

**MINUTES OF THE 359th PLENARY SESSION
OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK**

May 10, 2011

The meeting was called to order by UFS Chair Cooper at 6:30 p.m. in Rooms 9204/05/06 at the Graduate Center. 88 of 119 voting members were present.

Baruch: Present – Bazzoni, Ellis, Hill, Martell, Pence, Weiser, Wine, Wymbs and Alternate Harel. Absent – Remler. **BMCC:** Present – Conway, d’Erizans, Friedman, Martinez-Lopez, Persaud, Salam, Samuel, Wiseman, Alternates Freas and Vozick. **Bronx CC:** Present – Ismail. Absent – Bandar, Prabhu, and Skinner. **Brooklyn:** Present – Ball, Belton, Buchholz, Cirasella, Dexter, Florence, Jacobson, Winslow, Alternates Okome and Sapozhnikov. Absent – Bank-Munoz, Massood, and Wills. **CCNY:** Present –Crain, and Dalglish. Absent – Brass, Jablonsky, Khanbilvardi, Kiely, Lascar, Raj, Rinard, and Watkins. **CSI:** Present – Cooper, Klibaner, Talarico, Yousef, and Zimmerman. Absent: Verzani. **CUNY Law School:** Present – Goldscheid. Absent: Burton. **Graduate School:** Present –Albrecht, Baumrin, Burke, Maxfield, and Philipp. Absent - Aguirre-Molina. **Hostos CC:** Present – Pimentel, Sharma, and Alternate August. Absent – Ovtcharenko. **Hunter:** Present – Baumann, Blundell, Kuhn-Osius, Spark, Strayer, and Young. Absent – Ancona, Demeo, Grossman, and Guzzetta. **John Jay:** Present – Crossman, Kaplowitz, Katz, Kimora, Kubic, Tovar and Alternate Powers. Absent: Browne-Marshall, Dunham, and King-Toler. **Kingsborough CC:** Present – Arliss, Barnhart, Hume, Ruoff, Stubin, Wood, and Alternate Cowan. **LaGuardia CC:** Present – Albrecht, Kurzyna, McCormick, Mettler, and Alternates Lerman and Sokolski. Absent Berke and Shean. **Lehman:** Present –Carey. Absent – Alexanderson, Larimer, Jervis, Marianetti, and Maybee. **Medgar Evers:** Present – none. Absent – Ezuma, Reid, Stewart, and Withers. **NYCCT:** Present – Bennani, Gelman, Hounion, Richardson, and Woytowich. Absent: Cermele. **Queens:** Present – Brody, Gonzalez, Grover, Moore, and Savage. Absent – Cool and Zevin. Vacancies - 3. **Queensborough CC:** Present – Pecorino, Tai, and Volchok. Absent –Borrachero and Meltzer. Vacant – 1. **York:** Present – Hughes, Klein, and Rosenthal. Absent – Corkery and Lewis.

Governance Leaders present: Brody (Queens), Burke (GC), Hume (KCC), Jacobson (Brooklyn), Kaplowitz (John Jay), Martell (Baruch), Philipp (Lehman), Rosenthal (LaGuardia CC & NCC), and Tai (QCC) attended. UFS Executive Director Phipps, Administrative Assistant Pasela, and Secretary Blanchard were also present. Guests were Judith Barbanel, Kathleen Barker, Anick Boyd, Siochain Hughes, Dina Dahbany-Miraglia, and Ciny Wry.

I. Approval of the Agenda: The agenda was adopted as proposed.

II. Approval of the Minutes of April 12, 2011: The minutes were adopted as proposed.

III. Reports - Recorded in Reports & Deliberations

- A. Chair – Update of the Pathways Initiative (oral & written)
- B. Chancellor Matthew Goldstein (oral)
- C. Task Force on Assessment, Professor Kathleen Barker
- D. Budget Advisory Committee, Professor Terrence Martell

IV. Nominations and Election of Members-at-Large of the Executive Committee: Professor Kaplowitz presided over the election. She suggested a method of ensuring compliance with the Perez Decision: the body agrees in advance that the five people who receive the highest number of votes will be elected. If there are any ties, there will be a run-off. If such a motion is passed by an absolute majority, she explained, then the body can go ahead and elect people conventionally. She then moved that the UFS declare that for the election, the five highest vote recipients will be declared the five at-large members of the UFS Executive Committee. There was a second to the motion, and no discussion. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote. The results were as follows: elected were Stefan Baumrin with 51 votes, Kay Conway with 57,

Phil Pecorino with 48, Emily Tai with 58, and Jay Weiser with 66; runners-up were Michael Barnhart with 45, Campbell Dalglish with 42, and Kathryn Richardson with 40.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

William Phipps
Executive Director

REPORTS AND DELIBERATIONS
OF THE 359th PLENARY SESSION
OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

May 10, 2011

Chair Cooper – Welcome to the 359th plenary of the UFS. A particular welcome to the new members, some of whom I met just a while ago, and congratulations to the re-elected and the newly elected members. Is there a motion to approve the agenda? That is done. Is there a motion to adopt the minutes of April 12? That is done. I will switch my report with the Chancellor because he has arrived. Welcome to the Chancellor.

Chancellor Goldstein – Thank you, Sandi. For those of you who are new to this body, congratulations. I wish you good success in your work. For those of you who are reelected, I wish you even more success in your work, which is good. I've been distracted for the past week by a matter! But we were able to finish successfully, so I'm pleased with that, but I'm on to very pressing business that I've shared with you before. I'm going to be very brief tonight, and really just take questions because this is the last meeting of the year unless you have a meeting in June?

Chair Cooper – It depends on what you guys do! **Chancellor Goldstein** – Well, I can't be here in June. Just a couple of things. We are coming to a point in the legislative session where major events hopefully will take place, and it will largely be around our work in trying to develop a tuition policy for CUNY and for SUNY. We are working very closely with SUNY and with legislative leaders and the Governor on this matter. For those of you who follow this in the press, you probably have noticed that SUNY is proposing a five-year program of changing tuition by no more than 5.5%.

I'm very supportive of a rational or predictable policy for tuition and I very much support a multi-year policy as well. Where CUNY and SUNY are a bit divergent is that we are deeply concerned about the TAP issue. That ceiling is about to be pierced. I believe SUNY is away from that ceiling by just a few dollars. We are further down the ladder on that, but if we were to impose tuition in another year or so we would certainly pierce that, and our students are at a different economic level than SUNY.

SUNY doesn't seem to be as concerned about that as we are, and that's going to be something we will have to deal with as well. There is an awful lot of pressure for SUNY to do differential tuition at its four flagship campuses, Stony Brook, Buffalo, Albany, and Binghamton. The discussion is about 300 basis points (3%) above the average of 5.5%, and it's not clear to me whether that's going to fly. The Governor has come out in support of this, and in part it was a result of so much discussion around a plan which I believe I shared with you last time called Buffalo 20/20, which was promulgated several years ago. It's a very ambitious plan of capital formation in the city of Buffalo. The price tag on that particular program is about \$5 billion, and I don't think in this environment there is much likelihood that can happen. If it did, it would have to happen over stages because the State is not in a position to finance something of that magnitude.

So instead of doing Buffalo 20/20, at least right now, the plan would be to take those four campuses, the focus being on Buffalo, and allowing capital formation to occur there whereby the State would put in some financing mechanisms to build buildings, and then the extra tuition that would be generated would be there to help support the operating needs of those facilities that would largely be faculty support staff and others. Once the Governor gets involved, the State Senate and Assembly are debating various parts of this, and it's quite conceivable that this will move very quickly. The session is scheduled to end the third week of June, so there could be matters happening very quickly here. We will keep you informed.

On top of that, we have a companion problem which has to do with the \$40 million that was levied for the University as a result of the 5% tuition increase that we instituted in January of this year. This was embedded into the Governor's budget and the Assembly's budget. The monies were held hostage by the State Senate as a negotiating tool to get something that they wanted. Depending on who you have that discussion with, what they want just varies all over the map, but we believe that we are going to converge on that solution and hopefully we will get that money recognized in our budget.

The irony of all of this is that in the State appropriated budget we have sufficient room in our revenue budget to have that money be collected and spent. So there's a lot of moving parts here, but this to me is a very critical juncture for the University because we have been cut so dramatically, as has just about every state university in the United States, and we desperately need this revenue. We have not had, although we're ready to pull this out if we need to, a discussion about fees. A number of the presidents have asked me about fee changes, which I'm supportive of. It's largely at the graduate level, but spilling over into some other functions as well. But we're going to hold that, and see how this tuition piece goes along. If it happens, obviously we will need some Board action at some point to get this instituted. You do know that the Board in November voted to recognize that 5% and another 2% and to give the Chancellor the authority of 3% above that to institute those changes if the economics of the time required that to be the case. So we have already brought action for up to another 5% on top of the 5% we did in January.

But the bigger question here is really about an overarching program for tuition, get that instituted, but at the same time working on the financial aid piece. While that is going on, there is a lot of interest on the part of the Governor to utilize universities across the United States as engines for job creation. Obviously we are going to be intimately involved in the effort as well, concentrating in New York City, which obviously is our domain. SUNY will be, along with the privates, involved in many other aspects of the State, but that potentially could have material benefits for the University if it is done thoughtfully and in partnership with others who could create opportunities to serve as matching components against what the State might provide through a number of vehicles – either straight appropriations or through the Empire State Development Corporation, which is basically a financing vehicle for the kinds of things we would be interested in here at CUNY. So a lot of moving parts; a lot of things moving very quickly. We will keep you up to date.

We have the general education program that we are going to address at the June Board meeting, which is largely, as I've said before, the set of initial conditions that really is the very first small

step in a much larger discussion about courses that would satisfy learning outcomes for general education, and giving students more freedom in the exercise of options on the things they want to study. I think that is a critical element here. It is fine to define a set of courses that you believe are general education courses, and I think that's a pretty straight forward thing to do, and it's largely done at our campuses right now. But for me the much more interesting challenge is to challenge our students to be a little more free to try out areas that they may not have had an opportunity to do before because their programs are so overly prescriptive and overly parameterized in terms of giving them options to explore things that they may not have time to do. That to me is really a driving force in undergraduate education, to allow students to really explore the wealth of opportunities to study with men and women who can challenge them in ways they may not have had the opportunity to do before. And there are discussions obviously with the Senate, there are lots and lots of discussions. I've visited 11 campuses so far and seen a lot of enthusiasm for the effort on general education and transferability. Usually a couple of hundred people and sometimes more are in the audiences. I've been on this road trip, and it's been going very well.

Beyond this reformation that I referred to as general education and transfer, there are a whole lot of other things going on. Other faculty groups and presidents have asked me about the establishment of a couple of exciting institutes for the University that I think have really exciting opportunities for the University. Our building programs continue to move well. We are thinking about very creative capital deals. We will see if some of them pan out. We just had a large meeting yesterday at the Governor's office with some developers talking about some development opportunities for CUNY. Much of our work is moving along quite nicely up in the Harlem where we will be opening up a dorm, and a new school of public health, and a new school of social work. That is an area of the city that interests me in part because it is so underserved, but there is much demand and many demographic changes in that part of Manhattan. The New Community College is moving along very nicely and will be moving into that temporary space very soon and start accepting a class for September 2012. So there is a lot going on in the University. With that, I'll stop and take a few questions in the time I have.

Professor Martell – Classes end next week, so could you give us an idea of where the Gen Ed issue is right now. What is going to be proposed to the Board? **Chancellor Goldstein** – It is still being worked on. The area we still have to do a little work on is the step function, the number of credits that would be required of students who are transferring from one institution to another. I think we're converging on that, and we should have some closure on it in the next week or so, and at that point this will be written up. We want to do it very carefully and methodically. Lots and lots of discussions. I know there are discussions with the Senate, but also huge numbers of meetings and discussions with faculty groups around the University, with presidents, and chief academic officers, trying to cut this path in a way that we get it as right as we can. I just want to reinforce, Terry, that the big work is not what we are doing now. This is fairly easy because we have so much national data, and we know how we fit, and in the discussion we believe, given our discussions with so many people on our campuses, that we can get this done. The big issue, and it's not going to be a hard issue but will take a lot of work, is working with discipline councils, the Senate, and various faculty around the University, with students and others, to develop a rather rich inventory of courses. Many of those courses already exist, so that work won't be hard, but we just want to make sure that the courses are aligned with

very well-defined learning outcomes. Oftentimes, that is not the case. In order for this to work University-wide, we have to agree on those learning outcomes, which have to be driven by faculty, and that's really where the effort is going to be. I'm much less concerned about this first step. It's really the next step, which is a good 18 months or two years of work, before that will ultimately be done.

Professor Dalglish – You mentioned the focus on jobs. Can you elaborate on how you see us doing that with the number of faculty and students that we have, and with the new Gen Ed model?

Chancellor Goldstein – I don't think the Gen Ed is going to have much, if any, of any impact on job creation. We will still have the same number of students, more or less the same number of full and part time faculty. The job creation is something that the Governor rightly so is interested in. When you leave various parts of the State, like New York City or certain parts of the Island, certain parts of Westchester like Rockland County or a little higher, but when you start going a little west or all the way north, there is not a lot of economic activity going on, and universities really should be partnering with venture capitalists, with people who are interested in starting small businesses. If you take a small piece of geography and this is attractive to a very large company, that company is going to want at a minimum to know if there is going to be an adequate labor force that they can depend upon that is well-educated, highly skilled, if the decision is to move a facility. That is where universities, in part, can be working to understand what the needs of those companies are and to develop opportunities to train people that would be attractive for those companies. The other thing is working with small businesses on ideas. There is a treasure trove of thoughtful, highly education, highly skilled people that work at universities – faculties, first and foremost, and graduate students, who can easily be brought into those kinds of discussions, create opportunities for people who have capital that want to develop an idea or move a facility and to generate the kinds of products or services that could be jobbed along with faculty.

This goes on all over the United States. When you look at parts of California or the Research Triangle of Raleigh/Durham/Chapel Hill, and the 128 Corridor around Boston, there is huge interaction of universities and companies that have benefited both sectors. We really should be doing a lot more of that in New York. Probably the best example in recent years is that nanotech facility at SUNY Albany, headed by a great entrepreneur named Alain Kaloyeros, a physicist. That facility has attracted huge numbers of businesses. In the next year they are talking about 4,000 new jobs being created in chip fabrication and other type of nanotech work. So there is lots of opportunities for universities to align themselves. This is the way we are going to have to think at this university and others. I've talked to you about the regression of support that we are seeing away from government toward higher education. We are seeing it in New York. We cannot replace government with students supporting the effort. It's unfair and not realistic, so we have to think about other ways to generate capital.

Professor Barnhart – During your remarks I perked up because you were talking about the desirability of having students explore a rich academic experience and challenging themselves in new ways. It reminded me of remarks I've heard about Gen Ed from some senior college faculty exactly along those lines. These faculty had structured their Gen Ed already to do that. My

guess is also that they are well above the 42 credit limit that the current proposal is placing on Gen Ed at the senior colleges. My thought was that one way senior colleges might be able to meet this kind of concern that students should explore and challenge themselves would be to structure the electives, and I was wondering if you had any thoughts or concerns about the proposal.

Chancellor Goldstein – I'm most concerned about this overparameterization that gives students very little choice in credits because they have so many they must take in a group of Gen Ed courses and in their majors. There are certain majors that are overly prescriptive. It regularly happens that many students go through their curriculum and do not have the option to really dip their toes into areas they are interested in but don't have the time to do. It was the case with me as an undergraduate. I was very interested in taking some Humanities courses beyond the smattering which I always found to be totally uninteresting, you know, the beginning level courses that everybody takes. I wanted to take some advanced literature courses, music courses, and so on, and the only way I was able to do it was by taking more credits. That to me is the beauty of what the undergraduate experience is. We think we know what is best for everybody, but I don't think we're all that smart. **Professor Barnhart** – What about a requirement for a certain number of upper-level electives? **Chancellor Goldstein** – I would like to find a way to avoid that because that to me would defeat the whole purpose.

Professor Crain – The UFS sent you a resolution on Gen Ed. **Chancellor Goldstein** – I know what the resolution is, and it's very close to what I'd like to see. I don't see this as a big issue. **Professor Crain** – The curriculum is the faculty's responsibility. Thank you for supporting the survey done by the School of Public Health. It shows about 40% of our undergraduates are worried about food, and many are skipping meals because they don't have enough money. Shouldn't this make the University rethink its steadily rising tuition and fees? **Chancellor Goldstein** – You're speaking to the converted here! Let me tell you how this all came about. I chair a Council of Presidents meeting once a month and somebody said to me at that meeting that they encountered a student that came to school missing breakfast because they didn't have enough money. Someone else said we've identified students who haven't had breakfast, and I stopped the meeting and went around the room asking each president if this was something they had encountered. Not everyone, but some said yes. It really hit a chord with me, and I said we have to do something about it. I went back and brought in a group of people that afternoon and said I want to find a way to establish pantries on campuses that request this, and we will fund it – coffee, rolls, fresh fruit, whatever. We started it, and it still exists. I think that action led to a discussion with Nick Freudenberg, who I have great admiration for, and he was instrumental in helping us think through the CUNY School of Public Health. That led to a survey about not only hunger but other things. So yes, we all know we have students in great need. They have problems that many of us never believed they did have, and some of it is about finance and some about other considerations.

Professor Florence – The rationale for tuition increases is puzzling to me [tape turned over]...

Chancellor Goldstein – The money raised in January was spent in the spring semester. Obviously, because we had the legal authority to do it. Students paid those bills and those monies were spent on various functions at the University. What has happened is that the revenue

was not recognized by the State Senate commencing in July of 2011. That's when the new fiscal year begins. So we're collecting the money and eventually will spend the money, but we'll have to spend it in a way that is within the revenue caps that we have for it. I'm hopeful we will get that resolved, because I think people realize that was wrong and needs to be corrected. In addition to that, we have authorization now from the Board to raise tuition up to another 5% if that is approved by the State Legislature, and that is still subject to discussion. That is really what I was talking about. In the long run, what we want is a policy on tuition, which we now don't have with a very helter-skelter approach. There is a lot of momentum. The Governor is interested in this, and members of the State Legislature seem interested. The problems we will have are more about financial aid because for many of our students that becomes a serious problem, especially if you layer on top of that the prospect that the Pell Program may be under pressure as well because of its deficits. We were one of the institutions that took a lead on this. I personally sent over 80 letters to CEOs of public institutions around the United States asking for them to do what we were doing to get our senators to put pressure to get the Education Department to reinstate the money, because it would have been about an \$845 reduction. That happened, but that expires at the end of September. It's a serious issue for all universities.

Professor Cowan - Is the University looking at a system-wide approach to the food problems on our campuses? I don't mean Monsanto, Cargill, or Tyson! I mean actual real health alternatives. **Chancellor Goldstein** - To work with vendors who would provide much more balanced kinds of menus? I have not had those discussion at all, but that would be something I'd be in favor of.

Professor Burke – You mentioned a number of faculty groups you've been meeting with on general education and transfer. I'm aware of the UFS and the discipline councils that Professor Cooper has brought together, but can you tell us what some of these other faculty groups are, and what their standing is? **Chancellor Goldstein** – I am personally not doing that. Lexa Logue has probably had 50 or 60 meetings with lots of different faculty across the University, and I will tell you there is very strong support for helping students in ways that we have not been able to help them before. The UFS has a proposal that is not very different from the original proposal. What are you asking for, 46 credits? So we're close. Once you're in that arena, you're really talking about nearly crossing the finish line. I think we're going to get this done, but we're also going to be informed by national data. Let me tell you that nationally we are way out of sync, appallingly so. There is no reason that we should look so different from other places. **Professor Burke** – With your permission, I'll email VC Logue and ask her what some of those groups were.

Professor Moore – I've heard a rumor that our part-time College Assistants might all be let go. Is that true? **Chancellor Goldstein** – Sometimes I feel like the Forlorn Spouse – I'm the last to know. This one, I haven't heard at all. That's not to say people aren't making decisions on campuses, but there's no University policy.

Professor Pence – As to general education reform, I agree with your statement that the faculty are interested in improving the process of transfer. That is the main motivation I've heard behind the general education reform. The resolution from the UFS pushes the idea that there is an alternate way to deal with this, which would be reform of the online information for articulation, and more integration of the catalogs of the campuses, and a better process for providing that information. I was very interested in your comments about allowing more

students the opportunity to dip their feet in different fields and experiment with different disciplines or courses. That gives me a lot of concern about the idea that the general education requirements would reduce the number of credits they are allowed to take within that framework, because we see general education as giving student exactly that chance. It may be at an introductory level, but it gives them a sense of what they might want to major in. So we're very concerned about the reduction of credits. The final thing I'm worried about is having this coordinated through a central task force, because each individual campus has unique interests and issues that they are grappling with. At Baruch, we have the three colleges that are trying to balance each other, so it would be my concern that there would be representatives from each campus on that task force, although it would be a very large task force. I'm wondering if you could speak to these three issues, and how you expect the task force to function in a way that would give adequate representation to each campus. **Chancellor Goldstein** – What we are going to do is reduce the number of gen ed credits from some place as high as 62, which I think is absurd, down to a much smaller number. The average in the United States is in the 30s, and this is across a very wide spectrum of state universities. We are so far out of step – that is the first thing. The second thing is this is an embedded tuition increase for students because they typically have to take so many more credits than they typically would need if they are going through on a straight arrow, that this is costing the student lots of money. I don't think students think it through, but when you think about having to graduate with 136 credits, which is not that uncommon, that itself is a tax on our students that I think we could do much better at. With respect to the TIPPS and articulation agreements, those are all good things and we have been at that for 50 years. The TIPPS program is a fine tool, but all of that in my mind is an inefficient way to address the problems. If we can take the time, and do this in a thoughtful way with lots of participation across the spectrum of talents, then I think if it takes a year and half or two and a half years, it's well worth the effort to get it right and know it's going to be an organic process. Even when it's done, there will be constant refinements and changes because courses are constantly changing. But, at the end of the day, no dilution. If anything, this process has to be accretive to the experience that the students have, and that they have a much better chance of exploring options that they do not have to the extent I would like to see it. Lastly, to get a degree. We have so many students spending time at this college and they leave without a degree. This is not going to solve that problem, but it certainly will go a long way to moderating where it is now to someplace where it should be. With that, I have to go. Thank you.

Chair Cooper - I put on the UFS website more resolutions from the campuses on Gen Ed and transfer. You will see a growing number of responses to the current draft that is being circulated. We have no idea what the revision will be. The UFS normally doesn't meet in June unless we have emergencies. If the language of the forthcoming resolution seems to be in the nature of a serious issue, we can convene our plenary on June 7. We haven't done this frequently, but on occasion we have.

The next meeting of the full Board of Trustees will be on June 27. There will be a public hearing one week before. In order to speak, you must sign up in advance. I will post the instructions. It will be in the Bronx at Hostos Community College because this hearing is also doubling as the annual Bronx Borough Hearing. You can send in comments by mail if you cannot attend that hearing. This issue of Gen Ed and Transfer has been with us for some time. I understand that the petition being circulated about it has close to 900 signatures, and I believe early next week we

will send that to the Board. We have been sending to the chancellery one of these college senate resolutions every week. If that doesn't have any impact on the shape of it, I don't know what else can be done, save an uproar such as greeted the Kushner vote! But somehow this doesn't rise to that level.

I will report quickly on two other things. I'm going to scroll through the emails that were received by the Trustees on the issue of the honorary degree to Kushner so you can see what 500 emails looks like. Of these, five supported the trustees. Pretty impressive. This does not include the mail that came into some of the presidents from Singapore, Hong Kong, and other parts of the universe. This issue obviously generated bad publicity for the University. Yesterday the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees entertained a resolution by the Chancellor to reverse the decision to award the degree, and it's my understanding that Tony Kushner has agreed to accept it at the John Jay graduate. Would that we could be this successful in seven days over other issues! On the back, I've taken the liberty of distributing the letter I sent to the Trustees, 24 hours after that vote, having been authorized by the Executive Committee to do it.

We did have some success in pushing back the Bylaws revisions that the Vice Chancellor for Legal Affairs has initiated when he decided to update and simplify and revise the Board Bylaws. He had changed the language of 8.6 to read in such a way that suggested all the faculty could ever do is recommend something about curriculum, and it was entirely up to the Board to agree to it. This language, coming at the same time as all these other initiatives, seemed like a claxon bell of the end of any kind of faculty authority. Jay Weiser and I did spend a great deal of time with Rick Schaffer, the Vice Chancellor, and he agreed to change that language to match the relevant UFS Charter language, which is 8.13. That is the text that authorizes this body to deal with cross-University academic issues and to participate seriously in the making of academic policy.

The Vice Chancellor, in addition to reorganizing general education and transfer, is creating a nationally normed test. So far the Task Force that is working on it, most of whom she appointed, has yet to come out publicly with anything. That may happen very soon. A nationally normed test, for those who love nationally normed education outcomes, is a test which examines students as they enter a college and as they exist, without the proviso that they do not have to be the same students. You can take a batch of 50 freshmen and a random sample of 50 seniors, and that will determine whether a college has "added any value" to the investment the parents have put into this experience. We have Professor Kathleen Barker, who is out in-house guru on psychometrics and yet also devoted to the liberal arts. You will remember that Kathleen is the person who ran that very successful Faculty Experience Survey. She has served on this Task Force and, despite the fact that they are meeting behind closed doors, she will share with us whatever can be shared.

Professor Barker - My comments start tonight with historical reference to the "Report of the CUNY Proficiency Examination Task Force, September 2010," in which there were a number of recommendations. This Task Force effectively terminated the CPE exam at CUNY and the numerous reasons are documented within that report. Tonight, it is the recommendations within that report that I draw your attention to:

First, I will quote at length from that report:

Recommendation 4. There are a number of reasons why a nationally normed standardized test instrument might have a place in the University's assessment agenda. Assessment begins with a definition of the program, the program goals, and a plan of action, and assessment tools should be chosen to fit the purpose and goals of the program. The choice of a test must be made deliberately and in consultation with faculty and program managers. Further, no one test can fulfill all purposes; effective assessment requires a battery of different types of tools, and those tools will differ for different campuses and disciplines.

The University should promote and assist with the *creation of a culture of evidence and continuous improvement*. [Of utmost importance is the conversation that takes place among stakeholders as they establish goals and progress indicators and analyze feedback on what is working and what is not, and use that information for future improvement. The emphasis placed on standardized tests in addition to locally developed ones will depend on the nature of the instructional activity and the usefulness of the standardized test results for making adjustments. Faculty and academic administrators can be expected to welcome data from standardized tests if the data are meant to guide program improvement.]

Recommendation 5. The Task Force advises experimentation with publicly benchmarking CUNY colleges if it can be done without compromising the primary function of enhancing students' learning, if the benchmarking methodology is sound, and if the cost is reasonable.

The Task Force recognizes the importance of public accountability, but urges caution if the University decides to adopt an instrument for this purpose. [Because performance scores are highly correlated with the SAT and ACT, students

attending less selective institutions tend to score lower on the MAPP, CAAP and CLA. CUNY must take care to educate members of the public about the distinction between level of performance and the “value added” by institutions serving less well prepared students. Another concern is with sampling methodology. The MAPP, CAAP and CLA are norm referenced, and one must take care to ensure that test-takers are representative of their colleges. If the University adopts a new accountability test, it should consult with faculty, both to select the best instrument and to plan how to use the results not only for accountability but also for the improvement of teaching and learning.]

There are two handouts provided tonight. Handout number one:

1. Charge to the TF on Assessment. I will not re-read the charge. It boils down to focusing on the growth of students over time at their institutions. Unlike the CPE, the planned assessment is intended as a measure of institutional effectiveness and thus is a “low” stakes test for students.
2. Personnel of the Task Force include: **Faculty (5 + UFS rep)** include Lisa Ellis, Professor, in the Department of Library, Baruch College; Dahlia Remler, Professor, School of Public Affairs, Baruch; Ellen Belton, Professor, English Dept, Brooklyn College; Howard Everson, Professor and Senior Research Fellow, Grad Center; Margo Edlin, Assistant Professor and Faculty Fellow, Basic Educational Skills, QBCC, and myself, Kathleen Barker, Professor of Psychology, MEC, the UFS representative.

Personnel: **Administrative staff (5)**: Chairs: David Crook, Univ Dean for IR & Assessment; Raymond Moy, Director of Assessment; Karrin Wilks, University Dean for Undergraduate Studies; Richard Fox, Dean for Institutional Effectiveness, KBCC; and Mosen Auryan, Director of Assessment, Hunter College.

4. Meetings: approximately 9 meetings have occurred over the semester, the initial one being January 28th, 2011. Much of the activity of the TF coalesced during the month of April during a period of evaluation of tests. April was a period of intense Task Force activity.
5. The major highlights are as follows and there will be too little detail for a few Senators and too much detail for others:
 - Review of a test-specifications document that listed the main areas of evaluation for deciding whether or not to use a particular test for a specific purpose of gauging learning. This review initially addressed content, design, test development, interpretation of scores and logistics of administration/scoring/reporting.

- The TF discussed the general learning outcomes that were developed by the Association of American Colleges and Universities. These are referred to as the LEAP “Essential Learning Outcomes” – The LEAP guidelines generated an extensive set of rubrics that guided discussions.
- A survey of CUNY-wide general education learning outcomes resulted in a draft document that detailed CUNY wide general education outcomes so that the TF could get an overview of where each college was situated on communication skills, quantitative analyses, critical thinking, research and technological literacy, arts & humanities and civics/personal values.
- In following with the CPE Task Force’s suggestions and VC Chancellor’s charge to the TF, the Office of Institutional Research, in tandem with some members of the committee, surveyed the instruments measuring college level learning and this resulted in the selection of 4 tests for evaluation. They are the:
CAT: Critical Thinking Assessment Test (not the CUNY Assessment Test)
CAAP: Collegiate Assessment of Academic Proficiency
CLA: Collegiate Learning Assessment
ETS PP: Educational Testing Services’ Proficiency Profile (formerly the MAPP)
- Evaluation of each test took place along the dimensions of:
 - Purpose of the test
 - Serviceability of the test (given learning outcomes across CUNY)
 - Psychometric quality (such as content validity, progression of students across rubrics, external criterion validity, validity generalization, reliability, and test development and logistics)
- Individual task force members were randomly assigned to a test and these became “test teams”
- Teams evaluated each test
- Teams presented their test evaluation results
- On May 9th, the TF members met to share their individual scores for each test and to discuss the scoring – some of these results are still outstanding
- It is with confidence that I state that many members of the TF liked the CLA but that a final TF decision has not been made and the grading of the 4 tests is still being aggregated. Therefore, there is no announcement tonight about the final recommendation of the TF. Repeat – no final announcement.

More about some concerns that were expressed: At each stage, faculty members voiced multiple concerns over the feasibility of producing exacting specifications for General Education that could be met by any test. TF members frequently asked “to what do we want to make inferences about?” when considering the purpose of the test. TF members wondered about the test’s implementation and logistics and when were faculty going to be consulted?

Therefore, the next stage of the TF will address the various issue bearing upon the process of obtaining a degree at CUNY and how that will affect test scores for institutions. For instance, at some institutions, remediation may take up to a year – how do we control for this? Another is the transfer process, a topic of much discussion this academic year. There are both internal and external transfers to consider in institutional scoring and credits accumulated at different institutions within and without CUNY. There is the matter of a selection bias through attrition but some think this is easily dealt with statistically. Each of our campuses has their own culture and SES ratings – how will these influence scores? How do the various roles of developmental education or remediation at the different campuses affect scores? Importantly, what is the role of student motivation at various testing points? How will the tests be used in benchmarking campuses within CUNY and to colleges external to CUNY which are part of a Voluntary Assessment group. Are there campuses similar *enough* to us for benchmarking?

- **Future Tasks:** How will this all happen and what does it mean for faculty? For CUNY? For instance, in terms of benchmarking/comparator questions - comparing our colleges with like institutions, authors of the CLA have cautioned against using the results for accountability purposes.
- What are the logistics of conducting the testing? How will sampling occur? How will benchmarking take place? When will there be an RFP? And when does all this begin—it is really in the hands of the Chancellery.

[Some discussion followed, which was not picked up by the microphone.]

Professor Martell – I'm reporting on the Budget Advisory Committee (BAC) meeting, which I chair, that took place last week. There are two issues you ought to know about. The first is something called the Expenditures Report, which is for FY '10 how each college spent its money, broken out in pretty fine detail. I would urge you to get that report, either from your local campus, or from your local BAC member. It's not on any website, but I'll see if that can be fixed. It is a very useful report because they try to give you 5-year data that they swear is internally consistent. That is useful if you want to know adjuncts vs. full-time vs. administrators vs. anything you are interested in. Useful information.

The second matter we spent a fair amount of time on was what will happen if the \$40 million does not in fact get released. We're talking about the FY '12 budget here. What is happening as we speak at the individual senior colleges, they are preparing two separate budgets: one with a cut of approximately 3%, and one with that cut plus what people guess will be their fair share of the \$40 million cut. The expectation is that the budget authorization documents, the spending authority that comes from CUNY to the individual colleges, will be released relatively soon. They are hoping that the \$40 million is resolved; if it isn't, you're going to get both budgets to deal with. I know at Baruch, because I serve on the cabinet, that process, which is painful at our school, is starting and it is not pleasant. Hopefully it will be resolved, but as it stands now you will have to deal with the regular budget cut we already know about, and then whatever comes out of the \$40 million.

[Some discussion followed, which was not picked up by the microphone.]

