

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

March 31, 2008

The meeting was called to order by UFS Chair Philipp at 6:45 p.m. in Room 9206/07 at the Graduate School and University Center. 61 of 118 voting members were present.

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

Newly elected Senator Arliss attended. Professors Gordon and West attended.

Vice Chancellor Dobrin, Chief Information Officer Cohen, Director Flynn, and Director Otte attended.

Governance Leaders present: Carey (Lehman), Cooper (CSI), Hume (KCC), Kaplowitz (John Jay), Mettler (LaGuardia), Philipp (Lehman), Raj (CCNY), Tai (QCC), Tobey (Brooklyn), and Young (Hunter) attended. Parliamentarian Moran (NYCCT), 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 March 3, 2009: Minutes were approved as distributed.

III. Reports (Recorded in Reports & Deliberations)

- A. Chair
- B. Executive Vice Chancellor Allan Dobrin and Chief Information Officer Brain Cohen.
- C. Representatives to Board of Trustee Committees.
- D. College Delegates on Presidential Transitions Under Way.

IV. Nominations for Members-at-Large of the Executive Committee:

Professor Jay Weiser, Chair of the UFS Legal Affairs Committee, opened nominations for election of members-at-large of the Executive Committee. Nominations remain open until May

5th. The following Senators were nominated (in order of nomination from the floor): Anne Friedman (BMCC) , Sandi Cooper (CSI), Rishi Raj (CCNY), Stefan Baumrin (Graduate School), Philip Pecorino (QCC), Terrence Martell (Baruch), Leslie Jacobson (Brooklyn), Michael Barnhart (KCC).

V. Joint Resolution concerning the PSC-CUNY Research Award Program:

The resolution was endorsed unanimously by the plenary. See Reports & Deliberations for a full account.

University Faculty Senate

Proposed: March 31, 2009

Adopted: Unanimously

**Resolution Endorsing the Joint Resolution
concerning the PSC-CUNY Research Award Program**

BE IT RESOLVED, that the University Faculty Senate (UFS) endorses the Resolution below adopted by the UFS Research Committee and the University Committee on Research Awards (UCRA), dated March 12, 2009.

Joint Resolution concerning the PSC-CUNY Research Award Program

Adopted by the UFS Research Committee and the
University Committee on Research Awards (UCRA)
March 12, 2009

Prologue:

In 2007, 1,280 faculty colleagues conducted research and scholarship supported by PSC-CUNY grants averaging \$3,000. Awards are distributed widely across the CUNY campuses. The funds for this program are specified in the PSC-CUNY contract. In 2007-08, the total budget was \$3.6M and the administrative expenses for running the program were only \$165,751 or 4.6%.

The PSC-CUNY Research Award Program is a faculty peer-reviewed grant program designed to assist faculty at all levels to pursue their research and scholarship. The University Committee on Research Awards (UCRA) is responsible for program review. Members of the UCRA are screened and recommended to the Chancellor by the University Faculty Senate. The UFS Research Committee has been in continuous service to CUNY since 1970. This committee initiated review of the FRAP (Faculty Research Award Program) awards that in 1973 became the PSC-CUNY Award program as an allocation from the money set aside for collective bargaining by the city and later also by the state. By arranging for high quality peer-review of PSC-CUNY grant applications, the UFS Research Committee and the UCRA continue to collaborate and support the needs of CUNY faculty members.

In November 2008, the Vice Chancellor for Research, Dr. Gillian Small, established a task force based on her assumptions that the program is “unsustainable” and needs “restructuring.” In contrast, broad faculty opinion across the university is strongly supportive of the way the faculty peer-reviewed research program functions now, and is supportive of the manner in which grants are distributed.

During the two meetings of the task force, the arbitrary assumptions that surfaced were:

- *Separate, Local* campus decision-making is desirable
- Recompensed Peer review is much too expensive
- Too many grants are awarded.

A draft report has emerged. Contrary to Article 25 of the PSC Contract, Vice Chancellor Small's draft report radically alters the present practice of peer-review, which has assured the program's academic integrity, by transferring the authority for grant approval to the provosts on each campus. This would open the way to arbitrarily focusing awards in certain disciplines, or to politicization of the selection process.

A reading of the PSC-CUNY contract states that responsibility for establishing guidelines rests with the University Committee on Research Awards. That committee consists of faculty members who are recommended by the UFS and appointed by the Chancellor. This Contract makes no reference to having university administrators be part of the review process. There are good reasons for this. In particular, it is not appropriate for administrators to be involved in funding decisions in a program that derives from monies that otherwise would be available for faculty compensation. Therefore, we ask that Vice Chancellor Small's task force on the Restructuring of the PSC-CUNY Research Award Program be disbanded. We further ask all faculty members to place the attached resolution, suitably adapted for your college, on the agenda of your campus governance body. We also ask that the UFS Executive Committee place this resolution on the agenda for the March 31st plenary session of the University Faculty Senate.

Resolution:

Whereas, the monies that fund the PSC-CUNY Awards program result from the PSC-CUNY Contract, which are funds that by consent of PSC members, are excluded from use as salary and other compensation and are not part of general city or state funding of the University; and,

Whereas, the task force set up by the chancellery is an inappropriate body to alter the present arrangement of making these awards,

Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the UFS Research Committee and the University Committee on Research Awards reject the restructuring proposal in the task force draft report, and

Be it Further Resolved, that the UFS Research Committee and the University Committee on Research Awards ask that the Task Force on the PSC-CUNY Awards Program be disbanded and that its suggestions be presented to the UCRA and its Executive Committee, for their consideration.

For more information on this issue please visit www.cunyUFS.org, where you will find the March 3 panel discussion on this issue and background documents.

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 343rd PLENARY SESSION
OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

March 31, 2009

III. Report of the Chair

Chair Manfred Philipp, Lehman—My report is in written form, as usual. Is there anything you want to ask me about that report? There is a report on the budget, and on the lobbying that we have done and that we plan yet to do. Our meeting with our SUNY counterparts is mentioned, as is Blackboard, which we will hear more about tonight. The spring conference has been moved to May 8, and I encourage you to sign up. We'll be sending out details, probably tomorrow, on who is speaking. There is a report on the new community college planning process, with the names of the faculty members who are on the steering committee. We urged that the colleges appoint people who are satisfactory to local governance and who are cognizant of governance issues. I mention the issues surrounding student retention, and there is a table giving retention data in your packet, which is important data. Retention could be higher, but you know the situations we face. And, there is mention of the task force on the PSC-CUNY Awards Program, and we're going to have a resolution proposed on that tonight. There is also mention of an action by one of the discipline councils on the Advanced Science Research Facility, asking that an appropriate governance body be established for that facility. And then you will notice that there is a report on the proposed School of Pharmacy, whose planning is continuing. Note that the School of Public Health and the Hunter School of Social Work that they are building is going to be in one place at 118th Street and Third Avenue. Lastly, I'm happy to say that the Faculty Experience Survey is making good progress. The survey itself is set, the funding is in place, and we thank Vice Chancellor Logue for arranging that funding. This evening we have nominations for the at-large membership of the Executive Committee, so please don't leave before you have a chance to do the nominations that you want. We also have a resolution, and we'd like to have a quorum for that resolution.

Professor Bill Crain, CCNY – The Executive Committee was lobbying with respect to focusing somewhat on TAP. Do you have an update on that? **Professor Karen Kaplowitz, John Jay** – On Friday we had a Budget Advisory Committee meeting with Vice Chancellor Ernesto Malave, and he reported that the TAP proposals that we all objected to are all off the table. **Professor Martha Bell, Brooklyn** – There is only one change that has been made to TAP. At this point, up until now, income for people on public pensions were not counted towards TAP income. They are now counted. That's the only major change in TAP. Otherwise, it remains the same. Also, it should be noted that the original proposal to 15 credits did not include, although we originally thought it would, Opportunity Programs. That was never on the table.

Chair Philipp -- I would like to welcome Vice Chancellor Alan Dobrin to this group. There are lots of things to talk about, and we look forward with pleasure to hearing you.

IIIB. Executive Vice Chancellor Dobrin & Chief Information Office Brian Cohen

Executive Vice Chancellor Dobrin – The Chancellor asked me to express how sorry he was that he's not here tonight. This is actually one of the groups he enjoys going to, versus a lot of other groups! On the budget, Martha's report was exactly right. We were actually opposed to the TAP changes, not because all of them were horrible, but we took a look at where the savings were going to come from and they disproportionately affected our students. TAP needs to be

reformed, but reformed the other way where there is more help for people at the bottom and less for upper middle class people. So the Chancellor opposed this very strenuously and was glad to see it not happen. Hopefully before this meeting ends, we will find out what our State leaders have done. Unless something changes dramatically, which in Albany it always can, much more likely than not we will be in a position where we won't have any major cuts to make, and we will have an opportunity to make some investments, including in full-time faculty. We would like to have much more, but given this is the worst fiscal situation in this nation in my lifetime, if we are in a position in the coming year where we're actually able to begin to hire some more faculty and student support people, it's not the worst situation to be in, given how a lot of other universities are. We will see tomorrow morning if that is completely true.

Tonight we also wanted to talk about Blackboard 8. Brian's going to go into detail, but I'll give a brief overview. For a long time, we were working with a lower level of Blackboard, 6.3, and we made the decision in consultation with many of the people in this room that it was time to move to Blackboard 8 for two reasons -- one, it had better functionality, and two, we were told there would no longer be support for 6.3. Everybody decided to move to 8. Brian will say more, but a mea culpa for both of us, we then went to the campuses and mostly through governance we said who wants to part of the first wave of doing this. We anticipated two or three schools would want to do that, but it turned out everyone wanted to do it except two or three schools. So we probably, at that point, should have said No, we'll take two or three -- sorry. But we didn't. We really wanted the faculty to have what they thought were the latest tools. If we had it to do over again, I promise you we would have only done two or three. I asked Brian to take 5 minutes to tell what went wrong, and then 10 minutes about what we are going to be doing go forward. I would ask if you can, when we do the Q & A, to accept my word for two things: one, don't spend a lot of time trying to make us feel bad because we feel really bad; two, don't try to spend a lot of time convincing us that this was a problem for everyone on the campuses because I swear to God I know that. So more, listen to what we want to do going forward, tell us if you think those are the right things, or if there are things we haven't thought of, because that would be really helpful. With that said, I want to introduce Brian Cohen.

Mr. Brian Cohen – Good evening. For those who don't know me, I'm the Associate Vice Chancellor for Technology and the University's Chief Information Office. Alan is right that we do feel terrible about how things occurred over the beginning of the semester, but I wanted to provide you with as brief an explanation of the challenges because it's not just Blackboard 8 that started this. Actually, Blackboard 8 was found out more of a problem as the result of the challenges we had with the Portal and the LDAP to sign onto our systems at the very beginning of the semester. We had problems with our data center, we had a heat condition, we had files that became corrupted, and we had files that were lost as a result of a hard failure of our storage network. These things together manifested a problem that didn't allow people to get into systems. You couldn't create passwords and you couldn't get recover passwords, and you couldn't get in and it created an enormous challenge on the campuses to try to get students registered and into classes. We did a lot of work to try to recover from that. Some of our systems, because we're replacing them, they are older technology, and it's sort of like the chicken or the egg: as we're trying to replace our older systems with newer technology we're trying to keep the older technology on life support to some degree. It doesn't make sense to make the investment twice, so we're trying to leverage what we're doing with CUNY First and upgrading a lot of our older systems. We recovered from the Portal/LDAP problem after a few days, and the first week of classes everything worked fine. Monday morning, February 2, Blackboard 8 went down. We were flabbergasted because we thought we had resolved this problem, and it wasn't related to the Portal or LDAP. Now it was a Blackboard problem. When we originally brought in the Blackboard 8 system, we were planning to do a Blackboard 7 upgrade. During that process, Blackboard announced that they were not going to encourage you

to go to 7 but to 8, which is basically 7 with a little bit more. Through a governance process and an evaluation committee, we decided it made sense for us to go to Blackboard 8. We had gone through a pilot at the Graduate Center and the Online BA Program, and we were very successful aside from some issues with slowness and load, but we thought we had all those issues corrected. We brought Blackboard in to actually help us deliver, install, and configure the system; they knew our environment, how big we were, the load of the number of students who use the system, our class sizes, our faculty – everything they needed to know about us. They configured the system, and we were ready to go in December. We made an announcement to the IT Steering Committee in November, seeking their assistance in reaching out to campus governance to get the involvement of the faculty, the provosts, and the president to concur with the colleges' approach to go onto the Blackboard 8 system. As Alan said, hindsight being 20-20, we thought it would be two or three colleges, not all but two or three, but everyone saw the true benefit of going to Blackboard 8 with the new functionality. On February 2 when the system went down and we started trying to do some troubleshooting with Blackboard and we had them on the phone and on site, what we found is that in their configuration of the system they didn't configure it to meet CUNY's volume, but in some cases they configured it out of the box. You can't configure a system like this out of the box. You have to tweak it, and size the databases, size the load. To give you an idea of the size of our Blackboard installation, when we first started in 2002 to bring Blackboard in as a centralized system, we had about 22,000 students on the entire system. We have 128,000 users of the system today. We have up to 47,000 users on the system per day. There are over 10,000 classes and 5,000 faculty. The system is used highly around this University. Blackboard didn't size it correctly, and what we found after doing the diagnostic work is that the reason it was coming down was (1) the database wasn't sized correctly, and (2) a third party product by Learning Objects called Expo was taking advantage of the problem we were having with our database and bringing our software down again. So we were fighting two battles. Unless you have the right people in the room telling you what is going on, it was extremely difficult because we knew we didn't have the Blackboard 8 expertise. We had expertise running 6.3 – that's what we'd done for the last seven years. Then we resolved those two problems and Blackboard remained up and running for several weeks, but then we ran into another problem late in February when it came down again. We did diagnostic work with Blackboard, we elevated it to a Sev-1 Error with them, and we sought their guidance in telling us what the problem was. We got the system back up and Blackboard never followed through with telling us why the Sev-1 Error was a problem, and then again on March 16, Blackboard went down again. What we found in our own diagnostic work is that it went down for the same exact reason it went down in February. We fed the information back to Blackboard, and they came back and finally admitted to us that this was a Blackboard 8 bug, and said here's the workaround, there will be no patch to it unless you'd like to go to Blackboard 9. Since no hands went up for Blackboard 9, we said we'll do the workaround and now we know what the diagnostic is and what our load is, and Blackboard has been up ever since. This has been a tough semester, and my staff has worked enormous hours to help bring us back. The problem that we went into almost a week ago that kept us down for four or five days was not a Blackboard problem although Blackboard was affected by it, but a Sun problem. Since we have so much going on in the data center upgrading our environment, we were told we needed to upgrade the Sun operating system to support the environment in a better way for clustering purposes. We had done the upgrade in our test environment and it was successful. The only difference between our test environment and our production environment is that the former is a single Sun server while the latter is a clustered server. The best I can describe a clustered server is think of it as two towers which are both running at the same time distributing the load across multiple servers; then if one fails the other automatically picks up the additional load. Well, Sun gave us this upgrade on the patch and we did it, and it worked in test. When we put it into production, when we brought the servers back up, the clustering immediately failed, the systems went down, and we couldn't recover. The best way to describe this is when you see that blue screen of death on your PC. We

didn't know what to do. We had Sun on the phone immediately, we raised this as a Sev-1 issue with them, they had their resources on site, and they didn't know what to do because it was their patch and their words were "We've never seen this before." That scared us. I will say we were fortunate that Sun was able to find relatively close, Moscow, resources that were able to help us recover from this failure and bring the Sun cluster back up in an unclustered state which is how we're running right now. The two machines are there and we run Blackboard all on one side, and we are working now to mirror image the other side. We are actually at a point where we don't want to take the chance in this semester to put the clustering back in. We don't want to introduce any potential interruption into the system. As long as we're functioning fine with the number of users we're seeing on the system today where one side is working well, the second side will act as the DR site so if the first side fails we can come over to the other side and bring the system up in a short period of time.

So those are the things we have experienced and done over the last couple of months, which were enormously challenging, but I wanted to tell you what we are doing going forward. We are taking a much harder approach to working with our vendors. We are holding them far more accountable: Sun, Blackboard, Oracle – they all had their hand in the problems we've experience the past several months. They all in some way or other tried to support and assist us when the problems arose, but when it came time to help us find the solution they were not as supportive because in some cases they didn't know what they were. So we are going to hold them far more accountable in helping us find the solution so we're not the source of finding a Sev-1 error, and the CUNY environment is not the one who is suffering from it. The second thing we're doing is taking a much more aggressive approach for disaster recovery. We did this with the Portal problem we had at the beginning of the semester where when the Portal went down, the Portal DR site came back up which allowed us to at least give you access to systems if you had a user id and a password. The problem was if you didn't have them, you couldn't get them at the previous DR site. It was sort of a Catch 22. We have now as a result of this at the end of January, the Portal DR site now has all the functionality associated with managing a user's account, creating them, recovering a password, connecting to the systems through a sign-on capacity – all of that is there today on our DR site. The only thing missing is that if you have a Portal DR site up, if you log in to Blackboard you use one user id and password and you can't at the same time also be logged in to the SIMS system or Degree Works; you have to log in to those systems themselves because there is no single sign on capacity on the DR site. The second thing we're doing on DR is looking at how we provide DR for our Blackboard environment. There are three approaches we are taking. There's a short-term, mid-term, and long-term. We view Blackboard to be a mission critical system supporting this University. In the case of the Online BA program it's like brick and mortar and quite frankly it has potentially 47,000 uses per day. This is not a small system, by any means. So on a short-term basis, we have now reached out to Blackboard and have now contracted with them to provide us with DR capabilities immediately so that if we have a problem the production people will provide us with recovery services. They will have the application up and running, and we will copy our data over there over a certain number of times per day so that we have minimized our data as far as recovery, and that will be in place to support us until our end-term solution is in place. The end-term solution we're working on is to put the third party DR location outside of New York. If we're going to go through this process, good DR says you should be at least 75 miles away from your current location – outside the power grid. We're going as far as Syracuse. We have a relationship with a vendor that is on our network so we have the bandwidth going up there. They have the capacity that we can install our servers up there and actually put a mirror image of our Blackboard environment up in a third party location. That's where we will have our end-term solution for the immediate needs for Blackboard. When I talk about a longer-term solution, there are far more applications that we think we are going to want to install in the DR site to provide the same level of support on a day to day basis for our mission critical systems. They go beyond

the academic community because they also start at applying online so students can get to the University, being able to register, being able to manage your bill paying, being able to support yourself through classes with Degree Works – there is a set of applications that is not small that we believe need to be in a DR solution. That will include bringing in external consultants to help us build the environment and to help us develop the procedures, the testing policies, that will allow us to test this on a regular basis. An additional item we are doing is that DR alone is a good solution if you have a hardware failure or a power failure or an Act of God. But DR is not going to help you when you have a software bug because the same bug will be sitting in your DR site. If you fail there, you'll fail at the other location so what we need to do from a University-wide perspective with administrators to faculty to deans is everyone needs to think about business continuity. I was extremely impressed with the approach that many of the faculty had taken the last time when Blackboard was not available. They used other means of communication to get the message out to their students. They used email to let their students know there were extensions on assignments, or what the assignments were, or what the reading was. That which could have been accomplished in Blackboard was done through other means of communication. It can't do the testing or submission of the work, but at least it got out the message to students about how to continue to operate. A memo went out to presidents today asking them to identify an individual who will join a new business continuity committee that Alan has established, chaired by both Dean Robert Ptachik and Dr. Howard Apsan. The purpose of the committee will be to learn from what the campuses have done and what some of the best practices have been used when Blackboard was not available. How did you continue to operate and how can these messages be shared with other campus communities to explain to them what they may want to consider doing. We are also bringing in experts in business continuity planning to provide some templates and best practices to campuses as they work to build these continuity plans. In most cases you don't need on a campus 5,000 plans, but just one way that works. We understand some things will have to happen to support the continuity plans. The IT shops on campuses will have to provide ways they can distribute email addresses to faculty if that's their chosen approach to communicate. We may have to do some training or bring up some backup software or communication software to support the effort. We understand the campuses can't do this all on their own and we are prepared to support them.

Professor Campbell Dalglish, CCNY – I teach screen writing and completely went to Blackboard 7. I loved it, was using it for two years, and when it broke down I immediately, like others, went to email and solved my own problem right away but decided not to go back to Blackboard at least until the fall. This is a question that could lead to a suggestion. Would you have been able to maintain Blackboard 7 in such a way that while you are switching to Blackboard 8 I could have had all the information, my students' emails and posted my syllabi, and so on, on Blackboard 7 until Blackboard 8 was broken in? **Mr. Cohen** – I apologize for the challenges you went through. As a technologist, my first reaction when you have a problem doing an upgrade is can we back out? You always need to have a way to recover. The problem with going from Blackboard 6.3 to Blackboard 8 is that there was no way to back out. In fact, it wasn't a traditional upgrade. From Blackboard 5 to 6.3 was a traditional system upgrade. They give you a new set of software, and it's essentially a stacking up of the old system with some new features and functionalities, and it looks great. But Blackboard 8 was a brand new system, a whole new install. We went from being virtual instances to being a domain environment, from having 23 instances to having 1. There was no way to back out because we had custom programs that were written that took content from Blackboard 6.3, converted it into Blackboard 8, but the software wasn't written to reverse it back to 6.3. The only thing you could have done, if it got to that point when we just could not recover, was go back to your original content in 6.3 but all the work you did and the preparation time of getting ready for your course would have all been lost. Trying to tell 5,000 people that they are about to lose all the work they did wasn't the message I was trying to send out at the time. We were spending most of our attention getting the

system back up, and to understand why it wasn't working. We found we didn't have this problem in the Blackboard 8 pilot project with the Online BA and the Grad Center because of the load. Even if we had throttled back on having 20 campuses on the system, we wouldn't have found out the problem as far as the load until we opened it up. We would have had the false illusion that it was working fine.

Professor Roberta Klibaner, CSI – First I'd like to compliment you on the LDAP improvement. But maintenance from 6 until 8 a.m. is a problem because it doesn't always end at 8, and classes start at 9. If you want to put something up just before class, it's not always available. We used to have maintenance from 5 until 7. It was a much better system. Is there a way to change that back? **Mr. Cohen** – We can certainly look at changing that. It's just a matter of calling staff in at earlier hours. As long as I can get the resources in, I'd be glad to start it earlier. **Professor Klibaner** -- Is there a workaround for discussion boards if we have a Blackboard problem? **Mr. Cohen** – That's a good question. I will be the first to say I'm not an expert in this area as far as the third party products at this point in time. We have a patch from Learning Objects. We are working with them to test it. The problem is there is no certification process of third party products with Blackboard. Unless we feel comfortable as a University and see that these third party products can handle the load that we're under, I'm concerned about bringing a third party product in because I don't want to see a repeat of what we had before, especially when you as faculty begin to rely on it to be there. I would have to depend on both Professor Pecorino and George Otte and the other expertise in these products out there to provide me guidance. I don't choose them, I only evaluate them from a technical perspective.

Professor Roberta Brody, Queens College – I know all of us are people of good will or we wouldn't be here, and I don't want to make you feel bad but I do want to make you feel guilty! Here's why: we need to have an examination not just of this system, but all things paper or technology-wise that take into account our sheer hugeness. Scalability problems are not new. They are in every single piece of technology that exists, and we need to consider that. It needs to be part of our technology policy, and part of our vital records program which I know exists, that includes a vital technology program that is seamless and deals with these bigger issues before you get involved in the extraordinary efforts you had to go through with afterwards. Are you going that way, and looking from the top down now at scalability and at being part of the bigger University vital records program? **Mr. Cohen** – Let me talk about it from a scalability perspective. Everything we think about from an Enterprise perspective has to scale to meet the entire University's needs. That's how CUNY First is being developed, that's how the original Blackboard system was being developed, and that's why the hardware we have on these systems are in fact scalable to support large masses of people. Campuses don't typically get 47,000 logging on to a Blackboard system in one day. We do try to scale them. Our challenge here is when you scale the environment, not many Universities are our size. **Professor Brody** – Granted, and if that is the case then maybe we need distributive systems on campuses for those kinds of software that have not been tested on a wide scale, or we need to go to systems that are in place with the U.S. government which can handle massive amounts of data like we do. **Mr. Cohen** – In some cases we have those distributive systems on campuses that have never demonstrated that they can be large-scale systems. Blackboard, in our opinion, always scaled to this University's size. As a matter of fact, today it still shows us that it's scaling to our size because it's handling the load. But it is a brand new product, it does have its bugs, and it does have to be worked out as a natural process. When we chose our PeopleSoft product, they said the CUNY First product has to be tested in fully-load environments. We have load balancing software, we have Mercury interactive testing, we have a full DR site that supports, and when we go through a testing process bringing this product up, it has to demonstrate that it can handle a certain number of users per minute and per second.

Professor Felipe Pimentel, Hostos – I have been using Blackboard for 10 years. I teach four online courses. There is a distinction between courses that use Blackboard for support and those online courses that totally depend on Blackboard. When we had the crisis in February, people who are teaching full online courses were left in limbo for a week. I didn't know what to tell my students. Second, students using Vista are still having the same problems all the time. Finally, I think we need to decentralize the system to help, with mirrors at the local level for particular courses. **Mr. Cohen** – Thank you. **Professor Terrence Martell, Baruch** – We understand that the extraordinary events of the past three months put a strain on all personnel at the central office and at the schools. I'm not in IT but I observed what happened, and I just have a simple request. We've got a very good group at Baruch and we're proud of what BCTC does, and I can't help but note that this has put an extraordinary strain on them, responding to the needs uptown and also trying to maintain what happens at the campus. I would appreciate it, as you plan and think, that you perhaps give a little more thought and weight to how the impact of some of these requests, requirements, operating contingency plans, committees, etc. are really impacting the ability to get the job done at the local campuses. We note a deterioration of service as a result of this strain and as a result of the fact that we've got difficulty hiring people. **Professor Ed Volchok, Queensborough** – I'm the chair of the distance education committee. First, I've got to tell you that my mailbox is full of angry, frustrated, and complaining faculty members and students. When they look for solutions, they are looking for one or two things: a spare tire next time Blackboard goes down so we have educational continuity, and other people say I never want to see Blackboard again so give me something else. We're looking at E-Portfolio, or sites on the college website. My question is what is CUNY going to support for our faculty members? Will they support something entirely different? **Mr. Cohen** – You get to a question of how many systems we can support because in any environment you would end up having N number of systems because everyone may choose another solution that works best for them. If there is a system out there that works better for this University, and I mean not just different but better, then of course we would not look twice at supporting it. We don't as an office make the decision as to what tool will be used in an academic setting. That comes from the faculty. I understand that a subcommittee of the Chief Academic Officers is looking at the alternative solutions and is going through the evaluation process; we will certainly participate in that process. If there is a better solution, we will participate in bringing those systems up and do multiple pilots to see how that system will work in a University setting. I always think it's good to let Blackboard know that there is competition on the block. **Professor Volchok** – In the interim, what if the faculty member is so frustrated and afraid Blackboard will go down again? I've been teaching online for 8 years using Web CT and never once experienced more than an 8 hour drop, and that was twice. Would the University allow a professor not to use Blackboard but some other system even if they can't support it? **Mr. Cohen** – I can't start supporting all the systems that are out there, from a central office perspective. I can't stop a faculty members from using a product. That's not where my responsibility is. My staff is focused on supporting the system we've been told to support, and we're continuing to support that. I can't go out there and start supporting N number of systems. Whether it's Blackboard or something else, they will all go down at some point whether it's the servers running on a shared third party product, or the servers over at 57th Street, or it's the Internet, or the ISP provider – at some point, every system goes down. The only thing I can assure you is that we are doing everything we possibly can to provide the DR site so if we have a problem at 57th Street, we can recover. We are actually going to be building a brand new data center that has generator capacity, back-up support coolants, and all the things you should have in an Enterprise data center that supports this kind of organization. **Chair Philipp** – If we have a complete back-up system, does that mean that when you have a service event, say you shut it down for one hour to upgrade some software, that the back-up would take over during that time so the user would not see anything? **Mr. Cohen** – In a maintenance scenario, I don't know. We have to work on our back-up and disaster recovery procedures on this. If we bring the production environment down and we switch over to the DR environment

during maintenance, I don't know the amount of work that is going to be involved in doing the cutover. There is a data synchronization issue that occurs. When you go over to the DR site, the data you start working on is at the DR site. Then you've got to bring all of that data back over to your production environment. That replication process takes a lot of time. So it may be better for us during our maintenance window to just be down for that period of time because our statistics show, similar to Professor Klibaner's, that during those hours usage on the system is very low. We may be better off not interfering with that loss of data, just going into shutdown mode.

Professor Philip Pecorino, Queensborough – I stand here as a UFS appointee to the University's Committee on Academic Technology. Faculty need to know that there are these groups who are both at work now, and willing to receive faculty input on what these alternatives are that are currently being discussed and maybe recommended. So I would like you and George Otte to describe how you see the Committee on Academic Technology. Every campus has a representative on that Committee, feeding into what you were describing as hearing from the community, the faculty, what the alternatives were that were being discussed, implemented, or recommended, leading to the awareness that we don't want our students to suffer. Students who are taking four or five classes can't, in the middle of a semester disaster, then go and learn three or four alternative programs because the faculty had several alternatives available. It's just too much to ask students to do.

Professor Sandi Cooper, CSI – Most of what you're talking about could be Inuit, for all I know. However, I do understand the following. Besides what happened to the students, which I appreciate, I ran a search for a new colleague and we were told it had to be conducted on Blackboard. After I concluded the search and the date for final applications was past, it turned out that Blackboard had eaten up about 10 applications. I found this out from a variety of accidents. So in addition to the academic issues that were described here, I think people should be aware that searches should probably be done with quill pens until the system is improved and becomes reliable. I'm waiting to be sued by these people who are quite annoyed that they did what they were supposed to do. Since this has happened and we know you are about to centralize everything, some of us wonder when you are going to start doing the payroll so we can take early retirement! **Mr. Cohen** – There is no plan to start doing payroll. That's one of the sacred things we all like to enjoy on a regular basis! I will say I wasn't aware of that search issue. If you get a chance, I'd like to hear more about it so I can figure it out and deal with it.

Professor Stanley Wine, Baruch – I have extensive experience in IT management in the financial services industry. You mentioned you were surprised that the database was not configured properly in terms of size and other factors. You also mentioned you use Mercury products, which is a load testing product. I'm wondering whether the new implementation of Blackboard was stress tested, which is certainly something one would expect to have done for a mission critical system, and if it was stress tested how is it that the configuration problems weren't uncovered? **Mr. Cohen** – The project plan had a load test, as far as the deliverable. We kept asking Blackboard was it load tested and never got a straight answer. We found out later on that the system was not load tested to our satisfaction with tools like Mercury. We don't own Mercury as a tool within the University. Actually we've used Mercury in a lot of the work we've done in the past for the Portal and other applications, but for some reason Blackboard did not use Mercury in this particular case. We are in the process of purchasing Mercury tools. **Professor Wine** – Stress testing should be a responsibility of the user, not the vendor. That's like putting the fox in charge of the henhouse, and kind of what happened to us. That should be our responsibility, not something we can hand off to somebody else. **Mr. Cohen** – Thank you.

Professor Angela Crossman, John Jay – This is an issue that came up for colleagues at our campus, whether frustration from students would boil over into teaching evaluations. That might be something for the administration to consider when we consider next year for our adjuncts and other professors.

Professor Mark Chaffie, John Jay – Do we always have to be addicted to the new? Maybe sometimes we should wait to see when something has been around for a year or two before we get into it. There are always bugs in the system. Sometimes things that work are more important than things that are modern. **Mr. Cohen** – As a technologist, generally we don't like to implement any systems that have a dot zero release. We wait until do 3 or 4 and let someone else work out the bugs. In this particular case, we spent a year and a half working to upgrade to 7 dot something. The window of opportunity to do this upgrade is two weeks in the summer and two weeks in December when we can actually switch over to the new system. In the middle of our planning in April when we were getting ready to go live in July, we were told we are now announcing 8.0 and it's just like 7 dot something, and we're suggested you go to that. We were not happy about doing an 8.0 release, which is why we also did a pilot project with it with Online BA and the Grad Center.

Chair Philipp – We must go to our nominations now, but thank you for coming and we hope to have you back. Also, Vice Chancellor Dobrin has three task forces working on approaches to the financial crisis. Can you take 5 minutes? **Vice Chancellor Dobrin** – Quick overview. You probably noticed a couple of financial problems in the nation? We got through last year basically because the government appreciates the great work this University has done, especially in the past several years. They worked with us on reserves and fringe benefits so we were able to get through with a minor OTPS cut and a pause in administrative hiring. The next two years, partially because of the stimulus package, we will get through that barring the economy's getting much worse, which is a real possibility, and we'll be able to make some investments. The question is what happens beyond 2011? We need to plan for that, so the Chancellor asked me to coordinate three working groups to think about long term things to do. One of those working groups is headed by Iris Weinshall, and we're taking a look at monetizing the University's assets. One example of that: it's a little gimmicky but faculty might like it – you could sell 80th Street. It turns out we have some air rights. You then take that money and use it to stabilize the budget for the next two years and we move to a campus or lease space somewhere else and pay it out over 99 years. The second committee headed by Ernesto Malave is basically looking at our budget at a real micro-level. We put everything we do into one of three budgets: core (faculty/student support), support services (for instance, security), and then wonderful things we do that are good for society but aren't something we have to do as a University (College Now, our immigration center, etc.). We don't want to stop doing those things, but if there is ever a choice between those things and the core, we will go with core. Then as we break the budget down into activities, we're going to do comparisons per unit between all the campuses. For example, it may turn out that between Queens and Brooklyn, similar campuses, there is a big difference in cost per student for security. One might learn from the other. No one wants to reduce security, but in the later years we would reduce security before we reduce faculty. We will compare with other universities in urban areas. What do they spend per person? Take payroll: if you look nationally, it's one full-time payroll person per 1,000 employees. We are at about 350. Can we get that number better? If we have to make that choice not to hurt our core business, we'll make those choices. The third group run by Rick Schaffer is asking what rule changes to we need to have to allow us to do some of the other things? Some things we can change. This Board is open to doing this.

Professor Mike Vozick, BMCC – This is a question for your thought. Did you have enough faculty input in making the decisions that you made, and do you have enough faculty input from

the ground in making new decisions that are in the process about Blackboard 8? Also, with regard to the three committees you just mentioned, is there any faculty input into the early planning process? **Vice Chancellor Dobrin** – On the decision to use Blackboard or not, IT did not make that decision at all. Vice Chancellor Mirrer, then, met with faculty and provosts and the decision was made. Blackboard is a monopoly and maybe nobody really like it, but nobody had another solution. Those decisions were made by the academics. Brian did not make the decision to go to 8.0. As I understand it, that was done with committees with people like George Otte. I understand it went through governance on individual campuses. **Chair Philipp** -- It didn't go through governance on campuses. **Vice Chancellor Dobrin** – Then I was misinformed, but it was not a decision the IT people made. It was based on faculty input. Whether we sell 80th Street, for instance, is a business decision but other things would be faculty decisions and we will absolutely include faculty. **Chair Philipp** – You need not just faculty members chosen by presidents, but representatives of faculty governance, which is a different group of people and they haven't been involved in this – certainly not decisions on which version of Blackboard. It never came up at my college. Presidents may choose committees of faculty but they are not representative if they are chosen by the president or provost. We have to be able to distinguish between people chosen by the administration or elected by the faculty. **Professor Karen Kaplowitz** – It's not just who selects the people, but it's who then the faculty representatives are responsible to report to. It's important that the faculty representatives report back to their faculty senates because then they get feedback and are themselves consultative so you get a truer voice than an individual from each campus who reports to the provost. **Vice Chancellor Dobrin** – I don't want to oversell my expertise on this. I'm actually not on the Academic Committee and don't know who is on that Committee. **Chair Philipp** -- That's an advisory committee. It doesn't replacing going to campus faculty senates, which administrations are loath to do unless they are explicitly ordered to do. We deal with this problem every month when things come to the Board of Trustees from the colleges, and we have to call back to the colleges to find out whether this item or that item pass faculty governance. The default option for administrations is, if possible, bypass it because it's a problem that creates difficulties. But we insist on it. I think we should insist on it in this area just as well. Administrations don't like to involve governance. I know of a college senate that has an information technology committee that was never touched on in this entire Blackboard process. Nobody talked to them, and yet they are the elected representatives. **Professor Kaplowitz** – The wonderful model is Vice Chancellor Malave. In his letters to the presidents reminding them that a fiscal plan is due or the Compact proposal from the college, he now always says please consult with your elected faculty because he really has listened to us and he sees the difference when that is done. There is real buy-in and real information provided by the faculty. He recognizes the wisdom of it. **Vice Chancellor Dobrin** – We set up a committee of IT governance when I came. I went to the presidents and said give me the person on your campus you trust for IT. Some were provosts, some were VPs for administration, some were CIO's. I also went then to the UFS and said give me a couple of people you would like. That's how we've done it, and how we tried to get governance feedback. If that's a bad model, I'll rethink it. **Professor Kaplowitz** – The problem is, it's two faculty and 20 administrators. The faculty voice isn't strong enough, and if there is a vote that's two votes representing thousands of faculty. **Vice Chancellor Dobrin** – It's generally done by consensus. If you'd like to have a special meeting of faculty, we can do that. **Chair Philipp** – The representatives on the IT Steering Committee don't report anything back to the faculty, and you've got an inherent problem of communication because the faculty who are actually teaching the courses don't get messages on what is going on. Good governance means you have better communication.

V. Joint Resolution concerning the PSC-CUNY Research Awards Program

Professor Anne Friedman, BMCC – I'd like to ask Professor Kathryn Richardson and Professor Jim Gordon to have a seat at the table. This is a follow-up to our last meeting when we had an esteemed panel up here, including Kathryn and Jim, to brief us on the very hot issue in the University now of the PSC-CUNY Awards. We promised that the UCRA and the UFS Research Committee would come back to us at this meeting with a joint resolution on the issue of the changing of the structure of the PSC-CUNY grants. They have done their job, and it's my job to read to you part of this handout that you should have which was on the back table. I'm going to start with the third paragraph:

“In November 2008, the Vice Chancellor for Research, Dr. Gillian Small, established a task force based on her assumptions that the program is “unsustainable” and needs “restructuring.” In contrast, broad faculty opinion across the university is strongly supportive of the way the faculty peer-reviewed research program functions now, and is supportive of the manner in which grants are distributed.

During the two meetings of the task force, the arbitrary assumptions that surfaced were:

- *Separate, Local* campus decision-making is desirable
- Recompensed Peer review is much too expensive
- Too many grants are awarded.

A draft report has emerged. Contrary to Article 25 of the PSC Contract, Vice Chancellor Small's draft report radically alters the present practice of peer-review, which has assured the program's academic integrity, by transferring the authority for grant approval to the provosts on each campus. This would open the way to arbitrarily focusing awards in certain disciplines, or to politicization of the selection process.

A reading of the PSC-CUNY contract states that responsibility for establishing guidelines rests with the University Committee on Research Awards. That committee consists of faculty members who are recommended by the UFS and appointed by the Chancellor. This Contract makes no reference to having university administrators be part of the review process. There are good reasons for this. In particular, it is not appropriate for administrators to be involved in funding decisions in a program that derives from monies that otherwise would be available for faculty compensation. Therefore, we ask that Vice Chancellor Small's task force on the Restructuring of the PSC-CUNY Research Award Program be disbanded. We further ask all faculty members to place the attached resolution, suitably adapted for your college, on the agenda of your campus governance body. We also ask that the UFS Executive Committee place this resolution on the agenda for the March 31st plenary session of the University Faculty Senate.

Resolution:

Whereas, the monies that fund the PSC-CUNY Awards program result from the PSC-CUNY Contract, which are funds that by consent of PSC members, are excluded from use as salary and other compensation and are not part of general city or state funding of the University; and,

Whereas, the task force set up by the chancellery is an inappropriate body to alter the present arrangement of making these awards,

Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the UFS Research Committee and the University Committee on Research Awards reject the restructuring proposal in the task force draft report, and

Be it Further Resolved, that the UFS Research Committee and the University Committee on Research Awards ask that the Task Force on the PSC-CUNY Awards Program be disbanded and that its suggestions be presented to the UCRA and its Executive Committee, for their consideration.”

I would now ask Professor Gordon or Richardson to add any comments, and then they will take your questions.

Professor Kathryn Richardson, NYCCT – We just wanted to tell you a little bit of the history of what’s happened since we had our panel discussion at the last meeting. The Research Committee of the Faculty Senate met the following week, with representatives from the UCRA at that meeting. We brainstormed about what we would like in the resolution, the wording, the points we wanted to make. We put it all together and came up with this resolution. It was then voted on by the Research Committee unanimously, and then we sent it to Professor Gordon, and he’ll continue about that. I’d like to thank everybody on the Research Committee. It was a pleasure working with everybody. Of course we were in full agreement with just about everything involved with the resolution. I would like to thank Manfred for all his ideas and emails going back and forth when we were putting the resolution together, as well as Stasia for all of her help always, and also Tom Bird for being my cohort as a representative on this task force. The next task force meeting is tomorrow, which makes it really important that we have this vote tonight. **Professor Tom Gordon, Hunter** – I’m a member of the Executive Committee of the UCRA, so I took it to the Executive Committee, which was very strongly supportive as it has been throughout the entire time. I should say that Cheryl Bluestone has taken over as Vice Chair of the UCRA because the Vice Chancellor, Gillian Small, who is the Chair, doesn’t come to meetings. So the whole burden of running this program has fallen to the Executive Committee and to Cheryl. We sent this resolution out to the members of the UCRA, and the vote was overwhelming in support of the resolution as it stands. In addition, each member of the UCRA sent this report to their panel members, so now the lines are extending out, and without exception people are shocked and frustrated and upset by this. I’m sure you have all run into this at your own campuses as you’ve talked to people about this. It’s unbelievable. I get email after email asking what can I do? I say, write letters to the Vice Chancellor and to the Chancellor in support of this. Now the UCRA and the Research Committee has voted for it, and now we ask you to vote in support of this resolution so we can move forward and stop this action. **Professor Friedman** – I think someone is going to present this resolution, and then we can have questions. **Professor Pecorino** – With regard to this matter, I introduce the following motion: Be It Resolved, that the University Faculty Senate endorse the Resolveds adopted by the UFS Research Committee and the University Committee on Research Awards on March 12, 2009. Professor Cooper – I would like to support this, and to report that last Thursday the Faculty Senate of the College of Staten Island unanimously voted for it, with the exception of those members of the administration that sit in the Senate, whose hands did not go up. **Professor Emily Tai, Queensborough** – I would like to report that the faculty voted in favor of this motion last March 25 at our faculty meeting, and this resolution is also going to be included on our Senate agenda for April 21. **Professor Richardson** – I just want to say we’ve heard from some of the other schools as well. The resolution will go to the Graduate Council of the Graduate School for endorsement at its next meeting, and the Executive Committee of the Queens College Academic Senate voted unanimously. I bring this up because we would like you to continue if your senate or college council are meeting in the next week or two to put this on their agendas. **Chair Philipp** – I’d like to thank Kathryn, Anne, and Jim for their presentations. I’m now calling the vote. All in favor? I declare this to have passed without dissent.

IV. Nominations for Members at Large – I’d like to call on Professor Jay Weiser, who is chair of our Legal Affairs Committee, to come up and oversee.

Lenore Beaky nominated Anne Friedman.
Robert Klibaner nominated Sandi Cooper.
Bill Crain nominated Rishi Raj.
Emily Tai nominated Stefan Baumrin.
Karen Kaplowitz nominated Phil Pecorino.
Phil Pecorino nominated Terrence Martell.
Martha Bell nominated Leslie Jacobson.
Donald Hume nominated Michael Barnhart.

Nominations will stay open through the next meeting.

I'd like to introduce Professor Weiser of Baruch College. He's the chair of our Legal Affairs Committee, and he has worked long and hard hours in every sense of the word on behalf of senators and governance leaders who have had issues with their college administrations. I'd like to take this opportunity to thank him for his very hard, useful and brilliant work.

VI. Reports on Presidential Transitions Under Way

Professor Charles Tobey, Brooklyn – We have a search. Our president resigned rather suddenly, or I should say, retired, about a month ago. We formed a search committee. We elected three members from Faculty Council to be on the search committee. The Board of Trustees has five member, one of them being chair, and a student representative from the undergraduate and graduate level, and an alumni representative. They came and visited the campus about three weeks ago and found out from the campus constituencies what they are looking for in a new president. The overwhelming words that came from the faculty were that they wanted someone who was consultative. Chris Kimmich, who has been our president, has been very good in that direction, and he thinks of himself as an academic rather than as an administrator. He was a teacher, he was chairman of the History Department, and he actually likes faculty which is not that usual in higher education. After that period of time passed by, we went into a full search and we have a consultant who is helping us with the search. He is going to make 1,000 phone calls, he says, to people in higher education in administrative positions. He's going to have the ads in the usual places, the Times and the Chronicle, but he feels there are many people out there who aren't sure they are looking for a job yet, or want to remain anonymous if they are. We hope to have a new president in place by June 7, and we're going to be working fast. There are a whole lot of resumes and applications, but they are unable to tell me the number which is confidential. But our president feels this is a plum job and we should get an outstanding candidate.

Professor Pimentel – We have three finalist at Hostos: Felix Matos Rodriguez, Cabinet Secretary, Department of the Family, Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; Natalie M. Gomez-Velez, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, CUNY School of Law; and Wilfredo Nieves, President, Middlesex Community College. The three candidates spent a day at the college and met with groups of faculty, staff, and students. The Chancellor promises to make a decision before April 15, and the new president will take over in June or July.

Professor Doris Withers, Medgar Evers – On February 24, an announcement appeared on the CUNY website that President Edison O. Jackson, the third permanent president, was retiring after 20 years. The announcement was made on campus on February 26. On March 2, guidelines were distributed to the college community on the process of the search committee. These came from central office, and were boilerplate except for one piece at the end which I'll tell you about in a minute. We also had a meeting with the search committee, two of the three

Board members, and two outside consultants, one of whom is the former president of Howard University, H. Patrick Swygert. That meeting was held on March 10, and in that meeting we had a number of people – faculty, deans, students, chairs, who met at separate times – to state what they wanted in a new president. At least among the faculty group of which I was a member, we talked about fairness, integrity, shared governance, freedom of speech and academic freedom, issues related to working with the community, issues of continued support for the college and being able to advocate for the college and not be a yes-person. You know what that means: a lot of campuses are struggling with the centralization of the University and presidents that say Yes – I don't know that that is totally true, but anyway... There were many other interesting questions asked, but here's the deal: most of you said you have a year to do this, right? We were told on March 10 that they were planning to interview by April, send three finalists by May, and name a president in June. They told us the process would be fair, transparent, and equitable. I think the process will be, but the thing that troubles our campus is the following: in the Search Guidelines there is provision if there is a stellar or otherwise special candidate, campus constituencies may decide to suspend the Guidelines for a specific presidential search and substitute a shortened process. We are somewhat concerned about that process on campus, and say we will let the process work but you have someone waiting in the corridor, and say run through the process, you're it. We want to be able to open it up to the best possible candidate. We don't necessarily say the one waiting in the corridor that may be waiting is not an excellent candidate, but we would like to process to operate and allow a wide net. We want to make sure the faculty on campus have a good input. That's where we are now. **Professor Cooper** – That last item you mentioned, that exception. If memory serves, it was added by the Board of Trustees about a decade ago with the purpose of bringing Goldstein in as Chancellor. That was not a piece of the process until the late 1990s. Every faculty members on the Executive Committee of this body then fought it, but of course we got nowhere because we didn't have any votes on the Board. I've been about five of these searches, and my problem with the process always was advising faculty on the question of who votes for the faculty representatives. That issue varies from campus to campus. In a number of places, the election was not held entirely by faculty. We tried at my place to have a mail ballot to all full-time people, but not everyone does that and in some representative bodies you've got HEOs and administrators and students voting. **Professor Withers** – When we had the last presidential search, which I served on 20 years ago, an assembly of all faculty was called and they were nominated. Our governing body is mixed with administrators, but at that time all faculty were called and we nominated tenured people (by the way, now we have a nontenured person on our search committee). This time, our president called our governance committee together and only faculty could vote. But understand who is on the governance committee – it's not the whole faculty, you see, so it came from an excluded body. Our Faculty Senate, which is separate, took exception to it. They had not been successful in overthrowing it because they felt they should be the body, but that body is exclusionary too because if you don't pay dues, you can't vote. The process we had 20 years ago, when we called all faculty together and said please vote, to me in my experience and opinion, was the best. So we got a person who is not tenured, and two who are. **Professor Leslie Jacobson, Brooklyn** – That shortened process has already been done. That's how we got Chris Kimmich when he was acting Chancellor. **Professor Richardson** – Usually if it's somebody who goes under that last guideline, there is not a whole search committee chosen, so you would know from the beginning.

Chair Philipp -- I would like to thank everyone for their attendance and participation. We will have an election next time. I would like to emphasize that it is important that your colleges elect representatives in an appropriate manner to the UFS. Not all colleges have done so. There is a particularly delinquent college that hasn't done so in more than a year and will lose representation entirely. I encourage you to actually check on your campus that the election process is going. If you go to our website and look at the list of delegates, you will see their

expiration date when their term is over, you can check on your own date, and truly try to make sure that on your campus an appropriate election does take place.