

MINUTES OF THE THREE HUNDRED AND FORTY-FIRST PLENARY SESSION
OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

February 3, 2009

The meeting was called to order by UFS Chair Philipp at 6:40 p.m. in Room 9204/05/06 at the Graduate School and University Center. 69 voting members of 124 were present.

Baruch: Present – Dumas, Freedman, Hill, Martell, Wine and Alternates Aubry and Remler. Absent – Freedman, Myers, Nematollahy, Pollard, and Vora. **BMCC:** Present – Friedman, Genis, Martinez-Lopez, Soto, Vozick, and Alternate Hachey. Absent – Kalogeropoulos, Niyazov, and Persaud. **Bronx CC:** Present – Ismail and Alternate Polanco. Absent – Bandar, Prabhu, and Skinner. **Brooklyn:** Present – Bell, Jacobson, Massood, and Shortell. Absent – Cherukupalli, Duboys, Magliozzo, Morrill, Shapiro, Tobey, and Viscusi. **CCNY:** Present – Crain, Dalglish, and Raj. Vacancies – 2. Absent – Habib, Khalil, Lascar, and Sank. **CSI:** Present – Cooper, Talarico, and Alternate Stearns. Absent – Batson, Klibaner, Petratos, and Yousef. **CUNY Law School:** Present – none. Absent – Bach and Farago. **Graduate School:** Present – Baumrin, Lennon, Mathews-Salazar, and Nolan. Absent – Orenstein, and Weinstein. **Hostos CC:** Present – August, Bernardini, and Alternate Sharma. Vacancies - 1. Absent – Pimentel. **Hunter:** Present – Demeo, Grossman, Spark, St. Hill, and Alternates Avcilar and Kindred. Absent – Ancona, Guzzetta, Kaye, Kuhn-Osius, Palanda, Simon, and Strayer. **John Jay:** Present – Chaffie, Crossman, Dunham, Kaplowitz, Katz, King-Toler, and Kubic. **Kingsborough CC:** Present – Hume, Ruoff, Sarinsky, and Stubin. Absent – Barnhart and Wood. **LaGuardia CC:** Present – Beaky, Lerman, Mettler, Shean, Alternates Forrester, and Kurzyna. Absent – Davidson. **Lehman:** Present – Hellmann, Philipp, and Alternate Carey. Absent – Jervis, Marianetti, Maybee, and Mineka. **Medgar Evers:** Present – Barker, and Withers. Absent – Cuffee, Stewart. **NYCCT:** Present – Cermele, Hounion, Richardson, and Woytowich. Absent – Horelick, and Panayotakis. **Queens:** Present – Bird, Moore, Savage, and Zevin. Vacancies – 3. Absent – Brody, and Gonzalez. **Queensborough CC:** Present – Barbanel, Iconis, Pecorino, Sweetnam, Tai, and Wein. Alternate Volchok. Vacancies – 2. **York:** Present – none. Absent – Baron, Cockery, Lewis, and Mawyer. Vacancies – 1. Professors Antonello (Brooklyn), Nelson (John Jay), O'Malley (KCC), and Dahbany-Miraglia (QCC) also attended.

Governance Leaders present: Baumrin (GS), Carey (Lehman), Cooper (CSI), Hume (KCC), Kaplowitz (John Jay), Mettler (LaGuardia), Philipp (Lehman), Raj (CCNY), Savage (Queens), Tai (QCC), and Woytowich (NYCTC) attended. Executive Director Phipps, Administrative Assistant Pasela, and Secretary Blanchard were also present.

I. Approval of the Agenda: The agenda was adopted as proposed.

II. Approval of the Minutes of December 16, 2008: Minutes were approved as distributed.

III. Reports (Recorded in Reports & Deliberations)

A. Chair

B. Chancellor Matthew Goldstein. (Chancellor Goldstein did not attend the meeting.)

- C. Representatives to Board of Trustee Committees.
- D. Outreach to Albany—Professor Martha Bell, Brooklyn College
- E. CUNY’s Endowment Management Policies—Professor Terrence Martell, Baruch College
- F. CUNY Academy of Arts and Sciences—Professor Susan O’Malley, Kingsborough Community College
- G. Update on Proposed New Community College—Professor Frances Ruoff, Kingsborough Community College
- H. Update on IT issues—Professor Bonnie Nelson, UFS Representative on CUNY’s IT Steering Committee.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Bill Phipps
Executive Director

REPORTS AND DELIBERATIONS
OF THE 341st PLENARY SESSION
OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

February 3, 2009

Chair Philipp—There are a few modifications to the agenda. The Chancellor will not be here this evening. I told him we would survive that absence. Also, Bonnie Nelson, our representative on the IT Steering Committee, will be giving a report on the activities of Blackboard and CUNYFirst. Given those changes, I’d like a motion to approve the agenda as amended. Second? It is carried. Now, approval of the Rules of Procedure? They are passed.

You have the Chair’s Report in written form. The only thing to add might be to say that we are making progress on the Faculty Experience Survey. Slow, but substantial. We have a commitment of financial support from the chancellery, and that is certainly progress. I’m very heartened. At some point, it will have to go through the IRB; I have to take some IRB training myself. Otherwise, the Report stands. You can ask me any questions now or at some other point in the meeting.

We have written reports from our representatives on Board committees. They are on the back table.

We have asked Prof. Martha Bell of Brooklyn College to speak about outreach to Albany this year. There is material on this in my Chair's Report. We will be asking almost all of you to join us in visits to your legislative offices to support CUNY. My Report is quite optimistic in terms of the level of support for this University. Today I heard some good news about community college support that indicates we will not see the cuts to community college budgets that we anticipated. That doesn't mean this is written in stone. Nothing has yet been passed by the Legislature. Just because we're optimistic does not mean we don't have to make a hard push in this climate for funding for this University. We have to do that. It is really our obligation, and Martha is here to tell us how.

Prof. Martha Bell—Let me talk a little bit about this year's budget. I was on the phone with Albany this morning discussing this, and, as you know, budgets in New York State are invariably late. Even when they are on time, they are late! This year, evidently people are predicting a very early budget. One estimate I heard this morning is that it could be done as early as March 1, which is really a departure. The Big Three, as they are called, met for the first time in conference last week, which is also an unusual phenomenon because that usually doesn't happen until well into March. So there is evidently some financial advantage to coming in with a very early budget because the poor income tax estimates will not be in by then, and the earlier they get in the more fanciful the estimates can be, as best I can figure. So that may lead us to an early budget. Nothing guarantees it, but that's one of the things we have. As all of you know, there is a real shift in the dynamics in Albany this year with the Senate having gone Democratic. As of about a month ago, the chairmanships have changed in the Senate, and the leadership has changed. So we have continuously lobbied up in Albany, but when we have lobbied the Senate we have lobbied the Republican majority. Now we have a Democratic majority, and those folks by and large don't know us. We've ignored them because they've been powerless up until now. So one of our jobs for this year is not only to visit our friends in the Assembly and talk to them, because the worst thing we can do is let them think we have forgotten them and this year when everyone is competing for the money we don't want them to forget us, but we have to establish new relationships with the Democratic majority in the Senate. Now, the most important committees for us are the Senate Finance Committee and the Senate Higher Education Committee. The Finance Committee is chaired this year by a gentleman from Sheepshead's Bay in Brooklyn where Kingsborough sits named Carl Kruger. He dislikes CUNY intensely, as best I can figure out. He does not much like public higher ed. He does most of his campaigning with senior citizens, and prides himself on constituent services to the 75+ set. In fact, when he sees students he is extremely rude to them. My students have left there several times in tears. One of the things we need to do is really visit the Higher Ed people and the Senate Finance people. I'm going to ask in their offices downstate, as well as upstate. It's very important; letters need to go there. We used to write to a different set of people. I'm going to put out a memo this week with a list of people that you and your students should write to. That's very important. Anybody who is at a Brooklyn campus or who has students living in Kruger's district should write him. We also need to hit certain issues. The key issue we need to hit is TAP. The TAP proposals for this year have a draconian impact on the students. HESC, the Higher Education

Services Corporation, which bring us TAP, is proposing to save the State money by cutting about one-half of the funds from the TAP proposal. They have already started without even going through the Legislature. They have changed regulations this year to require that no student be funded for any courses within their first 12 credits that are elective credits, which has caused some of the colleges to go back and retroactively remove TAP from students, going back to the fall semester. Their proposal for TAP is to require 15 credits successfully completed every semester, which is an enormous problem. And, they have changed the required GPA, which was 1.5, to 1.88. If you do the math on this, that means that a student carrying a 12 credit load cannot get a single F. They could get one D, but not a single F. Even a C- would put them in jeopardy. So it's certainly not even giving our freshmen a chance to get their feet wet, and to make a mistake and still persist because not only would they lose TAP but they would lose it prospectively for the next semester, too. We need to hit very strongly to the Legislature on the importance of maintaining TAP. As to the tuition raise, I don't see how we are going to live without it, but if we go with the tuition raise we have to lobby that the money be returned to the University, and not go into the coffers of the State but try to maintain as much as we can. The real problem, no matter what they say about creating a safety fund for the University students, if they lose TAP that safety fund is not going to provide enough. On March 3, if they haven't done the budget, that is the date that is set up for higher education lobbying day in Albany. The PSC, NYPIRG, SUNY, our University Student Senate, and of course we will all be supporting it. We certainly would like to hear from volunteers who are interested in going to Albany to lobby. We are also going to ask that each campus organize visits to the various legislators in the districts, and we will get to you with lists of who you should see and a contact person on your campus. We also ask that you bombard the world with letters. There is a private website, www.SupportCUNY.org, which has letters already composed and pre-addressed to your legislators. When you put in your name and address, it will sort out your legislators, so it's almost fool proof. You can modify the letter to your own needs, but at least it will go to all the possible people. I do suggest that people immediately go to that site and send those letters out, as a very minimum, and share it with your students. Ask them. I remind you you are not supposed to use University computers or email to send lobbying letters, so please encourage your students to use their computers at home to send these letters. Some of the campuses have designated certain machines that don't actually go through CUNY lines to do that. You can probably find out at your campus about that. But please try to jam up their emails with these letters! They are more weighed than read, but they do send the students back responses, and that is a good thing, too.

Prof. Mike Vozick—What is being done with the governance bodies on each of the campuses to enable the campus response to be as broad as possible? Prof. Bell—Each campus has a set of faculty members who belong to CLAC, the legislative action body. Each campus is to have a lobbying plan and set of dates when they will travel to Albany. The PSC has been involved with conference calls with the UFS, as well as the students. NYPIRG is organizing trips. There will be free buses to go up to Albany on March 3 that the union and NYPIRG will sponsor. The central office has sponsored this website, which is very useful. People have really gone out of their way to reach out to all the possible constituencies of the University this year. Don't sit still. This is not the year to

be disengaged from this activity, because every other constituency in the State is mobilized, so we need to do that, too.

Prof. Bill Crain—You say we can't do much about the tuition increase so we should say the money should go back to the University. I'm against it strongly. I'd rather we said nothing than that we accept it but the money should go to the University. If we're not going to oppose, as a Senate let's just be quiet. Otherwise, we are implicitly supporting it. Prof. Bell—I understand your position, Bill. If we don't have that tuition raise, I think the University will suffer incredibly. But it's each individual's decision but as to TAP it would absolutely be outrageous if we didn't really support the students, and I think that's the key thing we need. Every other year, we've led with Let's Add New Faculty. This year it's the kids, and let's have a fail safe for them. Prof. Philipp—We are sensitive to the differences of opinion in this body. Prof. Vozick—To the extent that we want strong student support, and especially the potential for large numbers of students expressing themselves, certainly their thinking is in the direction of preventing tuition increases, except for the leaders, who have been massaged. Prof. Bell—Having been on the phone with both NYPIRG and USS, they seem not to be fighting the tuition increase but focusing on TAP. That's all I can report. I've seen both kinds of students, and I don't want to argue it one way or the other. We've all studied this issue, and we all want what is best for the kids. But let's lead with TAP and do our best to save that program because that's the most important thing at the current moment.

Prof. Philipp—Thank you for that report. I'd like to change the order of the agenda slightly. Susan O'Malley has to leave, but she would like to give a report on the activities of the CUNY Academy. Susan is a former Chair of the UFS. Prof. O'Malley—Now I am president of the CUNY Academy. In the back, there is a letter asking you to join and become a member of the CUNY Academy. This organization has been going on for 26 years, and I am trying to reinvigorate it. It has a glorious history. You can see some of the speakers—Allen Ginsberg, Alice Kessler-Harris, David Lavin, and so on. Derrida was on our Board once upon a time. You can see the things we are doing this spring. The letter ends with a magnificent sentence that Sandi Cooper wrote: “You will also be supporting the only independent CUNY organization devoted to enhancing scholarship and research across the entire University, open to all faculty from two-, four-year, and graduate and professional programs.” So I encourage you to join, and also to send us proposals for lectures, seminars, workshops, and colloquia. Now, on the other piece of paper, I have a list of the spring dates so far. I've been running the Higher Ed Seminar and having a wonderful time, but you too could propose a seminar and we would help you organize it. We don't have a whole lot of money, but some. We are independent, not like the Center for Humanities, that has to think about their foundation grants, and they do. But we don't have to. If you see the list of things, we give out Stewart Travel Awards. Young faculty should have received a notice of that from your provost. Last term we gave out 25 awards of up to \$500. We also honor young faculty for their research – that's the Feliks Gross Award. Then there's the Greek Seminar, the Eisenstadt Lecture, and a new seminar run by an emeritus professor at Brooklyn College, Jerry Kruse, called Visual and Urban Ethnography. Also, Nora Glickman does a series of new faculty speaking on their research at several colleges. So

email me, and send in this letter with your dues, and above all have ideas for things you would like to explore together with others across the University so we generate a little excitement. Thank you.

Chair Philipp—Thank you. The Academy is connected to the UFS in that the Chair of the Senate is an *ex officio* member of the Academy Board. I'd like to add a few things before we go on. In your handouts, you have a notice about the UCRA awards. The UFS Research Committee would like you to nominate liaisons for the UCRA. This is the committee that runs the PSC-CUNY Award Program. This program is under study, should we say, by a task force that has been established by the chancellery. The UFS has two members on it, and the PSC has one. It was a topic of discussion at the Research Committee just before this plenary. You'll be hearing more about that. Another thing I should add is an addendum to my own Report – in the fourth paragraph, I note that Blackboard at 6 this morning was down, and it has been down for quite a while, most of the first week of classes. I'm told by the University's Chief Information Officer that it has come back up, and we hope it stays up. It's a situation in flux. I should emphasize that we've been in very frequent and close contact on this issue. This is a core academic issue, especially for online courses and for lots of other people who use it as an adjunct to the courses. Losing a week is a serious issue. The UFS has made itself somewhat of a pest on this, and I don't apologize for it. This includes comments on it yesterday at one of the Board committee meetings. This is critical for the University, a critical core function, and we will continue to watch it closely, I promise you that, and push them to fix this. Now Prof. Terrence Martell will report on CUNY's endowment policies.

Prof. Martell—I am the faculty representative on the CUNY Board Investment Policy Committee. I've been to exactly one meeting, so I'm not going to have much of an historical perspective to share with you. It does appear that it's a relatively new committee that is just starting to function. Let me share with you what the Committee is supposed to do, and where we are in the process. The Committee is charged with developing investment policy for the Board, including asset allocation or what types of investments the fund should be invested in, and with overseeing the investment managers of the individual funds and making modifications as appropriate. All of those things are, I would say, in various stages of development. The investment policy is not completely formulated yet. We did do some changes to the asset allocation mix, which I'll be happy to discuss if any wishes. It's a relatively small fund. As of December 31, it was approximately \$118 million, which as these funds go is not very large. It has a professional management service, Cambridge Associates of Boston, that provides technical advice to the Committee, and there is a chief investment office, Janet Krone, who is the CUNY employee charged with overseeing this policy. They have specified a pay-out policy, which I believe is reasonably consistent with generally accepted policies. Five percent of the three-year moving average of the Fund is what they will pay out, so you figure that Fund should throw off something in the area of \$5 million, give or take. I don't know the composition of the Fund since the Committee wouldn't know that – how much is restricted or unrestricted, so it isn't like the money can just be disbursed. We don't disburse it as near as I can tell, we merely manage it, and the gift documents that generated the original monies would determine where it goes. Prof. Stefan Baumrin—Do

you know if the endowment has been significantly eroded since September, and, if so, to what extent? Prof. Martell—It appears to have been eroded, but I don't have a precise number. The only number I saw was the December 31 balance. Looking through some minutes and other things would suggest that the number was bigger in September. The Fund was over weighted in equity and in debt, and I'm sure the equity portion took a hit, while the debt portion obviously didn't take the same hit. Prof. Baumrin—So we might, by accident, have done better than Yale? Prof. Martell—Remember, down 10% is the new up! I heard someone just say it was down 17%, but I can't verify that. Prof. Dean Savage—You've been talking about CUNY's central endowment. What about the funds on the various campuses, and do you have any oversight role with respect to those? Prof. Martell—I don't know yet, but I would assume, based on what I know about Baruch, that those are separate corporations, and there is no oversight. On the other hand, I would also assume, knowing CUNY as I do, that as they develop investment policies we will get to enjoy them at various campuses! Prof. Savage—If you Google "Form 990 Search" and you enter the zip code of the college in question, you probably will come up with the 501(c)(3) foundation, and you'll get a balance statement going back five years. So this is something that committees of this body could pursue with profit probably, and it's something that nobody on the faculty really knows much about. We simply do not know how much or how successful we have been in generating endowment money. We do know that the chancellery is holding all of the presidents' feet to the fire to go out there and emulate Baruch College, and I do think that is an essential part of the way forward. I think we do have to do that, but we don't know anything about it and we need to do more. Prof. Martell—And this Committee will not be the one that will help you there. We are not the fund-raising committee, but the Fund managing committee. I'm not sure anyone on the Committee would even know where the money came from and to what extent it was going. Prof. Cooper—Is there any accounting oversight of the campus fund-raising activities? Prof. Martell—All I know is that at Baruch there is an outside auditor. The people on the board have a fiduciary responsibility to see to it that the grant is used in accordance with the gift document, and it's their butts on the line if that doesn't occur. So there is an alignment of internal control with the objectives of the original donor, but that should come out of your office of campus advancement. They are the people who are in charge of making sure that they money is being spent in accordance with the donor's wishes, if there were any. Prof. Cooper—Do we know whether 80th Street is supervising how this is done? I can just see the *New York Post* headlines with the *scandal du jour*. Prof. Philipp—80th Street does hold meetings with the local boards of the college foundations and supervises these as much as possible. One of the reasons for this is that in two cases the local boards escaped the influence and control of the college administrations and went their own way, and it took, in one case, a special master imposed by the court to take the association of the foundation back under control. So they are very interested in riding herd on this. Prof. Campbell Dalglish—What your Committee does is manage these funds, so what are some of the procedures? Do you oversee budgets, accounting reports? Do you make sure the money that has been donated has been allocated properly? Prof. Martell—The Committee is responsible for the investing of the funds, but not for the dispersal of the funds. We allocate that money to fixed income, real estate, equities, etc., and we find managers to manage those groups, and we monitor the managers and assess their performance. We rely on outside

consultants to tell us who is actually adding value, and we change managers as appropriate. Prof. Dalglisch—What is the link then between faculty departments and your Committee? Any link at all? Prof. Martell—On the basis of one meeting, it looks to me that this is an investment committee. Here's the money, now manage it. Dispersal and other functions take place at a college's office of college advancement.

Chair Philipp—Thank you. Our interest in how CUNY manages its money will continue. The UFS is also by its bylaws mandated to participate in the creation of new units of CUNY. There have been several new units of CUNY recently for which we have had a greater or lesser degree of participation. You can think of the School of Journalism--to a lesser degree. The Advanced Science Research Center is a new unit that is still in formation, and we are pushing our nose into the formation of that. I had a meeting recently with Vice Chancellor Small on this subject, but there is nothing to report to you now. I'll give you more information later on. Another new unit is a new community college, and the effort to fashion it is being spearheaded by University Dean John Mogulescu. He met this afternoon with the Community College Caucus. He has also met in the past on this subject with the Executive Committee of the UFS. It was an interesting and contentious meeting, but at this point I'd like to ask Frances Ruoff, Caucus Chair, to report on the meeting they just had with Dean Mogulescu and his colleagues.

Prof. Frances Ruoff--Just to give you some background, I called Dean Mogulescu's office and simply asked him to attend the meeting of the Community College Caucus, which he was ever so willing to do. I did tell him I would forward to him any questions that were sent to me prior to the meeting. I also forwarded the seven-page concept letter to the members of the Caucus, and the 120 page draft that was published last August. Before the meeting, I sent him 10 pages of questions, single-spaced, based on the 120 page paper. I would say that he knew in advance some of the questions that were going to be asked. He also came to the meeting with two people actively involved, Tracy Meade, the University Director for Collaborative Programs, and Stuart Cochran, in charge of Research Evaluation for Collaborative Programs. The meeting was held and everyone was given an opportunity to speak. The first question was where is the money coming from? We're worried about TAP as everyone else, and suddenly we're going to have a brand new college. It seems they are planning on it coming from the City, State, and outside organizations. The Gates Foundation was mentioned. They sent in for a grant; Manfred will address that later. And, it will not come from existing colleges. He is saying that no money will be lost to the other community colleges for this new college. But, there was a caveat: he can't guarantee what will happen down the road. He said there are other choices, and most of this is in answer to the questions that were raised. If this new college is not possible, then the next best choice would be to add existing room space available at John Jay, which in 2011 is going to be moved to a different site. BMCC might be able to use it since it is in desperate need of more rooms, but that was the second choice. What type of degrees? That hasn't been established yet. They are looking at areas of importance for students. In Phase 2 of the planning, then they will figure this out and we will know what the degrees are based on the subject areas that will work. There will be a great deal of discussion. Basically, we were told that this 120 page

document was just in the pre-planning stages. What will happen in Phase 2, which is now going to start, is that they are going to work out the kinks. When questioned about articulation, they are very concerned about that, and they want to get involved and join programs, and they are not sure how that will work exactly, but some of the degrees or areas may have to go if they can't be articulated. They talked a bit about gene ed. They realize there are State requirements. They will meet with these issues as they go forward in Phase 2. He said the State and CUNY realize that we need to change things because the drop out rate is so high. What this program is to be is change for the better. We're stilling working on the specifics of the change for the better, but that is the intent of the program. He said the concept paper is just that. Things have to be worked out. It's just a concept. They want to shake things up. These are direct quotes. Statements, he said, in public are concerned with high rates of minority drop outs, so this college is supposed to be addressing the needs of those most affected. The question was asked, why not a pilot program, why are we going full-blown ahead with a brand new college? Tracy suggested that she wrote one, and it was rejected by the Chancellor, although I don't recall seeing any paper of that nature. Then she spoke about the original concept being for the Robin Hood Foundation. They call it At Home in the College, and there were similar projects planned to go on at three of the community colleges, KCC, Hostos, and LaGuardia. Since many of us are in the English Departments of these colleges, I haven't heard a word about it at all at any meetings, so this might be something that surprises us on the first day of school in September. He said this is to be a demonstration program, and that this is far more comprehensive than any pilot program. They are aiming at employment for the two-year vocational studies programs. But, there will be consideration given for their going on to 4-year programs. So we're still in a quandary where the focus is. The question was raised whether this was a model for other community colleges, or is this an extension to high school. He said no. Why the requirement for full-time students? The reason given was that full-time students will do better. This improves the rate of success, but some of us said this won't work for our students who have to work and commute. That didn't matter because the data don't support it. A suggestion was made that we need the statistics of how they wound up at the end of the first semester if they are full-time. In other words, what is happening by the end of the semester? Are you going to get back to us and tell us? Why don't we approach the students? Another suggestion was made to ask the students what their needs were? The issue of the sliding scale for credits – it is proposed that the faculty decide. The students will reach a point in the class where the faculty decide if the student has made enough improvement and how many credits they should get. If it takes two semesters to complete it, that's fine. But the goal is to have all the students complete more than 20 credits by the end of the first year. This is a community college. One of the problems that those of us in community colleges have is that the students are forced to pick a major when they start school. They won't do that, because they don't want the various departments to vie for the students. If you're in Travel and Tourism, they don't want you going after that student for your particular department. But students won't do that, and I don't know how they will get TAP when they have to declare right away. That's one of those little problems that will have to be worked out. The focus initially will be content courses. Work that is worthy of credits will be decided by the faculty. Remediation – basically, we don't handle it very well. Something needs to be done about it. That's it in a nutshell. In other words, this school

is going to come up with remediation programs that truly meet the needs of the students. When questioned why we have programs here but why were we not consulted, they said they will in Phase 2. The program itself is based on national data, and he wants to bring the faculty on board in the next Phase. About the space at John Jay, some questioned about where the space would be for a library? There isn't enough there for a two-year college that will meet the needs of the students. They will get one. They do not plan to take space from other colleges. Of course, any CUNY student can use any CUNY library. They want to get the students more involved in this process. How and when they are going to do that was not addressed. A comment was made that those involved with the program were hand-picked faculty and that a broader range of faculty was not represented. The answer was that he hopes to include faculty in Phase 2. He did not mean to be disrespectful when someone pointed out that we've been doing this for 30 to 50 years and basically you're coming in and telling us no, no, no, we know how it's going to be best for our students. At the end, he pointed out he didn't mean to be disrespectful by not addressing the faculty needs, and that they will be more active with us in the future.

Prof. Cooper—Did Mogulescu say whether this institution was going to give AA and AAS degrees, or AAS degrees? Prof. Ruoff—He said they are not at the degree part yet. They are just talking about possible areas. Prof. Cooper—Those who haven't read the proposal should read it. It will replace Hegel for going to sleep at night! However, the trouble is that if he is serious and the Gates Foundation is serious, this is the most extraordinary assault on intellectual life that I have read for a long time by somebody who is reportedly an administrator at a university. Prof. Ruoff—He said the proposal that came out in August had nothing to do with the Mayor's report on vocational high schools. If you read the two, it's hard to find the difference from the vocational high schools. Prof. Crain—Thank you for asking about the part-time student. At CCNY we have a tradition of being very proud of our part-time students in our evening program. They have lower income levels and higher family involvement and worked a lot, but still had perseverance and went to college. We have many great people who went part-time. Do you notice a trend of emphasis on full-time? It is worrisome. Journalism School is full-time, it's mandatory in the Honors College, and now at CCNY we have a proposal in the Art Department that will accept only full-time students. They are catching on that this is the wave of the future, and the way to please the powers that be. The smart chairpersons who want to be on the right side of things are moving toward full-time. We want to see graduation rates measured in six-year terms, which would be appropriate for the senior colleges. You can move toward full-time programs, but you are going to have wealthier kids who can afford it. So please keep emphasizing that we value the part-time student. Prof. Ruoff—They are trying to beef up graduation rates with this, but of course many of our student can't do this. They work 40 hour weeks. Prof. Vozick—I would like to note that this is the first time in my experience with the UFS where an adjunct is leading part of the presentation. So my compliments to the leadership of the organization and to you. The second thought is that what we're involved in is not a question and answer format, but more a kind of Thesis/Antithesis/Synthesis process. I'd like to point out some positives here. I'm not endorsing this plan. In fact I'm a strong critic of it. First, we've complained for years that the chancellery is not paying attention to

community colleges. This is one outcome of the Chancellor in his own way trying to pay attention to community colleges. It associates with his ideas about money and growth and centers of excellence. Whether it's great or not, it represents something we would be wise to engage with.

Prof. Savage—The background on this is that about 20 years ago about 20% of the two-year degrees in New York City were awarded by private colleges. People don't know this, and the number has been increasing every year. One of the most interesting things about this 120 page proposal -- which I read with great interest because I saw a lot of innovative things that need to be considered -- is an emphasis on getting people to attend full-time, and the emphasis on ferociously paying attention to placement. My question is, what kind of evidence do we have about the placement. Has he been able to talk about that? We haven't been able to be good at that. Prof. Ruoff—There was no comment on that. Many issues like that are being referred to Phase 2. We plan to have him back in September. Prof. Woytowich—In response to what Dean just said about community colleges, there is something they do that as far as I know we don't attempt to compete with them on and that's the associate of occupational studies degree, which are practically 100% technical courses, and virtually no liberal arts. I don't think we want to compete with them, but that probably skews the statistics. Also, I do a lot of advisement and I see very few part-time students. I see many students who are carrying 12 credits, the minimum to be full-time, and working full-time jobs. So unless they find a way to put a restriction on students' outside activities, I don't know whether insisting that student go full-time will really do what they want it to do. My question is about the Gates Foundation. Is there going to be some emphasis on the use of proprietary software in there, and is that something we think is healthy? Prof. Ruoff—That will have to be worked out in Phase 2! Prof. Woytowich—I'd like to go on record as opposing any dependence on a single source of anything, especially software. Prof. Pecorino—In the past I've heard Dean Mogulescu respond to the charge that they might be cherry-picking highly selective students say that we're having the same admissions criteria, first-come first-served. But then he says there will be an interview where we will advise them concerning the programs we have, meaning if they don't fit they are not in, and that they have to be full-time. So, have you ever seen him be aware that admitting that is admitting that they are being selective? Prof. Ruoff—There were many inconsistencies in what was said today. Prof. Doris Withers—What accountability measures are they now using to determine retention to say this is a group of students that we want to attract? The retention rates are low, but the question is what data are they using? The Center for National Education Statistics, or CUNY's own data, or New York State data? There are specific kinds of data, but the issue beyond that is what sub-cohorts are they looking at because quite honestly full-time attendance is sometimes a proxy for money. You should ask them what the sources of their data are. Prof. Ruoff—They used national studies. Prof. Withers—One of the recent studies that has come out of the Center for National Education Statistics is the non-traditional student who is older, part-time, and has family responsibilities. They have been studying that group because that cohort is in fact increasing, and New York City is a place where that non-traditional student is quite common. It varies on CUNY's campuses; some have a greater cohort of those students than others. So you really need to get who they are talking about. The Lumina

Foundation has done a lot of work in this regard. Prof. Baumrin—I had this colloquy with the people in charge of statistical analysis in the Executive Committee and then earlier today at the meeting. Their data, which they say is national data driving this proposal, are not disambiguated for class or for campus-driven schools, so the data are useless for our student body. I pointed this out to them. Prof. Ruoff—I don't know how anyone can compare New York City with Kansas. The national data is coming from where? Are there community colleges in Chicago and Detroit? You can't do a national survey and then say our students are like everyone else. They're not. Our students commute. They don't live on campus. Your data is skewed right there completely. Prof. Kathryn Richardson—Was anything said about the programs in the new community college? Prof. Ruoff—They are considering 12 different programs, but they have to work out certain problems like articulation with other schools. Some of these degrees, the way they are looking at it, I believe would be terminal degrees. I don't know if you're familiar with the State program at Delhi, but that program meets the needs of its students. It's in an agricultural area, and they have courses in animal husbandry and such things that work for their students, including plumbing and carpentry. When they leave there, they can do something. On one hand, we're being told they want the students to be able to leave with a two-year degree and do something, but then they also should be able to articulate to a four-year school. Prof. Richardson—When I read the document, something made me go very quickly until the middle of the document. I'm the chairperson of Nursing at City Tech, and when I got to the middle to see what the programs were, the very first one was Nursing, followed by a lot of technical programs. I was very concerned because the Nursing Discipline Council was never involved in this. If you look in the back, there must 200 names there of all the people who were involved in this proposal, and I saw one nurse there that I know who I haven't had a chance to speak with yet. There might have been another nurse from Long Island, but I can't recall. I've tried to get a meeting, through the Discipline Council, and people are telling me it's fine but it's all very nebulous and the responses are all nebulous. I think it has to be addressed because in the beginning it seemed to me that they were taking students who needed remediation and are bringing them into this school with all these ideas on how to remediate and work them into the program, and then after all of this remediation takes place they are going to put them into a Nursing program. After all we've been trying to do to educate everybody from the high school level up, that in order to become a nurse you need very strong math and science. Did they mention nursing? Prof. Ruoff—It wasn't excluded, but also in the nursing program you're not going to get them out in two years. Two or three years, and then pass the boards. What's the lab space available? They acknowledged they will have to use adjuncts at the new school, but then we don't even know what the degrees are. Are we going to have adjunct high school teachers? I don't mean any aspersions on the high school teachers, but that was one of the concerns, whether this would be like another high school. We have many vocational high schools that they can leave and get a job. Aviation is one. But, no, those issues were not addressed, and with vocational skills you're going to need labs, internships, and a great many things that have to be worked out. It's not that simple. We know what we want to do with the English and philosophy programs, but nursing is very specific. Prof. Vozick – The proposal seems to have presented some ferment, although I'm not endorsing it. One of the questions for us is whether we as the Faculty Senate are interested in being

involved in the next stage. They have announced that they are interested in both student and faculty involvement in the next stage. They have not made clear what the limits of flexibility are with relation to the original terms posited, and I think they might be open. I proposed one alternative, which was to consider a dual program, one half of which was a new experimental college, and the other half of which was a program of experimentation on the existing community colleges, so they would be financially rewarded for creative experiments to achieve parallel goals to the new community college, but in the existing colleges. They said very interesting. I don't know exactly what we should do, but I don't think we should look at all the faults of this plan and therefore just say they don't know what they are doing and they're not paying us any attention. We should consider carefully whether we want to be engaged in this plan, or make a counter-proposal, etc. Prof. Ruoff—We have to see what they come up with in Phase 2. We've seen the draft, now let's see where they go. They made a genuine effort to say they will involve faculty, and I believe some of these questions can be forwarded to the Executive Board. Chair Philipp—From the UFS point of view, it's not just faculty who they happen to have picked to be involved. It's people who are picked by faculty governance bodies, such as the UFS. Prof. Pecorino—Will the Caucus put together a statement of concerns and issues? If so, I will contribute to it, because up to now it's being advanced at the end of Phase 1 as if there have been no significant problems and issues raised about it, just that there has been a lot of interest, and a lot of people show up. Prof. Ruoff—I believe they were a little surprised at the questions they received today. We rocked the boat quite a bit, and I don't think they anticipated that. So, yes, we will come up with a statement. I can forward to you the 10 pages of questions that they read. Prof. Friedman—Some of us have been very engaged with this concept paper for a long time, even going back to the spring. The UFS Executive Committee had been trying to get information since then, and as soon as this paper came out, even though it was dated in August it came out in October. The Executive Committee has been dealing very deeply with this, so my sense is that in this room we have varying levels of background knowledge. While I very much appreciate you, Fran, giving this report, in my view this is not an issue for the Community College Caucus. Certainly it is good that we invited him because the community college people know most about the community colleges for 30 or 40 years, but this is an issue for the entire Senate. It's interesting that Fran has to answer all of these questions, because it should be Dean Mogulescu and his team. I think we should bring him here because new questions and concerns keep coming up in every venue from senior college faculty and others. I suggest we have him here, but if not it's the responsibility of the Executive Committee, which I am a member of, for us to come up with a list of concerns for what the elected faculty should do, in cooperation with the Caucus. I have to say that the suggestions about questions, and credit, and developmental education, and doing it better – none of this is new. Unfortunately in their voluminous bibliography at the end there was not one citation of any of the research done by CUNY faculty scholars in the area of developmental ed, or reading and writing across the curriculum, and this research goes back to when I was in junior high school. So there may be good things in here, but we shouldn't be under the illusion that they are suddenly coming up with the answers that we have not been able to come up with in 30 or 40 years. Prof. Ruoff—When I invited Dean Mogulescu to speak at the Caucus, I asked him why don't you speak at the Senate and his answer was I wasn't invited. So if you want

him here, invite him. As far as a statement from the Caucus, if the Caucus itself decides to sit down and formulate a statement, it can certainly be presented at a plenary meeting on behalf of the Caucus. If the plenary wants to formulate its own statement, that is fine. If the Executive Committee wants to address whatever they've been sent by the Caucus or any other body, that is fine but I'm not going to say the Caucus will not make a statement if it so chooses. It will be up to members of the Caucus. Prof. Judith Barbanel—Obviously, this issue has generated a great deal of interest and it's no longer just a community college issue. So I think it's important to invite him here. At the end of our meeting, he offered to come back again. Prof. Cooper—The UFS charter requires it to participate in the creation of new programs that cut across the campuses in the University. This means we have nothing to do with economics at Baruch College, but when something new like SPS is generated, our charter requires an involvement whether we like it or not, or they like it or not. This is an issue for the community colleges but also for anyone who teaches in a senior college. Mogulescu and company are the people who pioneered and pushed through the Board about a decade ago a policy requiring that any student with an AA or AAS degree be given all credit for that work when transferring to any senior college. I can't imagine, having looked at those proposed curricula, how anybody would end up with a baccalaureate. The earth science piece, for example, was so deficient in everything students need to process to the fourth year. Nursing is another case and there are others. It's really unfair to a student to tell that person that you're getting a degree which will validate your transfer to another institution where they won't have the core or the liberal arts distribution. That's an intellectual embarrassment. If you are expected to ratify a BA or BS degree for anybody graduating from your institution, you need to be able to stand behind that degree. That student cannot go out into the world and make a fool out of the institution by flubbing every job they try to get. I'm as much interested and responsible for this as anyone else in this institution. I believe we should have him here. I don't see how they can predict which two-year career programs are going to be valid 15 years from now. You can't train people so narrowly. Prof. Ruoff—I made one point at the end of the meeting. This has to be approved by Middle States. This is not a minor detail. We're finding the flaws, and I think Middle States will take a close look at this, too. Prof. Woytowich—I heard some puzzlement about whether the focus would be on vocational skills or upward mobility. My experience at City Tech since the financial crisis has been that our school has concentrated on those programs that can do both, but if that's the driving factor it may result in a selection of programs that may leave people scratching their heads. Otherwise, I agree with Sandi that the senior colleges should be in on this to say whether these degrees are going to be transferable. Chair Philipp—My opinion was that having him here without preparing this body for his presentation would not be useful. That's why I supported Fran having him at the Caucus, because they are expert in the community college curricula. It was better to have him here to be examined by that group before he comes to this plenary. This report you just heard from Fran will prepare you to ask the right questions when he does come. But while the Caucus does have that expertise, the senior colleges have a tremendous stake in this that they don't necessarily realize. That will come when there are demands for automatic articulation with this new community college. This is of the highest importance, and deserved the most serious treatment.

Chair Philipp--Prof. Bonnie Nelson has been our faithful representative on the IT Steering Committee for almost four years. She has done this in an unheralded way, and now we are at a point where IT issues are really critical because of the failure of some IT functions and because we're switching over to CUNYFirst. Prof. Nelson—Primarily I want to talk about the problems we've been having lately, but I could also talk about the IT Steering Committee, which is a fascinating body. You've all been aware that there have been problems with Blackboard. These started probably last semester because CUNY was switching from Version 6 to 8. The Graduate Center and the Online BA switched to 8 in the summer and fall, and they started reporting problems with response time. Instead of forcing all colleges to switch to 8 in the spring as they were intending, they gave the colleges the opportunity to stay on 6. Most wanted to switch, however. CUNY put everything they could into this. They worked with Blackboard, and did performance testing, but there were still serious problems. Blackboard was not the only problem. Other CUNY systems such as the Portal and the LDAP directory that underlies it had problems, as well as the library systems. These are basically all the systems they support for the whole University, and they all failed in the past two weeks. The library system has been struggling for a while, and had a major blow about a year and a half ago with the loss of some key staff. It took them a year to fill one of the key positions, and another has not been filled. Since that job has been vacant, the library system has failed totally three or four times. There were major crashes in May 2008, this past November, and then this past week when everyone was focused on Blackboard and the Portal, the library system was also down for two days. The Portal is the system that enables you to sign onto Blackboard. The Portal does a lot more than that, such as providing limited access to your personnel records, and provides access to the E-Mall where you can get free anti-virus programs and some Microsoft programs. The Portal also provides students access to E-Sims, so they can register, access to E-Permit so they can take courses at other colleges, access to Degree Works so they can see if they are on track making progress towards their degree, and also provides admissions – students now apply to CUNY on the Portal. It has been down, and is still down. The Portal authenticates students through the LDAP, a directory system with all the student and faculty log-on information. They've gotten that back up, but the Portal itself is still down and student who have applied to CUNY can't find out the status of their application. Students who have not yet applied, cannot apply. If you go to the application page, it says sorry, the Portal is down, please come back later. There have been problems with the Portal and LDAP since fall registration. The LDAP failed in the middle of registration, which caused tremendous headaches for the registrars. It's pretty alarming that all these systems failed all at once. The UFS Library and IT Committee just had a meeting with Ron Spalter and Brian Cohen, who said the reason they all failed at once was because on January 9 the BMW Building, which houses our central computing, had work done that required turning off the A/C and ventilation systems, and although CUNY was prepared with backup cooling, the temperature reached 90 degrees. They believe this caused damage, which was not recognized at the time. Anyway, everything was back up as of 10 this morning, and I hope Brian is right that the main reason for the problems this week was hardware failures. Chair Philipp—Thank you, and thanks for your service.

Prof. Dahlia Remler—CUNY made a decision to centralize things. At Baruch, for instance, we have excellent IT and we used to be able to get directly to Blackboard. Then the decision was made that we would have to go through the Portal. Whether or not it's a good idea to have one door for all these purposes and for all of CUNY, to pull it out, forcing everyone to go in, without carefully testing each stage so you know each stage will work, seems to me a mistake and one that could be avoided. I also have a question: the first week of classes, the Portal was down and you couldn't get to Blackboard. Friday evening, after essentially a week without Blackboard access, they provided a short cut so you could go directly to Blackboard even though the Portal was down. Could they have done that sooner and, if so, why didn't they? Prof. Nelson—They did, actually. I don't think it came up reliably, but that page where you can get into Blackboard if the Portal is down has actually been available for some months. Prof. Remler—We couldn't find out about it. Later on, that Friday I called the help line and they told me about it, but for most of the week if there was a way in, people didn't know about it. Prof. Nelson—That's the Portal Down page, which is supposed to come up. They tweaked it so if two servers were down, it was supposed to come up, and I saw notices all last week that the Portal was down but the Portal Down page was available. Things were very bad last week. Prof. Remler—Even after it was up, as you said, I did get on it over the weekend, but students who tried said they usually couldn't get on and when they did it was slow. Prof. Nelson—I would suggest that faculty stay in touch with their campus IT people. There is this CUNY IT Steering Committee, and on it sits either the VP for Administration or the Chief Information Officer of every campus. They do have a big say, and they do represent the campuses to the central office. Campuses where there are strong faculty senate technology committees or technology advisory committees do get their voices heard there. Faculty must realize how dependent they are on this now, and hold their feet to the fire. I've been to many meetings of the Committee where CUNY wanted to do something and campuses have been able to say I've talked to my faculty about this, and the don't want us to do this, and CUNY backed down. Prof. Remler—Slow incremental testing is well known in IT. Prof. Genis—I postponed my first quiz because of this. Now, some students can access Blackboard and some cannot. My question is when will all the servers be working? Prof. Nelson—They hope it's working correctly now. At the last meeting of the IT Steering Committee, when everything was down, CUNY CIS said we know it's not working and if we knew why we would fix it. Since then they have identified some things that they believe caused the problems, and they have tried to fix them. The LDAP has been up reliably for a few days now, so students can create accounts if they didn't have them before. So hopefully, it will be better. Prof. Gail August—About a month ago, E-Sims was changed and we have to have a new set of passwords with very specific requirements which have to be changed every 45 days. At Hostos we have about five different systems for finding out student information. Each one has a different password that must be changed frequently, and many people, including me, just don't use these systems any more because we just can't keep track of them. Is there any way for IT to rationalize the system so when you want to find information you can use one password? Prof. Nelson—The Portal is supposed to be, eventually, the one place you go to to access all the systems. There is hope you will be able to get in with one login and password. I also dislike passwords having to change, and I've argued about that at the Committee, and research shows making users change

their passwords leads to more insecure systems because they write them down on little slips of paper. They keep telling me this is mandated by New York State. This is another reason to be involved on your campus and make your voices known to your IT people.

Prof. Arlene Spark—Is it true that everything is at the BMW Building and when the air conditioning went, the system went. There are no duplicate systems someplace? Everything is there? Prof. Nelson—CUNY is not a bank so they don't have fail safe systems to come up elsewhere. That's enormously expensive. They do have the data backed up remotely so it's not a question of having a crash and losing all the data. The problem is that the data center at 57th Street was built to be a research data center, and not an administrative data center. CUNY has plans to move the center to MetroTech in Brooklyn in a place that has been built as a data center with redundancy and separate air conditioning, and all that, so this won't happen. All of CUNY's system apparently are on multiple servers that are balanced, so I think Blackboard is on 12 different servers. So there is redundancy in that sense. Not everything is running on one machine. The library system is on four different servers. The problem is that not all of these systems were meant to be run that way, but CUNY did it out of concern about redundancy, so that if one server failed, it immediately went over to another one. The problem they've been having is that they are all going down. The move from the BMW Building is planned in about two years.

Prof. Pecorino—I wanted to be fair and set the record straight, and let people know what has been going on that hasn't been mentioned yet. I am an independent appointee to the Steering Committee, although I am a faculty voice there. I am a UFS appointee to the University's Committee on Academic Technology, where I serve on the subcommittee on Blackboard 8. I've sat in on meetings even as late as yesterday with people at the University who are responsible at CIS for operating Blackboard and who speak to the Blackboard company. Let me explain this tsunami that is greater than the perfect storm. Imagine a building where every room on the first floor has a separate entrance from the outside, but there's a main door that you can go through and if you do you can get into each of the rooms. That would be the Portal. The door is locked. To get through that lock, you have to do an extensive procedure, but the basic procedure to get in there which checks your name against what you previously entered is the same kind of thing as the lock on every door in the building. So now when the Portal goes down, because massive numbers of people are coming and the problems with the circuitry, they created a way where you could go into the applications through the direct side doors. But again, it uses the same kind of checking device, which is called an LDAP. It's quite ironic that it's an acronym – imagine we've got 325,000 people and 150,000 users per day – for the Lightweight Document Authentication Program. Here's what they have learned and what they are going to do. They are going to study the campuses that have had less of a problem with the direct entry of students, and try and get those procedures brought up. They supported and facilitated the manual entry of students when the programs collapsed. They will replace LDAP with a new program probably within a month or so. The data center itself will probably move out of there pretty soon, but it will be in New York City with highest order of security with backup electric generators in the building in addition to these batteries that provide electricity when the system goes down, and the building will have redundant cooling. It will have a whole disaster recovery plan, which will be both in place and at a distance. Bonnie described how the redundancy is already sort of built in with a backup where they backup the data

every day. The University operates on two different networks or lines, fiber optic cable rings. The rings are both connected later on to something common and then they go down, so it was a real calamity of failures that coincided because of the physical problem when the circuit boards expanded due to the heat. They will do everything possible to see that it doesn't happen again. Blackboard 8 itself – the problem there turned out to be that Blackboard didn't tell them when they loaded it up that there was an additional patch they were supposed to put in. Until they started screaming to the highest levels at Blackboard, the CEO, they didn't get that information. They put that in between 6 and 8 o'clock. It came up and at 10:10 this morning I was online until 4 and it was behaving better for me than it did all last semester. So we keep our fingers crossed, but they are doing everything they can and hopefully they will learn from this a whole lot of lessons. If I were in their position, I'm thinking what more could I have done? Even if they had another location in Arkansas, you would still have to get into it, and in order to get into it you would have to get in through the same type of doorway to get into that room, and you'd have the same problem we encountered here. One thing they said they do appreciate is that they've got to get more messages out on a timely basis to the people who are most involved, and hope that those messages will go out to others. They don't believe it's appropriate to communicate directly with faculty. Manfred might work on that. How many steps does it have to go through before it gets to faculty? At the present time, they get it out to several people who they hope will disseminate it on the campuses, but it turns out some of the sys admins are not getting the information they think would be useful. Prof. Nelson—The staff worked incredibly hard. Many stayed up all night, many nights in a row to try and get things back. They were incredibly inventive. They wrote new code to bypass the Portal so students can set up authentication so they could get into Blackboard. I think we should all appreciate the work they put in. Chair Philipp—Thank you very much for your report. At this point, I'd like to express my personal sympathy to Morris Hounion, whose wife passed away. I'm sorry, Morris, for your loss and we all wish you the best. With that, I declare this meeting adjourned.