

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

December 16, 2008

The meeting was called to order by UFS Chair Philipp at 6:30 p.m. in Room 9204/05/06 at the Graduate School and University Center. 56 voting members of 118 were present.

**Baruch:** Present – Dumas, Hill, Martell, and Wine. Absent – Freedman, Myers, Nematollahy, Pollard, and Vora. **BMCC:** Present – Genis, Kalogeropoulos, Martinez-Lopez, Soto, and Vozick. Absent – Niyazov, and Persaud. **Bronx CC:** Present – none. Absent – Alozie, Durante, and Skinner. Vacancies—1. **Brooklyn:** Present – Bell, Shapiro, and Tobey. Absent – Jacobson, Cherukupalli, Duboys, Magliozzo, Massood, Morrill, Shortell, and Viscusi. **CCNY:** Present – Crain, Dalglish, Khalil, and Sank. Vacancies – 2. Absent – Habib, Lascar, and Raj. **CSI:** Present – Cooper, Talarico, and Alternate Stearns. Absent – Batson, Klibaner, Petratos, and Yousef. **CUNY Law School:** Present – Yanez. Absent – Bach. **Graduate School:** Present – Baumrin and Weinstein. Absent – Lennon, Mathews-Salazar, Nolan, and Orenstein. **Hostos CC:** Present – Bernardini and Pimentel. Absent – August. **Hunter:** Present – Grossman, Spark and Strayer. Absent – Ancona, DeMeo, Guzzetta, Kaye, Kuhn-Osius, Palanda, Simon, St. Hill, Splitter. **John Jay:** Present – Chaffie, Crossman, Dunham, Kaplowitz, and Katz. Absent – King-Toler and Kubic. **Kingsborough CC:** Present – Barnhart, Hume, Ruoff, Sarinsky, and Stubin. Absent – Wood. **LaGuardia CC:** Present – Beaky and Alternate Kurzyna. Absent – Davidson, Lerman, Mettler, Rushing, and Shean. **Lehman:** Present – Maybee, Mineka and Philipp. Absent – Jervis, Hellmann, and Marianetti. **Medgar Evers:** Present – None. Absent – Barker, Cuffee, Stewart and Withers. **NYCCT:** Present – Cermele, Horelick, Hounion, and Alternate Pinto. Absent – Panayotakis, Richardson, and Woytowich. **Queens:** Present – Bird, Brody, Gonzalez, and Savage. Absent: Moore and Zevin. Vacancies: 3. **Queensborough CC:** Present – Barbanel, Pecorino, and Tai. Absent – Iconis, Sweetnam, and Wein. **York:** Present – Lewis, Mawyer, and Baron. Absent – Cockery. Guests included: Professors Dahbany-Miraglia (QCC), Carlos Molina (HCC), Nelson (JJ), Ying (NTCCT), Hope (ME), and Borrell (Lehman).

**Governance Leaders present:** Baumrin (GS), Cooper (CSI), Hume (KCC), Kaplowitz (John Jay), Mawyer (York), Philipp (Lehman), Savage (Queens), Tai (QCC), Tobey (Brooklyn), and Young (Hunter) attended. Parliamentarian Moran, 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 November 25, 2008 – The minutes were approved as distributed.

III. Approval of Rules of Procedure – The rules were adopted as proposed.

IV. Reports (Recorded in Reports & Deliberations)

- A. Chair
- B. Chancellor Goldstein
- C. Prof. Michael Barnhart on Current Status of Enrollment
- D. Discussion of CUNY Public Health Programs
- E. Representatives to Board Committees (written)

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Bill Phipps  
Executive Director

REPORTS AND DELIBERATIONS  
OF THE 340<sup>th</sup> PLENARY SESSION  
OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE  
OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

December 16, 2008

Chair Philipp—I'd like to start this meeting off with the approval of the agenda and the minutes. So moved? All in favor? They are accepted. Now, the Rules of Procedure. So moved? All in favor? They are approved. I'd now like to welcome the Chancellor to this group. This is an important day for CUNY, given the Governor's message.

Chancellor Goldstein—It's good to see all of you. I hope the holidays that will begin very soon will be joyous and healthy, and you'll spend time with your family. I have a few announcements to make. First, I'd like to talk briefly about Governor Paterson's budget that he presented today. We knew what our condition was, probably two months ago, but obviously it would be improper for me to talk about this because we were working out the details. Let me just say that we will have stability next year. Nobody ought to be fearful, short of some catastrophic event that one cannot predict, that we will start the academic year in September in a very stable position. It will be more than a stable position—we envisage at this point in time that we will again have an investment program in the University that will be targeted primarily to our continuing development of building the full-time faculty. Since 1999 we have now incrementally increased our full-time faculty by slightly over 1200, and if we can continue to another two or three hundred, I think that is certainly moving in the right direction.

The Governor proposed a \$600 tuition increase. When I went to the Board, I asked for a slightly different approach, saying that the Chancellor would be responsible for coming in with a tuition increase of *no more than* \$600. I did that in a very deliberate way because I was hoping to reduce some of the burden. I don't know if we can live up to

that pledge but we will start the process now with the State Legislature and that will be one of the areas where we look for some relief; if we could accomplish it even in a marginal way, it will help the students. I think that would be a good thing.

The Governor proposed a 10% reduction in the base aid to community college students, which we knew again before and that was in part the reason that we recommended a tuition increase for the community colleges, again not going above \$400 in this particular sector. We will see where that goes. There are some minor adjustments, one in particular that is not deeply problematic because of the money involved, but I think problematic because of the principle, and that is again a proposed tithing of the Research Foundation overhead costs, slightly under \$2 million. That is obviously something we could handle, but I don't want to open that door again. When I became Chancellor, that door was pretty wide open, and I thought it was not helpful for us to extract those dollars from the Research Foundation, provided those dollars would be returned to the researchers who were generating that money, and we convinced the State to do that so for the last eight years we have not worried about a Research Foundation tithe but it's coming back again and hopefully we can manage that as well. And then there is a small offset to our general IFR accounts. I don't want to bore you with the details, but it's a relatively small amount of money. At the end of the day, again, absent any further increases that will result from our work with the Legislature, we will have a non-insignificant investment program for the University, which I think is very, very helpful.

On the City side, Mayor Bloomberg wrote, through his budget director, a directive to all of the organizations that receive funds from the City, and we do for about 38% of our operating budget for the senior colleges, that we would go through an exercise of a 7% reduction for 2009-2010. The memo was somewhat unclear in that we talked about a 7% reduction but then very quickly the budget director said let's suppose we start at a 5% reduction, and then maybe another 2%, but we will put together the necessary documents and move forward. There was one small surprise in the budget: a mid-year cut to the community colleges of slightly under \$4 million, which we can handle without a problem. Again, our main focus in all of the budget negotiations has been to protect the core. For me, that is operating principle #1. Protecting the core means protecting the academic work that we do at our campuses, which means protecting students, academic support services, libraries, laboratory work with personnel that manage our laboratories—that those items be protected in the budget, and that we would find ways of managing any particular cuts through other parts of the budget.

Remember, we expend in this University now about \$2.6 billion per year, so it is a large budget and there are always opportunities for us to reshape it but always reshaping it with the academic life of the institution very much in focus.

When I reflected on the Governor's budget today, I was really struck by things that I sort of knew but didn't fully appreciate the magnitude of the disparity between the funding of higher education historically in this State and lower ed. In particular, there is a slide here that I have, and I'll have the whole budget thing which you can circulate to everybody, but I just got the slide a couple of hours ago. School aid in this State has increased 69%

over the course of nine years. It is without precedent in the United States. Right now, the New York State spends slightly under \$15,000 per student in lower ed. The U.S. average is slightly under \$9,000, and that has been an enormous increase of 69%. When you look at Medicaid, the issue for Medicaid as well is that the numbers are really staggering in terms of their increases over time. In New York right now, we are number 1 in the nation in support of Medicaid per capita at about \$2,300. Again, the average is about \$1,000 in the United States. So when you look at two aspects of the budget, school aid and Medicaid, this State is so far, in probably the third or fourth standard deviation, away from the average that it really takes the air out of the room when you start looking for other ways to reshape the budget. At the end of the day, we are in a relatively good starting position. You know, there were talks around the University a couple of months ago about retrenchment, and younger faculty in particular were getting deeply concerned, and it is typical in this University and elsewhere of people who get the attention of other people and spew information and throw out data that are at best inappropriate and not thought through. So I wanted to shut that discussion down very quickly. We did, and the budget we are receiving certainly is consistent with that. Would we like to have more money? Yes. But will we have money to invest in critical ways at this University? Yes, and nobody should feel at all that we are in harm's way. That doesn't mean that we need to be silent about getting enhancement to this budget, and we certainly will be doing that in a very aggressive way. Aggressive, but polite, and at least when we cite data, the data will be supportable by the facts, not spewed on the basis of ideology or fantasy.

I circulated a piece that appeared in *The New York Times* today. I think everybody should receive it. This was on page A22-23, and I'd like to talk a little about this because it's wonderful for this University that we took the lead. The idea for what you will read here started a few months ago with a conversation I had with Vartan Gregorian, the president of the Carnegie Foundation, and the conversation went something like this: that over time, there is a paradigm shift, and that is a tired phrase that I apologize for, in the way that a certain class of institutions in the United States have access to capital and all other universities – and I'm talking about the major universities, not small arts and science institutions or proprietary schools, I'm talking largely about the very best public universities and the very best private universities. It was an interesting commentary because when I chatted with Vartan, I said the thing I'm deeply concerned about is that the bifurcation on the basis of wealth is widening. When I would have conversations with people like Mark Yudof, the new head of the University of California system, or with Mark Rosenberg, the head of the Florida system, or with the head of Illinois system, everybody was saying the same thing, that we the publics are having trouble competing against institutions that have built up war chests on the basis of their capital appreciation in their endowment portfolios, and that unless something is done to change this movement when we, the publics, get out into the marketplace to compete for faculty we are going to be in a very compromised position. So I think it's going to be *de minimis*, not only for this University but for the state universities in the United States, and something is going to have to be done to create some public awareness. Little did I know that at this time we would have such an implosion in the financial markets. I had talked to you about this, but I never really quite envisaged that we would see such dramatic shifts in capital in this country and abroad in just the past few months, and that has had a

very chilling effect on some of the very big endowments, and you have read about this as well as I have. So while I was having the conversation with Vartan about how to mobilize an effort to really create awareness, two things were happening and they were not happening in a way that presented our views in the strongest way possible. I started calling all of the top people in higher education, and this is a partial list of people who have signed on to the statement. And it was about the time that we were having discussions with some of Obama's people, before he received the nomination. We knew that if the economy was going to continue to go south as rapidly as it has, that the new president, whether it would be McCain or Obama, would have to do something around a stimulus package to really get the states cranked up again. It was very clear early on that people were saying whoever is elected president there is going to have to be a very large infusion to get people to work, something on the order of what we saw in 1932. It was at that point that we took a different approach from all the state universities that we were talking about. Sure enough, Obama was elected president, and we know that shortly after January 20 when he is the President of the United States one of the first pieces of legislation he will sign will be a very significant stimulus package that is going to be largely directed toward infrastructure. So if you can get shovel in the ground programs in place very quickly, then you put people to work and you create these channels of supplies that have to be brought into all these projects, and that creates jobs and a stronger economic environment. The idea of this piece, which I hope all of you will read carefully, is to say when that stimulus package occurs, and it's going to be hundreds of billions of dollars, and when those dollars flow to the states because that's the only way you could do this, that the governors of these states in consultation and with the support of the Federal Government agree on a principle that part of the money that would be used for infrastructure should be around rebuilding the great state universities that have had tremendous problems over the past few years because there has been a regression away from support by state governments. You know it, and I know, and we've been talking about it at these meetings for years. This now has gotten traction. Not only have essentially all the major presidents bought into this idea, and all of the major associations – ACE, AAU – but the governors also are understanding that this is a way for governments to do something that other infrastructure projects cannot do, and that is that we can create matching money. Why? Because all state universities, when you create infrastructure like a science building or new library, must be financed through the sale of bonds. Nobody has the cash to put on the table. Everybody is out, borrowing money. So that vehicle creates revenue that is then applied to the design of the building, and hiring all the construction people to build the building. Part of that money could be used as a match of Federal pass-through of monies to the states. When you think about other projects, you don't have that ability in the same way, because the state now can redistribute the money that they get from the sale of the bonds for these particular projects and go on and do some other work with it. So governors are excited about this idea. We now have very close contact with very significant people in the Obama transition team. They all have this, and we will see. If this happens, this would be great for SUNY and CUNY, and one of the great things for all of us is that this idea started here. It didn't start at Ann Arbor or Berkeley or Tallassee or Austin or Madison, it started in New York City. Today I've received more calls than I could imagine from people around the country saying this is great and let's move ahead with it. I don't know

if it will happen, but certainly it's a splendid start and what's good about it is that the money could be redeployed for other important projects here in New York State in ways that you can spread. If you think about it, if you build a \$20 million building, you hire more people if you have two \$10 million buildings because you have to replicate the electrical work, the mill work, and all the systems that go in, and so our approach is going to be to spread these projects as far as we can because that becomes yet another compelling argument for state universities to get part of the money.

The last thing I want to talk about, just to reinforce, is that while we are in very difficult times, if we get through next year with stability and by the second or third quarter if we start to see an inflection point in the economy, then I think we're on our way to creating more opportunities for investment. That's a theme that I have promulgated around the University – we must continue to invest even in bad times. You don't stop investing. So three or four very significant things are going to happen, one on the revenue side and three on the expense side. On the revenue side, we will probably in early 2009 announce a new campaign for the University. We announced a campaign with a \$1.2 billion target and achieved that four and half years earlier than we had planned to because it was the first campaign the University ever did. We were a little blind in having the history because there wasn't a history. We do have a history now, but we have a downturn, but we're going to be much more ambitious with our target the next go-around but we're going to stretch this out to hedge against the unforeseen issues associated with people's and institution's portfolios reducing. People say to me, how can you do a campaign now? Well, we must do a campaign now. Now is the time you have to get out there and start the process of convincing people and institutions that this is a worthy place to invest money because important work happens at this institution, and if don't do it, who is going to do it in the City? That's the first item, and I think I mentioned to Manfred that I'd like you to be there as we announce it to talk on behalf of the faculty and why this is really important and what this money will do for enhancing the life of learning at this institution. We are also making very serious investments in science at this University. I've often said to people that when you look at Ph.D. programs across the University, you have great delight when you look at some of the arts and humanities and social science programs, some of them are truly world class programs. But we've never operated in that same way across our science Ph.D. programs. All of us know we have some extraordinary scientists at CUNY, but they have worked in silos or in small clusters of people, never having that real critical mass that you need to do really important work. The first thing we did was give Ph.D. authority to two of our institutions, and it is my commitment to continue that with other institutions as they ready themselves with faculty and certain levels of research. But once you announce that you're moving in that direction, you have to make investments. We're going to make serious investments in a few critical areas of science so we can build up some programs to much greater stature than they are right now. That's not going to be cheap, but we're building that into our long-term budget planning, because I think most of us agree that a world-class university must have strong science. It's going to be much more obvious as we move forward because the world is going to require people skilled in the areas of science, and I think there's a moral obligation for us to do this. The second thing is that we've announced a new school of public health, something I'm very excited about. We have some truly

extraordinary people here at the university. Nick Freudenberg is one whose work I've admired for a long time at Hunter. We're committed to having a new facility where that school will be located, in the building where the new School of Social Work will be erected in Harlem. In exchange for that, we've gotten the largest gift that we've had at this University, a \$40 million gift to apply towards that building. That's not going to be cheap. If we're going to do it, we're going to do it right or we're not going to do it at all. Mediocre stuff has no interest to me, but with people like Nick Freudenberg and others who have done such distinguished work, we'll continue to hire faculty. We hired Ken Olden, who I think you've had here. Chair Philipp—He was invited this evening. In fact, we have a panel discussion on the public health school, with Jane Levitt and Barbara Weinstein. Chancellor Goldstein—So you're ahead of me. That's good. Now the last thing is that we're going to plan to develop a new community college at this University. If I told you what the application increase is for the fall, it would take your breath away. I'm concerned about it. I don't brag about it or celebrate it. I'm really concerned about the huge number of students who want to come to be students. The reason is our physical limitations and whether we can do the adequate job in learning. If we can't give these students an opportunity to do really good work, I think we're not doing justice by them. Some people around me say, it's revenue! But that's only one piece. There are other considerations as well. Having said that, as this University continues to grow and as the economy requires people to get education, and if they're not they are going to be left behind because employers will be unforgiving of people that don't have the skill, we're going to need to have more seats for community college. I'm determined to do that, but of course it's expensive. We need a new facility, a faculty, and a design that gives us the opportunity to do really good work.

Those are a smattering of thing going on at the University, and I know you have a busy schedule so I will take just a few questions. If we can get some new people to ask a question! I love the people who asks questions, but I'd love to see some new faces.

Professor Volchok—You closed on the topic that a lot of my colleagues are talking about. We are worried about the surge, not in Iraq, but of enrollment that we are expecting next year. Where will we fit these kids in our classroom? How will we handle teaching loads? Any ideas? Chancellor Goldstein—I'm concerned about it, too. We have not a legal obligation, but an obligation nonetheless, to enroll students into our community colleges and independent of their academic background if they have a high school diploma or equivalent, we have an obligation to teach them. I'm not sure how we will be able to accommodate all the students. There was a time when this University had more student than we have now, but over time the spaces have been reconfigured and there are no longer classrooms but other kinds of facilities which were needed at the University. It is because of that surge that we will have to rethink scheduling and where students will learn—they may not be able to go to the place where they want to go to because that place just can't accommodate them, but whatever happens we have to have more seats, and that's what we're working on. It's not an easy problem for us to solve, especially in a place like New York City where land is at such a high premium. This is not like SUNY that has hundreds of acres and can wreck something pretty cheaply and

quickly. Any place in New York City is much more expensive, and it's a problem but we're going to have to deal with it.

Prof. Crain—Why is it, when we reach tough times, that those who can least bear the brunt—poor, working class students—bear the burden? It's not the well-to-do citizens, it's not our highest paid people in the University—it's the poorest. They bear the burden by getting the tuition increase. Chancellor Goldstein—The State of New York will take about \$104 million out of our budget, which would account for about 1700 faculty if we were not to impose a tuition increase. That's a serious number. I think we should be having tuition increases. You and I disagree on it, but I think there should be a rational policy of having incremental increases, always understanding that any student who is in harm's way from continuing their matriculation that the University will have an obligation to keep them whole. We have not had a tuition increase at this University in six years. I do not know of any institution in the U.S. that has kept tuition constant for six years. Our expenses go up, and our resources are being pulled out. It is one source of revenue, but we would not have the situation today if we had a rational policy seven or eight years ago. We disagree on this, and you speak with passion and conviction, and you're a guy that I admire and I think of as a friend. The thing I have always objected to are these spikes that occur when there is a downturn. It's the most regressive way to create a tax system for students, and it's all based upon when you were born. There are students that get away because they enter the system at a particular time when tuition is flat. Then there are other students who come in when there is a downturn in the economy, and there are large spikes. I think that is unfair, and the way to do that is to smooth out the curve. The way to do that is having gradual, small increases during the investment period. The reason we have \$600 today is that we have never built up the reserve we would have had if we had had it.

Professor Crossman—Just a note about the community college. I assume that we need one quite desperately, but I would say that, given the space restraints that we already have at the College, building a new building is not going to be enough, in part because lab space is increasingly needed by very active and research and grant productive faculty members, and also increases in enrollment. I would hope there would be some room in a new community college for some of John Jay because we're being spread out in a way that students and faculty don't want to travel, and I think it is counterproductive. If we could have the college much more consolidated, I think it's much more beneficial for us and for the University. Chancellor Goldstein—I agree with that. You are talking about North Hall on 59<sup>th</sup> Street. That would be a wonderful location because it really should be at the epicenter of two points of great growth in Manhattan. That area would be great, and we have our eye on that. But any community college would never be able to accommodate the FAR of a building of that size, so I would imagine that John Jay would have access, and that would be in any planning document that we would have.

Professor Barnhart—I want to return to increasing enrollments, particularly at the community colleges. I was wondering if there had been any discussion of what the magic number is, the capacity of CUNY to absorb these students particularly at the community college level. Chancellor Goldstein—There is at least one community where you have

reached capacity. BMCC is a very desirable place. Students flock to that institution, but I'm concerned that they are reaching a point where students are not going to be able to get classes, and faculty will not be able to find places physically to have classes. The president there, Antonio Perez, has done very good work in utilizing that campus almost seven days a week. Other places in our community colleges have capacity. They can certainly utilize their grid in even more efficient ways. I know that is unpopular, but until we develop more physical capacity we will have to redirect students to certain places, and within the physical limitations we have at a particular facility to utilize that facility in a way that creates more opportunities for students to learn. Iris Weinshall, our vice chancellor for facilities and planning, is going through the numbers now, and we will be having discussions with campus presidents as we move forward.

Professor Vozick—I want to begin by thanking you publicly as I have privately for your remarkable work in getting Fiterman Hall funded, and also in passing call to your attention although I'm sure you know this without me telling you that BMCC's overcrowding really requires some serious separate swing space between now and 2012. But my real question goes to the issue of leadership. I really want to say you have my deep respect even though I keep challenging you, or maybe I keep challenging you because I respect you so much as a comprehensive manager. However, in the area that seems to me, because of my life experience, one of the most gaping gaps in the intellectual leadership of this University, you seem to be from another century. You seem to be committed to denial. I don't believe it, but I see the evidence. I'll put the point in terms just made—it's obviously about the adjuncts. You are starting a new community college. So we will have a tremendous need for new adjuncts, and they are an essential part of the teaching life, the academic life, and the core of the community colleges. I believe you when you say you want to preserve the core functions. But the adjuncts are in the core function and they are not protected. All I'm asking you for is not a giant change in policy but honest administrative reporting, to see that your staff produces for this body and the University as a whole an annual report about who the adjuncts are, what they are, what their problems are, their achievements, and so on—standard administrative questions. And the answers I always get from you, with all respect to you, are the usual adjunct boiler plate of hello, we love you, we respect the adjuncts, we need you, we are glad you're here. I'm asking for a whole new level of intellectual engagement, and I hope you will understand. Thank you.

Chair Philipp—I request floor rights for Professor Nelson, who is not a member of this body but is our representative to the Instructional Technology Steering Committee. All in favor?

Professor Bonnie Nelson—I was very pleased to hear you reiterate your support for the academic core mission of the University; in particular, you spoke to libraries, which was very gratifying to hear. What I'm asking about tonight is the issue of Internet filtering, which is going on at some of our colleges. A year or two ago, CUNY passed a policy on the acceptable use of computer resources, and in that policy it says that CUNY will not install filters that restrict access to websites based solely on content, and yet this is happening at two and possibly three campuses. It is affecting those campuses to the

extent that the Council of Chief Librarians recently passed a resolution about Internet filtering, reiterating that there should not be any. I was wondering how does one get the University administration to adhere to its own policy? Chancellor Goldstein—I have to admit that you are asking a question above my pay grade. You will have to write me something so I can give it to the right person, and we will correct it.

Professor Beaky—Another question about the new community college: as you know, we have been having meetings at each of the community colleges, there is a concept paper out there, and there have been a lot of discussions of the proposal. I was wondering about the trajectory of this proposal in terms of the Board of Trustees. What are the plans to bring it to the Board for consideration? And also, if I might, I'd like to give you opportunity to respond to Mike Vozick in his questions since you didn't have the chance to do that. Chancellor Goldstein—There will be more adjuncts next year than this year because our enrollment is going to be growing. Even though we are hiring more full-time faculty, we cannot keep pace. There is not going to be a diminution because our enrollment continues to grow. With respect to the life of an adjunct at this University, it's not about love, it is about really trying to understand what we are capable of to make life a little more pleasant for you as an adjunct, representing adjuncts, and I'm willing to engage in that discussion. To the degree that we can be helpful, I'll try to do that. Now with respect to the proposed community college, we are nowhere near bringing any action to the Board because it has very significant financial implications and there are a whole lot of things that have to happen first. When I addressed the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate, I indicated that I want the Senate to be involved at this point, and I think you should have been contacted about that, and move forward. There are a lot of academic issues that have to be discussed before we get out of this financial mess that we are in. So we are nowhere near. It would be irresponsible for me to bring an action without it being well-thought out, so there is plenty of time. It will not happen this year for sure, and at the earliest, next year.

Professor Cooper—I am in a department where the adjunct community seems to be quite well-integrated and happy with the way they are treated. However, one of the things that might be improved is the quality of the language in the non-appointment letter they receive. I got an earful of this statement of how we are ready to throw you into the narrows of the Hudson River, strangle you while you're still breathing—it was really extraordinary language. There is a nice simple way of stating something about financial ability without making people who are working very hard feel as if they have been thrown overboard. Then they get rehired. Chancellor Goldstein—If it is disrespectful and poorly conceived, that should be easy enough to do.

Professor Dalglish—I'm chairing the Status of the Faculty Committee, and the theme for this year is institutional renewal. We are putting together a proposal that we would like to present to you, but a question I have at this point is do you have any inspiring and practical strategies for departments – and there are probably close to 600 in CUNY – for raising funds for our own departmental needs as we see them? Chancellor Goldstein—I think that department chairs and deans of divisions or schools should be very much part of a president's team in helping to raise money. In most institutions I am familiar with,

chairs of departments raise money which is targeted for that department and deans of particular schools like business or medical or arts & sciences raise money specifically for that. That is something that we need to inculcate into the culture of this University. Remember, this is not a young institution. We've been around for some time, but there has never been a history of raising money, and I think there is a learning curve that needs to be developed more closely by our presidents. Some of our presidents are splendid at doing it, and others come from institutions where it was not done. I always believe that so much of the money should be returned or directed toward departments. I am meeting now with most of the presidents and their development people and their volunteers on their foundations. I'm asking a series of questions, one of which is wouldn't it be a good thing in any campaign that you do to have a target to develop a large number of [endowed] chairs for departments. They could be for entry level, mid-career, and so-called stars. I think if we do that, it would be relatively easy. This campaign ought to be about endowment building whereas the last campaign was not. I think the endowment should be directed much more to faculty, and to really give chairs and other members of the faculty the comfort to know that there is going to be a capitalization created that will help to sustain those departments over time. That's one thing. The other area, and CCNY is a great example because so much of the academic life there is around science and technology, is an insatiable appetite for equipment and instrumentation, and I think we ought to be raising money for departments and schools where that money is being used. It's important that presidents get the faculty involved. As a former president of two institutions, I often did not know intimately the needs of a given department, but the faculty do. First you need to mobilize and meet with the chief academic officer or president, and say here are the needs that we have to have if you are serious about building a strong department in this field, and we are prepared to work with you and donors and to prepare position papers and to go out with you and explain the need. Most presidents would be delighted by that opportunity because it gives them the ability to sell the institution. When I was at Baruch for seven years, I would often have some of our very distinguished faculty advise me, and I would take them to lunch with a donor and let them talk about the needs of this particular department. It's very common practice at universities around the U.S. Here, there is some learning to be done.

Professor Pecorino—On the concept paper for the new community college: no one disputes we need the seats. I agree with you that we have a moral obligation. The second factor is retention and graduation at community colleges. No one likes the current levels. Over two decades, folks at community colleges have done what they could with the resources they had to try to make a downward impact on that trend. But my concern is that a whole community college in this proposal is being created to try a new academic approach. Usually, we try it first at a smaller level. Be that as it may, suppose that our fondest dreams are realized, some formula is concocted, and it works. The retention and graduation figures of the new community college, with students similar to the other community colleges, are higher. What if that were achieved with a considerable increase in the infrastructure of support? Would you then extend that across the other community colleges, having learned a more successful formula? Are you prepared to deal with success, in other words? Chancellor Goldstein—Yes, absolutely, and I would go even further. It is conceivable that after we go through all of the academic and financial due

diligence, a decision would be made to reshape some of the existing community colleges, and give that opportunity to build some additional facilities associated with those community colleges rather than having a stand-alone. Part of the problem is seats, but part of the problem is we are just not successful. It is not an indictment of our faculty, or of our community colleges. I have heard for years about low graduation rates, and I used to spout the same kind of rhetoric that we've been spouting here for a long time. The fact is, it's unacceptable to have graduation rates as low as they are. It is just not acceptable, and we must get those numbers higher. The reason it is not acceptable is that a degree matters. I don't buy into the argument that somebody has a nice experience, and that's going to have a transformative effect in their life. We are not doing justice to that student by not getting them through the system to a degree. We must find a way to get graduation rates up, and it might be about how we engage the students. Professor Pecorino—To do justice to them might involve our attempting to correct the injustices done to them prior to arriving. That could be expensive. Chancellor Goldstein—On Thursday, we have an important meeting with Joel Klein, myself, and some staff people to really start drilling down and understanding why it is that some students are succeeding and some are not? Is it the school they are in, or is it the teacher they have? What is going on, so we can learn to try to improve it.

Professor Chaffee—What about our getting a piece of the lottery money? Chancellor Goldstein—Elliott Spitzer, when he was governor, came up with an idea of monetizing the net present value of the lottery system and then applying it to create a higher education investment act. He was not in office long enough to see if that idea would gain traction. Part of the problem is a visceral reaction among many in the State Legislature to doing that because they thought it would only create more people buying lottery tickets which would not be a good thing. Have a good holiday, everybody.

#### Report on Enrollment Management

Professor Barnhart, UFS Representative on CUNY's Enrollment Management Council—I was going to introduce this by saying that I had good news and bad news. The good news is that enrollment is going up, and the bad news is that enrollment is going up. The Chancellor has already mentioned some of the issues consequent upon an increase in enrollment of this size. CUNY has rolling admissions, so it's hard to get a very accurate target of what we are looking at, but so far it looks like a tsunami across the University. On the Enrollment Management Council, they circulate what are called phase reports. These come out of UAPC and are snapshots of where they are in processing applications. As of phase 1 for spring 2009, we are looking at an overall 23% increase in the number of processed freshman applications CUNY-wide. We are looking at an 8.7% increase in transfers, presumably that have been processed so far. Now there are continuing phases here, so this will only grow as we speak. The other small item of information that has come out is that the number of students applying who have an 85 or better high school average has increased by 14.6%. So we are talking about a substantial increase, and it's clear that students who otherwise would have gone to privates and other institutions are turning to CUNY because it's cheaper. Also, whenever we have a downturn, CUNY's enrollment seems to go up, but this is the most it has gone up in anyone's memory, as far

as I can tell. The issue this raises, obviously, is capacity. That's why I raised it when the Chancellor was here. Clearly if he is having Iris Weinshall looking at space issues on the campuses, it is not just BMCC. It may affect some senior colleges as well. So we are looking at a huge enrollment increase that is going to get worse before it gets better, and I don't think anyone has any particularly good ideas for dealing with it at the moment. The Chancellor had mentioned the idea of a new community college, but as you can see that will not materialize any time soon. It's a concept at this point. Especially since they want to address pedagogical issues that affect the community colleges by way of designing this new community college, it's not going to make any dent in our capacity any time soon. We are all looking at a major issue that nobody has any particular answer to. How do we accommodate all the students that are coming our way. Clearly, a time will come when they run out of seats for these students. We have a lot of green space at Kingsborough so maybe we can put trailers on it, who knows? There will be another phase report coming out soon, and if you'd like I'd be happy to report what they indicate and whether there has been any further rethinking about what to do with the surge of students.

Some other issues have come up this year. Basically the change in philosophy at CUNY in terms of enrollment has been to try to compete more effectively with the private colleges in the New York City region. They have been attempting to do a lot of things, such as expediting the process of applications, which tends to lag at CUNY and put us at a disadvantage with these other colleges. They have hired 15 new staff to help at the Office of Admissions Services who do both recruitment and application processing, and apparently they are of some help in this regard. This is the first year they have increased staffing levels, so we have yet to see. CUNY has been quicker at things like identifying missing transcripts, and notifying applicants they are missing SAT scores, and so forth. Also, CUNY is implementing a tool called Customer Resource Management provided by a company called Hobson's. There is a report from Hunter College, which is piloting this, and it involves basically ways for the college to reach out to applicants. Students fill out an online form, and then a VIP page is created for them, various personalized emails are sent out, relevant academic departments or offices concerned with admissions get information about the students. They are fairly pleased about that, and you'll probably see more of this on your campuses as time goes by. The other thing of some concern has been the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act. Many things in it are good such as increases in grant programs and simplified forms, but it also mandates reporting requirements for colleges. For instance, if you are ordering a more expensive edition of a text book, you must provide a rationale for the substitution and have to report it on your website. These types of explanation are complicated matters to take care of, and I think there is some concern of poaching on faculty prerogatives in terms of text book choice and things like that. There have also been a lot of book folly issues. My college is being sued over its relation to its bookstore for the credits that it gives financial aid students to use at the bookstore on the grounds this arrangement is unfair to vendors and students because they can't avail themselves of online purchases. I believe there has been a report that Andrew Cuomo is investigating the relationship between college bookstores and colleges generally to try to see whether everything is legally up to snuff. There is concern on the Council with CUNYFirst, mainly about the shift to PeopleSoft systems,

which are the basis of the system. For instance, it is not clear that PeopleSoft will be useful in doing admissions work. The other problem as we begin to roll out CUNYFirst in phases is expected glitches. Any questions?

Professor Savage—You are giving us a window into what they are saying at the top staff levels of CUNY concerning enrollment. Now, given a 25% increase, one of the things you can do with such a big increase, and you would expect graduate programs to do this, is to raise the admissions standards. Another thing you could do at the undergraduate level is to let everybody in who meets the contemporary standard, and then you'd have a crunch problem finding enough seats. Or, you could cap the enrollments on a first come, first served basis; use the normal admissions standards and then say we've got enough. What kinds of things are you hearing about such choices? Professor Barnhart—Nobody is talking about that. Caps were briefly mentioned. The concern there was that you cannot increase admissions standards at the community college since they are open enrollment, so it would have to be a cap.

Professor Martell—Has any thought been given to changing or improving the enrollment application? It's a very limited form with limited information. It does not give any kind of opportunity for a fuller understanding of a student's skills. Professor Barnhart—I believe they have a new admission form now. You apply to six different colleges. Professor Martell—No, that form is very limited. Professor Barnhart—The intent now is not so much to make use of the admission form as to use the Hobson's service that I mentioned before and use that as a way of more personalizing the interaction with the student. Professor Martell—When you said there was a 28% increase, was that adjusted for the fact that last year at this time they were very far behind in their processing, or is that some sort of reasonable look at what we have today? Professor Barnhart—It was a 23% increase. I'm not really sure where they are relative to last year. My understanding is that they are ahead of last year because fewer things were missing this year.

Professor Pecorino—Queensborough, for the last two or three semesters now, has admitted who met the criteria but we haven't registered everyone. There are those who couldn't get complete programs, or couldn't get any seats at all. Most of those we believe are lost and won't return. So the issue becomes while you admit everyone, registration is separate. We register honors students, then returning students, the new incoming students, and so on. Has there been any discussion of scheduling registration for those first-time admits in a different manner, so it wouldn't be necessarily first come first served, but some sort of academic criteria involved in the scheduling of registration? Professor Barnhart—I'm not aware of any disjunction between registration and accepted applications. It is true of course that not everyone who gets accepted goes to a place, for various reasons. Because they are admitted to six different colleges, they will be admitted but that doesn't mean they are going to go.

Professor Crain—At CCNY, we discuss this a lot and many agree there has to be a cap. We can't educate everybody, but only the number of people we have resources for. How do you set a cap? Raise the SAT scores, or accept only those who have a better chance of graduating. Then soon you're changing the profile because middle class students have a

better chance of graduating. I don't know what you think of this, but I don't think we should accept so readily the idea that there are limited resources so we can't take everybody. Then we've failed. Public schools don't do that. We can't do that. We have had higher enrollments than we do now. Professor Barnhart—If it's any reassurance, I haven't heard anything about tinkering with the formula in terms of admissions criteria. Obviously that Council wouldn't deal with that in any case since that is a college matter.

Professor Vozick—Bill is softly pointing out something carrying a very big stick, and this is where policy and enrollment management hits politics. I think there are many on the faculty who would like to see CUNY become more selective to produce students with greater likelihood of success, and I can understand the feeling—I'm in the classroom. It's perfectly sensible at a personal level or even at a narrow professional level, but if CUNY loses its connection with the people of being open, its original ethos, then its ability to withstand the vicissitudes of political attack will be weakened. So we have a real problem here that you can't address but we have to be thinking about, which is really do we want to be the university of the whole people or do we want to be just another university for the select?

#### Panel Discussion on the New School of Public Health

Chair Philipp—We have three panelists tonight, Jane Levitt, Barbara Weinstein, and Nick Freudenberg. Prof. Weinstein is the Executive Officer of the public health programs at the Graduate Center. I'd like her to start off, then perhaps Nick and Jane could finish up? The School of Public Health is one of the new initiatives for the future. The UFS is supposed to be involved, by statute, in new initiatives in a very direct way. This includes not just the new community college but this new school, so that's why we have our colleagues here.

Professor Weinstein—In fall of 2006, CUNY decided to establish a Doctor of Public Health program, so Susan Klitzman from Hunter College and I were working on a proposal to get that going. At our first or second meeting, all of a sudden, there was an announcement in *The New York Times* that the Chancellor had declared that there would become a School of Public Health. That was the beginning. Immediately after that point, things were fast tracked in terms of the doctoral program because in order for a School of Public Health to be formed you needed to have one doctoral student graduate from a doctoral program. So in fall of 2006 we did not have a doctoral program, but in fall 2007 about 15 students were admitted to the doctoral program, which was approved by the State Ed Department in May. That was quick. The doctorate in public health is the linchpin in the School of Public Health. CUNY has now hired a founding dean for the School of Public Health, Ken Olden, a very distinguished scientist who Nick will speak about. He was at NIH and is now working with the provosts and faculty at all the different campuses to help create and develop a structure for an inclusive School of Public Health. Nick is representing the Master's program at Hunter, the Doctor of Public Health program at the Grad Center, and Dr. Olden who is the founding Dean – so he is wearing three hats, and Jane is representing the Master's program at Lehman College. We will start with Nick.

Professor Freudenberg—The model of the School of Public Health that the Chancellor proposed in 2006 was to bring together existing public health programs at Hunter and Brooklyn Colleges, as well as a fledgling public health program now off the ground at Lehman, and to bring them together into a CUNY School of Public Health that would bring strengths from throughout the University. A planning committee was appointed that included faculty from those campuses and other campuses with health-related programs, and we spent a lot of time working on mission, governance, and so on, and made a report about a year ago to the Chancellor's office. Our plan is to open in the 2010-2011 academic year. Our focus will be on urban health, on cities, obviously because of where we are located and also because of the growing proportion of the world's population that live in cities. Last year was the tipping point when half the world's population became urbanized, and the expectation is that by 2030 two-thirds of the world's population will be living in cities. We believe that New York both has much to learn from other large cities, and also much to teach. We look forward to developing ways of doing that. Ken Olden, who came in in September as our dean, was the Director of the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences. He is a toxicologist, who looks at gene/environment interactions, and bring a wealth of knowledge, contacts, and help in developing our program. Together with the faculty he has outlined three themes that will characterize our School. The first is urbanization and a focus on how city living affects health. The second is population aging, with an understanding that aging begins at birth, and looking at the life course and what the health challenges are at various points of the life course. The third theme is disparities and inequities in health and what causes them. New York City has some of the starkest inequalities in health in the country. What can we do to end them? Those three themes and the connections between them will constitute the research, teaching, and service agenda for the new School. The last thing I want to talk about, briefly, is why we think this School will be a good thing for CUNY. I'm a CUNY lifer. I've seen other programs get resources when my program didn't, but we think this new School will be a benefit to CUNY. Already in the last year, we've had conversations with folks at the Law School, the School of Public Affairs, and the criminal justice programs at John Jay. So we think we will be able to interact with our colleagues and scholars in a variety of disciplines to both strengthen ourselves and them. One of the advantages a School of Public Health can offer is a capacity to put together inter-disciplinary teams that can get the NIH funding that is available, increasingly not for solo researchers but for inter-disciplinary teams. We think the School of Public Health can be a focal point for doing that. The second benefit is we believe our doctoral program will be a place where community college faculty who still need to earn doctorates or want to earn additional degrees can come to get training. Already some of our first cohort of doctoral students are faculty members at other CUNY campuses, and we hope to be training those who will be the educators of the future. Our first cohort of 28 is wonderfully diverse, talented, and connected to New York City communities and institutions, and we look forward to working with all of you in developing this School.

Professor Levitt—The faculty is very excited about the prospect of a School of Public Health. It poses a lot of unusual challenges because it's a collaborative model where there are three schools, actually four campuses, involved. Hunter has had an MPH

program for 30 years. Brooklyn has had an MPH program for 10 years, and Lehman started one in the spring of 2006 and graduated its first class in May of 2008. So there are three campuses, plus the Graduate Center. This is a whole new kind of ball game here. There are not too many institutions like that, and our accrediting body does not have anything like that, so we are faced with many challenges in terms of structure and governance which we are dealing with. Provosts, presidents, and faculty are all working on this because we want it to be a new model, and I think it could be an example for other places across the country as we progress. I want to mention that the different Master's programs all have different specialties. All of the Master's programs are working together to make sure that the core courses are all able to be transferred from one institution to another. Then, as was mentioned before, Hunter is the lead institution. They have five tracks, which is what is required of the lead institution. Brooklyn will have two tracks, and Lehman will have one – note that tracks are specializations. Lehman's, for example, is community-based public health with a focus on health equity. While Nick was talking about disparities, but we like to talk about it in terms of equities, changing that to be a more positive term.

Professor Baumrin—How are we supposed to understand this from a University point of view? From a University point of view, we saved the Law School to Queens. From a University point of view, we saved the Sophie Davis School at CCNY. The criminal justice program is basically at John Jay, but it's a Ph.D. program at the Graduate School, and the Botany program is at Lehman but it's basically at the Graduate Center in Biology. Speaking to someone on the subway, what am I supposed to say about this thing?

Professor Freudenberg—I think the particulars of that are being worked out by our Dean and the provosts. I don't think all the answers are in. The name the Chancellor used was the CUNY School of Public Health at Hunter College, and the model our accrediting body uses is called a consortial school of public health, which comprises in this case at least the four campuses involved, and we hope to be adding people from Baruch, Sophie Davis, and other campuses. I don't think we are creating a new model. Perhaps it will look like some other entities, or perhaps we will have to make a new entity to make it work. Professor Baumrin—So I'm a student of a faculty member at Lehman, and I get a DPH from this program. Am I going to put Hunter on my diploma, or Lehman?

Professor Weinstein—At this point, the DPH will be jointly granted by Hunter and the Graduate Center, so at this point the diploma will say Hunter and the Graduate Center. That may change, but that's the way it is. It's different from the science model.

Professor Levitt—In terms of the doctoral program, all of the faculty who are at Lehman and Brooklyn are part of the School of Public Health faculty, the CUNY School of Public Health at Hunter.

Professor Baumrin—That would be a very good model for the Law School. Chair Philipp—There is also a Department of Community Medicine at CCNY.

Does that have anything to do with any of this? Professor Freudenberg—Yes, Martha Gold was recently appointed to our faculty, and she has been a member of the planning committee. We hope to be adding other people, such as at CCNY. We imagine there are five or six other places at CUNY that will become part of our group while maintaining our identity. Chair Philipp—I'd just like to note that Martha Gold was the UFS

representative on the original planning committee. Professor Freudenberg—We were very happy to have her.

Professor Weinstein—The other thing important to note in terms

of the DPH and the involvements of people from campuses such as CCNY which were not part of the original formula for the DPH is the funding model for the DPH program is different, so that impacts at this point on campuses that have faculty teaching in the program – but that’s for another night. Professor Soto—I understand they have a new Doctorate in Nursing Science in collaboration with Lehman and CUNY. Some nursing faculty have enrolled in that program. Is there a possibility of enrolling the DPH as well with full tuition coverage? Professor Weinstein—The DNS, the DPH program, the Doctorate in Physical Therapy program, and the Doctorate in Audiology program are all within the Health Sciences doctoral program at the Graduate Center. So for the DNS program, which is housed in the Health Sciences, most of the students in the doctoral program are faculty members in the nursing programs throughout CUNY. Most of them have tuition being paid because of their status as faculty members. It would be the same model for the DPH. Professor Freudenberg--There is a tradition in public health of people in other health professions like physicians, nurses, and social workers earning public health degrees. Our doctorate does require some Master’s level courses in public health, but we would be happy to talk to anybody. Professor Soto—Right now, only the DNS is available to us, so these other options would be very beneficial to us. Professor Sank—What impact will this have on the overall CUNY budget? Will more faculty be hired? Will there be a building in the future? We’re talking about a budgetary crisis and the Governor is cutting education. Professor Freudenberg—I can just repeat what the Chancellor has said, that there has been a decision to invest in some new programs for which social need has been demonstrated, in which CUNY already has strengths. So the answer is yes, we have hired some new faculty and will be hiring some more. Yes, there will be a new building with the School of Social Work in East Harlem. Some of that is coming from a gift from a private donor, but other of it is coming from the capital budget of CUNY. So there are some costs associated with this, but we think there are also some real benefits for CUNY as a whole including bringing in some new resources and new approaches to learning and research. Chair Philipp—The students involved in the CUNY School of Public Health – is it anticipated that they will get support as do the science doctoral students or the Chancellor’s enhanced fellowships? What kind of support do the students get on the campuses, and the students in the existing CUNY doctoral programs in the health sciences? Professor Weinstein—In terms of the doctoral program, there was support for four doctoral students in public health, and at this point now we are on our own and don’t have Chancellor’s fellowships or any support like that. We are looking for support from private foundations and the NIH. Professor Freudenberg—We have requested and expect to get some University resources for fellowships for both Master’s and Doctoral level students. The budgets are now being negotiated by the provosts and the Dean and the Chancellor’s office. Chair Philipp—Thank you for coming. This meeting is adjourned.