

MINUTES OF THE THREE HUNDRED AND THIRTY-THIRD PLENARY SESSION  
OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

February 5, 2008

The meeting was called to order by UFS Chair Philipp at 6:45 p.m. in Room 9206/07 at the Graduate School and University Center. 69 voting members of 118 were present.

**Baruch:** Present –Dumas, Martell, Pollard, Vora, Wine and Alternate Aubry. Absent – Albright, Brandwein, Freedman, and Hill. **BMCC:** Present – Friedman, Kalogeropoulos, Martinez-Lopez, Niyazov, Rani, and Vozick. Absent – Persaud, and Roy. **Bronx CC:** Present – Alozie, and Alternate Ismail. Absent – Durante, and Skinner. **Vacancies—1. Brooklyn:** Present – Antonello, Jacobson, Shortell, and Tobey. Absent – Bell, Cherukupalli, Dubois, Rodman, Shapiro, and Viscusi. **CCNY:** Present – Crain, Lascar, and Raj. Absent – Daghli, Habib, Khalil, and Sank. **Vacancies – 1. CSI:** Present – Foleno, Klibaner, Levine, Petratos, and Alternate Stearns. Absent – Batson, Cooper, Jayatilleke, and Yousef. **CUNY Law School:** Present – none. Absent – Farago, and Lung. **Graduate School:** Present – Baumrin, Nolan, and Orenstein. Absent – Cross, Matthews-Salazar, and Lennon. **Hostos CC:** Present – August, and Alternate Sharma. Absent – Bernardini, and Pimentel. **Vacancies - 1. Hunter:** Present –Guzzetta, Palanda, and Alternate DeMeo. Absent – Friedman, Kaye, Krishnamachari, McCormick, Splitter, St. Hill, and Wimberly. **Vacancies – 2. John Jay:** Present – Chaffie, King-Toler, Kubic, and Alternate Petraco. Absent – Crossman, Dunham, Kaplowitz, and Romero. **Kingsborough CC:** Present – Barnhart, O’Malley, Ruoff, Stubin, and Alternate Nash. Absent – Hume, and Wood. **LaGuardia CC:** Present – Beaky, Mettler, and Rushing. Absent – Davidson, Lerman, and Shean. **Lehman:** Present –Jervis, Kolb, Marianetti, Mineka, and Philipp. **Medgar Evers:** Present – Alternate Daly. Absent – Barker, Hastick, Hope, and Stewart. **NYCCT:** Present – Cermele, Horelick, Hounion, Karthikeyan, Paynayotakis, and Alternate Bakewicz. Absent – Richardson. **Queens:** Present – Bird, Gonzalez, Moore, Savage, and Zevin. Absent – Brody, and Habib. **Vacancies – 4. Queensborough CC:** Present – Barbanel, Jacobowitz, Pecorino, and Alternate Sweetnam. Absent – Iconis, and Wein. **Vacancies – 1. York:** Present – Cockery, Lewis, Absent – Divale and Tewfik. Professor Martin (BMCC), Miraglia (QCC), and Tai (QCC) also attended the session.

Vice Chancellor Dobrin, Vice Chancellor Malave, Associate University Provost Logue, and Executive Assistant Cura attended.

**Governance Leaders present:** Baumrin (GS), Levine (CSI), Martell (Baruch), Mettler (LaGuardia), Pecorino (QCC), Raj (CCNY), Savage (Queens), and Woytowich (NYCTC) 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 the 332<sup>nd</sup> Plenary: Minutes were approved as distributed.
- III. Reports (Recorded in Reports & Deliberations)
  - A. Chair.
  - B. Dr. Alexandra Logue, Special Advisor to the Chancellor and Associate University Provost.
  - C. Mr. Ernesto Malave, Vice Chancellor for Budget and Finance.
  - D. Representatives to Board Committees.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Bill Phipps  
Executive Director

REPORTS AND DELIBERATIONS OF  
THE 333rd PLENARY SESSION  
OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE  
OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

February 5, 2008

III. Reports:

**B. Dr. Alexandra Logue**, Special Advisor to the Chancellor and Associate University Provost, on CUNY's presidential evaluation system.

Chair Manfred Philipp — Lexa Logue has been quietly inhabiting the building at 80th Street for a little while and she's been doing an important piece of work. She's been working on the process for the evaluation of the presidents. She has a very distinguished background — she got her degree in Psychology all the way from the Bachelor's to the Ph.D. at Harvard University. She was on the faculty at the State University of New York at Stonybrook. She became Associate Dean of Social and Behavioral Sciences and she rose to become the chair of the Department of Psychology. She then spent six years as dean of the Weissman School of Arts and Sciences at Baruch College. She was Provost at New York Institute of Technology after 2001. In 2006 she rejoined CUNY after having a distinguished career both in SUNY and CUNY as Special Advisor to the Chancellor and Associate University Provost, and she recently received a professorship at Queens College. It's a pleasure to have you. Dr. Logue has a video presentation. She's going to guide you through some of the information available on the net and then we'll have the usual round of questions.

Dr. Logue — Good evening, everyone. Thank you very much for having me here this evening. What I'm going to be speaking with you about is the Performance Management Process of CUNY, which is a system for setting goals for the different campuses and for rewarding excellent performance and for promoting the integrated university. The original part of it is mostly directed at doing annual evaluations and reviews of the campus performance and then after I explain that I'll explain how the president evaluations are now fitting into that. If you go to the main page of CUNY, you click on "Administration" on the left, and then click on the

“Chancellor’s Office” down on the left. Scroll down. This is where the information is about the Performance Management Process. If you can see on the lower left, over there, do you see where it says “Performance Goals” and then two bullets down “Performance Management Plan”?

Those are the two bullets that have to do with what I’m talking about today, which is the Performance Management Process of the campuses. You can all read it there. There is also here, you notice, a bullet for the Master Plan. That’s important that that’s right next to the bullets for the Performance Management Process which I’m going from here on in call the PMP; the famous acronym in some circles. The PMP really grows out of the Master Plan. If you could click on “Performance Management Plan” that’s going to bring us to a PowerPoint presentation which I’m not going to go all through because it would take too long. The goals of the Performance Management Plan to work on the integrated university, to ensure that each campus has specific goals for the year that are consistent with their own missions and with the Master Plan, to have accountability, to recognize and acknowledge progress, to ensure clarity about the university and college priorities. We don’t have to go through this whole PowerPoint because it will take a long time. If you want to read it you can.

Let me outline to you basically what happens. Every early spring semester the Chancellor issues a set of goals for the following academic year, which then allows the campuses to spend the spring semester working out their own goals for the next academic year. These goals for each campus are then turned into the Central Office in June and reviewed there. Then the following year, campuses work on their goals and the plans are rather elaborate. I’m going to show you where you can see your own campus’s goals for the current year, where that’s on the web site. They work on their plans and their goals and then at the end of that coming academic year, each campus turns in a report which comes in to the Central Office and also at the same time the Central Office is collecting through the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment all kinds of data and other information about the performance of different aspects of the campuses. All that information comes into the Central Office. It is then reviewed there, and the review information is given to the Chancellor who then communicates back the results of the review to the campuses. Then we cycle again. Every year what’s happening is that we are continually trying to improve this Performance Management Process, develop measures that are better than the year before, change the goals to be more consistent with what’s happening with CUNY, changes in the Master Plan, etc., and each campus is doing that also at the same time.

To give you some examples of what the goals look like -- can you go back to the Chancellor's web page? Go to Performance Goals. If you go to this page on the web site you can see each campus's goals for the current year. The top one is the one for the university. This shows the University's goals for the current academic year. This is not meant for showing in a setting like this. The key part of it is the second column which is the objectives column. There are nine objectives in the PMP. The first one has to do with academic programs. The goals here are about improving academic programs. That includes program reviews being done, are new programs being developed which are consistent with the particular campus's mission. The second objective is about the faculty so it's about attracting and nurturing a strong faculty that is recognized for excellent teaching scholarship and creative activity. It's done differently on different campuses but you may remember that last year you may have received a form to fill out about any publications or works of art that you produced in the past year which was being collected. That's one of the pieces of information that feeds into the reports for Objective 2. We also in that section look at diversity of the faculty and of the Executive Compensation Plan members. Objective 3 has to do with general education of students and also the campaign for student success, the measures that we use for that. Objective 4 is very much an outcome measure, it's retention and graduation rates. How well are students being retained and what are the actual graduation rates? 5 is post-graduate outcomes. Things like passing the nursing licensing exam rates, or the teacher certification exams, things like that. Objective 6 is student support services, both academic and non-academic, what's being done about that on the campus. 7 is enrollment goals. With 7, 8, and 9 we move more into financial aspects of the campus and administrative aspects, so 7 is enrollment goals and moving students from an associate's program to a bachelor's program, how is that working. 8 is increase revenue, decrease expenses. It has to do with balancing the budget, is the campus budget balanced? And 9 is other aspects of administrative services. Those are the nine objectives that are part of the PMP. Which one would you like to look at? Hunter? This is Hunter's plan for this year. You'll see that it's divided into the nine objectives, just like the university one is. Hunter here specifies what it will do this year.

Chair Philipp — We want to see one for a campus whose faculty governance leaders are present.

Dr. Logue — There's no one format for these things. I'm very glad to be here to show you all this. I think it's important for you to see this. We do believe very strongly that these kinds of things don't work well unless everybody's participating in them. What happens then, as I said, there's feedback to the campuses as to what has happened with their goals and targets for that year. We also work with the campuses to try to see how we can improve our measures. There's an administrator on each of your campuses who is what we call the PMP liaison, but we also work a lot with the institutional research directors. We had a meeting for all of these people in December. Each campus has its own wishes and desires about how the measures should be done. We talk about all that and try to come to a consensus as to how we're going to do the measures for the coming year. That's worked out pretty well. That explains that part of it. The Chancellor very much wanted to have evaluation of the presidents more closely tied to this PMP process and felt that up until now -- I don't know if you're familiar with the recent president evaluation process, but it did involve bringing in external reviewers who would visit the campus, meet with some people, prepare a report, and the Chancellor felt this was a very time consuming procedure and also that the information that he was getting was either totally complimentary or information he already had. He wasn't getting a lot of bang for the buck. He wanted very much to have campus voices to be more a part of the president evaluation procedure. He wanted faculty voices to be more a part of the president evaluation procedure. In December, the board passed a new procedure for doing evaluation of presidents and this procedure basically says that every three years, and it could be sometimes five, but it will be more on the three year end, probably, a president will be evaluated and during that time, several things will happen. The PMP results will be compiled for the number of years since the last evaluation, which will usually be three years. The president will also be asked to do a self-assessment. That's the traditional aspect of the procedure, but the other part is that there will be a survey that will be distributed electronically to many members of the campus to ask about their views on the professional performance of the president. This aspect of the procedure was pilot tested at the law school last fall and as far as we can tell, it worked well. We got a very high response rate. We're now starting with two other campuses. We are starting next Monday, the survey will start for the Queensborough President Eduardo Marti, and in March we're doing Hostos with President Delores Fernandez. The way this works is that all the different constituencies on the campus will participate. If the group is very large, the full time faculty, we will have to take a random sample of that group. I should tell you that this survey is all open-ended questions. There are no numbers

involved at all. It's a qualitative data analysis, so it's a very time-consuming and difficult data analysis, but that's the way it's being done because we felt that that would more accurately give us really detailed information and allow people to say what they really thought. It's completely anonymous. I should say that we've hired an outside company that will send emails to people and make the web site available to give the responses and store the data to help protect the anonymity of the respondents. This will be an essential part to the evaluation of each president.

*Professor Alfred Levine (Engineering, Science and Physics, College of Staten Island) — Thank you for a very interesting presentation. These outcomes assessment measures are most effective when they're owned by all the stake holders involved. I would suggest an improvement in this PMP by requesting that the governance bodies of the faculty vote on the performance measures as well as the student government, so that instead of it just being an administration that is saying "here is what we're going to accomplish" it's an entire campus. To be blunt, I have never participated in studying these objectives, nor have I seen them. /Dr. Logue — I understand. I'll go back to what I said before which is that I think these things work best when everyone's involved.*

*Professor Lenore Beaky (English, LaGuardia Community College) — I want to make a cri de coeur. You mentioned as an example of the data that you had requested, numbers of art works created. We at LaGuardia, at least some of us, have seen the spreadsheets, so I'm familiar with the whole process. In fact, the whole process has worked its way, I have to say, relentlessly, down to the departments. Frankly, it's very oppressive. That's my feeling about it. I'm just wondering where in those columns, in the objectives, is there a place for an artist who works in a department to say not "I produced x number of works of art," but "I feel better this year because I feel that my department is supporting me and as a result I have accomplished not in quantity but qualitatively." I don't feel that those spreadsheets really get to the feeling of what we have in our professional lives.*

Dr. Logue — I think that's an important point, because we do use the student satisfaction survey as part of this but we don't have a faculty satisfaction survey that's comparable. I think that's an element that we should consider. There isn't one that's being done every year. I don't mean that there isn't one that exists.

*Professor John Mineka (Mathematics and Computer Science, Lehman College) — Over more than 30 years I've heard of various efforts to evaluate the presidents and they come to naught. They're farces. The Chancellor is a statistician and I'm sure he'll love to get all these numbers, but he's not going to get anything meaningful that he doesn't already know. Unless you change your approach I think the faculty should not cooperate with this. After all, this is an administrative setup here and an administrative procedure which faculty and students have had absolutely no input on. You should begin by asking the faculty what they think would be a reasonable procedure for evaluating presidents and for insuring that faculty can candidly respond in their evaluation without fear of retaliation.*

*Professor Phil Pecorino (Social Science, Queensborough Community College) — Two things about the new presidential evaluation process. It seems like a good idea to generate random sampling. I guess the effort is to avoid a bias. However, I think in a lot of studies involving human beings and institutions you want a representative sample. The random distribution could produce a bias nonetheless, either in the randomness ending up with invitations to junior faculty who know little about the history or the operation of the college or all senior faculty, some of whom have axes to grind. The second aspect of the process is anonymity. Anonymity may be seriously compromised if the president of an institution knows that the faculty are going to be invited at random to participate and then sends out a general invitation to all faculty who are so invited to meet in his conference room where the vendor of the evaluation process will be discussing -- / Dr. Logue — That invitation went to everyone on campus. / Professor Pecorino — You stand by the door and see who's invited. / Dr. Logue — You will know if you're invited. / Professor Pecorino — People are going to attend a meeting just in case they do get invited? There are more important things about the PMP. I like to call it PETASI — Presidents Earn Their Annual Salary Increase. There are presidents who have taken that so much to heart that when you go and click on those things they are totally faithful to the university supplied template to the extent that I'm involved in a Middle States review of how well the institution sets its goals in light of its mission. The mission disappears as the University's PMP categories, columns and rows, take over. They are not necessarily inconsistent, they should be mutually supportive, but so dutiful are some in the new model of management that the local mission is all but non-existent in the document. I just wanted to bring that up.*

*Professor Mark Chaffie (English, John Jay College)— I would like to know if you are in favor of a level playing field. I think that in the United States we do in fact vote for our leaders. We have voting for various measures. It seems to me that with the computer you could anonymously ask every member of the faculty to vote and therefore they would be anonymous and they could vote. Then perhaps they should have a type of questions that should be posed should have something to do with their performance similar to what we expect to have of teachers in the student evaluations. Also I think this could be extended to the administration. The Administration is not very cooperative many times, they schedule things according to their needs, not according to educational processes. In fact, I know a certain university where in fact the department is invited to move during the Easter vacation. That means they'll move their offices and the students won't be able to find them just before exams. Isn't that educational? If they knew that they were in fact subject to censure, even to getting fired or something like that, or having an uncomfortable position, don't you think they'd be a little bit more responsive to faculty needs and to educational needs? Thank you. / Dr. Logue — Maybe it might be helpful if I tell you some of the topics in the survey for the presidents. Would that be interesting? / Professor Chaffie — How many people are involved in that survey? If you want to choose them, it should be the university. Everyone has to say how they are treated by the president. It's not as though the faculty do not suffer or benefit from the president's administration. / Dr. Logue — By the nature of the questions, because they're open-ended, it's very difficult to analyze the data properly with a huge sample. But we are asking, we generally ask about 200 people on a campus. They're not all faculty, but the biggest group of them is faculty. / Professor Chaffie — If we talk about democracy we talk about the universal rights. / Dr. Logue — There are six open-ended questions that are on this assessment form. The first one has to do with communication and quantitative skills and communicating the campus vision. The second is about decision-making, managing risk, and also delegating authority. The third is about standards for people and programs including the president's own integrity and the president's view supporting other people's integrity. Four is the flexibility of the president and the president's support of diversity not in a traditional sense you may think but in addition, diversity of ideas. The fifth is other behaviors that are important in developing and supporting campus members. And the sixth is anything anybody wants to write*

*Professor Terry Martell (Finance, Baruch College) — Two quick points. One, please remember that the PMP is based upon the overall goals and objectives of CUNY. It isn't like each individual campus has a free reign. The document that comes down is pretty structured and maneuverability within that is somewhat limited. Second, I'm surprised that my colleagues have never heard the word PMP because having sat through that process for several years, it is clear that it is a driver of decision making, it's a driver of resource allocation and we should, as faculty senators, and campus leaders, have some idea of what's going on. We certainly do at Baruch and I think it's positive and useful in that regard. Thank you. / Dr. Logue — I mentioned as a historical note, the PMP has actually been going since the year 2000.*

*Professor Stefan Baumrin (Philosophy, Graduate School & University Center) — It's hard to address what you said in a statesman-like way. All of the pronouns in your address referred either to the central administration or the campus administration. What is upsetting is that this is another way of evaluating the president and the impression you just gave to a philosopher reek of the Fallacy of Many Questions. Each one of them has to be evaluated in a yes and a no way. So you're not going to get any data out of those questions at all except that people twist their minds around. The general objection is this should have been generated by the faculty or at least by the campus government and maybe then vetted by the administration instead of the other way around. It is fully an administrative exercise and it looks like simply a way of managing bonuses.*

*Professor Mike Vozick (Science, BMCC) — I'm elected to represent the adjuncts and CLTs. That's my professional goal. I have to be a bit difficult. Let me start off with my version of what Stefan was saying. My understanding of the scientific method and general academic method is that any qualitative analysis of anything is going to be affected deeply by the assumptions of the analyst, right? If you're in anthropology, for example, if you have an analysis of a certain kind of cultural interaction between two different cultures, an analyst from one culture will see it very differently than an analyst from another culture. We have different subcultures at City University of New York and that's why I'm bringing that point up. / Dr. Logue — I think that applies to quantitative as well as qualitative analysis. / Professor Vozick — It applies very trenchantly, very poignantly, sometimes in that manner to qualitative analysis, because it's defining the terms of a discussion. If something is left out of the discussion because the analyst doesn't see it or recognize it, then it's not there. I've asked the Chancellor standing here, as I'm asking you,*

*whether he would report to the University Faculty Senate on the state of the adjuncts at the City University of New York. The data, the qualitative perspective, the goals of the university to try to improve the role and fit into the pattern. And the response I got, you can check it out in the minutes, was kind of a sad shrug of the shoulders and saying that he can think about many things but maybe this isn't that important to think about. That was deeply troubling to me, but that's their formal response. The first thing that I would ask is your overall goals talked about nurturing a strong faculty. Then I wonder whether the nurturing of adjunct faculty is a part of that picture or whether adjunct faculty in that level of analysis really aren't relevant. This is not a simple question or an easy problem. The next question is are adjuncts at all involved in this process when you actually do it?./ Dr. Logue — I've actually become concerned, and so are other people, that going back, the PMP, what we called a grid, didn't clearly indicate that part-time faculty were part of it and not just full-time faculty. A lot of the reports that we were getting from the campuses only talked about full-time faculty. Part-time faculty are extremely important and therefore it has not yet been released, but the new version of the PMP for next year, which is the '08-'09 academic year, explicitly mentions part-time faculty together with full-time faculty. / Professor Vozick — The adjunct problem in this university is 30 years in the development. I'm glad we're getting to the point where after 31 years it's at least on the list.*

*Professor Dean Savage (Sociology, Queens College)— One of the things that's most striking about this set of comments is how much variation there is among the faculty concerning their awareness of the Performance Management Process. Terry is very familiar with it and at Baruch they actually study it and they help to go ahead and formulate the goals. On my campus a few of us have been quite aware of it for some time, we've been looking at it and trying to evaluate whether or not the results bore any relationship to the awarding of bonuses at the end of every year. We concluded it didn't have very much relationship. Some campuses almost no one is aware. There are campuses in which everybody, like Lenore, feels it constantly as a drumbeat. There are places where presidents really push it. It certainly would seem to be the case that if you believe that these things work better if everybody's involved and if most of us believe that things work better if everybody's involved it certainly would be in your interest to go ahead and ensure that we are more involved. In many places, the faculty are not involved. We haven't been involved in setting the goals this time around, at least at most campuses, but could we not be more involved in setting these goals in the future and surely if we have helped set the goals we're*

*going to be successful in having a somewhat larger number of faculty go ahead and work to accomplish the goals. One of the things that happened on my campus as retention clearly became, with 46% of every operating budget dollar coming from tuition, that became a really much more important goal to accomplish. My faculty started doing a little bit extra to try to go ahead and keep people from dropping out. Maybe try to get them to go ahead and graduate a little bit earlier. Were that to spread throughout the entire faculty, you would find it possible to go ahead and achieve these. But you can't do it if the faculty feel as if this has been unilaterally imposed from the top with no effort to involve them. Talking about the faculty experience survey, we do have a faculty experience survey as you well know, and we're about to launch on another one, and maybe there's a way of involving this instrument as one of the ways of evaluating the performance of the presidents on different campuses. Surely you saw from the results of the last survey there enormous differences in the extent to which faculty have a favorable or unfavorable opinion of their president.*

*Professor Anne Friedman (Developmental Skills, BMCC) — I'm glad that Dean brought up the survey issue. As you recall, I'm sure, when the survey that you spoke about that's going to be used to survey the faculty that you said was piloted at the Law School, the issue of that survey came up when we discussed the new Performance Management piece for the presidents, for changing the evaluation of the president piece. The question about that survey came up at the Committee of Faculty, Staff and Administration, and I have it in writing a memo from Vice Chancellor Gloriana Waters confirming an agreement that we had at that committee that the University Faculty Senate would be a player in creating the survey instrument that would be used to survey the faculty in that evaluation process of the presidents. So I'm a little surprised to hear you talk again about the survey from the Law School and that it's going to be used at Queensborough and maybe another campus. I have that memo in writing and I believe I put it out in my CFSA notes to this body. I think that it would go a long way to addressing some of the concerns here in addition to keeping one's word, that the UFS be involved in creating the survey instrument that is going to be involved in our evaluation of the presidents. / Dr. Logue — I did send a copy of it to the senate a long time ago.*

*Professor Friedman — You've asked us to review the Law School survey? / Dr. Logue — It was after that meeting. / Professor Friedman — You want us to work from that survey and not start*

*from the ground up? / Dr. Logue — I think we should talk about what we would do. / Professor Friedman — You're in support of formal-- / Dr. Logue — I should point out that this survey is not just for faculty. It's also for students, it's for staff, in some cases it's being used for board members or elected officials in the community. It's for a lot of different people. / Professor Friedman — But you are interested in having formal UFS involvement in the creation of either this particular survey or something that would, obviously the questions that go to the faculty are going to be different. / Dr. Logue — We're trying to keep the questions all the same so that we can compare the results. / Professor Friedman — We look forward to working with you in developing or assuring that we have a survey that allows us to express our opinions. / Dr. Logue — That's what we want also.*

*Professor Dennis Bakewicz (Physical and Biological Sciences, NYCTC)— You have been discussing a highly centralized evaluation procedure but some colleges, as you might be aware, have evaluation committees that are already written into the bylaws and have been approved by the trustees, so they are legal in every sense of the word. Would you recommend that every college establish such a committee and that the data from those committees be forwarded to the Chancellor before they evaluate the president? Do you think that those colleges that do have such a committee and do collect this kind of data should have that forwarded to the Chancellor when these evaluations are taking place? / Dr. Logue — This is the first time hearing about this, so I don't know very much about it. I think in general the Chancellor welcomes all kinds of information that would be helpful. / Professor Bakewicz — Can we forward our evaluation to the Chancellor then with the expectation that he will take it seriously? / Dr. Logue — I can't speak for the Chancellor, because it's the first time hearing about this. But I know that one of the main reasons he changed this procedure was he wanted to hear faculty voices and other voices from the campus. / Professor Bakewicz — This would be the ideal way to do this since such surveys are prepared locally, the people who do it are elected by a college council. They're usually extensive. The last evaluation we did was 60 pages and incorporated overall surveys, interviews, as well as a presidential evaluation. / Dr. Logue — I'd really like to learn more about this.*

*Professor Patricia Kolb (Social Work, Lehman College)— I was just wondering whether the possibility of combining the qualitative and the quantitative approach should be considered where there would be a quantitative survey that everyone could have the opportunity to*

*participate in and then a smaller sample on the campuses respond to the qualitative part of the survey.* / Dr. Logue — I don't want to rule anything out because everything changes and evolves, but if you look at the literature on evaluating leaders and presidents, generally it doesn't recommend quantitative measures because it's very hard to ask the questions in a way that you've eliminated all possibility of somebody misreading the question and giving a number that isn't about what you really were asking about. We do try to take the qualitative information and make it quantitative in the sense that we're seeing how many people say this kind of thing. In the campuses that we are doing this spring, we are including a large sample in both cases of faculty governance people so that there is not a random selection of those people. Those people are automatically included.

*Professor Lawrence Rushing (Social Sciences, LaGuardia Community College) — I think the major difficulty of this Performance Management Process is that it doesn't just evaluate the president, it evaluates the institution, it evaluates the departments, and it evaluates individual faculty members. And so at LaGuardia we are very familiar with this grid because we can't get away from the grid. All we do is see the grid. The grid dominates the institution, and it dominates the activities of departments because everything that is done has to fit into the grid. There are no additional goals except these goals. These are the only goals that have any relevance. I fail to see, I must say, since 2000 that our institution has benefited in any way from this process, that the institution has moved ahead qualitatively in any real way. Everything is looking at numbers and basically looking at things in a very quantitative fashion. What's missing is this — the ability of faculty to be able to be creating or have any freedom and to be unencumbered by goals that are set from above. There are various dangers to this process and this process can be harmful. I just want to underline what many people have said here, that we really have to look at a more bottom-up process and begin this process of what's going on with the people who are the most responsible for running this institution and who do the work of the institution.* / Dr. Logue — I just want to encourage all of you to go to the web site and read the goals for a number of the different campuses because you'll see that there's a lot of variety in them.

*Professor Pecorino — At Queensborough, I've learned to move to the drumbeat of the grid. But I'm fortified in posing my next question by something else. If we were to submit in our assessment process for courses and student work, some of the language in here it would be*

*disallowed. I particularly like the phrase “makes good decisions”-- that must mean decisions that I like. I underlined your phrase that you were sensitive that quantitative analysis might be too misleading. That’s very clear – makes good decisions. I’ve learned to forbidden words and the approved words in assessment.*

*Professor Vasilios Petratos (Political Science, Economics, and Philosophy Department, College of Staten Island)— The union, the PSC, represents all the faculty and the staff. I think here you’re saying a word about including them in some kind of evaluation. After all, we are the employees, we do the work. They are the managers, they do whatever. Therefore, we should have a great deal of say in how they do their work and how does that apply to us in the college, and the students, and the university system generally. We’re the ones to judge what’s going on. / Dr. Logue — In the president’s survey, all the major constituencies on campus are sampled. It’s faculty, administrators, faculty, it’s staff. / Professor Petratos — And the Professional Staff Congress? / Dr. Logue — All the members of the union. / Professor Petratos — Faculty and staff are members of the union, but the union also has hierarchy and leadership, and this leadership comes in contact with the administrators, with management, and therefore we have a perspective and faculty work hard, and therefore the leadership of the union in contact with management has a perspective concerning the president and other management personnel.*

*Chair Philipp — I think you mean the union executive council and the chapter councils.*

*Professor Gail August (English, Hostos Community College) — I’m one of these faculty people who are not well informed about the evaluation. I’m surprised because every year as a faculty member I am evaluated by a strongly qualitative system. That’s extremely important in how I’m promoted and what I’m thought of. Also, in our departments and I believe through all the colleges we are going nuts trying to make quantitative performance objectives for every single course and practically every single thing in the courses and try to put them under numbers of and quantitative things. So I’m feeling like the university is coming at us one way and telling us everything has to be quantified into little pieces and them coming at us from the other side and telling us this is not a reasonable way to evaluate things. We on the faculty say we can’t really evaluate these courses in these little numbers and every single thing and we’re told that this is a new way that we’re supposed to be professional. I’m surprised at what you said. / Dr. Logue — I*

think if we could do other assessments in the way we're doing this presidents survey, maybe we'll do more of them by the qualitative method, but it's incredibly time consuming. It's practically very difficult. It takes about a full week of time just to analyze one president's controls. / *Professor August — It's bringing discomfort for us trying to evaluate teaching and our goals and objectives in everything we do.* / Chair Philipp — Does your campus Senate endorse that process? / *Professor August — Absolutely, we're going nuts with it.* / Chair Philipp — The campus Senate has approved that process, you're saying? / *August — I'm not sure, and I am on the Senate, but I'm also on the Curriculum Committee. I'm the Chair of the Curriculum Committee and I'm supposed to be having performance objectives for practically every minute of every class that can't be fitted into one, two, three, four, five.* / Chair Philipp — Your senate might want to deal with this and change it as it wishes. It's not powerless, I suspect.

*Professor Glenn Lewis (English, York College) — As a journalist the biggest problem here is not what anybody here is saying. The biggest problem here is gate keeping. Journalists determine the content of what they're reporting and the way it's perceived by their audience by the way the reporter gate keeps the information that comes in. What you have done is you have set up a process here that allows endless control to the people who are evaluating the incoming information of this process and they can gate keep this and interpret what they get out of it, the material that they decide to keep or eliminate any way they want. This is an open-ended system for allowing the people who are conducting these surveys to put out the opinions and the information that is predetermined before they ever did the survey because you have nothing that's defining how the answers have to be given, you have nothing defining how to interpret the answers when they come in. If everything is all qualitative, if it's all anecdotal, if it's all the kind of information that most journalists use to get quotes as opposed to get hard facts to base those quotes on, you can do anything you want with the information. It's not legitimate unless you first have something that quantifies and limits what it is the conversation is about and what are the facts it's being predicated on, then the opinions mean something. If you have only opinion, it's totally open to what the evaluator wants to do with it.* / Dr. Logue — I would make some of the comments that you're making I would make about quantitative data also. *That's why you need both.* / Dr. Logue — I think that that's why things work best when everybody discusses everything together.

**C. Vice Chancellor Ernesto Malave:** Chair Philipp — Thank you for coming. I'd like to recognize the presence of Executive Vice Chancellor Allan Dobrin. I haven't asked him to take questions because Vice Chancellor Ernesto Malave is on the agenda, and this is a very important season in the financial world. The Governor's proposed budget has been released and is to be disposed of by the Legislature. The Mayor's proposed budget has been released. To make sense of this all, Vice Chancellor Malave is here to tell us about it.

\*\*\*