

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

March 3, 2009

The meeting was called to order by UFS Chair Philipp at 6:35 p.m. in Room 9204/05/06 at the Graduate School and University Center. 76 voting members of 118 were present.

Baruch: Present – Dumas, Hill, Martell, Vora and Wine. Absent – Freedman, Myers, Nematollahy, and Pollard. **BMCC:** Present – Friedman, Genis, Martinez-Lopez, Niyazov, Soto, and Vozick. Absent – Kalogeropoulos, and Persaud. **Bronx: CC:** Present – Ismail, and Skinner. Absent –Bandar, and Prabhu. **Brooklyn:** Present-- Jacobson, Massood, Tobey, and Alternate Jensen-Moulton. Absent–Bell, Cherukupalli, Duboys, Magliozzo Morrill, Shapiro, Shortell, and Viscusi. **CCNY:** Present – Crain, Dalglish and Raj. Absent –Habib, Khalil, Lascar, and Sank. Vacancies. 2. **CSI:** Present –Klibaner, Talarico, Yousef and Alternate Stearns. Absent – Batson, Cooper, and Petratos. **CUNY Law School:** Absent –Bach, and Yanez. **Graduate School:** Present – Baumrin, Lennon, and Nolan. Absent – Mathews-Salazar, Orenstein, Weinstein, and Burke. **Hostos CC:** Present– August and Pimentel. Alternates Vacancies - 1. Absent –Bernardini, Czarnocha, and Sharma. **Hunter:** Present – DeMeo, Grossman, Kuhn-Osius, Spark, and Strayer. Absent – Ancona, Guzzetta, Kaye Palanda, and Simon. **John Jay:** Present – Chaffie, Dunham, Kaplowitz, Katz, and Kubic. Absent – Crossman, and King-Toler. **Kingsborough CC:** Present – Barnhart, Hume, Ruoff, Stubin, and Wood. Absent– Sarinsky. **LaGuardia CC:** Present –Lerman, Mettler, Shean and Alternate Kurzyna. Absent – Beaky, Davidson, and Rushing. **Lehman:** Present –Philipp, and Alternate Carey. Absent – Hellmann, Jervis, Marianetti, Maybee, and Mineka. **Medgar Evers:** Present – Barker and Withers. Absent –Cuffee and Stewart. **NYCCT:** Present –Horelick, Hounion, Richardson, and Woytowich. Absent – Cermele and Panayotakis. **Queens:** Present – Bird and Savage. Vacancies – 3. Absent – Brody, Gonzalez, Moore, and Zevin. **Queensborough CC:** Present – Barbanel, Iconis, Sweetnam, Tai, and Alternate Volchok. Absent – Pecorino. **York:** Present – Lewis and Mawyer. Absent– Baron and Cockery. Professors Bluestone (QCC), Dahbany-Miraglia (QCC), Divale (York), Gordon (Hunter), and Rodman (Brooklyn) attended.

Interim Executive Vice Chancellor Logue attended.

Governance Leaders present: Baumrin (GS), Carey (Lehman) Hume (KCC), Kaplowitz (John Jay), Mawyer (York), Mettler (LaGuardia), Philipp (Lehman), Raj (CCNY), Savage (Queens), Tai (QCC), Tobey (Brooklyn), 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 February 3, 2009: Minutes were approved as distributed.
- III. Reports (Recorded in Reports & Deliberations)
 - A. Chair
 - B. Interim Executive Vice Chancellor Lexa Logue
 - C. Discussion of PSC-CUNY Research Award Restructuring
 - D. Representatives to Board of Trustee Committees.
 - E. Faculty Experience Survey Update (Professor Barker and Savage)

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Bill Phipps
Executive Director

REPORTS AND DELIBERATIONS
OF THE 342nd PLENARY SESSION
OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

March 3, 2009

Chair Philipp—If we could approve the agenda? Thank you. Approval of the minutes? They are approved. Finally, approval of the Rules of Procedure? They are also approved. You have my report in written form, and this time I think I'll just mention a few of the highlights. The Chancellor has announced that he is moving forward with the study of a school of pharmacy, which was a proposal that this body put into the proposed Master Plan. I think that's a very significant thing. We will have a spring conference on April 24, Access to Higher Education in the Health Sciences. Leslie Jacobson is co-chairing that group. We've become involved, for better or for worse, in the new community college. We'll be watching that closely to see if it does come to pass it will be a quality institution, and will have the kind of governance that this organization traditionally demands. What probably will be the hot issue of this evening is the proposed changes to the PSC-CUNY awards program. We have a panel discussion. There is a draft, and I have to emphasize it is a draft, proposal floating around. Vice Chancellor Small, who chairs this task force, has met this evening with the community college caucus. It was originally to discuss the CUNY Collaboratives, but the discussion went over into the PSC-CUNY award process. I did invite her to this meeting, but she had to decline. I think the panel will be of interest to you. I should mention that the Council of Faculty Governance Leaders on Friday voiced its opposition to the terms of the draft that is circulating right now. I also want to mention that a week from today, members of the UFS will be going to Albany to lobby for more funding for CUNY. All of you are welcome to come along. At the same time, members of the Executive Committee will be meeting with the president of the SUNY UFS, and the president of the SUNY Faculty Council of Community Colleges to discuss joint initiatives, particularly in terms of funding. SUNY is under a significant disadvantage. They were foolish enough to try to preempt a tuition increase, but it turns out that 90% of it just goes to the State and not to anybody else. Both college presidents, students, and everyone else is unhappy about that situation. Our situation is a little different. In addition, we are arranging for visits to local legislative offices, which we will try to get you to come to, to lobby legislators, State senators and Assemblypeople, to vote for funds for CUNY. It's important that we do this, even though it doesn't look like the most dire scenarios will come to pass, we do have to support this University. The last item is to note that Executive Vice Chancellor Lexa Logue has provided \$30,000 to fund the UFS Faculty Experience Survey. In fact, she just walked in the door! You will hear from Professors Savage and Barker about the survey a little later.

Interim Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Lexa Logue—Good evening, everyone. It's a great pleasure to be here. Can everyone see the projection screen? Manfred asked me to speak with you tonight about what is happening in the Office of Academic Affairs, our goals, and our progress reports on those, and that's what this is about. Anybody can go to this website

<http://www.cuny.edu/academics/oa/goals.html>

and look at what the Office of Academic Affairs' goals are. This is the Central Office of Academic Affairs. There are 45 goals for this year, and actually not everything is on this chart. These are the ones, at least, that we put on the chart last fall. What we have done, now that it's been five months or so since we made this chart, is to write one page progress reports on each of the 45 goals. What I'm going to show you is how the chart is laid out, and maybe some of the goals and progress reports. You can get to the progress reports by just clicking on the name of

the particular goal and see what we are doing and what is happening. Each progress report also shows what we are going to do next. And, as you can see here, you can download the whole file if you want to and print out all 45 goals and progress reports, or you can just look at it on the Web. The way this is organized is that the first section are goals that have to do with faculty development and research, and then there's another section on curriculum, learning, and teaching, and another section on teacher education – because we spend a lot of time on that in the central office, and another on health and nursing – another big focus for us. Then comes enrollment, retention, and student development, followed by assessment and accountability, and technology. At the very bottom is a section on administration. Back to the very top, I want to show you what the columns are. There is a description of the goal, we have them clustered according to their topic area, and we also have success indicators for every goal with specific objection criteria to see if we are going to meet that goal. Then we list the people at the central office who are working on that goal. That's the team member, with an asterisk next to the person's name who is leading that team, and then other associated offices, other than Academic Affairs, who are working with us on this in the central office. If there is anything in particular that anyone is interested in, I could show you how to explore this. Let's take Adjunct Faculty Orientation and Support. Just click on that goal to see the progress report for this one. The team leader is Erika Dreifus. She is the director of communications in our office, but she has also frequently been an adjunct, so she ended up as the team leader for this one, because she has a personal interest in this. Also, working with her are George Otte, Judith Summerfield, and Yasemin Jones. You can see that each progress report has a summary at the beginning of what's been going on, and this team decided that first they would try to look for evidence of information that could help adjuncts to increase their performance, rather than actually increasing adjunct performance; because they didn't feel they could actually measure that yet. They are looking for things to help with adjuncts. Their goal is to find resources for adjuncts that might be made available to everybody in the system, to be used for adjuncts. They started by trying to see what the colleges are already doing. A lot of this kind of work is trying to share information and best practices from one college to other colleges. Collecting the information, and asking the colleges what would be helpful to them? What could we do? That is a lot of what we are trying to do: do things centrally that the colleges think would be helpful to them. For example, is there a website we could set up that the college would feel to be useful to them. If there is some software that we could buy for the whole system, and all of the colleges could use it and it would be cheaper to do it that way, then we would like to help in that way. If there was some kind of orientation that we could help with, we would do that. This team is asking the colleges whether they have a handbook for adjuncts. Then we can make this information available to all of the colleges, assuming the college is willing. So that's an example. Then we can go back to the original chart and look at a different goal. Anything in particular that anyone here is wondering about? **Voice**—How did you arrive at these goals? **Dr. Logue**—We went through a fairly extensive process last summer in the Office of Academic Affairs where we first met and tried to talk about what it is that the central Office of Academic Affairs is supposed to be doing. What is our mission? We should not be doing what the campuses are supposed to be doing, but what could we do to help. We had many discussions about that, also looked at documents like the current Master Plan. We had a number of criteria. Were they things that fit with CUNY's overall mission, did they fit with the mission of a central office as opposed to a campus office, were they things already in the Master Plan, were they things we had already promised to do -- perhaps even by signing an agreement? We had many meeting on it, and narrowed down to 45 goals. **Professor Crain**—Are you working on admissions? **Dr. Logue**—That's down in the section on enrollment. I can give you an update, because I know everyone is interested in admissions these days. We are spending a fair amount of time on enrollment management. Just to give you some data first. This spring, headcount is up 4.5% compared to last spring, but FTEs are up 6.5% compared with last spring. What that means is that the average student we have is taking more credits. Applications, according to the latest data that are only a week old, for next fall are up at the present time by 11% compared to last fall. So we are expecting to have a lot of students. Paramount among everything is maintaining quality for the students that we take in.

We want to provide access, but we want to make sure that we have as good an experience as possible for these students. We are not going to sacrifice quality. So, what has happened in response to what is going on is that the senior colleges have pretty much all decided that they are going to raise admission standards for next fall, and that is how they will control their enrollment for next fall even though they have more applications. But what that means is that there are more students who are rejected, obviously, from the senior colleges, and they will then be more interested in going to the other colleges in the system, who already have more applications because of our increasing reputation and the financial situation. So, we're expecting the brunt of the pressure to probably fall on the community colleges. We had a meeting last week with the representatives from all the community colleges, and also two of the comprehensive colleges, to talk about this situation and what was going to be done. From what I understand, this is the first time that we ever had a meeting with the community colleges about the possibility of too much enrollment. These are new times. We are talking with the community colleges about various strategies. One thing is that, as LaGuardia did I believe last summer, we may cut off admissions before the very end of the summer. This can have a number of advantages. At least in the past, at CUNY and at other community colleges, the students who come in at the last minute tend to be the least successful students. There are a variety of reasons for that, and some of them may have to do with the students themselves, but some of it may be because it is hard to test them, and place them, and get instructors for them at the last minute. So, LaGuardia cut off admissions in August and was very pleased with the results. Other community colleges, at least some of them, may do that this summer. People would not be told that they could not come to CUNY, just that they would have to wait until January. If we have to do that, what could we do for those students, especially the ones who, if we test them, it turns out they need some remedial courses, is maybe give them some special experiences during the fall, like Summer Immersion or CLIP. Of course, if things continue the way they are, we will have an even worse problem in spring of 2010. It will just all back up. Also, I know the community colleges are concerned to make sure that, no matter what, there will be room for students who finish community college to transfer to the senior colleges. Of course, that's a very high priority for us. You can see that there are a lot of different factors that we are looking at here. This is brand new territory for CUNY. We do expect that next fall we will have more enrollment than has ever been true in the history of CUNY. We will hit a maximum next fall. **Professor Vozick**—Have you given any thought about the possible effects of these cut-offs on the ethnic balance at our institution? **Dr. Logue**—That's a good question. I don't have any data on whether there is any difference in the ethnic breakdown between very late applying students, and somewhat earlier applying students. Thank you for raising that. It reminds me that I should mention that so far the biggest enrollment pressures have been on the Manhattan colleges. So we also want to make sure that we don't come up with a solution based on Manhattan which applies to everybody. That wouldn't be good. **Professor Barnhart**—I sit on the Enrollment Management Council as a representative of the UFS. One of the trends that has been consistently coming up in the enrollment data is the increasing number of out-of-state or suburban students, often better prepared with higher high school averages and SAT scores who are enrolling in CUNY. I wonder if there has been any discussion of the possibility, if we see a massive surge in that sort of enrollment, that we will see City students being pushed into the community colleges so that you get a sort of tiering effect where the suburbs dominate the senior colleges and the community colleges are dominated by City students. I don't think that would be a desirable outcome actually. **Dr. Logue**—Since part of our mission is to serve New York City, yes. That's another really good point, and I thank you for raising that. **Professor Crain**—As you look at admission standards, it's one thing to raise them but it's another to make sure the admission standards are valid and good predictors. At the senior colleges, we have an index that is based on the best set of predictors, but then we have these skills test in writing, reading, and math. Those are very poor predictors, and they do yield lower scores among students of color. Are you looking at these tests? They have to meet these tests to get in, yet what we are doing is disproportionately rejecting students of color. **Dr. Logue**—We are working on some very specific aspects of that. We have a task force working right now on the writing assessment test because we're not happy with it, and we want to revise

it. They are working very actively, and I've given them a goal of June to come up with a new test, or specifications for a new test. In terms of math, we are constantly reviewing the cut scores, and are also looking at Maplesoft to see if that might be a way that would better predict where students should be placed. **Professor Crain**—Maybe just junk the tests if you can't come up with something? **Dr. Logue**—We are actually Board-mandated to do the tests. **Professor Savage**—Is there any talk about capping the enrollment of the University and, if so, how would that work? Is it left up to the individual colleges and then finally when the last college decides to cap its enrollment, is that our policy? Or is there some overarching vision? **Dr. Logue**—Another good question. We do not see the system as a whole having a cap. We do see that what we need to do is to control the rate of growth because if we grow too fast, we can't keep up with it or maintain quality. In addition, there are individual campuses which reach maximum use of their facilities and resources. We are already there with BMCC. We have capped it for the moment. We are going to keep trying to get more facilities and do more online, but that doesn't help in finding faculty offices that we need. All these things are being juggled. But a bunch of the campuses do currently have space and capacity, and we need to shift more enrollment there for the moment. **Professor Bird**—Would you please unpack for us the goal of Enhancing Research and Commercialization? **Dr. Logue**—Dean Small is working on that. It has to do with particularly technology transfer efforts, which are something that many universities do a great deal of. We have not done so much with it. The effort is working with the faculty to see when faculty have patents to make them profitable. **Chair Philipp**—The University has an Intellectual Property Committee, and officer, who is Jake Maslow. The Committee is appointed by the UFS, and they are to evaluate declarations of intellectual property. This has not worked well in the past but seems to be working a little better now. **Professor Witherspoon**—I'm curious to know how you at the central office developed these particular goals. In what ways do you interface with campuses, and on what accountability measures are campuses evaluated? **Dr. Logue**—This is just us, evaluating ourselves. As to campuses, we intersect with them in many ways. For example, there's an Academic Council, which I chair, which is all the chief academic officers. There is also the CUE Council, an academic technology group that's meeting with representatives that is headed by somebody in our office, a librarians' group that meets and is headed by somebody in our office, and the enrollment management people. This chart has been distributed to all of these groups repeatedly. It's up to them who they forward it to. We interact also a lot with the Administrative Council, which is the chief financial officers at each campus, and I've presented these charts at that council and sent them to that group also. There is so much that we do that intersects with so many other offices. We can't work in isolation. **Professor Baumrin**—A lot of my colleagues use Blackboard. It says on the list here, "Establish an effective committee on academic technology." Is that a committee in your office, or a university-wide committee? **Dr. Logue**—It's a university-wide committee, but it's run out of my office. That's George Otte. **Professor Baumrin**—Will they take responsibility for Blackboard in the out-years? **Dr. Logue**—The charge of that committee is not to be in charge of Blackboard, which is under CIS. It's not run out of my office. The Academic Technology Committee was established this year to give an opportunity for campuses to share information on academic technology, to figure out what is the best software, the best way of using faculty development, and so on, and they are establishing something called the Academic Commons, which will be a Website where you can go and learn about all kinds of things, and we'll be hearing more about that from George Otte. **Professor Baumrin**—Do you want to say why Blackboard didn't work? **Dr. Logue**—There are a number of reasons that it didn't work for a while, and they were fixed. **Professor Martell**—With regard to this mix between the City versus the rest of New York State, I don't believe that we can have separate standards because we're a New York State-based institution. So while we do serve the City, I assume that an application from Buffalo would be treated exactly the same as an application from the Bronx. **Dr. Logue**—Someone was asking about out-of-state. **Professor Martell**—No, I think he was asking about Westchester and the suburbs, which gets to the second point. Again, this is the City University of New York, and we want to serve the City, but if we had a little more penetration into Nassau, Suffolk, Westchester, Rockland, Orange, and Putnam, our legislative problems

would be mitigated, I believe, because they see themselves as SUNY territory. You cross out of the Bronx, and you're in SUNY territory—but that's not true; a lot of our students come from that way. **Dr. Logue**—That's a good point, and as we continue to build residence halls, that's going to attract more students who are not from very close. **Professor Vozick**—Let me say gently that you are playing with fire there. I understand the point, but I also understand that squeezing out people from the City, especially from the bottom, is eviscerating the intention of the institution as a whole. **Dr. Logue**—There are points to be made on both sides. I do know that New York State Education Law particularly mentions CUNY as being to serve the City. **Chair Philipp**—Thank you very much for coming.

Chair Philipp—Now for our report on the Faculty Experience Survey. **Professor Savage**—We are handing out a limited number of copies of the response rates from the last survey. Please share. The bottom line is very simple. The response rates by campus last time varied from 24% at the bottom to 48% at the top. If the faculty really gets behind this, we can have a significant response rate this time. I'll let Professor Barker start because she did all work in setting up with the vendor you have identified and worked with. **Professor Barker**—The process has been ongoing for quite a while, about a year and a half. The beginning of the process was primarily methodological, when Professor Kuechler from Hunter joined Professor Savage and me in developing the original questionnaires. The initial questionnaire in 2005 was developed in partnership with Dean and his colleagues and did not include a survey of part-time faculty. Therefore, the methodological period of developing a survey took a little longer this time. Many surveys around the country were consulted for appropriate questions, and then customized to CUNY because we are so unusual and unique! That process ended around the mid-fall, at which point we started meeting with Vice Chancellor Lexa Logue. She has funded us. Initially, we tried to do various things with the survey, including a paper ballot as well as an online ballot; that was two to three months of discussing various contracts with vendors. That took us to January, when we finally decided on an online survey. **Professor Savage**—The reason we decided for online was that our estimate for doing it with paper came in at \$100,000. The University decided it was not willing to spring for that, but they were concerned that response rates would not be adequate with online. However, I think if the faculty really gets behind this survey with email notifications and other steps, we can have perfectly adequate response rates. The good news is that Vice Chancellor Logue is funding this, and it's going to include not just all 6,300 full-time faculty, but also all 9,000 part-time faculty. That's a first, and we're very please with that outcome. There will be two surveys, one for full-time and one for part-time. **Professor Barker**—The last time the survey was conducted, we were not as well funded. Therefore, surveys were distributed to your campuses by your mailbox. This time we are going to maintain the integrity of the survey by sending you a postcard at home, at least three times. That postcard will have your user ID and password, and you will hear continual drumbeats, we hope, from faculty governance leaders and you yourselves on campus are going to be messengers encouraging your colleagues to complete the survey, so that we can get as good a response rate as possible. What we're trying to say here is that the survey will be examined very closely by CUNY, we believe. They will look at it very carefully, and the higher the response rate we have, the better chance we have of their taking the findings very seriously. **Professor Savage**—As to dissemination, we have the data files all ready to run. The data will be entered by you as you respond to the questionnaire, so there will be a short turn-around time between when the survey finally is over. Then we'll be able to come up here and present a bunch of data, and disseminate it. We'll put it up on the UFS Website as well. We'll do a more complete job of dissemination and analysis this time. We'll be able to ask a lot of questions, the kind of things VC Logue was talking about—best practices, for instance. We will also know where there are pockets of incredible discontent – I'm sure there a few somewhere in this system! The higher the response is, the more seriously we will be taken. By the time we got done with VC Logue, she was editing the questionnaire and making suggestions, and she is into it. She likes this project, so I think we're going to get a good hearing, and all we need is a really good response rate. **Professor Vozick**—I'm glad you're doing a thoughtful adjunct survey. I wonder about the

question of response rates for adjuncts, because in every dimension working with adjuncts we've had tremendous difficulty in getting high response rates to anything. **Professor Savage**—We're going to get a complete address list from CUPS, and they'll generate a unique User ID and password, one for each of the 15,000 faculty members that we're dealing with. It will be mailed to your home address three times. Even that won't be enough because we can reach full-time faculty, but we can't reach the part-time faculty. It will be partly up to individual departments and campuses and governance leaders to do everything they can to reach out to the part-time faculty and urge them to fill out the questionnaire. They will have to go online to do this, and it'll take about 12-15 minutes for the part-timers, and 20 minutes for the full-timers. We don't think we're going to get everybody, and in fact I'd be astonished if we got most people. We only got 30% last time. On the other hand, 25% of 9,000 people is a lot of answers. We can discern some patterns pretty clearly by the time we've got that many. **Professor Vozick**—I'd like to see the UFS involved in participating in outreach to adjuncts. **Chair Philipp**—This is a UFS survey. This is our project, and we will be directly involved in outreach to the adjuncts. **Professor Barker**—That's why we're using home addresses. This is where paychecks and W-2's are going, and your records with the Feds, so we feel it has much more integrity than campus addresses. **Professor Savage**—Just as with payroll, in some cases it'll be to people no longer employed by CUNY. Postcards will arrive in the mailboxes of dead people. There will be a number of glitches, which is the nature of the business when we're dealing with a survey of 15,000 people. **Professor Volchok**—To satisfy my own curiosity, what is considered an acceptable response rate, and is that rate through statistical analysis or just gut feel? **Professor Savage**—My son just figured out how many spams you have to send out to get one sale – that response is 12,500,000! That's not acceptable. Then we have direct mail response rates, which go from 1-2%. That's not acceptable. If we get 30% with the full-time faculty, that will be a bit of a come-down because now the faculty have seen this survey one time, and they know there are incredible differences between the campuses and it's in the interests of people to fill it out because this has got the attention of the faculty. The part-timers? I don't know. I think the part-timers will be particularly hard to reach. If we have Listservs or email contacts at the departmental and program level all around the system, this can work. **Professor Barker**—Also, remember this is a census, not a sample. We're not getting a percentage of a sample, but of a total census. **Professor Klibaner**--Do people have to complete the survey in one sitting, or can they come back to it? **Professor Barker**—There is a stop and go. You can go back. Do we want you to? No. Please, if you sit down and do the survey, we would like you to complete it. There is a chance to stop and go back in however. **Professor Klibaner**—I'm concerned about computers going down, or links going down. **Professor Barker**—You could log back in. **Professor Klibaner**—Change your answers? **Professor Savage**—We had a deal where people could go back and change their answers until the cows came home, but we said no, that's too complicated. So once you give answers, we're going to be delighted you did. **Professor Talirico**—In anticipation of some of the questions that might come up for those people who remember the previous survey, and they'll say OK I did the survey, I saw the results, so whatever came of all the data they collected? Why should I fill it out again? **Professor Savage**—Actually, what happened last time was pretty astonishing. There were 60 percentage point differentials in terms of faculty satisfaction from campus to campus. This got the attention of the administrators on individual campuses. The people at the bottom were very unhappy. One of the reasons we are going way off-shore with this is that we are no longer confident that we were to distribute the questionnaires through department mailboxes that there would not be tampering. So we've got an off-shore outfit in Washington, D.C. who have it in their contract that if they give us any information on individual anonymous responses, they won't be paid. We've built the firewall. Nobody can get the data individually. They will give us aggregate. But your question is, did these data get used? Well, they made a splash. Did they actually get really used? Did the campuses at the bottom get magically transformed as a result? No. I don't think that happened as a result of this survey. One of the most fascinating bodies of research out there is research on what people do with all of this damned data that's collected in higher education? Does it ever get used? Are there ever, as a result, data-driven decisions? Does it ever lead to

change? I'm very frustrated about that on my own campus, and the answer for Queens College is No, it hasn't lead to very much of anything at all, but I hope at some point it will. The way we are going to get there is by having a high response rate, analyzing it to death, disseminating it widely, and then talking to the administration about how to make things better. **Professor Talarico**—Did 80th Street pay attention to it also last time? **Chair Philipp**—80th Street definitely paid attention to it. The way this University works, you can't expect a public response, or that in a public way heads will roll, or anything like that, but there is an effect nonetheless. **Professor Vozick**—Adjuncts will not only be likely to be disinterested – why should I do this? – but even maybe a little fearful about this being used against me? Some sort of informational piece coming out from you in advance, trying to explain the purpose, the philosophy, and the intention of this process and the importance of it, would be helpful so they can think it over before they are hit by it so they can think it over and see how it might be in their interest to do it. **Professor Barker**—Informed consent is very important to us. The firewall between us and this off-shore company is very important to us. The postcard will restate that we do not give CUNY officials or faculty access to any person's data and that we are only going to look at it in aggregate form. In response to the last question about how the data will be used: you will have the data, and you can sort it, and have a college profile and make that the topic of discussions at your local faculty senate meetings. I imagine there will be so much data that you could have many meetings to discuss, and also have meetings with your president and administration to discuss the findings. It's up to you also, as to how it is used locally. **Professor Savage**—Last time, I was the only one doing it, and I just ran out of steam. We didn't put it up on the Web. I had all these tables that could have been disseminated. There's a nice Website now, and we'll just put it up on the Web and people will be able to look at it. I just got an inquiry from Queensborough where the president has just asked them to form a committee on salaries. The chair of the social science department asked me if I had any data on starting salaries for faculty, and I shipped him all my data and I think this kind of thing is one of the ways that the University Faculty Senate can be most effective. This is the body that does the CUNY-wide monitoring, and this is the body that has the data that people can go look at. We're having enough success with this so that I was asked by a top administrator at my own college what the University policy was on enrollment. I said I have no idea if they have ever talked about it or not, but now I was able to ask the question tonight and I'll be able to go back with an answer. **Chair Philipp**—That's what the Senate is all about, so that you get information. Thank you, Kathleen and Dean.

Chair Philipp—The next item is discussion of the PSC-CUNY awards program. We have a number of really distinguished discussants. The first one is Kathryn Richardson, who is the chair of the nursing department at New York City College of Technology, and the chair of our Research Committee for many years. She is one of two UFS representatives on the Task Force on the Restructuring of the PSC-CUNY Award Program. Our other representative is Professor Tom Bird, professor of European language and literature at Queens College, a member of the UFS Research Committee, and has served on the UFS Executive Committee. The next member of our panel is Bill Divale, who used to be a member of the UFS. He is professor of anthropology at York College, and was a senator from 2005-2008 and served several terms as the UCRA liaison in Anthropology, and was chair of the UCRA task force in 2005. Bill's recent research has been funded by the NIH about \$5 million in the past 10 years. Cheryl Bluestone is a professor of psychology in the department of social sciences at Queensborough Community College. Her recent research is funded by the National Science Foundation and published by the National Social Science Association. She is vice chair of UCRA and is the liaison in interdisciplinary studies. Jim Gordon is professor of psychology and director of the Visual Psycho-physiology Laboratory at Hunter College. He is an elected member of the UCRA executive committee, and he has served as a liaison for several terms. Jim's research has been funded by the National Institutes of Health for a total of 30 years; that's a really impressive accomplishment. Welcome to everyone. We have important issues to discuss about the PSC-CUNY research award program.

Professor Richardson—We are all going to present for a bit about the Research Committee itself, the structure of the UCRA, costs, and two task forces – the one now and another in 2005 that Bill Divale chaired. Professor Bird will talk about the current task force in a moment. I'm going to start with a little history of the Research Committee. You all got these handouts in the back, and there is an overview of the PSC-CUNY Research Award Program. We are mainly here tonight because this is a faculty peer-reviewed grant program. The University Committee on Research Awards, the UCRA, is responsible for the program. Members are screened and recommended to the Chancellor by the University Faculty Senate Research Committee, which I chair. It has been in continuous service to CUNY since 1970, initiating the Faculty Research Award Program (FRAP) that later became the PSC-CUNY awards. The UFS Research Committee and the UCRA continue to collaborate and support needs of faculty at CUNY to conduct peer-reviewed research. You know that we have call letters that Stasia does such a nice job on every year, which look like this. We distribute them every year at the meetings. They are published in the *UFS Digest*, and Stasia does contact the individual schools, both the provosts and the grants departments, and we try to get people at all of the different colleges to volunteer to be liaisons, who are part of the UCRA. This yellow slip here each year tells the areas we are looking for liaisons in, and also the criteria for selection. We collect the curriculum vitae of the faculty and usually meet in May or June and go through all of the vitae that are submitted and decide as a group whether the people who submitted their CV's are highly recommend, just recommended, or not recommended. The highly recommended and the recommended people's names go to the Chancellor, and the Chancellor looks at our recommendations and from our recommendations appoints the liaisons. Now Professor Bluestone will tell us all about the UCRA structure.

Professor Bluestone—I suspect many of you have been involved in the PSC-CUNY awards and are vaguely familiar with the process, but I've been asked to speak about this because there is a crisis that has occurred that we're going to talk about in more depth. So I want to make sure that everybody understands the current process that exists. As Kathryn mentioned, we have 31 panel liaisons. They are primarily discipline based, so there's an Anthropology Panel, and a Psychology Panel, and there are also a couple of cross-disciplinary panels. They are quite successful in generating inter-campus collaboration. Many faculty from many campuses participate in the panels. The liaison recruits a certain number of people to take part in this process. We receive about 1,200 applications a year, and the job of the liaisons and panel members is to obtain peer reviews on each of the proposals to determine whether they meet the quality standards for fundability. Once these reviews are received, it is the job of the panel to meet in a collaborative process to decide which proposals should be funded, giving some preference to proposals that are scored more highly to junior faculty and other assorted reasons. That's the general background, but we should move on now to the heart of the issue. **Professor Richardson**—Next is Professor Gordon to talk about the costs.

Professor Gordon—You all now that we have program, and there are about 1,200 applications from the faculty. The program is funded in our contract. It is \$3.6 million now. I'll say something about the level of funding in just a minute, but I want to talk a little bit about how the money gets spent. It's our money. The Research Foundation is paid an administrative fee of 10%. There are three full-time people running it, and almost 1,000 funded grants, so it's not an insane number but it is a big number. The liaisons each get \$2,000, an in-service award. They can't apply for these grants, so it compensates them to a certain extent. That is \$62,000. Then there are the costs of running the program. The biggest single cost is that we spend about \$70,000 paying for outside reviews. Each outside reviewer gets \$50. Then, there are liaison expenses, so the total is about \$160,000 that we spend to run the program, and then \$360,000 for the Research Foundation. We spend about 4.6% of the budget. That number has gone up slightly from 3.6% over the past five years, which is not a surprising change, considering that we increased the number of grants by 22% over the same time period. The rest of the money, about

\$3 million, gets divided up among the approximately 1,000 grants, about \$3,000 per grant. The panels can decide how to divvy up the money. They get a certain amount, based primarily on the number of applications that they get. Then they can say that they are going to set a criterion based on the reviews with different cut-off values, and we can fund the proposals more or less well. The maximum amount for funding is \$6,000. It used to be \$10,000 but we never gave even close to that, so we thought it was silly to leave that number where it was. The bulk of the money comes right to the faculty so they can do their research. I should say that the proportion of grants funded is pretty high, about 80%. There could be debate about what proportion you want to fund and things like that, but that's how the money is spent for this program. I would just say something about the level of funding: in 1970, when I started here, I got a PSC-CUNY grant. It was for \$6,000. The maximum grant now is \$4,000 or maybe \$5,000. I think the value of the dollar has changed slightly in the last almost 40 years.

Professor Richardson—Professor Divale is going to tell us about the 2005 Task Force.

Professor Divale—I was a liaison, in Anthropology, for about 9 years. I was on the UCRA for three or four years, as well. I think this is one of the best-run programs in CUNY. I'll speak on that later. In 2005, Dean Small wanted to have a task force, and she met with the whole UCRA, and at one point asked me if I would chair the task force. Her complaint at that time was that too many proposals were getting funded, and so the amount of the proposals was down to about \$2,900 on average. Also, we were funding about 90% or 92% of the proposals. It wasn't competitive. We asked for volunteers for the task force. We asked for representation from the Union, but the Union did not want to take part. We had several members of the UCRA, in fact Jim was one of them, and we worked hard for over a year. We met regularly and came up with a report which you have copied here. At that time, Dean Small didn't seem to have much of a complaint with our report. One of the things we changed is that in the old days, the scoring went from 1 to 5, the lower number being the more fundable. You had to get a 2 or below to be funded. That range made it very hard to discriminate between grants, especially when people knew you had to give it a low score or it wouldn't be funded. Well, we increased the scoring range from 1 to 10, and the result of that over a couple of years has been that the spread of scores increased, and panels could now decide themselves what would be the cut-off point. The average funding rate is now in the high 70's. In some disciplines, it's even lower. It's getting more competitive. One of the things I'd like to refer to here is that one of the most important things we did with the report was conducting a survey of the faculty. We asked the Chancellor to include a blurb in his email that goes out about the faculty survey. Also, all the UCRA members went to their campus Listservs and posted the URL. We had around 550 respondents. 78% of them had at one time applied for a PSC-CUNY grant. This was not a random sample, and it was a sample mostly of faculty who were interested in the program. But there's no reason to think it was unrepresentative. If you can look at the handout, you have the task force report, and on page 9 there is one table which shows results to the question "Last year 90% of the applications were funded which meant average dollar awards were less. What percentage of proposals do you think should be funded in your disciplinary, on average?" You can see from the bar chart that it's towards the higher percentage where most of the responders were. In fact, 55% of the respondents felt that between 70% and 90% of the applications should be funded. And 84% of all respondents felt that between 50% and 90% should be funded. So it's clear that the faculty would like many awards to be given out, even if it's a lesser dollar amount. One of the reasons for this is that in the humanities this is almost the only source of funding, and in the social and behavioral sciences you can do a study with \$3,000 or \$4,000. You can get pilot studies done to get more money from larger agencies. Dean Small's argument was that the sciences needed bigger grants, more money. So that's why we had to make the program more competitive, so the natural sciences could get bigger awards so that they could get results from which they could then get large grants from NSF and NIH. But in terms of the survey, regardless of the discipline of the faculty member, the sciences as well as the social sciences and humanities, most faculty preferred more awards at a lesser amount. They saw this as a way for

people to do research, and it was an opportunity. The real problem with this issue is the amount of money that is available. Jim mentioned when he first applied in 1970 that his award was \$6,000. On page 6 is a table where we tried to find out what money was available over the years, and Stasia was very good in trying to dig up the data, but it was not kept. You can see the initial funding in 1970 was \$1.5 million. In 2005, it was \$3.3 million. So it really just doubled in that 35 year period, and yet in 1975 242 awards were made, and in 2005 there were 1,000 awards made, and now there are 1,200 awards made. So the number of awards made, and applied for, has gone up 5 times while the amount of money has only doubled. In fact, in 2005 we projected that the total dollars in terms of 1970 dollars corrected for inflation meant the UCRA should have been funded for \$6 million. Then it was \$3.3 million. The problem is not that we are not competitive enough, but the faculty has gotten bigger, we have encouraged research and more people are applying, and yet the money is not increasing. That is really the issue. This is the faculty's money. It's part of what is negotiated in the contract. It's clear the faculty want this money to be distributed as widely as possible. I agree that if it got down to \$2,000 it would be hard to do research; but it's not. If anything, the awards are creeping closer to \$4,000. Most people I know in the humanities and social sciences can do their research for that. I want to close by saying that I was a member of the UFS for a few years, and I finally didn't want to renew my membership because I felt this was a very negative body. In other words, whatever the chancellery came up with, you guys were opposed to it. I remember the online BA program, which I was for and I think it's one of the best things CUNY has done. This program is even better. If you read this report, you'll see something like 60% of the awards resulted in publications – this is self-reported so I don't know how true it is. And 47% resulted in funding. It's impossible to get anything more successful than this. If there's anything that we should make a stand on, and fight about, and this organization is great at being refuseniks, it is this thing. I think Dean Small is dead wrong. The University basically wants to take this award, and fund fewer proposals hopefully at bigger dollars, thinking it's going to result in bigger federal grants with the high indirect cost. That will kill the social, behavioral, and the humanities. I think we should fight this thing tooth and nail, and normally I support the administration, but not on this.

Professor Bird—The PSC-CUNY award program is negotiated by the Union with the University and built into our contract. As Bill and Jim have said, the awards are our money. For 35 years, the program has provided seed money to faculty. The program was designed initially with the goal of advantaging new faculty to launch their research careers, and also for current (middle and senior) faculty to do work preceding their acquiring external funding. Speaking for and from the faculty, the PSC-CUNY award program has been extremely successful. To address the present situation, a task force has been appointed and a draft has emerged, the fruit of the task force. Late last fall, Vice Chancellor Gillian Small confected a task force. It consists of three vice chancellors, one senior vice chancellor, three provosts, the president of the Research Foundation, and five faculty members. A familiar approach at 80th Street – democracy under proper supervision – but a curious group to be restructuring a faculty-owned program. The assumptions that the task force was given: one, change is needed. The faculty response was No, the present situation is fundamentally sound, and time and again when faculty have been consulted University-wide the faculty had been very positive about the program. Item 2: local campus decisions are desirable. What in the name of the Merciful could be wrong with local campus decisions. Well, there is a footnote: the local campus decisions would be shepherded by the provosts. Ah, yes. Three: peer review is much too expensive. I think you have heard the evidence that the fees are modest, and let me add that peer review is a valuable component. The critique that comes out of the peer review is valuable. It is especially useful for younger faculty. Next item: too many grants are being given. Well, the new draft would take care of that. The money would follow the number of applicants and according to the new draft that would mean a significant, long-term reduction of award funds, especially to the community colleges but to the smaller senior colleges, as well. Finally, there is a lack of accountability. We discussed that at length and decided that was a straw man. Friends, there is an undesirable lack of engagement

with the UFS, with us, by the two principals, our esteemed Chancellor, long may he reign over us, and by Vice Chancellor Small, who suggests when the issue is raised is that there really isn't a draft – it's only a draft, so there really isn't anything to discuss yet. But, there is a concern among some of us that, absent the concerted action that Bill has asked for, if fate moves through the City University once again as it has in the past, we will soon be informed that “after extensive faculty consultation and lengthy debate by the University trustees, a new policy has been adopted to take effect on September 1.” Friends, I suggest to you that we must not let that happen. Thank you.

Professor Crain—It sounds like the administration does not have the authority. **Professor Richardson**—They don't really have the authority, but the contract is rather vague in how it's structured. It does say that it's a faculty-run program, but really doesn't give any guidelines as to how the program is to be run. So over the years, and we're not really sure where it started, there are bylaws of the UCRA. **Professor Bluestone**—I just want to make the point that there are three legal staff on this task force, and they were extensively advising. We're basing this on a draft, so we're not 100% sure, but it looks as though what they're going to try to do is to evade what regulations there are. In other words, the draft has provosts administering the funds and then it comes back to us for a stamp of approval so there's a pseudo-committee that really doesn't have any function but we lose faculty control. The money would be controlled by the provost in “directed research efforts.” That would be another potential problem that may leave out certain departments and disciplines and so on. **Professor Divale**—In your handout, you have Article 25 of the contract, which explains the PSC-CUNY program. **Professor Bluestone**—The Union has taken the position that this is a negotiated benefit, but what we don't want it to come to is a grievance. We'd hate to see the program be destroyed, and then have to try to grieve it. **Professor Richardson**—We'd like to hear the opinion of the body, before we sit down and do any work on a resolution or anything. **Chair Philipp**—The UFS Research Committee is tasked to generate a possible resolution for this body. **Professor Barnhart**—I was looking at the contract language, and it looks pretty clear here in 25.2, subsection (c) in the sixth page of your packet, which says “The Committee shall be responsible for establishing guidelines for the application and approval of research awards and shall communicate these procedures to all members of the instructional staff.” It sounds as though the UCRA has jurisdiction over this. It doesn't really matter what recommendations this task force comes out with because contractually it is the UCRA that sets the rules, according to the contract. They can propose, but it doesn't sound like they can dispose. **Professor Gordon**—It does say, I believe, that the Chancellor appoints the UCRA, so the Chancellor could pick a set of faculty, at will. As it works now, the UFS makes recommendations as to who they should be, but there's no language about that here. **Professor Bluestone**—I think they've been very careful to go through those regulations to see if they can possibly evade or circumvent them. Whether they can or not, I don't know, but that's what our concern is. **Professor Pimentel**—I have received PSC-CUNY grants that helped me get tenure at the University. I am also concerned that CUNY is less and less committed to the humanities and social sciences. For instance, you see the Collaborative Grants and 90% of those have been given to the hard sciences. Then what are we going to do if the PSC-CUNY awards are closed to us? **Professor Nolan**—I served on the UCRA Committee and was also a liaison. There are two changes here that I think are important. One is that the campus-based initiatives won't be University-wide within the discipline so all of the chemists in the City University work together to see who gets these grants. **Professor Gordon**—Absolutely. I want to point out that having these panels, which can then recruit reviewers from the entire CUNY faculty and outside of CUNY, means that we get really excellent reviews and feedback about our grants. That won't happen with an in-house committee. Even if I were to write a grant at Hunter College in my discipline, who at Hunter College could actually review it and say whether this is a good grant or not? Only by going outside to a much larger arena of reviewers can you get this kind of appropriate review. **Professor Nolan**—Actually the way the program is run now, people cannot review grants from their own departments. You have to go outside your department to get a review. The other thing I found valuable when I was working on this was that the outside peer

reviews were of good value. **Professor Gordon**—And some of my faculty want the reviews in advance, and they are less concerned about whether they got funded than what the reviewers said because they want to know what they should modify as they submit their grants to NIH or some other place. **Professor Dalglish**—I fully support all of your reasons for opposing this change. Looking at Article 25, this is a legal document? And what they are proposing to do is to breach this contract. Isn't that so? How can they do that? Do we need legal counsel to stop them?

Chair Philipp—That's a matter for the Union, not the UFS. It's a contract with the PSC.

Professor Bluestone—Steve London made a couple of posts about this, and they view it in the same way. We're glad to have their support. Our concern is that it appears, but we're not certain, that this task force is prepared to try to implement this, and then we would be in a position to grieve it or do something about – again, I'm guessing, but that's our concern.

Chair Philipp—This body has a right to express its opinion about what should happen. We have had a long-standing role. I sit on the Board of Trustees, and the UFS appoints members to the Board committees with a vote on these issues. And our Research Committee is responsible for appointing all of the members of the UCRA, subject to the Chancellor's choice of our nominations.

Professor Woytowich—Would it be appropriate to read one sentence from the working draft that was given out at FGL? This wasn't given out to everybody, was it? "Each campus will establish a campus committee to make recommendations for funding to the provost." This to me is the heart of the problem. All of the other proposals we may or may not object to, but I think that one really does it. My concern would be that whatever the Union does, or we do, has to have some teeth if it means going to court, or calling on faculty to take some sort of action like refusing to participate. That's the heart of it.

Chair Philipp—Just to repeat, the UFS Research Committee has been tasked to suggest a response to the Executive Committee, and we will take the most rigorous possible response to this. Count on it. By the way, I've been asked to remind you that Kathryn and Tom are members of this task force, and at the present time Vice Chancellor Small is chair of the UCRA.

Professor Gordon—She is chair of the UCRA, but I should point out that basically after the last task force report was made she stopped attending the meetings.

Chair Philipp—That is something that I'm discussing with the Chancellor.

Professor August—I've gotten two PSC-CUNY awards, and been rejected by one, and the reviews are so important! Also, in the humanities it is almost impossible to get a larger grant. When I have applied, I've noticed that other people who've applied have five or six graduate students writing their applications, 40 or 50 pages. It's almost impossible to compete out there. So for research at the community colleges, these grants are essential. The last time I applied, and this is the part about on-campus overseeing, I was told that I could apply for whatever I wanted but my college would not allow released time for one of these grants. Particularly in my situation the most valuable thing that could be given to me would be released time because I don't think research can be done under a 25 hour per year teaching obligation. I would appreciate somebody checking that piece out.

Professor Divale—As it works now for the released time part, you still need approval of your chair.

Professor August—The chair would do it, but the college was saying no.

Professor Divale—If you look at page 5 of the handout, this shows the breakdown of awards by discipline and panels for the past three years. If you look at the social sciences, about 70% were funded, and if you look at the physical sciences, which is the thing behind Provost Small, they funded 940 and did not fund 93, which means the physical sciences are funding 90% of their proposals. It's clear down the line that what the faculty want is to spread this out, and I really think if there is one thing to go to the Board for, it's this. This is a program that works, and whatever we have to do, we should. And I'm not depending on the Union, because they should have been here way before. And it's a lot easier to stop this thing now than it will be later. Either a petition drive, or the UCRA will come up with an alternate proposal that will look pretty much like what we have now, so the Chancellor will know to leave this thing alone.

Professor Friedman—It's a little difficult to hear from the panel a comment about the PSC, what it should and shouldn't have done because some of us can respond to that and I don't want to get into that because there's a history, and I don't even know it all, but I feel frustrated because I want to make a motion, and I'm trying to think what the most pointed position would be, and I don't have all of the Whereases or know whether anyone came prepared

with a motion, but I would say at a minimum “Be It Resolved, that the UFS plenary.....” **Chair Philipp**—I’m not entertaining a motion right now. We have tasked the Research Committee to come up with an appropriate resolution for the next meeting. **Professor Friedman**—OK. I misunderstood. **Professor Baumrin**—The panel was terrific. Bill, you blew me away. **Chair Philipp**—He called you a nattering nabob of negativism! **Professor Baumrin**—I wanted to expand on a remark of Professor Gordon. When he says this is our money what he was really referring to is that the money is taken out of the lump sums that were made available when we were under the City of New York and then when we went under State funding, and if this money doesn’t go to this program it goes back into salary enhancements. It’s our money. I was there at the inception of this program when the money was taken away from the deans, primarily Hunter, Queens, Brooklyn, and City Colleges, and placed in this program under faculty supervision, the main point of which was the neutrality of the selection process. In other words, a peer-reviewed selection process. This is the most important research program in this University. **Chair Philipp**—I’d like to thank all the panelists for an outstanding presentation.