

MINUTES OF THE THREE HUNDRED AND FORTY-NINTH PLENARY SESSION
OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK
March 2, 2010

The meeting was called to order by UFS Chair Philipp at 6:30 p.m. in Rooms C201/C202/C203 at the Graduate Center. Sixty nine of 124 voting members were present.

Baruch: Present – Hill, Martell, Remler, and Wine. Absent – Bazzoni, Ellis, Myers, Nematollahy, and Wymbs. **BMCC:** Present – Conway, Friedman, Genis, Martinez-Lopez, Soto, Vozick, and Alternate d’Erizans. Absent: Kalogeropoulos and Persaud. **Bronx CC:** Present – Bandar and Skinner. Absent – Ismail and Prabhu. **Brooklyn:** Present – Bank-Munoz, Cirasella, Dexter, Viscusi, and Alternates Jacobson and Tobey. Absent – Bell, Duboys, Magliozzo, Massood, Morrill, Shapiro, and Shortell. **CCNY:** Present – Crain, Jablonsky, Raj, Rinard, and Sank. Absent – Khanbilvardi, Kiely, Lascar, and Watkins. **CSI:** Present – Cooper, Talarico, Yousef, and Alternate Petratos. Absent – Batson, Klibaner, Levine, and Zimmerman. **CUNY Law School:** Present – None. Absent – Bach and Rossein. **Graduate School:** Present – Aguirre-Molina, Baumrin, and Philipp. Absent – Lennon, Nolan, and Weinstein. **Hostos CC:** Present –Ovtcharenko, Pimentel, Sharma, and Alternates August and Hubner. **Hunter:** Present – Baumann, DeMeo, and Strayer. Absent – Ancona, Grossman, Guzzetta, Kaye, Kuhn-Osius, Palanda, and Spark. **John Jay:** Present – Dunham, Kaplowitz, Katz, Kubic, and Alternate Tovar. Absent: Crossman and King-Toler. **Kingsborough CC:** Present – Barnhart, Hume, Ruoff, Wood, and Alternate Stubin. Absent – Arliss. **LaGuardia CC:** Present – Beaky, Kurzyna, Lerman, and Mettler. Absent – Davidson and Shean. **Lehman:** Present – Carey and Mineka. Absent – Jervis, Larimer, Marianetti, and Maybee. **Medgar Evers:** Present – None. Absent – Cuffee, Reid, Stewart, Withers. **NYCCT:** Present – Cermele, Hounion, Richardson, Woytowich, and Alternate Gelman. Absent: Horelick and Panayotakis. **Queens:** Present – Bird and Savage. Absent – Brody, Gonzalez, Moore, and Zevin. **Queensborough CC:** Present – Barbanel, Borrachero, Tai, Volchok, and Alternate Kuszai. Absent – Pecorino. **York:** Present – Corkery. Absent – Baron, Lewis, and Mawyer.

Steve Stearns, Jason Young, Shawn Rice, Joseph Wilson, Chris Sula, and Anick Boyd were guests of the plenary.

Governance Leaders present: Cooper (CSI), Carey (Lehman), Hume (Kingsborough), Kaplowitz (John Jay), Martell (Baruch), Mettler (LaGuardia), Parides (NYCCT), Raj (CCNY), Savage (Queens), and Tai (QCC) attended. Executive Director Phipps, Administrative Assistant Pasela, and Secretary Blanchard were also present.

- I. Approval of the Agenda: The agenda was adopted as proposed.
- II. Approval of the Minutes of February 2, 2010: Minutes were approved as distributed.
- III. Reports (Recorded in Reports & Deliberations)
 - A. Chair (oral & written)
 - B. Update on UCRA, Professor Joe Wilson, Brooklyn College (oral)
 - C. Chancellor Goldstein (oral)
 - D. Representatives to Board Committees (written)
 - E. Professor Carmen Martinez-López, Chair, Student Affairs Committee (oral & written)
 - F. Presentation of Faculty Experience Survey, Professor Kathleen Barker (oral)

IV. New Business – The following Vote of Thanks to Professor Kathleen Barker was passed unanimously by voice vote:

The entire plenary joins the UFS Executive Committee in a formal vote of thanks to Professor Kathleen Barker for the professionalism, creativity, and endurance she has shown over the past year conducting the Faculty Experience Survey.

She took on sole responsibility for this enormous project, and handled the entire survey from the conceptual stages through to the tiniest details. She updated and improved the previous survey in light of that earlier experience, saw that part-time faculty were included for the first time, designed the instrument, did all the paperwork for IRB approval, and dealt with millions of details with the vendor administering the survey. She personally handled inquiries from dozens of faculty members, and then organized all the data to make it clear and presentable. Her efforts resulted in a survey of unquestionable excellence, with a very high response rate supporting the reliability of the survey results.

We are indebted to her for her outstanding service. Her work will help all of us make CUNY a better place.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

William Phipps
Executive Director

REPORTS AND DELIBERATIONS
OF THE 349th PLENARY SESSION
OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK
March 2, 2010

Chancellor Goldstein – It’s good to see all of you. I do have another very pressing engagement where I have to speak so I’ll take you very quickly through the landscape of what is going on, as I understand it. If time permits, I’ll take some questions; if not, I promise to come back the next time and devote more time to that. I don’t want to go through the Governor’s budget request. All of you have seen emails and other modes of communication that I’ve sent to the entire University community, so I don’t think it’s necessary for me to replicate what that message is. But there is a component of the Governor’s message which is interesting, and some of the recommendations I am very supportive of. Other parts I take serious issue with. We are working very closely with SUNY, obviously. We want to have a united front where there is a communality of views. Where there is disparateness in terms of our views, obviously, we will go alone, as will SUNY. But there is a rich mass of communality, and let me just talk about that for a moment.

For a very long time, probably as long as I have had the privilege of addressing you, you know that I have taken a very strong position on how the University ought to approach its tuition policy. Quite frankly, we don't have a policy, and the State of New York doesn't have a policy on tuition. We have gone along when the State was flush with dollars, not imposing any kind of tuition recommendation, but as soon as the State fell into disrepair with respect to its financial house we have seen very aggressive tuition hikes, which I have always thought was the most regressive way of approaching that source of revenue. As a result, several years ago we came out with this notion of the Compact, which was a way of creating an investment vehicle that in part would be fueled by a predictable but very modest increase in tuition, provided that the State of New York funded our mandatory costs like collective bargaining and energy, and a few other much smaller components of our budget, and that the revenue from the tuition would come back for investment into the college that levied that tuition. We have also taken a position of differentiating on the basis of market condition, on the basis of price elasticity, on the basis of the faculty, the program officers, the president, about charging additional costs for programs that we believe have that capacity to support that increase, but understanding that every dollar we raise differentially would return to that particular program for investment. The other component that we did was at one time we raised community college tuition when we didn't need to raise the tuition, in part because the difference between baccalaureate education and community college education was widening to a point that I did not think it was a good thing to do, and created a program at the community colleges where we did raise tuition, and every single dollar went back for investments at the community colleges, largely to enhance the number of full-time faculty in critical areas that I thought were needed. That has been our approach. This year, I think the Governor and the DOB started to listen, but they were very aggressive with respect to the manner in which tuition would be dealt with. There was an actual policy that was proposed to be written into State law, if indeed this would be supported by the Legislature. Let me just briefly tell you what that is. The Governor wanted to give both CUNY and SUNY trustees the authority to raise tuition, no more than two and a half times the Higher Education Price Index (HEPI), and that traditionally has run about 150 basis points above the Consumer Price Index. So if you go back in time, the implication of allowing the trustees, without having the necessary legislative approval, to raise tuition by two and a half times HEPI would have resulted in a 10% tuition increase and could be, according to the way the legislation was proposed, done annually. Now, we have to be judged on the basis of our actions, and in our actions since the Compact became an investment vehicle that we created here at the University, we have never been that aggressive because I've always believed in being true to the view of a rational policy of very small incremental increases – the phrase I would use in those days was “a basket of economic indicators,” whatever that basket happens to contain. And indeed, it was about the HEPI. At the end of the day, you could use fancy language, but it became the HEPI or some enhanced Consumer Price Index, and we've really kept that at that level, and that's what I prefer. I don't want to have a situation whereby we have people, students in particular, and their families concerned that there might be an opportunity to raise tuition by 10%. There are other views, in SUNY for example, of being very aggressive. But I personally don't believe that is prudent for CUNY, and I can only speak on behalf of CUNY. The SUNY administration would like to be much more aggressive, and there is strong support for this upstate and in some of the suburbs around New York City. But I don't think that is something we would ever seriously consider here at CUNY.

The second thing that was proposed in this omnibus plan was to take tuition, and this is my phrase, 'off the balance sheet' of the University. Another way of saying that is to take tuition off of the appropriation process. Tuition would be levied by the University and all of the money would be kept by the University. I think that is just not going to happen because, first of all, if you are a member of the Legislature that is basically saying you have no authority over tuition,

and let the universities deal with that money as well. The problem that I see with that, which was floated by the NTA a few years ago, is it would basically have CUNY and SUNY getting subsidies and that subsidy could easily end at any particular time. I just don't think that's a good thing to do. I have expressed my concern about that aspect of the plan, and I just cannot imagine that the State Legislature would embrace something like this. If we lived in a rational world where there were rational decisions being made, I could understand supporting something like that because it would be very good to lift the regulatory shield that now encompasses us, but it's just not the way the world works.

A third or fourth component of what the Governor proposed is to reduce the oversight of our procurement policies here at the University. This is something I very strongly support, as I testified recently in Albany. Let me give you an example for a faculty member. Suppose you are teaching a class in the natural sciences, say biology. You want to get a piece of equipment, and it costs \$100,000. Say it's a very sophisticated microscope, but it's below the level of an electron microscope, and there are a lot of optical instruments that cost that level of money. We would now have to go out and get three bids, and that bidding process would have to be approved by the State Controller. By the time the faculty member started that process in early October, we would finally get approval to purchase that microscope maybe in April or May. The semester is over, and those students are out of the game. They would be available for the next year. What I would like to see is to give the University the freedom to make those kinds of, I would think, prudent decisions. Obviously we'd always try to get the appropriate price, and if there was a concern there can always be post-audits, which we do under any circumstances. So I'm very supportive of that part of what the Governor is proposing. There is another part that SUNY is deeply interested in, and that is on-land use. For example, everybody is looking to improve their revenue posture. SUNY has a lot of land. Let's take a campus like Purchase, a highly regarded component of the SUNY system. It has a very prominent fine arts and performing arts set of programs, and there are people who would like to retire near a university campus, and we see this all over the United States, because they would like to be near cultural activities, and Purchase would love to be able to do this. They would like to take the land that they are now not utilizing, and have a deal with a developer that would build, say, senior citizen housing on their campus. The university would then get a revenue stream as a result of leasing or selling that land to a developer, and I just think it's a good way of bringing the community into the life of a university. I would love to be able to do that if we had land here in New York City, but we have none. So it's not an issue that concerns me, I would just be wishful that we had that opportunity. SUNY would like to do this in a number of different places, and there's been a lot of pushback.

The last component of this is differential tuition. SUNY is very interested in differentiating its tuition policy, depending upon the campus they are dealing with. In particular, they would like to be able to raise tuition at a much more aggressive level at a place like Stony Brook, Binghamton, Albany, or Buffalo. Those are Ph.D. granting institutions, have lots of expensive infrastructure and instrumentation, and faculty are at salaries much different than at some of the 4-year institutions. Then you have two AAU campuses. The Association of American Universities is a group of probably the most selective institutions in the United States, and there are two at SUNY, Buffalo and Stony Brook. So if you are in the SUNY world, and you sit in that component of that world, it makes a compelling argument to say that these types of programs require a lot of investment, and unless we have the ability to raise tuition in a different way, and do things with land use, we are not going to be able to be players relative to institutions that we deem to be peers. I am not supportive of that at all for CUNY. I think we are a different system, a highly integrated system of colleges where there is a lot of transferring among our campuses, especially a lot of transferring between a community college and a 4-year college, and

sometimes in reverse. So it would be confusing, and I think it would set up a tiering that I don't think really is in our best interests, and I've made it very clear that I don't support that component at all. What I do support, and have always supported, is differential tuition on the basis of program. We have done this at the graduate level at a number of institutions, most prominently Baruch in the MBA program. To me, it's a little crazy to have an MBA tuition the same as getting an MA in English, for example, where there are very different opportunities. I'm not making a judgment on the program, I'm just making a judgment on what the student is able to do when they graduate. When you get an MBA, you can generally count on a good job. Or, there is an program at Baruch in Financial Engineering, which I started right before I left Baruch. It is basically an applied math Master of Science program, and this is where all the "quants" are being trained, and even in this world, students are leaving with jobs around \$100,000 a year. They are highly competitive, very rigorous programs, and relative to the exact same program you would see at Columbia or NYU, our tuition is a fraction of what it is. There is a whole host of other programs, so I am supportive of differential tuition on a program basis, which would be requested by the faculty and the administration of those programs, and anything differentially that is collected would be brought back to that program for investment.

Whether any of these programs I've just outlines in the Governor's budget is going to be supported in the Legislature is still an open question. Whether anything is going to happen at this point is an open question – whether we will even have a budget is an open question! You understand, as I do, you read the press, you're informed people, that we are experiencing events in Albany that are without precedent in this State. It is very sad. It is *de minimis* to the work of good government, and how this is going to turn out in a time frame is speculative, and I don't want to go into any of those details of conjecturing what the next few weeks will look like. But things are going to happen very quickly, and they are happening at a time when New York State's balance sheet is a very weak one. To say this in a delicate way, we are facing very severe budgetary challenges, not just for next year, not just for this year, but I submit for a couple of years out, and it's going to require very delicate negotiations, quietly without fanfare, but that is in my experience the way you get things done, not by shouting and carrying on, but working methodically where the action really is taking place, and getting what it is you need. I told you this three years ago when I said there are storm clouds – you can check your minutes – I told you as early as mid-2007 that the people I was talking with and listening to were starting to see problems in credit markets, starting to see this very, very high risk taking that was without precedent, and very cheap money. Basically, banks were just throwing money at people because interest rates were so low, and people were taking big bets, not only on the basis of low interest rates, but they were leveraging their positions at unprecedented levels, and obviously the rest is history. When I wonder about some of these things, I had no idea it would be as bad as it turned out, and it's going to take a long time to unwind from this. It's not just New York State. There are probably 29, or maybe 31, states that are in similar positions. We, of course, have a particular problem because the financial services world that accounts for about 20 cents of every dollar that comes into the New York State Treasury is being totally restructured. It's not going to be that area of revenue generation that it was just a few years ago. There is an out-migration of people, there are higher and higher taxes creating that, and there is not a lot of magnets for new industries to come into New York State. So we have some real problems in the State, and obviously leadership is a very big deal going on now. So the one good thing that we have, at least in the short run, is that the resources of this University have been managed very prudently and conservatively. We have always insisted on creating reserves against unforeseen circumstances, and those reserves are going to help us over the next year. But because there is such a dynamic involvement now politically here in the State, I can't really tell you with any clarity of a lens where all of this is going to shake out, but it's not going to be great news for a while. What I'm hoping for is stability, which we will have. This year we will get through this

because we worked hard to create that stability. Next year, there will be a new governor, and new governors in the early stages of their tenure when faced with difficult budget problems, that is when they slash. Because they wait another two years and then want to ingratiate themselves with the electorate, and ease up on the brakes. So we have to be prepared for change in leadership, and we also have to be prepared for very real problems. The amount of money needed to run this State is considerably higher than the amount of revenue that the State is able to support those needs. But I believe the university, both SUNY and CUNY, are not going to be held out of harm's way, but I think we are both, especially CUNY, in a much better position at least in the short run, and by that I mean this year and perhaps into next year as well. So that is the climate.

Would you like to hear some good news? We are soon coming out with a campaign to celebrate the extraordinary female scientists that we have at the University. I've always felt we ought to do this and you're going to see a very aggressive campaign and all of the faculty that we've hired. Some of the young people, fresh with Ph.D.'s that have been recruited to CUNY throughout the University are extraordinary people, and we're going to celebrate some of them. That's an important thing to do.

Our retention rates are increasing incrementally. Our graduate rates are increasing incrementally, and we are attracting probably some of the best prepared students across the University that we have seen, maybe in our history, and that's a good thing. I think part of this is the economy, where students are looking to a university to come in and shore up their skills so that they can be a little more competitive as they leave the university and find employment. Many people can't find employment, so they are coming back to be retooled, and that's what a university should do. We are seeing record enrollment, and I'm a little concerned about that. I've expressed that concern to this group. We have to balance between keeping this University open to students that want to study, and that's a wonderful thing and it's in our DNA and we've always held that dear to ourselves. But the other thing that I think is pulling in the opposite direction is that we want to insure that the academic experience that these students receive is the best that we can provide. That means trying to maintain the level of full-time faculty, which I deeply believe in. Since we started in our administration, the latest data show about 1,700 additional faculty than we had in 1999 or 2000. We're going to lose the race because we're gaining more and more students, and it's very hard to keep that balance. Even if we don't win the race, I think it is still the appropriate investment to make, and we will continue to do that.

We will be starting a new School of Public Health, which is very exciting for us. It will be the first public school of public health in this area. We have negotiated with a developer, and we did a public/private deal where we were able to monetize a physical asset that we had and use those dollars to invest in a new facility in Harlem presently being built, and the building has been designed obviously during the first phase of this construction to be the home of the new School of Social Work, which is held in very high regard, and it will also be the home of the new School of Public Health. We have hired some extraordinary faculty. We just hired a husband and wife team, both distinguished professors at the Harvard Medical School, who are very interested in the themes that the School of Public Health will have, and they will join us at the end of this semester, and a bunch of other folks as well.

I am going to give a speech at the Center for Educational Innovation at the Harvard Club. There is much interest. They had to turn people away who want to attend. It is about community colleges, which I began to talk about very seriously starting three or four years ago. I will be announcing at that event on Thursday the results of the ASAP, the Accelerated Study in Associate Programs, which was this idea created and developed here. The results are absolutely

extraordinary, and we now have a very prominent research group who are looking at the data very closely to validate this, so we are comparing apples to apples, but the results are very impressive. I have always said to you, and some disagree, that a degree matters. I can't be convinced that just coming to a university and stepping in and stepping out is a transformative experience. It may be a good experience that adds to the life of the individual, but at the end of the day a degree matters. So for me getting graduate rates up, especially in the world we live in today, where these students are facing extraordinary competition for a limited set of opportunities, is a good thing for us to do. So I'll be talking about the efforts to create a new community college, and I think that's exciting. It's the first new community college in many decades in the State.

The Decade of Science, which was announced somewhat audaciously in 2005, is moving along well. The Advanced Science Research Center is under construction, and that is going to be a jewel of a science center for all of the University, and we are in the process of designing and constructing several science facilities throughout the University. I've already said you can't think of yourself as a leading university unless you do science seriously, and we intend to do science seriously. When you look at some of our Ph.D. programs, especially in the Arts and Humanities, they are truly world class. It has been that way for some time, and we want to make sure that the very serious investments we have been making in our Ph.D. programs will continue to attract the best scholar teachers that we can, and to attract the very best students that we can.

The Mayor is going to be making an announcement soon, and I'll wait for him to do that. I don't want to rain on that parade, but you'll hear about that soon.

Our fundraising continues to move ahead, even in this environment. We have announced a \$3 billion campaign for the University. We have raised about \$1.7 billion towards that goal. We will get to that mark hopefully before the calendar ends for that particular part of that campaign. People are making serious investments into the University. Our research proposals are starting to be very well received. In part, it is because of this aggressive posture that we have taken to helping faculty who are here now and attracting faculty that are new to the University to really take their research seriously and get it funded, and that's a good thing.

So there are a lot of good things happening at the University. It's a very dynamic place. But there are serious problems that are exogenous to what actually happens here at the University, but hopefully over a period of time the State of New York will get into better equilibrium than it is right now, and we will continue to move forward. Thank you for your patience. I will come back and answer questions.

Chair Philipp – Thank you. I'd like to thank Executive Vice Chancellor Lexa Logue for coming, too. You have my report in written form. I won't amplify on it. I think it stands on its own. So without further ado, let's welcome Professor Wilson. The future of the UCRA is a hot issue, since the Chancellor has requested some substantial changes in the nature of the PSC-CUNY awards program.

Professor Joe Wilson – I have been asked to reduce my 60 minute presentation to about 60 seconds! But first I'd like to let you know that the UCRA reviews and awards process is on track. We are about half way through reviewing 1,300 proposals, and we expect to wrap up the reviews in about three weeks. In terms of the support that the UCRA has received, both from the University Faculty Senate and from the various campus governance bodies, we are deeply appreciative, and we think it's critically important to preserve the integrity and function of the UCRA. I know many of you have participated in past UCRA panels as liaisons, and probably

most of you have written grant proposals and hopefully have received grants and awards. They really do make a difference in the lives of the faculty. The issue that Fred raises about the future of the UCRA, without going into many details, is currently subject to negotiations between the PSC and CUNY's administration. Suffice it to say that we are interested preserving the integrity and principles of the UCRA and its now 40-year historic mission, and we look forward to your continued support. I hope I kept it under 60 minutes!

Chair Philipp – Thank you. And now Professor Richardson, chair of our Research Committee, which nominates members to the UCRA.

Professor Kathryn Richardson – As you know, Tom Bird and I were on a task force looking into some of these questions with the PSC-CUNY grants. The task force hasn't met for a while. Tom and I told the Vice Chancellor that we are not going to any more of the meetings because we don't get any minutes, or agendas, so we've excused ourselves from the rest of the meetings. I don't think they've met anymore since this went into negotiation with the Union, and probably it will be quiet until something is decided at that level. I'm just prefacing this whole thing to tell you that we are continuing on with the process like nothing has ever happened, so we are looking for people to serve as liaisons. We really need people in all the different panels. I'll just read the panels that need volunteers: Art History and Visual Arts, Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, Business Administration, Communication Arts and Sciences that includes Linguistics, Speech, and Hearing, Comparative Literature and Foreign Languages, Engineering, Ethnic and Area Studies, History, Library, Math, Music, Performing Arts Production and Scholarship, and Women's Studies. Some of the panels have already received some CVs. Some we've received two, some three, but we always like a pool, so we're just going to say we need CVs from the faculty in all of these disciplines. We would like you to please advertise at your school, and try to get your colleagues to help us with this, because we are continuing forward.

Chair Philipp – I should note that in my report, the second paragraph, there is a link to the Call Letter for people to serve on the UCRA. If you know somebody who is interested, have them go to that link. The next item on our agenda is Professor Martinez-López, chair of our Student Affairs Committee.

Professor Martinez-López – You have our report in writing. I would like to share with you that the members of the Committee are doing a very good job. We are working very hard in order to identify some specific actions for the next academic year. It's no good for us to start every academic year from zero! We are here at the University because of students. It's not good that for many years this Committee was not operating. I was asking many times that I would like to be on that Committee but it was not operating. That is ridiculous. For what reason are we here? The students! Not for our own benefit. Thank you.

Chair Philipp – Thank you. Now we come to the results of the Faculty Experience Survey, but before we get to that I have a motion of appreciation for Professor Kathleen Barker. Moved? Seconded? All in favor? It is a unanimously passed motion. Professor Barker, you can't know how much we really appreciate the work you have done. She did it all alone. It is her achievement. Please come present the results.

Professor Kathleen Barker – Before I introduce the study, I want to say thank you to the UFS leadership and staff, as well as the offices of the Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Chancellor for supporting the faculty experience study, termed FES:09. There are many to thank but I've saved us some time tonight by referring those acknowledgements in the technical support, the first of five documents in your packet.

Let me start by saying that this is the most comprehensive view we have of CUNY faculty experience in the history of our University. There is a lot of data and information. My goal tonight is to give you the leg up on your campus in explaining how the report works because this is your report for your campus and you need to understand how it hangs together.

The response rate for the full-time faculty is not in the stars, but we got to Jupiter with nearly a 39% response rate. Furthermore, the faculty composition in the pool of Rs is split between senior and community colleges so that it is nearly identical in proportions as they exist in the University. The technical report will show that there is an acute resemblance on rank, race and ethnicity with one or two mild discrepancies -- these are detailed in the technical report.

The response rate for the pilot study of part-time faculty is not in the stars, but we got very good lift-off with a response rate of 21.6%. It is a conservative response rate based on using the lowest number of returned postcards. Furthermore, the faculty composition in the pool of Rs is split between senior and community colleges and is nearly identical to their proportions in the University. Like full-time faculty, women were slightly more likely to respond to the survey than men. The responses are similar to the breakdown for the entire university, with a slight under-participation by Asian, Hawaiian or Pacific Islander and African-American faculty. Like the full-time faculty, women were slightly more likely to participate than men.

On the basis of the comparisons in Tables 1 and 2 in the technical report (pp 11-12) and the charts provided in Section 1 of Appendix A and Section 1 of C, there is no reason to think that the responses are skewed

I want to point out something truly astonishing to me. This was a voluntary survey and people could skip items or questions-- I'm using these terms interchangeably tonight. This is an IRB standard we had to meet.

I was holding my breath for two and one-half months and lived to see that there is very little missing data. Faculty answered many questions. Therefore,

- not only do we have very good response rates for the full-time faculty
- response rates for part-timer faculty was higher than the minimum accepted on the AAUP's 2007 Changing Academic Profession (CAP) survey of faculty in seventeen countries, and
- we don't have a missing data problem on the items.

So, let's make sure everyone understands the mechanics of the reports and then get to some general comments with time for questions. There are five documents for the FES:09.

There is the technical report itself which describes how the study was conducted. It is the top document. Please refer to page Roman numeral "v" to view the contents of this report. There are 10 sections and references.

At the bottom of Roman numeral v, there is a list of the Appendices to the Report. If you go to page 13 of this report, you will see a description of the Appendices. The CUNY WIDE OVERVIEWS for the faculty are in A (FT) & C (PT). The rankings of items by campus are in Appendices B (FT) and D (PT).

Everyone, please locate Appendix A and proceed to pages A-1 & A-2. I'm going to walk you through a couple pages.

Appendix A is the CUNY-WIDE OVERVIEW FOR FULL TIME FACULTY. It details responses of all full-time faculty across all the campuses.

- Consider Pages A-1 & 2: These detail response rates by campus and the overall response rate for the survey.
- Following this section, items or questions are nested within sections.
- On page A-3, you will note a "Section 2". In this section, for each item, we can view how Rs responded for all the colleges from poor to fair. Also note the standouts here, both positive and negative, as well as the splits. 2a is somewhat of a split for faculty as is 2d and 2f. Note that about 70% of the faculty are unhappy about their physical plants and a close number are also unhappy about bathrooms.
- You're probably thinking, "what about my campus?" We'll get to your campus in a moment.
- Bear with me and turn to page A-4. Consider the percentages now and these reflect satisfaction on a scale of 1-7. The standouts are that full-time faculty are happy with their authority on instruction, and there is a split on 4e and 4f – the average for salary is a 4.0. Note also that 52% are unaware of faculty leave policies.
- Turn to page A-6, these sections get at your campus life. Note that the average rating for satisfaction with jobs is 5.4 and 5.2, fairly high. That's a national observation as well. You might be sitting there thinking, well, this is not *my* life. But hold on for a moment because I want to address the parallel appendix for part-time faculty.

Everyone, please locate Appendix C and go to pages C-1 & 2. I'm going to walk you through a couple pages.

- Section 1 in Appendix C details the response rates by campus just as Section 1 did in Appendix A on page A-1.
- Page A-2 shows that the breakdown of Rs matches the senior-community college splits.
- Page C-3, Section 2 displays some of the characteristics of the sample and some new information about our adjunct part-time faculty.
- Page C-4 begins to ask questions about campus life, dependency on health care and payroll issues.
- Finally, on page C-5, please note the "up-close" kinds of questions we asked the adjunct part-time faculty. Consider items 2u, 2v, 2w and 2x – the percentages of satisfaction are very high. Finally, let's compare the average rating for position satisfaction with the full-time faculty. It is higher at 5.7. Furthermore, consider the question on salary (A-7, 5E).

There are main findings of the study. First, we live in a community labeled CUNY but our CUNY world is not a universal experience by any means. Faculty on campuses have different relationships to CUNY based on many factors: the type of campus, the gender and race of the faculty member and sometimes the part- vs. full-time status.

- Turn to page A-9: However, findings show that faculty at community colleges are generally less satisfied than faculty at senior colleges though sometimes the differences are small. Where the differences are large, for the full-time faculty, the issue of workload and number of students appear important, at least at this stage.
- We see this play out a bit on another graphic p. A-11. It is not always the size of the differences that matter as much as the consistency in lower ratings by the CC faculty. That leads me to another sub-finding that resonates with national data.
- Pages A-12 through A 17: Faculty report some differences in how they experience their campus climates based on gender and race. In Appendix A, we see that more women than men are dissatisfied with size of class and workload, that women are more likely to report there is not enough recruiting of faculty of color or women faculty or that departments are working to improve the climates for women or faculty of color.
- There are comparable findings for the same questions by race.

Turning to Appendix C:

- Turn to page C-8: We are considering full- vs. part-time status of faculty. A major finding of this study is that part-time faculty tended to express high amounts of satisfaction on many variables, including overall job satisfaction and with how they are treated on the campuses.
- On page C-12, there is a graphic by Race/Ethnicity on this question that will prove interesting in that faculty report comparability across racial/ethnic groups of how they are treated is uniform between groups on each item.
- That said, Health Benefits, payroll problems, and salary dog the part-time faculty and do so sometimes uniformly but also sometimes differ between campuses.

So, how can governance leaders and senators and those elected locally at their FS chapter undertake to root out the problems? Your calls for action are rooted in Appendices B and D. That is where campus your story begins to unfold.

My first advice is that you need to look through all the items, campus by campus.

The major finding of FES:09 is that it replicates FES:05. There is enormous variability between the campuses on individual items. On many issues, we are living in separate worlds on different campuses. The accompanying story is that it means are students must be experiencing these different worlds as well.

Turning to Appendices B and D, campuses are clearly ranked by satisfaction. Rankings from *FES:05* to *FES:09* are sometimes available and these are provided. In those instances, we can see stability or change -- some campuses rise and fall dramatically on individual items, while no change can be registered as well. Rankings in Appendix B show prior standings of campuses if that data was available.

- If we consider Appendix B, Table 6 (B-6) shows a 64% point difference, Table 9 shows an 80% point difference, Table 10, an 82% point difference between the top and the bottom campus. On the other hand, Table 24 shows only an 18% point difference between the campuses.

- Appendix D: Table 3 there is a 44% point difference with a clustering of problematic campuses near the bottom. Yet, there is only a 20% point difference on satisfaction with position at CUNY (Table 10)

Governance leaders and faculty will surely be interested in these results and, when provided, the comparisons with *FES:05*. The evidence presented here represents the fullest and most complete expression of faculty opinions and attitudes at The City University that we have to date as well as over time.

In reviewing the data, very few readers will fail to note that the differences among campuses in the satisfied columns range from 20 to 70 or even 80 percentage points between campuses. These differences merit our attention and concern. Many campuses exhibit changes from *FES:05* to *FES:09*. The changes, however, are frequently bi-directional between items: a campus might improve on a number of items but decline on others. A handful of campuses merit special attention because they consistently perform in the bottom 25th percentile of satisfaction on a number of issues. That some campuses continue to demonstrate disrespect toward faculty or fail to change in response to earlier findings is cause for concern. Also noted, there is a tendency for some of our campuses to be at or near the bottom consistently and these will be clearly revealed if you carefully review Appendix B.

Interested readers are strongly encouraged to take note of change or stasis on their campuses. Rankings should be carefully examined in tandem with satisfaction rates. For instance, a campus may be ranked third from the top. Such a finding should not be considered “well-done” based on its ranking alone if it is also accompanied by a satisfaction rating below 40%. Being ranked 3rd with a satisfaction rate of 97% appears excellent but only at first blush because the bottom-ranked campus satisfaction rating is relatively high, for instance, 80%. A similar caution applies to instances in which a campus is ranked very low but the highest ranked campus has a satisfaction rating that is only 15 percentage points higher.

In the current study, faculty voice strong opinions about their campuses. On a substantial number of campuses, faculty are discontented. Full-time faculty are often split on a number of matters and that is predictable given the wide disparities between campuses. Across CUNY, on a few issues, faculty are generally content. The important finding of this study may well be that it replicates the broad findings of the *FES:05* survey of full-time faculty – that is, variability between campuses remained evident in the *FES:09* full-time faculty survey. Variability between campuses is evident in the *FES:09* part-time faculty survey as well.

Considering the accompanying trend data for full-time faculty, however, we see that there are limits to this variability. The same colleges appear to re-mix but within their segregated “tops” and “bottoms” of the University.

Finally, and similarly to CUNY full-time faculty (Appendix A), part-time faculty expressed considerable satisfaction with many aspects of their jobs and their faculty and staff relationships at CUNY in the University-Wide report (Appendix C). Commonalities between the two groups are also visible in certain areas, such as discontent with salary, certain resources and the physical plant. Also, variability between campuses is as true for part-time faculty as it is for the full-time faculty. For all of us, the CUNY-wide results may appear anomalous until we more closely examine our campus standings across and between items for both groups of faculty (Appendices B and D).

Although new leaders were not instrumental in the development of the documented campus issues, they were also bequeathed accomplishments from prior leaders. In order to solve problems that faculty have given voice to, a willingness to engage and dialogue with faculty, to advocate for their campuses, to become creative in solving areas of discontent, and also to preserve valued achievements would foster mutual governance.

The City University of New York will be well-served if faculty opinions documented in this report are vigorously addressed.

[A period of questions/answers and discussion followed.]