

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

September 23, 2008

The meeting was called to order by UFS Chair Philipp at 6:30 p.m. in Room 9206/07 at the Graduate School and University Center. 87 voting members of 116 were present.

Baruch: Present – Dumas, Hill, Myers, Nematollahy, Wine and Alternate Remler. Absent – Freedman, Martell, Pollard, and Vora. **BMCC:** Present – Genis, Martinez-Lopez, Soto, and Vozick. Absent – Friedman, Kalogeropoulos, Niyazov, and Persaud. **Bronx CC:** Present – Alozie, and Alternate Ismail. Vacancies—1. Absent – Durante and Skinner. **Brooklyn:** Present – Bell, Jacobson, Massood, Shapiro, Shortell, and Tobey. Absent – Cherukupalli, Duboys, Magliozzo, Morrill, and Viscusi. **CCNY:** Present – Crain, Dalglish, Khalil, Lascar, Raj, and Sank. Vacancies – 2. Absent – Habib. **CSI:** Present – Cooper, Klibaner, Petratos, Talarico, and Alternates Jones and Stearns. Absent – Batson and Yousef. **CUNY Law School:** Present – none. Absent – Farago. Vacancies– 1. **Graduate School:** Present – Baumrin, Lennon, Mathews-Salazar, Nolan, and Orenstein. Absent – Weinstein. **Hostos CC:** Present – August, Bernardini, Pimentel, and Alternate Sharma. Vacancies - 1. **Hunter:** Present – Grossman, Guzzetta, Kaye, Palanda, Spark, St. Hill, and Strayer. Absent – Ancona, DeMeo, Kuhn-Osius, and Simon. **John Jay:** Present – Chaffie, Crossman, Dunham, Kaplowitz, Katz, Kubic and Alternate Petraco. Absent – King-Toler. **Kingsborough CC:** Present – Barnhart, Hume, Stubin, and Wood and Alternate Repetti. Absent – Ruoff, and Sarinsky. **LaGuardia CC:** Present – Beaky, Davidson, Lerman, Mettler, Rushing, Shean, and Alternates Kurzyna, and Sokolski. Absent – Forrester. **Lehman:** Present – Jervis, Marianetti, Mineka, and Philipp. Absent – Hellmann, and Maybee. **Medgar Evers:** Present – Barker. Absent – Cuffee, Hope, Stewart and Withers. **NYCCT:** Present – Cermele, Horelick, Hounion, Richardson, Woytowich and Alternate Pinto. Absent – Paynayotakis. **Queens:** Present – Bird, and Moore. Vacancies – 3. Absent – Brody, Gonzalez, Savage, and Zevin. **Queensborough CC:** Present – Barbanel, Iconis, Pecorino, Sweetnam, Tai and Alternate Volchok. Vacancies – 1. Absent – Wein. **York:** Present – Lewis, and Mawyer. Vacancies – 1. Absent – Cockery.

Chancellor Goldstein, Interim Executive Vice Chancellor Logue, and Executive Assistant Cura attended.

Governance Leaders present: Baumrin (GS), Cooper (CSI), Hume (KCC), Kaplowitz (John Jay), Mawyer (York), Mettler (LaGuardia), Philipp (Lehman), Raj (CCNY), Tai (QCC), Tobey (Brooklyn), Woytowich (NYCTC) and Young (Hunter) attended. Parliamentarian Moran (NYCCT), Executive Director Phipps, Administrative Assistant Pasela, and Secretary Blanchard were also present.

- I. Approval of the Agenda: The agenda was expanded to include VI. Approval of Standing Committees. The agenda with addition was adopted.
- II. Approval of the Minutes of May 6, 2008: Minutes were approved as distributed.
- III. Reports: (Recorded in Reports & Deliberations)
 - A. Chair.
 - B. Chancellor Matthew Goldstein.
 - C. Representatives to Board of Trustee Committees.
 - D. UFS Committee Chairs.

IV. Old Business:

A. Approval of the UFS Draft Statement on Academic Freedom – After discussion, the motion to endorse the document as UFS policy was moved, seconded, and approved unanimously by voice vote with one abstention.

V. New Business:

A. Election of one at-large member of the Executive Committee to fill the vacancy left by Professor Alfred Levine, who is on administrative leave this year. Three Senators were nominated for election: Professor Leslie Jacobson (Brooklyn College), Professor Michael Barnhart (Kingsborough CC), and Professor Rishi Raj (City College). The plenary heard statements from each candidate. Voting was by ballot. Professor Jacobson received the largest number of votes, 28, and was elected to fill out the one-year term.

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 337th PLENARY SESSION
OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

September 23, 2008

Chair Philipp--Ladies and gentlemen, you have an agenda in front of you. I'm going to modify the agenda slightly by adding item 5B, which is approval of the standing committee roster. With that modification, I'm going to ask that the election of the at-large member of the Executive Committee be moved up in the agenda, so that we're sure to have a quorum in that election. The Chancellor and Vice Chancellor Logue are here, but we do need to have a quorum during that election. So could I have a motion to approve the agenda as amended? Second? All in favor? All opposed? Abstentions? Thank you. Next item is the approval of the minutes. Do I have a motion to approve the minutes? Second, moved and seconded. All in favor? Thank you, they are approved.

For the new members, I am Manfred Philipp. I'm chair of the University Faculty Senate. This is our 337th session of the Senate. We have these plenaries, as you know, approximately once per month. One of the members of the Executive Committee, Alfred Levine, from the College of Staten Island, an at-large member, has had to resign his seat on the Executive Committee as he accepted an acting deanship at the College of Staten Island, and is no longer eligible to be a member of the UFS. We understand that he will

be coming back in a year, but that year is a term on the UFS Executive Committee, so it's really appropriate that we elect someone to replace him. I'd like to open nominations.

Professor Sandi Cooper (History, CSI)--I'd like to nominate Leslie Jacobson of Brooklyn College. Leslie's a long-term member of the Senate. She was a very important committee chair when it came to the earliest and most original articulation agreement, the studies that we did and conducted. She has served in a variety of functions on the faculty advisory Council of the research foundation, and I think she knows this University just as well as about as anybody and has always stood up for the faculty.

Professor Tom Bird (European Languages & Literature, Queens College)--I'd like to nominate a distinguished member of this body who served on a number of important committees with distinction, Michael Barnhart.

Professor Bill Crain (Psychology, City College)--I'd like to nominate Professor Rishi Raj, who is currently the chair of the City College Faculty Senate. Rishi is a distinguished faculty member in the school of engineering at the college and has done an incredible job to revive and give energy and authority to the Faculty Senate at the City College.

Chair Philipp--I don't see anyone else standing to make a nomination, therefore I will hear a motion to close nominations. Second? All in favor? It is passed. The three nominees stand up? Would you like to give the nominating speech? If any of the three wish to do so, you may approach the microphone. Otherwise, we would dispense with those speeches.

Professor Leslie Jacobson (Health and Nutrition Sciences, Brooklyn College)-- I've been in my department for more years than I wish to acknowledge. I've also been a member of the University Faculty Senate, for many years, and Sandi has already mentioned that I've chaired several committees, especially the academic policy committee. A little bit about myself-I hold a PhD in biology. I've talked at both the undergraduate and graduate levels at Brooklyn College, and I've served as chairperson of the department. My administrative experience includes long tenure as an undergraduate and graduate dean, and as a dean of research. At Brooklyn College, I served as the director of applied sciences, and spent three years as acting vice president for research development at the Research Foundation of CUNY. My wish to serve on the Executive Committee comes with from my knowledge that I can advance the goals of fostering the positive contributions to the purpose of the University Faculty Senate by my work on the Executive Committee. This is supported by my expertise gained over many years to effectuate change for faculty and students at the University. I strongly believe that the faculty is the soul of the University. Our students leave, hopefully with a degree within a reasonable time. With all due respect to the Chancellor, administrators change, but our faculty remains, and is committed to leading the University and providing an intellectual and social framework for developing an educated citizenry. As the members of the University Faculty Senate are guardians of faculty rights and responsibilities at the University, my long and extensive experience in the different arenas of academic,

administrative, and political would serve me well as a member of the Executive Committee of the UFS.

Professor Barnhart (Philosophy, KCC)--I'm Michael Barnhart. Let me first say that Leslie would be a great choice. I like Leslie very much. I have been in the faculty Senate at KCC since 1997. I joined the faculty at Kingsborough in 1992. I'm a full professor of philosophy there now, and I've been a full professor now for a number of years. I served as a senator, I think, since 2001. I have chaired the academic policy committee, and I've also served on the committee on student affairs, chairing it for one year, and I've also been your representative for two years now in the enrollment management council, which is a group that meets at 80th Street and handles all matters of admissions, financial aid, and so forth. I guess what propelled me to consider running for this position are some of the things that are looming on the horizon, which I think may very negatively impact on CUNY. I'm very concerned about the future, so it's a concern and urgency and desire to maintain the role of faculty in the University in what may be very difficult times to come. That encouraged me to consider this, so I hope I have your support, and thank you very much.

Professor Raj (Mechanical Engineering, CCNY)--I'm Rishi, and I was in front of you a couple of months before. I'm the chair of the city College Faculty Senate, and I have been there at City College for 33 years. I am professor of aircraft engines, and I served in the Navy and Army, and I'm a graduate of the Penn State University. I believe the University Faculty Senate can make a big difference on many fronts. I also believe that CUNY can do better. It would be my privilege to work with you and the leadership of our friend Manfred. Before I close, I want to quote the words of William Rainey Harper on the role of democracy in the University: "Democracy has been given a mission to the world, and it is of no uncertain character. I wish to show that the University is the prophet of this democracy, as well as its priest and its philosopher; that in other words, the University is the Messiah of the democracy, its to-be-expected deliverer." I thank you for your support.

Chancellor Goldstein--I'm unfortunately running a little late, and I understand that you have serious business tonight. I just want to say a few things that are important around the developments that we have seen this past year, certainly in the financial markets, and how I see this impacting at the state and city level, and to share some ideas with you. I only have time to take a couple of questions, and I apologize that I had hoped to start a little earlier to give you more time, but I must be at another event quickly.

This body has been briefed by me now for well over a year, when I shared with you conversations that I was having with very prominent people in the financial services industry about what we saw as, I think I used the metaphor of storm clouds around the fixed income and credit markets in the United States, largely around collateralized debt obligations--the sort of structured investment vehicles that derive their value from mortgages. These are serious people that I was having conversations with, and I shared with you some of my concern that this had the potential of being a serious problem that we needed to be mindful of and keep an eye on. But never in my wildest dreams did I

believe that that portend of some problems that we would be facing would explode to the deep problems that we're facing, not only in the United States, but globally as well.

This is a very serious problem, and I don't know where many of you stand on this. I will tell you my own personal view that the actions that are being proposed by Mr. Paulson and Mr. Bernanke, while they may need some modifications, really need to be adopted very quickly because if they don't-- you see what's happening already in the financial markets: the uncertainty, the fears, that are still very embedded in the mindset of this industry, both here in the United States and abroad. They're very nervous, and they are hair trigger in the way in which they are responding to rumor and innuendo, and unless we get our arms around this very, very quickly, this has the potential of really becoming deeply serious, much more than it is already. I would say this goes back to a year and a half ago. Most were saying because they look at where the broad market that was hit last October, they talk about this as a one-year problem, but this really started several months before that. So we're actually going into about a year and a half of where information was starting and really getting to the point that we are now.

I will tell you in no uncertain terms that there is clarity to what I'm about to share with you, that this is going to have deep impact on the state of New York and on the city of New York, not so much for this fiscal year, but for the fiscal year that we will face commencing on July 1, 2009. I believe that when Gov. Paterson puts together his budget, that he will present to the state legislature in about the third week in January of 2009, there are going to be some very serious consequences for not only SUNY and CUNY, but for state agencies, and then city agencies as well. There is even the possibility that in the budget we are working under now, that the state legislature could be asked to reconvene--I don't think before the election, because I think the politics would be a little too difficult for members of the legislature to really do anything, but there is a very real possibility of that after the election.

There will be an opportunity for the legislature to come back and looked closely at the budget that was adopted last April, and changes could be made to that budget. That would result in one of two things, or maybe both things happening, that revenue would have to be generated beyond the revenue that is coming into the state coffers now, or further expenditure reductions. I hope that is not the case, and if it is the case it would be mild relative to what I believe we are going to see next year. I will tell you in no uncertain terms that we will be proposing a tuition increase.

No longer can this University think of tuition increases as touching the third rail. It is an old and tired view that too many of you have had in this University for a very long time, and as a result of that I think our students have suffered because we saw the spikes in tuition that occurred for three years in the mid-1990s that were obscene and they were thoughtless, and they resulted in an out migration of tens of thousands of students over that period of time. I think the University suffered as a consequence of that because the students suffered, and when the students suffer it casts a stain on this University as well. It was a very poorly thought out strategy, and that is why I have been for several years now very vocal about the need to have a rational approach to setting tuition. For this

University not to have a tuition increase in six years, which we have not had, and for this University not to get the kind of investment in other sources of revenue, I think is a problem that is unsustainable and needs to be corrected.

I've had many conversations with the Governor about this, and the Mayor, and everybody around this decision, so everybody knows where I stand and as a result of that these ideas were embedded into the CUNY Compact which has now been adopted by SUNY as the SUNY Compact, and as a result of the commission on higher education, the New York Compact--this idea of shared responsibility for finding investment. However, in the budget that will be proposed, unless there are dramatic changes, and I follow financial matters pretty closely, I don't see the odds of dramatic changes occurring very quickly, and its effect on the state revenues, we will be forced to find ways of generating revenue and to operate the University in a way that will sustain the vibrancy and forward movement that we have tried to create in this University on a going forward basis. I don't mean to sound gloomy and casting a very dark cloud here. We will manage this. I will assure you that we will manage this, and manage it well, but it's going to be a bumpy ride from here going forward as soon as the election for members of the state legislature are done. We are going to see very different kinds of movements both the state legislature and the Governor's office, and also here in the city for Mayor and city Council, to find ways of managing what we all know would be very difficult period of time.

Some of you still hold views that we should have no cuts, we should charge no tuition, but then the University should still be great--well, if somebody can show me how to make that happen I'd be very happy to embrace that, but I don't really see that happening. So we will need to approach our problems and very bold and collaborative ways, and at the end of it we will maintain a stable University, we will protect people as much as we can. By people I mean people who work here at the University and people who come to study. I think both of those constituencies are critical clearly to what makes up this great University.

We have a lot of things going for us. There's a lot of goodwill, tremendous goodwill, and that goodwill will help us tremendously this year in putting together a \$68 million financial plan that we have to implement in order to satisfy the needs of the University, and if not we would have had a hostile takeover of the affairs of the University which is something I would not permit and certainly the board would not permit. We handled those cuts well by maintaining our core business. By the core business, I mean we protected the people and we paid attention to the core business of the University--that to me was critically important. And we will do that again. We will do everything we can to protect people, and to protect the core business of the University but it's going to result in generating revenue in ways that we haven't seen in a while. We're certainly not going to permit those kinds of spikes that we saw in the mid-90s.

I don't need remind you that we had a much lower base of about a \$2000 tuition level then, and we were increasing tuition by 38% to 42%. I mean, it was ridiculous, it was crazy. We're just not going to do that again, and people respect this University in ways that we haven't seen before in, I think, a long time. People have confidence in the

leadership that we have on our campuses, at the board level, with a faculty that I believe is very well respected and admired. There's a lot of goodwill out there now, and it's going to help us very, very importantly as we go forward. I can go into all the financial issues, but I'm certainly not going to bore you with that. We did hear today from the Mayor with respect to a further reduction, and we were expecting this. I mentioned to the board that I thought within the next couple of weeks that we would get some definitive statement on a further reduction at community colleges.

I'm not in a position to go through the numbers now, but we will manage it well and will be able to handle it. Much of this is about anticipatory actions that were taken about a year ago. I didn't make this very public because I didn't want to create a stir, but we hedged against what we believe would've been assaults that this University had and had we not done that and put in place remedial measures to buffer against problems, we would've been in a very different situation managing these cuts, and we're doing that now as we look out to 2010 budget.

So I want you to leave tonight understanding that there will be problems, but I also want you to believe that we will manage those problems, and it's not going to be the fallback to the problems that we've seen in the past where decisions and policies were implemented that were very disruptive to the University--we're just not approach the problem that way and I'm going to need your help. I've often said of his body, I look at the University Faculty Senate as a partner. I mean that in the most sincere terms. I need ideas and wisdom, and so forth.

Last night at the board meeting, I mentioned that a couple months ago I directed some of the vice chancellors to start creating working groups to look at how we expend our operating budget, how we can monetize our physical assets that potentially could be reshaped and restructured--assertive capital restructuring of these physical assets to support the operating budget, and I directed the third committee to look at the operating guidelines of how this University has behaved over the past several decades, looking at all those three major components. Obviously they are all interwoven, and to create ideas again against a hedge for what we may have to face in the next several months. So I think there is good thinking, and at some point as I mentioned to Manfred individually maybe a week ago, and as I mentioned to the board last night, but we will need to bring in members of the board, the University Faculty Senate, certainly our presidents, through the fiscal affairs committee, to consider ideas that will germinate from this due diligence that we are doing now.

So that's where I see the terrain, and obviously it's very fragile. I am deeply concerned obviously that we get some measures that will be enacted by the Congress and supported by the president decisively and quickly because time is not our friend here. This has to be done, not everyone is going to be happy with what is going to be proposed, but no action here is going to be a much more serious consequence than taking action and not having a sort of optimal solution. I think that one of the reasons that in the last half-hour the broad market went down considerably today after being in very neutral ground is

because there's nervousness that the urgency is not fully being embraced by people who are jockeying for political position here.

I obviously have no control or impact on how Congress and the president are going to behave here and how quickly they're going to act, but clearly I think all of us here in this room understand you are astute and good observers of what is happening here, that swift and decisive action has to take place, and unless that happens we will have even further erosion as we go forward. I'm not going to talk about new initiatives because I don't have time, but I felt it was important for me just to lay this out, and I can take just a few questions. Let's make them substantial questions.

Professor John Mineka (Math, Lehman College)--Mr. Chancellor, when you were first broaching this idea of a tuition increase you're also coupling it with the idea that students from low income families would get a boost in the tuition assistance so that their education would not be at risk because of an increase. Now you haven't mentioned it tonight. I don't know whether you've dropped that idea, or whether you intend to couple that to your tuition. Chancellor Goldstein--John, that has been my position. You have said it well. I am invariant with respect to that position. The TAP schedule has sufficient leeway to allow students that are in most need to be covered, and I've also made the pledge in the past and I make it again tonight, that a tuition change that is either pushed by the Governor or supported by this board, any student who is placed in harm's way as a result of this change, we will make that student whole. Professor Mineka--The problem is that TAP is a very deficient program for part-time students and for students who spend more than eight semesters in college. Chancellor Goldstein--That is a structural issue about TAP. What I'm saying is that the TAP schedule goes up to about \$5000 right now, and within the way it's structured that's the operating opportunities we will have to have.

Professor Mike Vozick (Science, BMCC)--It's good to see you, Chancellor Goldstein. My heart goes out to you in the struggle you're making. I read a lot between the lines of what you're saying. I want to sidestep the issue of tuition except to say it's a huge gorilla and I won't argue about it with you at the moment, but it requires much more time than we have now. I did bring to your attention at an earlier meeting the issue of student loans, and I suggested to you this would be an area in which you could show some leadership. You thought it was premature but I would remind you that I think you are in a position to be able to do something about student loans. I would mention to you that in the area of contingent faculty, which of course is my main responsibility, whenever any university today is impacted financially, the dependence on contingents tends to rise, so again I would bring to your attention and ask you to think more deeply and put more time into understanding how you can raise the profile of the function of contingent faculty at this University. The third point I would make to you is the trauma of Fiterman Hall being defunded by the city in the context of what you're speaking, and talking about a committee for assets leaves my teeth chattering that maybe we will lose Fiterman Hall. I don't want to appeal to you only on that question, but I want to say it's a biggie for us. Chancellor Goldstein--Let me respond very quickly. At the commission on higher education, I supported a student loan program that would be enacted through legislation at the state of New York. Gov. Paterson has agreed to that, and we'll wait to see how

legislation develops but I was very strong proponent of that and continue to be. I value our contingent faculty. I've never used the term contingent faculty. I use the term part-time faculty. I've never actually heard the term contingent faculty. Professor Vozick-- We've created a new organization called CUNY Contingents United. Chancellor Goldstein--they will continue to be a valuable part of our teaching power. Fiterman is something that I spent an awful lot of time on, and we know what we have to do. It's really a matter now for the Mayor and the Governor to come together and agree on how they will structure each individual's obligation. But none of the ideas that I'm thinking about monetizing physical assets has anything to do with Fiterman. Professor Vozick--I just want to say I'm satisfied on your first and third answers, but the second needs more attention, my friend.

Professor Crain--I would strongly oppose a tuition increase. We have had tuition increases. They've been small incremental increases so to avoid a spike that would be reckless. I assume were going to have larger incremental tuition increases. In terms of the greatness of our University, somehow during the Great Depression we had no tuition and we survived with no tuition. That only changed when the University came predominantly students of color in 1976 when we had a crisis. But we did manage to avoid tuition during all that time, and I would suggest in terms of the overall economic situation that if we could somehow get out of Iraq we are throwing away three or \$4 billion a week, that would help enormously and we've been opposing that for a long time. Finally, I hope you'll consider not raising tuition and take a look at the cost of a top-heavy administration. At City College we have more vice presidents than you can shake a stick at. We have all kinds of deans. At CUNY Central you have all kinds--you've been hiring new ones at the high levels. Put them back in the classroom. You can make a lot of adjustments that way. My vision of the University is as an affordable University and tuition increases are just a very bad idea.

Professor Barnhart--Memories on my campus are very long. Many of the faculty have been there for a long time. Many of them went through the 70s and the fiscal crash that New York City went through at that time. So, many of the questions I've been asked I'm not really in a position to answer them so I said I would pass them along to you tonight. I think this is something you're going to have to still in terms of fears in the ranks. Most of the questions I was asked have to do with when are we going to have to start retrenchment in the midst of all these crises. People are very, very frightened. It's more of a comment than a question. I think people are fast losing their confidence that it's going to be manageable in a way that does not do damage to our core business as you say, so if it is manageable I think they're going to need specifics very quickly before they lose their morale. Chancellor Goldstein--Michael, I'm very opposed to retrenchment as a policy. I always have been and I will continue to be opposed. The remarks I started, maybe they sounded too alarmist. I don't see at this particular point that we will be in a position even next year to even think about that kind of level of attack on the University's balance sheet. What I worry about is giving the students a chance to realize their fullest potential through engagement with faculty and others here at the University. So I really worry about a degradation of that interaction, and I worry about a degradation of our ability to really provide not only great instructors but all of the other support services and

the things that faculty in particular need to do their best work. That's what I'm worried about--the stepping back from, I think, some of the momentum that we tried to create here in the past few years. At this particular point, I don't see that level of draconian--and I use that word advisedly--effort, so if you want to bring back to your campus that message then hopefully that view will be sustained over the next months.

Professor Vasilios Petratos (Political Sci., Econ. & Philosophy)-- As you know, we have a new president, and I think he's doing the best he can with circumstances. Nevertheless, with the University budget the way it is, we have 60% adjunct faculty or as my colleague said contingent faculty, teaching students. I rise also to oppose tuition. All the way back in the 50s and 60s, you remember that we had just about the best students and the best faculty and we had basically no administrators anywhere. You were there, you remember how it was. You spent a good deal of your presentation talking about the economy. You do know that what you have is the incompetence and greediness in the regulating and the regulators also. And they tend to remain the same. So I would disagree with you very strongly that we have to pass any bill anytime to make sure that those financial institutions fail, or at least their stockholders and others pay for their assets instead of having the American taxpayers foot the bill. I would point out once again the incompetence of the government in regulating at least for the last 8 to 10 years in what happened in the financial sector. I heard a Republican senator today saying that he objects to it because it's financial socialism, which of course is one of those absurd statements. Chancellor Goldstein--I very much disagree with what you said, especially the part about the financial markets. If you'd like to have a conversation or a cup of coffee one day, I'll be happy to do it one on one with you. I have a very different view.

Professor Cooper--I wonder if you might repeat publicly your commitment to encourage us to go out and recruit new faculty in this environment. Chancellor Goldstein--We have a pause that I directed to be implemented with our presidents, but the pause excluded faculty. I have spoken to many of our presidents and faculty continue to be hired, certainly replacement faculty, and until we get a sense of what kinds of difficulties we're going to have next year, we just have to be cautious, that's all. But we have not stopped the flow of dollars to support hiring faculty. Professor Cooper--If I spend another year on the full-time job of hiring another historian in my department, and that person shows up in the fall of 2009, we're not going to have to tell that person that they have to sit on my lap and share my salary? Chancellor Goldstein--They may want to sit on your lap, Sandi, but that's a private matter between you and them, but I don't think they'll have to share your salary.

Professor Raj-- I'm very concerned about the negative publicity in a graduate school publication I picked up in the lobby of this building. It's very discouraging for us. Chancellor Goldstein--The graduate students' newspaper? I will get a copy. Okay, that's it, I've got to go.

Chair Philipp--I'd like to introduce Interim Vice Chancellor Alexandra Logue to say hello and tell us a little bit about yourself. Vice Chancellor Logue --I'm trained as an experimental psychologist specializing in learning and motivation. I spent 17 years as a

faculty member at Stony Brook, the last three years as the chair of the psychology department. Then I came to Baruch College as dean of arts and sciences, spent six years at Baruch, then went as provost to the New York Institute of Technology for five years, then came back to CUNY, this time to the central office. That was about 2 3/4 years ago, where I worked on central academic affairs projects and that very infamous acronym, PMP. The PMP is the performance management process, and it's the University's system for both setting goals consistent with the University's goals for all the campuses and then assessing performance on those goals. It's done every year. There's a lot of information about it up on the website. You can look on the Chancellor's part of the website. But I'm not directly doing that anymore. Since June I've been serving as interim executive vice chancellor and University provost.

Professor Baumrin--I've heard that the graduate school will not connect with ERP because it's on Banner. Do you have any insight into this? Vice Chancellor Logue--From what I understand, the graduate school is in the University Center, which has different entities as part of it. It has the graduate school, but also the school of professional studies, the school of journalism, and these are on different systems. That, as I understand it, is the challenge, but we're working on that to try to connect everything. But it is a challenge. There are many things that are a challenge with the ERP. Professor Baumrin--It wouldn't be a bad idea if a simplified explanation of what the ERP is, for new faculty in particular, could go out occasionally to faculty.

Professor Jacobson—I'd like you to say something about the consortial relationship on the school of public health. I know it's called the school of public health at Hunter College, but as somebody in the public health area at Brooklyn College, I know we have faculty members who work with us, but I need to know more information about the consortial relationship. Vice Chancellor Logue--I know quite a bit about that. I've been working a lot on the school of public health, and it's the CUNY school of public health at Hunter College. The reason for "at Hunter College" is that the accreditor for schools of public health requires that there be what they call, as their term, not our term, a "lead institution," which by itself has all the characteristics of an creditable school of public health, the idea being that if the other institutions drop away from the collaboration that then there will still be an creditable entity left. Hunter has by far the most faculty already in public health.... Professor Jacobson--Brooklyn has a lot, and we are an accredited institution in public health. Vice Chancellor Logue--Brooklyn and Hunter both have accredited Masters in public health programs. What we're talking about is an accredited school of public health, which is far more complicated. Being an accredited school of public health, you have to have three different doctoral programs and you also have to have five different Masters of public health programs, and you have to have a certain number of faculty in each of those areas. So we're working on that, but there's going to be very close collaboration among Lehman, Brooklyn, the Graduate Center, Hunter, and Baruch is also very much involved. We've had faculty from City College also involved. We've had some interest from Queens and other places, and this is where the strength of our school of public education is going to come from. It's going to be an urban focus, which is unique in this country, and it's going to be very community-based

and that fits integrally with the fact that it's many different campuses because each campus is based in its community.

Chair Philipp—Thank you. Now to the item, the University Faculty Senate statement on academic freedom. I'd like to ask Professor Lenore Beaky to come to the podium and to present that statement.

Professor Lenore Beaky (English, LaGuardia)--This was not included in the packet, but you will see a copy of a resolution that's on the table in the back in case you didn't pick one up. We are asking that the Senate endorsed the document and make it a statement of University Faculty Senate policy, and that the Senate authorizes the Executive Committee to update the document from time to time and that the Executive Committee will submit the text of those proposed changes to the plenary for the opportunity to accept or reject those updates. But basically this is the document. It was included in the packet. It is the document that we discussed in May, with revisions. I want to thank first of all Phil Pecorino for initially prodding us into this project, and the PSC academic freedom committee for participating, and our own UFS academic freedom committee with Steve Stearns as chair. In particular I'd like to thank my chief collaborator, Steve Lieberstein, who is here at the moment. He is formerly a member of the AAUP committee A and has written on the topic of academic freedom and several books and articles. I think you have the document in front of you. It presents past examples, some current examples, some principles of academic freedom, and processes by which if you feel your academic freedom is being infringed upon or violated what you can do about it, and there is, at the end, a list of sources that you can consult. So we intend this document to be used by faculty and to be referred to as a source of information along with other sources of information. This one is particularly CUNY-oriented. It considers issues of full-time faculty, tenured faculty, our faculty in the performance of our work as faculty in teaching, researching, writing, and speaking, and the problems of contingent faculty and how to protect the academic freedom of full-time tenured and contingent, untenured, part-time faculty. We recommend very strongly that every campus have its own academic freedom committee. I think now only a minority of campuses do that, but I wish all colleges would consider it--please do. Chair Philipp--Thank you, Lenore, for your leadership in getting this document done. We had long and intense and repeated discussions about every line in the Executive Committee to make sure we got it just right, but at the same time this is now open for discussion in this body.

Professor Dahlia Remler (School of Public Affairs, Baruch)—I'm new to the Faculty Senate and so was not a participant. I just want to comment on, perhaps not the precise wording, but the tone, for example "any demand that any faculty member use a particular textbook or other resource" or similarly a particular methodology -- I see a lot of problems where faculty just do what they want to do. They're going to ignore the students, they are going to ignore the more traditional, and often if you try to get anyone to change, they invoke academic freedom. I'm glad to see you put the department there, but I just want to add that in my experience administration are often fantastic at representing the interests of students, and the faculty will often ignore the interests of the students and declare academic freedom as their defense.

Professor Cooper--I would say that in addition to the reasons that Lenore gave and the printed reasons here for inviting, I hope, unanimous support for this is you should remember that the University passed a policy which gives students a huge amount of leeway in bringing complaints against faculty, the student complaint policy. If you're not familiar with it, it's on the website. I would urge that we support this document, because it seems to me if we don't speak out at this point on this issue we are really sort of lying down and accepting the other side on this issue. The ways in which a faculty member not performing his or her duties can be managed by a department are numerous, and a department that is clever knows how to do that. If we have a case of somebody who is really derelict, we are obliged to deal with it. But this is not a matter, I think, of dealing with an individual who rides a certain hobbyhorse, this is a matter of standing up for principle in a political climate that is not supportive of us, and that is not just in the humanities and the social sciences but it's in the biological sciences, it's in geology, and everywhere. I have colleagues who are teaching astronomy who have students complaining that they are not teaching astrology and bringing charges against them. It seems to me that we have to reassert what has to be stated in the 21st century.

Professor Barnhart--As I was looking at this, I had a couple of questions actually because it appears to me to be two documents in one. The one document, which actually I think is a big improvement over what we saw last spring, is followed after page 7 with a section about infringing on academic freedom. Did we have that before? Are these all part of one document, or is this two documents in fact? Professor Beaky--It's intended that that second section be one page, and the rest of the text would sort of wrap around it if necessary, and that that list would be a one-page reference for those who want to see a quick reference summary, examples that are intended to stand alone and will be highlighted with a different typeface, and so on. Think of textbooks where they separate parts of the text in blocks and so on, that kind of thing. Professor Barnhart--I want to look through the text again, but besides that just as an editorial matter there's a lot of repetition there with the other document. It looked to me that two different documents are mashed together, and I thought especially if this is going to stand as a statement by the University Faculty Senate in regard to our position on academic freedom--and I really do support putting out a document on academic freedom--I think especially as times get tough that we're going to want to have a statement of principle on which we can fall back in terms of dealing with pressures that may come to bear. I'm wondering if some editorial tightening of that might not be warranted. Chair Philipp—I'd just like to comment that the way this resolution is crafted, we will be readily able to do editorial types of changes to make this a stronger document without changing the sense of it. Professor Barnhart--Right, the resolution says minor changes, and I wasn't sure how minor minor changes are. Chair Philipp--If there is a duplication in text, I think we would agree. Of course, ultimately the plenary will decide what is minor and what is not.

Professor Vozick--I want to begin by offering support and commendation to the fact that this work was done, and this document is updated, and the University Faculty Senate has taken this issue seriously and is trying to bring it forward so the next generation of faculty can reexamine this issue. I think you handled the treatise fairly well and allowed the

latitude for changes on minor issues. So I'm going to support this document. However, areas that are not covered, or that are covered allusively in the document, are--you have to fill in your own word--tremendous, horrendous, humongous. It's hard to pick the correct word. The question of the academic freedom of contingent faculty is a question that has not been addressed in the American university, and yet when we have a majority of contingent faculty who experience on a day-to-day and a semester-to-semester basis that their employment can be discontinued without reason, that the whole concept of academic freedom does not apply, and that should we wish to come into the 21st century and discover ways of applying what we've learned in the 20th century about academic freedom to the conditions that we face and will continue to face, will require a very serious paradigmatic effort, a real looking at the whole picture. Now I would not reject this document for that reason. I support this document--let me be totally clear. But this document seems like a good piece from the old world, and it should be used, and it should be promulgated, but anybody's concept that this deals with the current reality is severely absent, severely disconnected. And so, I would like to propose a process to re-examine what the next step is. As one of the very few number of contingent faculty members, and with respect for the traditions of this body and the selected leadership of this body, I'm very uncomfortable getting into a thrust and parry process. This happened with the Master Plan documentation, and the results were disillusioning even though some felt they were excellent. I think in the case of academic freedom, which is so important, that we have to have some meeting of the minds of how to move forward, and so it's vague and not exactly parliamentary, but I'm calling that to your attention and asking others to speak to this.

Professor Crain--Mike raises good issues, and he raised them in a way that's workable, I think. As it stands now, I consider it a superb document. I thought it's really well written, and it's really the best document I've seen. So I think it's invaluable now, and I second the concerns of Sandi. It's really valuable to have this document right now. I plan on distributing it. It is going to be very useful. I would hate to postpone it. I would urge the Senate to take Mike seriously, and set up a committee to write part two that will probably take several months or a year to work out what we really need to do with respect to the contingent faculty, and I would encourage that process. I really give you my praise and applause for this document. I'm very impressed by it.

Professor Barbara Moore (Student Personnel, Queens)--I have a question about the final bulleted item on page 8, "Any prohibition by an administrator of the offering or display of creative works of art at the college in any of its programs, including continuing education." I was just wondering how fully are the teachers in the continuing education Department vetted or interviewed before they are hired. My sense is that it's not that well, so this might give just a little bit too much. Professor Pecorino--I write too much and need to be edited down, but there are two federal court cases behind this. Before I tell you about that, on November 14 the UFS is sponsoring our fall conference. It's called welcome to the collegium, and in it is an important element that as members of the faculty we work together and exercise academic freedom more in our collective than we do as individuals. In a court case, a Corpus Christi, Texas college was putting on *Jesus Christ Superstar*. There were groups that didn't want that on the campus. The court said

as long as the faculty of that campus thought it was appropriate, it was for them to make their own academic judgment about their own performing arts series. At Queensborough, my campus, we discovered Continuing Ed was about to offer a class in astrology and numerology. Several of us took offense at that. Our taking offense caused the administration to notice that in our governance system we have a committee on Continuing Ed, and they are now charged to review all offerings of Continuing Ed before they are made known to the community to ensure that there is nothing being offered that would detract from the standards we have set. They can refer anything they are suspicious of to the faculty for review through the governance body. The courts have acknowledged that faculty do have this role even over Continuing Ed offerings. Now as to the vetting of Continuing Ed faculty, maybe that's something for us to look into. A good part of where academic freedom goes awry is, in my view, a failure on our part to preserve our prerogatives and to exercise our freedoms as a collective as forcefully as we should. When we default in our role in searching for faculty, reviewing things, that leaves others to put their judgment in the place of ours, and then come conflicts when we don't agree.

Chair Philipp--We are losing members, and I'd like this vote take place while we still have a quorum.

Professor Kathleen Barker (Psychology, Medgar Evers)--I just wanted to say that I think one of the more important legacies of each generation of faculty is to provide educational documents for those faculty who follow us. I think the UFS should be applauded and all the individuals who worked on this. Having said that, I also want to say that I think this is a well-written, articulate document. I do want to pass this out at my campus immediately. My last point is I really, truly appreciated the examples that start this document, and I would like even more to be added over time. Maybe we could think about a website.

Chair Philipp--If everybody agrees, we can take this vote by voice. Second? All in favor? It is passed. Now I call the vote on the motion itself. All in favor? All opposed? All abstentions? One abstention. I declare this motion to have passed. At this point, I'd like to invite Professor Marissa Moran to come forward. She is our parliamentarian. She has been waiting very patiently. She's from the law department at City Tech. Thank you for coming.

On the agenda, we have reports from committee chairs but first I'd like to have approval of the committee roster with a few corrections. Ned Benton and Jason Young are added to the facilities committee. It is moved and seconded. All in favor? It passes.

Professor Vozick would like me to call your attention to this flyer about a seminar series at the division of worker education at City College. Professor Vozick--This is a world-class series of events that has already begun. The next one is on October 6. I bring to your attention to pass on to your colleges if you're so inclined.

Professor Morris Hounion (Library, NYCCT; Chair, Library and Information Technology Committee)--This is my second year as chair of this group. In the packet that you received for this meeting, there was an annual report that I wrote of our activities last year, 2007-2008. We had a number of well-known speakers and experts come, such as the CUNY librarian Dr. Curtis Kendrick, and we're going to ask him to come to one of our meetings to update us on the state of CUNY libraries again this year. We also had, thanks to Michael Barnhart, Dean Ptachik, chair of the enrollment management council. He came twice, once to talk about undergraduate admissions and the second time to talk about graduate admissions. Then we had George Otte, head of instructional technology, and he gave a very good presentation also. You probably have a list of our charges for this year. We have five extensive tasks before us. One of them is library policies for the University. We all do research, and CUNY libraries are an excellent resource for articles, books, and other materials. We also have issues of access for people with disability issues--that's a brand-new sub topic, and we will definitely go into that. Another issue is the uses and effects of educational technology on teaching, curriculum, and the future of the University. Another issue is the need for archiving both academic and governance materials. Also, information technology as related to the integrated University--this was mentioned before when Lexa Logue was here about ERP, which now is actually called CUNY First. We hope to be interviewing many people involved with CUNY First. For information about CUNY First, you can go to the Queensborough website and find a lot of information there. Finally, we are taking up distance learning and faculty input in related policymaking. Anyone who is interested in joining this committee please let me know.

Professor Katherine Richardson (Nursing, NYCCT)--I'm chair of the Faculty Senate research committee. We had our first meeting this evening before the plenary, and there are a few issues that we are looking at. We're going to do our usual job of trying to recruit faculty to submit CVs and then we review the CVs--this is for liaisons for the UCRA, the PSC-CUNY Grant program. We review the CVs, we recommend, highly recommend, or not recommend the liaisons to the Chancellor and then the Chancellor makes the final decision and sends out letters to the people to tell them that they are appointed liaisons or not. This year we had difficulty getting liaisons for certain particular areas, and if anybody is in anthropology, we're still looking for a liaison for the anthropology discipline. Right now, there are grant applications coming already, and they don't have anyone for the anthropology discipline so if anybody is out there who is an anthropologist or knows an anthropologist or lives with an anthropologist, you might want to have them volunteer and send their CV so we will have somebody to be the liaison. We're going to look at the whole process as to the way we've been doing it for many years, and is that the way it should continue? We're also going to continue something that we started last year, and that is looking into the possibility of a match funded program in the City University, and we'll be talking to the Chancellor about that. There are some other issues. There might be some other subcommittees formed, but right now this is basically what we're doing. Chair Philipp--You have a very difficult assignment, and we appreciate what you're doing.

Professor Robert Nolan (Earth & Environmental Sciences, GSUC)--I'm on the facilities committee. I guess a few years ago I started on the committee, and then they made me the co-chair, and then the chair. So this is a committee on which there is a lot of opportunity! What we do basically is meet about three times per semester with the Vice Chancellor, and discuss the construction and the facilities issues that are going on in the University. So the committee gets an opportunity to see what is going on in the University, how it's being planned. We meet with the staff of the Vice Chancellor for Construction, Iris Weinshall, and it's a very interesting committee to serve on. We don't deal with the individual griping about all the things that are wrong with the facilities, but we try to deal with some structural issues so last year one of our most important accomplishments was to have the state of the facilities be part of the evaluation of college presidents so they would feel somewhat responsible for what goes on on their campuses because many times there are improvements made to your campuses but then there is maintenance and other things that need to be done with it. Anybody who is interested in serving on this committee can contact Stasia, and she will pass your name along to me and we will arrange for you to be on the committee, if you'd like.

Professor Campbell Dalglish (Media & Communication Arts, CCNY)--I've been on the status of the faculty committee, first with Morris Hounion as chair and then with Dean Savage as chair. I was surprised and also honored when Manfred asked me to be chair for this year and also asked me to pick a theme. I've been working at City College for the past year on a committee on resource allocation, planning, and institutional renewal in preparation for the middle states review. We conducted a survey on campus up at City, and realized that there is a basic problem in the infrastructure at CUNY in the operational management budgets. We are faced with institutional renewal, and we are looking for a definition of that, thinking that the faculty is actually involved in saying what we want to do in the future with our programs but everything is really in the management of the administration and the budget. So I have a question before I say what our charge is. How many of you on the departmental level have some kind of committee that actually focuses on planning or resource allocation or institutional renewal? Any department? What college? At John Jay? For space and resources, but nothing that really addresses institutional renewal? When we looked at it from our point of view in the department of media and communication arts at City College, we thought, oh, another committee to spin our wheels on and to not have anything come out at the end. In other words, if we are going to get together a committee that's going to come up with ideas, ideologies, and hopes for a change and renewal, and what does renewal mean, we can stand in our future and say this is where we should be, and defining renewal in terms of that, or say here's what we've got in our infrastructure and how can we improve it. I'd like to say that we can stand in our future and say here's where we want to be and then look back and say here's what we've got to, how can we change things to make it to come what we want it to be at the institution? So working with Chair Philipp and Professor Pecorino, we came up with the charge--to examine in the context of middle states accreditation process, faculty governance's role in the entire University budget process; special attention will be given to the involvement of faculty governance in planning and funding any institutional renewal process at all CUNY colleges. I'd like to see this break down into four subcommittees, one that would focus on justifying what institutional renewal means since

that's what were supposed to be doing, and you have to make a report to middle states that says this is what we're doing and how you're doing it. The second subcommittee would be working on what committees across the University at the departmental level are actually focusing on the budget that would support that institutional renewal idea. A third subcommittee would focus on management models of how do you manage the budget, and of course the budget model would have to be in place but then the management of that budget. And then the fourth subcommittee would be on kinds of accounting. Now all of these are interrelated, but we're breaking them down to simplify the task and not have it feel so cumbersome for everybody. There is another charge for our committee, and that is something has come up in terms of violence in the workplace, and we want to pay attention to that. So those are our charges. If you're interested in joining our committee, please let me know.

Professor Vozick--I do have an inquiry and a proposal, which may have to be put over to the next meeting. I listened to the announcements of all of the committee leaders, and I can see that the concerns around contingent faculty are really buried--the words were not spoken. That is not a criticism, and I understand they might occur within any committee, but I would like to propose, and if it's too late at this meeting to act on it then for consideration at the next meeting, the establishment of a committee not of contingent faculty only but that of regular and contingent faculty to take a look at the relation of full time and contingent faculty concerning the Faculty Senate and the University as a whole. Chair Philipp--We started a conversation over this, and we'll continue that. Professor Dalglish--I invite Mike to join our committee. We definitely would love to address all contingent faculty in terms of institutional renewal. Professor Vozick--Professor Dalglish, I have the greatest respect for you. I've served on the status of the faculty committee under Professor Hounion and again under Professor Savage. I've attempted to raise those issues. I listened with intent detail to every word you spoke. I did not hear a word in your entire presentation that I could relate to so I'm asking for a different committee.

Professor Jacobson--I want to thank my colleagues for their support. I want to assure you that my best efforts will be made on your behalf. I want also to thank Michael Barnhart with whom I have worked, and he is really a very, very able person so thank you, Michael, for your support, and also to Rishi, I wish him the best of luck. So thank you so much.

Professor Baumrin--I really have a tremendous amount of respect for Leslie, for Rishi, and for Michael. It could very well have been the case that it was 25-25-25. I think you are all really terrific senators, and it's been a pleasure working with you all. I also wanted to say, sort of en passant, this was a great meeting tonight and it was nice to be here. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Chair Philipp--I also very much appreciated the meeting from this side.