

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

February 27, 2007

The meeting was called to order by UFS Chair Philipp at 6:40 p.m. in Room 9206/9207/9208 at the Graduate School and University Center. 63 voting members of 118 were present.

**Baruch:** Present – Martell, Vora and Alternate Aubry. Absent – Albright, Dumas, Freedman, Hill, Pollard, and Smith. Vacancies – 1. **BMCC:** Present – Belknap, Friedman, Martinez-Lopez, Niyazov, Persaud, and Rani. Absent – Agwu, and Roy. **Bronx CC:** Present – Alozie, and Asimakopoulos. Absent—Durante. Vacancies—2. **Brooklyn:** Present – Antoniello, Bell, Cherukupalli, Jacobson, Shapiro, Tobey, and Viscusi. Absent – Bloomfield, Rodman, and Wills. **CCNY:** Present –Daglish and Khalil. Absent – Crain, Habib, Lascar, Leonard, and Sank. Vacancies – 2. **CSI:** Present – Cooper, Klibaner, Levine, Petratos, and Alternates Stearns, and Zimmerman. Absent – Foleno, Jayatilleke, and Yousef. **CUNY Law School:** Present – Copelon and McArdle. **Graduate School:** Present – Baumrin, Lerner, and Orenstein. Absent – Cross, Matthews-Salazar, and Nolan. **Hostos CC:** Present –Bernardini, Pimentel, and Alternate Sharma. Absent – August. Vacancies - 1. **Hunter:** Present –Palanda, and St. Hill. Absent – Friedman, Guzzetta, Kaye, Krishnamachari, McCormick, Sherrill, Splitter, Wimberly, Vacancies – 1. **John Jay:** Present –Crossman, Kaplowitz (by conference call), King-Toler, and Alternates Chaffie, Dunham, Petraco, and Soto-Fernandez. Absent – Caldwell, Kubic, Pascoe, and Romero. **Kingsborough CC:** Present – Barnhart, Galvin, and Wood. Absent – Hume, O’Malley, Ruoff. **LaGuardia CC:** Present – Beaky, Davidson, Lerman, Mettler, Rushing, and Shean. **Lehman:** Present –Kolb, Mineka, Philipp. Absent – Aronowitz, Jervis, and Marianetti. **Medgar Evers:** Present – Barker, Hope, and Alternate Daly. Absent – Stewart, and Hastick. **NYCCT:** Present – Cermele, Dreyer, Horelick, Hounion, and Richardson. Absent – Karthikeyan. **Queens:** Present – Bird, Moore, Savage, and Tse. Absent – Brody, Casco, Habib, Gonzalez, and Zevin. Vacancies – 2. **Queensborough CC:** Present – Barbanel, Iconis, and Pecorino. Absent – Hest, and Jacobowitz. Vacancies – 1. **York:** Present – Frank, and Lewis. Absent – Divale, and Rosenthal.

Executive Vice Chancellor Dobrin, Vice Chancellor Malave, Chief Information Officer Cohen, and Deputy Chief Operating Officer Spalter attended.

**Governance Leaders present:** Anderson (BMCC), Baumrin (GS), Cooper (CSI), Levine (CSI), Martell (Baruch), Mettler (LaGuardia), Pecorino (QCC), Raj (CCNY), Savage (Queens), Tobey (Brooklyn), and Young (Hunter) attended. Parliamentarian Andrea McArdle, Executive Director Phipps, Administrative Assistant Pasela, and Secretary Blanchard were also present.

I. Approval of the Agenda: An update on the State budget by Vice Chancellor Malave was added as item III. D. The agenda was then adopted as proposed.

II. Approval of the Minutes of January 30, 2007: Minutes were approved as distributed. One member correction is forth coming to the Reports and Deliberations section.

III. Discussion, Proposed Policy Regarding the Disposition of Allegations of Misconduct in Research and Similar Educational Activities: Senator Baumrin moderated the discussion, which is available in the *Reports & Deliberations*.

III. Reports: (Recorded in Reports & Deliberations)

- A. Chair.
- B. Representatives to Board Committees.
- C. Invited Guests, Executive Vice Chancellor Allan Dobrin, Chief Information Officer Brain Cohen and Deputy Chief Operating Officer Ron Spalter on the ERP.
- D. Vice Chancellor for Finance and Computing Ernesto Malave.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Bill Phipps  
Executive Director

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

February 27, 2007

IV. Reports:

**A. Chair, Manfred Philipp:** Welcome to the 326th Plenary Session of the University Faculty Senate. We have a large amount of material for you and we have some changes in the proposed agenda. In particular, Vice Chancellor Malave is here to give you an in-detail presentation on the University budget. And I think that's a presentation you will want to communicate to your own faculty bodies on your campuses. We want to have an informed Senate. Then Vice-Chancellor Dobrin will be coming on later on to give a report. And after that I'll give my report orally, briefly, but I think in deference to our guests, we'll start immediately. We'll start with Vice-Chancellor Malave to give a discussion -- now the materials that he's going to be presenting are on the desk outside. Before that starts, though, I'd like to ask Prof. Kathryn Richardson to stand up and do a short announcement about the PSC CUNY Research Awards program. If you could, please?

Professor Kathryn Richardson (Nursing Department, NYCCT) I know that you all know me from being the Chair of the Research Committee, the UFS Research Committee. I would like to ask you again to spark some interest on your own campuses for people that will serve on the UCRA and, you know, help us with these following areas. The yellow folders are outside on the table. It's art history and visual arts, biochemistry and molecular biology, communication, arts, and sciences, linguistics, speech, and hearing, that's all one, comparative literature and languages, economics and business administration, engineering, ethnic and area studies, history, library, mathematics, music, performing arts, psychology and physiology-psychology, and women's studies. It sounds like we're going to have a busy year in May or June when we go over the Curricula Vitae. So please grab a few of these off the table and let your grants officers know, and also the faculty. Thank you.

Chair Philipp: Thank you very much. Vice Chancellor Malave, please. It's a pleasure to have you again.

**D. Vice Chancellor Ernesto Malave:** Thank you and good evening. I notice that some of you may not have the materials, but all of it is outside. Let me just tell you what I'm going to be working from, so you could, if you don't already have it, and you wish to get it, it's right outside. I want to just - this is just for your leisure time, the budget request book, which includes all the details, investment programs from the campuses. There's two pages for every school, so if you wondered exactly what it is that your colleges are asking for, when we ask for the University to request, it's pretty detailed, so you can always have the opportunity to go back and read that. So you'll enjoy that. The second thing is that there's one page entitled 2007-2008 Budget Priorities, which was handed out yesterday at the board meeting of the Trustees. Some of you may have already downloaded this, the preliminary budget recommendations, which include also some materials directly from the Governor's Executive Budget Presentation. Finally, I'll start with this document. I put the PowerPoint that we presented yesterday to the Trustees.

The last time that I was here was January 30, which was the day before the Governor released a budget, and I indicated that I had to go back to the office to get the briefing, because we were getting the overnight briefing. So when I left here, I went back and found out exactly what the Governor had recommended. But I did -- and I cheated a little bit - I did have a little sense of

what it was that the Governor was going to recommend, but the information was embargoed, so I wasn't free to hand it out and to explain it. Let me just go over the PowerPoint presentation on page 2, and go over the senior college highlights. It's basically a very simple budget, really very simple budget compared to some of the others.

There's nothing complicated about this budget at all. But the bottom line is -- a couple of things, for the senior colleges, the Governor has recommended \$1.6 billion in additional operating -- not in additional operating support -- in the overall funding for the senior colleges. And that's an increase of \$71.8 million. That is a nice amount of money for those of you who are wondering -- \$71 million goes a long way. It is very substantial. The University is in a good position to begin an Executive Budget with. As you can see from these two dot points, what's in the \$71.8 million? \$67.8 million is to fund all the mandatory costs that the University - we project about \$40 million in additional funds will be needed for just to cover the cost of fringe benefits which are largely, those increases are largely for by pensions and healthcare cost increases. There's \$7.5 million for collective bargaining. \$30 million for increased energy, and \$17 million for other inflationary increases. These increases mean the cost of the increment on the campuses, the OTPS past inflation that's budgeted on the campuses. So this base condition, which is the worst that it's going to get, with this base condition, you could assure yourselves that everything that is already occurring on your campuses this year, with respect to the compact spending has all been folded into the bases, because the base budget includes everything that we received last year. So everything we got last year has already been budgeted in the base, and on top of that we have another \$72 million. And you can see most of that goes to fund those mandatory cost increases. But the Governor also included \$4 million for what they define to be an Empire Innovation Program that we define to be our Master Plan Priorities. We just simply put it as a lump sum for the University to allocate in accordance with its master plan. So that's the worst case scenario. And for those of you who are veterans of the budget process for a dozen years, at least for a dozen years, and even before then, at this point we're trying to figure out how to get back \$100 million, just to get back our wallet, not in any way, shape, or form trying to secure any resources so we can make any investments. So it is truly a sea change in the way in which the Executive certainly is treating the University and this of course applies both to CUNY and to SUNY. Many of you are familiar, if not all of you, with the CUNY Compact, which is a vehicle that we created to fund the University's budget requests. It also includes tuition increases. In this case, the budget request included a proposal for tuition increases, 2.5% at the senior colleges. The Governor did not recommend, if you haven't already seen it, did not recommend a tuition proposal. The Governor decided instead to call for a Commission on Public Higher Education to examine the issue of tuition policy. And at this time, I would just like to, if we can just go toward the end of this document, and I'll come back to it, but I think it's very important that we go to this here. This page entitled Excellence in Higher Education. This comes directly from the Governor's budget materials, and as you can see, and the first thing they call for is a Commission on Public Higher Education. And you can read the second dot point, that "among the charges of the commission will be to develop a rational tuition policy to promote the affordability, stability, and predictability in future tuition charges as SUNY and CUNY." And if you go to the next page, on page 2, at the top it's titled "Higher Education Investment Strategy." And I'll just read it for a second and tell me if it sounds familiar: "That the financing of our public University to the partnership or taxpayers, students, and campuses sharing responsibility for supporting campus operations and programs. Under this partnership, number 1: taxpayer support fixed operating costs at SUNY and CUNY and invest in targeted initiatives for academic programs and promote economic development." So the Governor's up-front strategy, even before he hands it off to a Commission to consider the details, is in the first instance, that the public taxpayers and the tax levy dollars ought to support what we define as our mandatory costs, and what we define to be our 20% investment, they define to be a targeted, that's okay. And number 2: "students support a portion of their college costs through affordable and predictable tuition increases." It's important

- and the reason I'm mentioning it as important - the Governor is not hiding behind the Commission and saying, "all right, you're telling me what to do. And if you're telling me to raise tuition then I'll do it." I think it's important that the Governor comes out and makes the case that a predictable tuition, modest, affordable policy ought to be in place to guide the Commission's work. So he's not hiding behind the Commission, that's important. And the third: "The campuses achieve efficiencies to ensure the prudent expenditure of taxpayers' and students' funds." Who would argue with that? And I think that the only thing that's missing from that to round out the compact is the issue of philanthropy, which I guess they didn't want to put it in because they didn't want it to be accused of plagiarism, although they did suggest that maybe they have plagiarized our budget request. And I think that - so that's important to point out, that the Governor didn't recommend a tuition increase although they support the modest, predictable ones, because we have argued, and I'll go back now to the analysis, our budget request included \$19 million in revenue that was associated with that \$100 increase in tuition. And we wanted that revenue to come back to support the investment program of the University. And the Governor came up with a very good start. He took a big burden away from the legislature of having to try to cover all of our mandatory costs, which were very, very difficult to go to the legislature and argue, "Can you give me money for pensions? Can you give me money for healthcare costs? Can you give me money to cover inflation?" Legislators, one, aren't in the business of doing that, they're always toying at the margins, but it's very hard -- it's not a very sexy kind of argument. You go to the legislature, on the other hand, you say, "I need more money for more full time faculty, support, libraries," they light up and they can actually support that. So we're arguing that the legislature ought to take the \$19 million that the Governor did not give us the authorization to raise tuition, and give us those dollars in taxpayer support. And we're pretty encouraged. We went to Albany and we made the rounds, and it was actually - it was kind of a tough, not a tough, but it was a very different experience. We're normally, as I indicated, they're always looking for a three-digit number. And we're normally there because someone just put a gigantic hole in our budget, and so what we're asking for is over \$100 million. And we said that we need it to fund our entire investment program, \$24.3 million and they were waiting for the other number to come and it never came. And that's not a bad place to be when at the end of the day you can in fact fund your budget requests with what they would consider to be a relatively modest \$24.3 million. But before you get too enthusiastic about that, this sort of cuts both ways. On the one hand, it's good to see that they, the legislature, don't view that they have a major problem to fix, that they don't have to find a \$100 million, \$150 million for CUNY and SUNY combined. They can also say, "Gee, you guys did pretty good. You've got a budget that covers all your costs, your inflation, and now on top of that they gave you \$4 million in additional support, and between that and your philanthropy, you guys are off to a great start. And let me go off and fix Medicaid," which is the only real problem that the Governor gave to the legislature to fix. And for there, they're looking for \$1.3 billion in order to sort of restore cuts to Medicare. So for the senior colleges, we're off to a very good start. For the community colleges, it's not bad either. Our budget request sought an increase in base aid of \$125 per FTE. Just to remind some of you the way in which the State of New York funds community colleges is on a per-capita basis, both for CUNY and for SUNY, and the way they do it is to either increase base aid by a marginal amount. This time, they increased it by \$100, and that came from the Governor-- also a very good start. So the difference between what we asked for and our entire request, and what we received in the Executive Budget is \$2 million. That's also not a bad place to begin. We have some issues with the city administration that I'll come to in a moment. But we start with the operating budget for CUNY in the best position we've started. So we ended this past fiscal year with the best budget we've had in 20 years and we begin the next fiscal year with the best Executive beginning that we've had in a very, very long time. The last point on page 2 of the Executive Budget Analysis is financial aid. The other big story in Albany is that-- and there's hundreds of thousands, half a million students, that are going to receive TAP and many hundreds of thousands of students in the state of New York receive tuition assistance from the TAP

program, which spends about a billion dollars statewide. And it's good to see that the students who receive financial aid do not have to figure right now whether they're going to have a challenge in receiving financial aid next year. That was all part of a very cynical budget strategy on the part of the previous Governor to secure the Legislature into not funding more than a certain amount to the higher education. But it was done in a way that put a lot of people, parents and others, in a very anxious set of circumstances because they wondered whether or not their financial aid was going to be good. It is good to see that this Governor is not going to play that game with the families in New York and is not going to simply cut the budget knowing that it's going to be restored by the Legislature later and is simply not playing that game. I think that's very important. Outside of whether or not it makes our issues easier in terms of a budget restoration, which I think is good for New York families. Whether it's good for constraining spending in the State of New York, that's another matter, but we could talk about that later. But for New York families that's a good thing. On the capital side, on page 4 of the analysis - and I'll come back to the City because I think the last time I was here I covered the City budget, we didn't cover the State. But on page 4, we talk about the capital budget. And the capital budget, the Governor has recommended almost \$266 million in additional support for the colleges. And that was a number of things. The science buildings at City College, both the City College Science Building and the Advanced Science Center received \$69.8 million. There was another \$69 million from Health and Safety and Preservation and Facilities across the campuses. Marshak continues to need resources at City College. Any of you here from City College? Who's City College? Where's City College? City College here? You guys know Marshak, I'm sure. So that's very, very important. It's one of our -- City College is extremely important to the University right now and the work that it's doing, the work that needs to take place, because we have to, at the same time, because we continue science at City College, we need to rebuild and to strengthen the facilities there. In addition there was \$40 million provided for the community colleges. Almost all of that went to Borough of Manhattan Community College to round out the needs for Fiterman Hall, and for Medgar Evers College \$11 million. And for the community colleges that are a state match for capital facilities with the community colleges, they're funded 50% by the city and by the state. So that \$20 million is only real to the extent that the City of New York kicks in their \$20 million in order to fund the \$40 million program shortfall at BMCC for Fiterman Hall. In the case of Medgar Evers, they have a \$22 million need. The state is now kicking its \$11 million and we expect and hope, in fact tomorrow we're meeting with the City Budget Director, and hopefully the City Budget Director will kick in the \$11 million to round out Medgar Evers. So it's not a bad place to begin the Capital Budget as well. In addition, the Governor has said that he wants to advance the new, and create a new five-year plan. Right now there's an existing five-year capital program. Like most new Governors, they sort of want to take a look at everything brand new and they've asked the University to consider putting together a new five-year plan. We're going to hear from Senior Vice Chancellor Dobrin soon and Brian Cohen, the Chief Information Officer, and they're going to be talking about probably the biggest initiative in the University right now. And there's Mister ERP walking into the room right there, Mr. Ronald Spalter. We're going to be talking about the need to secure additional funding to support the ERP. So if we get the \$24.3 million in additional support we're able, we're going to be able to do everything that's in this book. Because you have to add to the \$24.3 million all the other elements of the compact that are not included in that \$24.3. We're still seeking roughly \$5 million, about \$4.5 million in philanthropy and another \$4 to \$5 million in efficiencies in the systems. So there's another \$10 million that is going to be added to that the \$24.3 to support the University initiatives. To the extent that we continue to grow in this university, some of our campuses are a little tapped out, and some of the campuses continue to grow, all that additional revenue is also going to be plowed back to support the initiatives. So I think we're off to a great start. This page here, which is the budget priorities, you can see what we're asking for. We're asking on the top item for the senior colleges, \$24.3 million. In state aid for community colleges we're asking for \$5 million. If you heard me a moment ago, you only heard me saying that there

was a \$2 million deficiency between \$100 and \$125 and where's the \$5 million coming from? Because the Governor did not propose a tuition increase for the senior colleges and because the legislature is not going to do one in lieu of the Governor, and not stepping in, you can bet your money that the City of New York is not going to propose a tuition increase as well. But like the senior colleges, the community colleges had a tuition component of \$45 a semester, \$90 per year that was built into the community college budget request. So since we're not going to raise tuition at the community colleges we now need and would like the state and the city to kick in and backfill that amount with additional city support so we can run an investment program at the community colleges like we are running at the senior colleges. The challenge we face at the community colleges is, for those who remember from last month, and it's included in the analysis, that the Mayor's preliminary budget, which he released also last month, called for not insignificant reductions in the community colleges on the order of magnitude of \$17 million in support, and eliminated the Vallone Scholarship Program and otherwise gave us about a \$35 million challenge for the City of New York, mostly for the community colleges outside of the Vallone program, which largely benefits senior college students. As a result, we're not in the same position we are. And between now and the time that the Mayor issues the Mayor's Executive Budget, which is late April or early May, we hope to convince the Mayor to pretty much follow in the Governor's footsteps and not play the budget dance. Give us our funding for the mandatory costs, give us additional money for some modest improvements in the operating budget. We'll figure out the rest, and we'll be able to engage in the community college investment program. So somewhere we're in pretty good shape with senior colleges, we have some work to do with the community colleges, and hopefully by the time this all done, in May and June, we can report back that we are about to enter year two of an investment program, which would be an unprecedented situation at CUNY. Thank you.

Chair Philipp: Thank you very much.

[Applause]

Chair Philipp: I'd like to think that a large piece of a responsibility for the improvement in CUNY finances is of course Vice-Chancellor Malave's good work. And thank you. Before I open for questions, I'd like to recognize Elliott Dawes. Elliott, could you stand up please? Elliott Dawes is the University's Director of the Black Male Initiative. He was presented to one of our UFS committees this afternoon, and I thought it would be interesting for him to come and see our plenary. Now, Vice-Chancellor Malave's report is open for questions, if anybody wants to come to the microphone, please.

Professor Alfred Levine (Department of Engineering Science and Physics, College of Staten Island): We're all thrilled that we were able to request the \$29.3 million from the legislature and not have to raise tuition for anyone. So thank you very much -- this is great news. I'd like to ask a question about the capital budget. On page 80 of the budget request, the senior college capital budget lists the projects according to priorities, and, for example, priority number four is the Science Research Center and priority number five is the new Science Facility at the City College campus. I believe that the Governor's executive budget distinguished between these and funded the new Science Facility but did not fund the Advanced Science Research Center at this degree. Is that correct?

Vice Chancellor Malave: The Governor's executive budget funded both. It did not fund the entire requested amount for the Advanced Science Center because they were redoing the capital budget and they calculated how much cash we would actually need in '08 for the Advanced Science Center and they estimated that number to be at \$14 million. So even though we need \$72

million to fund the project, the cash cost in '08 was \$14, so they decided to play conservatively and give us the \$14 million.

Professor Levine: But they didn't give us any more than they could expense?

Vice Chancellor Malave: They did separate the two.

Professor Stefan Baumrin (Philosophy Department, Graduate School & University Center): I don't think I understand what you said about the ATB.

Vice Chancellor Malave: Let me complete it. There was -- and the reason I say that is because there are -- the Governor did propose changes to the use of the Ability to Benefit Test, which is a federally-mandated examination, be discontinued to be eligible to receive the Tuition Assistance Program. Right now in order to be eligible you have to have a high school diploma or receive a General Equivalency Diploma, and also, if you pass this examination, you're also entitled to receive TAP. This is largely a program that benefits the proprietary sector. You've heard all the stories about Interboro and all the schools that allow students to come in and in 18 months guarantee them an Associates Degree, and when they transfer to CUNY can't pass the Assessment Examination. So one of the things that they're doing in the state is reforming that process and they're eliminating that. So there are many, many individuals in the state of New York today, who take the Ability to Benefit Test instead of taking the GED as an entrance into a higher education program. By eliminating the Ability to Benefit examination it doesn't necessarily mean that they won't take the GED and still enter a program. It simply takes that vehicle - it's an examination that is not quite as rigorous as the GED. We have a number of -- about a couple of hundred students at CUNY, because we have another very small program that is run at the community colleges, at a number of the community colleges, that allow a limited number of students to come in without a GED. We believe that for those students who come in under those circumstances that we can prep them to take the GED and that they can take it, pass it, and enroll. A lot of them having - you know, their ability to attend college compromised. It does mean that there may be a few proprietary institutions in New York who will go out of business. And a lot of people think that that's a very, very good idea. And that's why I didn't mention it because it's not something that affects CUNY, but for the most part, for the Tuition Assistance Program, for the lion's share of the people of the state of New York, they don't have anything to worry about.

Professor William Daly (Library, Medgar Evers College): I was looking at the phrase "increase or replacement of [inaudible] and the construction at Medgar." One is \$20 million and Medgar is starting from scratch right now, it's \$11 million. The word "replacement" had me saying that our structure and replacing it and then you're building something new and the number is --

Vice Chancellor Malave: No, in the case of Medgar Evers we have over \$150 million that's already in the bank to build the new Academic Complex. There's a little shortfall of \$22 million that needs to be completed in order for the \$180 million to be available. That's what that is.

Professor Vasilios Petratos (Political Science, Economics, and Philosophy Department, College of Staten Island): The CUNY compact -- [Tape turned over]

Vice Chancellor Malave: ...a series of things, including full-time faculty, faculty support, scholarship activities, research. It also has, not insignificantly, a student service component, which has a number of issues for advising and counseling, financial aid, etc. And it has issues for information technology and facilities. So that's the structure of the budget of the master plan that was approved by the University. We invite the colleges within broad categories to collaborate

with their various constituencies and come back with a proposal for how they would allocate that within broad categories. Some campuses chose last year, I think City College primarily, that they didn't think it was appropriate in '07 to hire full-time faculty, so most of their dollars went for faculty support and research and some of the other things. Staten Island had a different set of priorities. So at the end of the day, we do the broad categories, we tell them they have to stay within those broad categories because we have to be consistent with the master plan -- that is what our operating vehicle is, we just can't ignore it. But we also give them flexibility to say if through consensus one determines that you really do want to invest more in student services and you want to take it out of full-time faculty, that you can do that provided you do that in a collaborative effort. So there are some constraints that are built into it because of the master plan, but beyond those broad constraints, you know, the issue that you have to contend with is that there are many constituents here on campus. Faculty is only one constituency, students are others, administrators are others, and when you get them together, collectively, a librarian says, "thank you very much for those important issues, but we really need to stock up on the periodicals and we need an investment in the libraries." There are many, many competing interests and the work of a college administration is to work with everybody to find consensus with what those priorities are. And people do that in different ways.

Professor Petratos: Let me inform you that those categories are broadly specific. They present them the way that they want to. They say we have to stay with these categories, and there is not much leeway out of them. Now you said the different constituencies. I represent faculty. But that's not the most important constituency on the campus. The most important constituency is students. And we cannot educate them, basically. And in fact, in the past, you had given us some tables looking at and comparing different campuses, the percentage of the budget that goes for instruction. Do you remember those tables?

Vice Chancellor Malave: Absolutely.

Professor Petratos: Could you come up with them again if you don't mind?

Vice Chancellor Malave: I'll come up with them again.

Professor Petratos: And where I am and many other places, we find that something like 18 or 19 or 20% of the total budget goes for instruction. Therefore, everything else is unnecessary or superfluous. Here we are and we're all trying to make salad dressing, but we have no salad. I'd like you to respond to that.

Vice Chancellor Malave: The only thing -- And I'd be very happy to come back and show you the new schedules on the percentages. I'll come in and show it to you if you want to personally, I'll prepare that as well. But let me just say, in terms of where we were before where almost zero decisions were made on the campus in terms of the budget priorities, it may not be perfect with respect to how much discretion people have, but two years ago there was zero discretion. Now there's a considerable more discretion for colleges to build their budget requests. And what I see in these budget books comes from the campuses. It may not be perfect but, boy, it's a lot better than it was.

Chair Philipp: There are no other questions? I'd like to thank you.  
[Applause]

Chair Philipp: The next item on the agenda is Vice-Chancellor Allan Dobrin. He has several members of his group with him, Chief Information Officer Brian Cohen, and Ronald Spalter who is clearly one of the most important people in this University because he fixes every problem in

the administration. So Vice-Chancellor Dobrin, if you could come, please? The topic of interest, the most important topic, I think, but he may change my mind, is Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP). This is going to take a lot of money out of this University, and hopefully for good purposes, and we're going to hear about that and other things. Okay?

C. Invited Guests, Executive Vice Chancellor Allan Dobrin: Thank you, ladies and gentlemen. Before he leaves, I just want to take the opportunity to just say how much I appreciate and think Vice-Chancellor Malave is terrific. That certainly we don't have all the money, or even nearly all the money we'd like, certainly we don't have all the money we need, but it's a hell of a lot better than what we saw a few years ago. Now we're having conversations about whether we're spending the investment right. A few years ago we were having conversations about whether we raise tuition, you know, lots, or whether or not we cut back on services. So while they're still hard conversations and we hope it will be better, a lot of the credit goes to Vice-Chancellor Malave.

Let me kind of -- I guess I'll apologize ahead of time -- I'm a quasi-technologist. Brian's a real technologist. And it is impossible, it is bones to jargonate things, I'm really going to try real hard not to. When I became Commissioner of Technology, and again, I'm not a real technologist, when I went to my first staff meeting, everybody seemed to be saying "Dazdy" and "Mips." And I was still the director of the Mayor's Commission on Special Ed, so I went to my second staff meeting. I said, I just came back from the Mayor's Commission on Special Ed and was thinking of putting the HD 10 and 20s with the ABRs. And everybody looked at me like this. I said I could have said that to you, or I could have said I just came back from the Mayor's commission on Special Ed and we're thinking about taking children who are using crutches and wheelchairs and putting them in buildings with elevators and escalators, depending on whether I want to communicate with you or intimidate you. So the next person who says "Mips" and "Dazdy" instead of computer capacity of tape drives is fired. And all of a sudden, everyone tried to speak English. So with that in mind we will try to speak English also.

Six years ago IBM did a study and they looked at CUNY's computer systems. They looked at our administrative systems, both HR and financial, and they took a look at our student systems. And they said basically, "You have a big problem; these are antiquated systems." Number one, they're written in what are called "second generation" languages. You don't want to be in second generation languages --that's not good. Those of you who in this business, words like COBOL, Fortran, Assembler, these are not good things to hear from a consultant. For a while it was okay because we still had people coming from the former Soviet Union, but you can't find people in even the former Soviet Union anymore who can do this. So that was problem number one. Secondly, because when you talk to young people and say, "Listen, I have a great job for you. You're going to become an expert in COBOL." It's hard to get them to work for you. We were starting to lose people. So our major student system, which is SIMS, we have three people who can still write to that system. I went to visit them because I was concerned about this. Two of them didn't look well, and the third had a brochure on his desk that said "Florida" on it. So we were very concerned. We only have one person who can write to the financial aid system. This is of real concern to the University. The other issue is privacy, which I know is a very serious issue for this group. Years ago when people built systems, they built them with the identifier being? Yes, social security numbers. That's a bad thing. We cannot just do away with that, we need to reform the systems that do that. There's also a lack of functionality. You can't write to them, you can't change them. You know, we want to do CRM systems, Customer Relationship Management, where we prospect for students all the kind of things that, you know, more well-endowed universities do. We want to do online HR things so that you can go in, if you want to change something, that you can do it online, go in at two o'clock in the morning and take care of whatever business you want to do. So there's all these things that we really want to do. Every

time we do something new, whether it be an intersession program, or now we're going to do the ASAP program, Brian has a heart attack. You know, he sees the world very simply. We say, "Oh, we just got \$20 million from the Mayor to run a program. We're going to make an investment in the community college system." He looks pale and I worry about him and I look and make sure he doesn't have a Florida brochure. And fortunately, he's too young to do that, but it's almost impossible to do anything new and add it to these very clunky systems. And as you all know when you're on campuses, we're starting to see some problems. We're starting to see some things that we're concerned about. So we went to the market and there were only two vendors who came back and said that they could build something for a system of our size. Oh, actually, there were three, I'll take that back, now it's two. There was Peoplesoft who had done lots of this throughout the country. There was Oracle and there was SAP. And we said fine, and we started a procurement. And then we looked one day, and what did we see? Oracle said they were going to buy Peoplesoft, and they put in a real poisoned pill and they say, "by the way, after we buy it, we're no longer going to update it. And if you bought it, basically, you're a giant loser." Now I thought that was a poisoned pill and they were just saying that so nobody would buy Peoplesoft, but it worked really well because it froze the market. Nobody went into the market. As it turned out, they weren't kidding and they bought Peoplesoft, so now there's only two vendors. We're down to SAP and Peoplesoft. And we did the most complicated, largest procurement in the University's history. We had over 190 people participate in different ways. So we've got a lot of people involved, as best we could. And I gave Brian one instruction: I want to do this in the most conservative way possible. No matter what, I did not want to become the Cal State system where they're spending over a billion dollars on putting in a system. And they did, in my view, everything wrong, so we wanted to not do those same things. So, you know, normally what you do when you do these systems is you have two major contracts and some minor contracts. The two major ones are you get a software provider and you get a systems integrator, and then what happens is they point to each other. So you have a problem -- the software provider says "Software's great, the systems integrator, they don't know what they're doing." And then the systems integrator says, "We're the best systems integrator in the world. This is horrible software. Why did you even go into business with these guys?" And that's the problem with every one we did.

We're going to try to stick as close to the software as we can. What really happened in the Cal system, everybody maintained their own way to do everything. It's the worst decision you could make. It's not just more expensive, but every time they do new release in the future, we'd have to have all the release levels customized also. It will be a nightmare that will turn into a really expensive -- it's a really expensive project already-- it's going to be a \$3 million project. But it will turn into a much, much more expensive project than that. I'm going to have Brian take you through the key goals, a) because he's, much better at this than I am and, b) I want you all to have some confidence that we have an absolutely terrific CIO. Brian is absolutely sensational. He's going to talk a little bit about what's in the contract, and that's our effort to show off to you that we actually have reasonably intelligent people running the administration, so you can sleep at night. And he's going to talk about the benefits of the system, because that's, at the end of the day, secondarily what it's really about. Primarily, it's just, they're really old, and you've got to get on with it at some point. You can argue that we can, you know, send a code out there in the end -- there's things we can do to keep it alive another two, three years, with failures, with social security numbers, we can do that. The Chancellor asked me if we can do that. I said, "Yeah, we can keep it alive for another three, four, or five years, but then it's going to be a catastrophe when it goes. So we've got to do that." But then secondarily, some good things will come out of it. And then Ron's going to talk about the worst thing of all, which is how do you get something like this done at the City University of New York. So that's going to be a joy. And then we'll all be here to answer questions to as long as you're willing to stay.

CIO Brian Cohen: Thank you, Allan. Let me give you a sense of what the key goals of this project is. First and foremost, it's to replace our antiquated systems. And if you count how many antiquated systems we have, we have over 25 antiquated systems that one would say, "Wait a second, we have one student information system called SIMS, but there are six -- actually 17 versions of SIMS out there. Every campus has their own SIMS application, and not one of them is identical. So we have to replace all 17 of those. Borough of Manhattan Community College has their own system called TIF. We have the Graduate Center, which has Banner. We have CUPS, we have FAS, FIZ, and I think there's a FUZZ out there. There are a lot of different systems out there that need to be replaced. The financial systems, the financial aid systems, they're all out there, and they need to be replaced. They're all in various levels of coding. They're all in a lot of ways failing every day. We have staff that just try to keep these systems alive. And, as Allan said, as they come up with more and more great programs for the University, we have to modify these systems. And when you introduce new code to these systems, you're introducing a whole series of new errors. And as the workforce transitions into retirement, the people who have the knowledge of these systems and the documentation in their head leave with that knowledge, and we cannot keep these systems going. It really has an impact on the University. We need to reengineer the way -- and in some cases standardize the way -- in which we do things here in the University. I'm sure you'll find this hard to believe but, you know, we have 19 different ways of doing bursaring and 19 different ways of doing registration and we have, you know, 19 different or 23 different ways of timekeeping. There is no standardization here. We don't have one way of doing it, and that's one of the reasons why we have 19 different student information systems, or in this particular case, almost 21. So we need to standardize. We need to come to a point where we're all doing things very similar in a lot of ways, with an understanding that there is still a need for uniqueness. We need to manage our data in one single database. As you understand, given all the different systems out there, all the data sits in different systems. We cannot standardize on the data. We cannot make sure that how people use fields and how they enter data is the same way across the entire university. We cannot do reports across all this data. We cannot necessarily be able to pull data from the student systems with the personnel systems, with the financial systems, easily to create reports that look at this entire University and give us a picture of how we are doing. And then you add into the complexity the fact that we have hundreds of shadow systems, little systems that were built out there to perform things that we couldn't do with our legacy systems, our computer systems that have managed this University for such a long time. We have data in hundreds of other systems, and we are replicating this over and over again. Add into all of the things that I just talked about the fact that in order for this University to continue to move forward, we need to be able to provide new functionality. Things like a customer relations and management system. Things like being able to do student prospecting across the entire University. Functionality like inherent in managing an organization this size, over 35,000 employees. You want a workforce management system. Things like that we cannot introduce into our legacy systems. They just won't have the functionality. Finally, of course, and something that's near and dear, is security. And Allan touched on it when he talked about social security numbers. You know, 25 years ago, using a social security number was an acceptable thing to do. The words 'identity theft' did not exist in our vocabularies. Today it is not acceptable. Reengineering our legacy systems to sort of eliminate social security numbers is an impossible thing to do. They're so imbedded in the way in which this university operates. Everyone who has access to our systems, whether it is a clerk, a payroll administrator, a faculty member, will access the data via a social security member. And they're looking at this data; they have it available to them. We cannot control that level of access. The systems weren't built for that. We need to change the way in which we use our data. Social security numbers should be only important to those people who need to know it. There should be a student identification number or an employee number that is not in any way identifiable to an individual. We should be protecting that data and protecting identity. We can't do it with our legacy systems. Allan talked a little bit about the process that we went through and

the contract that we have negotiated. Let me tell you that this has been one of the most aggressive procurements I have ever participated in. We have done dual negotiations with both our vendors at the same time. We're in the middle of the RFP. We're actually just about finishing up on the procurement. We have not awarded a contract at this time, but we've negotiated contracts at the same time with both vendors. So it wasn't just one set of meetings, it was two. And there are two contracts, fully signed, by both the vendors that the University has actually yet to sign itself. The price of the Oracle contract went down over \$32 million in negotiations. Not only did the price go down, but the scope of work went up. So we got them to do more for less. On top of that, we put things in this contract which we have had experts and outside consultants provide us with sort of feedback that they have never seen in higher education. As a matter of fact, they had never seen it in the corporate world that a vendor would agree to the things they have agreed to. There are actually 18 milestones in the contract itself that if the vendor fails to meet those milestones in time, they are subject to penalties and fines. And if they miss those milestones, if you add up all the penalties and fines, it's about another \$22 million coming back to the University. We've built in protections for us: growth. One of the things that software vendors love to do is say, as you would hit that threshold, as you hit your certain number of licenses, you are now in the new category, so come back and negotiate with us about the next set of categories you want to be in. We didn't do that. We said to them that you will provide us licensing for the software that we are buying based upon our growth estimates for the next 25 years. They're locked in. And it's not a number we picked out of the hat; it says what our IPEDS report will be for the next 25 years. They had to commit for those services that they're going to provide on a time and materials basis, for the next nine years at today's rates. Locked in. Now, many of you may know that when Oracle bought out Peoplesoft that eventually there's going to be a new product called Fusion. So what happens? We start with Peoplesoft. Where are we in five years from now when they come out with Fusion? We don't want to be the first one to put Fusion up. I'm not going to put us in that position. I also don't think that we should be the last one to put Fusion up, but somewhere in between we want to start thinking about rolling out Fusion functionality. When we move to that within the next 12 years, they have to give us \$5 million worth of services to begin to do that work. And the licensing and the cost of the Fusion software are absolutely free. We do not pay for it again. The only thing we will pay for is for any new functionality that would not exist today in their current software packages or in their current release packages, up until the time we go into Fusion. So we have built in protections for functionality, we have built in growth; we have built in damages if they fail to provide us with the services they say they're going to provide us with on time. We've also built in a limitation of liability. Now, most vendors would like to say that our only liability to the University should be equal to that which you paid us. And in some cases that could be a couple of million dollars for the software and then maybe whatever the services were that we said. We said that's not good enough. Their limitation of liability is equal to 175% of the value of this contract. That is a huge opportunity for this University, because we're saying to them that if you don't deliver, your risk here is far greater than just the value of what we paid you, it's equal to the value of this contract times 1.75. So we've done some really great things. We have a fantastic team here negotiating. Our general counsel's office was there. We brought outside counsel in, and you know when you bring outside counsel in he'll have done this before and we started out with our contract, not their contract. We knew we had a problem when the first vendor called us and said, "We'd like to meet with you, and do us a favor, don't bring your lawyer, your outside lawyer with us, and we really want to complain about him." At that point we knew that we hired the right lawyer, and they had been absolutely on the money with everything that we've done and we've been able to achieve things that no one else could ever do. And as a matter of fact, when North Carolina went out with their RFP for doing what we're doing now, and they attached our agreement to their contract, every vendor responded and said "No, we're not negotiating, we're not responding to this if you're going to include that." So we knew that there was definitely something that we did right, and they really wanted this. So that's really where we

stand with a vendor who wants it. Let me just talk very quickly about the project timeline. You've got to understand that there are lots of things that we're doing here. We're looking at functionality that's in the Human Resources area, we're looking at putting up modules that are in the financials area, and we're looking at replacing the stale student information system. And when you break these systems down into bits and pieces, there are different modules in each of them. There is no way that we can just shut off SIMS tomorrow and turn on the new system for everybody. There would be chaos. You have to roll this out. You bring up functions, you bring up pieces. Some of the early pieces that we're looking to bring up, for instance, were areas that we feel were most vulnerable: financial aid system. We're going to bring up the new financial aid component to the system early on, first phase. We're bringing up core Human Resources functionality early on, first phase. We're bringing on things like general ledger early on, first phase. And then you start building on that. And as you build on that, you also roll it out to colleges in what we call waves. Not everyone can come up with the same time. But some of them we have to. Financial aid, when you shut it off, you've got to bring it up for everybody. So we will bring some functionality up for everybody at one time, and other things we'll bring up in various ways. And of course, you should understand that the timeline is a moving target. It's a living and breathing document that will change as things change, as time changes, that's very sensitive to deliverables. So if we miss certain dates, it may push us back in time. So what I want to talk about real quickly is the benefits of ERP. And if you want to put it into context of what are the benefits for students or faculty, what are the benefits as an employee or university managing employees, and what are the benefits in the category of managing our finances? From a student perspective, think about having the ability as a student to be able to see what courses are being offered across the entire university from one screen. Being able to understand where things are offered, what the schedules are, as opposed to having to go to, if you were a student, 16 or 17 different course catalogues, but having things available to them at their mouse level on one screen. Think about the ability of having a totally online, rather than standing in line, bursaring or registrar functionality, so you could do things online completely, instead of having to stand in line. It's not to say that you're going to achieve total online opportunities, but you can build more. Think about the ability to do recruiting activities across the entire University. I understand that many of the campuses tend to recruit sometimes the same students, but what if we all knew and shared this information and were able to explain to the students that the students are receiving multiple different types of recruiting opportunities and from whom within the University. From an HR perspective, wouldn't it be great if we moved into a paperless environment, being able to actually say, "Congratulations, welcome to the City University of New York, here's your link, please go log in and complete the online paperwork"? And you enter your name, and your date of birth, and your social security number once. And wouldn't it be great that when that information gets entered, it gets populated across the payroll system, the benefits system, and our personnel system all at the same time, and you don't have to worry about being Brian Cohen, Brain Cohen, and Brain T. Cohen with different social security numbers in the same systems, because it's all happened and we know it's happened. Wouldn't it be great if you could manage your own personal information? If you move and you can go online and change your home address instead of calling your HR department and saying, "Could I have the form to change my home address," and they say "We sent it to you." And you're waiting and then finally you get the form and you fill it out and you send it back to them and six months later you realize that the information is still going to your old address because someone lost the form you sent in. This is stuff that we should be able to do. This is a large organization, and we have to be able to put the power into our own hands to manage this. And we can do this with new systems. Let me just give you real quick, some quantitative benefits associated with the ERP project. We can reduce the cost of customizing all of our legacy systems. It's very expensive to go out there and buy customized solutions based upon where we are -- [tape flip] of how good they are, we can do this through e-procurement. I think creating the proper controls that we can do to sort of protect the University from a security perspective as well as by putting the right

things into the system we can also find the disallowances. So there's a lot of benefit to this. It's an exciting project. So thank you.

[Applause]

Deputy Chief Operating Officer Ronald Spalter: You know you have a great chair of the University Faculty Senate when he tells the next speaker, be brief, even before he started talking. So let me do it in three minutes, if I can. Clearly Brian owns the technology component to this activity. I own something called Campus Readiness. Are we ready as an institution to implement something this large that will involve this many employees of a university of our size and diversity in ways that we've never worked collaboratively before? And the answer to that is, I believe we are at some levels of this project. As Allan indicated, we've already had hundreds of people participate at some level in helping us get to where we are today. We've had 200 people participating very in-depth in going through all of the issues involved in putting a system like this together. And tomorrow we begin with 140 people from the colleges where large components of the work will actually take place. We've asked your president to designate somebody on your campus to be the accountable official for your campus' efforts with the ERP. We've asked them to identify someone who will be in charge of campus communications to make certain that everybody on your campus knows what's going on with this project and how it impacts all of your employees. We have them designating someone who will be responsible for training. We're going to have to train thousands of people how to do the similar work in new ways and how to do new work that didn't exist before. Thousands of people. We don't have a long history in CUNY of doing lots of training. So this is a pretty big lift for us. We believe we are prepared for it. Then we have subject matter experts, people who are experts in HR, in finance, and in the student systems that are core in the University. They're all coming together to spend a day with us tomorrow to get a greater sense as to what their responsibilities are in this project, and so far, the people have been spectacular who've been assigned to this project and who've been willing participants. So, bottom line question to the University Faculty Senate, if I were sitting in your chair, "So what does this mean for me as a faculty member?" At the very base level of what percentage of my time is going to be involved in this ERP, the short answer is, in terms of your scholarship, and in terms of your teaching activities, not so much. There will be some ministerial activities that you currently perform vis-à-vis your students in terms of registration, those of you who are engaged in advisement, those of you who are involved in add/drop, those things will become a lot easier because we're bringing new technology to it. But in terms of your teaching in the classroom, in terms of the scholarship that you enjoy, this ERP doesn't affect that at all. So maybe I'll stop talking, and ask for questions.

Professor Michael Barnhart (Department of History, Philosophy, and Political Science, Kingsborough Community College): I found it very interesting. Actually, I've been sitting in the enrollment management council where they mention ERP all the time, but I never really knew the scope of what they were talking about. In any case, I have a very simple question.

It's a money question, a question about the bottom line, ball park - I realize that --

Deputy COO Spalter: 300.

Professor Barnhart: 300? With several zeros in front of that, right?

Deputy COO Spalter: The answer's \$300 million no matter what. But \$50 million a year. We have the first \$50 already, and the next five-year plan will get about \$50 a year. It's a good deal of money. But I don't think we have a choice about doing it. To give you a comparative sense, a capital budget during this period, this five-year period, it's about \$3 billion all in. So this would

be about 10% -- I hope our next capital budget will be more, hopefully considerably more than \$3 billion. But that's the order of magnitude. But if you take a look at what this university spent on technology compared to other universities or other companies, we've been behind.

Professor Glenn Lewis (Department of English, York College): I'm wondering two things. Number one, do you expect that the new student information system will be more user-friendly and easier to work your way through?

Deputy COO Spalter: Absolutely. If it's not that, then we've failed.

Professor Lewis: The other thing also is something that I had the feeling is in the works but never saw a sign of it in the University is the idea of trying to do more to coordinate efforts for internships and job placement throughout the University and in programs like journalism. Is there any kind of system built in here, any kind of management system for coordinating internship efforts?

Deputy COO Spalter: To the extent that the data is organized around particular programs where internships are important to those programs, absolutely yes. There's also going to be an effort underway now to talk about even an alternative transcript, the kind of transcript that records the student's student government activities, that records students' success in areas other than the classroom. So this system allows for many activities like that.

Professor Lewis: Because the other thing also is that there's a lot of corporations that are involved in these internships, and some of them are media corporations who probably could partner up in some way and help facilitate those kinds of systems, and are you looking at that as well?

Deputy COO Spalter: We're going to be looking at everything over the next couple of years. This is really going to be the largest effort to reengineer the University's administrative systems that will go on in our lifetime.

Professor Roberta Klibaner (Computer Science Department, College of Staten Island): I had a question on the budget and it had to do with the \$40 million for equipment. The senior college requested \$50 million for this year, \$5 million was design, 5 million was construction, and \$40 million for equipment.

CIO Cohen: It's the way in which they lay out the budget. Equipment falls into a lot of categories. It's hardware, software, and consulting services. In the \$5 million for design and \$5 million in construction, again it's just how they break it up programmatically, but ultimately for us it's \$50 million and we'll allow it to take the \$50 million based upon how we negotiate it.

EVC Dobrin: I'm going to use this as an opportunity just to say something. I've been blessed through my five years here with a productivity advisory committee by the faculty which Professor Levine is one of. I've asked permission from the president to use that committee -- because it's a good committee that really works well together and is really smart people, and many people who are not here are on that committee tonight, Ned Benton is on the committee, Karen's on the committee -- to turn it into the Faculty ERP Advisory Committee with the addition of additional members. So to have a committee that already works so well together I'm going to try to cheat a little bit and use that for this purpose also. But I just wanted to take the opportunity to thank you for being on that committee, and we'll abuse you further.

Professor Alfred Levine (College of Staten Island): First of all, let me say that I think you've done a wonderful job of negotiating with the vendor. And I certainly think it's about time that what you call the legacy systems, and what I call the antiquities, be updated and so that we can at least move into the 20th century, if not the 21st. For most faculty though, they're concerned about nuts and bolts issues and so I want to put something on the table. I want to make it clear that in no way are these databases intended to be used in deliberations on promotion and tenure. So I want to get that on the record by having you address that issue.

Vice Chancellor Dobrin: I don't know. It's not the intention. We're not building it for that purpose. You know, somebody who will look in the database and check your address and check your -- I don't know what in the future anyone's going to do. I can guarantee they're not being built for that purpose. Decent systems are going to have it -- they're going to use it for that purpose like they use it for every other purpose. So you're looking for me to say today that the computer systems in the City University of New York will never be used in any way to take a look at whether somebody should be tenured. I can't say that today. But I can tell you that's not the purpose.

Professor Sandi Cooper (Department of History, College of Staten Island): This question will reveal that I am basically a pre-industrial type. And a specialist in antiquities. What happens if this company goes out of business? Like Peoplesoft?

Executive Vice Chancellor Dobrin: Well, it's unlikely they'll just go out of business. If somebody else even bigger, say, IBM buys them, IBM will have to take on all the responsibilities and the contracts that they have.

CIO Cohen: There's also an escrow agreement. All the source code that is actually used for the compiling of this system is stored in escrow. And upon contract breach or failure of the company to perform services or if they do go out of business, we have escrow rights to access to code and we also have the ability to access consultants who will still know a lot about the systems.

Professor Terrence Martell (Weissman Center for International Business, Baruch College): I looked at the university-wide systems in Human Resources, finance, student systems, and I recognize the articulated need for a change in systems. I would like more elaboration on one point that you made in passing, which is the desire to standardize and to maintain the distinct nature of the individual campuses. I do have a mild concern that at least we should have a philosophical discussion at some stage about the tradeoffs. We talk about management and how important that is, we understand the benefits, but there are those of us who have been around for a while -- "I'm from 80th Street and I'm here to help you" -- and we wonder about where all this might in fact end up. So how are we going to maintain individuality and the strength of the diversity if we're going to have one system?

CIO Cohen: Let me first say that while people will call this a technology project, this is not a technology project, but a business project. Okay, so the technologists are not deciding on what the business process will be and how we standardize or where we standardize. There are a series of subject matter experts that exist in this University who know far more better than I do about how we should be doing things. We cannot turn this University into one single process because of some of the uniqueness associated with the campuses, the programs, and the way in which we're organized. But we can where we have the opportunity to standardize across University when you look at the different business processes, for instance, at multiple different campuses. And we say "Can we make a change in the way in which this campus does it so that everyone else can do it the same way?" And run that decision past a series of advisory groups, and we have every advisory group that you can imagine in this University who are part of our

governance structure. We have the campuses, we have the bursars, we have the registrars, we have the academic councils, we have the administrative councils, we have the IT steering committees, we have a series of far better experts about these things than I am, or the people who are coding it. So we are looking for the advisors and the councils to provide us with what the best process is for the University. Then we need to go to the code and say, "can we" -- we don't use the word customize anymore, we use the word configure -- "can we configure this system based upon this business process map with this tool?" And if the answer is yes, then we can do it. If we have to have multiple different processes for every single campus, then we run the risk that we will have 19 or 23, depending on how you count, different types of systems, and when it comes time to upgrade our systems, we will be where we are today five years from now.

Professor Baumrin: First, is there an off-site backup system where everything is stored? Secondly, is it actually your intention to issue computers to all faculty members? You spend \$300 million to design the system, but you're not providing all faculty members with computers. That's crazy.

Executive Vice Chancellor Dobrin: I'm confused, what school are you at? Because all the other schools give laptops to every person who works here.

Professor Baumrin: I don't have a portable typewriter.

Professor Philip Pecorino (Social Sciences Department, Queensborough Community College): You're in a room of academicians and you cannot imagine any way in which we could make use of the data you are gathering. Some of us are fascinated by information. We would look at it just to stare at it, wonder at it, and delight in it. We'd like to gather it and analyze it and then report about it. And that's almost any and all types of information. But you are going to be amassing information in a way that's far more accessible than we've ever had it before that will tempt the imaginations of our researchers to wonder at and then make requests for access to that information to study things like, in the hundreds of thousands of students who have come through our University since the data was gathered, in several different variations they took sequences of classes. Was there any particular pattern that was revealed with the outcomes most desirable for the sequencing of those classes? Now that would then mean access to information about a whole lot of people across a lot of time, across a lot of campuses. Who will get access to that? Under what conditions? For how long? So I'm interested in security and in particular related to pedagogic research that will now become vastly more possible than it ever was before. Thank you.

Executive Vice Chancellor Dobrin: We'll have lots more conversation about the whole question of what data do we give over for research? What's really confidential? And that we'll have to, you know, down the road. At this point we haven't, you know, signed the contract with the vendor yet. We'll have to sit down, make decisions about what's really private and what's not private. I mean, I tend to be an academic at heart. There's almost nothing I enjoy more than looking at data. I just love data. I read books at night like *Statistics of the 20th Century*. And I spin it all kinds of ways in my head. I like the whole academic process and my tendency would always be within, you know, the rules of privacy to give more out to the faculty to have them do more kinds of interesting thoughts about it. That's just always going to be my tendency.

Professor Morris Hounion (Library, NYCCT): I was wondering how the CUNY libraries would fit into the ERP system? Is there a library component?

CIO Cohen: The library system itself is more of a programmatic system. We're not looking to replace that as part of ERP. But what we will look, since you will have one similar depository

where all of our students are coming from, the bridging will have to be put into the library system for access so that a student, rather than -- right now you use the barcodes, so our goal will be that your student-- let's call it a student identification number, will become the number that you use to access our other systems around the University like the library system and eliminate the need to have these multiple different type of ID numbers that we have to have around the University. So we're looking to bridge those systems into our new ERP solution.

Professor Hounion: You're talking about the library number on the CUNY card for example?

CIO Cohen: Right, those things like that. And you know, obviously, you'll be able to have better access to the student financial accounts. So we'll know that if there's outstanding library fees and things like that it will all be put into the system so that there will be more information available to someone when they go to pay their bill or when they go to take a book out.

Professor Dean Savage (Sociology Department, Queens College): I'd like to follow up on Terrence Martel's question a little bit. And that is that the incredible centralizing power of the system that you're starting to put into place has the potential of making a lot of people on the campuses feel just a little bit uneasy about how all of these things are going to grind everything into a single homogenous mass. And maybe it's partly a perception problem, but I think you probably need to think about sensitive and diplomatic answers to concerns of this kind. The faculty, once they start to understand just how thorough-going the transformations are going to be and how all of the systems are going to be made uniform, are going to get quite uneasy and I think that you do need to spend some time addressing this question. I think it's going to be partly up to the faculty too to go ahead and think of the ways in which individual campuses and individual programs continue to be different and unique and how we have to do this and we can probably live with it. But I'm telling you, from this simple point of view, it's going to seem crazy. Some of the objections that faculty on various campuses have, you're going to say things like "if we don't make everything the same, in five years, we'll be exactly where we started from."

Executive Vice Chancellor Dobrin: I heard that recently. We'll try to be sensitive. And it may philosophically be more the integrated university. It's mostly on the administrative side. And I'll give you an example. I get here, to my first technology steering committee, I say, "just out of curiosity, what kind of PCs do you use?" And it turned out that everybody except one campus was using Dells. I said, "gee, you know, that's great. Why don't we just all use Dells? Does it matter if you use a Gateway, or is it a commodity?" And I said "what do you guys pay?" Every campus paid a different price. And so I sent Brian, and Brian's the only person in the University I worked with in my previous job. Brian had been a Deputy Commissioner when I was a Commissioner. Brian had been in charge of the Y2K project for the whole City of New York. Not an easy project. So I said, "Brian, go get them." So he went to Dell and he said, "listen, you're charging different prices throughout the University. Let's take the best price that you charge any campus, and subtract 25%." And they said, "What are you, crazy? That's our state contract price, that's the best price we're allowed to do." He said, "you know, that's interesting, and I respect that. There's no reason for you to change. Maybe Gateway can do better." And they said, "well, really it's more of a guideline than a rule." And now, every time we buy you know, four computers in this University, we're only paying for three of them because we did it together as a university, then we did the same for software. There are hundreds of things we can do like that. And what's going to happen is we're going to learn those. We'll sit in a room on every single thing we do with everybody from every campus and we'll say, "is this something we can do together? Is this something that has to be individualized?" But there's going to have to be a reason. It can't be, well, it's the Lehman way, it's the Baruch way, and we've always done it that way. We can't afford to have that happen. Because the budget at the end of the day, at the risk of

you all killing me, is a zero-sum total game. So if we turn this into a billion dollar project like the Cal system, that's \$700 million, we can do a hell of a lot more with building science labs and other things. So that's the art, that's not science, that's the art of what we've got to balance. But my instincts on this are things are administrative. We should do the same things that are related to the academic program, where we can, we should do them. If there's a reason, definitely. But there has to be a reason other than "we've always done it that way." This is going to be a real hard project. One of my favorite sayings is "nobody likes change except wet babies." I swear to you, if I got up today and said I'm going to reach into every personal bank account and give every single student \$50, people would criticize it. They would say, "what, are you crazy? You've got to give more to the poorer students; you've got to give more to this group." No matter what you do, people don't like things to be different. I don't like things to be different. We've been getting the Vice Presidents for Administration ready for this for four years. We bring in people to talk about change management. I really need you guys to be partners on this. But it's going to be hard because nobody's going to like the change.

Professor Wilbert Hope (Department of Physical, Environmental and Computer Sciences, Medgar Evers College): I was just wondering whether we should worry about consolidation of campuses. If this is a preamble?

Executive Vice Chancellor Dobrin: You're the first person to even ever raise that concept in my five years here. Thinking about consolidating campuses? Absolutely not. You know, the campuses are in communities. The answer is no.

Deputy COO Spalter: In response to Professor Savage also. The fact that we have a permanent database doesn't mean that we have a common transcript. Only the campuses can award degrees. Only the campuses can determine the credit load and the course content and the information. The fact that it's residing in a common database doesn't mean that there's a common way of doing that. That's still governed by the governance of the colleges. And the fact that the data is stored in a similar place using similar definitions doesn't mean that it's now homogenized data. You still own that data. The students' records, the faculty information, that still belongs to the colleges. It doesn't belong to Brian. It doesn't belong to the technologist. He's like a bank.

CIO Cohen: IT service is like a bank, like a safe deposit bank. You put your stuff inside the bank and we would hold onto it. But that data goes with the students. So if they're in community college and they go off to a senior college, you don't have to recreate that student in a whole new system. You get to sort of take the data with them. It's one record for that student. It still has the branding of the campus and it will have the transcript for the campus, but the data goes with the student. It travels with them. And one employee record for the adjuncts, if they're going to be teaching at multiple institutions, we'll know who they are, what they're teaching. It's the same kind of method.

Executive Vice Chancellor Dobrin: Last thought. The project manager for this is a former IBM executive who had done the IBM for Y2K for us. He's just wonderful. He was willing to retire from IBM to do this. I said to Brian, "let's find somebody who's done one of these before and wants to do another one." Nobody in the country has ever done two of these. So that's a sobering thought for me. But anyway, I know we took a lot of time. Thank you for listening.

[Applause]

Chair Philipp: Thank you very much.