

**MINUTES OF THE 358th PLENARY SESSION
OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK**

April 12, 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. Sixty-four of 119 voting members were present.

Baruch: Present – Bazzoni, Ellis, Hill, Martell, Weiser, Wine, and Wymbs. Absent – Nematollahy and Remler. **BMCC:** Present – Conway, Genis, Martinez-Lopez, Samuel, Soto, and Alternate Vozick. Absent: d’Erizans, Friedman, and Persaud. **Bronx CC:** Present – Ismail. Absent – Bandar, Prabhu, and Skinner. **Brooklyn:** Present – Cirasella, Florence, Jacobson, and Massood. Absent – Bank-Munoz, Dexter, Morrill, Viscusi. and Wills. **CCNY:** Present – Brass, Crain, Dalglish, Lascar, and Alternate Sank. Absent – Jablonsky, Khanbilvardi, Kiely, Raj, Rinard, and Watkins. **CSI:** Present – Cooper, Klibaner, Talarico, and Zimmerman. Absent: Batson and Yousef. **CUNY Law School:** Present – Burton and Goldscheid. **Graduate School:** Present –Albrecht, Baumrin, Burke, and Alternate Vora. Absent - Aguirre-Molina, Philipp, and Weinstein. **Hostos CC:** Present – Pimentel, Ovtcharenko, Sharma, and Alternates August and Hubner. **Hunter:** Present – Baumann, Blundell, Kuhn-Osius, and Young. Absent – Ancona, Demeo, Grossman, Guzzetta, Spark, and Strayer, and **John Jay:** Present – Crossman, Kaplowitz, Katz, Kubic and Alternate Tovar. Absent: Browne-Marshall, Dunham, and King-Toler. **Kingsborough CC:** Present – Arliss, Barnhart, Hume, Ruoff, Stubin, Wood, and Alternate Cowan. **LaGuardia CC:** Present – Berke, Kurzyrna, McCormick, Mettler, and Albrecht. Absent: Shean. **Lehman:** Present – Alexanderson, Carey, and Jervis. Absent – Larimer, Marianetti, and Maybee. **Medgar Evers:** Present – Reid. Absent – Ezuma, Stewart, and Withers. **NYCCT:** Present – Cermele, Gelman, Hounion, Richardson, and Woytowich. Absent: Bennani. **Queens:** Present – Brody, Gonzalez, Moore, and Zevin. Absent – Savage. Vacancies - 5. **Queensborough CC:** Present – Borrachero, Pecorino, Tai, and Alternate Meltzer. Absent – Barbanel and Volchok. Vacant – 1. **York:** Present – Hughes, Klein, Lewis, and Rosenthal. Absent – Corkery. **Governance Leaders present:** Brody (Queens), Burke (GC), Hume (KCC), Jacobson (Brooklyn), Kaplowitz (John Jay), Martell (Baruch), Mawyer (York), Parides (NYCCT), Rosenthal (LaGuardia CC & NCC), and Tai (QCC) attended. UFS Executive Director Phipps, Administrative Assistant Pasela, and Secretary Blanchard were also present. Guests were Dina Dabhany-Miraglia, Hyacinth Martin, and James Horelick.

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

II. Approval of the Minutes of March 2011: The minutes were adopted as proposed.

III. Reports - Recorded in Reports & Deliberations

- A. Chair (oral & written)
- B. Chancellor Goldstein (oral)

IV. New Business

- A. Proposed Resolutions on General Education and Transfer – See texts below; also **Recorded in Reports & Deliberations**
- B. Nominations for Members-at-Large of the Executive Committee - Professor Hounion nominated Professor Dalglish of CCNY. Professor Tai nominated Professor Pecorino of Queensborough. Professor Cowan nominated Professor Barnhart of Kingsborough. Professor Pecorino nominated Professor Tai of Queensborough. Professor Lewis nominated Professor Conway of BMCC. Professor Carey nominated Professor Baumrin of the Graduate Center. Professor Philipp nominated Professor Weiser of Baruch. Professor Friedman nominated Professor Richardson of New York City College of Technology.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

William Phipps
Executive Director

UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE

Proposed: April 12, 2011
Adopted: passed 41-10-5

RESOLUTION ON GENERAL EDUCATION

The University Faculty Senate strongly recommends in order to preserve the richness of general education that the general education requirements at the undergraduate colleges of CUNY be composed of 30 credits plus at least an additional 16 credits to be resolved by the appropriate curriculum committees of the colleges, rather than the proposal in the Draft Resolution of 36 + 6.

UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE

Proposed: April 12, 2011
Adopted: passed 59-0-0

RESOLUTION ON TRANSFER

The University Faculty Senate strongly recommends ON TRANSFER that:

1. For externally accredited programs (e.g., nursing, engineering) and other high-credit majors, clear cut University-wide course requirements be developed to ensure student success in the transfer process.
2. An appeals committee be created by the UFS and the OAA to decide on requests from colleges for waivers.
3. Curricular counseling for students be extensively improved.

ON TRANSFER PROCESSES:

1. Improved technologies
 - linkage of college catalogs
 - TIPPS for program to program
 - transcripts available electronically to advising faculty
2. Clarify to students that A.A.S. degrees are not designed for transfer to four year colleges, and that to transfer they will have to take additional courses to satisfy more intensive general education requirements.

3. Discipline Councils - Funding to support periodic meetings of Discipline Councils which would work to create a mutual understanding of course content and outcomes in their areas to facilitate the transfer process.

4. Any University-wide curriculum committees or task forces that are created shall consist of at least one faculty representative from each CUNY unit elected by each college's faculty governance body or by the college's faculty. The committee will establish mechanisms to include student consultation before making final recommendations.

5. Articulation agreements must be elaborated for as many majors as possible. Faculty at colleges with significant transfers between any two colleges (e.g., BCC and Lehman) should work out detailed agreements on the most common programs.

REPORTS AND DELIBERATIONS
OF THE 358th PLENARY SESSION
OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

April 12, 2011

Chair Cooper – Good evening. Let us approve the agenda and the minutes. That is done. Now the Chancellor is here, and we are inviting him to the podium. Welcome.

Chancellor Goldstein – It's good to see you. I have a lot of things to tell you, and then I'll take questions, but I need to get onto another event where I have to speak. I don't want to go into a lot of detail about the budget, which I assume is given to you by various committees and reports. But let me just highlight some things I have been doing around these issues, because this is such a central issue that occupies a lot of my time. If you go back in time, and embed into the resources that was just voted upon by the Legislature you will see that this University has lost approximately \$335 million over the course of just three years. That's the bad news. The good news is that relative to what is happening in higher education nationally, especially public higher education, it almost pales in what we are experiencing around the United States. I have talked to you about this at great length. Just this week, I had calls from a number of colleagues at several of the top major public universities around the United States talking with me about what is our strategy because they are hemorrhaging and really don't see much daylight ahead. I've reported that we took an initiative in 2008 and again in 2010 just this past November where we assembled the very top people in public higher education to really dig deep into the issues that we are all confronting, and trying to understand not only the political dynamics that is driving a lot of what we are experiencing today, but how are we going to re-imagine public higher education on a going forward basis to secure our balance sheets and to give us the kinds of resources we need to really do the job that we are all capable of, and to most importantly advance the goals of our students who come here and trust in us that they are going to be given the kind of experience that can launch their professional lives and help improve their personal lives. Those are weighty things for us to do, but the reason that we do what we do is in part to really assist students in realizing their professional goals.

The story is not an optimistic story thus far. There are all sorts of layers of complexity, why states are regressing away from supporting public higher education. At some time we can engage in that kind of discussion, but I don't think that is appropriate for this evening. Just yesterday, I was in Albany again and had a series of private meetings with the very highest levels of people in the State Legislature, and in the Governor's office. I will be with the Governor tomorrow, talking about some of the issues that I'll be discussing with you tonight, and spent a fair amount of time yesterday not only with two of the top people in the Executive Branch but also the people heading the higher education committees in both the Senate, Ken LaValle, and Assembly, Deborah Glick. I was spending time with Lieutenant Governor Duffy, who is the former mayor of the city of Rochester, a very smart, charming, and affable fellow who really looks at his job as an

important component of what the Governor wants to achieve in New York State. All of you have seen how this Governor has operated. He was, depending on how you view the world, successful in what he wanted to accomplish and really in record time, a true paring of the budgets that were in disarray, and was able to accomplish that with less rancor than one would imagine with such weighty things needing to be done.

He is now focusing upon jobs. This is a recovery, slowly coming out of this very nasty recession that has not seen what we typically see with spurts of job creation. It is a tale of two regions in New York, downstate which includes where we are in the five boroughs, parts of Long Island and Westchester, but when you get up to central and western New York, it is a very different economic climate. There has been an out migration of lots or people. Businesses have not only shut down, but there has not been a big spurt of new jobs created, in part because there hasn't been the ability to draw in small businesses that can be properly capitalized with working capital, with some risk capital that could be arranged with some financial institutions, and most importantly to create an environment where people want to move and to create a beachhead for their work and raise families. One of the things the Governor wants to do is job development, and he really sees universities as critically important in job creation. The Lieutenant Governor was asked by the Governor to create a series of ten regional councils that he would chair. If you look at the map of the State of New York you see that they are carved out around very large cities, Ithaca, Rochester, Buffalo, Syracuse, and New York City. New York City is going to be one of those regional councils. He is going to chair each of those regional councils, and there will be two co-chairs who will do the operations work. One will be from the world of university life, and one will be from the world of business. What I was trying to convince him of is the importance of CUNY being very much involved in this. The reason this is so important is that there is going to be a lot of off-budget investment through the State and lots of different financial mechanisms that ultimately could find its way into CUNY to support a variety of things that we do right now. It was important for me to get to know him and to talk to him about the depth of talent here at this University, the incredible faculty we have, the kind of work that is done. You will see that a lot of universities put out economic impact statements. We've done it ourselves several times, but what we have been able to demonstrate, in part because we are so much a fabric of the City of New York, is that we've actually done this. The data are very clear. We can demonstrate this, and if you look at our inventory of work that comes to the University, which is now about \$350 million per year, and so much of it now has been shifted to basic research, which is new to the University, so much of it is also about the University in service to the City of New York. It was a very convincing argument for him. We hope we will become an important player in this. So those discussions took place in earnest yesterday, and within the next few weeks you will hear the Governor announcing regional councils and I imagine we will be involved and have a seat at the table.

I also have had extensive conversations in Albany about the needs of the University. It is important for the whole body to understand what we did around tuition, and what I see going forward. This is a critically important time for us. When I said we have had extracted out of our budget about \$335 million, part of that was a lack of recognition of the revenue that we created as a tuition increase in the spring. We had the legal authority

to do it. Our revenue budget approved by the State of New York had sufficient room in that budget that we could raise an additional \$20 million, and then annualize \$40 million. It was tried in court, and I'm happy to tell you that we won in court. The judge, Eileen Rakower, and the State Supreme Court just ruled in favor of CUNY in the way in which the tuition was implemented. But there was a kabuki dance that went on, very symbolic and strange, especially if you're a Westerner because it's an art form that you need to understand in order to appreciate the artistry. It's a dance between the Assembly and the Senate. We had approval directly from the Governor and directly from the Senate and from the Assembly. They all agreed that they gave us the green light.

But then a kabuki dance occurred as the budget started to close down, and there was posturing and CUNY got caught in the crosshairs of bargaining. I've seen this before, but as resources start to shrink it really annoyed me, and it should annoy you as well. I believe this is going to be adaptively corrected over time. I believe that before the Session is over, which is well into the summer, that we will get this corrected. What's interesting is that as a result of the State Legislature acting our revenue budget went way up. We could increase our tuition today and still be within that revenue target. So there is a lot of cleanup needed, and that's why I used the word kabuki. When you look at the analytics of this, it just doesn't make sense. It will be an interesting spring and summer, as we try to get some of this corrected.

What's embedded in this are two even bigger issues. One is our issue alone. SUNY tried to raise their tuition a year ago and they were rebuked because they did not have the authority while we did. But there are two other issues related to tuition that are critically important. The old issue is finding a rational way of setting tuition, and I have been unrelenting in my support for this. The whole CUNY Compact is embedded with some basis upon which to make a decision about tuition. You just don't pull a number out of the air and say we need 4%, 6%, 7.2%. You need a basis on which to make that kind of declaration. Obviously the politics always is part of the discussion, the internal and external politics, but at the end of the day revenue is revenue. You need revenue to continue to feed a large organization like CUNY. It's not sustainable over time unless you have the revenue.

So we have been talking about a rational tuition policy for ten years. SUNY's Chancellor Nancy Zimpher is now talking about the same thing. The rational way for me to conceptualize raising tuition is starting with fundamental principles. For us, that is our Master Plan, which we write every four or five years, and basically it's a roadmap. Here we are, and this is what we want to do over the next few years, and this is what it's going to cost. Our last Master Plan, which expires in 2012, posits an investment of about \$50 million a year after paying all other expenses. This is true investment. The way we approach that is, look at all the ways you can generate revenue – philanthropy, efficiencies, reshaping the academic budget to free up money elsewhere and redeploy it to do things we didn't have money for, and targeted enrollment growth, entrepreneurial activities. All of these things can be monetized, and tuition. You back in a number, and you need to do this if you want to have a rational policy that kicks in periodically. You don't just do it once and then forget about it.

You have to look at the whole terrain. So we are marching on, shoulder to shoulder, with SUNY in terms of how to approach the State Legislature and the Governor about how we conceptualize a tuition policy for CUNY. Very fundamental. But there is a contaminant going on that you need to understand. Several years ago, there was a plan promulgated by one of the SUNY campuses. It was called Buffalo 2020. It was basically a plan to revitalize a city that is now not seeing its best days. It's a different city from what it was 30 years ago. It has high unemployment, outmigration, shuttered businesses. That is a city in Western New York that needs revitalization. In that city, you have an AAU campus, SUNY Buffalo. It is a very significant place. John Simpson, who no longer is there, was the driver of this plan. It was an economic development plan that utilized the university in ways that it had never been used before to really create the kind of mojo that is needed to revitalize that city. There are a lot of interesting things in it. Embedded in that plan is a totally different tuition structure for SUNY Buffalo, basically saying over the next five years we want to raise tuition by 75%.

These are the central things I'm thinking about and have to confront. The Legislature is going to be grappling with this over the next few weeks. When people heard about Buffalo 2020, Stony Brook said wait a second, I'm also an AAU campus and I want to jack tuition up. Then Albany and Binghamton woke up. So now there is this buzz in the SUNY federation of selecting a few campuses to really get steep tuition increases. That is contaminating some of the discussion about creating a rational tuition policy because between SUNY and CUNY we have 87 campuses, and to pull out four – though admittedly two of those four are very significant research campuses that need to be supported to do the great work that they do – that's a contaminant.

The last contaminant making this tuition discussion for CUNY very difficult is the whole issue of the Tuition Assistance Program. The next time SUNY raises tuition, and we are not too far behind, the TAP ceiling is going to be pierced. Once your tuition is higher than the TAP ceiling there is no way to support the students who need financial aid unless you self-support it, which I think would be a terrible mistake to do. First of all, we don't have the resources, especially if the numbers are big, and I think it's a terrible precedent. I would fight very strenuously against that, because it sets up yet another theme that is coursing its way through public higher education, that the State can walk away. You guys can find a way to help yourselves. That is a chilling prospect that we all have to be mindful of.

What I just described to you is going to be amplified and you will start to see those waves amplified because this is going to be a central discussion between the Legislature, the Governor, and certainly SUNY and CUNY. If TAP is raised by \$1000, that probably would cost the State another \$100 million. And as soon as it's raised the air will be sucked out of the room by the privates because every private tuition is above \$5000. As soon as it goes above that, they have plenty of students who need the support and that money is going to go right off the table. People understand this, and it's a real conundrum that we're facing. As we talk about revenue, the complexities of this kabuki

dance become more and more prominent, and it's going to take a lot of our effort to see this happen.

The good news is that the House of Representatives took a shot at cutting \$850 from the Pell Grant program, which has a cap of about \$5,500, and I'm happy to tell you that when the federal budget was adopted on Friday, at least through September Pell was put on a better footing than it was before. It's conceivable that between Pell and TAP our students could get \$10,500. We have a number of students at CUNY who do get that. And Pell doesn't have the restrictions that TAP does. You can get Pell for a long time, and use it for anything you want. It's unrestricted, while TAP is highly restricted. All of these nuances were important for me to share with you.

I've been on a road trip around CUNY. I did this about four years ago, visiting every campus. I give some broad strokes about public higher education and about CUNY. I talk about some of the issues I think are center stage. At the end of this week, I will have visited eight or nine, and then I'll visit a couple more and finish up some time in the fall. They have been extraordinary visits, as they were four years ago, huge crowds of people dominated by faculty with lots of deep and thoughtful questions. At the end of this week I will have visited CSI, Queens, Lehman, City, LaGuardia, BCC, Queensborough, and York. The students who have come have been wonderful, something all of you would be very proud of.

I know we have issues. That's what universities are about. We are organic institutions. We shed, we acquire, we argue and debate. Hopefully we treat each other with respect, and in my experience that has been the dominant theme in all of these visits. You would be proud to hear your colleagues, many of whom don't attend plenaries, who are involved in lots of interesting work with graduate students, running laboratories, and everything. To me, it is very invigorating to see the vitality, the energy, the enthusiasm within this context of problems that exist in this country with lots of rancor and anger and sniping. This is a great University that will continue to be great. It has its greatest days ahead of us. The one theme I would leave with you is we have to be mindful that public universities are under attack, not malevolently but by benign neglect. The idea is somehow they will figure it out.

When I look at the DOE schools, and they are so fundamental to this city, 1.1 million children being educated every day in 1200 schools, and so many of them come here. When I look at the resources that they've had: when I started as Chancellor the operating budget of the DOE was about \$8 billion and it's now over \$20 billion. When I started here as Chancellor, the University's budget was not that different other than our mandatory costs. If you pull those out, there hasn't been much investment. What we've been able to do, you the faculty and others, has been quite extraordinary, and I want to thank you for that engagement. With that I will end, and take any questions you have and then go do what I have to do.

Chair Cooper – Since the Chancellor doesn't have a lot of time, I'm going to ask that questions be single, pointed, and preferably from people who don't ordinarily get to ask him questions. This is a result of a consensus in the Executive Committee.

Professor Cowan – What is on the agenda with the Governor tomorrow?

Chancellor Goldstein – Some is private, not about me, but things he needs to be aware of. The primary exchange is going to be about resources. I have organized a group of people to talk to him as well. It will largely be about resources, and for him to fully understand the impact of this University on the life of this City and this State. I think he understands it, but I want to discuss it in much greater detail. I have some specific items I would rather for the moment keep quiet. **Professor Cowan** – When you say resources, do you mean the hope of mitigating future cuts that are quite as extreme as what we've seen. **Chancellor Goldstein** – Yes, and also giving us authority that I believe we have.

Professor Weiser – Given the plan for ten regional economic development councils that are university-centered, which sounds like a continuation of the State's failed economic development efforts to shovel money upstate, have we thought about reaching out to any of the colleges upstate on the theory of partnering with them since that might be a cheaper place to build new basic science facilities that then we could use and that way we could get some of the money that's going to get shoveled upstate?

Chancellor Goldstein – That's a great question. Let me respond succinctly by saying that the way we have to position ourselves in New York City is in a way that is very different from what some of the upstate cities need to do. We have different needs. The major banks or health care organizations or media organizations and the huge businesses of New York City are all doing fine, but there are many small businesses and large numbers of people in parts of New York City that are struggling. What I think we need to do in addition to talking about our research agenda is to see how the University can in partnership with the State of New York be in service to those communities. That is going to be a major theme. With respect to partnering, to give you a very good example is when Mayor Bloomberg and Deputy Mayor Steel announce this idea for an applied science facility, I got on the phone and had a conference call with the heads of Cornell, Columbia, Rockefeller, NYU, and Mt. Sinai. As a result, we developed a plan with NYU, Carnegie Mellon, University of Toronto, and IBM, which is in play, and another with Columbia and CUNY, to partner on an ongoing basis. That's what we're trying to do with SUNY. We've never been a partner with SUNY in the way that we should. It's not clear to me that the money is going to be shoveled up to parts of the State. I think that's a good strategy, but there will be dollars directed to New York City alone, and that's what I think we have to be a participant in.

Professor Crain – I appreciate the efforts to keep tuition less than it might be, but it seems to me that the states and the country have abandoned the obligations that they have to the poor and needy people in the country, at the same time they are refusing to tax wealthy people. It's a travesty. Hospitals are being cut. We're raising tuition on our students. All sorts of social services are being cut, and the rich are getting away with

murder. We have to make a statement that we want a just society that gives everybody a chance, not just the wealthy. **Chancellor Goldstein** – You’re making a statement, and I support much of what you are saying.

Professor Rosenthal – In the spirit of Professor Crain’s remarks, I’m going to make a request. First of all, I’m not categorically opposed to tuition increases at CUNY. That being said, I urge you when you meet with the Governor to impress upon him the fact that our tuition increases are paid largely by persons with family incomes of \$20-40,000 a year, whereas the so-called Millionaire’s Tax that the Governor is so far refusing to reinstate is paid by persons with family incomes exceeding \$200,000 a year.

Professor Florence – Have you ever considered going to the colleges unannounced, or maybe just sitting in a class? I wonder if you could just do that. If you go to colleges announced, it can be stage managed. I’m not saying that in a bad way, but I would love to be surprised.

Chancellor Goldstein – I don’t stage anything. I go in and speak what my mind is and take questions. I will say that I am doing that *sub rosa*. On some of the campuses where I’ve visited, a couple of mathematics faculty have come over to me and said why don’t you come to one of our classes, and I said yes. So I’m going to do it *sub rosa* without fanfare. **Professor Florence** – And I look forward to the day when I hear you’ve come into Brooklyn unannounced. **Chancellor Goldstein** – I really don’t remember my schedule and whether I’m going to Brooklyn this spring. **Professor Florence** – Surprise us!

Chair Cooper – I would like to move this agenda. We have two business items to deal with today. The first is the Resolutions on General Education and Transfer. I’d like to first read a statement that I prepared. This year, as you know by now, the biggest issue we have been concerned with is a proposed resolution on general education and transfer, which has come out of the office of Vice Chancellor Alexandra Logue. She and her staff have been at our plenary a few months ago. She has presented the position. We have all put it on our websites. We organized a panel in this room to discuss the implications of the resolution. We attempted to discuss it at a dinner between the trustees and the faculty governance leaders in March. Terry and I have had private meetings with the Vice Chancellor and the Chancellor. They have been at the Council of Faculty Governance Leaders, and she and her staff have visited a number of your campuses. We have therefore spent a significant amount of faculty time on this issue this year so far.

I have written to the chairs of many liberal arts departments urging them to either assemble, or reassemble, or create discipline councils. This has achieved some limited success. I have been invited to and spoken at a few faculty senates, and I’m available to anyone else who might want me. The UFS Executive Committee has assembled its own task force or ad hoc committee drawing from people on each campus who have been interested in general education. We asked governance leaders to send us the names of faculty who have experience in general education on your campus. This committee has had two meetings. They have been productive, and a great many issues were aired in

these meetings. They occurred on March 18 and April 8, and they have resulted in some resolutions which we will shortly present. The last meeting included representatives with an interest in general education. It included heads of discipline councils, the governance leaders of the colleges, members of the UFS Executive Committee – about 50 people.

There was a general consensus after three or four hours of discussion about how to move forward. I would like to raise one issue that came up which troubled me enormously. There was one faculty member last Friday who seemed to believe, based on misinformation spread on his campus, and some off hand remarks by some administrators, that the faculty concern and opposition so far to the draft resolution is a product of senior college disrespect for two-year college level work. That was not the case, and if that is something floating around your campus it would be very helpful if you would scotch it.

The idea that this might be true rehashes a rumor which appeared in 1999 when the resolution we live under now was passed by the board, in which the transfer of all two-year college courses to senior colleges had to be accepted if the student had an AA or AS degree. The rumor is not the case. The faculty who have attended these meetings from the two-year and the four-year colleges who have examined and struggled with the issues believe that what was proposed for the June board meeting is basically an attack on campus faculty authority to determine curriculum and graduation requirements, according to its expertise. We believe we are appointed, tenured, and promoted because we supposedly know something about our fields and about what students should learn.

From these meetings the consensus emerged: (1) general education and transfer are two different issues; (2) transfer must be addressed in the interests of fairness, but the reduction of general education in the senior colleges to 42 credits is not the solution. Most of the senior colleges have general education requirements that range from 42 to 60 credits, and are based on discipline specific requirements, not generic outcomes; (3) The OAA resolution promises to create a task force to determine “buckets” – that’s the latest word for silos – of courses which will fulfill “outcomes.”

This approach to general education was not supported by the meetings that I convened. We have not yet been convinced that there is something called “outcomes” that is the same thing as education. That language has been promulgated nationally by a group of non-academic foundations, notably the Lumina Foundation, the president of which spoke in this building yesterday at the conference on collective bargaining, spending most of the time defending himself against faculty accusations about the way he was meddling in what higher education was doing. If you read today’s online version of the *Chronicle* you get the understanding that there are a significant number of people who believe that an “outcome” in the social sciences can be attained by any one of six courses, and I picked social sciences but it could be any area, and that the specific courses don’t matter. This was not something that I have the impression the CUNY faculty are accepting. (4) The faculty who attended the meeting would like a resolution that would create an elected faculty committee with a delegate from each campus to establish serious transfer policies.

This is in lieu of the OAA's suggestion that they will establish a task force to create buckets and outcomes.

So our resolution, as I assume you have seen, makes that distinction. If these resolutions are endorsed by this body, we will disseminate them to all campus governance groups and to the central office, and some of us will undertake the job of trying to persuade the OAA to adopt something closer to our proposals than theirs. Finally, in the back of the room we have provided you with the most up to date collection of resolutions that have come in from the campuses. They are also up on the web at www.cunyufs.org/A. These come from faculty senates in some colleges, from discipline councils, from departments, from a Phi Beta Kappa chapter, and from two student senates.

About the Student Senate: at the dinner meeting of the trustees and the governance leaders, which some of us felt we were hijacked at, the administration permitted a student from the USS to read a resolution, the implication of which was the USS had passed it. The resolution supported word for word everything in the OAA resolution, including such things as the right of students with AAS degrees to transfer and have everything accepted as general education. It turns out that it was a Steering Committee proposal, or their Executive Committee. It did not pass their plenary, and as I said student senates from two different colleges have refused to support it. So there is no student unanimity thus far. It may emerge.

The trustees, as far as I can tell, have been told the students are behind this. It seems to me crucial for the faculty to take a very strong stand, as united as possible, so that we can present to the central administration a set of positions as alternatives. I doubt realistically that we can totally derail this thing or expect them to pull it. They have been repeating everywhere they go that they are going to present it to the board, and at the moment they are in the process of collecting information and points of view. I urge very strongly therefore that we provide a point of view. That's my introduction.

Professor Moore – At Queens there are two levels of required courses. One part is called basic skills which includes basic English and math, and three semesters of foreign language. Then come the general education courses, and then three writing intensive courses. Now, when they are talking about the number of credits accepted as Gen Ed, are we talking about all of those courses? Does the 30-16 you are proposing include all of the required courses that are non-electives and not for the majors, or just ones that are subsumed under Gen Ed?

Chair Cooper – Each college is slightly different. So the answer to your question is something I can't offer. **Professor Martell** – On at least ten separate occasions, the Executive Vice Chancellor has made it perfectly clear that if it's required of all, it is Gen Ed, regardless of where you put it, what you call it. You can call it a graduation requirement or whatever you want; if it's required of all, it's Gen Ed.

Professor Philipp – A few years ago, the Chancellor hatched a plan to devolve the PSC-CUNY research awards to the provosts. We got a response from almost all of the college

faculty senates opposing this. That plan was ditched. The reason is that the senates opposed it. I would strongly encourage the senates to oppose this. This is a much more serious attack on our academic rights and academic integrity, both at the community colleges and at the senior colleges. The implications of this for the community colleges are really horrendous. We should oppose this, and we have successfully opposed it in the past. I think we can successfully oppose this if we stay united and vigorous.

Professor Friedman – Point of information. Is there a resolution on the floor?

Chair Cooper – Let me read the two separate resolutions, in conjunction with our notion that these are two separate issues. [They are read.] Just as a note, according to State law, community college students must have a 60 credit package to get an associate degree. They must have about half of that in a so-called major or special program. For them to be required to provide 36 credits of general education will cut into the specialization programs and whatever electives the students might want to take. That's from the two-year college point of view. From the senior college point of view, the initial proposal of 36+6 is totally inadequate, and 30+16 isn't a whole lot better but it is somewhat better and it is our effort to demonstrate reasonable compromise. Not everybody loves it, and it came in fact from faculty at both Hunter and Baruch who have a big stake in this issue as far as Gen Ed goes, but in fact so do other colleges from what I'm hearing.

Professor Crain – If this issue goes to the heart of academic integrity, and our duties and responsibilities to design curricula, I don't see why we are compromising. It sounds as if we are saying we just want to modify your plan. As I see it, CUNY central has no right to set any limit. So we oppose it. We had a good resolution last time opposing it. Let's stand by that resolution. This sounds like we're saying they have the right to do but give us a few more credits. **Professor Martell** – The point is that the trustees have the right to set policy under the New York State laws. It is delegated to them. They are not going to say that they are going to select the course. They always describe this as a framework. What we're asking for here is some ability to negotiate a better position than I think we will get if we don't negotiate. I understand your concern. **Professor Crain** – What's wrong with opposing the whole premise? **Chair Cooper** – I wish I agreed. I did until a few days ago.

Professor Remler – I want to speak in support of negotiating and compromising. I think it's extremely important that we participate and show ourselves willing to participate. Otherwise, we will lose out big.

Professor Dexter – I agree with Bill and Manfred that we need to be vigorously opposing CUNY's move to take over general education. We lose by negotiating this. I fully understand the urge to express willingness to work with the administration. I think we can do that with the transfer issue, but with Gen Ed we lose big time if we try to do a public negotiation like this. Speaking for many of my colleagues at Brooklyn, I'm not happy with this resolution. It works against many other resolutions that we've seen from other governance bodies. I would hope the UFS, the umbrella organization, has the strongest position on this.

Professor Baumrin – I am co-author of the resolution on the Executive Committee. The resolutions that came out of the colleges are terrific and I applaud each of the college bodies for having done a very good job in undermining the central administration's position. But in the resolution before you the key words are "at least." That leaves up to individual college curriculum committees the power to expand from 16 to more, and to impose graduation requirements. The thing is the imposition of graduation requirements varies from college to college, but so long as they can be imposed, whether they are writing or foreign language or math requirements, it's up to the curriculum committees and the college governance bodies. This resolution, as weak as it sounds, strikes at the heart of the central administration's move. It says this is up to the college curriculum committees.

Professor Philipp – I was not speaking before to this resolution. I was speaking in favor of college senate resolutions. I think the senate resolutions are the most powerful tool we have. I encourage senates to make those resolutions. Speaking to this resolution now, I support it because it is a negotiating tactic that I think was proposed by both Professor Martell and Professor Baumrin and others. I'm not entirely happy either, but as Professor Baumrin says it says "at least."

Professor Jacobson – This afternoon at the Faculty Council of Brooklyn College I summarized and read most of the five principles that were agreed to by this body at the last plenary. So I'm wondering now how I go back and reconcile this proposal with the five principles that were so exquisitely stated. **Chair Cooper** – She is talking about a contradiction between this resolution and the statement we passed last time. Anybody want to take that on? How do we reconcile this willingness to propose today's resolution to the statement of five principles the UFS passed the last time? I suppose the only answer I can give you is historical. Since we provided those five principles and I delivered all of those resolutions to the central administration, I have the impression I have been talking to concrete. The response has not indicated any willingness to budge. Terry and I have made that clear to them privately, have we not?

Professor Martell – Without exception. Our view here is that we are trying collectively to position ourselves as looking like we appreciate all of the problems associated with transfer, but curriculum has nothing to do with them. However, if you think there is some huge problem there, we will give you a little bit here but we won't give you much because the resolution says "at least" and it has governance powers in it. We are trying to look like responsible stakeholders in this community while still trying to protect faculty rights and trying to avoid having this shoved down our throats. **Professor Dalglish** – Who defines the 30 credits of Gen Ed? Is there going to be a dialogue, for example between curriculum committees in the community colleges as well as the senior colleges? **Chair Cooper** – In the second resolution, if we could get to it, you will see we have a proposal for the election of a university-wide committee, resembling to an extent the one we've already assembled.

Professor Crossman – When I first started coming to this body, the School of Professional Studies I think had been fairly recently begun, with what I understand were a lot of promises about not infringing on other academic programs. The most recent is the online Psychology degree, which probably infringes on every single college in the system. So I think taking back and protecting as much governance as possible is really important.

Chair Cooper - I would point out that when I read the proposals for both the online Sociology and Psychology baccalaureates, I wrote a letter to the chair of every department inviting them to send in comments. If they did, I never got them. Maybe they commented to someone, but not to me. That is where you need a discipline council, a body of chairs of departments in the same field who can communicate face to face or however. If we can't do that across the campuses, there is going to be more of this. Is there any objection to the calling of the question? All in favor. It is passed. Now a vote on the first resolution on general education. So it is passed with 41 in favor, 10 against, and 5 abstaining. The motion carries.

The second part of the proposal deals with transfer. I hope you've got the piece of paper than summarizes all of that. Let me point out that this is a resolution that proposes a variety of mechanisms for dealing with transfer. It may not be complete. If you can think of another mechanism, I can't imagine anybody would oppose it if it makes any sense. Any discussion?

Professor Vozick – I've spoken at my two campuses, Hostos and BMCC, and I've gotten some commonality of response. I'd like to suggest one modification. This is a complex document, but I'm looking at the second part that's labeled "on transfer processes" and point #2 on discipline councils. It says "funding to support periodic meetings of discipline councils which would work to create a mutual understanding of course content and outcomes in their areas." I'm seeking consideration of changing it to "a mutual understanding of course content and outcomes and increased commonality of transfer requirements in their areas."

Chair Cooper – Is that understood as a friendly amendment by the Executive Committee? **Professor Baumrin** – Can we just stick the word "common" before "course content"? Would that take care of what you want to say? **Professor Vozick** – The transfer requirement is not only course content, although that would help. The reason I'm cautious is that the complaint I hear is that it's very difficult from a community college chair's position in the STEM disciplines particularly, but I think in others as well, to figure out how to advise and prepare students when requirements are different at different campuses. Therefore, transfer requirements seem to be about the language. **Professor Philipp** – Would Professor Vozick be willing to have the Executive Committee after the fact change that language? **Professor Vozick** – I would like to be totally friendly with the Executive Committee. I'm just very familiar with academic procedures of removal by minor change. If high faith is present, yes. **Chair Cooper** – Please give us something in writing.

Professor McCormick – Just two points. “Clear advice” does not really fit under the heading Technology. That’s a minor thing. The reason I got up was because the phrasing about AAS students sounds derogatory to the students, the aims of their programs, and their faculties. So I think it be easy to rephrase it. **Chair Cooper** – The issue has to do with the fact that AAS students frequently do not seem to understand that the liberal arts requirements of the State Education Department do not come anywhere near the liberal arts requirements for baccalaureates. And the students get to the senior college very upset to discover that they haven’t gotten this information. One of the reasons it’s under the Technology area is that since apparently we are not going to get the money to hire counselors – the Chancellor has made that abundantly clear – we were hoping through some kind of Internet setup the students could be given very clear cut instructions and information on what is what.

Professor Dexter – At Brooklyn College in the past couple of weeks the chair of Philosophy, SEEK, and I have met with the leader of our undergraduate student government at Brooklyn College and with Cory Provost, the president of the University Student Senate, about the Pathways proposal. I think that’s part of the reason the student governance came out against this. Through those conversations I believe students are absolutely the key as to how this is going to fall out. I would strongly suggest that the language be modified to invite students to join us specifically in this work on transfer. I can write some language. I worry about us doing our thing and leaving the student and the administration doing their thing. We can’t force USS to do anything, but I’d like this language to invite them to join us in a joint task force with students from the campuses. **Chair Cooper** – Please write something. Let me say I invited Cory Provost to come tonight. I told him he could have the floor rights of any guest. He didn’t think he would be able to. I’ve made several efforts to reach out and talk with them, and I hope something bears fruit sooner or later. That may end up being a way of dealing with this.

Professor Conway – I was hoping we could rethink point #3 at the bottom under On Transfer Processes about one member from each college. I think this needs more thought. I agree we want faculty to control this process, and seats at that table are essential to that. Ideally I would like to see that we are a majority of seats at that table so that we ultimately have the control and the vote. But one college may not be the optimal solution. I’ll give you an example. Let’s assume that at the various colleges we all elect someone from the Math Department. Now we’ve got representatives from all the schools and they are all Math people. No English or Sociology people. So we didn’t do anything there. I know we’re talking about having separate discipline councils or committees, but they are not going to be the ones ultimately coming up with this. That’s just one thought that occurs to me. We want to make sure it was a diverse disciplinary group. The other issues that comes to mind, which I say as chair of the Community College Caucus as well as a community college faculty member, is that I see this having a huge impact on community colleges. We’re talking about 30 credits out of our 60 credit load, versus say 16 out of 60 at the senior college level. Clearly what happens is going to be very significant to how our curricula are redrafted. Again, for that reason we might want to think about the extent of representation for the community colleges on this, as opposed to

just a one for one. I'm not saying I have the answer, but I don't think one to one as now defined is optimal.

Chair Cooper – On the first point, when I asked governance leaders to send people to this Gen Ed Committee we created, I asked people to be chosen based on the experience of those people in their own local Gen Ed committees. And we ended up with people from every discipline. The combination of those 20 people plus the discipline council heads and others who were present gave us a wide range of representation. This is an editorial comment, but if we could get that Committee we have assembled to do this work, or something very close to it, we would be approaching Nirvana, considering. The OAA appointed a committee of bureaucrats and some faculty to review the choice of an assessment exam that will replace the CPE. The UFS was asked to appoint one person, and we had to be sure that person had psychometric experience. So my guess is if we don't insist on a faculty-elected committee, we are going to get an awful lot of people picked by provosts, and people who may not have the Gen Ed concerns. I'm not saying that the members of this assessment task force are necessarily working against us, but we had one member this time, and that was after a certain amount of hassle.

Professor Weiser – In terms of the mechanics and who should be elected, I think the one to one is probably as good as you're going to get. Obviously we will need to encourage representation of different disciplines, and obviously we do have a strong need for community college representation. The problem with these large committees and CUNY's having so many departments and schools is that you can never specify everything adequately in advance, and the more constraints you put on it the harder it will be to fill out your committee. Plus, anything that happens here would have to be approved by the trustees, so I would say the language right now is flexible enough and then hopefully in the appointment process, if this passes, we will then get the appropriate representation.

Professor Remler – Responding to Professor Conway's concern, the language could omit "one" and say the committee consists of "faculty from each CUNY unit elected, etc." **Professor Martell** – Or say "at least one." The key here is it's a faculty committee elected by the governance leaders. Those are the points that have got to be made. Otherwise, it will be a committee with people who may be great or may be lousy but we will lose control of it.

Chair Cooper – On the motion, all in favor? It carries.

In May we elect the five members at-large of the UFS Executive Committee for one-year terms. Nominees can send a written statement describing their interest in serving in this capacity to the Senate office. The election will be held in May. You can nominate on the floor of the next meeting also, if you so choose.

[Professor Hounion nominated Professor Dalglish of CCNY. Professor Tai nominated Professor Pecorino of Queensborough. Professor Cowan nominated Professor Barnhart of Kingsborough. Professor Pecorino nominated Professor Tai of Queensborough.

Professor Lewis nominated Professor Conway of BMCC. Professor Carey nominated Professor Baumrin of the Graduate Center. Professor Philipp nominated Professor Weiser of Baruch. Professor Friedman nominated Professor Richardson of New York City College of Technology.]

Professor Martell – On Friday we had 52 members of our faculty around CUNY sitting down in a conference room at 80th Street talking seriously about curriculum issues. I don't think that would have occurred without the drive, determination, and tenacity of our Chair. So I'd like to thank Sandi for all she has done. **Chair Cooper** – Thank you, and that's the first time he hasn't pointed out how much older I am than he is! **Professor Baumrin** – For those of you who were not there, the performance of your faculty was absolutely terrific. I was never prouder of being a faculty member at this University.