

MINUTES OF THE THREE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-NINTH PLENARY SESSION
OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

May 15, 2007

The meeting was called to order by UFS Chair Philipp at 6:45 p.m. in Room 9206/07 at the Graduate School and University Center. 78 voting members of 118 were present.

Baruch: Present – Hill, Martell, Wine and Alternate Aubry. Absent – Albright, Brandwein, Dumas, Freedman, Pollard, and Vora. Vacancies – 1. **BMCC:** Present – Friedman, Kalogeropoulos, Martinez-Lopez, Persaud, Rani, Roy, Vozick and Alternates Krauss and Pezon. Absent– Niyazov. **Bronx CC:** Present – Alozie. Absent – Asimakopoulos, Durante, and Skinner. Vacancies—1. **Brooklyn:** Present – Bell, Cherukupalli, Dubois, Rodman, and Shapiro. Absent – Antoniello, Jacobson, Shortell, Tobey, and Viscusi. **CCNY:** Present – Crain, Khalil, Raj, and Sank. Absent – Dalglish, Habib, Lascar, and Leonhard. Vacancies – 1. **CSI:** Present – Batson, Cooper, Foleno, Klibaner, Levine, Petratos, Yousef, and Alternate Stearns. Absent – Jayatilleke. **CUNY Law School:** Present –Lung and McArdle. **Graduate School:** Present – Baumrin, Cross, Lerner, Matthews-Salazar, Nolan, and Orenstein. **Hostos CC:** Present – August, and Alternate Sharma. Absent – Bernardini, and Pimentel, Vacancies - 1. **Hunter:** Present – Palanda, Splitter. Absent – Friedman, Guzzetta, Kaye, Krishnamachari, McCormick, Sherrill, St. Hill, and Wimberly. Vacancies – 1. **John Jay:** Present –Crossman, Kaplowitz, and Alternates Chaffie, Friedland, and Petraco. Absent – Caldwell, King-Toler, Kubic, Romero. **Kingsborough CC:** Present – Barnhart, Hume, O’Malley, Ruoff, Stubin, Wood, and Alternate Nash. **LaGuardia CC:** Present – Beaky, Davidson, Lerman, Mettler, Rushing, and Alternate Kurzyna. Absent – Shean. **Lehman:** Present – Kolb, Mineka, and Philipp. Absent – Aronowitz, Jervis, and Marianetti. **Medgar Evers:** Present – Barker, Hastick, and Alternate Hope. Absent – Stewart. **NYCCT:** Present – Cermele, Horelick, Hounion, Richardson, and Alternate Paynayotakis. Absent – Dreyer, and Karthikeyan. **Queens:** Present – Bird, Moore, Savage, and Zevin. Absent – Brody, Casco, Gonzalez, and Habib. Vacancies – 3. **Queensborough CC:** Present – Barbanel, Iconis, Pecorino, and Alternate Sweetnam. Absent – Jacobowitz, and Wein. Vacancies – 1. **York:** Present –Lewis. Absent – Cockery, Divale, and Rosenthal.

Senior Vice Chancellor Jay Hershenson and Dr. Rosemary Feals, Executive Director of the Modern Language Association, attended as guests of the UFS.

Governance Leaders present: Anderson (BMCC), Bass (BCC), Baurmin (GS), Burke (GS), Cooper (CSI), Feinerman (Lehman), Georges (Lehman), Gillespie (QCC), Ianni (LaGuardia), Kaplowitz (John Jay), Kraljic (KCC), Levine (CSI), Lopez (Hostos CC), Lowe (Queens), Martell (Baruch), Mennella (NYCCT), Mettler (LaGuardia), Oley (ME), Pecorino (QCC), Raj (CCNY), Read (BCC), Savage (Queens), Stapleford (Hunter), Tobey (Brooklyn), Vendryes (York) and Young (Hunter) attended. Parliamentarian Andrea McArdle, Executive Director Phipps, Administrative Assistant Pasela, and Secretary Blanchard were also present. Professors Dahbany-Miraglia (QCC), Kamal (BCC), Martin (BMCC), and Zimmerman (CSI) attended.

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

II. Approval of the Minutes of the 328th Plenary: Minutes were approved as distributed.

III. Reports (Recorded in Reports & Deliberations)

- A. Chair Philipp.
- B. Vice Chancellor Hershenson.
- C. Task Force on Evaluating Scholarship for Tenure and Promotion, Executive Director Feals, Modern Language Association.

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

There were five nominations for the five positions for Member-at-Large of the UFS Executive Committee. The Secretary cast a single vote to elect:

- Stefan Baumrin (Philosophy, Graduate School & University Center)
- Sandi E. Cooper (History, College of Staten Island)
- Anne Friedman (Developmental Skills, Borough of Manhattan Community College)
- Alfred Levine (Engineering Science and Physics, College of Staten Island)
- Philip Pecorino (Social Sciences, Queensborough Community College)

V. New Business: A Resolution Concerning the PSC/CUNY Research Award Program was proposed by the Executive Committee. After considerable debate and one failed amendment, it was adopted as proposed with one abstention.

Resolution Concerning the PSC/CUNY Research Award Program

Based on the work of the UCRA Task Force (2005-2006), the UFS Research Committee and the UFS Executive Committee believe that the PSC/CUNY Research Award Program is overdue for a new approach and a substantial increase in funding. The following provisions are intended to greatly improve the program for both faculty and the University itself, enhancing the reputation of the University and increasing the number of quality proposals capable of attracting outside private and public funding at a time when emphasis is being placed upon hiring new faculty and supporting CUNY as a research institution.

Therefore, Be It Resolved,

1. That CUNY be requested to double the funding for the PSC/CUNY Award Program, from \$6 million to \$12 million. This increase should be made out of existing university funds. The program has been in stasis for nearly a decade, to the detriment of our new faculty.
2. That a small number (10-20) of special awards valued at least \$15,000 be provided for research proposals that are deemed outstanding by peer review discipline committees, as well as a special awards committee to oversee final decisions;
3. That CUNY-wide grant-writing training workshops be made generally available at times convenient to the teaching faculty; that these workshops cover the format, research review and goals suitable to the **development and improvement of grant applications**;
4. That all research applicants should be encouraged to include in their research budgets funds for assistants who will contribute to the work of the faculty researcher and who will also improve their writing and research skills;
5. That the PSC/CUNY research award program be extended to all faculty, including adjuncts with at least three years of CUNY service and/or who teach at least two CUNY courses;
6. That grant applications should be held to higher standards of performance and review, including a requirement that within three years of the completion of the research project, proof of a published or unpublished study, experiment or report be provided prior to the submission of a new award application;
7. That greater publicity, within and outside the university, be given to the research award program, to the awardees, to subsequent published studies resulting from the research awards, and to selected outstanding completed and published research projects, in the form of media briefings, communications to the university community, and special presentations and recognition ceremonies.

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 THREE HUNDRED AND TWENTY NINTH
PLENARY SESSION
OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

May 15, 2007

III. Reports: At this point I'd like to give the floor to Vice Chancellor Hershenson. Jay Hershenson is the person responsible for all of these interesting ads that you see on the subway and in the buses and maybe on TV, the ads featuring our faculty. I suggested to Jay quite some time ago that he was doing a great job with ads featuring our outstanding students but we also have outstanding faculty. I'm glad to see that Jay accepted that suggestion. He's going to give a short presentation on some of the things he does and I think you'll be very interested. Vice Chancellor Hershenson, it's a pleasure.

B. Vice Chancellor Jay Hershenson – Thank you, and good evening. I want to thank Chairman and Trustee Manfred Philipp for his invitation to speak with you tonight. When I was coming over here I realized that the first time I spoke at a Faculty Senate Plenary was in 1975. That was when the university was facing budget issues and a new State Commission on Higher Education which I happened to serve on and that was about to be announced. I was either 12 or 13 years old at the time!

I still believe as I did then, the youngest Chair of the University Student Senate at the time, that getting older is a function of mind over matter -- if you don't mind, it doesn't matter. It's good to be back and I have spoken here several times over the last three decades, but who's counting. Manfred made mention of the "Look Who's Teaching at CUNY Program" that we have unveiled. How many people here have seen the bus panels or the TV ads or some of the stories? Thank you very much for raising your hand. It really began with the earlier campaign we did starting 3 years ago which was called "Superstars Choose CUNY" and then "More Superstars Choose CUNY," where we sought to publicize the achievements of the students who were winning these magnificent awards from the Goldwaters to the Trumans to the Rhodes Scholars, the Marshall Scholars. We also actually had a campaign called "Immigrant Superstars Choose CUNY," so there were lots of iterations. Indeed, Manfred and the Chancellor did ask me to move to the next level which involved showcasing our faculty and together with my creative team we were able to begin that process and we are under way.

Without any further adieu I'd like to show you a public service announcement that is being televised at every Yankee home game. The way this came about was last year we did a "Superstars Choose CUNY" featuring student award winners and it got such a great reaction. The Yankees with the help of George Steinbrenner who personally approved it for free, allowed a PSA at every home game and on the YES Network. Lo and behold, a couple of weeks ago the Yankees called us up and said that they would love to feature us again and so consequently you are going to see what has just been unveiled with the

Yankees. Four million fans attend Yankee home games throughout the season. So please enjoy the PSA.

[PSA played]

There is no university in the country that is featuring its faculty the way CUNY is. I am negotiating now with some of the largest office buildings in the city. We're going to have messages in the elevators, on the digital screen in these office buildings which have hundreds of thousands of employees. Some of you may visit Inside Higher Education. If you take a look at it tomorrow morning you'll see Godfrey Gumbs from Hunter College or Elizabeth Nuñez in the right hand corner perfectly positioned. Remember what happened during the search? We had one of the candidates for President of the College of Staten Island talk about having coffee with CUNY faculty every single morning because of what we're doing with Inside Higher Ed, and many of the scientists in the University are coming out of the laboratories to work with us and position the opportunities for students to learn more about what they're doing.

I've only mentioned a few of the aspects of it but clearly what we're trying to do is showcase the world class talent that is available in this university system. The next phase will include faculty from other disciplines. You've see how we've also showcased the community colleges. We're also going to, when we do our "Study with the Best" DVD's that we provide to about 150,000 families, to be featuring faculty in the university and the great work that they do in the early fall. I will tip you off that once we get through this phase which will go on for several months, the next phase will be faculty and students together. Mentors, mentees, award winning faculty members along with students who've won scholarships together. We continue to send a message of quality.

One of my mentors, Joe Murphy, always used to say that the truest measurement of quality at a great university is the quality of its faculty and I think that's what we're trying to get across. It's a very important and developing effort that we're doing. Of course, we have to simultaneously keep our eye on the ball. Manfred said I would speak about a few items that are under my jurisdiction. Of course, working closely with the Chancellor on the city budget and what remains of the state budgetary process is always first and foremost of greatest concern. The Chancellor will testify on May 21, before the City Council Finance and Higher Ed Committee on the community college budget and those aspects of the city budget that impact the senior colleges, such as the Vallone Scholarship Program, the Safety Net Program, and many of the initiatives that are under way.

I had originally intended to give out what's called a green sheet, which the Faculty Senate Leadership knows is a one page summary of our budget situation. The Chancellor really preempted me because over the last two weeks he's had conversations with the Mayor and the budget director which have gone a long way toward maximizing our resource position in the current city budget which you will see as the next couple of weeks unfold. As we go forward a lot more work has been spent on the Mayor's side and the Chancellor will speak to that directly when he testifies before the city council, but I will tell you that the so-called PEG that would have had an impact this year has been worked on to the point where it will be ameliorated and we'll be able to move forward with the gains that we made on the state level, including a \$150 baseline increase in community college aid. There are outstanding capital needs on the

city side -- we still need to fill in some additional costs for Medgar Evers. The price of steel does go up and that's a very high priority. Fiterman Hall continues to be very much a priority on the university screen. We have the state matching funds for the final piece; we're now working with City Hall and the Council to get the last piece from them. We will continue to move along those lines. You all read the newspapers; Albany is a rather acrimonious place these days, to say the least. If you visit Albany, you have to be very careful not to get caught in the metaphorical gunfire.

There is a little talk of a supplemental budget. If there is a supplemental budget, we think it's going to be on capital. We've been spending time trying to make sure that all sides have our lists in the event that in the final days prior to the conclusion of the legislative session, which will be around June 22, that our items will come up.

Having said that, all arrows really point to next year because very shortly it looks as though the Governor will announce a new Commission on Higher Education. It originally started as a Commission on Public Higher Education. My sense now is that the final nomenclature will be "Commission on Higher Education" but that the principal focus will still be on public higher education. The Chancellor and a number of Presidents and I believe faculty and students will be involved in the work of the Commission. Obviously the State University is paying a lot of attention to these dynamics, given that the Chancellor of SUNY resigned and shortly an interim Chancellor will be named there. A lot of the focus of what is occurring on the second floor is indeed with the future of SUNY in mind and, frankly, some very positive impressions about what happened here at CUNY. At the end of the day however, commissions are valuable to the extent that they result in investment and that really needs to be, I think, our collective focus. I know I certainly speak for the Chancellor when I say that and there is no better time than at the beginning of a new administration to try to maximize our position through that vehicle. We'll see how that develops. There is no question that there will be involvement from the private colleges. There's no way that any commission will be established without the private colleges having input both formally as members, as well as through the various methods that they exercise in order to participate. We're going to have to continue to work closely with our colleagues at SUNY. I know that there's a great relationship between the Faculty Senate and the public higher education governing board that Dr. O'Malley was very involved with. You're going to need to keep that relationship up as we move through the Commission process because, again I learned this from my past involvement with commissions, if commissions go past the timing of executive budgets then they do not have an impact on the resources and my hope is that there will be interim recommendations from the Commission that will impact on next year's executive budget, and I think that's going to be on everyone's mind.

Somewhere in this room there are clippings from a project that we did a little less than two weeks ago called "Citizenship Now," and "Citizenship Now" is a great story at City University because when you talk about branding and when advertising agencies talk about branding they often mean logos and themes, and I believe that what we have done over the last several years, it's taken about 10 years, is that we have branded the City University of New York as the lead higher education institution in the nation that not only cares about the future of immigrants but is rendering a public service that is helping to

transform immigrant lives. Two weeks ago, with the tremendous help of Professor Allan Wernick, a professor at Baruch College is the Director of the Citizenship and Naturalization Project, we were able to organize over 200 volunteers including international student advisors and lawyers and paralegals that manned a switchboard every day for 5 days, 9am to 7pm in every language you can possibly imagine to help New Yorkers, for free, with their citizenship and naturalization issues. By the end of the week we had helped 13,000 people. This was with 48 phone lines; this was the fifth time that the University has done this. It resulted from some conversations I had with Martin Dunn who is now the Editor of the News, and we entered into this partnership. This citizenship and naturalization effort is so important to this university and to the people it's serving because when you help 13,000 people that stretches into many, many more families, many of whom are having their first contact with the university through a program like this. The photos of the volunteers from the colleges represented here in this room were printed in the News day after day after day, nine days of solid publicity about the public service that this university is rendering, and it's part of a larger program where we are now offering swearing in ceremonies to new immigrants on CUNY campuses, we're now offering with the help of Dr. Wernick and his colleagues graduate courses in immigration law and immigration policy where every weekend, every weekend, we are in some neighborhood or community in the city helping people with either their citizenship and naturalization issues and invariably if they need admissions information we, of course, provide that too. I literally mean every weekend. We've actually gone to the Mayor and asked the Mayor to call us the "New York City CUNY Citizenship Corps," which he is doing and his people are doing. This is a continuing effort, I know that a number of the faculty here have worked for years to help immigrant communities in this city.

While I'm involved with many, many immigrant communities, I would point out that the Mexican community in this city which is often invisible has a 7% college going rate, and clearly there are communities in this city that we have to pay a lot more attention to and that's one example. For me that's what branding means, when you're able to render a public service and have the message that CUNY is a welcoming, hospitable place. It does make a difference when you partner with media and that's something that I've looked to do in many of our activities over the last several years so that the people in the media get to know us in a different kind of way. We work much more closely now with the publishers, the business people, the circulation people as well as the editors and reporters who pay attention to what happens at the university.

In a very similar way, tomorrow night, again public service provided at City University, we are going to unveil at 6:00 down at the Tweed Courthouse, where the Department of Education is located, the first Women's Leadership Curriculum that CUNY is presenting to the Department of Education which we were able to arrange for The New York Times to print and work closely with us with support from TIAA/CREF and JPMorgan Chase. The Women's Leadership Curriculum is based on the Women's Leadership Calendar that many of you saw copies of which we published last year. About four years ago we went down the path of a voting rights and citizenship calendar, website, curricula, then a women's leadership curricula, same principle, calendar, website, curricula and now we're in the Nation of Immigrants phase which is also a calendar and soon to be curricula.

Again, at the heart of this project is Professor Richard Lieberman and his colleagues at LaGuardia from the LaGuardia Wagner Archives. I would say about 100 faculty, staff and students are involved in this project. With the help of The Times -- yes, it matters to have a media partner because they send out the curricula with subscriptions and they help to make it available through their resources -- it is the kind of communication that is important. That's going to happen tomorrow night, again another example of public service. I think it's important to bring this to your attention because it is important to showcase our students and our faculty but at the same time we want to communicate the public service that this University is providing to the community.

In early June we'll be opening CUNY Express in Washington Heights. It's one of several portals that's available at this University; you'll be seeing Voter Awareness Month, which is going to be planned for September and October, leading into CUNY Month. Let me close -- since as I turn to my left I know that when my host stands it's usually not because his keys are bothering him in his pocket by telling you know that this is a great time for the university. We should really be energized and I find inspiration in the students and the faculty. I'm going to continue to work as hard as I can to showcase the great talents in this University. Thank you very much. /

Chair Philipp- I have to say that I only realized that you were closing so I figured I'd stand up first. Are there any questions for Vice Chancellor Hershenson?

Professor Stefan Baumrin (Philosophy Department, Graduate Center) – In this thing with faculty and students are there going to be the faculty and the faculty member's students, or just some odd collection of students? /Vice Chancellor Hershenson- In the third phase, for example, where there is a graduate student who is working with a Sociology professor and they're working together on a project. So the answer is that it would be faculty and students who are working together often in mentor/mentee situations.

Professor William Crain (Psychology Department, City College of New York) - I'm wondering, would we ever showcase the student who said, "If it weren't for City University I could never have gotten off the streets." We showcase the talent. I know that David Lavin's written a new book following 30 years later the first open admissions people, and he's having trouble getting that in The New York Times. We still have a Welfare Rights Initiative that, as you know, we lost like 20,000 women due to workfare requirements over the last several years. We still have a Welfare Rights Initiative that is trying to use this main avenue of education to get, which will get them off of welfare if they can somehow do so. I'd like to see us at some point showcase those that not only couldn't go to Harvard Law School without CUNY or are going to Oxford or Harvard but those who could not have gotten their lives together, gotten off welfare, beat the odds that poverty imposed. / Vice Chancellor Hershenson- It certainly makes sense and we try to do it, to showcase students in many ways. You happened to mention the Welfare Rights Initiative, which is a group very close to my heart and I'm the one who worked with Professor

Steve Loffredo as you know, on the cases to provide appeals for the students and I've been very involved with that on a long term basis. The answer is yes.

Professor Mike Vozick (Science Department, Borough of Manhattan Community College) - At the same time that many wonderful things are happening, it still seems to people who look with a close and critical eye that the open admissions idea is under a lot of pressure, to put it mildly. It is being squeezed out in some sense due to the limited space and the pressure that the community colleges are under. The other comment that I'd like to make is that with all of our emphasis on immigrants, and I'm all the way on that, there's a lot of feeling in the African American community that there are deep unresolved problems in the opportunities available to African Americans, and I can imagine some people wondering whether they're being forgotten as this goes forward. The question I want to ask has to do with my duties in this body. I'm here to represent the adjuncts. Knowing you, I'd like to do it less by way of speech than by way of question but I have to say a few facts in case there are people here who aren't aware. The majority of courses are still being taught by adjuncts. It looks like that's going to go on even though there's always a lot of talk of changing that. The bedrock of CUNY, the backbone of CUNY, is the adjuncts but we say nothing about it. I ask you to respond to that. / Vice Chancellor Hershenson- The first part I guess is an example that no good deed goes unpunished. I could talk for 20 minutes about the Black Male Initiative which is going on at City University at 17 campuses, 21 projects. The other night I spoke at 100 Hispanic Women and I indicated that we have 36,000 Latinas now at City University and if you look at the proportion you will see that the vast majority of the Latinas at CUNY are now attending the Senior Colleges and that Hispanic enrollment went up 11% since 1999. There are lots of statistics one could quote but the bottom line is that universities, as you know better than me, are living, growing organisms and that's what we need to emphasize. Certainly CUNY's enrollment continues to increase. I think you're very much aware of that. I'd like to sit down and talk with you further about your insights on adjuncts. I personally benefited from that and would love to sit with you.

Professor Diane Sank (Anthropology, City College of New York) – Switching to another area, at City College some administrators have been stating that in reappointments of faculty research, publications and grants take priority and are counted more than teaching and service. Some of us remember that in the Board of Trustees by-laws and I think even some other documents, it lists teaching service and research equally. It doesn't give a different weight. Is this a new policy at CUNY or is this something unique to City College? Especially when Harvard University just last week in the newspaper indicated their recognition that teaching is a very important element in judging faculty. / Vice Chancellor Hershenson- I'll be pleased to share your concerns directly with the Chancellor.

Professor Terrence Martell (Gov. Leader, Baruch College) - The issue of branding is very, very important to all of us. We've got CUNY, we've got the colleges, and we've got schools. I'm noticing a dynamic tension between the needs of the overarching octopus and the smaller units that actually do the work. / Vice Chancellor Hershenson- I tend to think a starfish is more like it. / Professor Martell- Alright, a starfish. I'm wondering how do you balance the needs of the many against the needs of the one? / Vice Chancellor Hershenson- The University's identity campaign makes it clear from the outset

that individual college themes not only continue but they are enhanced and that what is involved is that all of the 23 colleges and professional schools need to share in being part of the larger university but they are able to retain their individual themes and their individual identities. That's really where the balance is. Now, if you were to talk to me about Baruch as I have most recently with your President, I would be emphasizing that Baruch Equals Success, and I would be looking for as many ways as possible to get that message across, rather than that it's the largest of its kind. People are looking for success and Baruch certainly provides that, but that's how we do it. We strike a balance and make sure that the colleges can retain their themes. A perfect example is the City College ads that were in the newspaper over the last few days where clearly City College continues to soar and yet it has the identification that City College is CUNY, and that's how we balance it.

Professor Sandi Cooper (History Department, College of Staten Island) – I must say that when I first saw those ads on the sides of buses I was reminded both of Red Square and Tiananmen Square but I've finally adjusted. However, you did raise the City College thing which I was going to ask about. I don't suppose you're responsible, that may well be a local person, but perhaps you might suggest to them that in addition to male graduates there were some of the rest of us. The line up of pictures reminded me of that photo of the Republican Candidates on the front of The New York Times. The only women that showed up were married to somebody else. / Vice Chancellor Hershenson- I'm so glad that you indicated that. I was thinking about whether or not I was going to say this tonight. A major motivating force for me with the "Look Who's Teaching at CUNY" program was when I picked up The New York Times and saw a full page ad in the Metro section, a black and white ad of three faculty members at Rutgers University. All three were white males, and I said to myself, "They are getting their message across." That is obviously the message that they want to present to the public and if you look really carefully at the work we've been doing, which I hope will lead by example, you will see that not only are we showcasing diversity, we are showcasing quality. I would just end with the following comment. There is a Professor, I'm not going to name the individual, who didn't want to participate in the campaign who happens to be African American and he happens to be a shy person so he didn't want to participate. Some of the other faculty went to him and said, "You really should do this." Then we started taking photographs and he became a movie star, he started doing poses. He is someone who we should be so proud of, as we are showcasing. I will point that out to my colleagues at City that they should learn by example and I'm glad that you said that.

Professor Eda Hastick-Harris (Department of Social and Behavioral Sciences, Medgar Evers College) – I am here again to express our deepest gratitude to you, Vice Chancellor, for all that you do behind the scenes, behind the cameras to help people of color, immigrant groups to name a few. What you do at the Black and Puerto Rican Caucus is tremendous. The Male Initiative at Medgar Evers College, Caribbean American Chamber of Commerce and Industry, the 40th anniversary of the SEEK Program, your marvelous production; you do a tremendous amount of work that very few people know about. I for one, as I leave the Senate tonight, would like to say, "Thank you for all that you do." / Vice Chancellor Hershenson- I should get out of here at this point!

Professor Emily Anderson (Gov. Leader, Borough of Manhattan Community College) - You mentioned Fiterman Hall and I need a little bit more clarity on exactly what's happening there. You said that some of the matching funding had been allocated and you said that there was more still forthcoming. Could you go into a little bit more detail on that so that I can take it back? / Vice Chancellor Hershenson- Sure, there's a final \$26 million that we obtained from the State that needs to be matched by the City. We're in discussions now with the Mayor's office. They are very encouraging. Obviously we're talking to the Council too. Let me say BMCC has representation on the Community Advisory Committee which is meeting later this week and there are a number of people at the college involved with that. We do need that last piece in place. It's not holding us up at all because we're moving forward with seeking approvals from EPA and all of the work that the engineering consultants are doing and I would say that by early June we should have that completely resolved. Thank you very much. / Chair Philipp- Vice Chancellor Hershenson is a person whose heart really is with this University and it's always a pleasure to have him here.

V. New Business: At this point I'd like to have your permission to make another slight change in the agenda. Professor Kathryn Richardson who is a proponent of the resolution has to leave; I'd like to do that resolution early. You have in your packet a resolution concerning the PSC/CUNY research award program. This resolution was presented by the Research Committee of the UFS and it has been worked over and modified to some extent by the UFS Executive Committee, so I would like to ask Professor Richardson if she would like to stand up and speak to this issue.

Professor Kathryn Richardson (Nursing, New York City College of Technology) – We got the revised resolution and we had a meeting at 5:00 and we'd just like to recommend the deletion of the sentence in Number 1 that says "This increase should be made out of existing university funds." As a committee we felt that the language was stronger without that sentence and we thought it was better not to specify where the funds were coming from. There were many different sources where we could get the funds from and that was kind of limiting to existing university funds. We also just want to clarify that Number 5 is contingent on getting more money, which is Number 1; because if we open it up to the adjunct faculty we're going to increase the pool of applicants without increasing the pool of money. So even though we don't want any change there, we just felt that we'd like to clarify that, that Number 5 would be conditional on Number 1 being approved. / Chair Philipp - I'd like to say that the sentence in Number 1, "This increase should be made out of existing university funds" was put there in order to make it clear that this should not be an added subject of PSC/CUNY contract negotiations. That's why that sentence is in there so that the University would not go to the PSC and say, "Lower your salary a bit so that we can raise the PSC/CUNY Award Monies." / Professor Richardson- Actually, the committee felt that it was important that it should be part of the PSC/CUNY negotiations and when we wrote the original we indeed had that language in #1 and the language was significantly changed to say that it comes out of existing university funds. We felt that by taking that sentence out that it really could go either one way or the other. Chair Philipp- I understand you. You'd have to make a motion to amend this motion as it stands. We'd have to have that motion but right now this is the motion on the floor. It was the opinion of the Executive Committee that the Union not be asked to make this an additional part of the negotiations.

It is, apparently, the part of the Research Committee that it be asked. These are two fundamentally different positions. / Professor Richardson- Well, I think it's the opinion of the Research Committee that what is important is to get the money. Where we get the money from, we might get the money from negotiations, we might get the money from the university, we might get the money from philanthropy. We didn't want to just limit it to saying that it's coming out of existing university funds. / Chair Philipp- I understand that but in a formal sense you would have to move that this be struck as an amendment, if you wish to do that. / Professor Richardson- Well, do we vote on this first or do you want me to do the amendment first. / Chair Philipp- You should do the amendment first. / Professor Richardson- I would like to offer that amendment then, that sentence to be taken out of Number 1. / Chair Philipp- It's been moved that the sentence to be taken out of Number 1 in this motion. Is there a second to this? / Unannounced Speaker- Second. / Chair Philipp- It has been seconded. Is there any further discussion on removing the sentence?

Professor Anne Friedman (Developmental Skills, Borough of Manhattan Community College) - I certainly appreciate the committee's resolution. It's very important that this money be increased. We did have a lengthy discussion about this at the Executive Committee. The problem as we saw it and as I see it, in Number 1, is if we do not leave this sentence in then in effect we are leaving ourselves open. In effect we need to say to the Union, I think, that we want this to be put on the bargaining table and that we want to negotiate for more funds. That money will come out of our collective bargaining agreement if we should come to that agreement and we really believe, the Executive Committee believes, and I strongly believe, that the University has money for many, many initiatives that it wants to fund and it should certainly be able to find the money to double the allotment as it is now and that we should not have to take that out of what generally has been a very minimal economic package that CUNY has offered us. I would speak against removing this sentence.

Professor Jack Zevin (Secondary Education and Youth Services, Queens College) - I have a lot to say about this but I'll try to make it very short and to the point. I have had the privilege of serving on the UCRA Executive Committee and I'm the head of one of the panels that awards grants. I would favor removing the sentence because to the best of my knowledge the PSC/CUNY awards are managed and part of the PSC contract and it seems to me that changing the funding source and not making it a bargaining issue on the forthcoming contract would really alter the way that the awards are given and I think it would diminish faculty control over the awards. It would no longer, in a way I think, be our awards. I don't entirely understand the purpose of the sentence and the argument. I think it should be a PSC/CUNY issue and that doubling the money is really a very, very small amount given the entire budget.

Professor Stefan Baumrin - Rarely do I have the pleasure of being able to agree with Professor Friedman entirely. I only want to add that there's plenty of money and it doesn't have to come out of the money for the PSC negotiations. / Chair Philipp- Professor Levine, to the amendment please.

Professor Alfred Levine (Engineering Science and Physics, College of Staten Island) – I wish to speak in favor of deleting the sentence, reaching the opposite conclusion from my colleague, Professor Baumrin, for the same reason that he stated. If indeed part of, for example the CUNY campaign, which currently is raising \$1.5 billion, a donor were to appear and donate \$6 million for the PSC research awards, would we then say that this must be part of the negotiation? I do not care where the money comes from, whether it's part of the negotiation, donation, money put in our budget in Albany, money put in as the Vallone Research Award Program, money found on the street, all I want is the money. Let's get rid of the sentence.

Professor Vasilios Petratos (Political Science, Economics & Philosophy, College of Staten Island) – I think it would solve the issue of where the money comes from if the word “existing” is taken out. Therefore it reads “This increase should be made out of university funds,” as opposed to “existing university funds” with those connotations. That would be sound whether it comes from philanthropy or any other sources including the agreement as well. / Chair Philipp- Thank you, is that acceptable? / Professor Richardson- If coming out of university funds does not preclude that it can come out of PSC/CUNY negotiations then I would agree to it. / Chair Philipp- You'll have to make a decision about whether you agree or not as a friendly amendment to your motion. It's simply the language, do you agree or do you not agree? / Professor Richardson- Then I don't agree. / Chair Philipp- You don't agree, OK.

Professor Susan O'Malley (English, Kingsborough Community College) - I am going to agree with Stefan and I don't always agree with Stefan. I think it's extremely important that this stays in. Now, what happens in bargaining? I'm not on the bargaining committee. What happens is that a certain amount of money gets given to the union and they figure out how it's going to be divvied up. What will happen is that they will play us against each other. In other words, we will be blamed or the union will be blamed, but you didn't take money out of salaries to put into the PSC/CUNY, you didn't take money out of the welfare fund, and you put.... You see, they're not nice in negotiations, not at all. What we don't want is to be played against each other and that's my fear. I want the most money we can get. This is so woefully under funded but we've got to do it wisely. /

Chair Philipp- I'd like to bring this amendment to a vote. All in favor of deleting this sentence please say “Aye.” All opposed? Abstentions. OK, it is not deleted unless somebody wants a detailed vote which I hope we do not do. Let's go to the motion itself. Further discussion on the basic underlying motion which is not changed? / Unidentified Speaker- I didn't really hear too much of a difference between Yay and Nay. / Chair Philipp- Then we have to have a written vote. / Executive Director Phipps - We can have six negative votes; we can just do it that way. If there are more than six negative votes it fails. / Chair Philipp- Because of the *Perez* quorum rules; let's see who is opposed to this motion, if it is more than six. Is that correctly phrased? Let's repeat the vote. How many are in favor of the motion to delete this sentence raise your hand please? OK, Bill. Now how many are opposed to this motion to delete this sentence? More than six, OK, thank you. Now, let's go on to the fundamental motion itself. Professor Sank- I'm concerned about Item Number 5. I have mixed feelings about this because adjuncts

are in a sense treated as second class citizens, at least in terms of their salaries. I'm also aware that the reality of it is that there is a cap or pie concept in funding so if money will go to adjuncts somehow I think it will be lost to full time faculty. I have a bigger enigma-- what if an adjunct should get funding and then not be reappointed the following year? Let's say they need the lab the following year. / Chair Philipp- I think it's safe to say that if they're no longer employed by the university they will not have the money. / Professor Sank- It's a strange situation. / Chair Philipp- As has been suggested, untenured faculty who get an award and then lose their job are in the same position, equally strange. OK, Professor Crain, do you wish to discuss this motion?

Professor William Crain– I do. Just say I'm glad that the adjuncts are put in there, Number 5 is the adjuncts, they're part of our workforce. They're part of us and I think good things could come of this and I'm glad to see it. It's not put in here but I would say open it up to the adjuncts regardless of whether we get more funding or not. They're part of our community and it's time we recognize them as full citizens.

Professor Philip Pecorino (Social Sciences Department, Queensborough Community College) - It's a point of clarification. I support the measure but I'm practically minded. If this body does pass, to whom are the communications sent? It seems like it ought to be directed to more than one agency or unit of this university. Could you explain to us what happens if this body does approve. / Chair Philipp – We'll put it in the public record, we will send it to the Chancellor, we will send it to the Trustees, and we'll send it to the UCRA, everyone who is concerned with this measure.

Professor Jack Zevin- I apologize for coming back again but I have spent a lot of time on this. I have a comment and a question. The comment is that it seems to me, having done this many years that it does matter quite a bit how the grant is administered. I think that having it come out of university funds and having come out of the PSC/CUNY could result in quite different operations, I'm not sure quite what would happen but I agree with Professor Levine that it really doesn't matter in some ways how it's funded as long as it gets the substantial increase that it needs. After all, this university is about research, at least in good part, and I think we're at a desperate point in terms of the development of this program because it's stuck in my opinion. The other thing is that I'd like to hear from Professor Friedman or O'Malley. I don't quite understand the nature of the opposition because it seems to me that if this money is coming out of the PSC contract then it seems to me in previous contracts the PSC should have abandoned or given back or rearranged other possibilities for the .../ Chair Philipp- Professor Zevin, may I interrupt? That question has been settled by the vote on the amendment so it's no longer up for discussion. / Professor Zevin- I apologize. / Chair Philipp- We do have a limited amount of time. We have to discuss the issues on the floor; we have a guest who's waiting.

Professor Vasilios Petratos- Concerning matter 5 here apparently the makers of the motion put a conditional term there that 5 should pass if 1 is approved. Am I correct? / Chair Philipp- No, this stands as it stands. / Professor Petratos- Without any conditions? / **Chair Philipp**- Yes. / Professor Petratos- OK, then I'm in support of number 5 the way it is. I think adjuncts ought to be incorporated .

Professor Mike Vozick– Commendations to the insights of those who have put in Number 5 and to Professor Sank’s point. Any successes that adjuncts might have under these grants would redound to the credit of their departments, their colleges and the university as a whole. This is a move to strengthen the university. / Chair Philipp- Thank you very much. I now bring this matter to a vote. All in favor of this please say “Aye”. All opposed to this motion? All people who abstain? Thank you very much. We have a guest. This was close to unanimous. Our guest now is Professor Rosemary Feals. She is from the MLA, and she will be speaking on the Modern Language Association Task Force on Evaluating Scholarship for Tenure and Promotion. Professor Feals, it’s a pleasure to have you here.

III. C. Report of Modern Language Association Task Force on Evaluating Scholarship for Tenure and Promotion, Dr. Rosemary Feals:

- Thank you, I’m glad to be here. I’m at the Modern Language Association but I am on leave from SUNY Buffalo where I was Professor of Spanish, particularly Latin American Literature. I’m really glad to have the opportunity to talk to you this evening. Domna Stanton who is here in the Graduate School in French was not able to come tonight and she asked me to do the honors. Domna chaired a task force for the Modern Language Association when she was its president on evaluating scholarship for tenure and promotion, and one of the questions that we heard before about this shift in what counts in universities and how it counts is exactly what I want to talk about today. I’m going to speak very briefly and I see that you like to ask questions so I’d much rather make my presentation concise, send you to MLA.org for our complete report, and leave you with the Executive Summary and take your questions and discussions. Now, the reason we established this task force was because of the perceived creep in tenure requirements at all kinds of institutions, not just doctoral granting institutions, and what’s often called the tyranny of the monograph as an absolute requirement for tenure. Similarly, the devaluation, if you will, of teaching and service. We really wanted to look at what has changed in tenure and promotion and to that end we did a statistical survey. Some of you probably even got it and took it.

What I’m about to tell you refers specifically to the fields the MLA represents, English and the Modern Languages but except for the Hard Sciences you’re going to see a lot of parallels with any of the fields that you’re in. I think the Sciences have different criteria although some of the issues that I’m going to talk about certainly will impact. The first thing we wanted to ask is “What is the rate of tenuring?” because we were really concerned about what we were hearing about how few people were getting through the eye of the needle. You probably won’t be surprised to learn that of those who go up for tenure at the institution who hired them on the tenure track, 90% of those get tenure but it’s what happens before that that really is the picture and that’s the first slide that you see. In our fields, languages, of the 100 people who get a doctorate, only about 60 of them go on to get a tenure track position within the first five years

We think it’s important to show the whole path so that that 90% tenure rate is really 34 of 100 doctorates in English or Foreign Languages are getting tenure. We looked at the monograph and how it counts in institutions and what you’ll see here is that in doctoral granting institutions, 88.8% say that the

monograph is important to earning tenure. In master's institutions it's nearly half and in baccalaureate's it's really half. As far as requiring more publication for tenure, this shows you the percentage of departments where the importance of publication has increased and you can clearly see that creep. Where is that creep most noticeable? In the baccalaureate institutions and the master's granting institutions. This is what we mean by "Tenure Requirement Creep." Or trickle down; it's the Doctorate Institutions Standard that has crept to Master or baccalaureate institutions.

Unfortunately our survey did not encompass AA granting institutions so I'm not able to make a comment specifically about those institutions. Now, when we asked about how departments look at digital scholarship, scholarship produced in a digital environment, we found that the familiarity of departments remains quite limited and that quite a few institutions, including in the doctoral sector, either don't have experience evaluating digital scholarship or don't count them. This is a grave concern to the Modern Language Association and I imagine all of you because younger scholars, all scholars, are increasingly working in a digital environment and yet departments either don't count or have no experience counting that scholarship on the whole.

This tells you specifically about refereed articles in digital formats in the different Carnegie types and this tells you about the shifts in teaching and publication between 1967 and 2005. The Modern Language Association and the National Council of Teachers of English studied the situation in the 1960's so we were able to make a contrast. You can see what's changed is not teaching. At the great majority of institutions teaching still counts for tenure but now you see in the 2005 survey that publication counts heavily at 75% of institutions whereas in the late '60's it was only about a third. Going back to Professor Sank, what you were saying before and this gives you the statistical evidence of how our work counts at institutions.

We also ask what resources college and universities give to their junior faculty members, with the notion that if you're going to require high tenure publications then you ought to be funding research leaves and incentives to do that kind of scholarship and not surprisingly we see that in the doctoral institutions there are things like summer research funds and other research funds but we also see in the master's and baccalaureate sector, and this is fairly new in the history of the academy to see resources in those other sectors. These are statistics on the start up packages and subventions offered to junior faculty members, again doctoral institutions; the great majority do offer these. Then, you see in the master's institutions much less economic support for what we call a start up package or subvention to publish a manuscript or in the case of the sciences your page fees.

Notice again that it's the master's granting institutions where the tenure creep has been most noticeable but we don't see a corresponding creep in the resources given to faculty members which leads to real pressure on faculty members when they're asked to produce so heavily and they're not given corresponding resources. This is the percentage offering junior leaves, again, doctoral institutions, virtually all of them value the monograph but only 65% of them offer paid leaves. This is the average support. It might look like a lot at a doctoral institution to say \$21,000 but you have to divide it over the

life of the junior faculty's pre-tenure years and that's typically 6 so that's not a heck of a lot of money in support of their research. We also asked about the use of outside letters. I know many of you have received requests to write such letters. We found that the great majority of all types of institutions require outside letters and we also found that the doctoral institutions, virtually all of them, correspondingly less in master's and baccalaureate but look at the average number of letters required: 5.1 in the doctorate.

That's just average, so when you look at the number of letters required at the doctoral, plus you've got nearly 17% of the doctorate asking for 7 or more. I was tenured before I went to Buffalo. I was at Rochester and we were asked to have 12 outside letters as a minimum, a minimum -- it's absurd. This is not completely atypical, look at the 6, the 5. Not only are we requiring scholars to do more and more for tenure, we're also requiring tenured scholars elsewhere to participate in this hyperinflation of credentialing in what we in our MLA report call outsourcing, because frankly colleges and universities rather than having their tenure committees first in the department then university-wide take care of the evaluation process, they are continuously increasing the degree to which these processes are outsourced. Outside reviews for books, outside reviews for these letters, even third year reviews sometimes require letters from the outside. I've been asked to write them, so I know about this.

We see that in the Carnegie doctorate institutions, they have the largest faculties, they have the largest number therefore of candidates who come up for tenure so the multiplier effect throughout the system of those large institutions asking for 6 or 7 letters, you can really feel that impact. We also asked "Who's rethinking their tenure and promotion criteria?" and we did find out that about half are not doing any consideration and the other half have either been considering recently or plan to reconsider and we hope that our report will indeed help pave the way. Now, if I had to sum up the recommendations in two words, the first word would be this, "Institutions should support what they value." If they want publications as the primary criterion for tenure, they must support that. The second is "Institutions should align their tenure and promotion standards with their mission." It makes absolutely no sense to the MLA, and I hope to you, to have tenure standards that do not match the institutional mission, the stated mission, and that which the institution supports in terms of the support to the faculty for what they carry out. I promised to stop, I'm stopping and I'd rather open it up to discussion. / **Chair Philipp-** Thank you, that was very informative.

Professor William Crain- Thank you for report and your presentation. I'm in psychology, but I agree from what I know about the tyranny of the monograph, the tyranny of the book, there's no alternate routes. / **Professor Feals-** We're proposing them in our report. / **Professor Crain-** I understand and appreciate that. I can't believe, unless we're idiosyncratic, I can't believe that teaching is valued at the same level as scholarship. I think it's probably because this is based on interviewing Deans and Administrators and they're giving you a party line. / **Professor Feals-** Yes, they are. / **Professor Crain-** When I went to City College as a young man, I was told, "Don't waste your time teaching. Publish because otherwise you're dead." Informally everybody says that. / **Professor Feals-** It's the lip service -- they say that teaching matters. At Rochester, the line was "You have to clear the bar on teaching, if

you're not an excellent teacher you can't get tenure." But, it's understood that it's the publications that will put you over, not the teaching. They say it's important but what we're saying in our report is, "Are you putting your resources behind that? Are you helping faculty members in their teaching?" / Professor Crain- Do you have ways of encouraging that? / Professor Feals- We do, so I'll have you read the report.

Professor Mike Vozick- I'm sure you're aware that CUNY is a uniquely integrated institution with community colleges as well as senior colleges. I notice that your study was essentially about senior colleges. I wondered if in the course of the study you had picked up any information in your literature, researches, etc. about how community colleges are being affected? / Professor Feals- That's certainly on our minds. Unfortunately the membership of the MLA has a small percentage of community college members and most of those who answered our survey were connected to the MLA. What we have found is that community colleges, and again not a surprise to those of you who teach there, have been increasing their entrance requirements for faculty members, meaning the degrees that faculty members hold. Even though we weren't able to document the creep, we saw the creep throughout the entire system. Our presumption in talking to community college faculty members is that even though the shift isn't so great there has certainly been a noticeable impact on this trickledown of credentialing and increasing all across the board, in degrees held, publications required.

Professor Lenore Beaky (English Department, LaGuardia Community College) – Let me urge you and the MLA to consider doing a follow-up survey of the community colleges. It is certainly our experience of the community colleges here at CUNY that exactly this creep is taking place, certainly taking place at my place, the importance of publication and all of that. I hope that this is under consideration. / Professor Feals- We have a committee on community colleges and a recently elected member of our Executive Council is from a community college, so we are paying more and more attention to those issues. I will take this back.

Professor Angela Crossman (Psychology, John Jay College of Criminal Justice) – This is just a question in general about the data. Do you have a sense about whether there are some market forces behind this which universities are capitalizing on? It's harder to get a job -- there's a lot of Ph.D.'s so the standards coming in are higher? / Professor Feals- It's exactly how we phrased it. We've called it a narrowing down of the profile of faculty members because at this point with the buyer's market the way it is, at least in Humanities, institutions of all kinds from community colleges to doctoral granting institutions can hire whomever they want. You can say, "We as a community college want Ph.D.'s and one book under contract." And you can get that because of the buyer's market. We say that's not a good thing for the profession because it leads to this disjuncture that I talked about between Mission and Standards. It also narrows the profile of scholars by saying that just because we can get one book and 12 refereed articles doesn't mean that those profiles of scholars are the only kind we want to see at institutions. Many of us, and I include myself in this group, probably wouldn't be hired today with the profiles that we had. I'm sorry I think we all should be on campuses and yet with the buyer's market institutions can afford to play the ratings game and say that they will only hire those who already have got enough credentials, practically, to be tenured. That's bad for the profession as a whole. Hopefully,

the job market will shift. It won't shift as long as we continue to hire predominantly off the tenure track, but as conditions shift we're going to find ourselves with another disjuncture between the kinds of professors we want and we need and those who have narrowed their scholarly profile to fit what institutions are prizing at the moment.

Professor Diane Sank- I'm so pleased to hear your report because of what we've been hearing at City College. What you're saying is that if the emphasis is to be placed on research, then more funds should come from the college to support research. At City, right now the attitude is that we spend half a million dollars, or three quarters of a million dollars -- I was told personally to set up a lab for this professor, that we want him or her to go out and get grants to pay us back, it's like a business. We invested money; we want to get the same back or more. This is the attitude in terms of reappointment. They're saying to professors, which is really not proper because the PSC contract does not allow this to be said, that "you've been reappointed for the next year but your external funding is questionable." In other words, the emphasis is again on funding. The point here is that at City College we're mainly an undergraduate college and people are doing research and they do very little teaching. The question came up if someone got a seven figure grant and they were bad at teaching would they be phased out at City College? The whole question here is diversity. In other words we want excellent researches and if they're not the greatest teachers then let them spend more time doing research, but we also want people who will satisfy the needs of the undergraduate students. / Professor Feals- You've hit two points that I think ought to be stressed. One is the corporatization of the university has had some of these effects. The second is that it's a question of balance. We've got the system, right now, out of balance. We need people who attract zillions of dollars in research money, we need professors to write their books and scholarship, that's what we do at institutions of higher education. But it's out of balance right now. The emphasis is heavily skewed to the funding and the research publications and we don't have enough faculty members on the tenure track so that we have enough people for the classroom. It's really out of kilter here, in general, not everywhere.

Professor Laurence Splitter (Curriculum & Teaching, Hunter College) - I'm the director at Hunter's Center for Teaching Excellence and we've been having some of these discussions, obviously not with these details, but it occurs to me and I wonder if you agree with it, that there's a kind of a tension that perhaps we feel ourselves -- interesting that we just heard from one of the Vice Chancellor's who was talking about showcasing the university via its eminent scholars and students. There, it seemed to me that it's all seamless, teaching, research, it all comes together. I'm glad that you've reminded us that there is a distinction. Isn't it true, when I say tension, that if we push forth more resources for research it's almost like saying that we agree that teaching is not as important. We need to have these discussions ourselves; do we really think that teaching is important? You refer to the mission statements of the university and the colleges. I'm assuming by that you mean reference to teaching because they all talk about being superb teaching institutions and then the message is that we want more resources for research. I just think there's a kind of a tension there. / Professor Feals- When I say mission, I don't just mean the Mission Statement which often has all sorts of stuff in it. I mean also the way in which the higher administration allocates resources according to what they purport to be doing, in other words, the

inactive mission. In listening to what you said, one of the things that immediately comes to mind is that the people we have to convince about this problem. It's not ourselves on the faculty; it's the deans and the provosts and those who make those tenure decisions and who make the funding decisions. We really have to convince them that it is not in our student's best interests, and of course our own best interests as well rounded faculty members, to keep this tension and this division between excellent teaching and excellent research going. I think that the institutions that have sought to make a better balance have happier faculty members and certainly have happier students. Students who only have access to freeway flyers and whose tenured professors are always off in the research lab or in the library are not happy campers either. There has to be a much better integration between the research and the teaching missions. / Chair Philipp- What are freeway flyers? / Professor Feals- Freeway flyers are adjunct professors who have to cobble together a living; in New York we would be subway and bus, Subway schleppers.

Professor Phil Pecorino- I'm looking forward to seeing your entire report because you've mentioned a few phrases -- I hope there's more material in there and I'm going to follow up on them now. We have different perspectives from which we view this. We're academicians, so we can look at how there's teaching, there's service, there's publications and research. That's not necessarily the way the managerial class looks at this. They have a different model but we do our best to try and deal with it. In part it was because of our focus as academicians and disciplines on research and publications that we allowed, to a large degree, a managerial class to come in and start taking over some of the functions that were reserved to the faculty. Now we have Boards of Trustee members who are appointed because of their corporate connections and political connections. We have Chief Operating Officers of our universities and colleges who are not academicians and a structure of accountability that stresses productivity. It's easier to count the publications than the quality of our teaching can be measured. / Professor Feals- But we've given up that insistence. / Professor Pecorino- That's right, and they'll count the percentage who graduate because it's quantifiable, but they don't examine the degree to which the importance of research takes away from our ability to spend time raising the retention rates and the graduation rates. This disparity between the ways in which people approach the entire enterprise, the mission, is manifested in a number of different ways. Until we get at this root core, we're not going to turn it around. One of the things, as you already said, is for faculty to take back their proper role in making the key decisions. Turn around the criteria. I see in your enumerated list of recommendations, the making of things transparent, and you place that with department chairs and faculty to do this. I think you're right. If we take up those recommendations and begin to enact our explication of what we expect, it will be hard for them to then override us but most of us are not, we see the body here, we don't get full attendance. People aren't into governance and the reversal of the process. So in the large report do you follow up on these things? And will you follow up with them in the future? / Professor Feals- We will absolutely follow up and this kind of going out and talking to faculties is one of the ways we're following up and we urge you to communicate with us. Again, Domna Stanton right here at the Graduate Center is the key person on this report and it's thanks to her that we've gotten as far as we have. A shout out to Domna wherever you are tonight! Absolutely, and what we also discovered was that tenure committees and deans and provosts say they count on the field to articulate its standards and

you guys in English publish books, that's what you tell us. Or you guys in foreign languages do translations or whatever it is that you do, so it's up to us in the field to articulate what constitutes high quality investigation scholarship and to do that evaluation among ourselves. It's time in a sense to go back to the days when the tenure committees would sit around and read everybody's stuff and pass judgment on it because that's what we're trained to do. That's why we have Ph.D.'s in the discipline, because we are trained to evaluate scholarship and to know good stuff and to know not-so-good stuff. /

Chair Philipp- Thank you. You do have my report in written form; I should add though that there are some new developments that I didn't have time to put in that written report because they happened today. You're aware of the move to restructure Engineering and Science Doctoral Programs in CUNY. On Thursday the City College Senate will vote to establish independent doctoral programs in Engineering at City, not at the Graduate Center, not consortially. Also, on Thursday the City College Senate will vote to establish Doctoral Programs in Chemistry, Bio-Chemistry and the other Sciences in a consortial way but also based at City College. These are shoes that are dropping. I think I've been reporting on the task force in the Sciences and that it's been going on for a while and so that process is going forward by Fall '08 we will have a different structure in the Doctoral Programs, that affects the entire university. It is limited for the moment to the sciences and engineering but I don't think that in the long run it will be so limited. One other development that is not in the written report -- there are two newspaper reports that the university has moved to invoke eminent domain against the Structural Biology Center which is located on the City College campus; eminent domain because this is on CUNY property and the Structural Biology is resolutely blocking the construction of three new buildings next to them because of the vibrations in the construction process. This affects the entire university because the Structural Biology Center is a consortium of Columbia, Rockefeller, NYU and other universities around the region. CUNY only gave the land, but they gave the money. The other way it affects the entire university is because two of the three buildings in question are slated to belong to the Advanced Science Research Center, a CUNY-wide facility, which the Chancellery is pushing very hard in connection with their restructuring efforts in the doctoral programs. I've had discussions about this with City College President Gregory Williams last week, and today Stefan Baumrin who is the Chair of the Structure Committee of the Graduate Council had discussions with the Provost at the Graduate Center. I will keep you posted. At the same time I have to say that this has been a very good year, and we've done some good work. One of the important things is that we've been pushing to get information from the Chancellery. We today had one significant victory -- we got information on indirect cost recoveries for the first time. There is a mandate that these dollar amounts be given to the Board of Trustees every two years. That mandate has been ignored since its inception over a decade ago and today we got the first spreadsheet. It came too late in the day to distribute to you; we're going to demand other such documents. For the first time the faculty will know on their campus, approximately, in gross categories at least, how their indirect cost recoveries are being spent. Having said that I do think this has been a useful and productive year, and I look forward to the next year. Thank you for all the work you've done in the committees and have a good summer.