. These awards are marks of individual merit, but the College is proud to say that most of these are “home grown” successes—faculty who started their careers at John Jay College and are flourishing here. Although these are among the most prestigious accomplishments of the John Jay faculty, there are many other examples of the faculty’s distinction as researchers and teachers. A necessary goal of a successful college is to create an environment in which such individual achievement in teaching and research is nurtured and fostered. In recent years the College has increased its efforts to create the working conditions in which faculty can advance their teaching and scholarly agendas.

Support for Research

As part of the plan to move from a CUNY comprehensive college to a Senior College, John Jay has expanded its support for full-time faculty in their role as scholars. The Provost’s Office has succeeded in directing money to help faculty launch and develop their scholarly projects. The College provides much more than the contractually required support for faculty travel to conferences, having spent, for example, $212,514 on faculty travel in 2011-2012. In the three years preceding the budget crisis, the Provost’s Office also directed over $700,000 for start-up for new faculty, largely to establish labs, buy equipment, and support innovative research.
agendas (see Table 6.1). In addition, each faculty member arriving at the College receives a new (or recently purchased and upgraded) desktop or laptop to support his/her work.

Table 6.2. Start-up money provided by the College to new faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Number of Faculty</th>
<th>Visas</th>
<th>Moving</th>
<th>Equipment &amp; Materials</th>
<th>Travel</th>
<th>Summer Salary</th>
<th>Research Assistant</th>
<th>Total Start-Up Commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>69,000</td>
<td>244,066</td>
<td>34,086</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>347,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>56,000</td>
<td>130,181</td>
<td>9,200</td>
<td>26,897</td>
<td>17,400</td>
<td>255,678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>37,000</td>
<td>37,240</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>21,666</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>102,407</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Office of Sponsored Programs (OSP), with three veteran full-time professional staff, provides valuable support to individual faculty navigating the grant application process and sends out a useful newsletter of grant opportunities to the entire faculty community. The CUNY-wide “Faculty Experience Surveys” (FES) in 2005 and 2009 found that money available for academic travel and help with grant applications were some of the highest positive response items at John Jay. Faculty members who actively compete for grants commonly praise the staff and suggest that Sponsored Programs needs more office support. The need for additional administrative support is particularly acute in view of the fact that grants are administered centrally through the Research Foundation of CUNY, and faculty find it challenging to manage their grants in that complex bureaucratic environment. In 2009, the President established a task force on the relationship between the CUNY Research Foundation and John Jay College, which issued its report on January 12, 2010. One of its recommendations was to add an additional full-time staff member to the Office of Sponsored Programs. The Task Force report concluded:

The CUNY Research Foundation does not have the resources to allocate staff whose specific purpose would be to liaise with John Jay principal investigators. We recommend that the College itself earmark resources to bring in a new staff member to OSP whose primary job would be to engage proactively in trouble-shooting on behalf of the College’s principal investigators.

This position was filled in spring 2012, one of the first staff positions approved when the College emerged from its lean budget years.

The Office for the Advancement of Research (OAR) oversees Sponsored Programs and works to increase faculty scholarship. To this end, from 2009 to 2011, the College distributed approximately $66,000 to 35 faculty members to reward them for their research productivity or to provide seed money for potential grant funded projects. The OAR has organized various colloquia and workshops on publishing and grant writing. Training workshops run by OAR and Sponsored Programs may account for a relatively strong success rate in the University-wide Professional Staff Congress (PSC) grant competition and an increasing number of federal grants.

Each year through the PMP, CUNY asks for a report on the faculty’s scholarly productivity, compiled by OAR through the self-reporting of the faculty. John Jay has had a low report rate from its faculty (32.3% in 2011 compared to 86%-100% at other CUNY senior colleges). Thus, though we believe our faculty to be highly productive, the College appears last in the University
on this metric. The picture would be quite different if a greater percentage of faculty members reported. To address this under-reporting, OAR will launch an awareness campaign in academic year 2012-2013 and will pursue faculty more actively through the chairs of the academic departments to increase faculty self-reporting. As a consequence, next year’s PMP data should show a marked improvement both in rates of reporting and in productivity.

The College has made a considerable effort to develop the full-time faculty’s international relationships, many of which are now blossoming into more formal partnerships. Such work supports our goal of becoming an institution with an increasingly global reach. Already our faculty members are conducting research in countries all around the world. Our students bring to the College a diversity of cultures and languages from more than 130 countries. The College has dozens of institutional partnerships with universities, governments, and NGOs around the world. The issues of justice are universal, and our students will be better served if they are prepared for global citizenship. As articulated in our Vision Statement, we want to “translate ideas into social justice and action on a global scale.”

John Jay has hosted a number of visiting scholars who have shared their work with John Jay faculty through book talks, lectures, and participation in symposia and conferences. In academic year 2010-2011, John Jay hosted fourteen visiting scholars from throughout the United States as well as from Spain, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, Brazil, Israel, Austria, and Turkey. The College has joined a range of international partners for student and faculty exchanges, research, education, and international conferences. The College has a long-standing faculty exchange with the Police Staff College, Bramshill, in the UK. The OAR has explored relationships with institutions in Mexico, China, Ukraine, Uruguay, Qatar, and Saudi Arabia. In addition to these projects, John Jay has signed MOUs with various institutions in South Africa, Senegal, Russia, and India, to name a few. These efforts will create additional research and exchange opportunities for faculty members at the College.

Support for Teaching

The College has done increasingly well at providing support to the faculty in their role as teachers and has re-emphasized pedagogy with the creation in 2009 of the annual Distinguished Teaching Prize (up to three $1000 prizes awarded each year), the Faculty Service to Students Award, and the Outstanding Scholarly Mentor Awards. While the primary responsibility for guidance in teaching rests with the department chair or designee (University Bylaws Article 9), the College provides many of the tools for effective teaching and much additional guidance. Every classroom is “smart” allowing faculty to integrate technology into teaching. The Faculty Senate and the Office of the Provost co-organize a well-attended day-long Faculty Development Day (FDD) every semester. For example, on August 25, 2011, a total of 129 faculty members participated in FDD in which there were 11 workshops on topics including faculty-student research, multi-media in the classroom, outcomes assessment, student participation, small group work, simulations and games, motivation, assignments, and peer learning. Interest in FDD has remained high with a total of 135 faculty members attending 17 workshops on August 24, 2012; 117 faculty came to the latest FDD on January 25, 2013. The most significant development in support of teaching was the creation of the Center for the Advancement of Teaching (CAT) in 2006. With a full-time director, CAT provides material and internet resources, confidential consultations, orientations, workshops, and salons to improve pedagogy. In 2008, CAT created a faculty e-handbook on teaching, which is currently being updated and revised. Although the creation of CAT was an important milestone, and its growth is vital, its funding has been minimal and staff support inconsistent. As such a critical part of the infrastructure for teaching, CAT needs more resources so that its services can be more robust,
including, for example, videotaping classes for teaching improvement, a faculty fellows program, more professional development opportunities for adjuncts, and additional competitive grants for innovations in pedagogy.

**Academic Freedom**

The College has cultivated an environment respectful of academic freedom in terms of both the right of faculty to their scholarly pursuits and the right of free expression. A review of College events shows that controversial political topics are open for scholarly debate, from the political right or the left. Forums and speakers have addressed topics such as human rights, racial profiling, gun control, torture, war, terrorism, the death penalty, “stop & frisk,” and Islamophobia. When a national controversy emerged in fall 2010 around the building of an Islamic Cultural Center in downtown Manhattan, the President asked faculty to organize, as they saw fit, with his office’s financial support, public events to raise the level of discourse on the subject. In spring 2011 John Jay College launched a public forum called *Mosques, Veils, and Madrassas: Muslims and Institutions of Justice in Pluralistic Societies* (http://johnjay.jjay.cuny.edu/mvm/). In recent years, only one issue was brought to the Faculty Senate and to the union regarding academic freedom: in 2007, the then Vice President of Development ordered that a piece of art be removed from display in the lobby at a conference about gangs. When faculty protest was communicated to the President, he reversed the decision of his Vice President and insisted that academic freedom prevail.

**Faculty Engagement in Curriculum Development, Review, and Revision**

The faculty of John Jay College has demonstrated robust engagement and wide participation in the review and revision of the curriculum. Since its last reaccreditation the College has seen two cycles of five-year review and revitalization of all majors. Between 2006 and 2011, the faculty has developed over 129 new undergraduate and 27 new graduate courses, revised 96 undergraduate and five graduate courses, and created six new majors (English, Economics, Gender Studies, Global History, Philosophy, and Law and Society), two new graduate degree programs (an MA in Forensic Mental Health Counseling and an MA in International Crime and Justice) and a dual degree program between the Forensic Psychology MA at John Jay and the JD at New York Law School.

Three additional new majors (Latin American & Latina/o Studies, Anthropology, and Sociology) have moved most of the way through the development and governance process. In 2006, the College began the monumental and widely inclusive task of revising its General Education requirements. In 2008 the Task Force on General Education issued its report, which articulated the principles and learning objectives that would guide John Jay’s General Education reform. This report was endorsed by the College Council in 2009. Two years later, in May 2011, the completely new, outcomes-based model and curricular framework for General Education at John Jay College successfully passed through the College Council.

Unfortunately, despite this excellent track record, in 2011-2012, a major conflict arose between faculty across CUNY on one side, and the CUNY Chancellor and Board of Trustees on the other, over a Board of Trustees Resolution regarding student transfer at the University, which mandated a reduced number of General Education credits and a standardized core curriculum for all CUNY colleges, John Jay included. This policy, called Pathways, was opposed by CUNY-wide faculty representatives (the University Faculty Senate and the faculty union), and by governance bodies at John Jay such as the UCASC and the Faculty Senate. In a letter to the University in November 2011, President Travis conveyed the faculty’s opposition to Pathways,
including the opinion of the faculty “that the Pathways process has violated the traditional rights of faculty governance over curriculum in that Pathways has ignored the role of the local campus faculty in setting the college’s curriculum and in that the new curriculum is to be imposed by the Board of Trustees without a vote of the faculty governance bodies of the college, which normally vote on new curriculum.” In spring 2012, in compliance with the Board of Trustees resolution and the Pathways guidelines developed by the Office of the Chancellor, the President nonetheless forwarded to the Chancellor a new John Jay General Education curriculum plan (the “College Option”), developed and adopted by the college’s General Education Subcommittee. Because this curriculum plan had failed to win approval from the appropriate College governance bodies, the Faculty Senate issued a resolution condemning the President’s action as a subversion of faculty governance. The Council of Chairs issued its own resolution, which expressed understanding of the "predicament presented to the College and our President" by the Pathways framework. It placed the President’s decision to forward the College Option developed by the General Education Subcommittee without College Council consent in the context of that "predicament." The President responded to the Faculty Senate resolution in a May 22, 2012 letter in which he provided the context for his decision and committed himself and the Provost to work on ways to improve the relationship between the faculty and the administration, and specifically between the Faculty Senate and the administration, in the 2012-2013 academic year.

Faculty Satisfaction

On the whole, retention of full-time faculty has been good. Only twenty-five tenure track faculty members have left the College of their own accord since 2007, a faculty retention rate of 94%, which can be taken as a proxy for faculty satisfaction. We have other more direct measures in the UFS Faculty Experience Surveys (FES) of 2005 and 2009 and the COACHE 2010 survey of untenured faculty, all of which suggest that satisfaction with administrative support for “intellectual life,” “academic freedom,” and “academic integrity,” as well as the areas of “collegiality” and “quality of departmental life” was above the general CUNY average and on par with our COACHE peer institutions. In 2012, the COACHE survey was administered to tenured faculty. Respondents reported satisfaction with the quality of colleagues within their departments and with opportunities for cross-disciplinary work and collaboration with faculty colleagues both within and outside their departments. However, both groups of faculty expressed dissatisfaction with the teaching load and with the promotion and tenure process, the tenured faculty being much more dissatisfied than the untenured on both counts. In response to the very negative results of the 2012 COACHE survey, the Provost brought a facilitator to the College to conduct discussion sessions with the tenured faculty so as to get behind the numbers and hear the thoughts and experiences that prompted the responses. Approximately 75 faculty members attended the seven sessions, which the Provost attended, over the course of three days in October 2012. The sentiments expressed in these sessions, in addition to the COACHE reports themselves, inform the sections below on “Teaching Load” and “The Tenure and Promotion Process.”

Teaching Load

The most common full-time faculty complaint, as indicated in the UFS FES 2005 and 2009 surveys, the 2010 COACHE survey of untenured faculty, and the 2012 COACHE survey of tenured faculty, is the teaching load, which is a combination of class size and number of hours taught.
Prompted by a Faculty Senate and Council of Chairs initiative, the College developed a class-size policy and ultimately began to reduce average class size over the last four years. In fall 2011 and spring 2012, average class sizes decreased compared to the previous year. There are still some sections at a 40-seat maximum but the number of them has declined over the past four years. In addition, the College has lowered the size of first-year seminars and foreign language, mathematics, composition, and writing-intensive courses. Still, the faculty finds the size of even these classes daunting. Because many John Jay students are underprepared, despite our slow but steady effort to improve the academic profile of our entering students, the faculty, who wish to positively impact student learning, find teaching our students intensely demanding. The larger the class, the more difficult it is to meet the needs of the majority of students. The goal of our enrollment management plan is to achieve a better match between the students we admit, the demands of our curriculum, and the support we are able to give our students. When the ideal match is achieved, faculty satisfaction with teaching may rise.

The full-time faculty contract requires 21-hours of teaching per year, a 4/3 course load, for tenure track faculty of all ranks in Senior Colleges, and 27-hours of teaching, a 5/4 course load, for lecturers and instructors. Untenured faculty members receive 24-hours (eight courses) of release time to be used for their research during their first five years (on a seven-year tenure clock). Both COACHE surveys show that tenured and untenured respondents alike find the teaching load too heavy, especially in view of the expectations for scholarly productivity. The research active faculty is aware that the teaching load at most research intensive institutions is 3/2 or 2/2, and they find the College’s research aspirations and expectations unrealistic given their much higher load, even with the eight courses of contractual release. The tenured faculty perceives the 4/3 teaching load as a barrier to promotion and to progress on their research agendas. Those who enjoyed the benefit of the contractual course release in their first five years at the College find themselves staring “over a cliff” upon their tenure and promotion to associate professor and wonder how they will ever produce the quality and quantity of scholarship to achieve promotion to full professor.

However, it must be said that not everyone teaches a full load. According to PMP reports, the mean teaching hours of untenured faculty increased incrementally from 2009 to 2010 from 6.6 to 6.7 hours of teaching per semester, or a little more than a 2/2 course load. According to PMP reports, the mean teaching hours of veteran (those with more than five years of service) full-time faculty increased incrementally from 2009 to 2010 from 7.3 to 7.4 hours of teaching per semester, which is about a 3/2 annual course load. The mean here is misleading because fewer than half of veteran faculty actually receive release time. Those who are released from teaching bring down the mean because of the number of course releases each one has.

The only faculty members with the potential to receive course reductions to support scholarship are those in fields with available grant funding (science and social science primarily) who are successful in competing for grants. For most faculty members on reassigned time, course reduction is received in exchange for administrative work that many find more onerous than teaching and so time consuming that it interferes with scholarly pursuits. Thus, the faculty finds that both teaching and the administrative work that provides release from teaching decrease their scholarly productivity in an environment where promotion is increasingly dependent on scholarship, not on teaching and service.

Through the union, the faculty is advocating for an across the board reduction to a 3/3 load, as was done many years ago at two of the CUNY Senior Colleges (Queens and Hunter). This would carry a fairly high price tag and would come at the expense of the faculty hiring plan and teaching coverage by full-time faculty. A possible measure is to make more reassigned time
available through a competitive process to support research and to reward excellent teaching. Finally, the standards for promotion and tenure should be re-examined so that the reward of professional advancement is available to all who excel, whether they achieve distinction in teaching, service, or scholarship.

The Promotion and Tenure Process

The COACHE 2010 report suggests that to some extent the untenured faculty understands neither the personnel process nor the College’s expectations, while the 2012 survey reveals that the tenured faculty is not optimistic about the possibility of promotion. These concerns are attributable to a number of factors.

Since the arrival of the current President in 2004, much has been said about the “new John Jay” with its greater attention to research and its aspiration to be one of the Senior Colleges of CUNY. This has led to rising expectations for faculty scholarly productivity. In addition, John Jay has been in the enviable position of hiring dozens of faculty during a depressed academic job market, a situation that has allowed us to hire our first choice candidates in almost every search, a choice determined by their potential to contribute to the College’s scholarly profile and new aspirations. Many of these newly hired faculty members come to the College having already published or having secured significant grant funding. As they continue to advance along their ambitious scholarly trajectory and as they enter the faculty personnel process, they have the effect of raising the bar for those already here at the College.

In December 2009, the College Council approved Faculty Personnel Process Guidelines, developed at the initiative of the Faculty Senate and the Council of Chairs, which for the first time described expectations for a faculty member’s advancement through the personnel process and clarified the reappointment, promotion, and tenure process. The existence of written guidelines has had the seemingly unanticipated effect of making the faculty review process more rigorous, even though the guidelines articulate already existing standards. Having these standards in writing has meant that faculty members are more consistently held to them. Other changes have been made in the hiring, reappointment, tenure, and promotion process that in the aggregate may have caused anxiety for the untenured faculty and may explain the tenured faculty’s sense that expectations are changing. For example, in regard to teaching, starting in 2010, job applicants were asked to submit statements of pedagogy and, where possible, were invited by chairs to submit teaching portfolios, which had not occurred before. The recent revision of the “Form C” personnel self-evaluation asks candidates to say much more about their teaching than the previous version; candidates are now asked to explain and document the ways in which their teaching has developed and improved annually. In regard to research expectations, the new “Form C” asks candidates to comment on and evaluate the quality of the outlets in which they have published, sending the accurate message that quality of publication counts more than quantity. Quantity keeps increasing, nonetheless. A comparison of tenure cases between those considered in 2006 and 2012 shows a significant increase in the number of publications. For example, the median number of first authored peer-review journal articles went from two (2.6 average) in 2006 to five (7.1 average) in 2011. Perhaps the most significant recent change was an increase in the tenure clock from five to seven years as a result of the collective bargaining agreement reached in September 2008, which left faculty as insecure juniors for two additional years and fostered the mistaken impression that with an extended clock come higher expectations for tenure. Increased emphasis on research and the longer period before tenure are in line with the aspiration of the College (and the University) to become a preeminent research institution. However, along with the terrible job market outside the College, these changes inside the College create anxiety about the personnel process.
Despite efforts by the FPC to articulate and clarify expectations with regard to teaching, scholarship, and service, it is clear that anxiety remains. The Office of the Provost and the FPC have continued to support and illuminate the personnel process by a number of means. The Office of the Provost has increased its attention to faculty relations, creating a position, Director of Faculty Affairs and Services, and developed a staff dedicated to improving life for faculty at the College, especially around the reappointment, promotion and tenure process. The Director and his staff have simplified and clarified the process and currently provide individualized attention to faculty going through it. The Office of the Provost created a handbook and provides training for chairs, who bear the primary responsibility for guidance of junior faculty (CUNY Bylaws Article 9 and the Collective Bargaining Agreement Article 18). The need for attention to the chairs was clear because, in five out of six cases in recent years when full-time faculty were not reappointed, the individuals grieved that their department chairs had failed to provide sufficient guidance and the faculty members eventually won settlements. The Office of the Provost frequently sends out general and targeted memos keeping candidates and committees aware of their responsibilities and keeping the process running smoothly. It posts the Faculty Personnel Guidelines in visible places such as the Academic Affairs site and the Provost’s website.

In an effort to be more explicit about expectations for reappointment, tenure, and promotion, the College-wide Faculty Personnel Committee (FPC) established working groups to create general statements about research, teaching, and service expectations, statements that are intended to expand on the criteria articulated in the Personnel Guidelines. These statements have been reviewed by the FPC, revised by the Task Forces, and will be discussed and voted on in the academic year 2012-2013. The FPC has also provided an optional model of a new protocol for peer observations of teaching, with more detailed instructions for the faculty member being observed and for the observer. The College is also exploring how to effectively observe courses taught online and in a hybrid environment. CUNY-wide, a new mandated Pre-Tenure Review ensures that an academic administrator (Provost or Dean) reviews every full-time junior faculty member’s file after a successful fourth year reappointment, in order to supplement the guidance of the chair and to put the faculty member in better touch with the Faculty Personnel Committee’s standards. The Center for the Advancement of Teaching (CAT) holds several workshops each semester devoted to the reappointment and tenure/CCE process. The workshops are led by senior members of the faculty including, for example, the President of the Faculty Senate and the Chair of the Council of Chairs, as well as administrators such as the Director of Faculty Affairs and Services, key staff from the Library, and the CAT staff. The faculty union, PSC-CUNY, provides information for faculty on the personnel process via its contract. Faculty receive information from the administration on the organization of personnel files and are encouraged to meet with members of the Office of the Provost to discuss their files and the reappointment, promotion, and tenure process. Each faculty member not yet tenured or promoted is asked to review his/her file each academic year and approve all documents and materials within it.

Despite the unease of faculty going through the process, the clearest evidence of the efficacy of our work to clarify and disseminate our expectations for advancement is the success rate of our junior faculty in achieving tenure. On average fewer than one faculty member per year has been denied reappointment, and, by and large, most faculty who come up for tenure or CCE are awarded this status.

The dissatisfaction with teaching load and the anxiety over tenure and promotion point to a tension between the College’s research aspirations, its obligations as a teaching institution, and
its need for faculty willing to serve the college community. It will be important in the years to come to strike a balance among these faculty activities—teaching, scholarship, and service—and to communicate clearly to faculty the expectation that ideally they will achieve a balance among these sometimes competing demands. We also need to shape the promotion and tenure process so that it recognizes that some candidates will excel in teaching, others in scholarship, and yet others in extraordinary service, and that distinction in one area will be rewarded as long as the faculty member shows sustained true commitment, energetic engagement, and high-quality achievement in the others.

**Diversity of the Faculty**

The College has made improvements, but still falls short, in its efforts to recruit and retain full-time faculty of color and women. In 2011, women represented 46.2% of full-time faculty and minorities represented 31.3% of faculty: Blacks/African-Americans represented 12.3% of full-time faculty, Hispanics 10.3%, Asians/Pacific Islanders 8.7%. Concerns about diversity were raised in the UFS Faculty Experience Survey 2009 and are evident in the **Affirmative Action Plan**. College data on affirmative action are available in a [CUNY summary](#). In 2006, an Affirmative Action Director was hired, thus removing this responsibility from the Office of Accessibility Services and significantly raising the quality of affirmative action analysis, planning, and action. The College established a percentage annual placement goal whenever minority or female representation within a department was less than would reasonably be expected given the availability of females and minorities in the pool. The Provost’s Office allocates lines, but the search process is carried out by department chairs and department search committees. Department chairs coordinate with the Affirmative Action Director to draft and file a Recruitment Certification Plan that supports affirmative action procedures and goals and mounts searches that reach the widest possible pool of candidates (JJC annual notice from Provost).

Analysis of the full-time hiring process suggests that it has been open and equitable between 2006 and 2011. For example, in 2010-2011 there were 855 total applicants for faculty positions, resulting in 22 hires (3%), and almost half of the hires (45%) were minorities, mirroring the minority to non-minority applicant ratio. Consequently, there has been some improvement in under-utilization. The Provost has re-emphasized the importance of diversity in her search protocol in the search for faculty for fall 2012 and fall 2013 and has announced her willingness to assign an additional line to departments that are trying to make a choice between two candidates, one of whom would correct their under-utilization. The extra line would allow them to hire both candidates. Despite these efforts, a more aggressive campaign is needed.

**Adjunct Faculty**

The greatest threat to the health of the faculty community is the over-reliance on part-time faculty. In 2009, the number of full-time faculty peaked at 431, compared to 338 in 2004, but budget cuts resulted in a hiring “pause” and an Early Retirement Initiative, which reduced the number of full-time faculty down to 374 by 2011. There are approximately 800 part-time faculty members teaching at the College, and they teach about 65% of the course sections. Currently the College provides a welcome packet from HR and from the Provost’s Office, and adjunct faculty are invited to attend an orientation day that focuses directly on pedagogy and standards and indirectly on building community inside and outside the departments. As talented and capable as many of our adjuncts are, they are paid only for the classroom hours of their course, and if they teach two or the maximum of three courses, they are paid for only one additional professional development/office hour per week. Consequently, adjunct faculty, although
dedicated to the institution, are often unable to participate in the wider College community because they are also working elsewhere to make a living or are graduate students working on their own degrees. This limits their participation in College governance, curriculum development, College-led faculty teaching and research development activities, and advisement of students. The College has begun to wrestle with this issue. The English Department developed training sessions at a variety of days and times so that adjuncts could attend at times of their choosing. In the spring of 2008 and 2010, adjunct mathematics professors received stipends for attending pedagogy workshops. Such compensation is greatly needed if adjuncts are to be included more widely in their departments and the College.

In October 2011, the Provost created the Adjunct Initiative Working Group in order to determine how John Jay College can better support its adjunct professor population. The Working Group, comprised of full-time faculty, adjunct faculty, and staff, conducted a survey that indicated that many adjuncts are long-time employees who see themselves still working at John Jay in five years. There are indicators that many adjuncts feel happy at John Jay, but they also report an awareness of being seen as a second-class part of the faculty community. The group made specific recommendations regarding the provision of informational and infrastructural support and other measures of inclusion in the academic community (see Adjunct Initiative Report). A key recommendation was the creation of a standing Committee on Adjunct Affairs to address the concerns of adjunct faculty and to give them a representative body and a collective voice. Adjuncts will continue to have a voice through the union and the Faculty Senate, but this new committee will address quality of life rather than contractual or governance matters and will inform and advise the Provost as to what she can do to improve the work experience of adjunct faculty. The Committee on Adjunct Affairs was constituted in fall 2012 and meets regularly throughout the year, issuing recommendations and engaging the Provost and others in discussion as appropriate.

A similar committee may be needed for full-time faculty as well. On May 11, 2012, the President and Provost attended the Faculty Senate to hear about faculty concerns, particularly about the amount of service asked of untenured faculty and the sense among faculty that service does not count toward promotion and tenure but is still expected. The senators made it clear that faculty want some regular, ongoing way to raise issues around faculty workload and expectations, something like an advisory committee, not just to air issues, but also to propose solutions and move those proposals forward to the appropriate administrator, a kind of open portal between faculty and administrators. The President later suggested parameters for the establishment of such a committee and committed himself and the Provost to discussing this subject at the Senate. The need for such discussions was confirmed by the results of the 2012 COACHE survey of tenured faculty. However, the Faculty Senate disagreed with the suggested parameters of such a committee and decided the existing structures are sufficient.

Despite recent perturbations, the faculty at the College has, for several decades, enjoyed a strong sense of camaraderie and collegial support for teaching, service, and research. Now, in addition to this collegiality, the College has made steps to create formal systems of support such as the OAR, the CAT, a Director of Faculty Services, an Affirmative Action Director, and a Committee on Adjunct Affairs.

**Strengths:**

1. John Jay has a very dedicated and distinguished faculty, committed to students, teaching, research, and service.
2. Faculty are committed to working with colleagues across the disciplines.
3. Many faculty are also engaged in the world of practice.
4. Very often faculty research leads to changes in policies, laws, and practice.

**Concerns:**

1. The faculty, especially the tenured faculty, is deeply distressed about the heavy expected teaching load and the other demands made on them.
2. The College relies too heavily on part-time faculty to cover course instruction.
3. The College does not sufficiently support part-time faculty.
4. Teaching is not supported sufficiently, and the value of good teaching has not been recognized sufficiently in the faculty personnel process.
5. Service is undervalued and insufficiently rewarded.
6. Faculty diversity is not what it should be in some departments.
7. The faculty personnel process has not yet articulated balanced expectations for teaching, research, and service.
8. Too many faculty experience anxiety about the faculty personnel process, despite efforts by the administration to clarify expectations and to support faculty as they go through it.

**Recommendations:**

1. The College should find additional ways to improve the underutilization rates in selected academic departments.
2. Teaching should have more support in the form of a better-funded and more active Center for the Advancement of Teaching.
3. The College should continue with steps to better support part-time faculty.
4. The standards for promotion and tenure should be re-examined so that the reward of professional advancement is available to all who excel.
5. The College should pursue a full-time faculty coverage rate of 50%.

---

1 Hiring departments prepare a Personal Vacancy Notice (PVN) and a brief description of the position for advertising purposes. The Affirmative Action Officer meets with and encourages each search committee to advertise for the position in a variety of sources available on an extensive resource list that is provided to the committee chairs. The Affirmative Action Officer also assists management and chairs in arriving at effective solutions to recruitment problems and provides workshops regarding recruitment efforts, interviewing techniques, new regulations, and policies of the CUNY Board of Trustees, the Chancellor, the University Affirmative Action Committee, and Federal, State, and City agencies.
Chapter Seven
Standard Eleven: Educational Offerings

Introduction

John Jay College's unique mission of educating for justice flavors all of its educational offerings. Undergraduates select a major from an array of degrees, including traditional liberal arts majors that speak to the theme of justice—Economics, English, Gender Studies, Global History, Humanities and Justice, Law and Society, Philosophy, and Political Science; pre-professional majors that prepare students for public service—Computer Information Systems, Criminal Justice Management, Fire and Emergency Service, Fire Science, Police Studies, and Public Administration; forensic programs that link rigorous and traditional science and psychology curricula to forensic applications—Forensic Psychology and Forensic Science; and a variety of majors in the field of criminal justice—Criminal Justice BA (Research and Policy Analysis), Criminal Justice BS (Institutional Theory and Practice), Criminology, Culture and Deviance Studies, and International Criminal Justice. Students' learning is grounded in General Education degree requirements, a curriculum that has been recently reframed to focus squarely on student learning outcomes and strengthened to address changes in the student population, the assessment of learning, and new University-wide core requirements.

John Jay's nine master's programs complement the baccalaureate programs in the criminal justice and public service fields. Each of the programs is intended to meet the special needs of pre-career, in-career, and second-career students. The College also supports three doctoral programs, one in Criminal Justice and two in Psychology. While all doctoral degrees are granted by the CUNY Graduate Center, these three programs are housed at the College, with classes taught almost exclusively by John Jay faculty. At all levels of the curriculum, the faculty ensures the rigor of educational offerings through the design and assessment of programs and courses. The College ensures that students learn the goals and outcomes of programs and courses through advisement, the web, print materials, and course syllabi.

First Year Experience

The First Year Experience (FYE) program offers freshmen the intellectual and social foundations for their college careers. The strategic priorities for FYE from its inception have been to expand the learning community program, increase curricular connections and collaborations, and increase student engagement with peers, faculty, and campus resources. The Library supports FYE with a new Freshman Services Librarian. Learning communities were the initial focus for the FYE. Later, in 2009, based on NSSE findings that indicated low levels of student engagement and on first-year retention data, FYE launched first-year seminars. The seminars focused on transition goals, including faculty-student engagement; increased knowledge and use of academic programs, support resources, and opportunities; self-assessment and goal clarification; and increased knowledge about disciplinary orientations. Since the inception of the First Year Experience program in 2006, the College has gradually expanded these offerings. The seminars and learning communities currently provide significant enrichment to approximately 41% of all first-year students. Learning communities have grown from 14 in 2008 to 20 in 2012. First-Year Seminars have increased from four sections in 2009 to 28. In fall 2013, however, First-Year Seminars will be required for all students because it will be the 100-level course in the Justice Core of the new General Education curriculum. (Learning
An analysis of retention data shows that the impact of first-year interventions begins to wear off during the student’s sophomore year. To address this directly as part of Undergraduate Studies strategic planning, FYE has expanded its scope and been restructured into the Office of Student Academic Success Programs (SASP). SASP now includes additional first-year staffing, a director of student learning and assessment, and an associate director of sophomore and transfer programs. During spring 2013, the SASP staff is overseeing work to provide all students with carefully planned and innovative programming for milestone academic and co-curricular planning, engagement, and increased academic success.

Programs of Study

John Jay College currently offers 22 undergraduate majors, two of which are being phased out, and nine graduate programs at the master’s level. Three additional undergraduate liberal arts programs (Anthropology, Latin American/Latina(o) Studies, and Sociology) have been designed and are in various stages of the approval process, and two more majors are under development (Fraud and Forensics, and Human Services). On the graduate level, in addition to the nine master’s level graduate programs, the College offers a combined BA/MA program available to students studying criminal justice, forensic psychology, and public administration; an MA/JD in Forensic Psychology and Law, in partnership with New York Law School; and three doctoral programs under the auspices of the CUNY Graduate Center — Criminal Justice, Psychology and Law, and Clinical Psychology.

All offerings are closely linked to the College’s mission, and there is a general awareness among faculty regarding the importance of interdisciplinary and integrative learning. The tenured and untenured faculty of the College have indicated through the COACHE surveys that they benefit from and value the opportunities for interdisciplinary, collaborative work with colleagues at the College. At least five of John Jay’s undergraduate majors and four of its graduate programs take an interdisciplinary approach. Three additional undergraduate interdisciplinary programs are under review or in development (see Table of Undergraduate Offerings). Undergraduates are also offered an opportunity to participate in the Interdisciplinary Studies Program (ISP), an inventive set of undergraduate courses that are designed and taught by faculty teams from different disciplines. The program builds a learning community that fosters close relationships between faculty and students. Information and technological literacy is integrated across the curriculum. This is ensured through the mission of the Library, the work of our faculty Librarians, their collaborations with faculty across the disciplines and program levels, and their membership in the curricular governance bodies of the College. In addition, Librarians teach specific class sessions in information rich courses, offer development workshops for faculty, and provide extensive consultations in the curriculum development process.

Graduate and undergraduate students benefit from high impact curricular practices such as for-credit internships and study abroad. Guidelines for credit-bearing undergraduate internships are working their way through governance. Guidelines for graduate internships are already in place. A new honors program, which enrolled its first cohort in 2009, offers high-achieving students a set of rigorous courses and extra-curricular enrichment that center on the theme of the common good, another dimension of John Jay educating its students for justice.
In order to graduate, undergraduate students must complete 120 credits, successfully fulfill all major and general education requirements, pass all required tests, and earn at least a 2.0 GPA. As part of their 120 credits, students also have the option to take electives and complete one or more minors. A proposal to permit students to double major is working its way through governance. There is some variability in the number of credits in the majors, from 33 to 73 credits (for Forensic Science), with most majors in the 36-42 credit range. Planning is currently underway to provide additional structure and intentionality to degree plans in response to the new and smaller General Education program that the College will launch in fall 2013 (http://www.jjay.cuny.edu/academics/994.php). With a smaller General Education curriculum (reduced from 57 to 42 credits), students will have space in their programs of study for second majors, carefully selected minors and certificates, and other curricular enhancements. Those in more professional majors will be encouraged to elect a minor or a second major in the liberal arts. Through the implementation of a multi-year advisement plan in 2011, on-going, careful review and update of academic policies (See UCASC minutes 2011-2012), new curricular structures for General Education, and new advisement tools, the undergraduate programs have been working to ensure that all students engage in careful degree planning and benefit from the full array of curricular options available at the College.

Candidates for master’s degrees must earn at least a 3.0 GPA, and those enrolled in combined BA/MA programs must maintain at least a 3.5 GPA, meet the requirements of undergraduate General Education and of their major, and complete the master’s degree program, (http://johnjay.jjay.cuny.edu/registrar/registrar/jjauditpolicy2.html). Masters programs range from 30-43 credits, and most programs require students to earn between 39 and 42 credits.

Curriculum Development, Assessment, and Revision

Since 2006 the faculty has engaged in extensive and intensive curriculum review and development in order to provide undergraduate offerings appropriate to the Critical Choices decision to phase out associate degrees and re-introduce liberal arts majors. With the exception of Political Science, which has undergone considerable revision, transforming itself from a government major to one that represents the scope of the discipline today, and Humanities and Justice, a cross-disciplinary major that seeks to examine justice from the perspectives of philosophy, history, and literature, all of the College’s current liberal arts majors have been developed in the last five years according to specific and rigorous guidelines. In addition, majors that were previously more narrowly pre-professional (Criminal Justice, Forensic Science, and Forensic Psychology) have undergone significant revision, adopted liberal arts learning goals, and have evolved away from professional training and closer to the traditional liberal arts disciplines. The review process for new and revised liberal arts majors includes approval by departmental curriculum committees, by the Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee (UCASC), and by the College Council. College-wide feedback and assessment ensures an up-to-date and appropriately challenging set of offerings. All undergraduate programs are designed according to learning goals. The UCASC uses guidelines, informed by best practices, to ensure appropriate rigor and scaffolding of curriculum at all levels. Since 2007, minors have been structured by a set of guidelines to ensure rigor and will now be subject to the same thorough review processes as courses and majors.

The master’s programs have also developed and begun to implement assessment plans in consultation with the Director of Outcomes Assessment and the Associate Provost for Institutional Effectiveness in order to ensure that program goals and learning objectives are being met. The MPA programs also undergo periodic reaccreditation review by the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA).
In addition, since 2008, two new master’s degree programs, and a dual MA/JD degree, and six certificate programs have been approved. The new Forensic Mental Health Counseling and the International Crime and Justice degrees are grounded in the expertise of the graduate faculty. The programs were developed by the faculty in response to the need, respectively, for counseling programs leading to professional licensure and for an interdisciplinary graduate program addressing the globalization of crime and justice. In both cases, an extensive College, University, and New York State Department of Education approval process was required. Letters of Intent were reviewed by the Committee on Graduate Studies, the College Council, and the University Office of Academic Affairs’ Program Review staff and circulated to the CUNY college presidents for comment. Full proposals were then developed and approved by College governance and then sent back to the University for additional review before submission to the Board of Trustees for approval. The proposals were finally submitted to New York State Department of Education for approval and registration. The Forensic Mental Health Counseling MA also required assurance of conformity to New York State requirements for curriculum leading to licensure. The dual degree program, combining the Forensic Psychology MA program and the Mental Health Law specialization at New York Law School was approved through the same governance bodies in addition to those of New York Law School. Six Advanced Certificates (see Chapter 9, for descriptions) were also developed by the graduate faculty, approved by College and University governance, and registered with New York State during this period.

All undergraduate majors are scheduled for Program Review at five-year intervals (see schedule of program reviews). Faculty members engaged in the self-study process provide information in response to a standard about how the learning outcomes for each course relate to the learning goals for the major. Regular curriculum mapping and assessment planning facilitate this analysis. Assessment data and program review findings are routinely used to improve curriculum and make it responsive to student learning needs and outcomes. Departments meet with the Undergraduate Dean and the Executive Academic Director of Undergraduate Studies to plan the department’s response to its self-study and review. Last year’s program review in Political Science, for example, noted the need for some curricular updating. In response, the major was changed so that its foundations now include all current undergraduate sub-fields of Political Science and are aligned to those that are standard in the discipline. The analysis of capstone assessment results also led to informed curricular revision (discussed on page 108). This year self-studies, external program reviews, outcomes assessment, and planning activities toward the development of action plans were conducted for both Computer Information Systems and International Criminal Justice. It is anticipated that significant curricular improvements will be put in place after their plans are completed and have gone through governance. These activities show the extent to which internal policies and processes support regular assessment and curricular improvement at the College. Externally, academic program reviews are monitored in the annual PMP reporting process.

Graduate programs are also actively engaged in self-assessment. By 2010-2011 most master’s programs had created program assessment planning schedules. They created curriculum maps in which program goals and course learning objectives are linked. They have since developed outcomes assessment plans (available in the Assessment Committee Blackboard Organization site) and begun to implement them. An important initiation of the outcomes assessment process for most graduate programs has been the crafting of grading rubrics. The Protection Management, Public Administration, and Digital Forensics and Cyber Security programs have used grading rubrics for their qualifying examinations. Forensic Science, Public Administration, and Criminal Justice have used grading rubrics for the thesis, capstone project, and comprehensive examination respectively. Forensic Psychology and Forensic Mental Health
Counseling have used rubrics in grading key courses, Research Methods and Clinical Instruction (a "mini capstone), respectively. While some course and program revisions have occurred as a result of this first round of assessment, closing the assessment loop with more significant curricular improvements in graduate programs will be the next step in the assessment process. In addition, a revised graduate program five-year self-study template that asks for the program's outcomes assessment report was adopted by the Committee on Graduate Studies. The first such self-study is currently underway by the Forensic Psychology MA program.

The learning goals for the majors and programs are publicized in a number of ways—through the undergraduate bulletin, advisement handouts, and the web. Our undergraduate majors now have learning goals that are clearly stated and students understand them as demonstrated by the 2006 and 2009 “Student Evaluation of the Major” survey. After the 2006 survey, which indicated that only 64.7% of student respondents thought that the outcomes were clear, the College took swift action. It redesigned its website, created web pages for each major, increased the frequency for updating the bulletin and assigned the bulletin’s revision to an academic director rather than to marketing staff. These actions had a considerable impact. By 2009 more than 83% of the students surveyed thought that the goals are clear (See Summary of Student Evaluation of the Major 2006-2009 with Regard to Learning Goals.) The College is working toward further improvement in this area. To this end, a more student-friendly website, which will carefully highlight program learning goals, assist students in the selection of majors, and promote more intentional degree planning, is in development.

Rigor of the Curriculum

Consistent attention to the curriculum has ensured that students experience it as rigorous and sufficiently challenging. First-year student respondents to the 2009 and 2012 administrations of NSSE showed a significantly higher benchmark score for Level of Academic Challenge than first-year respondents at peer institutions. The students’ perception of difficulty may be related to their levels of preparedness for college-level work, especially in gateway mathematics courses. Grade distributions in some foundational mathematics courses indicate that those courses are being taught at a level that does not sufficiently match students’ preparation and skill levels.

Consistent with research on student learning, it is important to us to provide challenging coursework but with achievable goals so that students are motivated to learn at their best. This means that we pay attention to building skills progressively, both within courses and through pre-requisites, so students can meet our high expectations.

The College has taken a series of steps to achieve the appropriate balance between challenge and motivation in its developmental and foundational math curriculum. Starting in 2007, it invested in curriculum assessment and revision through the Math 2012 initiative. A paced college algebra course (Math 104) was added for students whose math skills test scores indicated that they would benefit from slower pacing. The initiative also included intensive development for its foundational math faculty. This investment did not yield the intended outcome as indicated by studies of students’ retention of concepts from term-to-term and by recent assessments of Math 104. In part, the lack of success can be attributed to the fact that almost all of the instructors in Math 104 are adjuncts, and many were not available for the professional development opportunities provided by the department. The Undergraduate Dean and the Provost rethought the approach and hired a seasoned math educator, effective fall 2012, to lead reform and coordinate foundational and developmental math. The position reports to the Undergraduate Dean. This structure, leadership, and oversight of faculty and curriculum, combined with the hiring of a cadre of full-time lecturers over the next few years (who will report directly to the new math coordinator), has been put in place to more fully and
systematically address the issues. The Dean and the Math Coordinator have developed a plan that will focus first on full-scale assessment, adjunct assessment, curriculum coordination, pacing, and a new recitation offering.

On the graduate level, the MPA and Protection Management programs have revised their qualifying examinations to provide an early challenge to graduate reading comprehension and writing skills and to tie the exams to competencies required for student success in the programs, including passing the Protection Management program’s comprehensive examination and the new capstone policy paper in the MPA programs. The Digital Forensics and Cyber Security program’s Advanced Certificate in Computer Science for Digital Forensics now provides an opportunity to strengthen the computer science competencies of potential program applicants. The bridge program is comprised of two intensive and accelerated courses created for the certificate program plus two of the degree program’s core courses.

Consistency in Multi-Section Courses

The College is concerned with how to ensure rigor and consistency across sections of large, multi-section courses. A spring 2012 survey of department chairs identified methods that are used in our 11 largest multi-section undergraduate courses to ensure consistency. For nine of the 11, the method is the appointment of a course coordinator who monitors all sections. Another method all 11 use is to establish learning outcomes for the course that are shared among sections. Most use a common syllabus and a little fewer than half employ prescribed assignments across sections. More than one-third use common exams. All provide a new faculty orientation or mentoring to faculty teaching sections of the course. Not all faculty teaching multi-sections are observed or given model syllabi, however. In multi-section courses, these two strategies could help improve consistency (See Survey of Chairs on Multi-section Course, spring 2012). In fall 2012, the Undergraduate Dean recommended these strategies to major coordinators and began to discuss them with chairs of the departments that offer these courses.

Common syllabi, grading rubrics, and comprehensive examinations are important tools for ensuring consistency in graduate courses with multiple sections. The large MPA programs share multiple sections of the foundations course, PAD 700. They are taught from a common syllabus and common grading rubric as are several other required courses. The MPA capstone course also has multiple sections that employ a common grading rubric and, to ensure consistency, uses three faculty evaluators. Comprehensive examinations and grading rubrics in Criminal Justice and Protection Management also function as reviews of the consistency of program courses. In Forensic Psychology, a grading rubric for the Research Methods course provides a standard for that key course. Other graduate programs are also in the process of developing rubrics for multi-section courses.

Educational Experience of Transfer Students

Because of the College’s Critical Choices plan that included the phase-out of associate degree admissions and the development of the CUNY Justice Academy, the student transfer experience is especially important to the College. Starting in 2009, the College began to systematically examine the experience of transfer students. NSSE data in 2009 revealed that seniors who entered John Jay as first-time freshmen were substantially more engaged in learning experiences and activities that require familiarity with the College than seniors who entered as transfer students. These differences were particularly true for three benchmarks: 1) Student-Faculty Interaction, 2) Enriching Educational Experiences, and 3) Supportive Campus Environment. The situation is nearly the same for the 2012 NSSE results. The College was also aware that transfer orientation and advisement were inadequate, and it developed and
implemented plans to address these concerns (see pages 56-57 for orientation and p. 59 for advisement, in this document). For CUNY Justice Academy students, the Office of Enrollment Management began to reserve seats starting in spring 2010 in selected upper-level course sections of the Criminal Justice major to facilitate the transfer students’ engagement and enrollment. We created a pilot math bridge program in the 2011 winter session for CUNY Justice Academy transfer students. In terms of retention and graduation rates (Appendix 7.1), transfer students hold their own relative to the other senior colleges and often do better, but there is more work for us to do in terms of students’ general engagement.

The new Honors Program also benefits transfer students by offering sophomore and junior admission. Academic advisement for transfer students was moved from the Counseling Department to the Academic Advisement Center (AAC) effective fall 2012. While resources are not yet in place to provide comprehensive transfer advisement on par with the advisement that we offer first-time freshmen, increased staffing has gone some way toward meeting the need. In fall 2011, 1,385 new transfer students registered at the College, and the AAC provided individual advisement to 45% of them. For spring 2012, the proportion rose to 63%, and we should be able to advise 70% of incoming transfer students in fall 2013 and nearly 100% by fall 2015.

In addition, we funded three part-time on-site advisors at the community colleges for CUNY Justice Academy students. A comprehensive advisement website, called Transfer Central, has been planned and is being implemented incrementally. To improve faculty and transfer student interaction, the Justice Core of the new General Education will provide a transfer version of the 300-level seminar, which will include activities that bolster student-faculty engagement outside of class, similar to those activities offered to freshmen in the 100-level Justice Core Freshman Seminar. Finally, the implementation of the advisement plan for advisement in the major also will help ensure that transfer students have increased, meaningful interaction with faculty.

Qualifications of Graduate Faculty

Full-time faculty are appointed to the master’s faculty from the general faculty, and adjunct faculty members are hired to teach based on program needs. Review criteria for graduate faculty status differ considerably among the nine programs. In most cases, however, a graduate faculty member holds a terminal degree and has a publication record in the teaching field. In areas where professional experience is highly valued, such experience is sometimes deemed sufficient, in addition to a master’s degree, for select adjunct appointments. Graduate program directors, who compose most of the membership of the Committee on Graduate Studies, nominate graduate faculty candidates to the Committee. In the last five years, 65 full-time and 12 part-time faculty members’ nominations have been approved by the Committee on Graduate Studies and submitted to the Provost by the Committee. None has been rejected by the Committee although one candidate was conditionally approved with the understanding that he would be closely supervised because of his limited teaching experience. Given the review and decision-making processes and the fact that not a single applicant has been turned down by the Committee on Graduate Studies, standardized criteria would help ensure the quality of faculty who are recommended to the Provost for graduate teaching status. By contrast, the doctoral programs have membership committees that vet applicants for admission to the doctoral faculty and that maintain a regular schedule of review to ensure that doctoral faculty members continue to meet the standards set by the programs for doctoral faculty status.

Adequacy of Resources and Facilities to Support Educational Offerings

In the past there have been somewhat divergent opinions about facilities and space, with students generally more satisfied with space and facilities than faculty. The College’s move to
the New Building starting in fall 2011 has greatly improved the quality of classroom and academic service space to support the curriculum. It will undoubtedly take time for the effect of these improvements to be understood and appreciated. In its planning for the New Building the College paid attention to the needs of students and departments and is taking the appropriate steps to provide its faculty members with the resources and facilities needed to support the curriculum.

New labs in both the Departments of Psychology and of Sciences have increased students’ opportunities to engage in research with their faculty members. Smaller teaching labs limit forensic science lab section enrollments to 24 from a previous 32-seat cap, which will intensify the learning experience for students. A moot court and an art gallery add new learning environments. The English Department has a new computer lab, while the theater faculty has a second performance space with the opening of a black box theater in the New Building. The New Building also houses a cutting-edge high-rise simulator and an emergency simulator, one of the first of its kind in the country. This facility supports the teaching function in the Department of Security, Fire, and Emergency Management and the Department of Public Management, as well as activities of such centers as the Academy for Critical Incident Analysis and the Christian Regenhard Center for Emergency Response Studies, and also the professional education provided for security and emergency personnel through Adult and Continuing Education.

Many departments have seen a significant expansion of their current resources, most prominently the Science, Psychology, and Mathematics and Computer Science Departments. The Mathematics Department has seen its forensic computing lab space increase dramatically, from 738 square feet in North Hall to 1,856 in the New Building. Similarly, Psychology has almost twice as much space in the New Building, with 4,810 square feet in lab space (versus 2,582) and a 725-square-foot moot courtroom (versus 475). The Science Department has 22 teaching labs in the New Building for a total of 23,000 square feet, compared to 10 labs totaling 13,000 in North Hall. The number of research labs will decrease from about 25 to 4, but with an increase in space from 6,000 to 9,000 square feet. This decrease in the number of research labs will actually be a welcome change, as the labs were unnecessarily disjointed in North Hall.

Many departments now have extra space devoted to students. For example, both the Mathematics and Political Science Departments have student work offices, while the Psychology Department now has 16 dedicated doctoral student offices. Moreover, public space for student interaction and meetings allows students to meet for discussion of class projects and for learning together in informal settings, an experience that was nearly impossible for John Jay students until the New Building opened its doors.

There is currently some concern that classroom space is insufficient to support the planned number of small-size writing intensive course sections, first-year seminars, and learning communities as these expand with the new General Education curriculum. The Office of Enrollment Management has begun to assess the capacity to support these initiatives. In addition to the amount of space, there are concerns about the kind of classroom space that exists in the New Building. Most classrooms have built-in desks and seats which means that collaborative pedagogies are more difficult to implement since the majority of classroom space is not flexible and therefore does not support small-group work. Classroom size and configuration will ultimately restrict the College’s pedagogy by limiting the number of small sections and the number of flexible spaces.

The Library’s physical facilities are also limited, but luckily our electronic collections are excellent and support the curriculum very well. Given the increasing importance of electronic
resources in the Library, the Provost has recently made it a priority to enhance the Library’s
digital capacity by allocating lines specifically for emerging technologies and information
literacy Librarians. There is also concern about the extent to which the campus provides
sufficient computer labs for teaching purposes across the curriculum. The Undergraduate Dean,
the Vice President of Enrollment Management, and the Director of ITSS have begun to address
the issue by assessing current utilization and need and initiating a cross-divisional planning
group to determine future needs.

Finally, communication about space plans and planning could be improved. Some chairs and
faculty believe there is insufficient notice or consultation about the College’s space allocations.
The Senior Vice President for Finance and Administration has addressed the need for
notification by issuing a regular newsletter to the College community about space matters. The
ongoing focus of the SPS on space (see Chapter 2) provides the vehicle for consultation on space
issues of concern to both the faculty and Academic Affairs administrators.

Transition to Senior College and Development of Liberal Arts Degrees

Since its Critical Choices decision, the College has been grappling with the extent to which its
current offerings in the liberal arts are sufficient for its new status as a Senior College of CUNY.
It was not until the 2005-06 Critical Choices process ended that CUNY granted permission for
John Jay to transition to Senior College standing and develop new majors in the liberal arts. The
Critical Choices report found that some of the country’s most prominent specialized colleges
offer liberal arts majors to varying degrees while maintaining a focus on preparation for specific
careers and training.

Analyzed from the perspective of the College’s mission, John Jay would seem to need a very
broad array of liberal arts majors since questions of justice are at the heart of liberal learning.
We understand that liberal arts learning goals—critical and creative thinking, civic knowledge
and engagement, ethical reasoning, and problem solving among others—are the characteristics
of engaged citizens in just societies. Our motto—educating for justice—with its list of modifiers
incribes the expansiveness and inclusiveness of our mission in a list of the kinds of justice we
educate for, including gender, racial, environmental, economic, philosophic, and even, with
tongue somewhat in cheek—poetic and real justice.

There are other compelling reasons for the College to expand its liberal arts curriculum. Most
importantly, the College needs to prepare students for the world that they will inherit, a world
that is shaped and connected by a global economy where multiple careers and employment
instability are likely to be the norm. To achieve success, students will need to view problems
and solve them from multiple perspectives. They will need to develop dispositions and habits of
mind that they have not yet imagined as they work with complexity and ambiguity, apply
intellectual rigor and learn how to persevere. John Jay students, among the least prepared and
“ready” for College of those attending the University’s Senior Colleges, will need to compete with
more privileged graduates who started their college careers, based on current academic profiles,
better prepared; they will need extensive liberal arts training to thrive in this world.

To this end, the College has begun to cultivate an environment that supports professional
studies, liberal arts, and integrative curricular experiences, like our Humanities and Justice
Major. Here we take our cues from our faculty, whose scholarship, across all disciplines, brings
injustice to light and influences the course of justice, and from the communities of practice that
support our mission. From a truly integrative educational model—without obstructionist
learning silos—we work toward the future, developing the kind of liberal arts programming that
actualizes liberal learning and provides opportunities for students to immerse themselves in a full array of its constituent learning experiences.

A critical step in this direction is to provide a diversity of liberal arts programs so that a student, for example, who does not excel in Forensic Science can consider majors in biology, chemistry, health, or environmental sciences rather than dismiss scientific exploration altogether. We often ask ourselves: how in today’s world can a Senior College offer only one science major? For the College to mature and meet the needs of its students and the volatility of the labor market, the same spectrum of diversity is needed in all areas of the liberal arts. We need to work toward majors like Health and Humanities so that our students who come to John Jay for the health care related pre-professional preparation that we envision in the future are adequately prepared with the tools of the humanities to meet the challenges that their professional career choice will present. This kind of programming will give our students a competitive advantage as it develops their capacities for life-long learning.

In addition, increased liberal arts programming is necessary because many of our entering students are exploring the frontiers of knowledge for the first time. Many of these students are initially drawn to the College because of its reputation as a leading institution in the criminal justice field. Once enrolled, however, a considerable number of these students, who are exposed to liberal arts disciplines in the General Education curriculum, marvel at new areas of knowledge and skills to which it exposes them. They want to pursue liberal learning toward graduate preparation, creative expression, or a leadership career in public service. If the College does not offer liberal arts majors that address our students’ burgeoning interests, the College loses students it has worked hard to recruit and weakens the diversity of academic interest of the student body.

With the expansion of liberal arts options and integrative programming, the College will be better equipped to prepare students for justice-related careers, for leadership roles in the public’s service, and for graduate education. John Jay will then be able to fully realize its Mission.

**Strengths:**

1. John Jay has an international reputation as a leading institution in criminal justice and public services education.
2. Curriculum development and review is active and rigorous.
3. John Jay’s new liberal arts majors are innovative and cutting-edge.
4. First semester freshmen are well-served by our First Year Experience program which has expanded steadily and will continue to do so.

**Concerns:**

1. Our classroom sizes and configurations do not always support our pedagogical aspirations and class scheduling needs.
2. There do not seem to be standards, at least not consistent ones, used by the Committee on Graduate Studies in the identification of faculty for teaching in the master’s programs.
3. Transfer students continue to report significantly lower levels of engagement compared to native students. (NSSE)
4. There is no plan yet for completing the liberal arts component of the Critical Choices agenda.
Recommendations:

1. The Committee on Graduate Studies should develop formal standards for the nomination of faculty to the Provost for teaching in master's programs.
2. Academic Affairs and Student Affairs should more actively develop programs and activities to engage transfer students.
3. The Undergraduate Curriculum & Academic Standards Committee and the Graduate Studies Committee should attend more to comprehensive academic planning, including needs assessment.
Chapter Eight
Standard 12: General Education

Introduction

John Jay College has been deeply engaged in the processes of general education reform since 2006. This effort, propelled by the College’s transition to Senior College status, best practices for liberal learning at the undergraduate level, assessment findings, and the CUNY Pathway’s initiative, will culminate in the launch of an innovative 42-credit general education program in fall 2013. At the center of the new program, emanating directly from the College’s mission, is a justice-based core curriculum that unifies the academic and intellectual experiences of the campus’ undergraduates and drives the entire community—students, faculty, staff and administrators—to reflect and act on justice. The community shares great aspirations for its General Education program, which specifies unique institutional learning goals that have been carefully shaped by the College’s mission. The assessment plan for General Education is based on a best practices pilot that was implemented in AY 2011-2012. Rigorous and multi-tier assessment will contribute to the ongoing development and enhancement of mission-based and outcomes-based General Education for John Jay’s students over the next decade.

General Education Reform at the College

Beginning in 2006-2007, under the leadership of the Undergraduate Dean, the College’s faculty immersed itself in planning for a new General Education program at John Jay College. A task force composed of faculty and administrators was formed. The College’s mission mandated a General Education curriculum that would improve students’ critical reasoning, information literacy, technological skills, and communication abilities; foster innovative problem-solving; enhance moral judgment and ethical practice; promote interdisciplinary approaches to problem-solving; and facilitate global awareness and personal and social growth toward engaged citizenship and public service. The Critical Choices decision, coupled with the nation-wide movement for the revision of liberal learning and information about our students’ achievement, pointed to the need for significant General Education reform at the College.

In December 2008, the Task Force on General Education issued its report, which specified a broad range of issues and options to guide curricular development. With the College’s mission in mind, the Task Force found that the College’s General Education program had “eroded” over the years and that neither students nor faculty were engaged by the program. The Task Force also found that the General Education program lacked sufficient oversight. The report proposed a set of learning objectives for undergraduate education and posited a variety of General Education models for the community to consider. As the next step, a General Education Steering Committee developed a draft General Education curriculum architecture for the College that addressed the Principles for Effective General Education, which had been developed by the Task Force and adopted by UCASC and the College Council in May 2009.

During the 2010-2011 academic year, the Steering Committee recommended a 47-credit, justice-themed and learning outcomes-based General Education curricular structure that was approved by governance in late spring 2011. The proposed curriculum organized credits into six broad categories, including 1) a scaffolded Justice Core (9-credits), 2) Communications and Reasoning (21-credits), 3) The Creative Dimension (6-credits), 4) Learning from the Past (6 credits), 5) The Natural and Physical World (7-credits), and 6) Self, Culture and Society (7-credits). The
categories themselves show how fully the new curriculum would be tied to the College’s mission. The proposed curriculum, however, was not developed further because of a CUNY-wide initiative that overrode our College’s plans.

In its meeting of June 27, 2011, the CUNY Board of Trustees approved a resolution establishing the Pathways to Degree Completion Initiative ("Pathways") for the entire University. The initiative’s purpose is to create a curriculum that will streamline transfer, promote credit accumulation toward degree completion, and enhance the quality of General Education across the University. Obstacles to transfer at the University among colleges have been significant and have greatly impeded student success, according to the Associate Vice Chancellor’s 2010 assessment of the transfer problem at the University. The Pathways initiative was developed to ensure that the 30-credit common core will contain only courses that after University-wide review are ipso facto equivalent among campuses. Since it is an outcomes-based curriculum, course by course equivalency determinations for transfer students will no longer be required.

The Pathways initiative supplanted the new John Jay model, although both share many elements. Since the initiation of Pathways, faculty and administrators at the College have worked to ensure that the new curricular structure put forward by Pathways is closely aligned with the College’s May 2011 adopted vision and architecture for General Education. Both models focus on student learning outcomes and abilities, and a number of the organizational categories are nearly identical. Most importantly, the College’s mission undergirds the structure’s categories as described below.

The Pathways'42-credit General Education curriculum includes a 30-credit liberal arts Common Core, combined with an additional 12-credit college option for the senior colleges. The Common Core is composed of a 12-credit Required Core and an 18-credit Flexible Core. The Required Core includes three credits of Natural and Physical Sciences, six credits of English Composition, and three credits of Mathematics and Quantitative Reasoning. The Flexible Core is composed of six three-credit liberal arts and sciences courses, with at least one course in each of the following five categories—1)World Cultures and Global Issues; 2) U.S. Experience in its Diversity; 3) Creative Expression; 4) Individual and Society; and 5) The Scientific World. Students may not take more than two courses in any discipline or interdisciplinary field. John Jay’s new General Education curriculum—Common Core and College Option—is depicted in Diagram 8.1 below. John Jay elected to use its 12-credit College Option to create a meaningful and common experience for our students that emphasizes the College’s unique mission. The College has entitled this common experience “the Justice Core,” a vital six-credit curricular structure that clearly orients students at the 100-level and sharply focuses them at the 300-level on the relevance, scope, and depth of the College’s mission. The 100-level course, Justice and the Individual, acts as the First-Year seminar, easing the student’s transition to college and introducing the College's mission through the meaning of justice for the individual.

The 12-credit College Option includes two additional categories in addition to the Justice Core: 1) Learning from the Past; and 2) Communications. In the College’s model, foreign language resides in the Communications category. Students will be required to take a 101 and 102 course sequence in a foreign language, unless exempt from all or part of the requirement. The 101 course will reside in the World Cultures and Global Issues category of the Flexible Core, while the 102 course will reside in Communications. Students who are not exempt from the foreign language sequence will: 1) satisfy the 3-credit Communications requirement with the 102 course, and 2) be required to take the sixth course of the Flexible Core in the World Cultures and Global Issues category.
The new General Education program is designed to address numerous deficiencies that our recent comprehensive general education assessment pilot study identified in our current General Education program. The 2012 faculty-led assessment provided the College with its first comprehensive study of student learning in General Education. The committee decided to pilot an approach that would accomplish two goals: 1) provide information about student achievement in our current General Education program, and 2) provide baseline data and concrete recommendations for curriculum, pedagogy and General Education assessment in the new curriculum.

The study was designed to address six Middle States-recommended areas of General Education competence: written communication, oral communication, scientific reasoning, critical analysis and reasoning, technological competence, and information literacy. Wherever possible,
competency areas were assessed using relevant AAC&U VALUE rubrics because they provide a reliable, national standard against which to measure our students’ learning. The findings were illuminating in every area of assessment.

Most broadly the Committee found that John Jay student abilities as assessed in the capstone were below national norms. This is not surprising, given the average level of preparation of John Jay undergraduates upon entry as indicated by mean CAA scores, SAT scores, and the CUNY skills assessment tests. The undergraduate dean suggested to the General Education Assessment Subcommittee that a value-added approach to assessment that examines student skills levels upon entry and establishes interim and exit benchmarks would be a useful addition to the General Education assessment plan for John Jay going forward. Faculty concurred and are anecdotally reporting improvements among students that they have taught as freshmen and then again as juniors and seniors. A value-added approach would capture these improvements and help specify areas of strength and curricular weakness. A standardized assessment such as the CLA and portfolio assessment are among the options to be considered. The General Education Subcommittee of UCASC has developed a full assessment plan for the new General Education program based on the results of the pilot and the new curriculum.

Although the General Education Assessment Report reveals that students are performing below national norms, it found that “the majority of capstone students are at least moderately proficient in the basic academic skills. They can select a topic, identify and access sources, and manage the mechanics of writing. Their performance is weaker on more challenging tasks such as analyzing data, drawing conclusions, and putting their subject, ideas and writing in context....” In some majors, students do not seem to have systematic and scaffolded opportunities for writing, a skills area through which liberal learning knowledge and multiple General Education skills can be learned, practiced, and assessed.

The College launched a Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) program in 2007. A key feature of the WAC program has been the development and certification of faculty in Writing Intensive course development and preparation. While 119 faculty across the College have participated in WAC development as of the start of the fall 2012 semester, WAC assessment shows that only a handful of liberal arts departments actually offer writing intensive courses. This coincides with a key finding of the General Education pilot report: selected majors are graduating students that the assessment found to be “highly competent” in the more challenging analytical areas of academic performance. (“Papers from capstone courses in the Political Science, Humanities and Justice Studies, English, Global History, and International Criminal Justice majors scored higher than others” pp. 3-4.)

To enrich students’ degrees with the new General Education program, which has 15 fewer credits, and to address the liberal learning performance gap in some majors, the Academic Standards Subcommittee of UCASC is considering proposals to strengthen liberal learning. In addition, the undergraduate dean is recommending that select majors advise students to enroll in complementary liberal arts minors to ensure that critical General Education skills are sufficiently developed and routinely practiced. She is also discussing General Education assessment results and their bearing on the major and the department’s contributions to General Education. Pinpointing how majors and minors contribute to the General Education outcomes will be a focus of work for major and minor coordinators beginning in the spring 2013. Action plans for specific improvements in departmental contributions to General Education will be developed from these discussions and shared with the General Education subcommittee of UCASC.
Beginning in the spring 2013, UCASC will begin planning a series of events that bring faculty who are teaching General Education courses together to discuss assessment results, promising practices, and successful strategies for seamlessly linking General Education outcomes with the curriculum of our majors and minors. The Policies, Procedures and Practices (PPP) subcommittee of UCASC will consider how UCASC’s program and course planning and proposal documents and procedures can be updated to emphasize this curricular integration. Student Academic Success Programs and Academic Advisement will support this curricular effort. They will partner with Student Affairs to ensure that there are many opportunities for all students through each milestone in their careers to reflect on their learning through General Education and its integration with the major, minor, certificate programs, credit and non-credit internships, and other curricular and extra-curricular learning experiences. The seminars in the Justice Core will provide rich opportunities at the 100- and 300-levels to reinforce this integration.

The assessment report also states that there seems to be very little consensus among faculty about which General Education requirements are most important and what the requirements for mastery should be. There are multiple interrelated issues that contribute to both the unevenness of expectations and outcomes across majors and the lack of consensus about expectations and mastery levels among faculty. At the core of these issues is the fact that many full-time faculty members have not been engaged in teaching General Education courses. Depending on the semester, only between 21% and 25% of all sections taught at the 100-level, for instance, are taught by full-time faculty. The new General Education curriculum, which allows faculty to teach in areas of immediate interest related to General Education outcomes, should increase the number of full-time faculty teaching General Education courses.

Faculty ownership of General Education is critical but it is in itself insufficient for improving outcomes. Both adjunct faculty and full-time faculty beginning in spring 2013 will be offered numerous development opportunities (Appendix 8.1) in scaffolding curriculum and in using pedagogies which engage students and develop and reinforce critical General Education skill sets. College faculty, key administrators, and external experts will design and deliver the workshops in consultation with the dean, the Office of Student Academic Success Services, and the General Education Subcommittee of UCASC.

To address the consensus issue, UCASC developed guidelines in the spring 2012 for courses at all levels. The guidelines, agreed upon by the UCASC, which includes the chair or representative of each department’s curriculum committee, scaffolds General Education skills across all course levels. Having received the full General Education assessment report in September 2012, UCASC approved specific guidelines for the capstone as well. In UCASC’s further investigations into the capstones, the committee has learned that there is a conflation between 400-level courses and capstone courses. The proposed guidelines separate these and specify that capstone outcomes include integrative learning, synthesis, and higher level analytical and critical reasoning skills. Transition outcomes have been included. The guidelines will be used by UCASC to assess new courses and to provide feedback to departments through the assessment process. The guidelines also will be used for faculty development. They highlight skills that are important across the curriculum and that will facilitate consensus.

Strengths:

1. The College Option in the new General Education program permits us to offer courses about justice, which so many students come to John Jay to study.
2. There has been considerable faculty participation across many departments in course
development. The new courses also reflect faculty interests more than current General Education courses. This should increase the number of full-time faculty teaching General Education courses at the 100- and 200-levels.

3. Learning outcomes are tied to the College’s mission and interdisciplinary perspectives, part of the academic vision put forth by the Provost.

Concerns:

1. The new General Education program will require more careful degree planning to use credits effectively given the number of credits in the new program (42 v. 59+).
2. Pathways brought to the fore departmental territoriality. It has been difficult to work toward increased interdisciplinarity in this context.
3. The General Education structure does not provide for sufficient integrative opportunities for student learning.
4. The new structure does not scaffold curriculum sufficiently across the students’ entire undergraduate experience (first 60 credits).

Recommendations:

1. We should monitor student degree planning to ensure appropriate scaffolding of General Education courses.
2. We should develop some 300-level integrative model core courses for the Justice Core.

---

1 For a discussion of the controversy over Pathways at John Jay, see Chapters 3 and 6.
2 Circles outlined in black indicate areas of the Common Core (30 credits). Circles filled in red correspond to a Required Core Area. Circles filled in green with black outline indicate a flexible core area of the Common Core, and circles filled in blue denote the College Option.
3 Quantitative reasoning was assessed through the learning outcomes in mathematic courses (College Algebra to Calculus). Additional reports on the assessment of learning in courses meeting our current general education requirements in Skills, Core Requirements, Cultural Studies, Social Sciences, Natural Sciences, and Physical Education are also available on the Blackboard site for the John Jay Assessment Committee.
Chapter Nine
Standard Thirteen: Related Educational Activities

Introduction

Consistent with the mission of “education, research and service in the fields of criminal justice, fire science and related areas of public safety and public service,” the College offers special programs and activities, both credit-bearing and not-for-credit, beyond its traditional degree programs. Differing greatly from each other, all serve to connect the College community to other communities beyond our walls, to expand access to the College’s areas of expertise, and to create opportunities for students and faculty alike to leverage their John Jay connection to advance their professional standing. These extended college programs include certificate programs, experiential learning, adult and continuing education programs, courses at other locations, high school programs, online education, and the centers and institutes in the John Jay Research Consortium. On the whole, these programs show a range of dynamic and exciting educational offerings, most of which grow from the College’s unique mission.

Certificates

The College offers nine credit-bearing certificates, designed both to augment the regular curriculum and to provide a bridge to the College for non-matriculated professional students.

New York Police Department (NYPD) Leadership Program. Supported and authorized by the New York City Council, the NYPD Leadership Program is a tuition-exempt program of four credit-bearing courses, especially designed to give New York City police personnel an understanding of the multicultural population they serve and an enhanced capability for service-oriented leadership in the supervisory ranks. With separate programs for undergraduate students and for non-degree graduate students, the NYPD Leadership Program offers over 40 sections annually, serving well over 300 students. Academic advisement and career counseling are provided throughout the year. Faculty serve as academic directors of the program and monitor syllabi and student satisfaction. Students may apply NYPD Leadership Program credits toward a Bachelor’s or Master’s degree at John Jay College.

Undergraduate Certificates

• Addiction Studies Course Completion Certificate. The Addiction Studies Program of John Jay College is a New York State Office of Alcoholism and Substance Abuse Services (OASAS) Certified Education and Training Provider for the Credential in Alcoholism and Substance Abuse Counseling (CASAC). We offer eight courses that fulfill the education requirements for CASAC and two courses that fulfill the training requirement.

• Dispute Resolution Certificate. Upon successful completion of 30 credits, including a practicum, matriculated students receive a certificate in Dispute Resolution, authorized by the Board of Trustees of CUNY and by NYSED.

Graduate Certificates

• The Master’s Program in Criminal Justice offers two certificates, open to both matriculated graduate students and non-matriculated students in possession of a bachelor’s degree from an accredited institution.
- Advanced Certificate in Terrorism Studies
- Advanced Certificate in Crime Prevention and Analysis

- Postgraduate Certificate in Forensic Psychology. The Psychology Department offers this certificate primarily for those who have already received a master's or a doctoral degree in psychology, social work, counseling, or a related field and who wish to develop a forensic specialization. The certificate does not lead to licensure but provides course work for students who have applied for licensure and who have been requested by state licensing boards to take additional courses.

- The Master’s Program in Digital Forensics and Cybersecurity offers two certificates.
  - Advanced Certificate in Computer Science for Digital Forensics, a bridge program for post-baccalaureate students seeking entrance to the Master’s in Digital Forensics and Cybersecurity. Those who complete four courses with a B or better receive a certificate and may apply for transfer into the Master’s Program.
  - Advanced Certificate in Applied Digital Forensics is awarded upon completion of four graduate courses in the science of digital forensics and upon receiving a score of Pass or better on the Applied Digital Forensics Certification Exam.

- Advanced Certificate in Forensic Accounting, articulated with the MPA in Inspection and Oversight, prepares students for professional careers in accounting with special focus on the investigation of fraud. The curriculum meets the content standards of the Association of Inspectors General.

The courses in these certificate programs are part of the regular John Jay curriculum. They are subject to the same governance processes and the same expectations as the courses in majors, minors, and graduate programs of the College. The distinctions could be more clearly articulated in the College bulletins among certificates approved by NYSED, credit-bearing “course completion” certificates for matriculated students, and certificates offered to non-matriculated students as professional training or graduate school.

Though all certificates have been approved by governance, not all of them meet our expectations in terms of setting and assessing learning goals. The undergraduate certificates are more regularly evaluated and assessed than are the graduate certificates. For example, the Dispute Resolution Program undergoes a formal self-study (see Dispute Resolution Self Study) and external review every five years (like other NYS registered majors and programs), and the CASAC certificate must abide by NY State OASAS regulations and is re-certified every three years by OASAS. Most of the master’s certificate programs are new and represent areas of study only recently emerging. Although the graduate certificates have program goals and individual courses have learning objectives, a review begun in spring 2012 revealed that too few graduate certificate programs had assessment plans and that some of them lacked mission statements and learning goals. Only one graduate program, Digital Forensics and Cybersecurity, has included assessment of a certificate program in its overall program assessment plan. The certificate programs are now more closely monitored (see Appendix 9.1) by the deans of graduate and undergraduate studies to be certain that all of them meet our expectations for regular assessment of the curriculum and for clear communication to students and faculty about goals and mission.

Experiential Learning

Internships. Experiential learning in the form of internships provides another bridge between the College and its communities of practice. Many internships at John Jay are attached to
credit-bearing courses and many provide an alternative to a thesis or research course as a way to fulfill the capstone requirement for various majors and masters programs. There are between 150-175 students each year in undergraduate internships and around 200 in graduate internships.

The Center for Career and Professional Development coordinates most of the undergraduate and all of the graduate internships and provides assistance to program directors for externships. Guidelines for undergraduate internships have been revised and are now going through the governance process and are slated to be in place by fall 2013. The new undergraduate guidelines will redress problems that have been noted in the past. For example, internship placements have not been carefully monitored for appropriateness. In the new guidelines, which represent best practices for practice-oriented learning experiences, faculty will oversee students in the field and approve internship sites. A contract, to be signed by the student, faculty member, and field site supervisor, will be required. The faculty will collect the signed contracts and use them to maintain regular contact with the field supervisor during the term. A packet of information for field site supervisors will introduce supervisors to the professional requirements of the internship, describe the curricular relationship, and provide the contract. To sustain the best practices being put in place, we are hiring an internship coordinator who should start in spring 2013.


There are two Graduate Career Advisors, one for the MPA students, paid for by the differential tuition increase recently established for CUNY MPA programs, and one for all other graduate students. The Graduate Career Advisors meet multiple times with students interested in interviewing for internships. The Graduate Career Advisors explain the policies and help students assess their skills and plans in terms of the available internship opportunities. Although some students find their own internship opportunities and others are alerted to opportunities by the faculty, the Graduate Career Advisors help coordinate most interviews and maintain a record of interviews, placements, and successful experiences. In order to receive credit, students enrolled in 780/781 (the fieldwork course number in every graduate program) must complete, with the instructor, an individualized independent study prospectus, which describes the required work and the basis of evaluation (such as a final report or paper). Some internship hosting agencies, such as Legal Aid, also require students to do multi-week trainings and submit final reports. To provide additional oversight, the Graduate Career Advisors stay in monthly contact by phone and email with internship hosting agencies to check on the attendance and performance of our students.

Pre-Law Institute. The Pre-Law Institute (PLI) also provides curricular enhancement through experiential learning and career preparation. The Institute was created in December 2005 with the mission to "identify, motivate and prepare John Jay students and alumni who are interested in preparing for a career in law." What distinguishes the PLI is its emphasis on offering skills-
building programs called Pre-Law Boot Camps as early as the freshman year to support and strengthen students’ undergraduate academic achievement and enhance their performance on the Law School Admissions Test (LSAT) while actively providing students with information about the rigors of a legal education and a legal career. Beginning with the 2009-2010 academic year, the PLI set out specific learning outcomes and assessment plans.

PLI offered over 45 programs for the 2011-2012 academic year. Participants improved their writing skills (in the range of a 19% to 25% increase using pre- and post-intervention faculty-created evaluations) and critical thinking skills (increases ranging from 40% to 45%). After an initial assessment that identified a 12% program persistence rate (January 2009) the Pre-Law Boot Camps have been improved so that for each of the last three years they have sustained persistence rates of between 90% and 100%. For the 2009-2010 year, the Pre-Law Boot Camps experienced an increased level of participation (72.8%) and persistence (63.5%) compared to the previous year. In addition, the PLI has an email list (nearly 300 subscribers for the first year and now at 800) and a Facebook page, which began with no members and has reached just shy of 1200 subscribers. The PLI increased the opportunities for students to receive individualized advisement by identifying faculty pre-law advisors and adding a part-time professional pre-law advisor to its staff and also by partnering with Student Affairs and Academic Affairs division offices to craft numerous non-traditional opportunities for students to receive advisement (advising tables during orientation, leadership, and career advisement events).

Through the efforts of the PLI, we have seen an increase in the success rate of John Jay students seeking admission to law schools. For the years of the PLI’s existence the success rates have gone from 30.2% (2005-2006) to 65.9% (2009-2010). In addition, connections with the metropolitan area legal practitioner community have resulted in several expanded opportunities created specifically for John Jay pre-law students as interns and paralegals at private law firms, networking program participants, and judicial, public interest, and federal government legal interns (10 in 2009-2010; over 20 each semester in 2011-12).

Adult and Continuing Education

The College’s adult and continuing education (ACE) offerings (non-credit), loosely gathered under the heading of Continuing and Professional Studies, are critical to the mission of the College because they directly serve law enforcement and other public and private safety professionals. This area of the College is currently in transition. In 2005, the College established the Office of Continuing and Professional Studies (OCPS), headed by a dean. Ongoing and new ACE offerings were overseen by the dean and administered by a director. When the budget crisis emerged, OCPS was identified as a low priority for shrinking resources, and in 2010 the office was dissolved, the dean was terminated, and her duties were reassigned to other administrators, saving the College $250,000 annually. With no clear leadership, the remaining ACE programs failed to comply with CUNY requirements for ACE business operations and enrollment tracking. In fall 2011, the Provost decided to put ACE into the same portfolio as weekend and summer/winter programs and national and international educational partnerships, to be run by a new Associate Provost for the Extended College and Educational Partnerships. The search for that person recently failed to yield a viable candidate. Though there were many strong applicants, their expertise was either in continuing education, or study abroad, or international educational partnerships, or online education; none of them brought the kind of broad, academic experience, which would have provided the necessary academic vision and leadership in this area of the academic enterprise. In the meantime, the Dean of Graduate Studies announced her intention to retire at the end of the academic year. The Provost has decided to redefine the Associate Provost position so that it will combine Associate
Provost and Dean for Graduate Studies and will capitalize on the potential synergies between these separate areas of the college.

Through the revitalization of adult, continuing, and professional education, the College seeks to strengthen its relationships with communities of practice in the justice and public service fields so as to create educational programs aligned with the needs of these fields. With an administrator in place, the College can then more carefully monitor the academic quality of these programs and their financial viability and can develop new programs and reorganize existing programs as appropriate and necessary.

In the meantime, the College continues to mount some long-standing and successful ACE programs, under the direct administration of the Provost’s Director of Operations, who is functioning as the Interim Director of Continuing Education, pending the organizational change described above. With the support of the Director of John Jay Online, the Interim Director is automating revenue collection and enrollment tracking with the implementation of a Lumens online system. Current ACE program directors received training on the system during the fall 2012 semester. Once this system is fully implemented the College will be in compliance with CUNY regulations. ACE programs are expected to generate revenue or, at the very least, be self-sufficient.

The existing ACE programs are: the Office of Special Programs (OSP), the Security Management Institute (SMI), the Fire Science Institute (FSI), and the Center for Private Security and Safety.

The OSP provides professional training for the NYPD, the Department of Homeless Services, and other public entities. It is responsible for three training programs.

1. The New York City Police Department’s Managing Situations Involving Emotionally Disturbed Persons (EDPs), or Emergency Psychology Technician (EPT) program, is a multi-year contract funded by the NYC Department of Health and Mental Hygiene, which has run at the College for 20 years. The EDP Programs train over 4,000 uniformed members of the NYPD per year. The faculty members who develop, review, and revise the curriculum and teach the courses are John Jay College Psychology Department faculty. They have set the learning objectives and are responsible for assessing whether the objectives are being met. The Department of Health and Mental Hygiene regularly monitors the courses through direct observation.

2. The Department of Homeless Services Training Program serves approximately 675 officers annually with four different courses. This is a state-certified program, tailored for the agency. The curriculum and exams are state-mandated. The state certifies the students who have successfully completed the course and passed the exam. Seventy percent of enrollees pass on the first try, and the agency regularly monitors outcomes.

3. The Public Service Workshops Program (PSWP), funded through the New York State Public Employees Federation AFL-CIO collective bargaining agreement, provides more than 44 different workshops and at least five credit-bearing courses to address the continuing professional development needs of this workforce.

Another long-standing ACE Program, the Security Management Institute (SMI), is an authorized New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services (DCJS) security guard and peace officer training academy. In addition, SMI offers a variety of professional development courses and on-demand training modules, which are designed to enhance the knowledge and skills of safety and security practitioners in the areas of customer service, dispute resolution, ethics, cultural competence/diversity awareness, communication, or emergency management.
In consultation with the client, SMI develops the curriculum, draws up the training contracts and delivers the classes. Learning objectives are assessed by practical application, examination, student evaluation, and client satisfaction. Instructors are selected from among John Jay faculty and a roster of subject matter experts.

A third ACE program, the Fire Science Institute (FSI), runs training courses for professionals in fire-related fields. The programs currently offered by the FSI are the Consolidated Fire Safety Course (FSD), the Emergency Action Plan Program (EAP), and Building, Operation, Maintenance, and Recordkeeping (Recertification). Instructors are hired as continuing education teachers, and all are fire officers who either work for or are retired from the Fire Department of New York (FDNY) or of New Jersey. The FDNY must approve all instructors. The FSI must apply for teaching accreditation with the FDNY on an annual basis by submitting an updated course curriculum and a notification of upcoming classes for the year. The FDNY can have its personnel attend and monitor any of these programs and may also send their new inspectors to the programs to familiarize themselves with the course material. All programs have an exam, written by the FDNY, which the student must pass in order to receive a certificate of completion in one of the three training programs. With a certificate of completion, the students may proceed to FDNY Headquarters and take the two additional tests required by FDNY for a Certificate of Fitness (CoF), which allows them to work in one of the five boroughs in the capacity for which they have trained.

The Center for Private Security and Safety, created in 2012, is the newest ACE program. The overarching aim of the Center for Private Security and Safety is the professionalization of persons, entities, and processes involving private sector justice and safety practices. The Center is dedicated to serving the diverse communities that deliver these services, including the corporate and industrial complex, institutions in need of asset and personal protection, hospitals and medical facilities, colleges and universities, banking and financial institutions, transit and travel operations, and military operations. The Center designs and delivers educational programs, such as short term continuing education and certificate programs, to communities of practice in both an in-person and online format; raises revenue for departmental operations; and is an active contributor to the City, State, and national forums where the Center's opinion is sought.

Credit-Bearing Related Educational Offerings

Courses at Remote Locations. John Jay offers courses at remote locations: West Point Military Academy and the FDNY Academy.

West Point is a formal extension program that guarantees students the opportunity to complete the MPA via courses offered at West Point. The curriculum is identical to that on the main campus, with the exception that students at West Point may choose from only two concentrations. The West Point program is included in all college-administered student evaluations of teaching, the MPA NASPAA Self-Study Report, and the outcomes assessment program being developed by the MPA programs. At the West Point campus there is an administrator on-site two days a week.1 Approximately 30-40 students are enrolled in the West Point program each year. Approximately a dozen sections are offered; half are taught by full-time professors and the remainder by adjuncts, most of whom also teach on the main campus. The graduation rate for students in our MPA program at West Point is near 100%.

The Department of Security, Fire, and Emergency Services (SFEM) offers classes leading to the undergraduate degrees in Fire Science and Fire Services at Fort Totten and Randall’s Island—the two NYC Fire Department training centers. These courses are directly supervised by the
chair of the department, who oversees compliance with academic standards. A designated full-time faculty member serves the students by teaching and advising on-site. SFEM also holds semester-based advisement sessions and Open Houses to care for our student population and recruit new students. SFEM also works closely with the Admissions and Registrar offices to ensure consistent criteria. Students must come to the main campus to complete the course work for the degree and to access to campus services. Our evaluation has found that John Jay courses at remote locations conform to the standards of courses at the College and appear to have adequate services provided to the students enrolled in them. Because these remote courses prepare students for public service careers in non-profit organizations and government agencies, especially in the uniformed and protective services, they are fully consistent with the mission of the College.

**College Now.** College Now is a CUNY-wide collaboration with the New York City Department of Education in which high-school students are offered tuition-free college courses, free books and supplies. This program has been at John Jay since 2002. Some courses are offered at the partner high schools, but most are offered at the College, including English 101, Criminal Justice 101, Psychology 101, Sociology 101, Counseling 110, and Ethnic Studies 125. Monitoring of these courses is done by two different administrators: the College Now Director and the chairs of the individual academic departments that participate. Course learning outcomes are monitored by the departments as part of their formal self-study and assessment processes. Faculty for College Now are also hired and reappointed according to their department’s evaluation and hiring practices. Each department monitors the syllabi by collecting and reviewing them. Two departments, English and Law & Police Science, do in-class peer-observation for one class period. The effectiveness of the College Now program is assessed indirectly in the annual CUNY PMP. Enrollment targets are set and the program’s enrollment is measured against these targets. In 2009-2010, College Now exceeded its enrollment goal. The PMP also monitors student performance. In 2009-2010, the percentage of students who successfully completed (grade of C or better) the College Now courses was 92%, up from 83% over the previous year and up from 76% in 2005-2006. However, the percentage of returning students remained at the previous year’s low of 21%, up from 16% in 2007-2008, but down from 28% in 2005-2006. While academic and administrative oversight of College Now is good, closer coordination between the College Now Director and most of the department chairs is needed. A strategic plan to improve College Now outcomes has been developed and was submitted to the Undergraduate Dean on August 1, 2012.

**John Jay Online.** One of the greatest opportunities to connect with professionals and distant students, while also augmenting offerings to traditional students, is the development of courses and programs online. At present, more than 200 fully online courses are offered to students across academic programs each year, and over 70 full-time and adjunct instructors have been CUNY-certified to teach online. The College has one program, the Master of Public Administration in Inspection and Oversight, fully online. This program was evaluated in 2009-2010 and 2010-2011. See the minutes of the May 15, 2012 College Council for the most recent evaluation, p. 84: [http://inside.jjay.cuny.edu/compendium/assets/PDFs/Col.010%20-%20College%20Council%20Committee%20Minutes%20May%202012.pdf](http://inside.jjay.cuny.edu/compendium/assets/PDFs/Col.010%20-%20College%20Council%20Committee%20Minutes%20May%202012.pdf). These formal evaluations, submitted annually to the College Council for review, show that this program meets College standards for learning goals, rigor, and educational effectiveness. The integrity, quality, and rigor of other online course offerings are ensured by their review and assessment according to the same standards and through the same mechanisms as our on-campus offerings.

We have established a basic support structure for distance education. The College assigns a faculty program coordinator and staff student advisor to provide orientations, academic
support, and advisement for our distance learning students in the distance education program. All distance learning students have access to training and support provided by our two full-time Blackboard and distance learning professionals specifically focused on student support, in addition to our two full-time Blackboard administrators. In addition, our IT Help Desk and other technical staff support distance students on various technical issues, such as computer accounts, webmail services, software configuration, and troubleshooting computer problems. The Lloyd Sealy Library at John Jay College offers extensive online collections and services through the Library’s website, including 24/7 online access to more than 250 research databases in all disciplines covered in the curriculum, as well as more than 44,000 electronic subscriptions to journals, magazines, newspapers, other periodical subscriptions, and e-books. Distance learning students also have 24/7 access to reference librarians through online chat and phone texting provided by QuestionPoint, a Reference Cooperative that includes librarians from all around the country. Moreover, distance learning students can receive research and reference assistance from our own librarians by email, with a 24-hour turnaround time, and also by phone, with immediate response whenever the Library is open.

As reported by the 2007 Task Force on Distance Learning Policy and Practice and confirmed by a February 2011 faculty survey, the College’s goal is to expand online offerings and the needed student-learning resources, student services, and faculty development opportunities to support them. During the 2010-2011 academic year, a second campus-wide Task Force for John Jay Online recommended a multi-year plan to accomplish this expansion. The work of the two task forces represents the best evidence of the College’s commitment to careful planning and implementation of distance education courses and programs. Based on the analyses of these task forces, the College will focus on the development of distance education programs in Public Administration, Security Management, and Criminal Justice.

With access to state-of-art technologies, the distance education staff provides technical support and collaborates closely with the faculty on the development of online courses and on training, augmenting the two-week CUNY School of Professional Studies online course workshop for faculty. Through faculty training, the distance education staff ensures the quality and effectiveness of our distance education programs. The College also supports members of the team in their continuing professional development in relevant areas through their own participation in conferences and training sessions.

**Centers and Institutes**

The College has 12 research-oriented centers, institutes, and academies (hereafter “Centers”) that together constitute the Research Consortium of John Jay College, an entity within the Office for the Advancement of Research. The goal of the Research Consortium is to influence criminal and social justice policy and practice in New York, our nation, and the world. Drawing on the expertise of the College’s faculty and engaging the College’s students, the Centers engage in research; sponsor conferences and lectures; and partner with community organizations, policy-making bodies, and criminal justice entities.

Though they are units in a consortium, Centers are expected to be self-sufficient, but the College does provide several years of investment if necessary when a Center is founded. Centers that did not meet the expectation for self-sufficiency after initial investment have been closed. Many existing Centers were started with grants and continue to raise money through grants and contracts to carry out their work. All centers are evaluated annually by the Dean for Research and the Provost based on a self-evaluation, using a uniform template. The self-evaluation is followed by an evaluation conference, which is then summarized in a letter to the center director from the dean. Goals are set for the subsequent year, and the subsequent evaluation measures
performance against the agreed upon goals. Centers that consistently fail to meet their goals are closed or put on hiatus.

The related educational activities discussed in this chapter represent numerous ways that the College connects higher education with communities beyond our walls, particularly with professional communities. The most important area for growth, online education, has received thoughtful and extensive planning and investment in hiring and other resources. Other areas that once were critical to the College, such as Professional Studies, have been somewhat neglected by planning processes but are nonetheless operating with measurable success. The College needs to turn more of its attention to its adult and continuing education offerings so that they meet the highest standards of academic quality and fiscal viability.

**Strengths:**

1. The College has enduring relationships with the NYPD and FDNY that maintain important elements of John Jay’s original mission.
2. John Jay is a leader within CUNY in digital learning and has plans for curriculum and infrastructure to expand our online programs.
3. The Research Consortium provides a unique and powerful capacity to conduct and shape national and local conversations concerning many aspects of criminal justice.

**Concerns:**

1. Adult and Continuing Education is currently underperforming in terms of its potential, due to lack of leadership and support.
2. College Now is not sufficiently integrated with the academic departments that provide the curriculum and staff.
3. Direct assessment of student learning in College Now and some Continuing Education programs is ad hoc and insufficient.
4. Coordination and monitoring of internships are inconsistent.

**Recommendations:**

1. The College should move ahead expeditiously with plans to hire an executive to oversee the extended college, educational partnerships, and other related educational activities.
2. There should be more supervision of College Now and generally more engagement between College Now and the academic departments that contribute to it.
3. The College should develop and strengthen assessment of certificate programs, where appropriate.
4. The Continuing Education programs should embrace learning assessment more systematically and comprehensively, beyond what they do for the sponsoring agencies.

---

1 The on-site administrator maintains a complete inventory of the relevant John Jay College and USMA documents necessary to keep students informed. John Jay MPA students at the West Point location are also permitted to use the U.S. Military Academy Library system, which is a federal government depository containing Congressional publications, military publications, and published documents from the U.S. Departments of State and Commerce.

2 The entire CUNY system uses Blackboard as its learning management system. It is hosted and maintained by highly specialized and dedicated Blackboard Inc. technicians and accessible 24/7 to all of our students and faculty. The four professional Blackboard support staff members at the College are well trained and available to support faculty and students during normal business hours. In addition, the College has access to a team of CUNY Blackboard support staff who collaborate closely with Blackboard Inc. technicians. Overall, the feedback we have received from our students and faculty has been very positive in terms of their experience with both our Blackboard system and distance education offerings.
Introduction

As assessment of student learning outcomes has grown into a ubiquitous and centrally important practice in American higher education over the past two decades, John Jay College was perhaps a bit behind the curve. This was, in effect, noted in the previous Middle States review in 2003 (Appendix 4.1). In recent years, however, John Jay has assigned outcomes assessment the priority it deserves, developing and putting in place College-wide assessment procedures that cover all undergraduate majors, graduate studies, and most other College-wide programs. Implementation of these procedures, including submission of 5-year assessment plans and inaugural collection of assessment data, began for many majors during the past three years. Assessment procedures for minors are well into the development phase, with measurement already begun for some programs and are to begin in 2012-13 for the rest. Concerted efforts to develop a culture of assessment at John Jay began in earnest with the Outcomes Assessment Plan (OAP, available in hardcopy only, Evidence Room), a significant piece of the “John Jay College Comprehensive Action Plan,” that the College adopted in March 2005. The OAP included student learning outcomes as one of the major foci of assessment and explicitly stressed as governing principles that, among other desiderata, outcomes assessment must 1) be ongoing and embedded in John Jay’s academic and institutional culture, 2) involve faculty (and other college and community constituencies) in a meaningful and wide-ranging way, and 3) be goal-oriented with objectives and goals that are clearly stated, measureable, and well-connected to strategic planning and the College mission.

Creating a Culture of Assessment

Guided by the OAP, the College has created academic and administrative environments in which assessment is a top priority. The College has created positions (and hired assessment-savvy individuals to fill them) specifically to help drive a culture of assessment (e.g., the Associate Provost for Institutional Effectiveness; the Director of Outcomes Assessment). In administrative hires over the past half-decade, it has also sought individuals with a background in assessment (e.g., the Dean of Undergraduate Studies).

John Jay has a Campus-Wide Assessment Committee (CWAC) empowered to coordinate assessment efforts for both student learning and institutional effectiveness, promote assessment activities and an assessment culture across campus through dissemination of information and best practices, and commission and receive assessment plans and reports from academic and other departments. Of 10 CWAC regular members, 7 are faculty distributed across the humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences.

The majority presence of faculty members on the CWAC is one important indication of a large faculty role in outcomes assessment at John Jay College. Widespread and meaningful faculty immersion in a culture of assessment can also be seen in the leadership of department chairs, graduate program directors, and major coordinators in developing assessments within the undergraduate majors and graduate programs, in generally large assessment committees in academic departments, in a required identification of learning objectives in syllabi and new
course proposals across the curriculum, and in the energy with which faculty members across
the College have facilitated ongoing assessment efforts in many of their courses.

The varied assessment methods being used will be described in some detail later, but first we
should note some additional ways in which learning outcomes assessment has been embraced
by the College faculty and now permeates and informs pedagogical and curricular activities. The
Undergraduate Curriculum and Standards Committee (UCASC) began using, in 2011, a new
form and template for the submission of proposals for new courses and revisions of existing
courses. Course proposals now must explicitly articulate learning objectives for the course and
how they will be assessed. At monthly meetings of this critical committee of 30 faculty members
that makes recommendations on curriculum matters at the College, discussion and review of
course proposals now very frequently include discussion and debate about student learning
objectives and outcomes. Requests for revisions of proposals by the committee often involve
more consideration of learning objectives. At the course level, it is now required that all course
syllabi—campus wide—include learning objectives framed in terms of student outcomes
expressed in behaviors, skills, perspectives, and knowledge gains. The learning objectives must
be related to at least a subset of the learning outcomes articulated for the umbrella major,
which, themselves, have been developed for every major at the College as part of the charge to
create and enact an assessment plan. Templates for undergraduate and graduate program
review were also updated to give more prominence to learning outcomes assessment. Finally,
most five-year assessment plans are intentionally linked to the scheduling of the five-year
program review, so that a complete cycle of assessment informs the multi-year comprehensive
program review.

An important part of the culture of assessment is an awareness of institutional learning goals,
which we have begun to map vertically to the learning goals in programs, courses, and extra-
curricular activities, and horizontally across the divisions of Academic Affairs and Student
Affairs. Our aim is to promote an alignment of effort across the College to reinforce in as many
learning experiences as possible the principles and educational goals embodied in our Mission,
Vision Statement, and program of General Education. The formal effort to foster an
institutional perspective on learning in very specific ways is just beginning at the College now
that assessment has been firmly established within degree programs; we assessed most
institutional learning goals via the General Education assessment exercise in fall 2012 (see
General Education Assessment Pilot Study, p. 88).

Outcomes Assessment at the Department Level: Who Does it and How?

Assessment programs focused on student learning outcomes are in place and active for all
undergraduate majors (See Appendix 10.1) and graduate programs (See Appendix 10.2
offered at John Jay College (as well as for several college-wide programs, such as the First-Year
Experience Learning Communities). Each department has developed, administers, updates, and
expands its own assessment program. Most departments have standing assessment committees
comprised of elected faculty members. Two-thirds of these committees have five or more faculty
members. In some of the smaller departments, the entire faculty comprises an “assessment
committee” that works on student learning assessment. Virtually all of the departmental
assessment committees were established in 2009 or later. Progress and action began quite
recently, but the College faculty has rapidly picked up the ball of assessment and run
productively and widely (i.e., involving many faculty members) with it.

In a December 2011 survey, department chairs commonly reported that assessment results are
distributed to all department faculty members and discussed at department meetings. Chairs
agreed that assessment data are discussed with the goals of identifying strong and weak areas of student learning, raising awareness of learning goals, and homing in on ways to modify syllabi, assessment instruments, and teaching coverage/methods to improve weak areas in the major curriculum.

Examination of departmental outcomes assessment plans and activities reveals the specific ways in which assessment is carried out at the College, the learning objectives and goals identified for assessment, and the philosophies behind the plans. Reports of outcomes assessment plans and assessments conducted in the past couple of years are included for all majors and graduate programs in the Assessment Committee organization site on Blackboard. Here we provide a brief analysis of the learning objectives across the spectrum of John Jay degree programs. In turn, illustrations of how learning outcomes for those objectives are being assessed by faculty are presented and then followed by discussion of some of the findings about achievement of outcomes and how the findings are being used to reshape and improve curriculum and pedagogy at John Jay College.

**Learning Outcomes in Goals and Objectives**

Learning outcomes in B.A. programs emphasize discipline-specific research skills, while those in B.S. programs highlight practical applications. All departments, of course, give a primary focus to student acquisition of a knowledge base in the major discipline. Demonstrable appreciation of ethics is included as a learning objective in most departments’ assessment plans and philosophies. Importantly, 20 of the 24 departments report that they aim to assess their success at educating “the whole student,” including writing and communication and critical thinking/analytical skills among the student learning outcomes of interest. Nineteen of the 24 mention learning outcomes on skills and knowledge dimensions relevant to entry into graduate/professional school, major-related careers, or both. In graduate programs, expectations for learning are more demanding in order to prepare Master’s students to become practitioners or independent researchers in the chosen field.

**Learning Outcomes Measured in Undergraduate Studies**

In all departments, direct assessments of the learning outcomes are being conducted in specific major courses. About half of the departments are assessing all or most of their courses in a multi-year assessment cycle using a rubric that matches specific courses to specific learning objectives or sub-objectives emphasized in those courses. A quarter of the departments are limiting assessment to three to six required major courses. The remaining department plans concentrate initially at least on a single course, usually a senior-level capstone course.

In 2011, which was the first year for most departmental assessment cycles, and the year during which most departments administered their first-ever formal assessment of learning outcomes, assessment reports were submitted for 17 majors and minors. All but two of the assessments focused on a single course, which was a capstone course in 13 of the 15 cases. A capstone course is a sensible choice for initiating an assessment plan, given that students should have achieved most or all of a major’s learning objectives by the time they complete the course, and their work in the course should reflect those achievements. In assessing outcomes among capstone students, departments invariably examined the final capstone project, which was typically a research paper or integrative literature review (or a poster presentation in the case of Forensic Science). In all cases, projects were evaluated against a faculty-developed rubric that described, for each of the major learning objectives or sub-objectives, what would constitute evidence, essentially, of exceeding, meeting, approaching, and failing to meet a learning outcome (or
comparable labels). Frequently, faculty members other than the instructor were recruited to read and rate individual student papers or other projects. Some departments opted for different or additional indices of outcome achievement. Economics, for example, administered an in-class essay exam in a capstone course and graded the essays in terms of its learning objectives rubric. Economics also administered a survey of self-reported knowledge to capstone students. Sociology, the department that offers the Criminology major, in addition to reviewing term papers in the senior seminar, administered a multiple-choice “diagnostic test” to senior seminar students designed to gauge the extent to which learning goals related to theory and methods were being met. Political Science supplemented its comprehensive assessment of capstone papers with insights gleaned from Political Science majors’ ratings in the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE, see below) of the extent to which their major courses helped them achieve learning objectives associated with independent research, effective writing, reading, and making judgments.

Because the program was new, the interdisciplinary faculty associated with the Gender Studies major opted to focus at the beginning rather than near the end of students’ involvement in the major. Sample papers and final exams from Gender Studies 101 were evaluated in terms of the learning outcomes identified for that major. Outcomes assessment for the Global History major was also focused on lower level courses, in this case three 200-level survey courses covering global history from prehistory to the present. Assessment carried out for the Africana Studies minor was focused on learning objectives associated with written communication skills and conducted in 100-level courses in Ethnic Studies.

All in all, the initial assessments of majors by departments broadly covered the major learning domains described previously. Knowledge of theories and concepts was assessed in 12 assessments, applications in 11, research skills in 11, critical thinking and reasoning in 13, and communication in 13. Most assessments addressed at least four of these five domains. Almost none, however, covered domains of ethical reasoning (only 1) and diversity (only 1). Findings from assessing the outcomes in the capstone experience provided the context for follow-up studies in 200- and 300-level courses.

In addition to majors, several cross-disciplinary and College-wide programs were targets of initial assessments in 2011-12. These included the College’s Writing Program, in which portfolios from English 101 were scored on written communication objectives, and the Interdisciplinary Studies Program, in which the focus was on reading, writing, and critical-thinking objectives. Two programs for first-year students, the First Year Experience (FYE) Learning Communities and First-Year Seminar, both of which involve small seminar-based classes with considerable faculty-student and student-student interaction, were also assessed. The FYE learning communities’ assessment focused on students’ ability to apply critical thinking and research skills in the discipline-specific course,1 as well as to meet the objective of writing about research and using evidence to support claims. The First-Year Seminar assessment examined students’ electronic portfolios and focused on specific objectives for the course associated with clarifying goals, growing intellectually, using resources, and successfully collaborating on a project. Thus, when John Jay College invests in and establishes programs that are intended to enrich learning and the college learning experience, these programs are not merely assumed to be effective and beneficial. The realization of these programs’ aspirations is being empirically examined via outcomes assessment.

Although only a few assessment reports to date have consulted them, it bears mentioning that indirect assessments of how students are faring on identified learning outcomes are in the
assessments plans of more than three-quarters of the departments. These include Office of Institutional Research surveys, department-created surveys, and students’ grades.

**How Students are Faring on Outcomes Measures: Early Returns**

Evidence of the extent to which learning objectives are being realized at John Jay College can be gleaned from a number of sources. These include the results reported for the major and program assessments just described, and to which we will turn shortly, as well as from indirect indices. Indirect evidence of student achievement in writing ability—a general education outcome essentially shared by all majors—comes from students’ performance on the CUNY Proficiency Exam (CPE) and from their self-reports of academic activities and accomplishments on the NSSE. The CPE assesses students’ writing ability upon completion of between 45 and 60 credits toward their baccalaureate degrees. The percentage of John Jay students passing this exam has consistently exceeded 80% over the past six years and has been approximately equal to the all-CUNY percentage. For example, in fall 2010 (the last semester in which the CPE was administered before being discontinued by CUNY), 1,524 John Jay students took the exam and 83.9% of them passed (compared to 84.8% of all CUNY students).

Suggestive indirect evidence of achievement on the meta-outcomes of “practical competence” and “integrative thinking” can be gleaned from students’ self-reports of academic activities and accomplishments on the NSSE. *Practical competence* is an inclusive concept that relates to the following learning-outcome domains: acquiring job/work related knowledge/skills, analyzing quantitative problems, using computers/information-technology, working effectively with others, and solving complex real-world problems. Converted to a 100-point scale, the mean practical competence scores of the first-year and senior John Jay students who completed the NSSE in the Spring of 2012 were 65 and 66, respectively. These scores translate to a point of self-perception about halfway between “some” and “quite a bit,” and compare favorably to the score reported by first-year peers. The senior score is essentially the same as our regional peers and within a few points of our national peers.

The *integrative thinking* score combines ratings of course-related skills and activities such as critical thinking, reflexive thinking, and application, and includes working on a project that required integrating material from various sources, including diverse perspectives in class assignments. Mean integrative thinking scores were 64 and 70 for the first-year and senior John Jay samples, respectively. Both groups reported a higher frequency of such activities than did all their peer groups.

The 2012 NSSE data clearly indicate that, at least in the eyes of students, coursework at John Jay College involves ample learning experiences and activities that incorporate and foster learning outcomes that define higher education and are identified in our learning objectives. This perception is pretty much borne out by perusal of course syllabi across the curriculum and the coursework and experiences they describe, and, indeed, by the assessment data collected by the academic departments.

What about those departmental assessments of learning outcomes in the majors? As described previously, student learning outcomes were assessed in courses covering a number of majors and other programs in 2010, 2011, and 2012. Do they provide evidence that objectives for student learning are being achieved? In one sense, the answer is unequivocally “yes.” On every learning objective, in every class examined, a substantial percentage of the students (never fewer than 20% and sometimes more than 90%) earned at least a “satisfactory,” “acceptable,” or
“meets expectations” rating for their work. Almost never did a student paper, poster, essay, or exam utterly fail or receive less than a rating of “approaches expectations.” Obviously, it is unlikely that any students could have produced work that met faculty standards in outcomes-related domains in the absence of their academic experiences at John Jay College.

More meaningful questions that we can examine with the still relatively thin slice of assessment data now available include 1) how well objectives are being achieved and 2) whether some objectives are being better accomplished than others. The answers vary from major to major, but a modest general pattern emerged: students typically meet or exceed expectations on knowledge and application dimensions, but are less likely (with some departmental exceptions) to have achieved satisfactory or mastery levels in the domains of research, critical thinking and analysis, and communication skills (especially written). Given the results of the recent general education assessments (see Chapter Eight), this comes as no surprise; the relatively weak results in general education skills underscore the need for our new General Education program and of efforts to connect it with the majors. It is true that some departments reported more positive outcomes than others. The full spectrum of achievement of learning objectives can be gleaned from summaries of outcomes for the various majors. Some of these, described first, reveal remarkably high levels of achievement.

Criminal Justice B.S. Positive evidence of achieving learning objectives was abundant in the review of capstone papers. From 64% to 79% of the papers were rated above average or excellent (four or five on a five-point scale) on dimensions of knowledge, integration, critical analysis, and organization/clarity.

Economics. On the one-hour in-class essay administered to capstone seniors, no one scored a “failure” on any learning objective. To the contrary, from 72% to 93% were rated good or excellent (four or five on a five-point scale) on four dimensions involving knowledge (identification and description of economic issues), critical thinking (analysis of economic information), application (recommend solutions), and written communication. Students were lacking—but still generally satisfactory—only on the objective identified as “demonstrating diversity of thought” (i.e., understood alternative theoretical perspectives).

Public Administration. Faculty review of papers in two capstone courses revealed that at least 75% of the students met or exceeded departmental expectations in domains related to knowledge (“argumentation”), application, and communication (“organization”).

Assessments in other majors also showed solid achievement of learning objectives, but revealed some areas of less robust achievement.

Police Science. Thirty randomly selected final papers in the major’s capstone course were reviewed, with the faculty reviewers concluding that virtually all papers were at least satisfactory on dimensions related to knowledge, critical thinking/analysis, application, and communication. However, a large percentage of students were rated only “average” on the first three dimensions, suggesting considerable room for improvement.

Criminology. On a diagnostic objective test of learning outcomes associated with knowledge/theory and research dimensions, only 20% and 30%, respectively, of students in a capstone course met or exceeded expectations. Seventy percent and 80%, though, at least approached expectations. On their final capstone papers, depending on the dimension, 50% to 94% met or exceeded expectations concerning knowledge, thinking/analysis, application, and written communication dimensions. The Sociology department concluded that it has a “need to
address the students’ grasp of key criminological literatures, theoretical and methodological concepts.”

*Political Science.* Review of the papers in a capstone course according to department standards showed that only about a third of the students’ papers were satisfactory on a dimension labeled “independent research,” which included ability to form and test a hypothesis and report, analyze, and interpret results. For the objectives of “effective writing” and “reasoned judgments,” students evinced better outcomes. About 60% were at least satisfactory and about a third of the papers were exceptional in these domains.

Finally, the data reported for several majors, while not indicative of a failure to achieve learning outcomes at any level, do suggest that outcomes are not being widely achieved at a level that the faculty defines as desirable or satisfactory.

*Cultural and Deviance Studies.* Faculty scoring of the final paper in a capstone course, Anthropology 450, yielded an average student score greater than four on a five-point scale on the dimension of “experience in carrying out a research project.” Yet the same students averaged 2.86 and 2.67 on communication and critical-analysis dimensions (where two = “shows little skill”).

*Global History.* Ratings on knowledge-, analysis-, and written-communication-related learning objectives of 850 papers in three 200-level courses revealed that at least 75% of the papers failed to meet departmental expectations for at least one learning objective. The majority of students reached only minimal mastery (two on a five-point scale) on “organization of argument,” “explanation of argument,” and “historical context.” But a majority of students exceeded minimal mastery for “pertinence of thesis” and “mechanics.”

*Forensic Psychology.* Fourteen writing assignments in a capstone course were evaluated on a subset of the Psychology Department’s goals for the major, including those relevant to knowledge, research, critical thinking/argumentation, and written communication. Using a four-level scale (rudimentary, developing, proficient, advanced), and admittedly using a very high, “professional standard,” the faculty raters placed the majority of students at the “developing” or “rudimentary” levels for each of the learning goals. “Proficient” was achieved by anywhere from 14% to 43% of students across the five goals; only a single instance of “advanced” was recorded.

Some mention may also be made of learning outcomes observed in the inaugural assessments of College-wide programs noted previously, which mainly involved students in their first or early years at John Jay College. For the Writing Program, the review of English 101 portfolios found that most students scored at or near “some proficiency” on all categories of writing identified on the rubric developed for the program. This is at least suggestive that the program is helpful in moving students toward proficiency after completing the first course in a two-course sequence.

Outcomes assessment of the FYE Learning Communities (LC) program was concentrated on students enrolled in the writing course, and compared LC students and non-LC students in eight categories of written communication (e.g., writing about research, writing about claims and evidence, writing conventions, rhetoric and style in writing, sentence fluency, etc.). Evidence for special efficacy of the LC experience was modest. Although LC students tended to score higher than non-LC students in most of the categories, the difference was reliable for only a single category (conventions). Typically, LC students scored at the “some proficiency” level, but some reached “exceeds proficiency”—an outcome that was never observed for non-LC students.
Finally, assessment in the First-Year Seminar program suggests that virtually all program participants minimally “approach expectations” on all four dimensions examined. However, fewer than half of the students were scored as “meets expectations” in the domains of “Resources” and “Collaboration.”

**Using Outcomes Assessment Data about the Majors**

As the foregoing survey of assessment results shows, a great deal of assessment of learning outcomes has taken place in the last couple of years. What we have learned has been rich and varied, with evidence of achievement of learning objectives present in all of the assessments, but to differing degrees across majors and across outcomes. Of course, documenting achievement of learning objectives is but one important purpose of assessment. An even more important purpose is to inform and guide teaching practice, curriculum revision, and course development in order to reach higher and more inclusive levels of student achievement of the learning goals we hold for them. So how are outcomes assessment data being used for this purpose across campus?

One ubiquitous consequence of assessment efforts in the majors and College-wide programs has been that learning objectives and their achievement is part of the conversation in all academic departments at John Jay. All the departments report that they have included discussion of assessment data in their meeting agendas, often with a specific focus on how courses, curricula, or both, might be revised or re-imagined to improve learning outcomes. At least one department had a formal retreat to discuss its assessment results. The First-Year Seminar program coordinators conducted a workshop for faculty members teaching in the program that targeted for discussion the two learning domains in which the assessment found most students lacking. The assessment committees of most departments have made recommendations for teaching and curriculum, as well as for improving the assessment instruments and scoring rubrics, based on careful reviews of assessment data.

One frequent focus of the recommendations has been the written communication dimension. Assessment results have drawn attention to shortcomings in ability to research and write about substantive content in the major, and a number of departments have discussed ways of rectifying this, such as by requiring more writing, providing more and clearer guidelines about writing, front-loading writing-intensive courses earlier in the majors’ course sequence, and making better use of library instructional resources.

Another frequent focus has been on using fewer adjunct faculty members and more full-time, content-specialized faculty members in courses that have learning objectives involving broad and deep academic knowledge and research experience/expertise. Still other recommendations have involved new courses and altered emphases in the coverage and assignments of courses. Simply put, assessment results have stimulated widespread and meaningful discussion and suggestions of what faculty members do in the classroom and, more important, what they expect and guide their students to do.

Space limitations prevent reviewing in detail all the specific actions that departments have taken in response to outcomes assessments, but some notable examples are briefly described here. Perhaps the most extensive response to its assessment results has been made by Political Science. This department has formally proposed revisions to its major that include changes driven by its outcomes assessment in conjunction with a self-study and an external review. Noting in its assessment the poor showing of capstone students on a dimension identified as
“independent research,” Political Science has designed a required 200-level research course that will introduce its majors early on to research methods in Political Science and activities associated with creating research ideas, investigating and synthesizing the literature, designing and executing research, and writing about research. It was approved by governance and first offered in fall 2012. In addition, the capstone course for the major has been reconfigured to devote more time to developing a research project. Faculty members have been asked to incorporate assignments and lessons that involve synthesizing knowledge and writing about it across the curriculum. Finally, review of knowledge and application outcomes contributed in part to a restructuring of the major requirements so that five foundations course will be required (instead of four of five courses) and fewer courses outside of Political Science (e.g. history courses) will be required.

Consideration of the assessment results in a capstone course associated with the Criminology major has led the Sociology Department to prepare and distribute to its faculty specific recommendations (Appendix 10.3) regarding teaching plans of coverage and assignments that will help improve student learning outcomes on the dimensions associated with knowledge of theories and research in criminology. Recommendations were focused on both the capstone course and 200- and 300-level courses that should cover the essential disciplinary content. The assessment committee also recommended that Sociology faculty members take a greater role in teaching the statistics/methods course that is presently taught outside the department by an interdisciplinary team.

Economics was concerned with how its capstone students fared on the objective identified as “demonstrating diversity of thought,” which involves students’ breadth of knowledge and exposure to alternative theoretical perspectives in economics and their ability to incorporate diverse perspectives into their thinking. The department has recommended specific textbooks for the introductory course that better cover diverse theories and plans to require two new courses of majors. One will be dedicated to issues of “Diversity of Economic Thought”; the other will be a 200-level course entitled “Political Economy.” A 300-level course on “History of Economic Thought” will be revised and elevated to a required course.

In the Psychology Department, the assessment committee has initiated department-wide discussion about the content and assignments in its capstone courses and what the common denominators should be that define a capstone experience in the Forensic Psychology major. The assessment results are a central factor in this discussion. It is noteworthy that the extensive revision of the Forensic Psychology major that was proposed in 2009 and approved and implemented since then was developed in no small part by using as reference points the learning objectives that had been formally adopted by the department. (The department adopted and adapted learning objectives for the undergraduate psychology major that have been recommended by the American Psychological Association.) This is a good John Jay example of a cyclical process of curriculum development in which explicit learning objectives help shape a curriculum, which then is evaluated and possibly reshaped in terms of whether it is achieving those outcomes.

The Psychology Department also used an outcomes assessment strategy to help it determine whether its large psychology 101 (General Psychology) sections of up to 300 students, which were newly introduced in 2009, are as effective in promoting student outcomes in the knowledge domain as its traditional small sections of 40 or fewer students. Two semesters of comparing the large and small sections on a common assessment test revealed no section size effect on students’ performance.
One other response to outcomes assessment that might be noted is that of the History Department. In the 200-level Global History assessments, a majority of students demonstrated only minimal mastery at best on learning objectives associated with knowledge and communication domains such as “organization of argument,” “explanation of argument,” and “historical context.” History’s assessment committee introduced the idea that the academic preparation and aptitude of a substantial segment of the John Jay student population, as well as students’ assumptions about what learning outcomes are expected at the college level, need to be more extensively considered in the teaching practices and reading sources that are employed to achieve better learning outcomes. To improve learning, the department is actively discussing ways to adjust and adapt teaching across its major curriculum.

Graduate Program Assessment

Each Master’s program has developed and administers its own assessment plan with program faculty acting as an “assessment committee.” Reports of outcomes assessment plans and assessments for all graduate programs can be found in the Assessment Committee organization site on Blackboard (see Academic Programs: Graduate Studies), and a summary is in Appendix 10.2.

Learning Outcomes in Goals and Objectives. All but one graduate program delineate at least four learning objectives, with three specifying five objectives and one, seven. All programs place primary focus on student acquisition of a knowledge base in the field of study being covered. Two learning objectives for the MPA Program, for example, are that students will “lead and manage in public governance” and “articulate and apply a public service perspective.” In Forensic Mental Health Counseling, one learning objective is to “to prepare students to become professional mental health counselors.” And in the Criminal Justice Program, one learning objective is that “students should be able to explain theoretical and empirical findings about crime and the institutions of criminal justice.”

Several programs report that their learning objectives extend beyond the boundaries of specific fields of study to look at their success in educating students to work in an increasingly diverse and multicultural world. For example, one of the learning objectives of the International Crime & Justice Program is that “students will develop the necessary multicultural communication skills to enable them to advance their arguments effectively in academic and professional settings in the United States and abroad.”

Learning Outcomes Measured. All graduate programs are conducting direct assessments, especially in the culminating capstone course where we expect to see mastery of all learning goals. Programs generally examined the final capstone project that was typically some type of research paper or a professionally oriented project such as the policy project in the MPA program. In all cases, capstone papers/projects were evaluated against a faculty-developed rubric that described, for each learning objective or sub-objective, what would constitute evidence of exceeding, meeting, approaching, and failing to meet a learning objective. Frequently, faculty members other than the instructor were recruited to read and rate individual student projects/projects.

In two programs—Forensic Science and the MPA—indirect assessment methods were also used to assess student learning. Forensic Science conducted employer surveys, exit surveys, and student satisfaction surveys.
With the exception of the MPA, John Jay’s graduate programs are in the early stages of student learning assessment, but the results so far suggest that most students have achieved or exceeded expectations. Full results are available in the Blackboard Assessment Committee organization site.

Closing the Loop. All of John Jay’s graduate programs are using the results of their assessment findings to improve the curriculum and pedagogy. The primary action taken is revising courses (Forensic Science; Digital Forensics and Cybersecurity; Forensic Mental Health Counseling; and International Crime and Justice). Other actions include increasing or changing specific assignments in existing courses (Criminal Justice), providing support structures such as tutoring or special help sessions (MPA), and reevaluating whether the learning goal or expectations for performance on that goal are appropriate (Forensic Psychology).

Conclusion

Assessment of student learning has become a ubiquitous and central activity at John Jay College. Assessment plans, including articulated learning objectives for programs, as well as for specific courses, are in place in every major. Outcomes have been assessed, in many departments for the first time, for all of the College’s undergraduate majors and for many of its College-wide academic programs. Faculty involvement in assessment is widespread. Assistance and coordination of assessment efforts by administrative offices created or configured for the outcomes assessment mission has been increasingly forthcoming. Results of assessments, in general, suggest that learning objectives are being met, but not always to a degree that the faculty considers satisfactory. Appropriately, assessment data are already being used by departments to guide changes and improvements in both the curriculum and the classroom to better achieve learning objectives—not just to a satisfactory level, but to a superior level in some cases.

Although learning outcomes assessment is established at the College, the task remains of deepening it and extending it to every program where learning takes place. No longer “a bit behind the curve,” we are actively engaged with and taking advantage of assessment. There can be no doubt that, at John Jay College, a culture of assessment is very much in the making. Students’ current achievement of learning goals and objectives, already in evidence, can only be improved as efforts at defining and assessing outcomes give clarity about the goals and the pedagogical pathways to achieving them.

Strengths:

1. There are active assessment programs in all academic departments that cover all majors and graduate programs.
2. Faculty own the assessment of student learning and use it consistently for program improvement.
3. There is a College-Wide Assessment Committee designed to coordinate assessment across the campus.

Concerns:

1. Given that assessment has grown rapidly since 2010, there are many individuals and groups newly involved in developing, conducting, and monitoring assessment activity. It may take some time to clarify in practice the roles of each.
2. The College-Wide Assessment Committee has perhaps too many responsibilities.

Recommendations:

1. The College should sponsor and promote at least one meeting a year during which assessment practices are shared in a campus-wide forum.
2. The College should develop and strengthen assessment of minors, where appropriate.
3. The College-Wide Assessment Committee should monitor assessment activities across the campus in the interest of removing duplication and extraneous effort, and it should seek to reduce or streamline its own workload where possible.

---

1 Learning Communities are comprised of two linked courses, generally a skills course, such as composition, and a discipline-specific course, such as Sociology 101.
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Statements on John Jay as a Liberal Arts College

Plan for Investment in Academic Excellence at John Jay College, September 18, 2006:

John Jay “does not offer the liberal arts majors that characterize other first-rate baccalaureate institutions.”

“To become a world class educational institution, John Jay College of Criminal Justice must also reclaim its position as a liberal arts college with a broad array of mission and non-mission specific liberal arts majors.” p. 8

“The Investment Plan described in the following pages will allow John Jay College to seize this historic opportunity and become a world class liberal arts college...”

Report of the Committee on International Programs, 2006, p. 5:

John Jay is “a liberal arts college with a criminal justice focus...”

Middle States Monitoring Report, April 1, 2005, p. 2:

“Within the context of being, first and foremost, a liberal arts college, and providing our undergraduate students with an excellent liberal arts education, our vision is that John Jay College be the nationally and internationally recognized leader in education—including professional education—and research in criminal justice and related areas of public safety and public service.”

The second Investment Plan will build JJ into a “more internationally preeminent, academically rigorous, liberal arts educational institution, dedicated to educating for justice.” p. 3

In asking for additional support from CUNY in the form of a second Investment Plan, the College committed itself to a “Transformation to a Liberal Arts College.” p. 15

Periodic Review Report for Middle States Commission, June 1, 2008:

“The College is committed to becoming the pre-eminent academic institution in criminal justice and related fields and to making respectable contributions in the liberal arts.” p. 16

State of the College Address, President Travis, November, 2010:

“We are on our way to becoming a full liberal arts college, adding majors in English, Economics, Gender Studies and Global History, with a half dozen more liberal arts majors in the pipeline.”

Revitalizing the John Jay College of Criminal Justice Identity for the 21st Century,” Siegel and Gale, Findings Presentation, January 25, 2011, p. 47:

“John Jay has to overcome its reputation as a ‘vocational school’ by aggressively promoting
and dramatizing its transformation into a college with a fully developed liberal arts curriculum providing the foundation for a world class educational program exploring justice in modern society.”
Appendix 2.1

Actions in Response to KPMG Report

The current year recommendations included two findings related to property management: a discrepancy in the inventory tag number and the failure to write off and remove from the inventory system items that had not been found for several years. As indicated in the College response, we plan to address these issues by re-training staff and implementing a procedure for follow-up to ensure equipment is properly tagged and written off. The third finding was related to the delayed entry of a newly hired adjunct professor into the payroll system. The College explained that the delay was linked to an emergency appointment to replace a professor who could not teach courses as planned, and the College followed the University policy by awaiting University approval prior to entering the record in payroll. The status of two prior year recommendations was fully implemented. The other prior year recommendation was in progress.
# Appendix 3.1

## Disposition of Disciplinary Cases: Spring and Fall, 2012

### SPRING 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Integrity</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Violation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaint</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confrontation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disorderly Conduct</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harassment</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapon</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>54</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing Scheduled</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior Contract</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution Contract</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved by Director of Student Relations</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved by Dean of Students</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FALL 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Violation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrested</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaint</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confiscation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confrontation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disorderly Conduct</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harassment</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incident</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal Dispute</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior Contract</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediation Agreement</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution Contract</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Excerpts from MSCHE responses to decennial Self-Study and Periodic Review Report

July 1, 2003 – MSCHE report on the decennial review called for Monitoring Report follow-up:

- Development and implementation of a comprehensive institutional strategic plan which links planning to decision-making and budgeting processes
- Development and implementation of a comprehensive facilities master plan
- Development and implementation of a written plan for assessment including student learning outcomes and institutional effectiveness

Nov 21, 2008 – MSCHE accepted the PRR and asked for Progress Letter documenting:

- Continued development and implementation of the institution’s long-term financial plan and a budget process aligned with the institution’s mission, goals and strategic plan
- Continued implementation of comprehensive, integrated, and sustained processes to assess institutional effectiveness and the achievement of student learning outcomes
- Continued implementation of the institution’s comprehensive enrollment management plan
Appendix 4.2

Major Assessment Reports

1. **Performance Management Process Reports.** This is the CUNY-mandated set of measures that aligns with the CUNY Master Plan and assesses performance against a wide range of targets. The purpose is to subordinate college goals and activities to University goals; to hold colleges accountable; and to permit benchmarking against other units in CUNY.

2. **Master Plan Report Card.** The broad goals of the Master Plan cover many important activities at the College, but not all of them, since strategic plans typically focus on a limited number of areas that will receive added emphasis over the time period of the plan. The Master Plan sets the direction for the College and the Report Card informs the extended College community about its success and serves as one check on planning for the following year.

3. **Critical Functions Measures.** Many routine but vital functions—generating the academic schedule; monitoring faculty and staff satisfaction, financial ratios and other indicators; faculty and staff development; monitoring appropriate levels of staffing; and many others—do not typically receive attention in strategic plans, but they do contribute indispensably to institutional performance. A number of the Critical Functions Measures are the day-in and day-out indicators of institutional vitality; they define the pulse of the institution and many should be monitored for stability, not growth. About 20% of the Critical Functions Measures link to the Master Plan Report Card and about 30% to the PMP Year-End Report. While the list of critical functions is complete, the assignment of values to them is in progress and should be complete by the end of the spring 2013 semester.

4. **Assessment of Student Learning.** This is a realm unto itself and of course a vital measure of the critical function. Assessment allows us to improve teaching and learning continually as we use assessment results to feed back into curricular and pedagogical re-design.

5. **Administrative and Support unit Assessment Reports.** Many units of the College have an assessment plan with measures for success drawn from various sources.

6. **Academic Program Review.** This occurs for each degree program and department every five years. There is a [template](“Instrument for the Self-Evaluation of Majors and Academic Programs”) that spells out the categories of analysis. After preparing a self-study, the department invites an external reviewer to comment on the quality of the program. The results of the Program Reviews contribute to resource allocation decisions and pinpoint areas for improvement or emulation. The Reviews are important in overall academic planning.
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Examples of key goals and the assessment-driven strategies used to achieve them
(additional examples)

Goals Under Critical Choices:

*Attract Undergraduate Students with Stronger Academic Profiles.* Coming out of the Critical Choices decisions, we have set our sights on academically better prepared students. The transition just in terms of numbers was difficult to manage successfully, and it was all but impossible to think about recruiting more and better students at the same time. We have, however, recently begun to target higher SAT scores and GPA’s for our entering freshman class. The creation in 2010 of an Honors Program at the College has attracted a pool of strong applicants, and more dramatically the acceptance of John Jay as part of the CUNY Macaulay Honors College has attracted more than 60 highly prepared applicants for the entering class in 2013. To increase the effectiveness of our regular admissions process in terms of attracting academically stronger applicants, we have reviewed data for our previous applicants in terms of academic profile and high school. Based on that review we have shifted more of our recruiting resources to those schools with an SAT average of 950 or better and a college academic average of 83 or better. We increased the number of target schools visited by 17% and decreased by 60% the number of schools that had yielded primarily conditionally accepted students. Moreover, we added 50 new schools which we had never visited before.

ASQ data tells us that non-enrolling accepted students think of John Jay as “intellectual” or “challenging” to a much lesser extent than students who do enroll. Whether a student chooses John Jay or not, we want to convey to everyone that John Jay is a place where serious students will be challenged intellectually. Our latest marketing pieces (available in Evidence Room) emphasize campus activities that will appeal to students with serious academic interests; in addition to the Honors Program we feature opportunities for undergraduate research, BA/MA joint programs, “cutting edge academic programs with award-winning faculty,” internships, the Pre-Law Institute to help prepare for law school, and graduate school preparation.

We were modestly successful in raising the academic profile of the class entering in fall 2012 by creating aggressive communications and activity programs for students who applied earlier and who tend to be the better prepared students. The same approach will be used for the entering class in 2013, and additional groups of students will be targeted. Looking at the results of these very specific efforts, and making adjustments based on them, will be the key to improving their effectiveness.

*Strengthen the Liberal Arts.* While we have negotiated the most challenging part of the Critical Choices Agenda—moving to an all baccalaureate population without a precipitous drop in enrollment—the next leg of the journey will be to fulfill the promise of our new liberal arts degrees. Since we hired many liberal arts faculty, we have the capacity and certainly the desire to grow them. More students in strong liberal arts programs are critical to supporting our mission of “educating for justice.” In any case, with more than 2,000 students in the Criminal Justice B.S. program, we are fast approaching the point where we simply will not be able to
serve those students effectively, even without potentially many more from the Justice Academy.\(^1\) We seek to re-channel some of that demand toward the liberal arts by showing students that the path to a career in criminal justice need not begin with a degree in criminal justice.\(^2\) To raise the numbers of liberal arts students we will have to alter the perception of John Jay (“we are not a ‘cop shop’") and to make the connection between the liberal arts and John Jay. Data from the ASQ\(^3\) and from the National Student Clearinghouse show that we lose many students to schools known for their liberal arts and professional programs, like Hunter and Brooklyn. We are not aiming to replicate those institutions by any means, but we do want to get out the word that the liberal arts are thriving and distinctive at John Jay. Thus, the fall 2012 edition of “JusticeMatters” featured a cover story on liberal arts majors at John Jay. The official opening of the extensive science labs in the new building, complete with high school principals, their students, and endorsements from public officials, was featured prominently on the website. Both steps were part of a major marketing campaign begun in late 2012, one built around the recent rebranding of the College, and we will watch the enrollment data carefully through the spring and summer to see if we have been successful with our new approach. We have a target of recruiting 700 freshmen and transfer students in fall 2014 (out of about 2,000 new undergraduates) who will come to John Jay with the intention of majoring in the liberal arts.

Goals under PMP and Master Plan:

*Improve Administrative Efficiency and Effectiveness.* As the Master Plan (and Report Card) and PMP Year-End Report show, we follow and respond to a series of metrics related to administrative efficiency and effectiveness.

A broad indicator for administrative efficiency is the percentage of expenditures for administration (general administration, general institutional services, maintenance and operations—everything but instructional activities). PMP data allows us to confirm that our efforts have been successful by comparison with the other Senior Colleges. John Jay consistently has the lowest proportion among the senior colleges:

---

\(^1\) Given the sheer numbers, we are thinking about raising the GPA required to enter the Criminal Justice B.S.—since that’s the target program for nearly all the Justice Academy transfers—but such an important decision needs to be informed by the best data possible. Even without the Justice Academy there are too many students in the Criminal Justice B.S. program; a smaller program would serve the students more effectively. There is no precedent at John Jay for a differential admission requirement to a degree program, and hence this discussion may have consequences for other programs as well.

\(^2\) Visits to “communities of practice” have confirmed this observation, as we discuss below.

\(^3\) ASQ data tells us that only 22% of the students accepted at both Hunter and John Jay, and attending one of them, come to John Jay. The corresponding figure for Brooklyn College is 25%.
The Division of Finance and Administration maintains Key Performance Indicators (KPI’s) across its functions, which often figure in the performance appraisal process for Directors. Some of the data is for reporting purposes to external organizations, but all of it potentially becomes the basis for program improvement. KPI data, along with results from the Division’s Customer Service Survey and Employee Engagement Survey drive decisions and actions. See examples.

**Improve Student Satisfaction.** Local surveys conducted over the past two years reveal very high levels of student satisfaction. Student surveys allow us to assess our performance, and we have taken advantage of that fact, and of the student tech fee, to enhance computer services for students. For the most recent survey, John Jay ranks number 1 among the CUNY Senior colleges in three of the four areas and tied for number three in the remaining one. John Jay has consistently done well in student satisfaction. That may be explained in part by the fact that in recent years a higher proportion of JJ students (60-67%) were attending their first choice school than were students at other CUNY campuses: students who come to John Jay really want to come to John Jay.

---

4 See pages 55, 56, 57, and 75, PMP, 2011-12 Year-End University Report, Final.
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Analysis of Early Start, Retention, Course Completion, and Credit Accumulation
(based on reports from Undergraduate Studies)

Early Start began at John Jay in summer 2010. Targeted at students who are admitted to the College but with profiles suggesting they will not succeed without support, the program provides an enriched academic and social environment beginning in the summer before freshman matriculation. The program continues into the fall semester in the form of individual and group consultation toward a portfolio, group research project, or as a credit-bearing second course. Even without the latter, students stayed in the same cohort and continued to work together with the supervision of their summer faculty. The “summer-into-fall” program structure allowed students to get an early start on one general education requirement for fall credit, giving them the ability to take fewer classes in the fall while still maintaining a healthy pace of credit accumulation.

The program so far has yielded quite dramatic results (see tables below) in terms of retention, course completion, and credit accumulation, but the outcomes are relatively short-term to date, and the program is fairly expensive. The Dean of Undergraduate Studies has won a CUNY grant to study aspects of the program to determine which parts have the greatest consequences for student success.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Students Enrolled</th>
<th>Passed Course</th>
<th>Passed Course with C or better</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Early Start (N)</td>
<td>Early Start (%)</td>
<td>Institution-wide+ (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>ENG 101</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>91.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ENG 101</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>95.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>92.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 2011</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>95.24%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>ENG 101</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>92.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 2012</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>95.97%</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>95.03%</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 Fall Term of Entry</td>
<td>One-Semester Retention Rate</td>
<td>One-Year Retention Rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EARLY START FRESHMEN</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>90.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG101 Conditional Admits</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG101 Baccalaureate Admits</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>88.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL FIRST-TIME FRESHMEN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottom Quartile</td>
<td>91.1</td>
<td>78.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second quartile</td>
<td>91.6</td>
<td>77.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third quartile</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Quartile</td>
<td>89.7</td>
<td>79.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 Fall Term of Entry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Credits earned in First Year (Summer ’11 included)</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EARLY START FRESHMEN</td>
<td>Eng101 Conditional Admits</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG101 Baccalaureate Admits</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL FIRST-TIME FRESHMEN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottom quartile</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second quartile</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third quartile</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top quartile</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 5.1

Targets for Full-time Advising Staff and Student Coverage (Group Advising)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>Fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Prof.</td>
<td>Prof. Staff</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Staff</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Time</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td></td>
<td>92%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Semester</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 7.1

Retention and Graduation Rates for Transfer Students

**One-year Retention Rate:** Percentage of full-time transfers into baccalaureate programs still enrolled in the college of transfer entry one year later (or earned degree pursued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Entering Class of Fall 2006</th>
<th>Entering Class of Fall 2007</th>
<th>Entering Class of Fall 2008</th>
<th>Entering Class of Fall 2009</th>
<th>Entering Class of Fall 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Jay</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>77.4</td>
<td>81.7</td>
<td>78.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior College</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>77.0</td>
<td>77.4</td>
<td>79.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Two-year Retention Rate:** Percentage of full-time transfers into baccalaureate programs still enrolled in the college of transfer entry two years later (or earned degree pursued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Entering Class of Fall 2005</th>
<th>Entering Class of Fall 2006</th>
<th>Entering Class of Fall 2007</th>
<th>Entering Class of Fall 2008</th>
<th>Entering Class of Fall 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Jay</td>
<td>66.9</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>71.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior College</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>68.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Four-Year Graduation Rate:** Percentage of full-time transfers into baccalaureate programs who graduated from the college of transfer entry within four years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Entering Class of Fall 2003</th>
<th>Entering Class of Fall 2004</th>
<th>Entering Class of Fall 2005</th>
<th>Entering Class of Fall 2006</th>
<th>Entering Class of Fall 2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Jay</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>52.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior College</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Six-Year Graduation Rate:** Percentage of full-time transfers into baccalaureate programs who graduated from the college of transfer entry within six years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Entering Class of Fall 2001</th>
<th>Entering Class of Fall 2002</th>
<th>Entering Class of Fall 2003</th>
<th>Entering Class of Fall 2004</th>
<th>Entering Class of Fall 2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Jay</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>60.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior College</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>57.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All data from “Performance Management Report, 2011-12 Year-End University Report Final,” July 10, 2012. Only in the most recent year was John Jay listed among the CUNY senior colleges.
# Appendix 8.1

## Faculty Workshops for New General Education

### FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

UGS is offering a series of faculty workshops to support our new general education curriculum. Faculty will receive stipends at the NTA rate for participation. Please RSVP to ugsfacdev@jjay.cuny.edu as soon as possible. The schedule is printed below. Contact Anne Lopes at alopes@jjay.cuny.edu or 212.484.1347 if you have any questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title/Facilitator</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>March</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anne Lopes</td>
<td>1:30-2:50</td>
<td>1:30-2:50</td>
<td>1:30-2:50</td>
<td>1:30-2:50</td>
<td>1:30-2:50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Making the Best of Student Papers</strong></td>
<td>Mon 2/25</td>
<td>Thu 3/7</td>
<td>Tue 4/9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betsy Gitter</td>
<td>2:50-4:05</td>
<td>1:30-2:50</td>
<td>2:50-4:05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Culturally Responsive Teaching and Student Academic Success</strong></td>
<td>Mon 3/11</td>
<td>Wed 4/17</td>
<td>Thu 5/2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Velazquez-Torres</td>
<td>1:30-2:50</td>
<td>2:50-4:05</td>
<td>2:50-4:05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Developing Curriculum at the 100, 200, 300, 400 and Capstone Levels</strong></td>
<td>Wed 4/17</td>
<td>Wed 5/1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Velazquez-Torres</td>
<td>1:30-2:50</td>
<td>1:30-2:50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Addressing the Writing Outcome in General Education Courses</strong></td>
<td>Wed 2/27</td>
<td>Tues 3/19</td>
<td>Thu 4/11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tara Pauliny/Writing Fellows</td>
<td>1:30-2:50</td>
<td>1:30-2:50</td>
<td>2:50-4:05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effective Feedback for Writing Assignments</strong></td>
<td>Tues 3/5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tara Pauliny/Writing Fellows</td>
<td>2:50-4:05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Integrating and Scaffolding Information Literacy Skills in Assignments</strong></td>
<td>Thu 2/21</td>
<td>Wed 3/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marta Bladek and Colleagues</td>
<td>2:50-4:05</td>
<td>1:30-2:50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Integrating Critical Reasoning Skills across the Curriculum</strong></td>
<td>Wed 3/6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James DiGiovanna</td>
<td>1:30-2:50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Developing Assignments to Meet General Education Learning Goals</strong></td>
<td>Tue 2/26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea Balis</td>
<td>1:30-2:50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reading across the Curriculum</strong></td>
<td>Tue 3/5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Davis</td>
<td>1:30-2:50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessing Oral Communication Skills</strong></td>
<td>Thu 3/14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dara Byrne</td>
<td>1:30-2:50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching with Learning Outcomes for General Education</strong></td>
<td>Mon 3/4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Lopes</td>
<td>1:30-2:50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RSVP to ugsfacdev@jjay.cuny.edu

OFFICE OF UNDERGRADUATE STUDIES  
999 TENTH AVENUE ROOM 532  
212.484.1347  
WWW.JJAY.CUNY.EDU/UNDERGRADUATESTUDIES
Appendix 9.1

Monitoring Certificate Programs

Since fall 2012, a staff person in Graduate Studies has been assigned to strengthen the implementation and administration of the certificate programs by working with Graduate Admissions and Enrollment Management to make sure that students are formally admitted to the certificate programs and coded accordingly. This will improve communication with students and make it possible to advise them and track their progress. A formal graduation audit process will be implemented for all advanced graduate certificate programs in spring, 2013. In addition, initiatives have been taken to have a centralized and accurate web appearance for the certificate programs for current and prospective students.

With respect to assessment, graduate programs in Criminal Justice, Digital Forensics and Cybersecurity, Forensic Psychology, and Public Administration have been instructed to include their respective certificate programs in assessment efforts. To date, an assessment plan has been outlined for the Post Graduate Certificate in Forensic Psychology, and the Digital Forensics and Cybersecurity MS program has included assessment of its Certificate of Applied Digital Forensic Science in its assessment plan.
# Appendix 10.1

## Undergraduate Majors Assessment Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Comprehensive Program Self-Study &amp; External Review</th>
<th>Assessment Plan</th>
<th>Assessed all Goals</th>
<th>Multiple Tools / Courses</th>
<th>Outcomes Report</th>
<th>Use of Results (Sample Actions in Response to Findings from Learning Assessment Studies, Self-study and External Review)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CIS</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Review prerequisites and key concepts. Major revision in progress, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrections</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Scaffold writing assignments. Attention to writing &amp; research skills at 200/300 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crim Just Mgmt</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Major revised 2010. Align rubric and assignments with LOs. Integrate LOs in syllabi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics(^3)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Revise LOs. &amp; rubric.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English(^3)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Curriculum revision in process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Emergency</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1 out of 5</td>
<td>capstone</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Replace course requirements. Revise capstone course. Major revised in 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Science</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1 out of 4</td>
<td>capstone</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Restructured 200 level assignments. Align 100 level outcomes to LOs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forensic Science</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Review LOs. Redesign rubric. Update syllabus guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Studies(^3)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Revise LOs. &amp; rubric. Scaffold writing and research assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global History(^3)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4 out of 5</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Restructure 200 level assignments. Align 100 level outcomes to LOs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int Crim Justice</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>New Methods course. Align LOs and materials in intro course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law &amp; Society(^3)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Assess 200 course as measure of progress toward program LOs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy(^3)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2 out of 6</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Assessment planning. Tracking students in the minor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Admin.</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Major revised in 2010. Revise LOs &amp; map. Align LOs and pedagogy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Mgmt.</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1 out of 5</td>
<td>capstone</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Major revised in 2012.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. A check mark represents the use of multiple measures or the assessment of program goals in multiple courses; otherwise the specific assessment context is indicated.
3. New Program. Self-study and external review not applicable.
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## Graduate Program Assessment Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Comprehensive Program Self-Study &amp; External Review</th>
<th>Program Assessment Plan</th>
<th>Outcomes Report</th>
<th>Multiple Tools/Courses</th>
<th>Indirect Measures</th>
<th>Use of Results (Sample Actions in Response to Learning Assessment Studies, Self-study and External Review)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Capstone</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rubric for comprehensive exam under review; comprehensive review course lectures to be taped and made available to students; more coursework to be coordinated with capstone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Forensics and Cybersecurity</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Multiple Tools</td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty will more carefully delineate links between courses and Program learning objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forensic Mental Health</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Mini-Capstone</td>
<td></td>
<td>Core counseling classes to be taught by counseling psychologists/counselor educators; assessment process to be revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forensic Psychology</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Research Methods</td>
<td>Student survey</td>
<td>More explicit rating instructions and examples for faculty assessing student learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forensic Science</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Capstone</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Selected courses to be revised; thesis perspective courses to focus more on student writing skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Crime and Justice</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Capstone</td>
<td>Research Methods</td>
<td>Improvements, particularly in the area of increased incorporation of research ethics, better linkages between ICJ715 and CRJ716, and more hands-on learning of research skills, will be implemented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPA b</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Capstone</td>
<td>Student Survey</td>
<td>MPA Qualifying Exam (MPAQE) Advisement expanded; Skills Clinic added to all PAD 700 courses; workshops being developed to focus on improving Capstone and MPAQE student performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection Management</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Comprehensive Exam</td>
<td>Grades</td>
<td>Approved new course for specialization. Developing online security program. Added the PMTQE to evaluate writing early in the program. Norming sessions for graders.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a New Program. Self-study and external review not yet scheduled.

b Because the split into two MPA programs from the “original” one program did not take effect until September 2011 (see MPA Assessment Plan), for the first three years of the Program’s five-year assessment cycle, the assessment population is all students enrolled for an MPA degree.*
Appendix 10.3
Report on the Assessment of SOC440


The following recommendations have been put in place following this assessment process to help students achieve the learning goals for Senior Seminar and thus, the Major as a whole:

1. Knowledge of the core literature and debates.
   Faculty teaching senior seminar need to include early on in the course at least one review session that pays particular attention to definitions of crime and deviance, measurement and causation (Action: to be put in place for Spring, 2012).

   A model syllabus for Senior Seminar has been developed with indicative readings. The model syllabus will be distributed as a guide for faculty teaching this course (Action: by December, 2011).

2. An understanding of the key components of criminological theory and the ability to apply theory.
   Faculty teaching senior seminar need to include at least one session early on in the course that provides an overview of the key principles of criminological theory (Action: to be put in place for Spring, 2012).

   Assessment of SOC203 Criminology, which provides an introduction to criminological theory, to take place 2011/12. Recommendations distributed to faculty (Action: June 2012)

   Review of a selection of syllabi for SOC309 and SOC308 in reference to the reinforcing of theoretical concepts through their application to specific subject areas and to make recommendations for improvement. (Action: Spring, 2012)

   Following the above review the findings will be communicated to faculty and meetings held with those teaching Senior Seminar and SOC309 and SOC308 to discuss the teaching of theory and its application to specific subject areas and to make recommendations for improvement. (Action: May/June, 2012).

   Administer either the diagnostic test or assess the final paper for a further year in Senior Seminar to monitor progress in this area (Action: Spring, 2012). If sufficient resources were made available the Sociology Department would like to continue to do this throughout the assessment process.
For the Criminology Oversight Committee to develop a short guide to criminological theory. This will reinforce core principles and serve to support learning by providing a reference tool for students throughout their degrees. This will be distributed to students on entry into the program and then put on the departmental webpage. It will be recommended that students re-read it prior to commencing Senior Seminar. (Action: Spring 2013).

3. **An understanding of research methodology.**
Faculty teaching Senior Seminar need to include at least one review session on research methodology (Action: to be put in place by Spring, 2012).

Faculty teaching research methods will review the material related to STA250 in order to assess whether it fits the goals of the Criminology Major in relation to research methodology and to make recommendations as appropriate (Action: Spring, 2012).


4. **The ability to make reasoned and informed judgments.**
There were some very good examples of innovative teaching in Senior Seminar designed to support this goal and these will be disseminated to the faculty as a whole. (Action: December, 2011).

5. **The ability to organize thoughts and communicate arguments effectively in writing.**
To include information on referencing and the constructing of bibliographies in all syllabi. To revisit the importance of being able to write effective academic essays in the first few classes in Senior Seminar. To ensure all faculty are aware of the extra help available to students through the writing center and library by distributing the relevant material/web links at faculty meetings and through email. (Action: Spring, 2012).

---

1 Renamed the Sociology Assessment Task Force (ATF) to reflect that the assessment process will include the sociology minor and eventually the sociology major.
II. FROM 2011-12 ASSESSMENT REPORT ‘LAST YEAR’S ACTIONS IMPLEMENTED AS PLANNED’

1. Faculty teaching SOC440 were recommended by the Sociology Department Task Force to include review or “refresher” sessions early on in their courses relating to the core literature and debates, key theoretical concepts and research methodology (Date: on-going, prior to every semester). Term papers have again been collected from this course to assess the meeting of the relevant learning goals. These are currently being analyzed. (NB. The Sociology Assessment Task Force (ATF) aim to review this course regularly throughout the assessment cycle as it gives an indication of whether the overall learning goals of the Criminology Major are being met.)

2. A model syllabus for SOC440 was developed and distributed (Date: Dec. 2011, see Appendix 3).

3. Due to concerns about the teaching of criminological theory, the assessment of SOC203 Criminology was prioritized and evaluated in 2011/12. This course is designed to underpin the theory component for SOC440.

4. Syllabi for SOC308 (Sociology of Violence) and SOC309 (Juvenile Delinquency) were reviewed in reference to the reinforcement of the theoretical concepts that are introduced in SOC203 and drawn upon in Soc440. Discussion took place with core faculty over the teaching of theory in these courses (June, 2012). (NB. Initial findings {Date: reported at end of Fall 2012, semester} reveal full-time faculty through the use of specific topics related to either violence or juvenile delinquency, spend course time reviewing theory and showing students how to apply theory to specific subject areas. Concerns were raised on the heavy use of adjuncts to teach these courses, especially juvenile delinquency, and the need for consistency in the teaching of theory. It should also be noted that the courses do not just cater for Criminology Major students and thus, not all students will have taken SOC203. SOC309 will be assessed in Spring 2013. SOC308 in Fall 2013 as Sociology currently does not have a full-time faculty member teaching the course.)

5. A short guide to theory is being developed for student use and as a teaching resource (Spring, 2013).

6. Coordinating the teaching of Research Methods with the teaching of social science statistics. Professor Kazemian reviewed the material related to STA250 and concluded it did adequately fit the goal of the Criminology Major in relation to research methodology. The syllabus was well constructed and the teaching effective. At this point in the assessment process no recommendations were deemed necessary (Spring, 2012). STA250 will be subject to its own assessment process in the future.
7. Examples of innovative teaching were discussed with faculty at faculty meeting (Dec. 2011, on going)

8. All faculty were instructed to make their syllabi compliant (Date: Fall, 2011, on-going). Professor Barrett collated the necessary material relating to the constructing of bibliographies, referencing, plagiarism, student services and so on which were distributed to faculty for “cutting and pasting” on to their syllabi. Thus all faculty members are equipped with information to support students in the developing of writing skills (Spring, 2012, see Appendix 2).

III. FROM PRELIMINARY INTERIM REPORT: SOCIOLOGY DEPARTMENT ASSESSMENT ACTIVITIES, FALL 2012

1. A blackboard site was developed by the Sociology Department to ‘house’ all model syllabi, relevant assessment documents and resource materials (Fall, 2012, on-going).

2. A short guide to theory is currently being developed. The Sociology Assessment Task Force is using Jock Young’s ‘Thinking Seriously About Crime’ as the basis for this (copyright cleared) together with other papers written and collected by the ATF, for example, on classicism, positivism, subcultural theory, the Chicago School, life course theory and key theorists. These papers have been made available in a resource folder and selected readings placed on blackboard (Feb. 2013). (Samples of material are included in Appendix 4).

3. In reference to 8. from the above 2011-12 Assessment Report ‘Last Year’s Actions Implemented as Planned’, additional material has been posted on the blackboard site for SOC440 on ‘How to Read a Research Article’ and ‘How to Reference Works’ (Feb. 2013) (See Appendix 4).

4. Best Teaching Practice Section: Professor Opotow’s method of assessment as the first example of ‘best practice’ is now available on the Sociology blackboard site. The Sociology Assessment Task Force is in the process of collating a list of useful websites for this course (Date: on-going Spring 2013).

5. Due to the concerns over the teaching of SOC203 all adjuncts and gtfs are supplied with a list of theories to be covered (Date: Fall 2011, on-going; see Appendix 1). To ensure adjuncts and gtfs are better supported in their teaching, the mentoring system was strengthened at the beginning of the Fall semester and all new instructors are additionally recommended to meet with Dr Jock Young, Distinguished Professor of Criminal Justice, for advice on the teaching of criminological theory. The ATF has been joined by Professor Trimbur. Professor Trimbur is teaching the core theory course on the CJ PhD program, this should ensure continuity between the theoretical education of the doctoral students and our needs on SOC203.
6. The Sociology Department has also begun to work much more closely with the Center for Advancement of Teaching to ensure that adjuncts, gfts and junior faculty are adequately supported. (Fall 2012, on-going). At our October 17th 2012 faculty meeting, Jess Kovler from CAT spoke of their work and the help and workshops currently available. All material related to CAT has been distributed to faculty and information is posted on upcoming workshops.

7. Ensuring Compliant Syllabi. Those involved in the evaluation of the teaching of adjuncts and junior faculty are required to review syllabi to ensure they are compliant with respect to the guidelines on model syllabi and learning outcomes. (Spring 2012, on-going).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAC</td>
<td>Academic Advisement Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAC&amp;U</td>
<td>Association of American Colleges and Universities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACE</td>
<td>Adult and Continuing Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFL-CIO</td>
<td>American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI</td>
<td>Academic Integrity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASC</td>
<td>Auxiliary Services Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASFD</td>
<td>Annual Statement of Financial Disclosure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPC</td>
<td>Budget and Planning Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAA</td>
<td>College Admissions Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASAC</td>
<td>Credential in Alcoholism and Substance Abuse Counseling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAT</td>
<td>Center for the Advancement of Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCAPS</td>
<td>Counseling Center Assessment of Psychological Symptoms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCE</td>
<td>Certificate of Continuous Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCNY</td>
<td>The City College of New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCPD</td>
<td>Center for Career and Professional Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>College Discovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CELS</td>
<td>Center for English Language Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLA</td>
<td>Collegiate Learning Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COACHE</td>
<td>Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoF</td>
<td>Certificate of Fitness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COI</td>
<td>Conflict of Interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPE</td>
<td>CUNY Proficiency Exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUNY</td>
<td>City University of New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUR</td>
<td>Council on Undergraduate Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWAC</td>
<td>Campus-Wide Assessment Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCJS</td>
<td>Division of Criminal Justice Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOE</td>
<td>Department of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOS</td>
<td>Dean of Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAP</td>
<td>Emergency Action Plan Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECP</td>
<td>Executive Compensation Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDPs</td>
<td>Emotionally Disturbed Persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPT</td>
<td>Emergency Psychology Technician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>Executive Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESM</td>
<td>Executive Staff Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDD</td>
<td>Faculty Development Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDD</td>
<td>Faculty Development Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDNY</td>
<td>Fire Department of New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FERPA</td>
<td>Family Education Rights and Privacy Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FES</td>
<td>Faculty Experience Surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLL</td>
<td>Foreign Language Lab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLL</td>
<td>Dept. of Foreign Languages and Literatures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPC</td>
<td>Faculty Personnel Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPS</td>
<td>Financial Planning Subcommittee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSD</td>
<td>Fire Safety Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSI</td>
<td>Fire Science Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>Full Time Equivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FYE</td>
<td>First Year Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEO</td>
<td>Higher Education Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP3</td>
<td>Investment Plan 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR</td>
<td>Institutional Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRB</td>
<td>Institutional Review Boards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISP</td>
<td>Interdisciplinary Studies Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>Information Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITSS</td>
<td>Instructional Technology Support Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JJC</td>
<td>John Jay College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI</td>
<td>Key Performance Indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC</td>
<td>Learning Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOU</td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPAC</td>
<td>Master Plan Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPF</td>
<td>Multiple Position Forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSRC</td>
<td>Math and Science Resource Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASPAA</td>
<td>National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSSE</td>
<td>National Survey of Student Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYPD</td>
<td>New York Police Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYS</td>
<td>New York State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYSED</td>
<td>New York State Education Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAP</td>
<td>Outcomes Assessment Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAR</td>
<td>Office for the Advancement of Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OASAS</td>
<td>Office of Alcoholism and Substance Abuse Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCPS</td>
<td>Office of Continuing and Professional Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIR</td>
<td>Office of Institutional Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIRA</td>
<td>Office of Institutional Research and Assessment (CUNY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OOA</td>
<td>Office of Outcomes Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSP</td>
<td>Office of Special Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSP</td>
<td>Office of Sponsored Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUR</td>
<td>Office of Undergraduate Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLI</td>
<td>Pre-Law Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMP</td>
<td>Performance Management Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP</td>
<td>Policies, Procedures and Practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td>Personal Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSC</td>
<td>Professional Staff Congress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSWP</td>
<td>Public Service Workshops Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVN</td>
<td>Personnel Vacancy Notice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCR</td>
<td>Responsible Conduct of Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SASP</td>
<td>Office of Student Academic Success Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEEK</td>
<td>Search for Education, Elevation and Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFEM</td>
<td>Department of Security, Fire, and Emergency Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMI</td>
<td>Security Management Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPG</td>
<td>Strategic Positioning and Enrollment Management Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPS</td>
<td>Strategic Planning Subcommittee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STF</td>
<td>Student Technology Fee Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWOT</td>
<td>Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAC</td>
<td>Technology Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCASC</td>
<td>Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UFS</td>
<td>University Faculty Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSE</td>
<td>Voluntary Support of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAC</td>
<td>Writing Across the Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>Writing Center</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>