

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

November 27, 2007

The meeting was called to order by UFS Chair Philipp at 6:35 p.m. in Room 9205/06/07 at the Graduate School and University Center. 68 voting members of 118 were present.

**Baruch:** Present – Brandwein, Hill, Martell, Wine, and Alternate Aubry. Absent – Albright, Dumas, Freedman, Pollard, and Vora. **BMCC:** Present – Friedman, Martinez-Lopez, Persaud, Rani, and Vozick. Absent – Kalogeropoulos, Niyazov, and Roy. **Bronx CC:** Present – Alternate Ismail. Absent – Alozie, Durante, and Skinner. Vacancies—1. **Brooklyn:** Present – Antonello, Bell, Dubois, Jacobson, Rodman, Shapiro, and Tobey. Absent – Cherukupalli, Shortell, and Viscusi. Vacancies –1. **CCNY:** Present – Crain, Khalil, and Sank. Absent – DGLISH, Habib, Lascar, and Raj. Vacancies – 1. **CSI:** Present – Batson, Cooper, Foleno, Klibaner, Levine, Petratos, and Alternate Stearns. Absent – Jayatilleke, and Yousef. **CUNY Law School:** Present –Lung. Absent – Farago. **Graduate School:** Present – Baumrin, Lennon, and Orenstein. Absent – Cross, Matthews-Salazar, and Nolan. **Hostos CC:** Present – August, Bernardini, Pimentel, and Alternate Sharma. Vacancies - 1. **Hunter:** Present – Alternate DeMeo. Absent – Friedman, Guzzetta, Kaye, Krishnamachari, McCormick, Palanda, Splitter, St. Hill, and Wimberly. Vacancies – 2. **John Jay:** Present – Chaffie, Kaplowitz, and Alternate Petraco. Absent – Crossman, Dunham, King-Toler, Kubic, and Romero. **Kingsborough CC:** Present – Barnhart, O’Malley, and Ruoff. Absent – Hume, Stubin, and Wood. **LaGuardia CC:** Present – Beaky, Davidson, Lerman, Mettler, Rushing, and Alternates Kurzyna, and Sokolski. Absent – Shean. **Lehman:** Present – Hellmann, Jervis, Marianetti, Mineka, and Philipp. Absent – Kolb. **Medgar Evers:** Present – Barker, Hastick, Hope, and Alternate Daly. Absent – Stewart. **NYCCT:** Present – Cermele, Hounion, Paynayotakis, and Richardson. Absent – Horelick, and Karthikeyan. **Queens:** Present – Bird, Moore, and Savage. Absent – Brody, Gonzalez, Habib, and Zevin. Vacancies – 2. **Queensborough CC:** Present – Barbanel, and Pecorino. Absent – Iconis, Jacobowitz, and Wein. Vacancies – 1. **York:** Present – Divale, and Lewis. Absent – Cockery, and Rosenthal. Professor Dahbany-Miraglia (QCC) also attended. **Chancellor Goldstein, Vice Chancellor Schaffer, and Executive Assistant Cura attended.**

**Governance Leaders present:** Anderson (BMCC), Baumrin (GS), Cooper (CSI), Philipp (Lehman), Kaplowitz (John Jay), Levine (CSI), Martell (Baruch), Mettler (LaGuardia), Pecorino (QCC), Savage (Queens), Tobey (Brooklyn), Woytowich (NYCTC), and Young (Hunter) attended. Parliamentarian Baumrin (Lehman), Executive Director Phipps, Administrative Assistant Pasela, and Secretary Blanchard were also present.

- I. Approval of the Agenda: The agenda was adopted as proposed.
- II. Approval of the Minutes of October 23, 2007: Minutes were approved as distributed.
- III. Reports:(Recorded in Reports & Deliberations)
  - A. Chair.
  - B. Chancellor Matthew Goldstein.
  - C. Professor Dean Savage, Chair, Status of the Faculty Committee.
  - D. Representatives to Board of Trustee Committees. (written)

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  
THREE HUNDRED & THIRTY-SECOND PLENARY SESSION OF THE UNIVERSITY  
FACULTY SENATE  
OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

November 27, 2007

III. Reports:

**B. Chancellor Matthew Goldstein** — Last night, the Trustees approved the State Budget Request that I had submitted for consideration. I'd like to first thank the Budget Advisory Committee of the UFS for being a wonderful partner in the construction of that budget and for the support that you gave. The operating budget is going to be the largest operating Request that we have made by far in our history, and the capital Request is a very forward-thinking, very differently structured Request than we have made in the past, emphasizing health and safety issues, which is a continuing concern, given we have an aged physical plan and moneys to maintain the plan which had never really been developed into the structure of the Request. I had an opportunity to review the SUNY Budget Request, which is going to the board this week. It may even go today, if not, tomorrow. Their Request was structured in a complementary way to ours, very parallel in other ways, around the Compact and the distribution of revenue to support investment at SUNY and CUNY. I must say that this is the first time in the history of these two institutions that we have walked in unison, and I think that kind of political force will get noticed and hopefully influence how the Governor ultimately is going to develop his executive budget that will then be remanded to the State Legislature for deliberation and then final approval later this spring.

Also, the presidential guidelines for review of presidents has been totally reframed and embedded into the PMP, which is a program that we initiated around 2002, which all of you should know about. It's a living document where we drill very deeply into the core of each institution. I spent a considerable amount of time over the summer reviewing with each president, one on one, the results of the metrics that we used to assess whether the campus achieved the goals that were established during the course of the year between the central administration and the campus representatives that were a party to that.

The third force is that within days the Commission on Higher Education will formally submit the recommendations to the Governor. I will tell you that in the last couple of meetings, it was rather contentious. We had to take a very aggressive role in ensuring that the recommendations really reflected what I believe the Governor wanted initially, and that is a set of recommendations that will help to renew both SUNY and CUNY. You've had a sense of what we were concerned about and what the kinds of recommendations I had made with respect to finance, governance, and issues around support of both these systems from a regulatory standpoint and policies around differential tuition and tuition policy, and things of this nature which we really very much drove. Within a few days that document will be made more public. There will be yet another public hearing. This one is scheduled on December 5th at the Graduate Center, and I would encourage any of you who would like to be heard, to do so. We have had several public hearings, and it would be good to hear from some CUNY people because we really have not had much CUNY representation, in part because of where these prior public hearings were held: one was held in Buffalo, one was held out on Long Island. This one will be in Manhattan, and I encourage any of you, if not to testify, to be in the audience. I'll be there and will respond appropriately. The Governor will release his executive budget by the third week of January. We hope that this budget message will in large part be influenced or shaped by the recommendations that the Commission on Higher Education has brought forth. When I was here last, I talked about, sort of metaphorically, an accelerator of two forces really twirling around in concentric circles and then colliding. That was really the Commission's recommendations, which, when you see those recommendations, are going to be rather profound, and if enacted and financed, certainly will have a profound impact on both these public institutions. That's the good news. The bad news is that, as I indicated to this body and I indicated to the presidents of the University on several occasions, there are serious and nasty exchanges between the Executive and especially on the State Senate side. When you have these forces of good will in terms of bringing forward recommendations with respect to support for both these Universities, and you have a legislature or part of a legislature, both on the Democratic and Republican side, both on the Senate side and the Assembly side, having tensions of some high level with the Executive, and you have the third, so I will now use another metaphor, the three body problem. For those of you who studied mechanics, you're familiar with the three body problem. The third force here that is active, of course, is the economy. I think that third force is going to have a very significant role in the way

in which the Governor is going to feel a sense of comfort with respect to recommendations that they're going to make. This has been a nasty several months in the financial markets, especially in the fixed income or credit markets that has infiltrated into the equity markets. Those of you who every day get onto your website and look at your TIAA-CREF accounts, I could assure you get a little unsettled when you see the results of what is happening. That is having a very chilling effect on projections with respect to the revenue that the state believes it generally can have to support all of the state functions including both SUNY and CUNY. So this three body problem of a strong Commission report that will get noticed, especially since CUNY and SUNY march together, this was something that I in particular worked very hard on to get both of these two institutions to be joined together in common cause. That is going to have an important impact. But the tension between the Executive Branch and the Legislature, plus the economy, these three forces whirling around and pulling in ways that we really can't fully fathom at this particular time, is going to finally sort itself out over the next couple of months. The Legislature, which we work very hard to develop relationships with and to try to sell in our most aggressive ways, that relationship is very important, but 98 or 99% of the gain is in the Executive Budget, and that was the strategy that we took. That was one of the reasons that we were in the very early stages, using that as a vehicle to try to influence opinion with respect to the ultimate budgets for both of these institutions. We will get a sense about this in a very few weeks. The Governor will release his budget around the third week of January and we'll get a sense from that. After I leave here tonight I'm going to be involved in a relatively high-level meeting to discuss some of these items that I am discussing with you now. Let me just end by saying one more thing. I'll go back to the Board meeting last night. The Board accepted my recommendations for two new Vice Chancellors, which Professor Philipp, I imagine, will brief you all on. We decided to bifurcate the portfolio of the Vice Chancellor for Faculty, Staff, and Administration into two separate portfolios, one dealing with labor relations and one dealing with human resource management. We appointed last night Ginger Waters, who was Brenda Malone's number two in the Office of Faculty, Staff, and Administration, as Vice Chancellor for Human Resource Management. We also appointed Pamela Silverblatt, who currently is the number two person in the Office of Labor Relations of the City of New York, working with Jim Hanley. She is a consummate professional in the area of labor relations, and as I see in the future, this University will reshape to a large degree an influx of people new to the professoriate, newly credentialed people. There's going to be an opportunity to rethink some of the things we have been party to for several decades that I

think we'll need to have a fresh look at. We will welcome both new Vice Chancellors. / *Chair Philipp — Will you comment on the City Budget for the Community Colleges?* / Chancellor Goldstein — All of the city agencies were given PEG targets. PEG is an acronym for Program to Eliminate the Gap, which is basically another way of saying “we’re going to cut your budget, and we want you to come up with a plan for reducing expenditures.” For the current fiscal year, the PEG reduction target was \$5.3 million. This is just for community colleges and has nothing to do with the senior colleges. For next year, the target is about \$9 million. Obviously, I wrote a very strenuous letter to Mark Page, the Budget Director for the City of New York, indicating that I thought these cuts were unwarranted and really objected to having to come forward with recommendations. We’re going to have to work not only with the Executive, with Mayor Bloomberg, but with the City Council as well, to see about getting these dollars restored. This will not be a problem, even if fully implemented this year, but next year, that is a more sizeable exercise, and we’re going to have to work hard to try to undo some of this. It will be moderated, unless, of course, this economy continues to lose steam, and then all bets are off at that particular time. Let’s worry about that if it happens.

*Professor Cooper (History, College of Staten Island) — If the gods and goddesses are smiling on us and all the bodies line up and the money comes through, is the Governor’s money likely to come through with the kind of strings that have been given to the lower schools? That is, these productivity measures, testing, demonstrating student progress towards degree?* / Chancellor Goldstein — None of those things that you just mentioned will be in the Commission Report. I can’t speak for the Governor, so I just don’t know. / *Professor Cooper — But the Commission is not recommending any barricades?* / Chancellor Goldstein — The Commission is recommending in just broad strokes, in a much more deregulated environment. We have always objected to having this highly regulatory framework that we are constrained to operate within. Also, to ask for a sufficient investment. Those are really the major things with respect to higher education. There are a whole bunch of other things that I will give a briefing, if you would like, Manfred, to the Senate, once this is released, and go forward and share with you some of the thinking. There’s a whole lot of other stuff about governance in SUNY. Virtually nothing on governance with respect to CUNY, and a lot of stuff about relationships with schools across the State of New York.

*Professor Rushing (Social Sciences, LaGuardia Community College) — I would like to speak to this question of the Union being denied email access at LaGuardia Community College. This seems to me particularly unfair, since the mission of computer use at the University is to promote education and research and community outreach. It seems to me that is also the mission of the Union; there's a consistency between both. It seems to me this is an unnecessarily antagonistic way of approaching the Union. Why can't the Union make announcements, as they have, for many, many years, about Union meetings? How is that violating computer use at the University?*

/ Chancellor Goldstein — I was briefed maybe for all of 30 seconds on this the other day. I just don't know enough about what the issue is and what was communicated and the reasons for the communication. I can't comment on something I really just don't know enough about. We'll get back to you, I promise you.

*Professor Crain (Psychology, City College) — I want to talk again about your new admissions standards plan. These tiers are creating a status panic among the colleges where those who looked like they were in the second tier now have this need to not be inferior, but to jump up to the higher tier. This is occurring at Lehman College, where they're planning to move into the first tier, raise their standards, because they're as good everybody else. A lot of this is focusing on the SAT. At Lehman there's a proposal to impose a new SAT minimum on the index. At City College, there's a proposal coming from the Provost to impose new SAT minimum scores on the indexes. The SAT already has a huge impact at the University. It's part of the admission to Honors Program. It's already part of admissions to some of the colleges -- higher SAT scores. I don't know if it's still part of the evaluation of the presidents, and that's a question. /*

Chancellor Goldstein — We don't look at the SATs of the presidents. / *Professor Crain — When I read the last rendition of the plan, the SAT scores of students was part of the evaluation of the president, what they'd done to raise their SAT scores of the colleges. It's a false god. It doesn't predict anything but freshman grades, and only modestly at that, nationwide. It doesn't predict anything at City University with any confidence at all. It's a very poor predictor of college success. It disproportionately screens out people of color and low-income students. There's abounding evidence that the darn test is biased. I really wish we would quit making this our god, the SAT, worrying about US News and World Report's use of the SAT and our status in that magazine, and think about what we're really supposed to be doing, what our mission is, how we*

*teach, and what our true goals are. Chasing this SAT, it's simply a status game and it's unbecoming of our great University.*

*Professor Mineka (Mathematics and Computer Science, Lehman College) — I'm concerned that we're abandoning a rational admissions policy in which each individual college admits students based on an array of scores and high school grades weighted to predict their college success, and rather abruptly substitute some rather arbitrary measures, which are not very predictive. Why so much attention to the math score, and so little to the rest of the student's record? Why so much weight to SAT scores, which after all do not predict college success, but correlate strongly with students' socio-economic status? Are we concerned to ensure our students' chances of success? Or are we concerned to change the social background of our student body? /*

Chancellor Goldstein — I will need at least 15 or 20 minutes to describe the admissions process that we go through, but let me just very briefly say it's different across each individual institution. It's not a common admissions standard. What we use is a linear function that incorporates the number of mathematics and English units, the SAT score, high school average, a few other metrics that we use. That is a procedure that is used throughout public higher education in the United States, in part because we get so many students. You don't have an opportunity to review each individual applicant with an interview as you would at smaller institutions. And it works fairly effectively. There are different weights associated with each of those components that I just mentioned in the linear function. It's basically a linear discriminate function. If you fall above, you're admitted and then you're given a battery of tests, an English reading test or writing test, and a mathematics test. That is the way in which we admit students. Every institution has a different set of variables and a different set of weights. Those weights are largely determined by correlating the first year and second year success of students in a longitudinal study relating to the nature of their profile and how the student succeeds. Is it a perfect system? No. I don't know of any system that is a perfect system. But that is the way in which we do our work. With respect to the SAT, and this goes back to Bill Crain's statement, and is embedded in your statement as well, when we looked at the profile of the students that are now studying at the university -- we really only did this at Baruch, at City College, Queens, Hunter, and Brooklyn College -- we found that their average SATs in mathematics far exceeded the original cut point that we used in 1999 of 480. I basically recommended to the presidents that it seems to me that we ought to raise this to 510 because when I look at the data, what I'm seeing

is averages around 540, 550, 570, well exceeding. So when we ran the numbers, there would be very, very little effect. So what we're really trying to do is match the actual experience that our students are bringing to the institution with respect to the weight we put into this function. /

*Professor Mineka — You are abandoning the old system whereby there was this sort of linear predictor, and on the basis of your having looked at some scores, decided to increase the required math score, and that's not a very scientific way of doing it. / Chancellor Goldstein — I think you have that wrong. When I arrived at the City University as Chancellor in 1999, the admissions criteria were essentially the same across the senior colleges. You either had to be in the top third of your class, an average SAT of 900 and there was some other measure, I forget what it was. It made absolutely no sense. They just took numbers out of the atmosphere and used it without even looking at what the profile of what the students are and how you can best make those kinds of determinations. This is what it was: 80 high school average, a 900 on the SAT, or the top third of your class. That was the admissions criteria that was used ubiquitously across the University. / Professor Mineka — At any rate, there's a new regime, and it's not clear what the basis for the new regime is.*

*Professor Beaky (English, LaGuardia Community College) — I have a question also about the Commission. The initial composition of the Commission had very little faculty in its composition. I have no way of knowing how much faculty input has gone into what you have now. A document is about to come out. As you said, there's been little to no contact with faculty. At CUNY there was a meeting at City College, but it wasn't public, and it wasn't a hearing, so a document is about to come out and now we get to testify. I intend to go. But I'm just wondering exactly how much real faculty impact there will be on this document and its deliberations. It seems like very little. / Chancellor Goldstein — There were several faculty on the Commission, one from CUNY, Buzz Paaswell, a distinguished professor of Civil Engineering at City College. He spoke eloquently, and he spoke with knowledge of the University, and he spoke with passion, and he spoke with intelligence. So I think he served a very useful purpose and was indefatigable. I think he made a very profound impact. There is a faculty member from SUNY, and there is a faculty member from one of the private institutions who, if I recall, was not nearly as active. It is a set of recommendations that, if enacted, will result in very significant investment in the University, which I think is really, for me, the most important aspect of what we can do. / Professor Beaky*

*— I look forward to reading them. I'm sure that those of us who labor in the trenches will be reading them with that perspective in mind. Thank you.*

*Professor Levine (Engineering, Science and Physics, College of Staten Island) — In an earlier meeting, you told us that CUNY had hired 800 new faculty this fall, which made everybody in this room very happy. But there was confusion as to how many were replacements, how many were substitutes. Could I ask for the following number: how many full-time, tenure and tenure-track faculty do we have this fall compared to the corresponding number last fall? / Chancellor Goldstein — I know it's larger. I don't have it, but it's easily attainable. I'll get somebody to send it to you. There are a large number of substitutes, and hopefully those substitutes will turn into -- they were all designated as tenure-track faculty lines. The results are not all tenure track faculty because the searches didn't succeed. I'd be happy to share it and hopefully when we're back in the market, where we are now, that those conversions will continue to take place and if we do get some investment this year, there will be further dollars provided to the presidents for distribution to divisions, schools, and departments.*

*Professor Sank (Anthropology, CCNY) — I'm the budget person at City College, and when I present my report, I always say I'm going to be positive to begin with. So I'll be positive to say we're delighted to have you come to City College January 15. / Chancellor Goldstein — I was at BMCC today and I will be at Queens College tomorrow. / Professor Sank — There are many problems that exist at City College, and many crises, one of which is at such severity that I feel I have to bring it to your attention today. The administration decided about two weeks ago to merge the department of Anthropology, of which I am a member, with the department of Sociology. Both departments indicated to the administration over this past two weeks, we absolutely did not want to be merged for professional reasons, for student reasons, and so forth. So yesterday, I learned informally, but I think it's accurate, that the administration has now decided because we refused to be merged, that they will be eliminating the department of Anthropology. I'm the college Ombudsperson, and my duty as Ombudsperson is to take complaints from faculty, students, and staff and to report on those. I have reported, and I have reported in disagreement with actions of the administration. Remember last year I brought to your attention that Hunter College felt that if they disagreed with the administration they might be retaliated against? / Chancellor Goldstein — I really know nothing about the merging of two*

departments. Usually in matters like this, faculty have a very important and prominent role in shaping those kinds of recommendations, and I would find it hard to believe that there wasn't that kind of deliberation. *Professor Sank — There was none. In fact, I'm telling you, we're not even officially told yet. But guess what happened? Yesterday, when the department informally learned that they were going to be eliminated, the chair of the department resigned, and then left for the meetings of the Anthropological Association. The critical thing here is that our administration has a practice of making decisions and actions which then when we tried to reverse them are almost impossible to reverse. That's why I'm bringing it to your attention. I wonder what the process and procedure is for eliminating a department, or even for merging it.* / Chancellor Goldstein — I would say that the most enlightened leadership, our best presidents, understand, as they should, that matters of academic import such as the merging of two departments is of such significant action that it really needs to be very much a partnership, if not driven by faculty. The best presidents understand that and they work very closely with governance groups and others to enact this. You're saying that that has not happened? I'll find out and we'll have somebody get back to you. / *Professor Sank — But also it's elimination, because they may act to eliminate our department before the beginning of the next semester. Once it's eliminated, it's very difficult.* / Chancellor Goldstein — We'll look into it. / *Professor Sank — The one negative thing was why are you coming in the middle of January when faculty are not on campus?* / Chancellor Goldstein — I thank you for letting me know. I'll be there in January.

*Professor Petratos (Political Science, Economics, and Philosophy, College of Staten Island) — The operating budget, any idea of what the sum is? Because we're going to discuss it tomorrow and I don't want to look it up. And the capital budget?* / Chancellor Goldstein — Our operating budget now has about \$2.3 billion. / *Professor Petratos — And the capital budget?* / Chancellor Goldstein — The ask is going to be around \$8 billion. *Professor Petratos — Just a rough number on the cost of the Central Office?* / Chancellor Goldstein — Excessive. I have no idea. / *Professor Petratos — Could you find out ?* / Chancellor Goldstein — I can have someone run it. / *Professor Petratos — And also, what is the cost of the two new Vice Chancellors?* / Chancellor Goldstein — Excessive, also. / *Professor Petratos — Please give us an idea. You know my name and where I am, right? According to you, the Commission will deliver a report that will be less regulatory. I think you mentioned the word deregulation or something like that. Therefore, it will*

*be moving towards what one may call in [inaudible] an upper market kind of a thing, away from [inaudible] that it has been [inaudible] since 1845. That's what I gather from that. / Chancellor Goldstein — You may gather that, but I look at it in a very different way. I look at it as more faculty-friendly and less regulatory from the State Education Department kinds of regulations and things of that nature. / Professor Petratos — I never would have gone to university if it weren't for City College. / Chancellor Goldstein — Same thing with me.*

*Professor Vozick (Science, BMCC) — You mentioned introducing the names of the new Vice Chancellors to us. I thought it was a very profound, important point that there's a changeover in the faculty happening, an outgo of faculty and an influx of new faculty, and that you were going to consider them and there will be some new things coming out of that. Can you share a little further about that? / Chancellor Goldstein — On the HR side, the human resource management side, we are going through a profound change in the way in which we design and implement our management information systems. We have a very arcane system built on a platform that was designed and written in the 1960s and part of the problem with these systems is that there do not exist people anymore who know how to write code in the languages. The human resource management Vice President is going to take a real leadership role, and that's going to be a multi-year project with a lot of people involved, a lot of members of the individual college communities involved. It seems to me that that job is of such magnitude now that we really need somebody to reflect specifically on that. That frees up the labor relations of Vice Chancellor to really think about reshaping some of the practices that we have in the University now, and we'll see where that goes. Obviously, some of it has to do with collective bargaining, some of it doesn't, but I need somebody to really reflect on those two portfolios, and that's the reason why it was bifurcated. / Professor Vozick — The second part is that I have this difficult responsibility of somehow in this body representing the concerns of the adjuncts, because it is part of this body's responsibilities. I was wondering whether, when you said influx and out-flow, I thought of turnover and new faculty coming in, old faculty leaving. We are going through a generational change at this point. I wondered if you'd been thinking about that and how that relates to this very large body of people who are doing the work. I don't want to pity the poor adjunct or create a negative aura about it, but we're a major part of the institution and whether there's going to be another generation of thought about it so that CUNY's leadership in so many other fields can occur in this field as well. / Chancellor Goldstein — When I said the out-flow, I was referring to*

full-time people, and it's not that it's just been at this University. I'm really concerned about this. I don't mean to be flip about it. I think this is a very serious issue not only for this University but for universities around the United States. There is going to be a large out-migration largely on the basis of demography. Many people received their advanced training in the early to mid-60s and they are at retirement age and there have been two generations that were not filled, both at this University and across the United States. So I worry that there's going to be a highly-contested auction, if you will, to get the best talent. A university has to have great faculty to do the work in teaching and in doing research. So I am concerned about that. It's also a city that's an expensive city. Housing costs are much higher and so forth and so on. These are serious issues. With respect to adjuncts, we will always rely on adjuncts. I'd like to rely on less rather than more and fill that gap with full-time people, and I would hope that some of the adjuncts that we have that aspire to full-time positions will be given very serious consideration by the committees of faculty that really do the work and make the recommendations, as they should.

*Professor Hope (Physical, Environmental, and Computer Science, Medgar Evers) — The last time I was here, the last meeting I left with an impression that worried me slightly, that there's a general or common knowledge that some students attend college not with the intention to graduate. What is the impact of those students, and why do we have no data on such students? My intention really is to protect them, so I'm wondering if we have any data on students that attend without the intention to graduate? The impact on the college? / Chancellor Goldstein — Professor Hope, let me see if I understand your question. You want to know, do we collect data on the intention of students to go on and get a degree as opposed to just attend? / Professor Hope — No. I got the impression the last time we were here, I think a discussion came up, and I think the statement was made that it is well known that there are students who attend college without the intention to graduate, or a statement to that effect. I think it's in the minutes. / Chancellor Goldstein — I'm sure there exists a cohort of students that want to take just a few classes and are not necessarily interested in completing a degree. I imagine that that's the case at many public universities in particular. / Professor Hope — I'm just wondering about the impact. / Chancellor Goldstein — I would just end my comment on this by saying, I am one who firmly believes that getting a degree counts. It's very important, and every college that I go to, especially the community colleges, I plead with the faculty to try to convey that point to the students. I understand that many of them lead very complex lives of poverty, of work, and of being a parent*

alone, we all understand that that's real. But at the end of the day, in the economy that we are in and the one that we are moving towards, having a degree really is going to make a difference in the options that these students can exercise. With that, I will have to leave. Thank you very much.

#### **A. Chair's Report – Written.**

#### **C. Status of the Faculty Committee:**

Chair Philipp: I'd like to call on Dean Savage, who is going to report on our next Faculty Experience Survey. The Faculty Experience Survey is a very important document because the presidents are evaluated. The evaluation process of the presidents that the Board passed last night includes a survey document that was done by the Chancellery and, I believe, CUNY Law. We hadn't really seen it, and we got an assurance from the Chancellor that we would be part of the formulation of the next evaluation instruments of the presidents. So Dean's survey that he is doing on behalf of the UFS is an important item in changing the way the presidents themselves are evaluated, because you can count on it that I will be presenting to the board members the results of the surveys when these presidents come up for their evaluations.

Professor Savage: I want to talk about two things. The first thing is going to be a very brief update on the report that got distributed with the packet this time, which is the product of the initiative on the part of the status of the Faculty Committee. It is an update on a report from a few years ago about a trend toward increased resignations on the part of junior faculty. I wanted to update that, and when I did I found that the tendency had tipped even a little bit further. Now, if you look at people who had not been tenured and had voluntary resignations, what you found is that if you combined the people who had not yet received tenure and added to them the people who left who had just received tenure, 80% of the people who were leaving Queens College, not including retirements, but 80% of the people who were voluntarily retiring were either untenured faculty or recently tenured faculty. At our discussion in the committee this afternoon, I got a question about why that's a problem, which surprised me a little bit. So maybe I should go ahead and lay the groundwork a little bit on why that is a problem. How many people in the room have been department chair? We've got a fair sprinkling of chairs. How many have served on the P&B committees? The majority of people have done that. The search process, being involved in

the search, is an extraordinarily arduous process. Everybody in this room who initiates the search is going to get a very large number of applications. I remember one time we had two lines, and we had 400 applications. Thank God it's not quite that bad these days -- we've only got 200. Karen's got 400 at John Jay. They do pay good salaries. One of the things that you do is try to whittle it down and be as fair as you can and go ahead and look at every dossier in as objective and impartial manner as you possibly can and narrow it down to 40 and then narrow it down to 20 and then go ahead and call up some people and maybe go ahead and bring in half a dozen and mobilize the entire faculty to bring them around and finally decide on the person you want and make your offer to two or three people in a row and finally find somebody who's willing to accept your offer. Then, after you bring them on board, help them get oriented, set them up, everybody meets them and they start to integrate into the department. Then you find they're on the market again and they're gone. The reason that this is crucial is if we are doing revolving door hiring, that is very demoralizing to a department. It's a terrible kind of thing for a college to have to experience. So my thought was, hey, if this is going on at Queens, I'd like to find out if it's going on on other campuses as well. If it turns out that it's happening all over CUNY, this is about as effective as we can be in making the case to the administration that there's something wrong with the salary framework that we have for our new hires. If we're losing people to colleges that we think of as less good than we are, and it's simply for reasons of money, eventually we're going to lose. Eventually we're going to lose out, over time, gradually, incrementally, and the better faculty will go to these campuses that are paying better salaries and the quality of the faculty at CUNY will gradually sink, which has implications for the Grad Center, it has implications for the quality of the education at the four-year campuses and the two-year campuses. The Status of the Faculty Committee is looking for collaborators to go ahead and try to carry out this study on a number of other campuses. We're going to be putting out a notice on the Faculty Governance Leaders listserv, but we're also going to be trying to get in touch with anybody who is willing to go ahead and collaborate or contribute. What it really needs is somebody on each campus or a group on each campus who know the chairs, who know the people, who have been doing the hiring, have been doing the recruiting, and who can construct a list that is similar to the kind of list that we had distributed here. So if there are any volunteers, please, my email is [dean.savage@qc.cuny.edu](mailto:dean.savage@qc.cuny.edu), and I would absolutely delighted to hear from you. The second step, as far as this process is concerned is that the report that you received in your packet is missing a few important pieces. It does not have the number of new hires each

year. So really what you need is to get the number of hires — what if we hired 200 people and 45 left? That's not too bad. But what if we hired many fewer? So we need to get it as a proportion of each cohort who departs. Steve London is starting out a study to look at the cohort of 2001 at every CUNY campus -- all the people that got hired, new tenure-track lines at CUNY campuses in 2001. I'm dying to see the results of that. But we need results for more than one year. Even if we had those results for every single year for the past six years, we would still not have information that I also think is very valuable, and that is, where did these people go, and why did they resign? If I can say in my report that we had a good assistant professor of accounting who was offered \$25,000 more a year to move his shop over to St. John's, which he really didn't feel he could turn down, that's an effective statement. We may have to force a third of the faculty to resign before we finally get our way. The second step, then, is to go ahead and try to get data on the number of new faculty members in the new cohort, and this will be tied in with a review that the Union's been doing of the number of substitute and visiting lines which has gone up rather substantially on some campuses. Not overall, if you look at the faculty and staff relations data on diversity. You'll see the number of visiting and sub lines, and for 2003 to 2006, it's been fairly stable CUNY-wide. I think maybe this last year, what with the extra money floating around, we might have seen a substantial spike, but we're waiting to get the data on that. Anybody who's interested in collaborating on this little project, please, please, get in touch with me. We would be delighted to have more collaborators. I know on certain campuses, initiatives have started up, and this is a bit of a job, and so you need people who are wired and connected, but if we can get reports from a significant number of campuses, this could be a very useful product that the Status of the Faculty Committee and its collaborators could go ahead and put together.

Second thing. About the Faculty Experience Survey. This will be very brief because we're making progress in a tentative fashion. We're going to do it on the Web. That means that the former negotiation that we had to do with the Chancellery about whether or not they would be willing to pay for it is probably not going to be quite as important, and that is because it doesn't cost very much to do a survey on the Web. This time we're going to do all 6,300 full-time faculty and we're also going to reach 9,000 adjuncts. So doing it on the Web will mean that you can go ahead and call up the questionnaire and when you get questions for full-time faculty we'll be able to have one module, and then we'll be able to put in questions that are specifically targeted at the part-time faculty, which we would not be able to do in a paper document in the

same way. So there are a number of advantages to going ahead and doing this on the Web. The real advantage is that once people take the survey on the Web, the data are automatically entered by the respondent, him or herself, which is so modern. I'm seeing the demo from votenet.com on December 3rd. We're probably going to go with an off-shore arrangement such as the various companies who do elections on various campuses. They seem to be fairly well set up to do this kind of thing. What we're going to probably do is have invitations to faculty members to participate, and that would involve mailing to you, almost certainly at your campus mailing address, a unique identifier and a user ID and a password, and then you can log on and you can vote. Once you have voted, that's it, that person has voted, and that will be the end of that. We're going to mount a fairly massive campaign to try to get the response rate up. You remember the last time around, for the 2005 Faculty Experience Survey, our response rate varied from 24% to 48%. The difference had to do with the degree to which people on various campuses were beating the drums asking people to go ahead and take part in the survey. I would really like to get the faculty governance leaders involved, I'd like to get all of you involved in figuring out how we can go ahead and mount the encouragement to have people participate in this survey when we finally bring it forward. Since I suspect that this survey is going to become a regular component of the UFS relationship to the Board of Trustees and the administration, we're going to have some core questions, which are going to repeat themselves every time the survey is done, but then there are some questions, which did not work out too well and do not need to be repeated every time. We don't need to ask again the question about how you feel about parking. The response about parking is not going to change in the intervening three years. It is not a useful use of faculty member response time. We're probably going to dump all the questions about what influenced your decision to leave since we're pursuing that in a much more concrete and persuasive way. So we're going to go ahead and have some new items and some new questions in there, but exactly what they are, we're just working on it. We're starting to develop the module. We hope to be in the field in late February or early March. I don't know if we're going to make it by that time, but that's the plan and if not, it will be a little later, but it's going to happen this spring.

*Professor Sank — I hope it will be a continual thing, not just sporadic. Regarding use of the Web, I would just caution you, because I was asked as Ombudsperson at City College, because of the nature of City College, when we make calls on our telephone, does the administration have*

*access to that? And I was told yes. The administration answered that the calls are kept and we could access them. They would only do it in criminal cases, but then I was also asked about use of computers, and I was told by computer specialists in my college that the administration could access the computer. So if we answer the experience survey anonymously, supposedly, protecting anonymity, then there's no protection for anonymity. / Professor Savage — Actually you can take the survey from your computer at home. / Professor Sank — Perhaps faculty should be encouraged to do it that way. That is a very good solution to that. The other thing about faculty leaving, I brought this up with the member of the Board of Trustees, remember when Botman was here, and I mentioned that our provost had sent the letter to a young faculty who was approved for promotion, and in the letter he said something like "congratulations on your reappointment (without tenure) but I would like to say that there's a weakness in your funding." What he meant was this administration wants funding for every faculty -- you should get your own funding. Not three figure, four figure, they want seven figure funding. If you don't get that funding, you will not get a reappointment. Botman didn't answer that question, and Berry asked me to send him a letter, which unfortunately, because of an illness, I didn't, but I will send him the letter. I'd like to share that letter. / Professor Savage — Certainly that is the case also at Queens College among science faculty because the perception is that the Chancellery is favoring City College, and if Queens College science wants to be on the top tier, they've got to go after major grants, and if they don't get them, they're not going to be able to hang in there. / Professor Sank — You see, this is why I think City College is like a test case. They're seeing what they can get away with at City College, whether it's merging departments, eliminating departments, but it's forcing faculty to get grants or they won't be reappointed. And if they get away with it at City College, you'll see it spread throughout the whole system. / Professor Savage — I'm sorry, I think it's good for scientists to get big grants. / Professor Sank — But what happens to the undergraduates? We are mainly an undergraduate teaching institution. When faculty are being evaluated, are they evaluated only on research or teaching, research and service? Our provost said research. "We don't evaluate them on teaching because it doesn't matter to us."*

*Professor Vozick — On the paper that was done at Queens, you said you were interested in getting the number hired. I would be interested in knowing the average number of untenured faculty at Queens in 1990 and 1996, 1997 to 2002 and the average number of tenured faculty, and just compare those numbers to the number that left. / Professor Savage — Actually, you've*

got to know the individual level of data to give a meaningful answer to the question that really is relevant here, and that is which share of each cohort is being retained? Which share of each cohort is making a voluntary decision to leave? That's the question that we really want to answer. It would be nice to have the data on tenuring. At Queens, in general, the tenuring rate was about 70% in the 1970s. It went up to 90% in the 1990s. I think in this current 2000 cohort, I think the tenuring rate has taken another dip. I think that's precisely because there is greater pressure on the junior faculty to go ahead and be productive. Some of these people voluntarily resigned because they were getting coded signals from their departments that their productivity record was not sufficient to make their tenure outlooks look very good. / *Professor Vozick — Is there a place where the 2005 study is published and we can see it?* / Professor Savage — I'll email it to you.

*Professor Chaffie (English, John Jay) — I think it's a good idea to have a survey, particularly a survey of adjuncts because it could in fact improve the quality of teaching. It is in fact very common for adjuncts not to have a place where they can see students, and not to have a place where they can hang their hats, in other words, leave their things. I know that you don't respect adjuncts! I can understand why. However, the fact that you do not give someone who's teaching adequate facilities affects teaching. You who are so interested in students should consider that. I think that if you pose questions about that, it could in fact improve conditions for students.* /

Professor Savage — One of the natural outcomes of a survey like this that does include questions to adjuncts would be to go ahead and find out at which locations in the university are we following the best practices. For example, in my department, every adjunct has a private office with a computer and an internet connection and unlimited laser printing. So we could go ahead for free telephone, anyplace in the United States, unlimited amount of time. What if we actually were able to identify those locations that provided these kinds of perks for adjuncts and then somehow other places were encouraged to adapt similar kinds of perks for the adjuncts, wouldn't that improve the quality of the work conditions, also improve the future?

*Professor Pecorino (Social Science, Queensborough Community College) — Soon after I saw one of the advance copies of your report at Queens, I sent out an email to all of our faculty at Queensborough asking for stories about people who have left recently and in particular, the reasons. We're going to follow up on that initial effort with a more organized approach that I*

*already reported to you. However, what I have to report is something to consider for the faculty survey. I received a few reports, and I wasn't surprised that people had left and the reasons why they had left. What shocked me was that in this process, I received almost an equal number of reports of current faculty who are looking to leave. So instead of asking the question as you did before, and you're going to drop out, what would influence you to leave? You might ask the question, are you actively pursuing another position or would you accept another position if offered to you? / Professor Savage — You recall that in the 2005 survey, there was a question exactly like that. It said "how likely is it that you'll seek a position outside of CUNY in academia next year?" and another question that said "how likely is it that you will seek a position outside of academia next year?" and a third question that said "how likely is it that you would retire." Those tables were not widely circulated. We can pass them around again, and there was a variation from campus to campus. Nevertheless, the intent to go ahead and look for a place somewhere else doesn't have anywhere nearly the traction as news that somebody has gone and done it. When you've got the record of the people who said "I'm thinking about leaving, and you know what? I got an offer and I'm taking it and I'm out of here," that is something that's likely to get people's attention. Except, let's consider the alternate and terrible scenario. What if the administration simply says, "Fine. We like having a lot of revolving door faculty. The new ones are cheaper and they all teach just about at the same level and we don't care about anything else." Not to be discounted as a possible response.*

*Professor Cooper — This is only going to be anecdotal, but everyone I have spoken to who's here and considering leaving or who hasn't come has mentioned the housing problem, especially in some of the boroughs. It's even bad on Staten Island, which means it's horrible everywhere else. This is something that the central administration will have to deal with. There are lots of things that the colleges and universities could do that are done in other civilized places, such as help people get local information, besides the New York Times classifieds. They do it for administrators occasionally. Really, I think at least five faculty have been around three or four years at those events that the University has for faculty who've won fellowships at receptions have asked me "how can I find an apartment?" as if I'm a real estate agent. It seems to me that the housing situation is crucial. That, plus the salaries, is a real lose-lose.*

*Professor Petratos — Do you have any idea how much, roughly, of any of the grants go back to the college or the university? One of the things that grants enable the faculty member to do is to buy back time. That I know for sure where I am the time is bought back at adjunct rates, which means basically that they're subsidizing private research. I have no problem with grants if they're [inaudible] university and the college benefits the students. But then when I get a \$100,000 grant and I buy back the two courses that I'm obligated to teach at \$7,000, you realize that doesn't help adjuncts or the hiring of adjuncts or the renewing adjuncts that [inaudible] unacceptable rate and so on and so forth. Do you have any idea of those numbers? / Professor Savage — The ways that grant moneys are returned to the campuses varies campus by campus. At my campus we have a published formula that I could share with you, but it won't help you, because you're at Staten Island. I know exactly that 50% of the overhead recoveries, the net, goes to the provost, that a certain percentage goes to the PI, a small amount goes to the department chair, another amount goes to the divisional dean. It's all set out in a clear formula. Then I sit on a committee that makes decisions every year about how to disseminate the several hundred thousand dollars that the provost's share amounts to that is invested in research, usually to buy equipment to support the research of clusters of junior faculty. It varies so enormously, and some campuses are a black hole. No one has any idea how the moneys are disseminated. Manfred had gotten a report after Bill Phipps had discovered a written bylaw that they had to go ahead and give a report on how much money came back to the campuses and he passed that around in June. That was a little bit opaque, nonetheless, because you need to see the entire budget and have somebody who really understands it walk you through it, but it was a first step. So this is a question that keeps on coming up. So all I can recommend is that individual best practices, if the best practices were widely known on all the campuses and the people on all of the campuses without the best practices continue to go ahead and push for it, I think that maybe over time incrementally would have some chance of having some kind of impact. / Professor Petratos — Any comment on the buy-back business? / Professor Savage — That varies enormously by campus. At a lot of campuses, if you've got a big NIH or NSF grant, you don't have to buy back, they'll give you a course off free. / Professor Petratos — Could you share your thing at Queens somehow? / Professor Savage — I'll show you the formula.*

*Professor Crain — Do you have any qualitative data on why they're leaving? / Professor Savage — Everything we have is in that report. / Professor Crain — Nothing about the attitudes*

*of the people. They say it's unfriendly?* / Professor Savage — I'm not a psychologist. / *Professor Crain* — *People wouldn't leave if they felt the place is...* / Professor Savage: Everybody's angry in one form or another, I agree with that. You should talk to the young women faculty at Queens College who got that news program. They're wild about maternity leave and parental leave. They're quite upset, quite angry. Hopefully some of this stuff is going to go ahead and make some kind of change on the contract.