

MINUTES OF THE THREE HUNDRED AND FORTY-SEVENTH
PLENARY SESSION
OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK
November 24, 2009

The meeting was called to order by UFS Chair Philipp at 6:30 p.m. in Room 9204/5 at the Graduate Center. 68 of 124 voting members were present.

Baruch: Present – Hill, Martell, Wine, and Alternate Aubry. Absent – Bazzoni, Ellis, Myers, Nematollahy, Remler, and Wymbs. **BMCC:** Present – Conway, Genis, Persaud, Soto, Vozick, and Alternate d’Erizans. Absent – Friedman, Kalogeropoulos, and Martinez-Lopez. **Bronx CC:** Present – Ismail. Absent – Bandar, Prabhu, and Skinner. **Brooklyn:** Present – Bell, Cirasella, Massood, Shapiro, Viscusi, and Alternate Jacobson. Absent – Bank-Munoz, Dexter, Duboys, Magliozzo, Morrill, and Shortell. **CCNY:** Present – Crain, Jablonsky, Lascar, Rinard, and Sank. Absent – Khanbilvardi, Kiely, Raj, and Watkins. **CSI:** Present – Levine, Yousef, and Zimmerman. Absent – Batson, Cooper, Klibaner, and Talarico. **CUNY Law School:** Present – Rossein. Absent – Bach. **Graduate School:** Present – Baumrin, Nolan, Philipp, and Alternate Vora. Absent – Aguirre-Molina, Lennon, and Weinstein. **Hostos CC:** Present – Hubner, Ovtcharenko, and Sharma. **Hunter:** Present –Grossman and Strayer. Absent – Ancona, DeMeo, Guzzetta, Kaye, Kuhn-Osius, Palanda, Simon, and Spark. **John Jay:** Present – Chaffie, Crossman, Dunham, Kaplowitz, Katz, Kubic, Tovar, and Alternate Cheloukhine. Absent: Browne-Marshall and King-Toler. **Kingsborough CC:** Present – Arliss, Barnhart, Ruoff, Wood, and Alternate Stubin. Absent – Hume and Sarinsky. **LaGuardia CC:** Present – Beaky, Kurzyna, Lerman, and Mettler. Absent – Davidson and Shean. **Lehman:** Present – Carey and Jervis. Absent – Hellmann, Jervis, Larimer, Marianetti, Maybee, and Mineka. **Medgar Evers:** Present – Reid. Absent – Cuffee, Stewart, and Withers. **NYCCT:** Present – Hounion, Panayotakis, Woytowich, and Alternate Gelman. Absent: Cermele, Horelick, and Richardson. **Queens:** Present – Bird, Gonzalez, Moore, and Savage. Absent – Brody and Zevin. Vacancies-- 2. **Queensborough CC:** Present – Pecorino, Tai, and Alternates Borrachero and Kuszai. Absent – Barbanel, Sweetnam, and Volchok. **York:** Present – Baron and Lewis. Absent – Corkery and Mawyer.

Chancellor Goldstein, Vice Chancellors Logue and Schaffer, Ms. Barbara Cura of the Chancellor’s Office, USS President Cory Provost, and Professor Kathleen Barker (Medgar Evers) were guests of the plenary.

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

- I. Approval of the Agenda: The agenda was adopted as proposed.
- II. Approval of the Minutes of October 27, 2009: Minutes were approved as distributed.
- III. Reports (Recorded in Reports & Deliberations)
 - A. Chair (oral & written)
 - B. Chancellor Matthew Goldstein (oral)
 - C. Representatives to Board Committees (written)
 - D. Professor Kathleen Barker on the Faculty Experience Survey (oral)
 - E. USS President Cory Provost (oral)
- IV. New Business – A motion was made by Prof. Pecorino, seconded, and unanimously approved to send a letter of condolence and appreciation to the family of late Vice

Chancellor Ernesto Malave (letter is attached to these minutes).

There being no new business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

William Phipps, Executive Director

REPORTS AND DELIBERATIONS
OF THE 347th PLENARY SESSION
OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

November 24, 2009

Chair Philipp—As you can see, the Chancellor is already here. I'd like to start out with a couple of formalities. This is the 347th Plenary Session of the Senate, and today is November 24, 2009. Can I have a motion to approve the agenda? Second, all in favor? Thank you. Motion to approve the minutes? Second, all in favor? Thank you.

Right now, we have the Chancellor so let's move to that, and I'll get to my report a little later. It's a pleasure to have the Chancellor here. His visit is clouded by the very unfortunate passing of Vice Chancellor Ernesto Malave. You will see in my report the statement I gave yesterday at the Board meeting. We are very, very sad about his passing.

Chancellor Goldstein—Manfred, I wanted to thank you and this body for placing that wonderful obit in the *Times* today. We will miss Ernesto greatly. He was an extraordinary fellow who came up the hard way, very poor. He did not have access to a good education, so he came to CUNY. His health was compromised even as a young man. But he never forgot from where he came, and he was deeply devoted to the students. I'm not just saying this because I'm here tonight, but he greatly valued the Budget Advisory Committee of this body, and would come back and tell me about the good work that he learned from that relationship. I really appreciate your paying homage to him. He was a very fine man, and we will miss him.

Let me just mention a few things, and then I'll take some questions. I must be out of here by 10 after 7. The Governor, just hours ago, amended his deficit reduction plan that was presented to both the Senate and the Assembly. Obviously the amended plan really deals with the concerns that the State Senate had, in particular about school aid and aid to health care—everything under the entire rubric of health care. We will see. All of us need to be concerned about this deficit reduction exercise. The deficiency that we are seeing for this year has been so wrenching, to get consensus among the three bodies, so then we can only imagine what may be the case next year when we expect much deeper financial problems, then even spilling over into the next fiscal year. This particular problem will be solved fairly quickly at this point, at least I hope it will be, and then we

will get a better sense of what the expectations are when the Governor releases his recommendations to the State Legislature. That happens toward the end of January, so we will be ready to address that and deal with it as we can as time goes by.

We have searches going on for three senior members of the University. There is the search for a new president at CCNY, with the resignation of Gregory Williams to become the president of the University of Cincinnati. There is also the vacancy occurring at Baruch College, and Terry Martell sits on the committee that we appointed to search for a new president of Baruch. I sit quietly as a fly on the wall just to be a resource for both searches. I envisage that we will complete those two searches by early spring, and have two presidents appointed hopefully by the April meeting, but certainly no later than the June meeting of the Board. We also are searching for a Vice Chancellor for Student Development. We have an interim in place, and we will conduct that search fairly quickly. I'll have an announcement about the position of Vice Chancellor for Budget and Finance that now is vacated because of the untimely death of Ernesto Malave.

We recently received word that our efforts to create a new School of Public Health have gotten to the point that we can call ourselves officially a School of Public Health because the accrediting body, which was a very arduous process to go through, has affirmed our credentials to be called a School of Public Health. We just have to graduate according to the rules of the accrediting process a couple of students in a doctoral program and a few students in a masters program. We have most of these programs already in place. Students are going through the pipeline, and we expect full accreditation by 2011.

The efforts to create a new community college are moving well. I'm delighted by the way in which this idea has taken root throughout the United States from Secretary Duncan to some of the finest and most visible foundations in the United States that are putting money behind this effort. That school will be created in a reasonable period of time. We're still going through the due diligence that has to be done, and all of the planning processes with many faculty groups. It's largely a faculty driven effort. I think there are 7 or 9 committees that are involved in various aspects of that school. We look forward to that as well.

Fiterman Hall is now deconstructed—we learned a new word! There is a level dirt field there as we speak. We will have a ceremony on Tuesday of next week. The Mayor will be there, along with Christine Quinn, Shelley Silver, the whole advisory group from the community will be there. Members of the Borough of Manhattan Community College will be there, and it will be a celebratory event, finally after 8 years. It is now fully designed and fully financed, and now needs to be built. We look forward to that. It's been a long wait and an arduous trip, but we're glad we got there.

About a week ago, some of us put shovels in our hand and shoveled some dirt on the place where the new School of Social Work will be erected, alongside the new School of Public Health. This is our first foray into East Harlem, and it's something we're quite excited about. The new School of Public Health is going to be a significant addition to the inventory of institutions at the City University of New York. And the School of

Social work, because it is such a well-known and important institution, really deserves a wonderful new facility. So a lot of things going on, some good and some sad. But this University has great strength and it has weathered extraordinary trauma over its life, and it has also experienced great joy and exhilaration by what we've been able to accomplish. Generations before us, and generations after us, we see the extraordinary students that are coming to this University who have options that they can exercise to go elsewhere. But as I've said here before, and Terry I think would affirm this, higher education is a great example of an efficient market, and people are making judgments and exercising options on the basis of the information that everybody shares. And we are getting large numbers of students seeking to get their higher education at CUNY. It's a joy to see the University being held in as high esteem as it is. For me, and I've said this over and over again, the joy is really to help our students achieve their dreams, professional and personal. It is an enormous force in this City that has transformed the lives of hundreds of thousands of students, and I hope and expect that all of you feel, as I do, privileged to be part of this very special organization. With that, I'll take as many questions as I can.

Chair Philipp—Before we do that, I'd like to recognize the presence of Vice Chancellors Logue and Schaffer. Welcome to both of you.

Professor Crain—This has been on my mind for several weeks, that the administration at City College instituted a policy for the spring semester which truncates the admissions process. If a student qualifies but does not receive exemptions from the skills tests on the basis of their SATs or Regents scores, they are not allowed to take the skills test and they cannot get in for the spring semester. Prior data indicates that this policy will disproportionately hurt students of color. One of our faculty governance bodies approved it, on a one-time basis, but my question is why don't you stop this? A student deserves a chance to go through the whole process and prove that they are qualified. This is a very misguided effort that has harmful consequences. **Chancellor Goldstein**—Bill, I wish I could answer your question very directly. I'm not close enough to the action taken, but I would imagine it derives from an ongoing iterative process of constantly raising admissions standards. I know that at a number of our institutions, the admissions standards have been raised above the cut points that we now use as exemptions from sitting for the skills tests. I forget what those exemptions are, but a certain level of SAT score, or a certain level on the Regents Exam, and if those admissions criteria exceed that, then that would automatically throw into effect the point that you are making. I don't know if that is the case at City. I would need to look into that, and get back to you. I know it is the case at some of the other campuses.

Professor Panayotakis—This is not so much a question as a brief comment on something you said. I think it's a little astonishing to talk about education as an example of efficient markets, especially after the meltdown of the efficient markets last year, and how this meltdown is decimating higher education around the country. We see what has been happening in California, and so on, and of course the budget cuts here. So in my opinion, an uncritical acceptance of this whole rhetoric of efficient markets is not the best way to promote the cause of public higher education. We should be at the forefront of rethinking this ideology. **Chancellor Goldstein**—The point about the efficient market

was merely to indicate that it is a view, an accepted view, of mainstream economists. All I am saying is that there are a lot of examples of efficient markets, and one is higher education. Whether you embrace it or not, it just is what it is.

Chair Philipp—The Governor’s original budget proposal suggested a \$50 million reduction for CUNY. Do you think that is still in the cards, given the current situation?

Chancellor Goldstein—Just to put precision on your question, there is a \$53 million deficiency year to year that the Governor has proposed for the senior colleges, and a \$260 per FTE deficiency for the community colleges. I do not believe that we will get relief on the \$53 million. I believe there is some opportunity to get relief on the \$260 reduction in aid to community colleges. Again, and I want to make this very clear, we anticipated about two years ago—and I remember talking to this body at least two years ago—about what I saw as the gathering storm that was gripping credit markets, and so forth, around the United States, and all of these securitized instruments that people were buying that perhaps were based on some very flimsy assessments of risk. People in the financial world were talking more and more about this, and we saw that it would affect states particularly hard, as it has. As a result of that, we directed our budget people to start preparing. While we could not inoculate ourselves totally against the problems that we have now seen, we created reserves and worked out opportunities to manage on some clever accounting practices with the Division of the Budget to help us weather the problems that we were going to have. None of us, and I will say this publicly for me, realized it would be as deep and as long lasting as it has been. Had we not taken that remedial action early on, we would have been in a much more difficult situation. Again, it’s next year that we will have to worry about. The \$53 million is going to have minimal effect on the academic programs that exist at the City University today. Next year, if the numbers turn out to be as deep and problematic as many of us believe will be the case, I think we will have much more significant challenges. I do promise you that we will get through this. We will get through it in a way that is the least disruptive way we can. There will be discomfort, pain, and some sacrifices that we have to prepare ourselves for, but this is a University that is well-positioned to weather some of these very deep storms. It’s not just the year. This is a long-term problem that is systemic throughout the United States. I tell this to the Board and to the presidents on a regular basis. I have frequent conversations with the top higher education, mainly public, leaders in the United States, at some of the finest public universities in the United States, and everyone is under assault. There is not one state that is not having serious problems. In my conversations with Mark Yudof from the University of California, their problems are without precedent in California, and very foreboding for the future. One of the things we really need to do, and this is for another discussion, is to re-imagine the relationships of public universities with their states. We cannot continue going down the road we are on now, because there is a growing blurring between public universities and private universities. As state support goes down and tuition goes up, there is very little difference between public and private universities. I think that’s a very bad thing. It’s a chilling prospect, and that’s why there must be a real thorough discussion about how we can rethink the ways that public universities are financed by the taxpayers in the states in which they reside. That is why, a year and a half ago, we brought, as you know, the top higher education leaders in the United States to New York and had the top people here. I was the convener with

the Carnegie Corporation, which I asked to help support this effort. We are going to do it again and take the lead, and bring higher education people together and see if we can start getting a discussion going on a national basis. New York State alone is not going to solve the problem. This has to be a national objective. I've used very strong words. I've said this is a national security problem. I really believe that, and it's not elliptical. This is truly a national security problem. Not that we are going to be invaded, but that we will be so compromised as a society unless we keep 80% of the students that now study at public universities out of harm's way. The way we are going now, we are not inoculating or preventing these students from being in harm's way, and I think that is a very bad and chilling prospect.

Professor Barnhart—My question is a little bit of a follow-up to Bill's first question in regard to admissions. I wanted to know your view in regard to adjustments in admissions criteria at colleges, and whether you thought that should be a matter that goes in front of college senates and councils as these things do get adjusted? I agree with you very much that we will be under a great deal of stress, and I think we will continue to have students flocking to our colleges in the foreseeable future. We are already facing a rather unprecedented surge in admissions, and I know that colleges are looking to adjust both when they cut off admissions, and also the admissions criteria that they apply. It's going to be an important issue as we move forward and try to deal with what obviously is going to be a very serious crisis. I just wanted to know what procedures you thought are appropriate for these types of decisions? **Chancellor Goldstein**—First and foremost, it must derive from the faculty. I think faculty really at each of our institutions must take ownership to the admissions process as it relates to setting up the criteria that we use. Whatever those criteria are, they are largely respected. I would never say centrally that at such and such a college, you will have the following admissions criteria. I really believe it should rightly be within the purview of the faculty. That's the way we operate today, at least in my administration where that is not going to change. The problem that we have is that, because of the burnishing of the reputation of CUNY and because of the very bad economy that we have, we are having large numbers of people seeking admissions to the University. Each campus is different, but we do have problems at a few of our campuses that we don't have the physical capacity to house the students, whether it's an open admissions institution or a selective institution. Open admissions does not mean you just keep the doors open and anybody could come in. If you don't have seats, and you don't have faculty to teach them, you have to close down the process. The moral imperative here, and it is a real moral imperative, is to keep the University open to students who need access to education, but on the other hand not compromising the ability for these students to learn. That is a very delicate balance, and something that we all must be mindful of. That's a long answer, but admissions criteria first and foremost must derive from faculty deliberation. That's something that we will always respect.

Professor Lewis—York College, like a lot of other senior colleges and community colleges as well, is going ahead with searches that have been set up for this year. As the chair of one of the search committees, and I'm on two others, we have been clearly reminded that these searches are conditional upon funds being available when it comes time to do the hires. In your opinion, do the searches that are being initiated for this

spring in order to bring people in for the fall have the funding there to do the hiring?

Chancellor Goldstein—Our expectation is that we would not give the go-ahead to a president to initiate the searches if we did not believe we had the capacity to fund the positions. Right before I came this evening, I had two back-to-back meetings with two presidents, one from a community college and one from a different institution. We talked about a number of matters, but we talked about that matter as well. In one case, I asked to slow the process down because the lines that were being funded were lines that we created and asked them to do because we saw a need, and they were one of the campuses that rose to the occasion, and we thought that that was appropriate. In the other case, I indicated that they ought to continue to go ahead and make the offers, but there were so many positions they were for. We will have better guidance by January, or I should say by February. Once the Governor releases his recommendations, it's an opaque lens but sufficiently clear to get a sense of what our capacity is going to be. At this particular point in time, my advice to each of the presidents is to go through the process, don't stop your searches, but when you have to make an offer then let's have a conversation. But I would imagine that most of them should go through. **Professor Lewis**—Do you see this as a matter of speed, where the people who go through the searches this year have a much better chance of doing hires than people who do the searches next year? **Chancellor Goldstein**—It's hard for me to answer that question definitively. My advice always is to be careful, methodical, and don't rush because you're trying to bet on the come line here. Don't do that because typically you're going to be on the wrong side of a bet. Go through it methodically, try to get the very best people that you can appropriate to the institution, and if we see red flags and blinking lights that cause us concern, we will get to the president very quickly. But right now I would proceed.

Chair Philipp—You had some comments about the state budget. The city budget for the community colleges is constrained by the maintenance of effort law. But, at the same time, the Mayor in his campaign did promise an extra \$50 million to our community colleges, if I recall correctly. Could you comment on that? **Chancellor Goldstein**—I'm going to be seeing the Mayor next week, and I'll have conversations with him about this. This was a commitment that he made that I imagine he will entertain. The recommendations that the Mayor has made with respect to the community college is about a 4% cut for this academic year and about an 8% but next year, but it needs City Council blessing. I suspect it will be moderated. It does not violate the maintenance of effort provision, in part because of the way in which our collective bargaining contract with the PSC and other unions is supported by the Mayor.

Chair Philipp—If there are no other questions, thank you very much for coming.

We have an unusual situation since the Executive Committee has not met since Vice Chancellor Malave's passing. But we will dispense with usual procedure, and I'd like to recognize Professor Pecorino.

Professor Pecorino—I'd like to make a motion that the University Faculty Senate Executive Committee receive the authorization from this body to phrase a letter to go to the family of Ernesto Malave, expressing our sincere respect and admiration for him as a

person, for his work, and for his support of shared governance in this University. **Chair Philipp**—Do I have a second? All in favor? This has passed unanimously. Can we have a moment of silence now, please? Thank you. Vice Chancellor Malave was a true friend, and I'm personally sorry that this has happened.

I would now like to welcome the new chair of the University Student Senate, Cory Provost, who has come to greet us. Congratulations on your election.

Mr. Provost—I'd like to thank my fellow trustee, Manfred Philipp, for inviting me to speak before this body. I'd like to say I come with the frame of mind that this body is rich in experience and knowledge that the University Student Senate would definitely like to tap into in helping us as students and as an organization. In the coming weeks, we would like to develop a more cohesive relationship because I think going forward the Student Senate and the Faculty Senate and the administration do have a common factor, and that is what are we going to do with the students? I'm glad we can all sit at the table and help answer that question. I'll be glad to take any questions.

Professor Pecorino—In the months and years immediately hence, the budget difficulties are going to be approached in a number of ways, and one of them is likely to be an increase in tuition. You may have already received information on this as part of the Compact scheme that we are operating on with the state. Will student government ask for a very close audit of what the impact of the tuition increases would be for students who would fall under or through the safety net of the increase in TAP, and what have you? The Chancellor has avowed that he will provide a security net for those who find it difficult to meet the increase in those tuition fees. Will you be mindful and ask for a careful audit of those who are so supported, and those who might escape that safety net?

Mr. Provost—Yes. I was the student member on the Board's Committee on Fiscal Affairs, and that is one of the issues that we discussed. How many students are really going to be affected by this tuition increase, and the number was minute but it is still something that needs to be looked at, and an audit would be right up the alley to make sure we have a good understanding of how many students are being affected by this.

Professor Baumrin—Does the Student Senate have any specific initiatives in the works for the spring? **Mr. Provost**—The Student Senate as of this past Sunday has just come together, so we're just beginning to pull things together. We look to get operational right after the holidays. We're having a meeting next week to discuss plans for the rest of this semester as well as the spring.

Professor Kaplowitz—Congratulations on your election. Can you tell us something about yourself, the college you attend, your major, how you came to be the Chair and a Trustee? **Mr. Provost**—I am from Brooklyn College, and I'm a Masters student in the Urban Policy and Administration Program. I'm also the president for the graduate student body at Brooklyn College. I was a delegate for the Evening Division at my college to the University Student Senate, and I decided to come back this year and seek a more active leadership role.

Professor Pecorino—If you listen to the budget allocations, there was an item of \$5 million for educational technologies. You're probably aware that faculty and students alike throughout this University have been using, or coming into contact with, a variety of said technologies. One of the most prominent of these technologies is the course management system known as Blackboard. There are faculty groups and faculty as individuals who would like to consider perhaps an alternative to that current system. To the best of your knowledge, has the student body ever been invited to express its position with regard to this type of technology, or to participate in any organized review of that system or alternatives to it? **Mr. Provost**—Not to my knowledge. **Professor Pecorino**—Do you think they should? **Mr. Provost**—Yes. From my personal experience with Blackboard, it hasn't been the most favorable system to use. I know that resonates with a lot of other students.

Professor Vozick—I wish you great success in the struggle you've taken on. Everything so far has been very smooth and professional and very nice in a certain way, and yet we know that in public higher education, this is a time of major turmoil around the country. I'd just like to get from the heart your take on what is happening to students at universities in public higher education in the country, and how you see yourself and the Senate you are working with. What is your perspective on these rather strong changes? **Mr. Provost**—The current economic system has put restraints on the job market in particular. That's what is really affecting students. We're in our degree programs and hoping to get a job when we leave college. That is an area the University really needs to focus on more. That's one of my personal plans, to really try and work with the career centers across the University to try to put them in better standing for us to use them, so when we do complete our degree we know there is a job for us.

Chair Philipp--Last night at the Board, the Trustees voted a tuition increase. In the past, the Chancellor has made promises to provide support for students who are not covered by TAP, for one reason or another, and are in danger of having to drop out. I didn't notice that kind of promise this time from the Chancellor at the Board meeting yesterday. Has the Chancellor made assurances of that kind to the USS in private? **Mr. Provost**—In the conversations that I've had regarding the tuition increase and how it will affect students, I believe he said that there is just going to be a safety net for students who would be affected. Usually, I believe it falls within the realm of undocumented or international students that are affected from not receiving TAP.

Professor Crain—It's frustrating to hear the financial shortfalls that we face when we are all aware of the billions of dollars that are going to bail out banks, and the billions that go to wars that the public basically doesn't want to see, and yet we are suffering. Do you see the students taking our issues in the larger context? **Mr. Provost**—Yes. I believe what will be critical going forward is really trying to remobilize or revitalize a stronger lobbying effort to get stronger conversations with our elected officials.

Professor Pecorino—In addition to raising tuition, some states like California raise fees across the board. We have one prominent fee called the Student Technology Fee. Has there been any discussion with you about raising that fee and, if so, what is your position?

Mr. Provost—I haven't been involved in any discussion about raising that Fee. My position on it would be contingent on what we are using it for. What services could we expect out of it?

Chair Philipp—Thank you for coming. We should work together on projects. In the past, there has been less cooperation between the two organizations, but you are welcome at every one of our meetings. We would like to have you, and thank you for coming.

Chair Philipp—My report is mainly written. The important points are that our conference, scheduled for December 11, is cancelled, and the Faculty Experience Survey. Professor Kathleen Barker, who is leading the survey, is here and will be making a few comments on this. You will see the issue of compensation and tuition is addressed in the report. One thing I need to add verbally is that at the Council of Faculty Governance Leaders we had significant complaints from Governance Leaders at three colleges, Queens, Queensborough, and BMCC, about the new process of CUNYFirst impacting on department chairs. CUNYFirst is the Enterprise Resource Planning System that the University is buying into, that is supposed to replace SIMS and CUPS and everything else. Department chairs who have been working with it at Queens and Queensborough, which are the lead institutions, said that this is not working well, and that it's creating a huge burden on department chairs. Naturally we have to look into this, and we will.

Another hot issue is the PSC-CUNY Awards. I have a long paragraph on that in my report. You should know we've had very useful and productive meetings with our SUNY counterparts, which we thought would be important as our state budget continues to deteriorate. SUNY is faced with a harder set of circumstances on the budget because the Governor can cut the SUNY budget at will since SUNY is a state agency. The \$90 million that was cut this year was not dependent on legislative action. For CUNY, it does depend on legislative action. SUNY historically has done fairly well. There is a study that the PSC put out a while ago saying they have historically done better than CUNY, but right now they don't feel that way. They feel they are doing worse, but it does depend on the campus. Some are pretty good in terms of their funding, like the University Centers, but the smaller colleges in the rural districts are hurting badly. That is something we don't want to have come to us. At this point, I'd like to invite Professor Barker to the podium.

Professor Barker—Good evening, everyone. I'm a professor of psychology at Medgar Evers College, and I've been working on the Faculty Experience survey for the past two years. It feels longer!

Some of you were around for the 2005 survey. It was piloted in 2005, with results presented to the faculty in 2006, and the results were very interesting. The survey for the full-time faculty is in its second generation, and there is a new survey that was piloted this time around for part-time faculty. I just want to make sure that everyone in the room knows that, and I hope that everyone here has gone on-line and taken the survey, and that you are encouraging people at your campus to do so. I want to say that the survey deadline has been expanded until Tuesday, December 1, at 5 p.m. There have been four

email blasts, so to speak, from the University Faculty Senate, and I want to thank Manfred and Bill Phipps for their help all along. They've been very instrumental in getting it moving.

The results, of course, are what a lot of people want to know -- what is our response rate, how many people are going online or calling into the vendor for their userid, and giving their response. I can say this tonight, only, that the results are extremely encouraging for full-time faculty. I will not give a number, because I'm a numbers person, and I know once you give a number, it's impossible to take that number back. It has a life of its own, and it lives forever! The part-time faculty response rate is somewhat lower, but encouraging as well. That is really all I have to say about the survey at this point. I'm thinking and imagining all sorts of ways to present the data to you, and that will be a while from now because it's 20 campuses, and so on. If you have any questions, I'm happy to answer them.

Professor Martell—First of all, thank you for all the effort you've put into this. It's extremely important, and we appreciate your due diligence. When you do the research, could you perhaps tell us, or help us figure out, whether extra efforts at the campuses had any effect on response rates? At Baruch, we sent out five internal blasts from different people, including the administration and the Faculty Senate coming from different angles but basically using the same list of faculty, part-time and full-time. I'd love to know if you compare that with campuses that did nothing, whether the response rate is the same.

Professor Barker—I imagine that the first page of Appendix I, which would contain the full-time faculty actual number CUNY-wide, will also report each campus, its N, and its response rate. Remember these Ns are CUNY Ns, numbers of faculty who appear and are frozen as of April, 2009. They do not represent your faculty in the fall of 2009. So I imagine that you will see those response rates, and the higher your response rate, the more reliable the data will be of course. You're going to see the efforts of your faculty at your campus in those response rates....[Professor Savage: You won't be able to analyze the effect of each email on response rate].....yes, as Dean points out, who was by the way the author of the first Faculty Senate survey in 2005 and was instrumental in developing this in its early stages as well with Manfred Kuechler, you will see only how your campus responded overall.

Professor Baumrin—Would you also have a table indicating the lack of response by those factions that responded less aggressively?

Professor Barker—There have to be precautions in the way the data is presented. For example, if at BMCC it turns out that it is primarily three departments that completed the survey, I have to be careful how I report the data for the individual colleges, because say BMCC is panned -- not that it will be, I have no idea since I'm not collecting the data myself, but I have to protect the respondents. So I can't answer that question now. I do not know how far I can "drill down" into the data, but the fewer the respondents, the less detailed data I can give. Once it gets below a certain N, I cannot provide it at all because you can identify respondents. **Professor Baumrin**—What I had in mind is if a certain

cohort, type of faculty member, if the response rate at a given school were significantly lower or significantly higher than the mean, it might indicate a morale issue.

Professor Barker—One might be able to look at that, but one would also have to consider how many people did not answer the question. For example, if two categories of faculty both with, say, ten years or less at the University, had a much lower percentage rate in terms of reporting on that survey question, I have to consider that but I also have to consider how many people skipped that question. The online survey is like a paper ballot in that sense, in that we didn't force you to answer the question. Forcing faculty to answer the question probably never would have passed the IRB. We would not have had a survey. I look forward to presenting the results when I have them in hand. Thank you.

Chair Philipp—We owe Kathleen an enormous debt of gratitude for doing the survey. She has taken the bulk of the work. It doesn't end. The interaction with the company that is doing the survey takes time because there are always minor glitches that have to be worked out. It really is an enormous job, and I'd like to give her another round of applause. We have to emphasize that we have respectable return rates, but the return rates for part-time faculty are lower than for the full-time, so if you are in contact with adjuncts please encourage them to fill out the survey. We do sincerely want their real opinions. If the response rate had been too low, we would have trouble ever repeating this. It has to be paid for, and the powers that be that pay for it don't want to pay for a survey that doesn't get a significant response. We do want a repeat survey in a couple of years. This one is being paid for by Vice Chancellor Lexa Logue, who was in the room just a while ago. She is familiar with response rates, and I think we're very satisfied with what is happening but we do need to have as high a rate that we can get.

Professor Barnhart—I was interested in two items in your report. The first is the University's decision not to stock up on H1N1 vaccine, and the second is what is happening with the UCRA, which looks very alarming. **Chair Philipp**—We've been trying to hold discussions with Vice Chancellor Dobrin and Howard Apsan, who are the point people on the H1N1 issue. Clearly, it was believed at the time they made these decisions that there would be a plentiful supply of vaccine. At that time nobody knew the production process would be low, and they decided not to ask. That was a decision that they live with. It was particularly embarrassing for the University, I think, to read in the *New York Times* that Goldman Sachs, JP Morgan, and Citibank did ask, and in fact commented that any responsible institution would have asked. It didn't reflect well on our University. I don't think it's going to happen this way again. I think it's clear that responsible institutions try to take care of their employees and their students, and that is what this University really ought to do. We put on some pressure, and other people have done that also. I hope this will be listened to. It would be really terrible if a member of our community would pass away because of this situation. It is a lethal disease. Older people have a lesser chance of getting it, but when they do it is a more serious disease for them. **Professor Barnhart**—Just from a self-interested standpoint, it's a potential public relations disaster for exactly the reasons you are enumerating. **Chair Philipp**—On the second issue, that's very much on the top burner. We are following that very closely, and trying to influence the outcome significantly. There is a fundamental problem that the Chancellery faces. The existing program has in some cases sent out grants for outside

review that were, in their view, embarrassing. The dollar amounts per grant are so low that it's somewhat embarrassing to send it out for outside review. These are real issues. At the same time, the UCRA has addressed these issues by doing a self study to try to correct some of the problems, and it's in the process of implementing the results of that self study. At the same time, the chair of the UCRA has rarely attended recent meetings, so the Vice Chair has taken up the slack, but the chair is an administrator and really ought to attend in order to have a dialogue. There hasn't been that dialogue. At the same time, the UFS has had an issue, that is, the issue of compensation of those people guiding the process of review. These are the liaisons. That compensation has been so low that people have declined to serve. In the last year, we never got anybody for the Anthropology panel. So faculty in Anthropology did not have anybody to evaluate reviews. Their applications were put into a general pot and were evaluated but it wasn't quite the same as having a specific panel doing it. This year, the UCRA decided to raise the compensation for themselves—that's the only group that can do it, and they do have the power to do it and have done so before without challenge by any administrative body. But this year the Chancellor directed the Research Foundation not to follow through on that recommendation. That doesn't end the story. The UFS Research Committee develops candidates for the UCRA, proposing three people for each position to the Chancellor and he picks from one of those three. That's in the bylaws of the UCRA. The lower the compensation, the more difficulty we've had to do it. There is a sense in the Chancellery that this is a University obligation, but at the same time the liaisons are not allowed to apply for a PSC-CUNY Award. This money is not personal compensation that goes into their pockets; it's a grant that's administered by the RF as any other PSC-CUNY Award. But these awards, the in-service allotments, are counted by the Chancellery as a cost of the program even though it goes to buy the very same things that people would buy if they got the grant. It's not really a cost to the program. If it were eliminated, these people would still be getting that money, because they would be applying for grants and since they are good people, presumably successfully. I've been discussing with the UCRA several mechanisms to make it clear that this is not a cost. At the same time, the Chancellor is interested in reducing the perceived cost. The main cost is actually the 10% fee that the Research Foundations imposes on the PSC-CUNY Awards because it's a very labor intensive process. The devolution of half, or some percentage, of the awards to the campuses would reduce that cost because those would apparently not be handled by the RF as the fiscal agent. These things all have to be worked out. The UCRA is quite willing to work with Vice Chancellor Small. I think that will happen. I believe she will attend as chair of the UCRA in future meetings. I think there will be a meeting of the minds. It's true that from my personal point of view, and others, that changes needed to be made because we had trouble getting the liaisons, among other things. The fundamental problem is that the dollar amount per applicant is going down, and as we get more faculty members and the pot remains the same, then that dollar amount will continue to go down. The Council of Faculty Governance Leaders voted to oppose unanimously the devolution to the campuses, even knowing that under the new proposal the Chancellor is proposing that control be given to local governance bodies. The real problem is that if there is no adequate review, everybody will apply. That's fine, but then the dollar amount in the absence of new money will go to ridiculously low levels, and we will see only one type of grant, a high dollar amount

grant, which may have been a primary goal of the Chancellery at the outset of the process.

Thank you for your attendance tonight, and Happy Thanksgiving.