

REPORTS AND DELIBERATIONS OF
THE 334th PLENARY SESSION
OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

March 4, 2008

III. Reports:

B. Chancellor Matthew Goldstein: It's good to be here. I'm going to make my remarks very brief because I'm a little short on time this evening and I want time for discussion. There's not a lot new to report on the budget negotiations other than to indicate that Mark Page, the budget director for the City of New York, today came out after his testimony in front of the City Council, indicating that he believes that the State of New York shorted New York City by about \$787 million. As a result of that, there will be another 3% reduction in agencies and that probably will have an effect on our community colleges. We're having a meeting tomorrow to look at this a lot more carefully. I don't need to educate anybody in this room. All of you are sufficiently well-versed in what is happening in this economy. The fact is that we are in a downturn here, and the question is how sustained and how deep this downturn will be. It's having a chilling effect on revenues both at the state level and at the city level. We've been, at this particular point in time, protected. If you look at the budget very carefully on the operating side, as I reported to you last time, it does provide for stability, absent any further perturbation that would result in further declines in our operating budget. I would not be surprised if in the next couple of months we will see a further regression away from the recommendations. I'm not being prophetic here, but I believe that unless we do see a rather dramatic turnaround that this is something that we really ought to expect and brace for. I will tell you that we have managed our resources well. We have reserves. We have the ability to weather some bad times in the short run, but what I worry about is long-run implications of these problems. When I look around this audience and I look at some of you who really understand financial markets well. I think that those of you who do this sort of thing would indicate as I have that this is a time that is confusing to a lot of people who are used to deep understanding of financial markets. Some of the people that I talked to really are flummoxed by so much of what is going on. Of course, we all read about things like credit default swaps and collateralized debt obligations, sub-prime mortgages, all of this stuff, and it's having an effect not only on your own portfolios but on the resources that we're going to have to run this university. This is clearly a very dynamic time. This is not a static time where there aren't a lot of very deep and confusing kinds of things going on, but in the end of it, we'll get through this. We have a governor who really deeply supports public higher education. He is going around the state. We will have a conference call with him, the trustees and the presidents, on Thursday, which we have helped arrange. We'll be on a retreat with the presidents on Thursday and Friday of this week, and the governor will be talking about the need to create an endowment for both SUNY and CUNY. The mechanism I've described to you before is not necessarily the only vehicle to accomplish this, but if you can for the first time in this university get an endowment, then an endowment will fuel the Compact which will then fuel the ability to make the kinds of investments that we need. Let me be very clear on this. Endowments are critically important for universities because an endowment

creates the ability to have revenue that is predictable in good times and in bad times. You may not get the bang in your portfolio on the basis of how the endowment is invested, but if you don't have an endowment, you are always starting from a point of origin and then building up from that. If you have an endowment, you have a base upon which to build. That will also give you the ability to make some investments. We'll get a better sense of where we are very soon. The budget is supposed to be enacted on April 1st. I don't know if that will happen, but it probably will not be a long and protracted time given there are other things that the governor and especially the State Senate are interested in at this particular point.

On lesser issues, I don't know if this is known to all of you yet, but Selma Botman has accepted an invitation to become the President of Southern Maine University. She will be leaving on July 1st. I have a press release that will be made available tomorrow and there will be information in that press release that will give you some of my thinking of an interim solution or at least interim coverage for that important office. We are going to be searching for a Vice President for Research. That is largely motivated by the big push that we are making in this university, especially in graduate education around the sciences, and we will have to build up that area to a much greater extent than we have before. This body, through Manfred Philipp, will be receiving a first draft of the proposed Master Plan. We will be discussing it with the presidents on Thursday and Friday. It's a good first draft, but it is only a first draft and I really implore you to look at this carefully. It is very important that the Senate be heard on the Master Plan because again, this is the document that will provide values and where it is that we want to make investments on a going-forward basis. I would imagine that we will be able to get you a good first draft by sometime next week. You'll have sufficient time. I'd like to bring this to the Board in June of this year, so we have a few months to shape this in a way that will benefit the university over the next five years. I'm going to stop here.

Emily Anderson (Social Sciences, BMCC)— I have a couple of questions related to the new lines for full-time faculty that have come out of the Compact. The first question is, is there any way that the University is going to be able to really help us to expedite these searches? One of the things that I'm concerned about is that the time factor; from the time the PVN is submitted to the time that it actually gets approved and posted, so that we can then have enough time for people to send in their responses, I think it's about 60 days or something that they have to be posted. I'm just wondering if there's anything that can be done to really help us do this in a timely manner so we can get the people on board before they're snatched up by someone else, and we need them by September, I believe. If you could just give me a little understanding about how the Central Office might be able to really help the colleges move more quickly on this. /Chancellor Goldstein— I think the way that I could help most, and I've talked about this in the past, is that it is essential that presidents make available resources for faculty to do the job that they need to do in order to secure the people that they'd like to secure for tenure-track appointments. I have made this very clear to all of the presidents that if I don't see very serious work on behalf of these administrations that we will start reshaping the resources to those campuses that are doing the appropriate job. Finding faculty is not an easy activity. It requires serious work and it requires serious time and it requires investment. You have to travel to a location, you have to wine and dine, and

I use that in a metaphorical way, it doesn't have to be great wine, it could be very modest wine, unless it's a very star professor that really has a great palate. I'm serious, that this really requires serious work. It requires time. So once these lines are allocated, and they have been allocated, because there's not a new group of investments that are holdover investments, there should be nothing that prevents this from moving immediately. What is a PVN? / *Professor Anderson— Personnel Vacancy Notice.* / Chancellor Goldstein— I don't really know what those are. / *Professor Anderson— They sit in the central office for a while. The second concern about the searches has to do with these lines that have been allocated as research emphasis lines. From what I'm understanding, I think BMCC got about six of these lines that have emphasis on research.* / Chancellor Goldstein— I'm not really sure what that is. / *Professor Anderson— We're not really sure either, and we're going to have to search for these people. We were trying to get some sense, for example, at a community college, the teaching load is 27 and we're talking about a person having an emphasis on research. Well, what really does that mean in terms of community college faculty? Are they going to be required to do less teaching and more research? Those are the kinds of questions that we haven't been able to satisfactorily get an answer.* / Chancellor Goldstein— Those kinds of questions really are very local questions that have to be answered. If administration is working with departments and indicates that they need a certain kind of individual and it's going to require some mix between freeing that person to do research and having a lower teaching load, that is something that a president and a provost and deans have discretion to make decisions on. There's no heavy-handedness at the central administration to guide those kinds of things.

Professor Stefan Baumrin (Philosophy, Graduate Center)— About the Vice Chancellor for Research. What do you envision as the faculty presence on the search committee? Do you figure it to be significant? The second part of the question is, if it's for research, how will we in social sciences be represented on that committee? Or is it only for natural science or laboratory science research? /

Chancellor Goldstein— The first part was that there will be very strong representation for the faculty, as there should be. Manfred and I talked and he has already recommended two. I'm recommending a number of faculty and they represent different areas. It's not going to be restricted to the natural sciences. The work that we really need to do given the remanding of Ph.D. authority to the first two campuses, Hunter and City, and then sole responsibility to City for the Ph.D. in Engineering, although faculty outside of City College will certainly be welcome to participate, leads to some serious questions that we have to deal with, some of which have to deal with policy, some of which have to deal with resources. There will be an emphasis on the work of this individual around our effort of the decade of the sciences, but certainly not restricted to that at all. We're hoping that we can put this on a fast track. I imagine that we will get a very rich pool of talented people who will be interested in the job. We'll see where we get. President Bill Kelly will chair the search. We'll have a trustee who is an observer to the search, but not a voting member. There will be a couple of administrators, but it will be largely dominated by the research faculty. All the faculty that I've invited are research-active faculty. That's really what I think it needs to be dominated by.

Professor John Mineka (Mathematics and Computer Science, Lehman College)— I'm very concerned about what seems to be a new emphasis on SAT scores in admissions of students. At my college, there's

a proposal that a 900 SAT score be required for admission. In other words, it's not just a factor in admissions, but it's a cut-off score, which I think is rarely done by universities. I wonder, given that the SAT is such a poor predictor of student performance, why we should emphasize it more. I think this is also happening at some of the other senior colleges. I wonder whether it isn't the matter of our trying to score higher with the US News and World Report ratings by finding ways of raising our SAT scores. / Chancellor Goldstein— Let me say categorically that I don't think about US News and World Report as we start talking about policy changes around admission. I'm aware of it, but it's not something that is a utility that I try to maximize when I think about ways that we should proceed. What Lehman is doing, what all of our campuses are doing, and they have been doing it for the past ten years or so, is incrementally changing admissions standards. Our admission standards are much more complex than a unitary measure like an SAT. We look at class standing, we look at the number of college preparatory units, we look at grade point average, we look at SATs, we look at a number of things that are put together as a composite, and that composite is the guiding force in terms of whether we think that a student has the necessary background. So GPAs are going up, the number of college preparatory courses are going up, the SAT is going up, and it is not going to be dominated by the SAT score. It's going up on all different measures, not just the SAT.

Professor Mike Vozick (Science, BMCC)— I have two questions and a Gedanken Experiment for reflection. We're on the edge of an impending national scandal about students loans and the way in which loans were made and the aftermath of student loans, which doesn't immediately directly affect us, but indirectly it does affect the context in which we live, and I wonder what you're thinking about that. / Chancellor Goldstein— We're very small players in that universe. / Professor Vozick— The second question has to do with a more specific thing, which is the very small percentage of the capital budget being allocated to community college needs. Somebody said the figure 5.3%, but I'm not exactly sure of that. It has something to do with the City not fully reimbursing the State and the community colleges being put at risk. I'll share the Gedanken Experiment now. Can we imagine a future in which the strengths of the adjunct faculty, the successes and achievements of the adjunct faculty, are regularly pointed out by the University each year as one of the sources of pride in what has been achieved? Can you imagine if the leaders of the University at different levels, as a part of each year's duties, involve meeting with groups of adjuncts to at least make some level of dialog with adjuncts as part of the life of the university? / Chancellor Goldstein— Can I imagine all of that? Absolutely. I think it's a legitimate question and a legitimate thought experiment. The answer is, absolutely. With respect to the capital program, this is an area that I am deeply concerned about. One of the problems, of many problems of big, complex universities have, is the need to provide a physical plant to accommodate the growth of students and the needs of faculty. Our physical plant is an aged physical plant that has not been addressed adequately for decades. We were boastful about the last couple of capital budgets that we received and we were delighted to receive it, but the fact is that those budgets were still quite inadequate for the needs. On the community college side it's particularly problematic because it takes two entities, two governmental entities to work in unison in order for us to get the resources for a program to move forward. The state puts up the dollar, but that dollar cannot be used unless the city matches that dollar. In the past, the state has been less reluctant than they are now to provide the dollar, but the city has not

provided it, and now the state is saying, why should we encumber those dollars if the city is not going to put the money in? Fortunately, Mayor Bloomberg, three years ago, after I had a very intense conversation with him, understood the problem and freed up about \$150 million in matching money and that unleashed a cascading of dollars for the community colleges. As a result of that, we're seeing throughout our community colleges today the results of that kind of an investment. But the fact is, it's still not enough. On a going-forward basis, when I look at the physical plant at BCC in particular, when I look at Hostos, when I look at LaGuardia, there are real needs, and this is something that we have to continue to work at.

Professor Lawrence Rushing (Social Sciences, LaGuardia Community College) — I'd like to ask you if you would reevaluate the exclusion of community college students from the Honors College for several reasons. One of the major goals of the University, as you know, is to promote transfer. Number two, and this is maybe the most important one, we have a whole cohort of students at community colleges who are worthy of being able to study at the Honors College and there is a tremendous inconsistency here. How is it possible that we can have students who are regularly going to institutions like Cornell and Barnard and Vassar and Mount Holyoke and Georgetown, how can that be possible when they are seeking out our students, welcoming our students, as transfer students into their junior years, and we won't do it right here at CUNY? How do we explain that? How would we explain that to Barnard that they'll accept our students, but the Honors College right here at their own institution won't accept our students? I think we really should consider this. I think if you're not ready to do it wholesale that at least let's do a little experiment. Who thinks that they are not qualified? Why don't you, as an experiment, take at least a small number of students and see how well they do? Have no doubt that they will do an excellent job.

/ Chancellor Goldstein— The response is very different than what your conclusion is. It has nothing to do with the potential of the student at all. I am sure that there exist community college students that could enter the Honors College and probably succeed and succeed well. The fact is, we don't accept transfers from our baccalaureate institutions either into the Honors College, and the reason is not that they are not worthy, the reason is that the first two years of the Honors College is a very structured experience. It doesn't exist in any other baccalaureate program that we have in the university and it doesn't exist in any of the associate programs. Just as we will not accept a transfer student from Hunter into the Honors College or from Baruch, we will not accept anybody from a community college as well.

/ Professor Rushing— I don't understand why you would set such a standard? In other four-year colleges, they don't say, you have to have gone through the exact same curriculum as our students at Cornell before we'll accept you into our institution.

/ Chancellor Goldstein— I will repeat what I just said. It's not about them not having the ability to do the work. It's about that they will have missed two years of a very structured program and at the end if they enter as juniors, they will not have had the experience.

/ Professor Rushing— You're making the assumption that they wouldn't be able to do the work.

/ Chancellor Goldstein— I've said it three times again, Larry, and I'll say it four times. It has nothing to do with their expectations of ability. It has to do with the structure of the program.

Professor Lenore Beaky (English, LaGuardia Community College)— About the Honors College. I've been checking on the LaGuardia experience of the ASAP program, and the ASAP program is also

conceived as a highly structured program in which cohorts of entering students will follow the rest of their coursework and academic activities and so on together as a cohort and I can report to you that since real life has intervened, students are continuing the ASAP experience, but not necessarily in the structured way that was envisioned. So I understand your point that this has not to do with standards, but rather with the idea that the Honors College would be structured from the first two years. But sometimes, as I say, real life intervenes, things become a little messier, so you might want to consider how this original idea of the highly structured first two years could be modified to allow transfers from the senior colleges and from the community colleges. / Chancellor Goldstein— That's something that could eventually be looked at, but I think one of the beauties of the Honors College is its structure and I'm not at the point where I'd want to fuss with that.

Professor Bill Crain (Psychology, City College)— I want to follow up on John Mineka's statement on the SAT. We have two components to admissions at the senior colleges for new freshmen. One is the index, which is based on the best possible predictors of freshman success, includes grades, units, and includes the SAT. The index, because it's based on what actually predicts success empirically, at City anyway, the SAT comes out weighted really low compared to grades, for example. At City it's calculated at seven and a half times lower because the SAT is such a weight predictor. Then if you get to the college, the student has to pass a standardized test requirement. We don't just let them in, they still have to pass a standardized test, the SAT or regents, or one of the COMPASS exams. Would it be time to have a look at the whole admissions process and put much greater weight on what actually does predict success rather than stick with these standardized tests which, as far as we know, are rather weak predictors, and put a big proportion of weight on tests which are hurting students of color. Isn't it time for another look at this? / Chancellor Goldstein— I would say that universities are organic institutions. They shed things that they no longer should be doing. I always think it's a good idea to be reflective on what it is that you do, especially how you evaluate students and what you teach and so forth. I would never close the door on an examination of, are we doing the best that we can to get the kinds of students that we need to give them every likelihood for success? I would not close the door on that at all. / Chair Philipp— Community college capital budgets. If you look at the square footage of the proposals, it's a very small proportion of the total, 5% or something like that. I understand why that is the case, because the city isn't coming up with matches for the state. In a practical sense, the needs of community colleges are probably greater than anywhere else because as you pointed out, the facilities are so antiquated and old, outdated. Where do you see community college construction going in the future, given the limitations of the city's pricing on us? / Chancellor Goldstein— When you look at the square foot of our physical plant, we're looking at about 22 million square feet of space at the City University. A very small proportion of that is the community colleges. They are smaller institutions. You can look at places like Hostos and LaGuardia, which are really concentrated in one or two buildings. So while there is a disproportion, it is very much weighted toward our much bigger campuses. The data really reflects where the action is. You look at City College, which I referred to the other day when I was at City College, as the mother ship. I think it's true because when I speak to people around the world, and I'm being very straight here, when I say "CUNY" they say to me "CCNY." The reason is it's the oldest of our places and it's a very large place, and it's in top shape. You look at the buildings across City

College, they are really in tough shape. Hunter hasn't really been touched for 30 years after the two towers were built. The Baruch building on 17 Lex hasn't been touched probably in any meaningful way since 1929. The gym at Queens College probably has not been touched in 60 years, 70 years, and so it goes. Brooklyn College's laboratories are probably the laboratories that we used in the 1940s. You know this as a scientist. There are very severe needs that we have at CUNY. When I was on the commission on higher education, one of the things I said was that while it is true that CUNY's main emphases in terms of investment are around building up the faculty, at some point we don't have the capacity to give faculty their own offices at many of our campuses. You take a look across the university. There are serious issues that we have, and in the next five years we're going to be spending \$5.4 billion in capital construction at this university. It is woefully inadequate. The community colleges have problems, but there are problems throughout the University. We just have to work. In fact, I keep on saying that you the faculty are so critically important in working to get across this message. I can't do it alone with my administration or the presidents or the board. I really need the faculty who are working in these facilities to really convey what your life is like and I really need you to do it. That's why I've asked you to be a partner in trying to get some of this done. / Chair Philipp— Lenore Beaky and I recently testified to Charles Barron's higher education committee on exactly on this kind of issue. I recently spoke to Senator LaValle in Albany about this kind of issue.

Professor Terry Martell (Finance, Baruch College)— I have a comment and a question. The comment is that often concerns about admissions standards are about putting too much weight one variable or another. I think the context has got to be understood. As various components of this university get better and better, and as the spread between public and private tuition widens and widens, the demand for our services goes up. We are almost inevitably going to see better class ranks, more college prep, higher SAT scores, just by the nature of the economic environment in which we find ourselves. It's almost an inevitability. As the school gets better, as the colleges get better, as the university gets better, that means more applications and even being sensitive to our traditional need, we're still going to see a better set of numbers. I think we would almost have to aggressively take action to avoid that result. It's almost preordained in the nature of the economy as we're going forward. I think we're going to see increasing numbers regardless. I saw something on a new desire on your part to fund a new community college in Manhattan. What is the timeline for that and how are we going to pay for it? / Chancellor Goldstein— New York City, as the demographers tell us, at least the people that I'm talking to, tell me that by the year 2030, New York City is going to have a million more people than we have today. Probably some place on the order of 9+ million people living and working in New York City. About one-half of the graduates of baccalaureate institutions today in the United States, about one and a half million of those students, have started with some experience at a community college. Either they took a semester or they got an associates degree. I see community colleges developing a larger market share of university people or people looking to get degrees on a going-forward basis and I think it's going to be particularly hit in New York City where the immigrant population is going to continue to grow. Many of these people are coming from places where their educations have been woefully inadequate and really are not prepared to start at one of our baccalaureate institutions and are going to need to start at a community college. In Manhattan, the two greatest areas of growth are in Upper Manhattan, Inwood and Washington Heights,

and surprisingly, down in the Wall Street area. One of the things that people are not really fully understanding is that it's not the JP Morgan tower that's going to go up or the Goldman Sachs tower, but there are lots of residential towers being generated in lower Manhattan. Manhattan only has one community college. John Jay is working to offload their associates degree programs with my very full concurrence. When I interviewed Jeremy Travis I talked about moving John Jay into a much more baccalaureate and masters level institution, and the president, along with the faculty, are moving in that direction. We desperately need another opportunity for students to study at a community college in Manhattan. Whether it's a stand-alone or whether it's associated with BMCC, we will see. There will be challenges for us to get the funding to do it, but we can't be static. If we know where the growth is going to be, we have to be prepared and to start the political process to see if we can get the resources that we need to develop that kind of opportunity. Whether we'll be able to be successful, I don't know, but we are planning it. / *Professor Martell— At Baruch we're reaching out to predominantly minority schools to try to attract and maintain our traditional distribution of students. We find in that attempt that the fact that we can't offer a dorm experience really hurts us in trying to attract and retain New York students. So I believe if we could have a little more flexibility on the dorm side, I believe that would be one impediment removed. What do I say to the guidance counselor who says to me, 'Terry, I'd love to send more of my kids to Baruch. I'm sending them to Syracuse. Maybe because it's a better overall environment for them, where they fit into this picture.* / Chancellor Goldstein— Let me respond and tell you what it is that we're doing. We have a board resolution authorizing the building of a dormitory on the Queens College campus. We will be building a dormitory on the College of Staten Island campus. We're working in a consortial way with Baruch, Hunter, John Jay, and the Graduate School to find a facility, a large facility, that would be a shared facility in Manhattan or close to Manhattan, say in Long Island City, just one subway stop away. I very strongly support the development of residential housing. We will always be dominated by commuter students because the economics just don't work out. We don't have land, and the cost of land is so enormously expensive, but we do need to be able to give some opportunities for students that want a residential life.

Professor Sandi Cooper (History, College of Staten Island) — This is a rhetorical question, as a way of making a comment. Is there something that you can do to ensure that in this new construction there's some quality control? I come from the newest campus, in quotes, of renovated buildings in this university. Within two years of opening in '95, we had so many cracked sidewalks, tree roots coming out. Now the gym floor is busted. What is it they mixed? Water with something, and they didn't put the foundation under the gym right. I can't remember all the details. These people got away with junk. The same companies get contracts again and again. That famous door that fell out at Medgar Evers and nearly killed Edison Jackson and me as we were walking through. It was put up by a company that got a contract at Staten Island. This is one way to get rid of old faculty. / Chancellor Goldstein— It's a serious question. We have been deeply concerned from the first time I walked into this job, we saw the relationship that we had with the Dormitory Authority as the builder for everything that we do at CUNY, and the project managers of what we do. We were successful just recently, as Rick Schaffer said, not getting a divorce, but an open marriage, where we have discretion now to say that we will use the Dormitory Authority. In the past, we had to use them so we never were getting the A team necessarily as

project managers. Now that we have the degree of freedom to make the decision whether we want to go with the Dormitory Authority or we want to go with a private vendor, we can make that decision. So we will have much greater opportunity to get a much more seasoned group of project managers, and I think that will have an effect on a going-forward basis. Thank you.

A. Chair's Report: Chair Philipp— If you look at the report itself, you'll notice a description of my meeting with Senator LaValle. Sandi and I earlier had a meeting with Deborah Glick, who's the chair of the Assembly Committee on Higher Education. Then the meeting with LaValle, who's the chair of the senate committee, was so difficult to arrange that I went alone, because I didn't know if it would be called off at the last minute like the previous one had been. Lenore and I also met with Senator Maltese who is a member of the State Senate Higher Education Committee. Deborah Glick was, I think, very supportive of CUNY and its mission, as I think we should expect, given that she comes from Manhattan and represents people who actually did go to CUNY. She wasn't enamored of higher tuition, and we discussed various future options for CUNY with her. LaValle was a little different. He was supportive of CUNY, I would say, but mainly mentioned the Compact, praised the Chancellor quite profusely, and thought that with this Chancellor, we're on the "right track," as he put it, but in terms of new money for the University for new faculty and so forth, all I heard was "The Compact." Of course, what we were proposing to everyone in sight was that we need 4,000 faculty members, not 2,000 divided between CUNY and SUNY. It was not an unpleasant meeting. Quite to the contrary. Lenore and I testified to Charles Barron's committee on Higher Education at the City Council, and that was my first time at the City Council, which was certainly an interesting experience. Charles Barron had a lot of interesting things to say about articulation between the community colleges and senior colleges at both CUNY and SUNY. He at one point said, "Well, if the faculty can't make articulation work, maybe the government should simply make it work." We got a defense of the faculty role in articulation from president Marti who testified before Lenore and I were at the table and who has said that this was a faculty prerogative. A more complete description of that is in my report. You'll notice there's a caveat added to the description of president Marti's comment. I was really worried about governmental interference in articulation. I'm very much in favor of articulation as much as possible. I used to work on articulation with Hostos and BCC and Lehman, including in several federally funded programs. At the same time, I pointed out to Mr. Barron if somebody takes chemistry for pre-nursing at a community college, they can't expect to get credit for chemistry for pre-medical students once they're at the senior colleges. These are very different courses. So articulation has to be done with intelligence. It can't be done with a sledgehammer, either. I don't think I got through. I think the interests of the students have to be maintained, but of course, faculty control of curriculum and so forth has to also. He did not really understand why in one system, inside CUNY, there wouldn't be complete, automatic, and full articulation across the board. Of course, that's a desirable goal, but the devil is in the details. The written description tells you more about what happened. There was very interesting and useful testimony from Cheryl Lynch from NYPIRG who also advocated for more faculty for CUNY.

What's happened at the Board of Trustees most recently is the completion of the restructuring process before it goes to State Ed. The restructuring of the science doctoral programs, the Program in Public

Health, and the movement of the Engineering Programs from the Graduate Center, from CUNY as a whole to City College. That's a complicated process, and as chair of the UFS I had to take a very careful path through that process, and the reason is this— different parts of the faculty have different interests in this process. For instance, the Hunter College Senate voted to approve this at a fairly early date, and I got confirmation of that from the chair of Hunter College Senate. The City College Senate approved it in principle and the Chair of the City College Senate is here tonight, and he can correct me if I say anything that's wrong in some detail. The detailed resolution that was first presented to CAPPR had never passed the City College Senate. That's a fair thing to say. Approval on principle is not the same as approval of every comma, let alone everything else. The documents that first came to the UFS on this, on the Engineering Program, claimed approval by the Graduate Council. I'm a member of the Graduate Council and I was well aware that it had never shown up in any form of any kind at the Council. What then came to the final board meeting had all those documents that had inappropriate attribution, and there were several of them, but the resolutions themselves that were done by the full board were either brief or did not include the kinds of details. Of course, generating a document that says it's been approved by the City College Senate or approved by the Graduate Council and those Councils had never seen that document is a severe academic problem. Those things were removed from consideration. It was a serious issue in my book because it touches on academic ethics. People made a mistake. Now these things have been passed by the Board. What goes to the State Education Department? There will be documents that have not been seen anywhere else. I've asked the Chancellery for copies of those documents before they go to the board. This is not an issue particularly concentrated on the sciences or engineering, it's an issue for us all, because if the Chancellery can generate documents and say that they've been approved by this or that Senate, and those Senates have not seen those documents, then it's really a problem for everybody in this room. So we're going to continue to pay close attention to this process. This has, by the way, happened once before, at a different college which I will not name. Let me describe the process. College X generates a proposal for a new degree program. The College Senate passes it. It goes to the Chancellery and for one or another reason is turned back to the college. The college re-works it, and over a year later, heavily revised, it comes back to the Chancellery. Has it gone through the Senate again? Well, no, the Senate hasn't seen it, but the Chancellery claims that the Senate has approved it. How have they approved it? They have approved the first version. They didn't approve the second one. That counts, in the view of some members of the Chancellery, as approval of the second one, even though they didn't see it. In that case, the Executive Committee of the UFS made some strong representations, and I did, personally, to the State Education Department. I think it's important because the UFS Exec decided that it was in the best interests of all concerned that we don't really talk too much about the details of that issue, but I'm telling you as much as I think I'm authorized by the Exec. That was a serious matter. I think it's always a serious matter when they say document X has been approved by people Y and people Y haven't seen it at all. No matter what curriculum it is. So we're going to keep on top of that. In this case, they pulled the questionable documents entirely, but it was written right on the front, "approved by City College Senate, approved by the Graduate Council" right on the cover, and they'd never seen it. So it was pulled, and we'll keep on watching that this never happens again. Let me tell you, this has been an interesting period. I think you'll understand it's an enormous amount of work to get these things done and the work that was put in leading up to having these resolutions go through

and having the Graduate Council be aware that this was going on and so forth, was not trivial. It was a huge percent of my time, it was a huge percent of Professor Baumrin's time, who was working on this issue as Chair of the Committee on Structure at the Graduate Council, and a large percentage of Professor Levine's time. Those two gentlemen can tell you more about this if you wish. That's the verbal part of my report. As you see in the report, you have not taken a formal position in this restructuring, and it's difficult to do that because it has, at least in principle, approval by the Graduate Council, Hunter College Senate, and the City College Senate. In the case of the Hunter College Senate, there was approval of the details, at least according to the chair of the Senate. There was no Senate resolution of any other college opposed in this process, although there was certainly testimony at the public hearing, both pro and con.

Professor Baumrin— The packages, and its relation to undergraduate education, is that something the Senate needs to know about? / Chair Philipp— Before I say anything, I have to emphasize that I have no official opinion on this. I'm not taking sides in this matter, because I don't think it's appropriate for the UFS to take sides, especially in the case where a college Senate legitimately has approved something. It can happen. I'm not saying it will never happen, but it certainly hasn't happened in those cases. The question of the joint degrees means that in the sciences at least, some colleges will have more control over the doctoral programs than others, which will not have any degree granting authority. The question is, will that mean that funding will follow this? Will the campuses that don't have joint degree granting authority get less funding for these particular disciplines? It doesn't have to be those disciplines in the future, It could be others. In these disciplines, undergraduates are expected to do undergraduate research with mentors that are generally in the doctoral programs. Will that undergraduate research suffer? That's a question that was testified to in the public hearings. The testimony indicated that yes, the undergraduate education would suffer. Having said that, there are no Senate resolutions through those colleges that might suffer and therefore the faculty as a whole has not taken a position on that matter. It's just an opinion of the individuals.

Professor Alfred Levine (Engineering, Science and Physics, College of Staten Island) — If and when you as Trustee of the City University of New York receive the actual package that's been sent to Albany on behalf of those proposals, do you have the authority to return that package to Hunter, City, and the Graduate Center for examination? / Chair Philipp— I believe that these are public documents. Unless I have some unambiguous indication that they're not, of course, I would have the right to do so. / *Professor Levine— I would urge Hunter, City, and the Graduate Center to carefully consider what is being proposed in their names.*

Professor Crain— I think where Charles Barron is coming from is, a lot of students, and they're often poorer students and students of color, who are told they don't have the qualifications and they're not prepared well to get into the senior colleges are then told that they can go to the community colleges first and then they go up to the senior colleges, but then they run into the roadblocks because they don't have full articulation, and they can't get in. So it's a hypocritical message to them. I think the Senate should really look at articulation and take a lead on how it really works out in reality. Articulation is

supposed to be, I think by mandate, it's supposed to be full articulation, but in reality it's not. I propose that we look at it and do whatever is necessary to make it full articulation. Otherwise we're blocking a lot of students from full progress in their academic careers. / Chair Philipp— Bill, I appreciate your comments. Right now I've taken a slightly different course, and let me tell you what I'm trying to do. There are discipline councils in this university. The discipline councils bring into one room the department chairs from both the community colleges and the senior colleges in each discipline. Those people have the greatest detailed knowledge about the courses that have to be articulated. As a particular example, the Natural Sciences Discipline Council, the chair of the council declined to call a meeting for most of the year. So last week I sent him a message saying that if he can't call a meeting, I will call a meeting, which I can do as chair of the UFS. We are going to have a meeting, and the meeting will be addressed by Vice Chancellor Botman, who wants to really talk about admissions issues, the kind of issues that you brought up and that John Mineka brought up. Those issues will be discussed at the Discipline Council. There's another active council that's been very active in admissions and I believe in articulation, and it's the Mathematics Council. I don't have really great contact with the Mathematics Council. I hear about what they're doing secondarily. There are other councils such as the English Council. These councils have a better handle on some things than the UFS. If those councils fail then I think that would be a reasonable thing to look at. / Professor Crain— We've invited how many times the chair of the Math Council to come to a committee, and he never came. / Chair Philipp— But he's elected by his peers.

Professor Vozick— I would like to follow up on the same point. The point that Professor Crain is making he made in a modest way, but it's an extremely good point for the need of openness within the City University in that the people who are denied articulation are, I would sadly say, from personal experience, people whose educational backgrounds are least advantaged, and therefore for the people who this university is funded to serve the most. Yet they're being hurt the most in this problem. Therefore, it really does behoove us to get our full intellectual, moral, and courageous energies together to figure out how to move toward resolution. I think in order to do that, we have to really think about what the problem is. At the last meeting, we had a program on conflict resolution. They seemed like they're interesting people who had very good principles about the future of an institution that is striving to maintain itself. Manfred, you mentioned that the problem might be described as "the devil is in the details," and I've heard that phrase for decades and I've thought about it pretty carefully, and I've come to understand that often the devil is in the principles or in the lack of understanding of the principles, not in the way the principles are worked out. That's what it looks like at the surface but then when you come to understand what is really going on, it's really a conflict of principles. This suggests to me, and that's my concluding idea, that a really careful look at the conflict dynamics that lead to what we call articulation problems would be a very significant way for this university to move forward, rather than resting, as we do, on academic tradition, and the implicit arrogance of the knowledge of the specialists of their field, as to what should be in the course that allows the student to come into their program. This is a very deep re-thinking, and I'm going to recommend it to us seriously. / Chair Philipp— You'll be invited to the Discipline Council meeting in your own discipline, and I think you can also present those ideas there.

Professor Baumrin— I'd like to spend a couple of minutes telling you why the natural science restructuring is important at least to senior college faculty and campuses and curricula, and to alert you to the fact that mishandled, this would be an academic disaster for education at the City University of New York. Whatever the reasons were that drove the Chancellor to wish to have joint degree granting status for City and Hunter, if it winds up leading out to the other senior colleges, Baruch, Queens, Lehman, Staten Island, and Brooklyn, the consequence would be for them an attrition in their undergraduate science offerings, and to the extent that those campuses are in the business of turning out people in pre-med and pre-dentistry, and nursing, it would mean that those programs would be seriously negatively affected. Another serious collateral issue is the fellowship packages which are allocated to the admissions process for students in the natural sciences. These are created by the individual colleges, at the moment 91 per year for the university. The colleges promised to pay for years two through six, and the Graduate School is to pay for the first year. Of course the money comes from the Central Administration -- that's how it controls the number of packages. The presidents, possibly the provosts, determined where they want these packages to be placed. To take the simplest kind of example, if they wanted them to be in physical chemistry, you would have the positions be for students in the physical chemistry and not in organic. You could understand that that might have an effect on the Ph.D. program curriculum, and it will also have an effect on the college's curriculum. After those colleges, you as faculty need to get involved in the design of the packages in the future and not leave this up to your local college administration.

Professor Cooper— I wanted to go back to the subject of articulation and Discipline Councils, briefly. Historians are compelled to urge people not to reinvent the wheel every year. I first joined the Senate in 1976, and the subject was on the agenda then. Maybe that gives people a certain amount of depth. I don't frankly see a whole lot of progress in the discussion since then. Leslie, who's standing there, we worked on it back in the '90s in an effort to bring something realistic to bear. The best we ever got were two things. For about years, a lot of functioning discipline councils, history, English, and math, foreign languages was the first, and they'd been working together well for a long time. We managed to have, I think something like eight or nine of them. We ran little conferences for people to talk about what they thought Freshmen and Sophomores should have in order to become Juniors and Seniors. This may not be deep thinking, and it may not be reinventing the wheel, but it started to work. Then we got 80th Street to create something called TIPPS, which is a computer programs that enables a student at Bronx or Hostos or Queensborough or anywhere to punch in some numbers or keys and find out what goes on at Staten Island, City College, etc. So that people can get a clue what they should be taking. A student who takes an AAS degree and expects to get credit for a BS in science is being misled because there's different stages that don't work. I think that's a good example. I've been told that more than ten times by scientists. It's a little more fluid in history than in some of the other areas, not that totally fluid, and it's not very fluid if your student wants to become a social studies or a history teacher in a high school, because if you want the truth, they have to pass the state licensing exam. It's a misleading thing for me to say you can take anything you want to take and then you'll become qualified to do this, that, and the other thing. I think we have to face certain realities. If the students were well-advised about this TIPPS,

if faculty knew about it, and it were kept up to date. If we could get more of these discipline councils, that is, chairs of department from the two and the four year colleges to sit down once a semester and talk to each other, I think a certain amount of this would dissipate on behalf of the students. That's the only measures I could ever come up with that had some effectiveness. If anybody's got other ideas, good. They did work for a while. Don't ask me why they don't continue. /Chair Philipp— TIPPS does work right now.

Professor Leslie Jacobson (Health and Nutrition Sciences, Brooklyn College)— My question is to Stefan. I would like to ask you, Stefan, if you are applying to a doctorate in physical chemistry at the university and it said there was a joint degree at City and Hunter College, where would you go? Would you end up going to Brooklyn? I think not. I also worry about that the fact that we have a new Doctorate of Public Health. It says at Hunter College. This is presumably a joint degree. If it says at Hunter College, that's where they will go and that's where they will seek their funding. While we have to be ever-vigilant, I think we have a problem.

Professor Baumrin— On the Public Health, that will be at Hunter College. It started there, and it's going to stay there. The Doctorate of Public Health was organized by the Hunter College Faculty and approved in that form by 80th Street. The committees lost control of it, because that's the way it went through. I'm sorry to stay it. Vigilance requires attacking at the right point. They didn't do that. So it belongs to Hunter College. /Chair Philipp— If I could interject for just a moment. When the first doctorate in Public Health was proposed, it was clear that it was going to be a Hunter College dominated operation. I prevailed on the Chancellery to include as a member the Chair of the Department of Community Health at City College to be part of the organizing committee because it worried me greatly that it was excluding other people in the same discipline throughout the University. When this proposal came down, of course, we were also guided by the opinions of the College Senates. I think it's important for the faculty to understand that if they oppose something that they should also go not only to us, but to the College Senates and get a resolution moving on it, because that's going to influence the UFS, especially in the manner that it has a contact with a college. Yes, I think both Stefan and Leslie are correct. It was mainly at Hunter College that it came from. But there was considerable involvement by other colleges. Did the other colleges object to the joint degree at Hunter? I didn't hear any objection. I asked, wherever I thought I could ask, but no Senate approached us. That I think is over. It's been passed by the Board. It's a lesson for the future. We have to invoke our own colleges' authority if there's something happening that we don't like. This Senate can go against College Senates, but not readily and quickly, and it has to take determined and unified action if it is to do so.

Professor Jacobson — I did state my objections. There are several others who stated objections very clear and very loud, to no avail. So we did try to make a point.

Professor Patricia Antonello (Health and Nutrition Sciences, Brooklyn College)— How do you vote on a negative? Why would the Faculty Council at Brooklyn College vote on something that's happening at Hunter College? /Chair Philipp— They could object to it, pass a resolution objecting to it and forward

that resolution to the UFS. It's very simple. In the case of the science doctoral programs, I pointed this out to some of the participants, in particular from Queens, who were vehemently against it. Stefan and I worked with these participants very closely. At the same time, I said, if you want this to have real effect, you'll have to go back to your Senate and have your Senate pass a resolution asking for either joint degree status for their own college or opposing it for the others. There was no resolution, and we suggested it in sufficient time. It's not my opinion to say whether there should or should not be a resolution, but you can imagine if UFS takes a position that is the opposite of what a College Senate has done, they will legitimately say, "what is it your business and what are you doing here?" In fact, that's happened, sometimes, and they have a right to do those things, but it has to be a very unified and determined position that we have. By the way, it's not for lack of intense involvement and trying to get the wishes of all the involved faculty respectively. We tried, very hard. Stefan in particular has put in hours and hours and hours.

Professor Barbara Moore (Counseling, Queens College) — TIPPS is a program where students could punch in a course they're taking at one college and find the name of the equivalent course at another college they wanted to attend. It doesn't say anything about requirements or anything like that. It's just course equivalencies. / Chair Philipp— I've used TIPPS a lot myself as a department chair. / Professor Moore— About articulation, I think the policy of CUNY at this point is that any student who has an Associate of Arts or an Associate of Science degree necessarily is presumed to have completed their Gen Ed requirements at any senior college.

Professor Baumrin— On the admissions issue, because the admissions issue is critical, we need to wrest the admissions process back from the central administration to the individual natural science programs. Today, we did it for chemistry, which put admissions in the hands of the chemistry Executive Community, and probably Physics tomorrow. The students who are admitted will elect their campuses at the end of their first year and they will not be assigned to them by City College or Hunter College, they will be decided by the Executive Committee in chemistry because the final resolution by Graduate Council says admissions, faculty membership, and curriculum will stay at the Graduate School. The only thing that will happen is if a student is doing his laboratory work at City College, he will graduate from the City University of New York Graduate Center and City College, and if he's doing his laboratory work in Biology at Hunter College, he will graduate from the City University of New York Graduate Center and Hunter College. If Brooklyn wants to get on the bandwagon, they'll just have to get it through their Senate. I don't know if that will ever happen, or Queens, even less likely. / Chair Philipp— Admissions, as Stefan indicated, is a big deal, if administrators take over admissions, especially in programs where that hasn't been the case. Professor Barnhart is the UFS representative on what's known as the Enrollment Management Council.

C. UFS Library Committee Report on Enrollment Management: Professor Michael Barnhart, Chair, Library Committee (History, Philosophy, and Political Science, Kingsborough Community College) —I'm going to report on a visit to the Libraries Committee from the person who's in charge of the Enrollment Management Council, which is the council on which I sit to represent you and take notes

and send Manfred reports and things like that. Does everybody know what enrollment management is, by the way? Enrollment management is newspeak for admissions, financial aid, and everything else all rolled together and managed as one unit. The individual in the CUNY universe at 80th Street responsible for enrollment management is Robert Ptachik, the University Dean for the Executive Office. The Council is a chamber involving all the admissions and financial people in both the central administration and on the various campuses. They gather in order to hash out difficulties that they're having as CUNY moves ahead with various initiatives involved with admissions and financial aid. Since I've only been there for a little over a year now and I'm still trying to come to grips with it and understand all the various ins and outs of it and all of the various initiatives that are being undertaken in this regard, we've been mostly trying to educate ourselves in what's been going on. So we've asked Bob Ptachik to come to speak to us and we chose Morris Hounion, Library and Information Technology Committee Chair, as our sort of guinea pig in which to try out this educational process. So Dean Ptachik visited us today and we discussed issues involving undergraduate admissions. We're going to ask him to come back in April to discuss graduate admissions, where there are a whole other set of issues. Essentially, he spoke about what's different now about the way CUNY does admissions as opposed to the way it used to do admissions. One of the salient differences is that all admissions applications go through what's called the University Applications Processing Center, which is on my home campus, on Kingsborough, a place where they used to process all the paper. It used to be that people would apply, they would indicate their first choice, if they got into their first choice, that's where they went, and so on. Now, CUNY students are allowed to apply to six different CUNY schools when they apply. This can be a mix of senior and community colleges. Transfer students can apply for up to four. At this point, if I'm not mistaken, for the last few years, students are given admissions to their first three choices. Now they're moving ahead to admitting them for '09, they're going to give them an up or down on all of their choices, so now they know whether they're admitted to every one of the six choices that they've put down instead of just the first three. What I think the point of all this is is that you're talking about processing a lot more information than they used to process in the past. Obviously, if you do this in a paper environment, people are going to be overwhelmed. There's a real push at this point, and this is one of the internal reasons for the push, there's a real push at this point in order to move all of this into an electronic environment instead of a paper environment and expedite the processing so that it goes along with some degree of rapidity. However, there's an external reason for moving from a paper environment where everything is done on the old application forms and so on to an electronic environment, and this has to do with the other issue that he brought up with our committee and which I think is really a guiding focus of all the things that they're doing on this council on which I sit. This has to do with competition. CUNY used to think of competition as competition between the various colleges for students. I think at this point they now see themselves as not so much involved in inter-college competition or intra-CUNY competition, but in competition with the privates— Pace, Adelphi, St. John's, LIU, this sort of thing. They believe that they lose out very badly, especially in the competition for better students, they lose out very badly to these other institutions, and there's a reason besides the issue of the overall quality of the institutions. The reason is because it's much easier to apply to these other places and these other places aggressively recruit students. He described us as more or less in the Stone Age in terms of our ability to reach out to students and try to bring them to CUNY colleges. So there are a number of initiatives,

actually, and a sort of restructuring that's going on in admissions generally in order to address these particular kinds of issues. The thing that they're doing at this point is to take admissions and instead of making it a process or a job that involves processing paper and looking at applications and admitting students and so on, sorting through the documents, collecting all the documents, all that kind of thing, to make admissions much more a question of recruitment and outreach to potential students, to streamline as much as possible the actual application process and to make it as electronic as possible. It used to be students filled out a paper form, they sent it into UAPC, and then all of that data has to be entered by people there at the office. If you have students entering the data themselves on the web, you cut out all of that processing. You get other problems; for example, you get a much higher error rate, and this has its own difficulties. In enrollment reports you often see, because CUNY has rolling admissions, we admit as we process these things, you can see where the lags are, and often the lags have to do with these kinds of little snafus. In any case, the strategy is to make that process more efficient. Also, therefore, to send people out to do recruitment in the high schools like Saint Francis, or Stuyvesant, or any of the other high schools that are in the area. I think they're aiming to try to broaden. Lehman is aiming to do more recruitment in Westchester, and so on. They're trying to broaden their approach so they take in students from a broader regional area. This involves a number of more specific initiatives, mainly having to do with changing the job descriptions and the roles of various staff in the various CUNY admissions offices, specifically on campuses and also at the Central Administration. They're looking to be able to move people around, to have more flexibility in terms of job descriptions and things like that. One of the members of the committee actually asked a question about union issues, which I thought was rather interesting, because obviously, as you move people, they're going to be changing the terms and conditions of their employment. Another thing they want to be able to do is to access information a lot more easily. The problem here, essentially, is as you move to a paperless environment where you're having students send in a web application in effect, they're sending in the web applications but they're not necessarily sending in the transcript or anything else. It used to be you bundle your whole admissions packet up and you send it in to the office and they go over it. That's not going to happen when it's on the web, obviously, because all you do is fill out the form on your computer and then the rest of the stuff you have to mail in separately. And this is also one of the reasons why sometimes you get these lags in the current system, especially as they've been moving to a paperless environment. By the way, almost all CUNY applications now are handled electronically. They've moved over in the past year and I think it's well over 97% now are electronic. What happens though when people have to send in supporting documents? They often don't do it. You really have to make it much easier for students to send these things in. With regard to students who apply from public high schools, there is a way that CUNY can access their transcripts electronically. That's been done -- I won't bore you with the details. What CUNY wants to do is move through this company called Connect Edu. This is in a very incipient stage at this point, but it is to be able to access also the transcripts of the private schools and so on and get these to come in electronically, because it's really with transcripts that you have the biggest lag in terms of admissions. The thing about this kind of automated transfer of information that raises issues in my mind and which we always ought to keep our eye on is of course security and access to the information. On the Council, they're wrestling a great deal with who should have access to all of this information, who should see it, how much of it should be available. So far

they've tended to make it available to everybody, which has been causing some security headaches because, of course, it is clear that everybody should be authorized to see all of this information. So on your own campuses, you might be sensitive to this kind of thing as a general rule. A couple of other things he talked about which I will mention. Another initiative that they're taking, and I don't know how many issues this will raise for us, but something you want to be aware of is also they're using a private company called Hobsons to implement what you would call a customer relations tool. Essentially this is an automated way through your web site of reaching out to students and bombarding them with emails and then they'll also follow up with telephone calls and things like that. Lastly, CUNY First was another issue that came up, something that you might want to keep your eye on. One thing that he said that I thought was fairly reassuring, is that in his opinion, in terms of making admissions part of the Oracle Peoplesoft system that CUNY is using in this initiative, he felt that it needed to go slow and as far as admissions goes, it's going to be limited admissions that will be part of the CUNY First initiative. I think that completes the report.

Professor Levine— I have a semantic problem. I have no difficulty with having data entered in electronic form, but I have an issue that goes beyond whether it's in electronic form or on paper or on clay tablets in cuneiform. According to the Perez decision, responsibility for admissions rests with the faculty. That's the law. I have no problem with enrollment management people doing the data processing, handle recruitment, handle financial aid, but the term admissions should always be the responsibility of the faculty. We should decide the criteria. This whole discussion seems to be carving out an admissions process where faculty are not involved. So I would just caution that we need a part. / Professor Barnhart— I think that's well taken. One of the problems that can occur is the mission creep here, where the processing begins to run the process. I think that's something we all have to be vigilant about, absolutely.

Professor Dean Savage (Sociology, Queens College)— How many people here have actually gone out and participated in the recruitment process? Not very many. This is when Terry Martell talked about going out to high schools to try to recruit. The question came to mind, how many people actually did get involved in this process. By and large it's my impression that the faculty have not accepted this as part of the job description at CUNY because it's a lot of work. But it is going to be increasingly important, and as the differential between the private and the public costs gets larger, Terrence is quite right, the potential is there, but it's going to involve something quite special. One of the things that I most enjoyed encountering on the web when Peter Salins was provost of all of SUNY was a remarkable set of documents for all 64 campuses in SUNY and what it showed you. They didn't put it up for more than one year, but it was great for that year, and it was the admissions process for every campus in SUNY in matrix form. It would show you who applied to Binghamton and to Albany and to Stony Brook, who was admitted to those three campuses, or all 64, and it showed you where they went. My question to you is do you see data like that that shows where our students are being admitted and where they choose to go, including choices between the public and the private sector? The reason I'm asking that question is that if we really knew more about which private colleges were our chief competition, we might actually be able to get more involved in the recruitment process. / Professor Barnhart— The enrollment council

does look at information like that. Some of that I've provided to Manfred when it's looked particularly interesting. The most recent example had to do with graduate admissions. We talked about this in the meeting today. One of the surprising facts is something like 55% of CUNY baccalaureate students who go on to graduate programs go elsewhere other than CUNY. There is actually a breakdown circulated as to where they go. Maybe I'll do what Dean Ptachik did today and ask you if you can guess which of the privates actually soaks up by far the lion's share of these CUNY graduates. NYU is second. Touro College is number one. / Professor Savage— *One of the things that's quite astonishing, if you go to nces.ed.gov website and look at the college finder, punch in the zip code for your college and look at all the colleges in a ten-mile radius, you'll be able to see statistics on the 25th and 75th percentile cutoff points on the SATs for all of the colleges in the local area, you'll be able to see how many students take out loans, you'll be able to see how much they take out in loans and what kind of debt burden they graduate with. What's astonishing for me, being from Queens College, is when I look at those data for St. John's, for Adelphi, for Hofstra, tuition going from 4.5 to 18 to 25 to 30, I see that the students are exactly the same in terms of the SAT cutoff scores. What the hell is going on? Then I look at the debt. CUNY students don't go into debt. If you go to CUNY, as Matt said, you're not a player in this business, you don't take on debt, you pay for it somehow.* / Professor Barnhart— You know what happens, though, Dean, is that these colleges, when they talk to a student, they'll say, "okay, you get Pell, you get TAP, you're going to get a grant from us and it's only going to cost \$5 thousand to go to LIU." That's the same as it would cost to go to Queens, they'll claim. Now of course, if that same student were to go to Queens, they would pay nothing, probably. A lot of it has to do with the way in which we market ourselves. / Professor Savage— *What I did is I went ahead and had a student start to do the research on how much debt St. John's, Adelphi, Hofstra students take on, how much debt burden they graduate with, why are we not putting this out there?*

Professor Karen Kaplowitz (English, John Jay College)— Before Michael was on this council, I represented the UFS on it, and what really surprised me, and Michael alluded to this, but the specifics really surprised me, according to what Bob Ptachik and the others on the enrollment management council said, when students apply to the privates like St. John's and so forth, they can go to the campus the same day, they're told whether they've been admitted, how much financial aid they will get, what the amount of college grant or scholarship they'll be given before they leave the campus. Compared to students who apply to CUNY who don't know and are anxious, and it's a long process. That's incredible to me that students would find out in less than one day's visit, and that's a challenge.

Professor Vozick— I'd like to point out that this emphasis on marketing that we're seeing should also be balanced in our minds with an effort to build ongoing relationships with the communities in which our students come from and from which our funding ultimately also comes from. The particular thought that I would recommend to people interested in this area is that we have a whole large junior faculty that knows almost nothing about what we're talking, and I don't see anywhere in CUNY any thinking about it, and this might be a place for those who want to work on it to initiate some kind of program to help junior faculty understand why we're involving ourselves in this. It would be useful in also making sure that the appropriate rewards come to them too.

Professor Petratos— There's an anomaly here, and the anomaly is a simple one. We are the best game in town and we are the least expensive game in town, and people don't come to us. If you go back 30, 40, 50 years ago, you did not need any marketing or advertising to go to City College or Hunter College or Brooklyn College. What has happened? Can you imagine having the best commodities in the market, in this case service, education, and people do not come? What has happened in my view after 37 years, the commitment to teaching is not what it used to be. Therefore, first of all, and our adjunct colleagues here are doing a great job and better than I did as a full timer, but that's not the issue. The issue is they don't have the time, they're not paid well, they're not there for office hours, they're not there to meet students, and then our full time faculty, the over-emphasis in my view on research and so on takes them away. They want to be provocative, they want to be given tenure, and so on and so forth. So it's not easy at all. I remember in my own college, the Vice President came after 25 years and said "Let's see. People don't know us on the island. I come from Staten Island." We had several deans of public relations, the large number of people in their offices. I said, if I were the dean for public relations or the Vice President for public relations, I would have gone to every single house on the island. A couple of hundred thousand, I would have gone in 20 years. There's something wrong, the commitment to the students and to teaching. Some other colleague pointed out before that we don't have information easily available— how much do you pay? Why do you pay that? What kind of a loan do you get and so on. But primarily, the commitment to teaching I think is the main obstacle. We are the best and the least expensive game in town, come and get it. They don't.

Chair Philipp— I'd like to thank Michael Barnhart for leading the discussion. I asked him to do this because it was clear that this was one of the sessions where we had time to do this. If you have suggestions for UFS for things you should email them to me. Feedback I've gotten is that some people are afraid to ask questions. One person asked me, if they ask a question, will we expunge it from the minutes? If they ask, we'll expunge it from the minutes, as long as the minutes get approved. People are afraid to ask because they're untenured junior faculty members. We'll do whatever is possible to have you ask questions freely. Let me mention some initiatives. Our Academic Freedom Committee is working on an Academic Freedom document that will see the light of day at some point. Dean Savage is busy generating data, and we've had extensive discussions about the Faculty Experience Survey, and that's still up and coming. This has been a very busy period. I thank you for your support and I would suggest a motion to adjourn.