

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

April 17, 2007

The meeting was called to order by UFS Chair Philipp at 6:40 p.m. in Room 9205/06/07 at the Graduate School and University Center. 71 voting members of 118 were present.

**Baruch:** Present – Dumas, Hill, Martell, Vora, and Alternate Aubry. Absent – Albright, Freedman, Pollard, and Smith. Vacancies – 1. **BMCC:** Present – Friedman, Martinez-Lopez, Niyazov, Persaud, and Rani. Absent – Agwu, Belknap, and Roy. **Bronx CC:** Present – None. Absent – Alozie, Asimakopoulos, and Durante. Vacancies —2. **Brooklyn:** Present – Antoniello, Tobey, and Viscusi. Absent – Bell, Bloomfield, Cherukupalli, Jacobson, Rodman, Shapiro, and Wills. **CCNY:** Present – Crain, Daglish, Khalil, and Sank. Absent – Habib, Lascar, and Leonard. Vacancies – 2. **CSI:** Present – Cooper, Foleno, Levine, and Alternates Stearns and Zimmerman. Absent – Jayatilleke, Klibaner, Petratos, Yousef, and Alternate Schumann. **CUNY Law School:** Present – McArdle. Absent – Lung. **Graduate School:** Present – Baumrin, Lerner, and Nolan. Absent – Cross, Matthews-Salazar, and Orenstein. **Hostos CC:** Present – August, Pimentel, and Alternate Sharma. Absent – Bernardini. Vacancies - 1. **Hunter:** Present – Palanda, and Splitter. Absent – Friedman, Guzzetta, Kaye, Krishnamachari, McCormick, Sherrill, St. Hill, Wimberly. Vacancies – 1. **John Jay:** Present – Crossman, Kaplowitz, King-Toler, Kubic, and Alternates Chaffie and Soto-Fernandez. Absent – Caldwell, Pascoe, and Romero. **Kingsborough CC:** Present – Barnhart, Galvin, Hume, and Wood. Absent – O’Malley, and Ruoff. **LaGuardia CC:** Present – Beaky, Lerman, Mettler, and Shean. Absent – Davidson, and Rushing. **Lehman:** Present – Aronowitz, Jervis, Kolb, Marianetti, Mineka, and Philipp. **Medgar Evers:** Present – Barker, Hastick, Hope, and Alternate Daly. Absent – Stewart. **NYCCT:** Present – Cermele, Horelick, Hounion, Karthikeyan, and Richardson. Absent – Dreyer and Alternates McManus and Paynayotakis. **Queens:** Present – Bird, Gonzalez, Savage, and Zevin. Absent – Brody, Casco, Habib, Moore, and Tse. Vacancies – 2. **Queensborough CC:** Present – Barbanel, Pecorino, and Alternate Burleson. Absent – Hest, Iconis, and Jacobowitz. Vacancies – 1. **York:** Present – Frank and Lewis. Absent – Divale, and Rosenthal. Newly elected Senators and Alternates Kurzyna, Nash, Sweetnam, Vozick, and Wein attended. Professor Martin (BMCC) was a guest.

Vice Chancellor Malave, and President Fernandez (Lehman College) attended.

**Governance Leaders present:** Baurmin (GS), Cooper (CSI), Mettler (LaGuardia), Kaplowitz (John Jay), Levine (CSI), Martell (Baruch), Mettler (LaGuardia), Pecorino (QCC), Raj (CCNY), Savage (Queens), Tobey (Brooklyn), Vendryes (York) , and Young (Hunter) attended. Parliamentarian Andrea McArdle, 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 327<sup>th</sup> Plenary Session: Minutes were approved as distributed.
- III. Reports (Recorded in Reports & Deliberations)
  - A. Chair.
  - B. President Ricardo Fernandez, Lehman College.
  - C. Vice Chancellor for Budget Ernesto Malave.

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

Parliamentarian and Chair of the Legal Affairs Committee McArdle reviewed the election fact sheet and opened the nominations.

Senator Baurmin nominated Senator Pecorino,  
Senator Cooper nominated Senator Levine,  
Senator Beaky nominated Senator Friedman,  
Senator Pecorino nominated Senator Baumrin, and  
Senator Stearns nominated Senator Cooper.

Nominations remain open through the election on May 15<sup>th</sup>.

V. New Business:

Chair Philipp made a special presentation to the Faculty Governance Leaders. They were each awarded a medal of recognition to be worn at commencement and other official functions, to much applause.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Bill Phipps  
Executive Director

REPORTS AND DELIBERATIONS OF  
THE THREE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-EIGHTH PLENARY  
OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE  
OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

April 17, 2007

III. Reports:

**A. Chair:** Now you have in your packet the report from the Chair, but since our guests are here, I would like to change this order slightly. President of Lehman College, Ricardo Fernandez, who is the board chair of the American Council of Education, attended the most recent post-Spellings meeting in Washington. And because of his attendance, I thought he'd come here to tell us about it. The Spellings Commission, you know, is called by Secretary of Education Margaret Spellings to discuss the future of higher education in the United States. We had our fall conference on the Spellings Commission Report. And after that report came out, Secretary Spellings called an implementation group into being which had close to 300 people on it. The only representative from the City University of New York was in fact President Fernandez. And so accordingly, I asked him to come here and give us a short presentation. And there will be some Q&A afterwards on how that meeting went. So, it's with pleasure that I introduce President Ricardo Fernandez.

**B. President Ricardo Fernandez, Lehman College:** Thank you, Manfred. I'm pleased to be with you this evening. I would like to perhaps just make a few comments initially, and then open it up to questions. I'm sure there are a number of questions that will come up that you already have or that may come up as a result of some of the things that I may have to say about the commission, the report, and more importantly, I think, looking forward, what the impact of that report is going to be on higher education. In general, I would say that we all like to think of letter grades and the best grade you can get is an A, and this report is about the three As: access, affordability, and accountability. That's essentially the three main themes of this. Education is big business in this country. By that I mean that there are billions, hundreds of billions of dollars that are being spent in this enterprise that has grown tremendously over the last 25, 30 years. It has become essential to acquire higher education if one is to aspire to obtain some sort of a job that will enable a person to raise a family and have any chance of becoming middle class. I'm not talking about wealthy people, I'm talking about people who make a living. And the commission, given certain indicators such as the increasing cost of tuition, the problem of access

that is caused in part by the increased tuition, and by increasing calls given the amount of money that is being invested in higher education, is interested in what are the outcomes? What's a product, what is the accountability? How do we demonstrate that these investments in the eyes of legislators and policy-makers are indeed worthy of continuing to be made? Beyond that, I think there's a broader issue, which is the sort of blurring between the public and the private that has increasingly been visible in American society in general. Education and higher education, certainly education at the K-12 level, has always been considered a public good. In fact, it's something so necessary that we don't make it optional, we mandate it. Students and their parents are forced to send their kids to school. Now, they don't have to go to public school, you can go to private school, but you must go to school somewhere. Higher education, however, is not mandated, but it is made available extensively to individuals at all levels. And in fact, I would say that one of the beauties of American education is that it has so many entry points into higher education. We have some of the best colleges and universities in the world by anyone's standards. We have some of the best graduate schools, certainly, and research universities. We also have four-year schools, public schools, private schools, small liberal arts colleges, and two-year schools where the bulk of Americans go to college -- 40% or so of all students in higher education attend community colleges. And yet, one of the glaring omissions of the commission, of the Spellings Commission, is that there was not one single representative of two-year institutions as a member of that. And that there was really no mention at all, there was mention in terms of transfer, there was mention in terms of cost of tuition, but those costs have gone up significantly, not just at the four-year schools, but more importantly, in the community colleges, which is for many students the entry point, certainly for many students within the City University. A recent report, and there's been a slew of them, talks about, "The "Perfect Storm" put out by Educational Testing Service and you can find it on the web site. By the way, two of the best resources that any of you who wish to follow this, some of you may already be receiving this information, but one of the best documents that I can think of that comes out on a regular basis is a publication *National Crosstalk* by the National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education. And every two or three times a year, they publish a publication that is distributed widely across the country. You can download it on PDF. It's very, very comprehensive and an excellent reference. They recently published a series of critiques or commentary by various individuals on, the Spellings Commission. But *The Perfect Storm*" is an ETS report, but I'd say there's been a number of reports and the magazine of the American Association of State

Colleges and Universities, AASCU, and they are talking about public universities in the 21st century. I mean, AAU, AAUSC, the private schools, the public schools, everybody's writing reports. In fact, it's overwhelming sometimes, the number of reports that have come out on this topic. But *The Perfect Storm* talks about three forces that are coming at the same time, that are converging. One is that the graduation rates from high school are stable in this country, and in some cases if you disaggregate it by groups, you find that they don't go over 50% for many students. Hispanic students have had a particular problem, and African American students. Overall, you could say that the graduation rate is 70%. But it's been stable over the last ten, 20 years. Not much has changed in that area. And compared to what other nations are doing, this is very low. Now one could argue, and in fact I heard someone say, that we measure everybody. We include everybody. In China they don't include everybody. So, in India, or in some other parts of the world, the statistics don't include every single student the way we do. So even accounting for that, there are some problems in that area that have been recognized. I'm not going to really dwell on that. Let's just take this as a fact. The achievement rates as measured by things like the National Assessment for Education Progress and other standards that the federal government has been utilizing over the last 20 or 30 years essentially tell us that there's a problem. Students start off at the elementary level with certain levels of reading and mathematics, and as they go up the grades those numbers begin to fall. And when you contrast that with students in other countries, our students are really falling below. And that creates a real issue. Now there's also been some significant changes in our economy. And one of the issues has to do with disparities in income. We have a growing gap between people who are rich and wealthy -- and I'm talking not just wealthy, I'm talking about filthy wealthy -- and people who are poor or middle class, or downright poor. They really have a problem. And every time I read statistics in the New York Times, that gap is growing even more in part because the skills that are now required to get into certain kinds of jobs, the best-paying jobs, the ones that really allow you to make a lot of money when you cash in all the stock that you have been given when you start with one of these software companies or some other IPO, are much more dependent on higher education than ever before. And that's a situation that's not going to change in any significant way. We also have a series of demographic changes that are quite visible in our society. Hispanics, for example, have grown to become the second largest -- the largest -- minority group. And it's projected by, depending on which projection, but whether it's 20-25 or 20-50 years, they're going to be about a quarter of all Americans. Now, one of the issues, going

back to the previous comment that I made, is that the kinds of achievement rates and the kinds of graduation rates that this group which will constitute 25% of our population in about 40, 40 something years, are not equivalent to the people that are now holding certain jobs and certain skills, and we're going to have a real problem because these individuals are not going to be able to hold the kinds of jobs that will require certain levels of education. They will be condemned to other kinds of jobs, and therefore will not be producing the right kind of income. Our standard of living could conceivably go down in a very significant way. This is a real problem because it's a silent kind of thing that most politicians won't -- even worry about getting elected the next time around -- have a hard time understanding and in some cases doing something about it. It's also more complex than that, I don't mean to accuse politicians of not trying to do the right thing. I think many of them indeed do that. But the competition for dollars in the public sector has grown tremendously. We have, I include myself in that area, a growing number of people over the age of 60. Some of us are going to be retiring and at some point we're going to be collecting Social Security, I hope, those of us that have paid enough and so on. As you get older, things go wrong, and you need more medical attention. So we're competing for dollars with Medicare, Medicaid, we're competing with other kinds of very significant pressures on the state budget, as we all know in New York. We're also competing with things like prisons. We're also competing with other kinds of investments. So out of all that, we come to the Spellings Commission. And the Spellings Commission talks about access, affordability, and accountability. The access is a real problem because fewer students -- because of the costs involved, it is estimated that about 400,000 students every year -- one of the studies that I read - are unable, even though they're able academically to go to college, they won't be able to enroll because of that. If you add that throughout a decade you're talking about between 1.4 and 2.4 million people. So affordability is a major issue. And accountability, I just want to focus on that because the cost of tuition is a major issue across the country. Surveys that I have seen indicate that America and most Americans have no idea what the actual cost of going to college is. A lot of it is inflated, and it's mostly the sticker price that you read about. But between the sticker price and the real cost, there's a lot of subsidy, a lot of discounting, not just in the private sector but in the public sector that I think has to be taken into consideration. Some of the solutions that are being proposed are problematic. Some universities have said, "you know what, we're going to fix tuition for four years--you're going to pay the same amount of tuition for four years." That's fine, except the next time the next class is going to pay more, in essence subsidizing the people who were before

them and so on down the line. So there is no perfect solution to this. Increasingly, legislatures that have in some cases turned over the power of setting tuition to boards of trustees and boards of regents in a state like Texas, are now saying, “tuition has gone up 69% in five years, so we’re going to take that power back.” So we have a lot of controversy around the country. The final controversy that I want to mention, and I want to stop here to maybe get some questions, is the issue of accountability. Outcomes, learning outcomes, is a major, major concern. We had a debate -- I was present at the fall conference and I heard Benno Schmidt talk about Collegiate Learning Assessment. My college is involved in that. We are looking for transparency. People who invest money in education are saying, “You know, you’re getting a lot of money here. What is the product that we’re getting?” When you talk to the head of a company who says “I’ve hired graduates here and they can’t really do this or do that,” that becomes a problem in a public relations kind of way. So we need to provide some measurable outcomes and evidence that indeed we’re turning out the kinds of products and students that have the right kinds of skills. The final question related to accountability is accreditation. At the more recent event soon after the summit that I attended, the Department of Education published what they called the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, and one of the issues--this is the way the regulations are--published them in the Federal Register--you allow a discussion period, and at some point this becomes the regulation that every college has to accept. One of the real bones of contention is the whole question of transfer of credits. Now transfer of credits from one institution to another is a real issue. It’s a real issue in CUNY, where it’s all within one system. So imagine what it is between systems. And one of the issues here for us that’s being debated in Washington, is the Department of Education is proposing that colleges have to accept all the credit that students bring with them, no matter where they come from, even from institutions that are accredited by national accreditation agencies rather than regional accreditation agencies. You know that on the East Coast, Middle States is really the accreditation agency. And you have the Western States and the Southern Association and so on. There’s about ten of them. There’s also national accreditation agencies. And some of the private, for-profit schools, are accredited nationally. We’ve all read about what the Regents in New York have done in terms of Interboro and some of the excesses. That’s not to say that every private for-profit is the same as Interboro. But on the other hand, for us to have to accept all of the credits and count them! They say you don’t have to -- you have to accept them but you can require more in terms of standards for graduation and giving them a degree, but you have to accept all these credits. And a lot of the privates and a lot of the

American Council on Education and a number of other institutions are dead set against that as a regulation. So this is still in the political arena. If those regulations are indeed published the way it appears that the Department is headed, then obviously, Congress will have to intervene and we're prepared to go to Congress and ask for amendments to budget bills and other types of legislation that will stop that from becoming an official regulation. So I'll stop there and perhaps entertain some questions.

**Chair Philipp:** Thank you very much for your presentation. The Governor is forming a commission on public higher education. Do you think that commission will have an important role? / **President Fernandez** - Oh, absolutely. I think that commission will have a significant say in what the Governor will propose and what the Legislature will entertain. I think it definitely will have a significant impact. And that's something that bears watching closely.

**Professor Sandi Cooper** (Department of History, College of Staten Island): This was extremely helpful. I had the impression from a glancing familiarity with the Spellings Commission that one of its objectives was to substitute a national system for things like the Middle States and to eliminate all of these regional agencies by some kind of national testing which resembles a No Child Left Behind, which, as we all know, is not a brilliant success uniformly in every state. At least that's the impression the news gives me. And I'm wondering whether you can corroborate this or elaborate on this because it seems to me that in addition to forcing us to take Interboro and Taylor Business Institute courses for 60 credits (which will be real helpful to a student who wants to become a computer engineer!) it seems to me that this kind of thing totally undermines every effort we have made, for example, to raise the standards of teacher education, to take one area where we're all involved in professional education on the four-year level. And I can think of a number of other majors and areas where you talk about cutting-edge work that will be undercut by this. I mean, have they ever lined their ducks up? I can't figure out the contradictions in this. Or am I just dreaming? / **President Fernandez** - You're right. There was extensive discussion during the commission on whether the regional accreditation agencies were really working the way that policy-makers expected. In other words, how serious were they, and should we perhaps have national standards. There was a great deal of opposition to that notion of one size fits all, primarily from the private sector. I think a lot of the recommendations that are in the commission's report are more of concern to private institutions than even the public institution. I

think they've sort of backed away a little bit from that specific recommendation or having just one agency rather than the regional accreditors. But the whole issue of what are the standards and how specific should those standards be, they haven't backed away from. So whether it's a national accreditation agency or is it a system of regional accreditation agencies which is what we've had for many, many years, the position of the government is that there should be very specific standards that have to be measurable, and the way to measure those, typically, is by having some sort of external mechanism, some sort of test that whether it's a national test or a series, or a battery of tests, would verify that.

**Professor Dean Savage** (Sociology Department, Queens College): One of the things that was featured in the Spellings Commission Report was quite a bit of emphasis on the need to reform the extremely complicated systems for providing financial aid for students. And you know, you had hope, you thought that they were serious about making some progress to clean up what is an excessively complicated system. But the thing that I'm most reading right now is that Sallie Mae has just been bought for \$25 billion, the management of that firm is going to be vastly enriched, and a higher share of student loans coming from uninsured government loans that are purely private at higher interest rates. We don't see any quick move to regulate this on the part of the government. The outcome of this is that the cost is going to be borne primarily by the students themselves and their families and by the government, eventually, in some way or another. This doesn't seem to me to indicate a real seriousness of purpose in providing more access and better financial aid for students. / President Fernandez -Well, you're absolutely right that the cost and the costs borne by students is significant. Now, in fairness to what Congress recently did, they reduced the interest rates that students will have to pay on some of the loans. I think Chairman Miller and some of the other people in Congress who are in charge of the committees are very concerned about this issue of affordability. And they're even talking about some more drastic steps. A lot of legislatures have capped tuition. You can't raise tuition, in some cases, over a certain percentage, a certain index, or some other way of limiting this. In New York, you know that no tuition increase is allowed unless the legislature votes and allows it. I mean, the Governor can propose it, but ultimately it's up to the legislature. And I just don't see, in New York State, the Board of Regents or the Board of Trustees being given that latitude to set tuition. Now, we have major research universities that really have a funding model that is completely different from what I have at Lehman College or a two-year institution has, and certainly a private school.

So the University of Michigan says, "I only get 9% of the budget of this university and I'm subject to every regulation. So why don't you keep your 9% and let me be a quasi-public institution." That sounds nice in some respects, but it's very dangerous, it seems to me, because policy cannot and should not be set for all of public higher education by major research universities that are the most visible. They're sort of the 900-pound gorillas all over the country, and we have a zoo, because you've got the Berkeleys and you've got the Wisconsin and the Michigans and so on. And those are very powerful voices that sometimes drown the concerns of places like Lehman and some of the CUNY schools, and certainly the community colleges. So in this whole area, I certainly suggest to you the work of Joe Burke, who's up in Albany in the Center for Policy. Find a book published by Jossey Bass in 2005 on this whole issue of how we set policy.

**Professor William Crain** (Psychology Department, City College): Thanks for this presentation. On the one hand the Spellings Commission acknowledges that we have the finest universities in the world and everybody's trying to get in here, and on the other hand they try to say that maybe they won't be the finest or they see bad things coming or something. So therefore we have to step in and regulate them with outcomes and tests to make sure that our universities are doing what they're supposed to be doing. And it's terribly un-democratic. They're going to take federal control of the universities in the same way that the federal government has taken control of the elementary and secondary schools through No Child Left Behind. This is unprecedented to have this amount of central, autocratic control over our schools. And it's going to be the same thing. And I'm very worried. Instead of being a creative professor, I'm going to be teaching to these various tests. Already we have to orient our instruction to the CPE and design our curriculum. And that's just the beginning. I imagine the privates are speaking up. They see the need for more autonomous, individual colleges and universities. But they speak about accountability. Why? Because the states are giving us so much money that we should be accountable to the legislatures -- or the federal government's giving us so much money, we should be accountable to the federal government? No. Most of all, we're accountable to the students. They're increasingly providing our funding. I think that the regulation thing is just a way of gaining control over us. / President Fernandez - But don't forget No Child Left Behind was bi-partisan -- Ted Kennedy was right there. / Professor Crain - That's true, to my amazement. / President Fernandez - It's ironic to me that the largest intrusion into education, which historically has been a state responsibility with

minimal participation, mostly funds, you know, on a limited basis, by the feds, is by Republicans. This is happened in the last several years. But in '98 it was Clinton. So this is not a Democratic/Republican issue. This is an issue of accountability, people on both sides of the aisle pushing for this. So this is not going to go away. / Professor Crain -Vote Green Party!

**Professor Lenore Beaky** (English Department, LaGuardia Community College): There goes our tax exemption! Thank you for mentioning the CLA, one of the measures of accountability. So I was wondering, since, as you said, Lehman is participating in administering the CLA, is that going to continue for the rest of this year? For next year? What are the plans for the CLA at Lehman? / President Fernandez: We started, I think two years ago, when we took a sample of our incoming freshmen and we tested them. We had obtained SAT scores and interestingly, one of the things that happened with the Lehman sample of students was that our students did better than predicted by their SAT scores on the CLA-type test. We're doing a second round. And the idea was really to set a benchmark of where they came in and then at some point we're taking a second measure to see what the value-added has been of their education at Lehman. We're not really focusing on content. These are broader skills in terms of reasoning and critical thinking and so on. And I felt that this was a pilot. I'm not necessarily convinced that this is the best way to do this, but I felt that it was important for us to get some sense of how our students are measuring and what our curriculum does to them over a period of several years. By the time they get to be seniors, they will be taking a test and then we'll be able to measure what the difference is. Let me just say, when I was in college, you know, as my friend Ira Bloom says, in 1802, I was a philosophy major. And I had to take the department of philosophy at Marquette University required me to take the Graduate Record Exam. Now, they didn't care what score I got. My graduation was not contingent on whether I scored X number at a certain level. But they wanted to have a sense of how I compared and every graduate compared to the graduates of philosophy in other schools across the country. Now, whether that's the best way to do that, I don't know. But that's the kind of thinking, back then. These were Jesuits, who were not necessarily - you've got Republicans, you've got Democrats, you've got Independents, God knows what they were. This is, I think, what some people want to see. They want to know, you got a degree from CUNY, if -- how does that compare to a degree from SUNY, or how does that compare to a degree from Michigan? Not necessarily the University of Michigan, but Eastern Michigan, let's

say, or Western Michigan. / Professor Beaky - So Lehman will be continuing with this next year?  
/ President Fernandez - Yes. / Professor Beaky - Thank you.

**Professor Jason Young** (Psychology Department, Hunter College): I certainly agree with Professor Crain's concerns. And one of the consequences, whether intended or not, of this focus on outcomes assessment is really to cast the spotlight on one particular segment of higher education, and that is the liberal arts, because by and large most of the other professional programs already have in place existing means of giving outcomes tests. So what we're talking about is liberal arts. And I'm curious at this forum that you were at, was there much discussion at all about the future of liberal arts education? Because it would seem that the biggest objection most folks are going to have about this is, yeah, how do you water down, how do you standardize a liberal arts education in a way that makes it amenable for comparison across different colleges? / President Fernandez - I would hope it's not watering it down. I mean, I'm a firm believer, I'm a product of a liberal education. And I especially think that public institutions need to be especially committed to giving that kind of broad-based background to all of our students irrespective of where they end up. There was a lot of discussion -- I talked to some of the commissioners -- some of them are professors of the humanities, many are professors, some engineers -- it was really a cross-section of all the disciplines. You're absolutely right. The professional schools have been doing this for a long, long time. This is really no big deal. It's required for accreditation. They're used to it. They put behavioral objectives and other kinds of objectives into their syllabi, because when the student graduates, takes his course, he soon will be able to do X, Y, and Z. Now, what does that mean in terms of philosophy? Well, I don't know. Do I know Plato? Do I know Aristotle? Thomas Aquinas? - / Professor Young "Watering down" refers to the fact that higher education in its best sense is very experimental. And in fact, schools, particularly the folks in charge of dealing with Washington or the accreditation agencies, are going to shy away from these experimental things that might, a) take resources away from focusing on whatever test there is, outcomes text, but b) simply say, well, let's just focus on what's going to make us look good, which is a higher score on these tests. Was there any sense of alarm at the -- / President Fernandez - I think there's concern about that. But ultimately what ends up, after all the debates, is how do you prove it? What can I measure? And you talk about content, you talk about breadth of knowledge, I mean, I don't know. It's a real challenge to do this, particularly in the humanities, the arts, the social sciences. We could say, in

certain areas it's easier than in other areas, but in a broad field like literature, well, I cover from 1700 something to 1800 something. So you read a bunch of books, and you talk about them. And how do you measure that? You've got to give some kind of a test that's content-based, I imagine, which is what happens in most courses. It's a real struggle. I think that's the kind of issue that accreditation agencies are really struggling with. When I go, as a chair of an accreditation team, and we go into other schools, we talk to faculty about that. Everybody's struggling with that. But the fact that we have to struggle doesn't mean that it can't be done. People are going to insist that it be done.

**Professor Alfred Levine** (Department of Engineering Science and Physics, College of Staten Island): I was going to ask a question about the budget, but I'm intrigued by this outcome assessment. I am one of those engineers who's been involved in outcome assessment for accreditation purposes for years, and there is something that is missed in this discussion. It is the faculty that specify goals and objectives in engineering. It is the faculty that are responsible for coming up with the measures, implementing the measures and showing them. And what is lost here is that yes, the faculty at the engineering program at the College of Staten Island could in principle come up with different measures than my colleagues at say, CCNY, and we would be asked within our own definition how are we doing. And we look at this as a way of improvement. What is happening is the faculty are being left out. Oh yes, maybe there's a delegate who was a faculty member on the Spellings Commission who's going to come up with a one size fits all -- I'd like to come back to your Jesuits, bless them, they decided -- that's what you said -- nobody from Washington said to the Jesuits -- no one from Rome said to your Jesuits "this is what you shall measure." They did it. Why can't we get that idea across? / President Fernandez - I think you make an excellent point. But I would not get down to the specific -- the question I would ask, the question that policy makers would ask, is, when all is said and done and an engineer goes through the curriculum at Staten Island or at City College or at the University of Wisconsin or Berkeley or wherever, do they know the same? Are they able to do the same things? Are they able to function professionally as an engineer who's fully qualified, who can pass whatever national engineering standard test? And if the answer is yes, you've got no problem. / Professor Levine - The answer is yes, and we have to document it. I'm all for accountability. I have nothing wrong with the philosophy professors at Lehman creating their measure and having that measure be different than the measure created by the philosophy

professors at, say, York. Let the professors do it. / President Fernandez - I agree. I don't think we have a difference of opinion here.

**Professor Michael Barnhart** (Department of History, Philosophy, and Political Science, Kingsborough Community College): I also am interested in outcomes assessment, but I was going to come at it in a slightly different way. It does seem to me that the whole assessment program is moving in the direction of encouraging some kind of nationally normed assessment, and therefore, you know, a standardized test seems to me, obviously, the sort of thing that might meet that. I wonder if, in the end, of course, every institution is going to want to demonstrate progress. So I wonder to what extent you won't get a kind of market failure where actually the test that ends up being the most popular is the one that's the easiest to show progress on and does not necessarily register actually the quality of the students involved. I'm thinking the GRE. You were asked to take the GRE at Marquette. I took the GRE too and I think it had very -- I was a philosophy major as well, in fact, I teach philosophy now. I don't see any connection between what I learned as a philosophy major and the GRE, which was a basically a rehash of the SAT. I think it's a very odd measure, actually, if you're going to compare the quality of your students. Especially if you're going to compare them in regard to the disciplines. So again, it fuels my fear that actually something that you know, that can be argued for, that is, assuring that there's some degree of quality in the product of a college education actually in the end, especially as we move towards a more privatized universe, ends up doing quite the opposite. / President Fernandez - Well, as you know, in professional areas, there are national examinations already. I mean, doctors take national boards, lawyers take multi-state, and you know, engineers take certain kinds of tests, and so on. I don't know that that necessarily means that we're headed in that direction, but you're absolutely right. Testing is big business, and there are a lot of people interested in creating tests. Some people in Washington right now seem to be obsessed with the notion of testing, testing brought on by No Child Left Behind, and this is sort of the No Child Left Behind II. This is No Student Left Behind at the higher education level. There's a little bit of that.

**Professor Jack Zevin** (Secondary Education and Youth Services, Queens College): I'm a professor of education. So we're following the commission closely. But I have a somewhat different question. Everybody's sort of obsessing over testing, but I would like to know what

you've heard or how you might react to the idea to develop a national curriculum, especially at the secondary level. Because one of the problems with the testing is, some argue we already have a national curriculum in disguise, as a series of fragmented state curricula, but there's a move to sort of standardize the course structure, because how can you have a standardized test when you don't have a standardized course structure. So I'm wondering how far you think they've gotten and are they actually willing to bite the bullet on this? / President Fernandez - I think that's a way's off. / I think you're dealing with, in essence, you know, decades of -- more than that, over a hundred years -- of local control. And you know, that's a lot of -- you've got to push hard, and states are going to guard zealously their control over that. I mean, look at what happened in Utah with No Child Left Behind. The state was about to rebel, and that's one of the red states. That's one of the reddest states. Bush had to send Spellings and some assistant secretary over to Utah to try to calm down the natives. / Professor Zevin - We find that very encouraging. / President Fernandez - Many people did. But it just points out some of the difficulties of having one standard that everybody has to meet and no flexibility at the local level. They have opted to provide flexible outlets or at least pressure valves that some states are able to negotiate and kind of back off. / Professor Zevin - Okay, thank you.

**Professor Angela Crossman** (Psychology Department, John Jay College of Criminal Justice): This is probably a bit more of a rant than anything else. In terms of testing, I definitely see the benefit in terms of outcomes assessment within an organization to see if when the students come in they've improved in some way when they leave. I see this as really valid for the job that we're doing, understanding whether we're doing it. But when you're talking about comparisons across schools, you have a lot of fundamental problems like what you bring in different schools is not the same across schools. It's really fundamentally important that you're comparing, you know, your students to themselves, not to other students who are fundamentally different to begin with. And also, I think the difference between the elementary school levels and the high school levels is that the government provides the education and it's a mandated requirement. College educations are not mandated requirements, they are still privileges. And I don't mean they should be financial privileges, I mean that people who want them should earn them and work for them. They are not a commodity to be purchased. And every time we come up with these discussions of the testing, it feels so much like that. Like business is saying, "we want you to prove to us that you're worth the money." And you know what? Students will get out of us what they put into us.

And to be driven by a business model is just inappropriate. It doesn't foster an educational requirement that is, as I think Jason said, experimental and innovative. And I think it's just an unfortunate direction and I, again, don't want to be a commodity.

**Professor Sandi Cooper:** ... group of faculty, I was not on it. People who specialized in the new area of world history and American history, and these were both university and high school teachers who were trying to come up with a set of national standards recommended, not required. And I actually looked at them and I thought they were very reasonable. There's a big fat project, a book I've got, with them in there. I don't know if you recall what happened, but Lynne Cheney got hysterical and she had the US Senate pass a 99 to 1 resolution trashing the thing because it didn't emphasize the glories of Western civilization. And this was followed up by a school district a few years later in Florida that fired a teacher who taught American history as something you could discuss from several points of view as opposed to the truth. This is a field which is a minefield, mine. And I'd like to know who is going to create a test that you can use in areas like this, especially in a society which is so divided? And the divisions are no longer religious versus secular -- they cut across in a million forms of the matrix. I mean, I can't figure out what they have in mind. If they're testing skills such as can somebody tell what a logical end to this sentence is, that's one thing. But if the test is content, we are really looking for more trouble than -- it's insoluble. And I will say that I was involved as a consultant in the world history project, and I put some critical parts in, but they didn't include most of them. This was an amazingly balanced piece of work, and the way it was attacked was a litmus test of something profoundly split in this country. Show me a way to walk across that divide and I'll maybe follow it. /  
President Fernandez - I don't think I can help you on that one.

**Professor Robert Viscusi** (English Department, Brooklyn College): I also went to a Jesuit school, just by way of warning. In a way what I want to say is a follow-up to what Sandi just said. It always seems to me when I look at outcomes assessment instruments that we seem to see more and more and more of every week, that to talk about skills is a Trojan Horse, because the skills that are specified are really not skills at all. Critical thinking, what is that? It's a vague, big blur of operations that are impossible, really, to measure, on the one hand. On the other hand, in the liberal arts that you adverted to, the disciplines, the central disciplines in the liberal arts: history, literature, art, women's studies, have been the subject of continuous political reactions

over the last 30 years. And the possibility of a content-based test operating as a kind of control is not speculative, it already exists. When my students go to take the Graduate Record Exam in English literature, most of the things that are on that test are very rarely taught in our colleges anymore because in our colleges people who major in literature study post-colonial literature, they student women's literature, they study African-American literature, whereas the GRE exam is basically the same test that they were giving in 1962 when I took it at Fordham College. So that's not a hopeful augury. I just think that should be in your mind the next time you go to one of these things. / President Fernandez: What is an educated person? What should an educated person know? E.D. Hirsch prescribed, in a big book, you've got to know about this and that. So you go through that book and you sort of remember all that stuff, and then you're an educated person according to him. What curriculum -- we have a finite period of time from the beginning of the freshman year to the end of the senior year. So the question is how do you fill those four years and what courses? It's impossible to cover every conceivable item under English literature, but at some point the faculty decides, "We're going to do this. We're going to do that." / Professor Viscusi - Of course, but an undergraduate degree in English literature is not a professional degree. And in fact, the glory of liberal arts colleges in the United States has long been their ability to experiment, their ability to surprise, and their ability to be who and what they are at Oberlin or at Bowdoin or anyplace else, rather than to provide a perfect template of what an educated person was in 1958, which is I think when Hirsch must have dreamt that up.

**Professor Timothy Aubry** (English, Baruch College): I just want to point out something that I think other people alluded to but didn't address directly which is my sense that the resistance to these national assessment measures and these national efforts to kind of make an overall curriculum would be far more resisted by private universities and private colleges. I have a feeling their interest in innovation and creativity would make them even more resistant to these sort of measures than the public schools. And my big fear, which needs to be articulated, is that this move will only widen the discrepancy between the public schools and the private schools at the level of the university. And I think that's a big concern. / President Fernandez - That is a big change. Thank you. [Applause]

**C. Vice Chancellor for Budget Ernesto Malave:** Good evening, everyone. It's good to be back. I will be brief because I know the night is getting along. I just wanted to be able to give

you a quick update of where we are with the budget, and to mention the implementation report on the CUNY Compact, which tells how colleges performed and what outcomes they generated. For the most part, the most colleges did a very good job in taking the \$30 million in resources that we provided in the Compact and implementing those plans. Some of you, when you look at the report, you'll see that some of these schools did fabulously well. John Jay did extremely well, Kingsborough did very well, and a few others. And then a number of schools have some work to do: Queens and Bronx in particular. But as I said when I met with a couple of weeks ago with the University Student Senate, we're very confident that despite the fact that some schools had a little difficulty in turning on the engine of spending and hiring and the like that at the end of the day they will all get there and the college investment programs will be fully implemented. And I'm very confident. And the reason I'm confident is that we promised to take the money back! I don't know why I came up with April 15, but we're telling them that by April 15 they either have to have the dollars encumbered or spent. Otherwise we will withdraw the funds. We've been keeping track of the campuses, and some are indeed spending. And that's how it should be.

For next year the legislature was able to add an addition \$6.2 million for the senior colleges. And as a result of that, as well as some of the estimates for some of the costs for next year and some energy savings, we'll be able to fully fund all of the investment programs that are contained in this book. So for example, this year Hunter College received \$5.5 million in new resources. All of that is coming back to Hunter College, and they're likely to get another \$5.5 million on top of that this year for round two of a fully-implemented program. So we're very pleased that at the senior colleges at least, for the second year in a row, we have a budget request that's fully funded. And we really, really look forward to that. And now that they've had their first year of kicking it off and turning on the engine and making sure that it works, we're also very confident that the colleges will not have the kinds of delays they had this year in hiring and pushing the programs. So we're extremely pleased and have already directed the college presidents to begin implementing the investment programs they already agreed to. One of the good things about having it done this way is that in the past they would wait for a letter from my office saying "this is your allocation. This is what you've got. Go ahead and do it." Well, they already decided that. Colleges got together with faculty and they already have a blueprint. So all they needed was the signal to go, and they've been given that signal. So we're very pleased. In addition, the state provided another \$652,000 for the SEEK program and that will be distributed by the Office of

Academic Affairs. And for those of you who follow legislative initiatives and member items, they were lined out in a way that they hadn't been lined out before. So there's about \$1 million in so-called member items funding. Just the little things, \$50,000 for this center, \$10,000 for that, that is a bit more transparent. For the community colleges, the state added another \$3.1 million to the \$6.3 million that the Governor had already included in the Executive Budget. State aid per FTE is up from \$125 hour to \$150, so we actually got more from the state than we had requested. We now need to figure out between now and the end of June, between the Mayor and the City Council to replicate what happened with the state. So we can have for the community colleges the same that we have for the senior colleges. I don't want a situation where we have this system divided and we don't have the kind of investment programs occurring at the community colleges as well. But I am encouraged that the Mayor is not only giving us the resources for the ASAP program, but as a result of that, as a result of visiting Bronx and talking to the president, the students are a bit more sensitive to the nature of the community colleges and their importance, and that's part of our campaign to secure funding.

There was no big news on the Capital Budget beyond what was already in the Executive Budget. They basically ran out of time in Albany to do a capital add-on beyond what the Governor had recommended. There was some talk at the time of \$25 million for the ERP. The legislature has indicated that by June they will do a supplemental budget which will include a capital add-on, so there may be improvements to the budget beyond that. On the capital side, we're also urging the Mayor to match what the Governor has already done. They kicked in \$27.5 million for the completing of Fiterman Hall at BMCC. We want him to draw down that money the City of New York has to kick in \$27.5 million. That's an important priority, and another \$11 million to Medgar Evers to round out that program. and we're hopeful that that takes place. The only other action -- there was some talk of the Senate and the Assembly having their own ideas about a commission for public higher education. That will all get illuminated and we're expecting the Governor to issue an executive order establishing the commission relatively soon. They need a charge and the members of the commission and the like. So as he indicated in his presentation, President Fernandez has probably a really, really important commission that I think will lay the framework, the foundation for public higher ed, financing, organization for at least the next ten years. It's going to be something that we're going to have to pay a lot of attention to. That's the quick update. Any questions? Otherwise, have a very good evening.

**A. Chair: (continued)**

**Professor Cooper:** I wonder if I could butt in with an unexpected issue. Would it be out of place to ask this body to write some kind of letter of sorrow and condolence to the Faculty Senate at Virginia Tech? I wanted to raise this before we lost the membership here.

**Chair Philipp:** We had discussed this in the office this afternoon. One of our speakers -- and I'm going to have to return this -- we in fact did draft a resolution. We thought it would be best to in fact have a moment of silence, which I was going to get to in this, but have not gotten to this at this time. So in fact, since you brought up the issue, I would like to ask us to have a moment of silence in memory of those who died at Virginia Tech. And let's if we could do that now please. Thank you very much. It's painful what happened today. And we were going back and forth for how best to deal with it. And there's no good way to deal with something so terrible. Now, at this point, I'd like to ask the following senators and alternates who are completing their terms to stand. From Baruch College, Cheryl Smith. From BMCC [inaudible], Joshua Belknap, Ling Chen and Susan Price are finishing their terms. Bronx Community College, Kamal Ismail and Neal Phillip, not here. Brooklyn, David Bloomfield, Josh Monroe, and [inaudible]. John Jay College, Liliana Soto-Fernandez and John [inaudible]. Kingsborough Community College, Jean Galvin, Lee Friedman, and Arnold Perlmutter. LaGuardia, Lori Gluck. Queens, Stephen Tse. Queensborough, Joshua Gold, [inaudible] and Jeffrey Hest. And York, Shirley Craig. None of them are here. Those are people completing their terms. We don't have election results from a number of other campuses so we would only [inaudible]. You want to hear the names? College of Staten Island, The Graduate School, Hostos Community College, Hunter College, Lehman College, New York City Tech, Medgar Evers and York. I'm asked to remind you to sign up for our conference on Friday, which will be on Human Subjects Research in the Social Sciences. A very contentious issue. In fact, it's so contentious that several speakers didn't want to speak because they were so divisive. But we got the conference together.