



Minutes of the Council of HEOs November 29, 2012

Call to Order: The second general meeting of the Council of HEOs for the academic year 2012-2013 was called to order by President Carina Quintian at 12:15 p.m. in room 630T.

Members Present: A list of members present appears at the end of this document.

Adoption of Agenda: A motion to adopt the day's agenda was made by Nancy Marshall and seconded by Sylvia Lopez. Motion carried.

Approval of Minutes: A motion to approve the minutes of the October 26, 2012 general meeting was made by Nancy Marshall and seconded by Christina Czechowicz. Motion carried.

Announcements:

Ms. Quintian welcomed everyone to the second meeting and invited all new HEOs to introduce themselves. One new HEO introduced herself: Rosa Rosario from the Office of Legal Counsel.

BPC Vacancy: Ms. Quintian announced that the HEO Council seat on the Budget & Planning Committee is vacant and asked for volunteers interested in filling it. Michael Scaduto raised the point that, given the nature of the committee, it might be wise to send someone who is a full HEO with 13.3.b status. Kinya Chandler agreed that those considerations are important but not absolutely necessary, and that in any case, the College Council would have to approve our nominee. Ms. Quintian noted that at this stage, what we need is a list of interested HEOs. Nikki Hancock-Nicholson volunteered, and additional volunteers will be solicited via email. A description of the committee's work and a list of current members will be circulated.

Revival of the Four Standing Committees: Ms. Quintian announced that the four standing committees listed in the HEO Council Charter would be revived and provided a brief description of the mission of each committee. The four committees are the Elections Committee, the Quality of Life Committee, the Charter Review Committee, and the Budget Committee. Volunteers to serve on these committees will be solicited by email.

Reports:

Ms. Chandler reported on the work of the Strategic Planning Subcommittee of the College Council's Budget and Planning Committee. Their current focus is on space allocation. The committee has requested that the college hire a space consultant to help with issues of space allocation. Even with the new building now open, there is not enough space on campus, and the college may ask CUNY for

additional space. To prepare for the space consultant, who would come in April, the college will need to inventory all of its current space and the space requirements of each department on campus, determined primarily by current and planned staffing levels. Going forward, the college's financial and strategic plans must be linked to the plan for space allocation, as we cannot hire people for whom we have no office space, and we cannot implement initiatives for which there is no space. For example, the college wishes to expand faculty research, but research requires space. In the coming months, as the inventory is made, it is important for HEOs to make their staffing and space needs known: we need to document what it is the college is asking us do and make clear how much space we need to do it. It is important for HEOs to voice their concerns during this process.

Ms. Chandler also provided an overview of the budget process and where we are in that process for the current year. Each year, the budget process begins in January for the budget that goes into effect the following July 1. We are behind in the budget process for the current year in part because we are waiting for input from CUNY. However, we do project that we will be within our budget for the year. We have incurred a few budget penalties from the university, but we should still be able to finish the year within our budget overall. Ms. Chandler stressed that it is important for HEOs who manage budgets to understand how their budget requests are processed and how they are aggregated at the divisional level. The BPC wants HEOs to understand the entire process.

Ms. Czechowicz suggested the college consider freeing up space by going paperless and eliminating file cabinets which take up space. Ms. Chandler indicated that this is happening in some areas but not others, in part because it is not possible for documents that require an original signature, such as Personnel Action Forms. The college did have a paperless initiative a few years ago, but it was set aside because of the cost of implementation. Ms. Chandler will bring the suggestion back to the SPS.

Jeffrey Brown described a trend in higher education toward moving services such as Human Resources away from main campus buildings and noted that John Jay has already done this by moving HR and some other offices down to the 54th St Annex. He described another trend in which colleges are relocating library collections into off-campus storage facilities, freeing up space for other uses. Students or faculty who need a book can order it, and it would be retrieved from storage and made available for on-campus pickup the same day. Katherine Killoran responded that John Jay's library is very specialized, and our books actually are utilized much more frequently than at other colleges, so that approach might not be a good fit for John Jay. In addition, CUNY has specific formulas dictating how many square feet of library space are required per student.

Old Business: None.

New Business:

Middle States Reaccreditation:

James Llana, Associate Provost for Institutional Effectiveness, spoke with the HEO Council about the Middle States reaccreditation process. Two handouts were distributed, copies of which are attached to these minutes. Mr. Llana began his presentation by extending an invitation to the HEOs to meet with him individually if they have any questions or concerns about the reaccreditation process. Reaccreditation affects all of us, and all of us should understand what will be happening in the next

few months. It is important that the entire campus community feels collective ownership of our self-study document.

About two years ago, six working groups were created, whose membership includes HEOs. They created an initial draft of our self-study report, based on the 14 standards published by Middle States. It has undergone several revisions and will undergo several more before it is sent to Middle States in March. The current draft is available on the web, and HEOs are encouraged to read it and submit comments before December 31 so they can be considered for the next revision. There is also a Wiki for discussion, and input can also be submitted directly to James Llana, Jane Bowers, or Karen Kaplowitz, who are overseeing the process. After that, a new draft will be published in January and sent to the chair of the site team.

The Middle States team reviewing John Jay has nine volunteer members and is chaired by the president of the University of Baltimore. The chairperson will come to John Jay at the end of January for a preliminary visit, and he will want to meet with a group of HEOs during that initial visit.

Ms. Marshall is part of one of the committees preparing for the site team visit and asked what would be expected of her and her committee. Mr. Llana told her that the chair of that committee would be getting more details in the near future and would pass them along.

Ms. Czechowitz noted that one of the handouts references John Jay's new focus on creating a "culture of assessment" and asked what had been done with the data gathered in student evaluations of faculty in previous years before the college adopted this new approach. Mr. Llana explained that student evaluations, like grades, are a form of indirect assessment, and with the current "culture of assessment" the college is focused on more direct forms, such as rubrics that score students' work against published learning outcomes developed for each major, minor, and course.

Michele Doney asked if the site visitors will be walking around campus interacting directly with members of the campus community. Mr. Llana said that for part of their visit, the team members will be walking around campus talking to people, and it is important for everyone to be as knowledgeable as possible.

Mr. Llana indicated that he was confident we would be reaccredited, and that the Middle States process is really about continuous improvement.

Mr. Scaduto asked whether Mr. Llana was concerned about any particular standards out of the 14 on which we will be evaluated. Mr. Llana's biggest concern is Standard 14, dealing with assessment of student learning. We have made significant progress in the past few years, but Middle States typically wants to see a track record significantly longer than that. He also has concerns about the standards dealing with space allocation and facilities, planning and budgeting, and the college's web site. He indicated that the college is making progress in all of these areas and noted that an outside company has been hired to help us with our web site and marketing in general. He also indicated a concern about how the college integrates part-time faculty into its academic departments. These faculty teach 65% of our courses, and the departments need to do more to monitor, supervise, and develop them. Middle States will be very interested in this area. In addition, as distance learning becomes a larger part of our offerings, we will need to be able to demonstrate how we verify the identity of online students and indicate how we define a credit hour.

The site visit will take place in the third week of April and lasts three days. On the last day, there will be an assembly where the site team will present its findings. All members of the campus community can attend, but we cannot ask questions. After the site visit, the team will render its decision. They may ask for a follow-up report in which we will have to document our progress on their areas of concern. About 70% of CUNY colleges are required to do these. Full reaccreditation takes place every ten years, but we will be asked to prepare an interim report after five years.

Mr. Llana described the importance of reaccreditation and consequences of losing accreditation, such as ineligibility for federal funds and students' inability to transfer credits elsewhere, but he is not worried at all that this will happen to us.

VP for Student Affairs Search:

Mr. Scaduto reminded us of the upcoming Open Forum to meet with the candidates for VP of Student Affairs, as follows:

Candidate: Lynette Cook-Francis

Tuesday, October 30th - Room 610T
4:00 – 4:30 p.m. -- Open Forum

Candidate: Jose R. Rodriguez

Wednesday, October 31st – Room 610T
2:50-3:30 p.m. -- Open Forum

He asked whether those in attendance would be able to ask questions of the candidates. Ms. Chandler said people would be able to ask questions, and we would also be asked to provide feedback afterward.

Adjournment: A motion to adjourn was made by Ms. Chandler and seconded by Mr. Scaduto. Motion carried. Meeting was adjourned at 1:15 p.m.

Members Present:

Baerga	Christine
Brown	Jeffrey
Carlin	Johanna
Carrington	Janice

Chandler	Kinya
Clemente	Simone
Coyle	Maureen
Crespo-Lopez	Sylvia
Czechowicz	Christina
Doney	Michelle
Hancock-Nicholson	Nikki
Johnson	Herbert
Killoran	Katherine
Kyriacou	Angelos
Laudando	Christopher
Marshall	Nancy
Mendes	Susy
Quintian	Carina
Scaduto	Michael
Stone	Adam
Valentin (Rosario)	Rosa
Ward	Cherryanne

Minutes respectfully submitted by Michele Doney, HEO Council Secretary

**John Jay College of Criminal Justice
Charter of Governance**

Approved by the CUNY Board of Trustees on June 23, 2008

Budget and Planning Committee:

There shall be a Budget and Planning Committee which shall be responsible for reviewing budget information, making recommendations on the financial and budgetary matters of the College, and providing guidance on comprehensive and strategic planning for the College.

- There shall be a Financial Planning Subcommittee of the Budget and Planning Committee which shall meet on a periodic basis in the development of the College's Annual Financial Plan.
- There shall be a Strategic Planning Subcommittee of the Budget and Planning Committee which shall provide guidance to the President on comprehensive and strategic planning including development of major planning documents and accreditation studies, related process and outcome assessment and space planning.

Middle States Reaccreditation—The Basics

What's this? John Jay is going through its decennial review by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education, our regional accrediting authority. A team of evaluators will be on campus from April 21 to April 24, 2013, to meet as many people as possible in order to determine if our Self-Study is an accurate assessment of our performance against the fourteen standards. If successful, we will be reaccredited.

What's the Self-Study and who produced it? The Self-Study is a self-evaluation of how we have performed in all the vital functions of a higher education institution, and it points to plans for the future. Approximately 100 faculty, staff, administrators, and students worked on six committees that produced working drafts for the various standards. The Self-Study will go through three drafts before the final version is sent to the visiting team in March, 2013.

Who are the evaluators? They are nine volunteers from Middle States member institutions that resemble John Jay in important ways; the team members are faculty, staff, and administrators, some of whom specialize in areas defined by the standards. The Team Chair is Robert Bogomolny, President of the University of Baltimore, Maryland state system.

What are the Fourteen Standards? You can see the standards at a glance on the John Jay Middle States website at <http://johnjay.jjay.cuny.edu/mstates/> and much more comprehensively on the Middle States website: <https://www.msche.org/publications/CHX-2011-WEB.pdf>. Essentially, the standards concern planning and assessment in the broad context of our Mission.

What's this got to do with me? A great deal, if you are interested in making John Jay the best it can be. It is important to the College and to the Middle States Commission that everyone participate in developing the self-study. As a member of the John Jay community, the Self-Study is about what you do at the College. We need to hear from you about the Self-Study drafts posted on the Inside John Jay website from late September through mid-December (now extended to the end of the month). The visiting team may want to hear directly from you as well during their stay on campus in April. Please review the John Jay Middle States website listed above to learn more about the entire process.

Why do we have accreditation? To provide a measure of accountability to the federal government that spends about \$150 billion annually on financial aid for students, and to prospective students and parents who bear much of the cost of higher education. Public institutions especially have to be concerned with the effectiveness of the education they offer, in and out of the classroom. We at John Jay embrace the reaccreditation review as one of the best opportunities we have to improve and to set the tone for continuous improvement.

A Guide to the Fourteen Standards of Reaccreditation

November, 2012

Jim Llana, Associate Provost and Co-Chair, Middle States Steering Committee

The Fourteen Standards

The Self-Study addresses fourteen standards framed by the Middle States Commission. The standards against which John Jay will be measured reflect various performance dimensions of an institution of higher education. Not every constituency will be interested in every standard, but it's useful to have a basic understanding of all of them.

Standard 1: Mission and Goals. One of the most fundamental questions we have to face is whether we are fulfilling our mission and achieving our goals. The mission is the foundation of the institution; it should specify our reason for being and describe the students whom we want to serve and what we hope to accomplish with them. Do the aspirations of the College framed in the Self-Study spring from the mission? More fundamentally, does the mission still make sense as you think about your needs and aspirations?

Along with the Mission Statement—you can find it in Chapter 1—you should read through the College Master Plan, *John Jay @ 50* (there's a link in Chapter 1). The key question is whether our goals make sense in terms of the mission, because if they don't we'll never fulfill the mission. And the goals should be realistic. Can we manage to accomplish them all with our limited resources?

Chapter 1 describes the importance of the mission and how it has been expressed in recent years in terms of "Educating for Justice," an understanding that serves a student population that is broader and more diverse than the one that opened the College. The argument made is that the Critical Choices Agenda proposed in 2006 (the key decisions there were to become an all-baccalaureate college and to re-introduce liberal arts degrees) is still guiding the College today. Many of our planning goals derive from decisions made in 2006.

Standard 2: Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal. This is one of the most important standards since without planning that makes sense and without linking planning to money, we will never get anywhere. In your experience, are plans and programs properly supported with funding? Do our yearly plans advance accomplishment of the mission? Another important issue is whether our plans are communicated effectively to students, faculty, staff and the public. Do all constituencies have a say in planning and budgeting committees? Finally, when plans don't work out as we anticipated, do we learn from that experience to improve the institution?

Standard 3: Institutional Resources. This one's not just about money but includes the question of whether or not we have enough staff, faculty, and facilities to fulfill our mission and meet our goals. The College is obliged to think in formal ways about whether we use our resources efficiently and effectively, so we rely on data of various kinds to answer that question. Does the College spend money well on things that advance the mission and Master Plan? Do

students, staff, and faculty have the technology they need? Is the library staffed sufficiently? Does the new building meet your needs?

Standard 4: Leadership and Governance. Governance concerns the way the institution is run, both as one college in a larger system and as one college made up of constituencies with different roles, rights, and responsibilities. The aim of governance in colleges and universities is to ensure the representation of different points of view according to a written set of rules and expectations.

Standard 5: Administration. Administration is more narrowly defined than governance. Key issues concern the match between administrators and their expected roles. Do they have the training, background, and resources to do their jobs effectively? Do they have too many responsibilities to handle effectively?

Standard 6: Integrity. This is all about whether we represent ourselves honestly to the public, keep our promises to everyone, and behave fairly with regard to students, faculty, and staff. Do we model and promote ethical behavior? The same standard asks whether we promote a diversity of viewpoints and guarantee academic freedom. Practically speaking, one question we can ask to see if we measure up is whether the website reflects the institution accurately? Do students have the ability to file grievances and complaints, both academic and otherwise? Are students treated fairly in matters of academic performance and judicial proceedings? Are there publicized and clear policies governing student behavior? Interestingly enough, this standard poses the question of whether the College offers courses with sufficient frequency so that students can graduate within the published timeframe? Is there a campus climate of mutual respect? While Standard 6 focuses on integrity, it is something that should be discussed in all the chapters.

Standard 7: Institutional Assessment. This is the last standard in the first seven, all of which address broad institutional characteristics. It is one of the three most important standards, along with numbers 2 and 14. (Standards 7-14 all focus on educational effectiveness.) The basic question here is how we assess our performance as an institution, and the most important thing we want to assess is student learning, the subject of Standard 14. So Standard 7 is a summary of our performance across all the standards. It is here that we have to address the question: “Are we fulfilling our mission and meeting our goals?”

We are saying that we do indeed fulfill our mission and meet our goals. We demonstrate that by pointing to evaluations of our performance. For example, we have a Master Plan Report Card where we evaluate ourselves against the goals and objectives of the Master Plan. We point to other formal evaluations, such as assessment plans for non-academic units, that suggest we are doing a good if not perfect job. A number of administrative and support units have assessment plans, and we will have to display them for the Middle States team. We also review the results of our research on Standard 14, Assessment of Student Learning, in Standard 7 since student learning is goal number one. It has to be important in the assessment of the institution as a whole.

Standard 8: Student Admissions and Retention. This is a standard that should attract a lot of student interest. The premise here is that any institution should admit students who have

a reasonable chance of success in the institution. Our mission implies the general kinds of programs we offer. Standard 8 asks if we have admissions standards and recruitment practices that yield students who can benefit from what we have to offer; the core issue is whether there's a good match between our students and the nature of the institution. We have to understand that our students may have various assumptions about what it means to succeed. Some students naturally want to earn a degree in four years; others know they want to transfer after a year or two. Still other students only want to take some courses for professional advancement. There's an integrity issue here: do we admit students whom we can reasonably serve, given the variety of goals that students have? In our recruitment and promotional materials, do we make it clear what kinds of programs we have and what will be required to be successful in them? Do we have support services for students who may barely meet or who may not meet the formal admissions requirements? The presumption is that we will not admit students who have no good chance for success.

The fact that not all students who want a John Jay degree fail to get one does not mean we have a flawed admissions policy. There are varied reasons for not graduating, but what counts is whether or not we have done what we could reasonably do to support our students.

You will find a discussion of admissions policies and enrollment targets in this standard. Since retention is an important component of an admissions policy, this too is covered along with strategies for improving retention (this will be more developed in the "second" draft.)

Standard 9. Student Support Services. Here's another standard that should interest students since it addresses John Jay's support of students as they pursue their educational goals. Our services for students should promote the development of the whole person; Middle States is interested in this, and our mission and Master Plan call for the same thing. Support services include admissions, financial aid, registration, orientation, advising, counseling, academic support, discipline, health, student activities, child care, security, and athletics, although we do not discuss every student support service. The particular kinds and delivery modes of services available should depend on the needs of a diverse student population, some of whom are taking courses online, some of whom have disabilities, some of whom are international, some of whom commute long distances, etc. There should be procedures for students to register complaints about student services and reasonable procedures for addressing those complaints.

Standard 10. Faculty. The key questions here are whether we have a sufficient number of full-time faculty to support the integrity of our academic programs and whether the faculty are qualified. It is expected that faculty create and sustain the curriculum, and that we have in place fair procedures and criteria for the evaluation of faculty. At John Jay, part-time (adjunct) faculty offer about 65% of the instruction, and we must be concerned that criteria for the appointment, supervision, and review of them are consistent with those for full-time faculty. We are obliged to spell out the responsibilities of faculty in terms of teaching, research, and service to the College.

Standard 11. Educational Offerings. This standard is about the "academic content, rigor, and coherence" of our academic programs. The first step in knowing we have met the standard is to

inspect the learning goals for each major, minor, and certificate. Those goals should be on every syllabus, so that students see the expected learning outcomes and can understand how their assignments relate to those outcomes. The activities in any course should move students toward achievement of the goals in that course and in the broader program (major, minor, certificate). Courses within a single program should collectively address all the learning goals of the program; coherence is important here. Students should be aware as well of institutional learning goals that may be part of any course; such goals are normally part of a general education program, and they often derive from the mission statement, vision statement, or Master Plan. This is more concern with program coherence. Examples of institutional goals for John Jay include personal and social growth and moral commitment.

Also included under Standard 11 is the need to equip students with technological competency and information literacy; they should be able to use the new media and technologies for learning and research. The college must have accessible learning resources, such as library and information technology support services.

The co-curricular activities of the College should relate closely to the mission and to the academic programs, since all activities in Academic Affairs and Student Affairs have a jointly-related and intentional educational purpose; again, we should evidence coherence in the educational mission.

Standard 12. General Education. Every student is required to complete the General Education program. At a minimum, General Education has learning goals for oral and written communications, scientific and quantitative reasoning, critical analysis, and technological competency. There will be further development of this standard in the “second” draft.

Standard 13. Related Educational Activities. This standard is a grab-bag of various things that don’t fall into other standards: certificate programs; experiential learning (internships and perhaps service learning, if it’s for credit, at John Jay); continuing education (non-credit courses often used for professional advancement); digital learning (online courses); college credit in high schools, such as College Now in CUNY. The overriding concern here is that such programs be constructed, approved, run, and evaluated with the same expectations as the “regular” programs. Student support services should be in place consistent with regular programs, and learning goals must be established. In addition, such programs should connect with the mission of the college.

Standard 14. Assessment of Student Learning. This is one of the most important standards—perhaps the most important—since any college is primarily about student learning. Notice that the emphasis is on “assessment” of student learning. The stress on assessment means that we will monitor the effectiveness of our programs (majors, minors, general education, certificates, co-curricular learning, etc.) in order to improve our programs. We constantly evaluate how well students are learning (meeting the specified learning goals) in order to improve our programs. If we see students are having a hard time understanding theory, then we change the program to provide more and better opportunities across the program for students to learn and demonstrate their mastery of theory. If writing is a problem, we look for chances to have students do more writing or to get more feedback on their writing. Discovering

weaknesses in our programs is not necessarily bad; the real problem occurs when we don't respond to those weaknesses through program changes.

In standard 14 we need to demonstrate that we have done assessment of academic programs and that we use the results for program improvement. In fact, we can cite lots of assessment and a fair number of examples where that assessment led to changes in academic programs. What we don't have is a long track record of doing assessment of student learning. Much of it began only in 2011, and it has taken root unevenly across the campus. The goal is to have a "culture of assessment" where it is done automatically and incorporated into program planning discussions.

* * *

For much more information on the reaccreditation process, go to the College website on Middle States. The link is on the College homepage.