

MINUTES OF THE THREE HUNDRED AND FORTY-SIXTH PLENARY SESSION
OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK
October 27, 2009

The meeting was called to order by UFS Chair Philipp at 6:30 p.m. in Room 9204/5/6 at the Graduate Center. 82 of 124 voting members were present.

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

Professor Martin (BMCC), and Kelly (Brooklyn) attended.

Vice Chancellor for Budget and Finance Malave, Interim President Altman (Baruch), University Dean Mogulescu, were guests of the plenary. Director for Collaborative Programs Meade (SPS) attended with Dean Mogulescu.

Governance Leaders present: Carey (Lehman), Cooper (CSI), Hume (KCC), Kaplowitz (John Jay), Martell (Baruch), Mettler (LaGuardia), Parides (NYCCT), Perez-Gonzalez (Brooklyn), Savage (Queens), Tai (QCC), and Young (Hunter) 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 September 22, 2009: Minutes were approved as distributed.
- III. Reports (Recorded in Reports & Deliberations)
 - A. Chair (oral & written)
 - B. John Mogulescu on the New Community College Planning
 - C. Ernesto Malave, Vice Chancellor for Budget and Finance
 - D. Stan Altman, Acting President, Baruch College
 - E.. Representatives to Board Committees (written)

There being no new business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

William Phipps
Executive Director

REPORTS AND DELIBERATIONS
OF THE 346th PLENARY SESSION
OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

October 27, 2009

Chair Philipp –We have a great crowd here, and I think we have a great agenda. Welcome to all. First, I'd like to have a motion to approve the agenda. That is done. And a motion to approve the minutes? That is also done.

The first item is the Chair's Report. You have my written report so I don't have to take time to go over it. The only thing I'd like to add is that over the weekend I spent some time in Utica, New York, talking at the SUNY UFS plenary. They also have a University Faculty Senate. In fact, their plenaries are three day events at a hotel since it's a state-wide event. I have to say that the SUNY folks are very concerned about the budget, as we should be. They have also said they are willing to come to some of our meetings.

The first item on our agenda is a presentation by University Dean John Mogulescu, which will be followed by a panel discussion with Phil Pecorino, Lenore Beaky, Sandi Cooper, and Anne Friedman, all of the UFS Executive Committee. John Mogulescu is a very important man in CUNY. He is a University Dean and also Dean of the School of Professional Studies. The reason he is here is that he is the leading figure in the move to get a new community college, one with perhaps different characteristics than our existing community colleges, which he will describe. John is very active. I've told him they force you to do too much for this University because his plate is more than overflowing – except the physical one, of course he doesn't have time to eat – so it's with considerable pleasure that I welcome John Mogulescu.

Dean Mogulescu – Thank you very much. I'm glad to be here. I don't know how important I am, but I guess it's nice to hear. Second, I don't know it's forcing me to do things, or maybe I'm not smart enough to say no to certain things. But I'm happy to be here, and I consider Fred a good colleague and friend. As a member of the governing committee in the School of Professional Studies, he has been helpful to me as we've tried to develop that School. I've been asked to only take 10 or 15 minutes to talk a little bit about the new community college, and then hopefully enter into a conversation with the panelists and answer any questions that they have as best I can.

A quick word about myself. I began my career at CUNY in 1972 and worked for 13 years at what was then New York Community College, now the New York City College of Technology, before coming to the central office in 1986. I've been there ever since doing a whole lot of things, building programs, building a new school, and probably the most challenging and in some ways exciting project I'm involved with is this one, to try to develop a new community college. I'm joined by Tracy Meade, who is sitting in the front row. She is the director of this project for me, and has been indispensable and was one of the main authors of the Concept Paper. I hope a lot of you have read the Concept Paper and maybe some of the other material on the website, but let me bring you up to date.

We are about 18 months into the planning for a new community college. First we created a planning team, developed the Concept Paper, and then sharing the Concept Paper with the wider university community. The Concept Paper served as a document moving the project forward. In

truth we were surprised by the attention it received locally and nationally from the moment distribution of the paper began. Articles began to appear in the press, calls asking for copies came in from around the country. For the most part, we received praise for the proposal of a college that would be somewhat different. We were truly surprised at the response. At the same time, the role of community colleges in higher education was prominent in national discussions. It never happened before. The Gates Foundation announced a major initiative about college readiness and success with an emphasis on community colleges and improving graduation rates. Next, the Obama Administration announced its own multi-billion dollar community college initiative to produce 5 million more graduates by 2020. Finally, the Mayor announced recently his own community college initiative, Gateway to the Middle Class. I never imagined when I was asked to take on this project that all these things would have happened at almost the same time. Just last year, we've been awarded a number of grants to support the project. As many of you know, we received \$560,000 from the Gates Foundation for planning which allowed us to build up the staff. A few weeks ago we received a matching grant of \$300,000 from the Carnegie Corporation to support the project – that was a match for the Gates grant. We also received a smaller grant of \$35,000 from the Macy Foundation to run an all-day meeting on November 16. Hopefully some of you may be coming to that meeting to discuss how to develop pathways to careers in the health professions, particularly in medicine and public health, and how to create opportunities at the new college for students to examine and understand major concepts of public and how these concepts relate to our lives and communities. Finally, we received \$2 million from Mayor Bloomberg over the next four years to help with the planning.

In early 2009 we distributed a committee structure to the Steering Committee for feedback. This identified the committees we would launch in December. The Chancellor and Executive Vice President Logue sent communications to presidents and provosts to encourage university-wide participation, and we sent an email blast to the entire university community announcing this and saying please volunteer because we need your help. We need the help particularly of faculty. As a result of that email, there were 300 faculty and staff across the university who applied for committee work. Presently we have seven committees up and running. The Chancellor and Executive Vice Chancellor spoke at an event to launch the committee work on October 1. We had a great turnout, with many talented CUNY faculty and staff from across the university involved in the development of the first-year educational model, in designing the facility, creating the library and technology plans for the new college. We were just thrilled that so many people came forward from around the university, literally every college in this university, who wanted to help build this college. A list of these committees and their membership can be found at the new community college website. We've tried to make this project as transparent as we can. Look under New Initiatives on the CUNY website, and you'll see a lot of information about what we're trying to do. The next round of work will involve committees and some will involve groups of faculty to help determine the governance plan, as well as the function and structure of two key offices of the college, the Office of Partnerships and the Center for Institutional Effectiveness. We'll also build the majors in this next round.

As for hiring, we've been developing the first hiring plans. We are looking to hire foundational faculty, college leadership, and key enrollment management positions probably in the next year or so, so people have an opportunity to come in build this college together with us. During this entire initial period, we have had continual contact with Manfred and other representatives of the UFS. Tracy and I have met with the Executive Committee of the UFS shortly after our Concept Paper was introduced in November of 2008. We met with the Community College Caucus of the Senate in February of 2009. I think I've said to Fred that if you're interested in talking to me I'd be happy to come to any group to discuss any aspect of this plan. As I said, I'm looking for support and I'm happy to answer any questions today, as well. The Chair of the UFS and two Executive Committee members, Phil Pecorino and Anne Friedman, are on the New Community

College Steering Committee, for a total of six faculty members, one from each community college campus. This was a suggestion of Manfred. We first had a Steering Committee of mostly senior administrators, but at his request we did add six additional faculty members as well. The progress that the 13 working committees make over the next six months will largely determine when the school opens, in 2011 or 2012. Much has to go right if it's to be 2011 in the planning process and critical decisions must be made, degree program choices need to be finalized, a facility identified, a budget needs to be agreed upon, and funding identified. We'll soon have a time frame for hiring full-time faculty, a president, and senior administrators. I should say publicly we are very intent to hire tenure-bearing as part of this college. That has come up as a question throughout this time, and I've always said that is our intent.

The work that we are doing is really hard. It's one of the most exciting things I've done, but also the hardest. Before I answer questions and begin some dialogue, I'm really asking for your support and help. I can't stand here in front of you today and promise that this college will look like any of the ones we presently have. In fact, we're making every attempt to make it somewhat different. I can promise, however, that CUNY faculty will be integrally involved in building this school. I think that has been the case so far. It has to be the case, and we welcome input. We're forming new committees, and it's an open process. I look for your help, I'm happy to come back, and I'm willing to talk about any aspect of this. I'm willing to exchange emails and take phone calls. I'm very good at returning calls! At the end of the day, I really believe this is a fair and reasonable process and one that is thoughtful. It will get attention across this country because it's a creative beginning and a good thing to do. With that, I'm happy to take questions.

Chair Philipp – What we have planned to do is to have a panel with discussants who are Phil Pecorino, Lenore Beaky, Sandi Cooper, and Anne Friedman. Could you come up, please? They will lead the discussion, and if there is some time left over, we will take questions from the floor. We have a tight schedule with Vice Chancellor Malave and President Altman coming after that.

Professor Beaky – Hello, John. My question is about the curriculum. I want to start by reading the complete list of majors in this new community college: Nursing, Surgical Technology, Environmental Technology, Energy Service Management, Earth and Environmental Sciences, Information Studies, Geographic Information Systems, Supply Chain Management Including Logistics, Community Health Worker, Disability Studies, Urban Education, and Urban Studies. That is the list of majors. The program is described as “one tightly designed and highly structured pathway to graduation.” New York City will be the theme throughout, apparently, and I want to describe two features of the first-year curriculum. First, a City Seminar. The theme for this, and I'm quoting from the Concept Paper which is evidently still in operation based on what you said at Steinhardt, “problem solving for the future of New York City.” Here's an example they give: “Monitoring New York City transportation, while accounting for long term population growth.” This would be case study pedagogy. Students would be meeting with practitioners in the field. There would be reading and writing workshops which would address “skills on demand” – I don't know what that means – these would be team-taught. So that's the City Seminary. And then there's a professional studies course, which will explore the degrees and how they interact with the courses of study, and will incorporate “work-based learning,” including more visits to work sites to observe real-world case study problems, and also “general workplace competencies.” There is also a math workshop. The chair of this City Seminar and Professional Studies Committee is the Queens College Vice President of Institutional Advancement, and she's also an associate professor of Math. So here's my question: Where in this program is there room for general knowledge, or general education? Remember these are first semester community college students.

Dean Mogulescu – There is an updated list of the majors since the Concept Paper. We will provide that, but it's on the website as well. The whole question of general education is an important one, and I'd look at it two ways. One, those excerpts are from a much longer document about what the first year is going to look like. But we want to experiment. I'm not saying it will necessarily be better, but it will certainly be different. The first year experience for students will be very different from the remedial model that we have today at this university. The general ed aspects of this – and you did say that we have one vice president who is an associate professor chairing the body – we have a number of faculty who are on this committee as well who are building this City Seminary, and what we will try to do in that first year is to immerse our students in reading and writing and math related to themes, as you said, and later to case study methods, that will prepare them for college in a way that we believe, perhaps, some of the present models do not do. Now, because this is a lengthy discussion just in itself, the whole question of what the first year would look like, and it's probably one of the things that has gotten the most attention, I can't go into an elaborate discussion about what it would look like. I need you to go back and read my talk, read the website, and make a determination for yourselves whether you think this is a thoughtful process or not. I would argue, if you do, you will find that the whole question of general education should not go away, but at least be partially answered. I would need to go on for another 15 minutes just on this one topic, but we want to do the initial experience of students who are coming in unprepared in a different way. We need you to look at it carefully, and then judge us in two months with regard to what this committee produces, because this is a sketch of what it is going to be. Then we will come back, and you'll have something much more tangible to examine. So I'm partially answering the question, but understand we are still in a preliminary stage with this. Give the committee two months, and I'm convinced that question will be answered.

Professor Friedman – Hi, John. Thanks for making yourself available. I've heard John speak many times. He's willing to talk and is very accessible and honest. There are still some questions that remain unanswered, and maybe you have some answers today. At the existing community colleges, we have academic and career departments with elected chairs, elected P & B committees who have a range of responsibilities related to hiring and promotion processes. In academic departments at the six community colleges, there is an increasing demand for the doctorate in hiring and tenure, commensurate with expectations of scholarship, research, and publishing. At BMCC, for example, close to 50% of full-time faculty hold the doctorate on the academic side of the house – the Humanities and Social Sciences and so forth – as opposed to the professional side of the house, because we offer Nursing, Allied Health, Accounting, and a whole host of career degrees. In the academic departments, we are only hiring people who have the doctorate or are in the process of getting a doctorate. If they don't complete it in five years, they are told they will be non-reappointed or fired, and that has been the case. Given the fact that you are the Dean of the School of Professional Studies, the equivalent of its president, and you operate differently if directors and programs and P & Bs made up of consortial faculty who are may hold full-time positions across the university but they are at-will adjunct employees at the School of Professional Studies, and since you have been honest and told us that some things are going to be different, assuming that there will be a core of full-time tenure-track faculty, and I appreciate your promising that, will there be a department structure with elected chairs, elected P & B committees, and what will the credentialing requirements look like?

Dean Mogulescu – I appreciate what you say about being accessible and honest. I believe that I am, so let me try to answer that question as honestly as I can. I can tell you there will be tenure-track faculty in this new college. I can't come before you today and say that the governance structure will mandate, for instance, department chairs, as Anne described that. My experience, and I use the School of Professional Studies as an example. I was not there when the governance was created, but it has evolved over now four or five years, the governance structure is different.

This governance structure is likely to be different. We are not there yet. We will have a faculty committee just on governance, and I've given my word to Fred and I will say publicly that the UFS will be involved in the process of creating the governance structure. That is the way it was with SPS, and while they didn't get a lot of things they wanted initially, over five years I would argue that while the structure is quite different, it is a different structure that works for the School and has been fair to faculty. I will say the same thing here tonight about that. It will be done in consultation. It will probably be different. It will include tenure-track faculty. It may or may not have departments. I don't know. It will come from what is created, and that is the honest truth. There have been no decisions made about governance right now. We've been too interested in putting together the initial concept for this program. I'm kind of punting on this issue because I don't have the answer other than honestly to say it's very conceivable that it will be different from what Anne described. On the question of the credentials of the faculty, where necessary and appropriate the same credentials that Anne is describing will be followed. Where it doesn't, in areas like Nursing and some of the career programs, it will not be followed. Lots of this has to be developed over the next year, and that will happen. I don't know if that is a satisfactory answer, but I don't have any absolutes on this other than what I just said. **Professor Friedman** – It's interesting to some of us that the questions of governance and staffing have gone on the back burner here, given that we are 18 months into the process. But can you just give us the reasons why you hesitate to commit to the academic department structure, the elected chairs, the P & B committees. I'm not saying everything is perfect, but this seems to work pretty well, not only at CUNY but around the world. What is the problem that is making you so tentative? **Dean Mogulescu** – I'm not saying there's a problem! I'm saying that the process we are undertaking is to come up with a structure that is interdisciplinary in some ways, and that at the moment has not been finally defined. It will be defined by a process that involves faculty. It may or may not be what you think is the best way to do this. The group that comes up with the plan may argue that there is a different and perhaps worthy of experimenting with a different way. I'm not here to criticize the existing structure. That would be the last thing I'd do. I'm here to say that for this new college, it is conceivable that a different structure may work better. I'm not here to say we've defined that. It will be open for discussion if it does move in that direction. I'm reserving the right to say it will be exactly the same, but it may very well not. When we present it, at that time we will defend it and tell you why we think it is worth trying.

Professor Pecorino – Up until very recently when you've been presenting remarks about the new college, it's been emphasized that while it may add badly needed seats, the primary focus is on doing things better, meaning more students graduate in less time than it has been taking at most community colleges at the present time. You hope that will be an experiment that will work well, but my question is if it works well, will anyone else be able to use what you learn? Why? In the concept, with admissions you are cherry picking people who are most likely to graduate in less time. No part-time students – they do take a long time. No transfer students. No students who need to work full-time and can't commit to blocks of time on weekdays for the freshman experience. Only 11 AAS programs, vocationally oriented, where students generally do complete at a higher rate, and one AS program, vocationally oriented. No AA program. So my question to you is if this program is successful, is it scalable? What other community colleges could emulate this kind of model? We would find that such students are already graduating at a higher rate than the rest of the student body. **Dean Mogulescu** – Phil and I are actually good colleagues. I will respond to all of these points. If you go to the website you will find that three of the 12 programs are liberal arts programs, including a liberal arts major. You should go and look. If you look at the percentage of liberal arts programs compared with the percentage at the six other community colleges, you will see that it's very consistent. On selective admissions. We are not going to be selective. We will take people as an open admissions school, with one caveat: that they will start the program full-time. Why do we say this? For any number of reasons. First – and this shocks many faculty – 87% of the first time

students who go to community colleges at CUNY start full-time. Most people don't realize that. So the idea of going full-time and the idea of full-time employment is already part of the MO of lots of the students who go to CUNY. But that's right, students who go part-time cannot come to this college. There are six other colleges in this university they can go to. I'm not going to say they are disproportionately weaker or stronger than other students. I would argue against this whole selectivity notion. The other thing I would say is every bit of data we look at says that students who go part-time have far less chance of graduating, everywhere. There is no indicator that says anything differently. I support part-time students, and I oversee one of the largest worker ed programs in the university. If you've read *Crossing the Finish Line* about the whole crisis of students graduating from college, one of the recommendations in that book is basically time to degree matters. Increasing time to degree among underrepresented minorities and students from poor families harms access to later educational and career opportunities. It carries high costs for the system as well as for individuals. I refer you to the book and the data. If we can get our students to take more credits within reason, and go full-time and get out in three years as opposed to six or eight or 10 or not at all, there is enormous advantage and I stand behind it.

Professor Cooper – Good evening. The reason I have an interest in this community college is the reason I've had an interest in all of them, and that is the problems students face when they transfer to the senior colleges. The advising they have been given about what they need to prepare, particularly those who come to the liberal arts majors or who plan to become teachers, which has become a highly prized career at the moment, must include what they need in order to pursue the upper division courses. Most of the list of majors, or I would say concentrations, are mostly career oriented. You have a few liberal arts, and I think I saw something about Education. **Dean Mogulescu** – Yes, Urban Education. **Professor Cooper** – Many start out in one of these areas and discovers that the job field has disappeared, the hot technology is no longer hot, and those students then want to be social studies teachers at the local high school. I find them in my office screaming at me for being elitist, a word that has been taught to them by some earlier folks, because I'd like them to take the work they have to take to pass the licensing exam and not louse up – pardon me – our pass rates. I worry about two things: a program which focuses on careers when we don't have any guarantee there will be actual jobs, and secondly the whole business of getting a student to transfer to a senior college which you promised them when you pushed through the Board of Trustees a few years ago that policy that once they have a two-year degree the senior colleges must accept everything they've had, and then we have this issue of when they are going to find the time to take 36 credits in education and 36 credits of history or English to become teachers. I am particularly sensitive to this partly because I joined this university in 1967 at a place called Richmond College, which was the upper division and masters degrees, and after one year it become very clear to those of us in the initial faculty that if we didn't go around and visit the community colleges and talk to them and find out what their students were doing, in order to make the adjustments for what we were asking, the whole thing is going to fall on its face. I must have spent a good four years visiting community colleges and speaking to faculty in my field in order to create this flow of success for them. I don't see on any of your committees that you're doing the reverse.

Dean Mogulescu – I would be the last person, having been here almost as long as Sandi, to defend the articulation problems that we have had over many, many years. We've partially solved them, but we are hardly there. There are lots of reasons for that. I want to go back to the whole question of our thinking about majors. We did a lot of research on the selection of possible majors. We limited choices because many community college students who start at a community college, with an enormous choice of majors for our most unprepared students, and often they pick incorrectly. They wind up in majors that don't work out for them, and they waste a year or more. So we wanted to be very precise in having a limited number of majors. I'll go

back to what I said before about the whole vocational aspect of this. What we are proposing is a combination of liberal arts and career programs that would be at any community college. Look for yourselves. Many of them transfer, and we have said many times that as part of what we do developing these majors is that it is incumbent on us to make them articulate. The last thing I would say, with great respect to the faculty who teach at community colleges in career programs – I just read about a study yesterday by the Community College Research Center at Columbia in *Inside Higher Ed* that talked about income variables with regard to people at community colleges. It is their view that career programs in many respects lead to higher income jobs for the people coming out of community colleges. With a nursing degree or a degree in engineering technology and some of the others, there is nothing wrong with that. That doesn't mean those students won't get exposed to some general education along the way. It also doesn't mean that just because you are in a career program you won't transfer ultimately into a baccalaureate program. But I believe the characterization of this school as a vocational school is not correct, and I ask you to look at this very carefully. Hold us to the fire about that. If we run into the same articulation problems that Sandi talks about, I believe we will be legitimately faulted.

Professor Beaky – My hypothetical student is different. Let's say she has gone through the first year and then at the end of the first year she is thinking I'd like to study about ancient civilizations, or maybe Renaissance poetry, or maybe popular culture, or astronomy. What would you advise that student to do? **Dean Mogulescu** – It's conceivable we might say you'd be better off at another school. A lot of students from community colleges transfer to other colleges, whether 4-year or not. Certainly we hope we will have an array of general ed courses where they get a sampling of some of this, but I don't know what you would say to that student at any of our community colleges at this time. Certainly larger colleges with more courses, there may be more opportunity. But we will have a liberal arts major that is well rounded and diverse, and students will have an opportunity to do that. But if they are very specific and we don't have that major, we will try to provide them the best advisement possible. **Professor Beaky** – If you consult some of the community college catalogs, you will see courses offered there that would permit that student to study there. **Dean Mogulescu** – I'm not denying that in that particular case that would be a problem. In a perfect world, I wish we could do everything. I'm not sure that we can here.

Professor Friedman – You got commentary on the Concept Paper from experts across the nation and from local folks at CUNY as well. Some were very interesting. To quote from one which stood out from now Executive Vice Chancellor Lexa Logue: “I am very intrigued by the concept that all faculty contribute to students' learning in all courses, and as a result all faculty participate with all syllabi with academic freedom being expressed at the level of the group.” Can you explain what this latter concept means? How is academic freedom expressed at the level of the group? **Dean Mogulescu** – I'm not going to speak for Executive Vice Chancellor Logue. I think she was interpreting the Concept Paper. I'd be happy to talk about academic freedom. I'm an absolutist on academic freedom. I've been surrounded by CUNY faculty my whole life. I live with one. I can guarantee you that the issues of academic freedom in the framework of this new college will be secure. When it comes to the issue of academic freedom, you have someone who will be on your side. It's not a debatable point.

Professor Pecorino -- I don't think you were fair to the previous question I asked you. I've heard your numbers recited many times before. They say we have many full-time students, but they work full-time. If you select them out in advance, you're going to have better results. You will have students in the freshman experience who have to commit to large blocks of time during weekdays. If those students have to work during the day, they won't be going to your community college. This is what I mean by being selective. You have 12 vocationally oriented programs, selecting out the general AA student, someone interested in the Arts. Many colleges

do that and are willing to admit they do it. You don't like the word selective, but your community college is going to be more selective than any community college in our system, and the results of that experiment are not going to be scalable to institutions with open admissions, which is part of our Charter. **Dean Mogulescu** – I respectfully disagree with you. I believe that within the parameters of what I said that this college is going to be open admissions. That's our commitment. I'm saying it publicly. One other thing – we have an example in the ASAP program, which understandably is for students who don't need remediation. Two years into this program, if you look at the data of existing triple exempt students at colleges, it is remarkable. Two year graduation rates are over 30%, and the comparison population is 11%. Three year graduation rates are going to be close to 60%. The comparison group is in the high 20s or low 30s. Some of those same requirements for ASAP students like full-time study and a bunch of other things is part of that. We have challenged some of the thinking about our students that maybe isn't as true as we would like it to be. So I am arguing that our students, if we tell them the data about how long it takes and what your chance is to get to your goal, so if you can kill yourself for three years and come out with a degree, it is in your interest. Yes, we will not take part-time students to start. That does not mean part-time students are any better or worse, but I can only say what I believe: this is going to be an open admissions college. I'm not committing to make an elite school – it's not what I've done my whole career.

Professor Cooper -- The emphasis you place on this being different from existing community colleges suggests some unstated problem with the existing community colleges. Can you elaborate? **Dean Mogulescu** – Sure. Yes and no. I've had enormous respect for the faculty of the community colleges of this university. They have hard jobs with incredibly high work loads. They work as hard as they possibly can. On the other hand, if you look at the data and examine the retention and graduation rates of, not just our colleges but on a national basis, community colleges and why it's getting this attention, I think it's worth a try to see if you do things somewhat differently, do you get any better results. Is there a guarantee of better results? Absolutely not. I don't know that we will. If we are proven right, hopefully we will have learned some lessons. I believe, given the data if you look at it, it is important to our students, especially our students of color, to get their degree. Right now, most of them are not. That is a fact. That is not necessarily a criticism of what we are doing. There are a number of issues of why this is happening, many of them beyond the university and the college. I think it is a worthy experiment. We will see if it makes any difference.

Chair Philipp – We are tightly constrained by time, and the original idea was just to have the panel because of our other guests. I don't know if you can take one or two questions? It's all we can do. We can't take everyone who is standing.

Professor Remler – I chaired about a year and a half ago a quantitative task force at Baruch looking at the best way for students to learn quantitative materials, basically with integrative exercises and the best practices. In many cases, departmental boundaries are a great barrier to those best practices. I was asked to part of the math topics committee for the new community college, but I didn't have time to do so but I've done some work with them. I just want to say this is really innovative best practice. I was initially skeptical about the full-time requirement as cherry picking, but what I've seen is very innovative, and they may need to start with full-time. I want to congratulate them, and I'd be glad to talk to anyone about what we've seen there.

Chair Philipp – Please be very brief. One sentence if possible.

Professor Crain – Manfred, I'd like to protest this. This is the most undemocratic experiment we've ever had with questions only from an Executive Committee. **Chair Philipp** – That's what the Executive Committee chose. **Professor Crain** – They may have chosen, but I want

them to hear it then -- you chose to restrict questions to yourselves. Do you assume the rest of us have not been thinking about the community colleges? This is a very undemocratic procedure, and I'm ashamed of the Executive Committee for choosing a debate that is exclusive with the Executive Committee and not within the body.

Professor Vozick – John, I know you for 25 years and I admire what you've achieved. I have over 50 years of background in experimental colleges. I support what Bill said. Hey, Executive Committee, let's do this again with the whole floor participating. On the issue, we haven't contextualized it enough, being caught up in the minutia of it. It's important to do the minutia. CUNY's an integrated university, and the beauty of this session is that people from senior colleges and community colleges are thinking about the future of community colleges. That's great. But the question I have to ask, which is an institutional question, where in your vision, or in the vision of those you are kneeling before, will the existing community colleges get direct benefits from this wave of innovation that you are introducing? Will it help them meet the problems that they define with their students as well as you in the corporate world have defined, and will they be put in an equal position to advance directly by the formation of this program?

Dean Mogulescu – All of you know from my background of 37 at CUNY that the corporate analogy just doesn't work. But let me try to respond to the question, which has to do with if we are successful – and understand it is being built by existing community and senior college faculty at this university – there is no question that we will learn things, what works, what is different, what is good, and not so good. And if we do, that knowledge clearly will be part of a process that will be shared with the rest of the university. We are committed to that. We're not going to change the world with a school of three or four thousand out of 90,000 community college students. Our intent is to see if we do things a bit differently, that perhaps in some respects we will have different results that can influence some of the things that are currently going on. I need your help, and I'm happy to talk with any of you about any of the things we have done. But I want your help and support, and I believe we can build a great institution. Thank you.

Chair Philipp – This discussion does not end here. As you know, during my tenure as UFS Chair I've been very open to all questions. Sometimes, it can't be done. We also have to realize that long questions remove the possibility of other questions from people in the line. If you have a very long question, go last. The next speaker is Vice Chancellor Malave. Welcome.

Vice Chancellor Malave – It's good to see everyone again. I hope you've had a chance to look at the handout. In that package, you have testimony that Chancellor Goldstein provided before the Assembly Ways and Means Committee, the Governor's proposed deficit reduction program, and a copy of the newsletter that my office provides called *Financial Disclosure*, which among other things spoke of the CUNY Investment Program at the beginning of the year that we launched, as well as gave you some warning of the conversation that we are having right now. You also have a press release from the Governor's office detailing the state of the economy in New York and the budget reduction, as well as a presentation by the Budget Director of the State of New York, and a news release from Controller DiNapoli suggesting that the State's budget problems are worse than the Governor is suggesting.

This year started off for the university, as you know, with a substantial challenge for the university. We had to raise tuition by 15%. We wanted to maintain the viability of the system – to not have to resort to any kind of contraction or retrenchment management, the kind of thing that nobody in this room wanted us to engage in, and nobody within the university was prepared to do, given the progress we have made in the past five or six years. So we bit the bullet, we raised the revenue we needed to maintain the system, but in addition to that the Governor and the Legislature also offered us a budget that enabled some opportunities. It enabled us to come up with an investment program at the heart of which was the hiring of an additional 200 full-time

faculty at the university. So despite these challenging times, and despite what is going on around the country, we started the year allocating funds for 200 new full-time faculty, and that was only part one of the investment program. The rest of it was helping to finance the needs of the financial aid offices at the university, career counseling, and veteran centers. Those were things that had been long neglected, we felt, which we need to engage in, particularly during these times. In addition to that, the Trustees have set aside \$10 million for a financial aid program to help those students who would be challenged by the tuition increase. We have a textbook initiative to allocate \$2 million to libraries to purchase textbooks and engage in other efforts to reduce the burden of textbook costs on CUNY students. Between community and senior colleges, there is a \$53 million investment program. This is after covering all the continuing obligations, mandatory costs, increment costs, and all the other inflationary requirements that we have. So we did all right in the beginning of the year, but we also warned that it wouldn't be shocking if the budget constructed by Albany would begin to fall apart. The only issue for us at the time was the extent of the uncertainty. So we advised the colleges to begin to establish 1.5% reserves and not be shocked by any developments along those lines. Unfortunately, it turned out to be a little bit worse than we had anticipated. We thought we would get a "haircut" and if we had to trim back the investment program a little, we would be able to do that. But, the Governor came down with a budget reduction of \$53 million for the senior colleges. That was the first shoe to drop. This was in relation to a \$90 million cut at the State University of New York and additional cuts in the financial aid program managed by the Higher Education Services Corporation. That was a little higher than we hoped, which would require some minor adjustments. In your packet is a letter I sent to college presidents about what we believe the challenge would be if, and only if, this were to come to pass, because it's not a certainty that our budget will be cut by \$53 million. The way the budget is constructed in New York, the Governor has the ability administratively to cut the SUNY budget by \$90 million, but in our case because of the way in which the CUNY budget fits into the larger budget of the State of New York, the so-called local assistance budget, the action of the Legislature is required to cut the \$53 million. So there is an approval process that has to move forward before they actually reduce the funding for CUNY. Having said that, last year the Governor proposed about a \$50 million reduction and the Legislature accepted it. If history is any guide, it would not be shocking if the cut is made although they would hold hearings trying to assess the impact on both CUNY and SUNY. You may be hearing about budget trauma at SUNY. The fact of the matter is that SUNY is an entirely different place. Outside of the University Centers with lots of resources, some of the other schools are in a deep struggle. They are not engaging in an investment program. In fact, they are cutting budgets pretty deeply. In contrast to what we are doing, despite the \$53 million reduction, we are going to continue hiring faculty and doing the student financial aid. And I'm confident that we are not going to have to take more actions beyond the actions that are reflected in that letter. The \$16.3 million that the colleges set aside at the beginning of the year will be more than enough to manage the challenge, and between that and some opportunities that have presented themselves in our budget, we should be able to not have to do anything more than OTPS reductions across the board. We believe that's as bad as it's going to get for the senior colleges this year. It could get better if the Legislature reduces the number from 53 to something lower. If you hear stories about classes that have to be cancelled – none of that is true, or if it is, it isn't because of a budget reduction. The community colleges received a so-called 10% cut, which amounts to \$10 million. Ten percent sounds like a lot if they're going to cut your budget, but it's 10% of whatever is unexpended in State aid. State aid happens to have the smallest share of funding for the community colleges; it's about 28% or maybe 30%. But we also planned for some contingency for the community colleges as well. I think the community colleges, at worst, will have to sustain a reduction of \$4 or \$5 million. And unlike the senior colleges, the community colleges received no reduction last year. They are in a pretty healthy budget situation.

That's where we are. We're in a situation that's a little uncertain because the Legislature is still pondering, but let's not kid ourselves -- we are entering an austere environment. It's clear the direction that this is heading when they are cutting your budget \$50 million one year and the next year, as the budget deficits get larger into the horizon. We should not be unmindful of the era we are about to enter. We are now constructing the Budget Request for next year. The challenge for us is to plan well. With your help and of course the Budget Advisory Committee, with Al Levine back, to help us figure out how best to manage and maintain the progress, we have made over the past 10 years. Over the past five years alone, we added 854 new full-time faculty in this university. That's an enormous uptick. So that's where we are with the budget.

Chair Philipp – Thank you very much. Could you also say a few words about TAP? **Vice Chancellor Malave** – There is not a whole lot I can say about TAP, other than the proposal being floated around to reduce every award by \$120. It is frankly one of those things that the Legislature is likely to address first. This makes the restoration of any part of this \$53 million just that much harder because the politicians will rush, as they probably should, to protect financial aid for the neediest students.

Chair Philipp – The next speaker is Professor Stan Altman, former chair of the Baruch College Senate, who is now Interim President of Baruch College. Please come to the podium.

President Altman – This is a pleasure on my part to be coming from the faculty and be sitting at the head of the College. First of all, it seems perfectly appropriate to me for one of the faculty to be running one of our colleges. We are deeply invested in what goes on in our institutions, probably more so than other at other places I've been. We make a major investment in terms of the quality of the education that we provide our students, and the kind of research that we do, and the whole environment, I think, of the City University at our respective campuses is really quite different from many other higher ed institutions around the country. There is a very special responsibility as a member of the faculty that I must say over the years I have garnered, having found myself in positions in various presidents' offices, now being the president. It started with my understanding when I was at Stony Brook and was asked to join Jack Marburger's office to work on housing issues. One of the things that struck me was that faculty are rarely invited to the table to be part of conversations about the strategic issues that affect our colleges and universities. And that as a result there is a certain input and perspective about what really goes on in the classroom, the departments, and what's really related to trying to educate our students. It kind of gets lost in that discussion. To be invited to be at the table is something we really want to have happen. We want to be a voice at the table, and a voice of reason at the table. That means that once we are invited to be at the table, we need to have a much broader perspective than our typical perspective about what goes on in our classrooms, or our departments. We really need to have an institutional perspective. So one of the things that was a pleasant surprise to me coming to Baruch as a dean was to find the kind of governance relationship that takes place between the faculty senate and the administration at Baruch. Over the years – this my 11th – it has matured with the President's Cabinet, which is the decision-making body on the campus, consists of the Vice President, the three Deans, the Chair of the Faculty Senate, and two senior staff that report to me. The faculty have a significant voice at the table, and that voice is responsible for the entire institution. It's not just about their respective dean's jobs or about their schools. We have a shared responsibility for how we make our institution better, and how we make it work. If we all come to that table with institutional perspectives, I don't need a Cabinet because then it becomes ridiculous. If you have a totally homogenous population, then you can have a sample of 1. If people are going to come to the table and simply have a rhetoric about what they are going to talk about because they're only going to talk about their particular special interest. We also end up degenerating to the problem of The Commons, where basically there are never enough resources to go around so that everybody gets what they want to get. Ultimately we have to make some shared decisions about what are the priorities. Given the

conversations I'm hearing at the President's Council and what the Vice Chancellor has said, that's a challenge we are all going to have to face about how to make our institutions strong, how we continue to maintain excellence of quality, and how do we end up doing that in an environment that is not going to give us all the resources that we want – not that we ever will have all the resources that we want and we probably don't even have all the resources we probably even need. But I think the way that works is when everybody is prepared to come to the table together and figure out what is in the best interests of the institution, which is our students. To some extent, it is us because we are the stewards. We are the ones who in part are responsible for delivering the service to the students who come to get educated. That responsibility means that we have to work in partnerships. I think it's very important at a time like this, for bodies like this, to rise to the occasion and say how do we become a partner with the University? There may be some natural differences, but that's a perfectly reasonable tension for us at universities. We have it across our own departments, and across our own faculty. So having tension among us is not really necessarily a bad idea, but I think we need to be able to come together and say collectively what is in the best interests of this university, and then how do we all move forward together to figure out how that works for all of us. There are many more win-win situations than one can imagine. If we approach it as I've seen at other universities that I have been at where the notion is one side wins, and one side loses. That's not a good healthy solution for figuring out how we're going to be able to work together. In many instances, giving up a little something, and getting a little something means that everybody is ahead in ways that weren't conceived of before than where somebody gets everything and somebody gets nothing. I don't think that works at all. So I think at Baruch we have reasonably good models for how this works. Not only is the faculty part of the governance process but, as I think Terry will attest, from my point of view I think it's very important to be able to sit down with the faculty and the administration to talk about what's important in our College and then be able to go back out to the faculty now that we've had the consultation process, and try to make it as transparent as possible, and then have the faculty senate meetings equally informative and being willing to talk about what we're trying to do. Ultimately to implement anything, we require your cooperation. We can't do anything really at a college without a faculty. Actually, when I first went to Stony Brook and started a new program, we had gotten a big NSF grant, and we were talking about how we were going to do things. I came to my first class of graduate students, and I said since this is an experimental class I would make some money available for travel off-campus, and the students said we want a budget. You've got all this money, so we want money. If you don't give us money, we're going to leave. So I said that's wonderful, so leave! I can get my research done, I can write my papers, and I won't have to drive myself crazy with you guys. Well, I guess maybe we won't leave. But if *you* all left, we'd have a hard time doing our job, right? These are trying times, but I think they are also exciting times. The more we collaborate and work together, the more we can get done what I think can be quite imaginative. All I can say as a member of the faculty and working with my colleagues at Baruch, they unleash this intellectual power and get all this creativity at the table and I think this makes the place work. With that, I'm happy to answer questions. If not, I hope this was useful.

Professor Alfred Levine – Is it possible that you could try to convince some of the other college presidents of the merits of having the head of faculty governance on the president's cabinet?
President Altman – Yes, I think it goes both ways. The governance bodies need to convince the presidents that being there it's not going to be the same old back and forth about you're not doing what I want. I think there is at some point some level of diplomacy that is required here. Remember, you now have a second president who comes from the faculty, up at City. A lot of new presidents have been added in the last year. I think there is a clear middle ground here, and I think it's possible to move both parties to the middle.

Professor Anne Friedman – Congratulations, and maybe some of the community colleges will be the next in line to have faculty who take the position of president. It's wonderful to see your approach, and I'm sure we would all love to participate in what you are inviting your faculty to do, and with the respect you give your governance bodies. One thing you said about the UFS, trying to be partners with 80th Street -- I think we have been trying to do that for a number of years, but the problem is that partners come to the table as equals, and there are major power relationships between a president and the faculty, if the president sees him or herself that way. But certainly in our dealings with 80th Street, they have the power, and they often use that power arbitrarily and capriciously. It's not that we should give up, but it has really been a struggle.

Professor Baumrin – I want to repeat Professor Levine's question in a slightly different way. I'm convinced from Terry's experience and from your experience that it would be a very good thing if representatives of the faculty were to meet collegially with the administration. But until they actually do that, we can't convince them that it would be profitable. **President Altman** – Absolutely.

Professor Beaky – You say that the highest governing body at Baruch is your Cabinet, but you also have a faculty senate. **President Altman** – We have a general faculty, and we have a faculty senate. I'm talking about on the administrative side, the body that makes senior administrative decisions. **Professor Beaky** – So, for example, something that is being proposed for the curriculum would go through the faculty body? **President Altman** – That kind of process would never show up in the Cabinet.

Professor Pecorino – My question goes to institutionalizing the sentiment and the tradition that you describe. The Board has delegated to the local governing bodies the authority to send policy to the Board for its approval or disapproval. You presumably have a governing body, and has it ever been brought to that governing body to institutionalize that practice by setting as a college policy that "There shall be a Cabinet consisting of..." and, if not, would you lead an effort to institutionalize this practice for the sake of your successors? **President Altman** – I have taken a step towards that. On the President's website now there is a description of the Cabinet, and it lists it by position. One of the positions listed is the Chair of the Faculty Senate. I've discovered that once it's on the website, it never leaves the website! It was explicitly done to make it clear the position of the Chair of the Faculty Senate. **Professor Pecorino** – Not a golden parachute, but a bitter pill for your successors? **President Altman** -- I don't think that's the issue at all. The issue is good practice. It's a natural thing for people to come in and have no idea about what has transpired, and just think you need to change things. I don't think with respect to this issue, there is any feeling at all that it needs to be changed, certainly not even among the administrators. I think the relationship we developed was a close working relationship where people felt perfectly free to talk with each other. There are a lot of issues that administrators try to figure out, and they don't have a clue and often feel alienated from going to ask the faculty thinking that somehow we've now crossed the boundary line. I don't think they think twice about calling Terry up, or last year calling me up, or in some cases, my being the point person for some of the things we were trying to get through the Cabinet because I had more freedom as a faculty member than if I had been a vice president. It all depends on the relationship we built. It also comes down to people trusting each other. That's what we work very hard at trying to maintain.

Professor Cooper – Baruch has an interesting history of faculty merging into administration -- Matt Goldstein, for example. There is this tradition. In the other institutions, by and large but not entirely, they bring outsiders in, who come with their own experience and cultural/political/academic backgrounds. My experience has been that with a few exceptions they immediately think that whatever we have needs to be remodeled according to an image they

have come with. I don't think the problem, frankly, is so much on the side of the faculty which has developed, if it's been around a while, a series of practices and traditions that work for it. The difficulty arises when people come in with an agenda because they have to impress the central administration to renovate a place they haven't been at for very long. Clean the Augean Stables.

President Altman – It's not an uncommon practice. At Stony Brook, I was asked to join the president's office, and in a very short period of time I'm marked to become his deputy. So for five years I'm working very closely on campus with faculty and the hospital. Then we had a brand new president. Immediately I was the other guy. Shirley Kenny looked at me and said you're obviously in his camp. Marburger was out, she was in. So I said that is fine. I'm going to get out of this 12 months a year, five days a week, 24 hours a day and weekends – and I went back to teaching. What do I care? It didn't take a year before Shirley began to say can you come in and have a conversation about some of the things I'm trying to deal with? Then I spend the next 10 years of my career advising Shirley Kenny. So I think when that happens, you have a lot of staying power and expertise that can be shared. Sooner or later, if the cards get played properly, that information is going to be sought and if properly delivered builds relationships for the type of thing we're talking about tonight. We're all smart enough and have been through enough institutional issues that we understand how to play this a little bit. What you are saying is absolutely true, but it doesn't have to be the conclusion that therefore the barriers have to continue to remain.

Professor Martell – There is a point Stan made that I want to reiterate. We bring these people up here in front of us, and they talk to us, and we see them seriatim, and we think they come from this homogenous place. In fact, just as there is departmental politics, there is enormous politics within and among the various divisions. One of the roles I've played in the past and play again is I that I don't report to Stan, and I'm a tenured, full professor. He can fire me if he wants, but I'm still president of the Faculty Senate. I've got a degree of freedom that others in that room do not have. A dean is still a dean and reports to a provost. They can speak, but they can speak within limits. I often am the point person to raise issues, but once raised they generate a wider discussion. I say that to the group because if you're looking for points that you could actually use internally to justify why it's useful to have someone from the faculty with some experience on that body, there are good fundamental reasons. But Stan's point about trust and respect and perspective – you go to that meeting and you're the dean of the business school and you always speak about the business school, you are compromised *per se*. Your opinions are reduced because everyone knows you're speaking your book. Thank you.

Chair Philipp – In terms of the community colleges, how do you see Baruch's interaction? You have articulation programs. Can you comment on that? **President Altman** – We've already initiated a conversation between Hostos, Kingsborough, John Jay, and Baruch about creating an accelerated track for students coming out of public affairs who want to get a public administration degree, in which they would move from the community college, articulate to one of our two institutions, and do a fast track through the graduate program. That's a conversation we're about to get started. We think it would speed up graduation. There is some potential overlap between senior and first-year grad stuff, so I think we're open to explore some real interesting partnerships here. From my point of view, we have enormous resources scattered around the university. If this is really going to be an integrated university, we will integrate by working with each other, not each one of us sitting in our own respective silos. We need to take our respective strengths and make ourselves even better.

Chair Philipp – Thank you. At this point, I would like to ask a new governance leader from Brooklyn College, Maria E. Perez-Gonzalez, to come forward so we can give her the UFS

medal, to be worn at commencement exercises. She succeeds Charles Tobey. Welcome to the Senate and the Council of Faculty Governance Leaders.

Before you go, I have an important announcement. We are doing the Faculty Experience Survey right now. All of you should have gotten postcards about this. If you haven't, let us know. If you have, please actually do it because it's important that we get as high a turnout as possible for the Survey. We need a high response rate to make the data more valuable. Tell your college to go and do that survey right away.