

**MINUTES OF THE 355th PLENARY SESSION
OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK**

December 14, 2010

The meeting was called to order by UFS Chair Cooper at 6:00 p.m. in Rooms 9204/05/06 at the Graduate Center. 73 of 116 voting members were present.

Baruch: Present – Ellis, Hill, Martell, Remler, and Wine. Absent – Bazzoni, Nematollahy, and Weiser.
BMCC: Present – Conway, Friedman, Genis, Martinez-Lopez, Persaud, Samuel, Soto, and Alternate Vozick. Absent: d’Erizans. **Bronx CC:** Present – Bandar. Absent – Ismail, Prabhu, and Skinner.
Brooklyn: Present – Cirasella, Florence, Jacobson, and Massood. Absent – Bank-Munoz, Dexter, Magliozzo, Morrill, Viscusi, and Wills. **CCNY:** Present – Brass, Crain, and Dalglish. Absent – Jablonsky, Khanbilvardi, Kiely, Lascar, Raj, Rinard, and Watkins. **CSI:** Present – Cooper, Talarico, Yousef, Zimmerman and Alternate Peters. Absent: Batson and Klibaner. **CUNY Law School:** Present – Burton and Goldscheid. **Graduate School:** Present – Aguirre-Molina, Albrecht, Baumrin, Philipp, and Alternate Vora. Absent -- Burke, Weinstein. **Hostos CC:** Present – Sharma, and Alternates August and Hubner. Absent – Ovtcharenko and Pimentel. **Hunter:** Present – Baumann, Blundell, Demeo, Strayer, and Young. Absent – Ancona, Grossman, Guzzetta, Kuhn-Osius, and Spark. **John Jay:** Present – Crossman, Kaplowitz, Kubic and Alternate Tovar. Absent: Browne-Marshall, Dunham, Katz, and King-Toler. **Kingsborough CC:** Present – Arliss, Barnhart, Hume, Ruoff, Stubin, and Alternate Cowan. Absent: and Wood. **LaGuardia CC:** Present – Berke, Kurzyna, McCormick, Alternates Albrecht and Lerman. Absent: Mettler, Richmond, and Shean. **Lehman:** Present – Alexanderson, Carey, and Maybee. Absent – Jervis, Larimer, and Marianetti. **Medgar Evers:** Present – none. Absent – Reid, Stewart and Withers. **NYCCT:** Present – Bennani, Cermele, Gelman, Hounion, and Richardson. Absent: Horelick. **Queens:** Present – Moore, Savage, and Zevin. Absent – Brody and Gonzalez. Vacancies -- 5. **Queensborough CC:** Present – : Barbanel, Borrachero, Pecorino, Tai, and Volchok. Vacant – 1. **York:** Present – Klein, and Rosenthal. Absent – Corkery, Hughes, and Lewis.

Governance Leaders present: Hume (KCC), Jacobson (Brooklyn), Kaplowitz (John Jay), Martell (Baruch), Philipp (Lehman), Rosenthal (LaGuardia CC & NCC), and Tai (QCC) attended.

Chancellor Goldstein, Executive VC and University Provost Logue, Associate University Provost Wrigley, and University Dean for Research Crook attended. UFS Executive Director Phipps, Administrative Assistant Pasela, and Secretary Blanchard were also present.

- I. Approval of the Agenda: The agenda was adopted as proposed.
- II. Approval of the Minutes of November 2010: The minutes were adopted as proposed.
- III. Resolution in Honor of the Late Bernard Sohmer: The Resolution was adopted unanimously and followed by a moment of silence.

Resolution to Honor the Late Bernard Sohmer

The University Faculty Senate, saddened by the death of its former Chair, Professor Bernard Sohmer (1998-2002), expresses its deep appreciation for the decades of his devoted service to the City University.

As Chair of the University Faculty Senate, he was a vigorous and tireless voice for the City University’s faculty and students, and an articulate and incisive spokesman for our multiple missions and our responsibility as a public university.

When Chair of the UFS, he discharged with grace and success the difficult task of representing this faculty when the City University was under attack by city and state politicians.

At CCNY as a classroom instructor in Mathematics, a Faculty Senate Chair, and as a Dean during some of the college's most difficult transitional periods, Bernie remained cool and thoughtful, a wry and wise voice rising above the clamor of dissension.

We mourn his passing, and we miss his friendship and the presence of his wise counsel which continued for the years after he left the Senate chair until his death.

We urge unanimous endorsement of this resolution, the re-endorsement of the resolution from 2002 that is attached, and a period of silence to mark our regret.

Chancellor Matthew Goldstein and the City University of New York have established the Bernard Sohmer Scholarship in honor of Professor Emeritus Sohmer's service. The scholarship will be awarded by the City College Mathematics Department to undergraduate students majoring in math or a related field.

For further information on the Bernard Sohmer Scholarship, or to contribute to the scholarship fund, please contact:

Rosemary Weiss, Executive Director of Development

**The City College of New York, 160 Convent Avenue, Shepard 154, New York, NY 10031
212-650-7178, rweiss@ccny.cuny.edu**

University Faculty Senate

Proposed: May 14, 2002

Adopted: unanimously

RESOLUTION OF APPRECIATION FOR DR. BERNARD SOHMER

WHEREAS, Dr. Bernard Sohmer was elected Chair of the University Faculty Senate on May 19, 1998, and was reelected on May 16, 2000, and

WHEREAS, Bernard Sohmer, by virtue of his position, has also served as the Faculty Trustee on the Board of Trustees of The City University of New York during those four years, and

WHEREAS, Bernard Sohmer, as both Chair of the University Faculty Senate and as the Faculty Trustee, has dedicated himself to effectuating the mandate of the Board of Trustees Bylaws that the University Faculty Senate be responsible for the "formulation of policy relating to the academic status, role, rights and freedoms of the faculty, university level educational and instructional matters, and research and scholarly activities of university-wide import," and

WHEREAS, Bernard Sohmer's leadership of the University Faculty Senate has been a vigorous and effective defense and championing of The City University of New York and of its students and faculty and of its mission, and

WHEREAS, Bernard Sohmer has worked with dedication and has drawn upon a reservoir of tremendous institutional memory to represent the faculty to the Trustees, to the Chancellory, to the College Presidents, to City and State Legislators, to other University constituencies, to national organizations, and to the general public, and

WHEREAS, Bernard Sohmer guided the University Faculty Senate during the last four years of the previous Mayor's terms of office during which CUNY was subject to relentless and unwarranted attacks, and

WHEREAS, Bernard Sohmer wrote a powerful and comprehensive rebuttal to the Board of Regents after CUNY Trustees approved the 1999 policy phasing out remediation in the senior colleges and imposing new standardized barrier tests to student admission and advancement, and

WHEREAS, Bernard Sohmer took a strong stand against a newly imposed policy of annual reviews of department chairs by college presidents, which lead to its being clarified and circumscribed by the Chancellor, and

WHEREAS, Bernard Sohmer organized and coordinated the faculty response to the aspects of the CUNY Master Plan undermining CUNY's mission of both access and excellence, and

WHEREAS, Bernard Sohmer applied steady pressure to ensure that CUNY's first priority was and continues to be the hiring of more full-time faculty, which is now being reflected in many initiatives of the Chancellor and Board, and

WHEREAS, Bernard Sohmer, as Chair of the UFS, was one of the founding members in 1998 of the Committee for Public Higher Education, which coordinates a group of educational, civic, labor, religious, legal, public citizen, and public spirited community groups to sustain the campaign for open access to CUNY, and

WHEREAS, Bernard Sohmer, as Chair of the UFS, was an active member of the Friends of CUNY and has also helped preserve the CUNY Academy, therefore

BE IT RESOLVED, That on the occasion of Bernard Sohmer's completion of four years of dedicated service as Chair, the University Faculty Senate, on behalf of the entire CUNY faculty, expresses its sincere admiration and its heartfelt gratitude, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the University Faculty Senate declares Bernard Sohmer a permanent and venerated Institution.

III. Reports:

A. Chair (Recorded in Reports & Deliberations)

B. Chancellor Goldstein (Recorded in Reports & Deliberations)

IV. Invited Guests: (Recorded in Reports & Deliberations)

Executive Vice Chancellor and University Provost Alexandra Logue, Associate University Provost Julia Wrigley, and University Dean for Research David Crook. Please also refer to the report "*Improving Student Transfer at CUNY*" and the Executive Committee's white paper "*Discussion of Improving Student Transfer at CUNY*"

V. New Business –There was none.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

William Phipps
Executive Director

REPORTS AND DELIBERATIONS
OF THE 355th PLENARY SESSION
OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK
(edited)

December 14, 2010

CHAIR COOPER: I'd like to begin the 355th plenary session of the University Faculty Senate. May I have motion for the approval of the agenda? Thank you. Second. Any objections? Seeing none, the agenda is accepted. A motion for the approval of the minutes November 2010? Thank you. Second? Thank you. Any objections? Seeing none, the agenda is accepted. We have a special surprise visit from the Chancellor, who did not expect to be here. And he has just given me permission before he comes to the podium to move the University Faculty Senate Executive Committee's resolution in honor of the late Bernard Sohmer, which is in your packet or was on your email. Bernard Sohmer was chair of this body as it says from the year 1998 to 2002. He was one of the most impressive and important faculty leaders both at City College and at this University, and in the Senate he served on the Board of Trustees. In addition to the written motion, you have before you the motion that was passed in 2002 on the occasion of the completion of his service as Chair of the Senate. Are there any objections to this motion? Seeing none, may I ask for approval of the motion? The resolution is approved unanimously. We will ask for a moment of silence.... thank you. At the bottom of the sheet of the resolution is information about the scholarship in Bernie's name that has been established, launched by a very generous grant from the Chancellor. The information about contributing to the scholarship is there, and in addition on the 13th of February at City College there will be a memorial for him. We will send out the details.

CHANCELLOR GOLDSTEIN: Thank you for placing that resolution into the record. Bernie Sohmer was a good friend, and I know he would be deeply honored to have the unanimous vote of the resolution of appreciation and the respect that all of you have given for him. I have a lot to report on but I promised the last time I was here that I would place my formal remarks aside and take the time that I have for you this evening for questions. I know a number of you would like to engage in a Q&A so I'm ready, and let me just say that Lexa Logue got up at the crack of dawn this morning and drove to Albany. I got a report that she was fabulously successful in her testimony today in front of the Assembly higher education committee, drove back, and now she is ready for a presentation. So giving her a little time to breathe, I'll just take some questions so that you can relieve her of that responsibility and she could just do her report. So the floor is open.

PROFESSOR BAUMRIN: Tell us where we are on the budget, please?

CHANCELLOR GOLDSTEIN: I don't know the answer to that. I could tell you that the Board approved our recommendation for about a \$2.6 billion operating budget that would commence on July 1st. Obviously I've had a serious conversation with the Budget Director -- many conversations, probably one a week -- just to get a sense there are shifting winds going on in Albany. So far we see steady as we go, and we have sort of a sense of order of magnitude of what the problem will be for us. We will be asked again to sustain a cut of not inconsequential value. We will manage it to the best degree that we can. As I have said over and over again, the real need is for a very significant uptake in employment, which is really the driving force here for revenue in the State. Unless there is a real inflection point in the curves here, we are in for a rough ride, and unless this rough ride is moderated by a federal intervention. It would be hard for me to believe that there wouldn't be some federal intervention because I think I reported to this body that at least 43 states are experiencing the kinds of problems that we are experiencing in the State, too much obligation and too little revenue to support the obligations. And much of it is off balance sheet, which is a very nice way of saying outside of the eyes of the general public. There is a lot of debt out there that you don't even read about but will come home to roost soon.

And we all worry about that because the numbers are quite unsettling. The terrain at this particular time is dark and hopefully we will get out of this faster than we have demonstrated the capacity to do so far. But I think the next year we are going to have cuts and we will be able to sustain those cuts I believe and the reason I am a little optimistic is that I know that the incoming Cuomo administration obviously is having very serious discussions as this budget is being put together so it's not just the Patterson administration that is doing the work. It's in very close consultation with the Cuomo administration, so we'll see. That is on the operating side. On the capital side the irony here is that money is still pretty cheap today but they are not lending the money. So interest rates are pretty low but it's rather hard to get that into liquidity so our capital programs. I must say that Iris Weinshall has been doing an extraordinary job in unclogging the pipeline of backlog in projects and now that artery is nice and freshly cleaned but we need more revenue to come through and clog it up again. So we haven't seen that happening yet but that's still an open question. Vague enough as an answer Stefan, but it's not that I am hiding anything, it's just that I don't have any more information. **PROFESSOR BAUMRIN:** You want to tell us anything about what you think Cuomo is likely to have in store for us?

CHANCELLOR GOLDSTEIN: I think he has drawn some lines in the sand. One that is particularly problematic to unions is a cap on property tax and there's been very strong opposition to that. He's taken issue on pension costs. There's an awful lot of pension obligation and a good chunk of it has not been financed and I think he's going to have to deal with that as well. There is an awful lot of unfunded obligations in the State of New York, much more so than I think many people realize and I think that they are going to have to

take this on. I don't see any other way of getting out of the problem.

PROFESSOR PHILIPP: Sandi and I were in an AAUP meeting in Washington. Some of the SUNY folks asked us how does CUNY do it with its construction budget? My answer was, well, we have Iris Weinshall.

CHANCELLOR GOLDSTEIN: Well, thank you. You know CUNY is a managed system and you know we try to do the best that we can with the resources that we have and obviously we need a lot more money.

PROFESSOR CRAIN: It's getting increasingly frustrating to me when my colleagues and everyone else talks about government policies as if with the weather you can't do anything about it because that's what in the cards. We know that there are certain ways the problems could be alleviated if our government would handle them the way we thought Paterson would, even though the very wealthy people have been given tax breaks under the former administration and those taxes could be normalized, we know that there are a couple of wars just draining the money out that could be going into CUNY and all the other social services. Do you agree with me that CUNY could be tackling the larger social context in saying DO something, pushing, do something about these problems that are killing our country, these financial problems that are killing our country rather than accepting the budget as is.

CHANCELLOR GOLDSTEIN: We don't just accept what we are given. Obviously we fight, we advocate, we try to engage as many people as we can. Even if there are somewhat disparate views there is a commonality that we all agree upon, and that this is a poorly funded university that deserves more. I'm going to be giving two major speeches coming up, dealing with re-imagining how to finance public higher education and I think we—and I—agree with you. I would love if we didn't have war in Afghanistan, if we weren't having a war in Iraq, if there was a more equitable way in which wealth was distributed, and so forth and so on. Obviously that would have profound impact on our society. I worry that we have a real national security problem in the United States because of our regression away from support of public education. When I invited 28 of the top leaders in public higher education here, every single one of the higher education leaders was lamenting the same kind of thing that we are saying here tonight and that is unless we wake up and start supporting these institutions that account for over 80% of the students that study for advanced education in the United States, we are going to have a quality of life that is going to be diminished. I am going to be in Abu Dhabi in early February and will look at some of the Emirates and what they are doing in higher education. Having travelled throughout China five or six times and seeing what China has been doing in higher education, and what India has done when I was there last year, it is a true wake up call to what we are not

doing here in the United States. So I agree, I just don't have the magic wand to make it happen.

PROFESSOR PECORINO: I know how hard you've worked to increase the number of full-time faculty in this university and how hard you fought to hold on to them and your dedication to keeping them even in these difficult times. I know that you fully supported in the master plan the goal of a 70/30 percent split between instructional hours taught by full-time versus part-time.

So now I ask you concerning two units of the university. Could we have your assurance that when the New Community College opens, it will have at least 70% taught by full-timers and a plan for how to sustain that? And second, in the School of Professional Studies where undergraduate degrees and master degree programs are now being offered to a number of students that equals some of our smaller senior colleges, the percentages are less than five taught by genuine full-time appointments to that institution. Could something be done to address that since it's an outlier in terms of realizing the Master Plan?

CHANCELLOR GOLDSTEIN: Philip, I have been indefatigable. I have been tireless in the advocacy for full-time faculty from the very first day I walked into the job, and it's still the major theme of this administration to build up the full-time faculty and academic support for full-time faculty. I will continue to do that until the day that I leave this position. The fact is we are in an economy that is very fragile, and I think that the fragility is going to last for several years. We are not going to be able to sustain the level of full-time faculty versus part-time faculty. We just cannot do it. The money is just not there. So we have to make a choice and the choice at least in the short run is to say yes we will continue to hire full-time faculty as aggressively as our budget allows, but it's going to be outpaced by the number of part-time faculty that we are going to have to deploy into the classroom because that is the only way that we can keep up with the large demand. We have to keep this university open to as many people that aspire to get further training so that they can provide opportunities for themselves to compete the jobs that they now cannot compete for. That is something that is morally the right thing to do. Now in the long run, I think that we will turn about but we have to think about that new modalities of instruction. It can't be only professors standing at a lectern or at a blackboard. We have to find ways to utilize technology that we haven't fully embraced in this university and I'm determined to really get that point across. That will help. We also are landlocked in the city. We are not SUNY, which has acres of land they could build on, but we don't. There are very few patches of land left that we can build upon at CUNY. So one strategy is really not going to be available to us, and that is to build more facilities. We are not going to be able to do that. So we have very

limited choices in the short run and that is going to mean more adjunct personnel and utilizing technology in ways better than we have so far.

PROFESSOR GELMAN: I heard about a proposal to establish faculty housing at Stuyvesant Town. Is that true?

CHANCELLOR GOLDSTEIN: Well, yes. We have a plan. Someone is going to say to me, you are buying Stuyvesant Town and we don't have chalk! That is true but we can buy America Bonds and buy stuff, real estate. We have favorable tax benefits as a public institution and because we can demonstrate demand for CUNY faculty. Our lawyers are telling me that we can do it but the politics because this is a very valuable piece of property but the for-profit sector has not figured out how to really do the debt service on something of this magnitude and we believe we can. If indeed we were able to do this deal, this would free up about 400 units a year -- one bedroom apartments, two bedroom apartments. Now I don't think we could utilize that for CUNY but we have had direct conversations with the department of education, which has a lot of teachers. We've had conversations with the fire department and the police department for firemen and policemen who may want to get some of this. If this happens, this will be, to use a tired phrase, a paradigm shift for CUNY.

So that's one thing. But that's the big priced one. The smaller prices we are working with developers throughout the city and finding opportunities for faculty to get low market value units. So far that has proved successful but in a very limited way. I would like to really open this up in a bigger way.

PROFESSOR VOZICK: I have been working in higher education for a long time and I'm listening to you for the last year and sensing what's between the lines. I want to say just from the perspective of the very few adjuncts in this room that as a leader of this university you are doing a quite remarkable job. There is a lot that we need to say that is not being said but I can feel and sense and it's quite extraordinary. So I want to start off with a compliment, I really mean that too. You mentioned this whole point about adjuncts and I'm one of the very few adjunct dealers in this room and probably mostly the only adjunct voice heard in this room, so it's a big responsibility to figure out how to use it wisely. But I heard you say that we were going to continue into the future with adjuncts as a significant part of the mix and certainly for the last three decades adjuncts have been a significant part of the mix. So it seems reasonable for me to enquire how we are going to optimize the effectiveness of adjuncts. And I don't mean to put you on notice if you have to answer a rigorous question and I'm deeply aware of the labor issues associated with it. But there are also educational issues and there are also relationships within the department issues. I'm wondering what you're thinking of doing to work

on this problem of how do we integrate the faculty so that we can get the best possible results out of it? **CHANCELLOR GOLDSTEIN:** Look, we will always rely on adjunct faculty; we need to. Many of our adjuncts are true stars and they chose to be part-time faculty because they have other lives and those are as important or more important for them so we value that. I would start with that premise. For me, full-time faculty is something that has to continue to grow at this university and all of you know the reasons as well as I do. It's hard to integrate part-time faculty as effectively as full-time faculty because they have other obligations in their lives. We do have many part-time faculty that do this as a full-time job. They bounce from one institution to another and you may be in that frame of mind and there are many who like that. It's very hard to integrate them in that same way because their presence is not felt as much as full-time faculty. Full-time faculty are engaged in a plethora of activities, advising, committee work, lots and lots of things that faculty are asked to do on the campus that we don't typically ask part-time faculty to do because we have different expectations. So for that reason and that reason alone, I think it's very hard to integrate part-time faculty as effectively as full-time faculty. I would love if a part-time faculty would hang around more and see students and be much more a part of the fabric of what goes on, on the campus but that's really a choice for them. **PROFESSOR VOZICK:** I just will say that, I hope we are hearing the beginning of some new levels of thought on this. I understand a little how you work. I appreciate your remarks.

PROFESSOR HUBNER: I attended Hunter College and was adjunct for 20 years. I now have a full-time position. When I went to Hunter I paid basically \$200 a semester in tuition and things have changed with that. Open admissions, things are changing with that. The issues of remediation, and a lot things that we talk about in this body seem to be about sort of ad hoc reactions to situations that have come upon us, and from what I've heard you talk about I think you are a man of vision and I just wonder if you could articulate sort of what that vision is for the university as we move forward. **CHANCELLOR GOLDSTEIN:** To be called a visionary...Newton was a visionary, Einstein was a visionary. Look, what I want is something really very simple, I want people to think about coming and studying at this university. I want them to complete their studies. I have bought into the argument that people say, well, they just dropped in and then drop out and that makes them a better person. But there is a big gap between staying the course and getting a degree. Lexa [Logue] is going to talk about this later in the evening. We have too many students that start and never finish and there is a whole variety of reasons and we want to attack that. Some of it is organizational, some of it is managerial, how we manage the campus. And I don't mean management versus labor, I'm just talking about the process of how you engage a student and do the things that you can to keep them going. I want the degree to be a valued degree. I want it to have importance and respect in the community and however you

define the community, whether it's locally or on a more broad basis. I want to be able to attract to this institution the best scholar teachers that we can, I want them to feel connected to the institution, I want them to feel that they can do their very best work and that they are going to be supported in doing their very best work. I want this to be a very vibrant experience for everybody that walks in the door whether they are students or faculty member or people who work in support services to be part of the community. They are all pushing in the same way. Now if you consider that a position, that's fine but that's to me very basic way of me saying I want this to be a pretty terrific place to be. Okay, thank you very much. I've got to run.

CHAIR COOPER: Thank you very much for coming. Okay, you are all well aware of the fact that a report was created on the issue of transfer in CUNY, transfer students. And the authors of the report were invited here this evening to present major findings on the issues that they see in this report. This will be followed by a discussion led by vice chair Terry Martell who started an analysis on behalf of the Executive Committee of the report. We have present with us tonight, the executive vice chancellor and university provost who is now an expert on the New York State Throughway. Having gone up and down it in one day, Lexa Logue and the associate provost of the university, Julia Wrigley, as well as David Crook, who is the university's statistical guru. I apologize for not having all your titles in order in my head. So I'd like to invite Lexa and Julia up here and it's yours. Do what you wish with us.

EVC LOGUE: I think it's sort of the reverse, but okay! Let me start just to follow-up on something the Chancellor said. You should know that in the testimony today that we did in front of the New York State Assembly we said that our top goal at CUNY was to increase full-time faculty and that we wanted the 70/30 distribution. So I want to say that because it's not just the Chancellor saying that; we're going out in public saying that. So I just wanted to emphasize that. So, our office has indeed been working for a good amount of time, at least a year trying to understand what some of the concerns are about what happens when students transfer and how the credit do or don't get counted. And I know that this is a concern to a lot if not all of you also. Many, many faculties are concerned about this. And we had a group of people who did prepare a report which is being distributed to you. I hope you've had a chance to read it. And we were really delighted when Sandi invited us to come and speak with you because we want to hear your comments, we want to get your feedback, and we want to hear what your concerns are and what your ideas are about all of this. I guess I'll try to set out where we think we are. One thing about the report that I found very interesting – Julia was the lead author on the report – is that I finally understood that the way that CUNY as a system decides whether somebody gets credit or not when they transfer is on a course

matching system. That's the way TIPPS works. It's all in course matching whereas many institutions don't do it that way. The way many other institutions do it is if you have taken a course at another institution that is properly accredited, you will get credit when you transfer in. We have not done it that way and so it results in certain things happening. Here's a very simple example. Say one of our colleges teaches Chinese, and a student takes Chinese at that college and then transfers to another one of our colleges that does not teach Chinese but has a requirement for taking a language other than English, it is very possible for the student not to get credit for that course. And we have seen a good number of examples of that. Now, we do have some existing Board policy that has tried to facilitate the transfer of credits, and I think one of the benefits of the report is in the back. It actually gives you all the Board policies because there're a lot of myths about Board policies that I've discovered. People say the Board says this and the Board says that, but you have to go really look at the language because sometimes we're not prevented in doing some things that we're totally prevented from doing. But there is a policy which says that if a student graduates from a community college at CUNY with an AA or an AS degree, and then they transfer to a senior college, basically all their general education gets counted. And as the report puts it, I think this is how they put it, the portfolio is not opened, right? But if a student transfers just one course short of an AA or an AS degree, then everything is opened up and examined. And what that means is that some students will get credit for courses that other students don't get credit for. We're trying to base what we do on data, on actual data, not on impressions although that's important; how people feel about things is important. But when they think it's not impressions of data is what I mean, we like to look at the actual data. And you may be surprised to know that in the senior colleges, every single one of them, over 50% of the students who graduate did not start at that college. Over 50% of them have transferred in from somewhere. You might also be interested to know that we have all different patterns of transfer. Most common, but it's the minority of the total transfers, is community college to senior college. We have everything going on, we have students transferring community to community, senior to senior and more than you would think, senior to community college. Everything's going on, it may be, nationally there's much more transfer going on than there was ten years ago, 20 years ago. It's called swirling, a great term. But we have more than the average nationally probably because we're so close together physically.

One other sort of basic point to this -- we're talking about what we could do in terms of a general education framework, not a core curriculum. A general education framework for the system would allow people to move around the system and get their credits counted more easily than is presently the case. And I just wanted to mention that, because I'm sure some of you are immediately thinking we're working on that on our campus and we want to finish what we're doing, or we just finished it so

why do we have to think of anything again?. A recent survey by the AAC&U, which is a fairly well respected national group, shows that 89% of institutions are working on their general education at any given time. There will never be a moment in time when most of our colleges are not working on general education. So we feel in the central office that an important principle is that students be able to move freely through the system, subject to the admissions criteria of the different colleges. So colleges can decide what kind of students they want to take but once the student is accepted, then that student should not be penalized for having moved from one campus to another. We want to promote our students' access to education resources throughout the system. But at the same time, what's very important to us is to allow as much flexibility in the campuses and as much individuality as possible because we think that's the way the system will evolve the best, if each campus gets to do its own thing basically.

We need to make sure also that general education at CUNY is structured in such a way that students and advisors can understand it and know what the requirements are. In our office we've been spending a lot of time trying to analyze the different core curricula at the different campuses and that has sometimes been challenging to try and figure it out. You may know that most public systems, and it really is most according to the counts that have been done, have moved to some kind of transfer roles or general education framework. In fact, the number of states that have a common core curriculum rose between 2001 and 2010 rose from 23 to 33, and in many cases this has happened in different states because the legislature ordered it.

Now I have to say that when we did our testimony today -- totally out of the blue I promise you, we did not plant it -- the chair of the higher education committee of the Assembly Deborah Glick started asking us about transferring at CUNY and were there any problems, and were all the credits counted? And she said she know that a lot of state legislatures are ordering this, and she thinks it would be good if she didn't have to order us.

Think about this, as we continue to evolve as a system, and remember I said we like the idea that campuses are different, and that campuses have their individual characteristics. If we are basing transfer on a course matching system, the more we differentiate, the fewer the courses that will match. So that's another concern. There's also concern that at some of our colleges, the core curricula have grown larger and larger, and they have grown so large that when a student transfers it's very difficult to satisfy the major and have anything left over. Now this is not the only reason for excess credits when you graduate. It's not; we know that. But it is part of the reason for why our students are graduating with excess credits, which costs them or TAP or somebody extra money. But sometimes they run out of financial aid because of this situation. Also, when students

transfer, because of the course matching, it can take a long time to evaluate the transcript of a student who transfers. You all know that some of your campuses we hear there are problems. During that period, students if they take different course, they may make the wrong choices. Also, during that period, it turns out they may not be able to get TAP, which is a problem. A few more things. So we're thinking about what we could do that might help with this. We are in very early stages. This is very embryonic, but that's why this is a good time for us to talk about it so that we can get a sense of comments, here.

We would not, absolutely not, create a defined core curriculum for the whole system. For example, there is one person who shall go nameless who has already sort of gotten the word to us that that person's discipline course must be in whatever. We don't think we should require any specific courses. We think the campuses should decide and faculties should decide what courses should be part of a general education framework. We are thinking that such a framework should have a limit on the total numbers of credits, that it might be divided up into big categories, like humanities, social sciences. Then within those categories the campuses could figure out which courses they found would fit in those categories. The categories would be defined according to learning outcomes that were set by faculty, by a CUNY-wide faculty group. And we would try to make the proportions of this thing as similar as possible to the existing core curricula that are at the campuses -- although that's hard, because they're so different. Well, not totally different. But there are some significant differences, which is one of the reasons students have problems when they try to move from one campus to another.

We've been looking at a lot of the ways other states have done this. One way it's been done is that when a campus thinks it wants to put a course in Category "X," say humanities, there is then a system-wide faculty committee that reviews the materials about that course to see that, yes, this does satisfy the learning outcomes specified for the category and whether it qualifies as an appropriate college-level course. So in this way the faculty maintains control over the curriculum, over the standards, and also then you can access against those learning outcomes. And faculty would also maintain control over that.

I should say, though, this general education framework, the total number of credits, to be right out there, would probably be smaller than is presently the case at many of our campuses. I don't want to leave that out. Because the idea would be that students at the community colleges should be able to do all or most of it, plus their major, at the community college.

VOICE: The introductory courses, you mean?

EVC LOGUE: Yes. You may think that shouldn't be hard, but the core curricula at our campuses range up to 63 credits. So you can see that it would be very difficult for a community college student to do that and his or her major in the community college. There are lots of things I'm sure you're immediately thinking about. How would this work? For example, there is the fact that almost all the senior colleges require a language other than English. And there's very little of that at the community colleges. That's a problem. We would like whatever we do to be made flexible enough so that campuses can use the work they've been doing on their core curriculum as part of this. We would like College Now be aligned with this so that high school students first of all would get assessed to see whether they were ready for college-level work. If they weren't, they would get catch-up courses. So in other words, doing the remediation in high school as opposed to with us. No credits for that. And it should be paid for by the DOE.

But if they were assessed as being ready for college-level courses and they took College Now credit-bearing courses, those should be courses that are part of the general education framework because right now kids in College Now are taking a bunch of courses that when they end up in a senior college they're not getting counted, or they're getting elective credit for them. And we're paying for that. So we would, if we could decrease students' excess credits this way, we could speed their graduation and thus speed them on to further education or employment. We would spend less per graduate. We would use our physical facilities more efficiently. Some of our recruiters would be very interested in this concept, student recruiters, because the idea is they could, when they're recruiting high school students, say there's one general education framework for all of CUNY and you can start at one campus; you could move to another, et cetera. Also, if we had a somewhat general education requirement, then students could do double majors more easily than they can now at many of our campuses. So anyway these are some of the thoughts we're having. And, what have I left out, Julia?

ASSOCIATE UNIVERSITY PROVOST JULIA WRIGLEY: There's a lot of elements that go into thinking about transferring at CUNY. And one issue is, I think, that transfer at CUNY has never been systematically addressed. And so the colleges have developed their own curricula and frameworks and approaches, and then they individually examine each course in this course matching system, and it does lead to a lot of variation in how courses are assessed by the different colleges. And that means it's very difficult for students to know what they can count upon. The system is not at all transparent. I would say that gen ed is not particularly transparent. For example, at the senior colleges, it generally constitutes defined block courses in some fashion. And you can go on the Web and see what those course are. At the community colleges, gen ed

tends to be by degree programs and it will tell you these are the courses in that program. And so it means that it's a little difficult. A student, when they arrive at a community college, behaviorally they don't know exactly what gen ed to take, unless they are already ensconced in some degree program. And so that's a lot to ask of a student. The way a lot of other universities approach this is gen ed comes first, and the students explore a little bit a range of subjects, including subjects unavailable to them in high school -- linguistics, or sociology, or philosophy, or psychology. So it's good to have gen ed open intellectual doors for students before they have to settle on a degree program. Our thought is that we could create a system that would be easier for students to navigate, and it would just make the whole pattern clearer to people.

We've done it up until now by articulation agreements. But these tend to be very faulty, because they get out of date very easily. You know, one college, they change their curriculum and they forget to tell their partner colleges in their articulation agreement about it, and it's often not the responsibility of any one particular or designated individual. So they just get more and more outdated. I think in the transfer report we actually looked at the dates of the articulation agreements that are found in TIPPS and we found that a lot of them are pretty old. They've been sitting around for a long time, and one would imagine they're not particularly up to date.

So instead of having all these bilateral arrangements, our thought is it would work better if we had a clearer, simpler system, where a broader range of courses -- it's what Lexa said, really -- if you take a course at a CUNY college and then the other colleges should give full faith and credit to that course, unless there's some particular reason for finding that course to be faulty. I mean, remedial courses should not receive credit. But beyond that, we think that students should be able to progress. Let me say one word about excess credit. That's a complicated issue because there are many things which feed into students' acquiring excess credits. But where we see the most excess credits so far is by students getting the AAS degree. And this degree has really evolved over time. It began as a career degree, where you weren't expected to transfer. But across the country, not just at CUNY, it is now a transfer degree. A third of the graduates with an AAS degree transfer. So this is a big block of students. AAS degrees are also common degrees at our community colleges. There are big programs where students receive AAS degrees. But practice hasn't caught up with the evolution of these degrees, so these students tend to have quite limited numbers of gen ed credits. If they graduate with that degree, they have 60 credits but they're not really the best kinds of credits for them as they move on into the senior colleges. And so these are often the students who really come with the least academic background. And I found, when I did some focus groups, that students didn't realize, even when they had the AAS degree, they didn't fully realize the implications of taking that degree,

compared to, say, the AS degree. It's not totally clear. You can look for a long time on our websites to find any clear explanation of what those distinctions are.

So our thought is, we don't want our students to be befuddled, and we could think more about what we could do, as the Chancellor said, at a broadly defined managerial level, just operational level, we could look again at our system and how we could improve it, simplify it, make it more straightforward.

CHAIR COOPER: If you don't mind, at this point, I think we should move on and have the response from the Executive Committee and hold your questions. Is that all right? Terry Martell, the vice chair of the UFS, is going to present a response to this report.

PROFESSOR MARTELL: Who could be against that, right? I mean, you just heard two professionals clearly interested in the students articulate some very nice proposals and ideas. My view is that curriculum belongs to the faculty, and if we're going to bring a systemic look at transfer credits and transfer issues, we ought to do that based on some facts and substance. I want to talk a little bit about the report, here. I want to thank the office for bringing this to our attention. It's a significant issue for CUNY and to that end they should be commended. CUNY, like any other university system, could do a far better job, of developing articulation units, of communicating, and this is important, to community college students the requirements and ongoing implications of particular choices and of reviewing transcripts of transfer students in a more timely way.

However, several recommendations in this report are problematic. The data contained in the report simply, in my view, does not support the recommendations. More significantly, there is data that could have been and should have been in the report, like graduation rates, but are not there. In fact, what is indeed striking about the report is that in many cases the recommendations are not backed up by the data.

By the way, I did this, right, for the Executive Committee. No one has reviewed it yet. I know it's going too hard for you to believe, but I could be wrong! I had to recreate all the data, I had to look at a lot of stuff, and I want some of my colleagues to look at this. It's seven pages, with about 12 Power Point slides, and I'll be happy to distribute it as soon as somebody says, Terry, you didn't make any really stupid mistakes. All right? That's why it's not out there now.

The first recommendations I find problematic is: general education should be standardized in terms of number of credits and division into broad curricula areas. Now, I don't want to repeat what the

recommendation says, but I'll highlight something. Under this model, and I'm quoting: "Students could, for example, meet social science requirements by selecting courses among those offered in anthropology, sociology, political science or other science fields at their particular campuses." In other words, we're going to group courses and take one from the list.

And the report also recommends that if this model were adopted it would apply to all students, native and transfer. Then there's a recommendation that we should establish disciplinary groups to identify the five most common courses taken as pathways, and those would be the pathways, without any articulation and without any specific faculty agreement within the particular disciplines, at a college level. I find that problematic. I also find problematic that you could accept courses for which there are no equivalent courses. And I highlighted a course in Chinese should not be rejected because the receiving college does not teach Chinese. The implications of that could be narrow, and could be pretty wide, and I don't like the implications without a lot more further and full discussion.

These recommendations have significant implications for curriculum selections in individual colleges. What are the drivers of these recommendation? In the review the report suggests that there are three: cost to students, particular information about individual courses at particular colleges, and three focus groups comprised who students who "had already acquired more than 120 credits, but had not graduated." Let me discuss each of these in turn.

The report on page 18 estimates the total cost of excess credits to be \$72.5 million. That's a lot of money. I'd like to take a look at that in more detail. This [referring to image on projections screen] is the original data from an appendix to the report: Improving Student Transfers at CUNY, and you see down there, \$72 million. That's a big number. Let's do the next one. Excess credits for first time freshmen cannot be characterized as a transfer issue. A freshman joining a particular high school, college, graduating from that college, all right, who had taken excess credits, does it for a reason other than issues associated with transfer. Maybe they changed majors. Maybe they decided they don't want to be an accounting major just because their father said they had to be. Right? Maybe, like me, who started off as a history major, and then strayed into a much more lucrative field, for which I thank Ben Weissman, who pushed me in that appropriate direction some 40 years ago.

All right, so let's look at that, let's take that out. There's the new number. Fifty-five. Let's go to the next one.

Senior colleges cannot be expected to have articulation agreements or, frankly, any other kind of agreement with non-CUNY

colleges. This is a report about CUNY colleges and CUNY transfers. There they go. Down to \$38 million.

Okay, let's go to the next one. There is no meat on my bones. It's just numbers, right? "Unknown sources" are not likely to be other CUNY high schools. We know that data problems exist here but go with my assumption. Go with my assumption. Out. Down to \$28 million. We're making progress.

"Internal transfers", that's the next one. Let's go. Internal transfers are transfers within a comprehensive college. Now, that seems to me to be a college-specific issue and not a CUNY transfer issue. Take that away. What do we got now? \$20.8 million.

We've gotten rid of how much? \$51.7 million. If this were an auction we'd be doing good. Next slide. Remember the first one? First time freshmen did seven excess credits, approximately two courses. Okay. Could that be for reasons of intellectual interest? Could that be for reasons of changing a major? Could that be for reasons of running into a particular professor in philosophy and wanting to take a second course? There are innumerable reasons why freshmen might take an extra course. Let's take that seven and say that's intellectual curiosity.

Let's assume the transfer students come in with two years. We know they come in perhaps with more, but let's say two years. I want to give them a course for intellectual curiosity. Give them a course. We're changing the mean of the excess credits to reflect basically a little over a course for intellectual curiosity. What does that do to the numbers?

Down to \$13.4 million. That's still a significant amount of money, but it's \$13.4 million. Now, we've gotten this number down from \$72 million, to \$13.4 million. Still something to worry about.

But now I want to raise another issue. What does excess course exactly mean? Excess course to whom? And depending on how you look at that number, those numbers change and the significance changes.

To CUNY, spreading 31,000 credits over 11 baccalaureate granting degrees with thousands of courses, perhaps someplace an extra adjunct would perhaps, an extra adjunct would pop up, but I would argue that that cost is *de minimis*.

Well, what about the students? Well, with our unusual pricing policy, the marginal cost of an incremental course, once you're full-time, is in fact, zero. In the 2009 data that I had, approximately 30.3 % of CUNY undergraduates were part-time. So if you take 13 million times 30%, you

get to \$4 million.

Now, I'm not sneezing at \$4 million. Four million dollars is nice, but it's not \$72 million. So my question is, why would we start off with \$72 million? My concern is that when we start off with a number floating around like \$72 million, that's a big problem and it calls for big solutions. Maybe it doesn't call for such a sweeping conclusion. All right?

With regard to the second driver: if there are issues with particular courses in particular colleges, they should be fixed. Articulation agreements are designed to address this kind of problem. Improve the TIPPS system, by all means. However, the three recommendations I already mentioned are not needed to address these problems.

Then there are the focus groups. To better understand why there are the variations in the number of excess credits across CUNY colleges, three focus groups of transfer students were interviewed. Not surprisingly, if you interview students with more than 120 credits, who had not yet graduated, you will find many interesting stories. And I include in my report a whole paragraph, the whole enchilada, that discusses this.

I'm going to summarize some things. Students were asked about their views on how they had generated excess credits. They provided a range of answers, including having changed majors, and needing to take more courses to bring up their grade point average. And then we have a whole bunch of other issues that I think you really ought to read because they're interesting, but they're not germane to what I want to say. Okay?

We have two pages of text, and then we have a discussion. One thing that came across strongly, though, was that these students had not acquired these credits through a simple desire to explore academic byways. When they changed majors, it was simply because they had trouble meeting requirements, especially math requirements, in their first one. They sometimes got stuck trying repeatedly to pass a particular required course. They noted that once they had a lot of credits, it was especially hard to raise their GPA.

Now, first of all, this is an amazing amount of information to glean from three focus groups. One could easily conclude that our transfer students changed majors because they cannot do math. I'm only being a little bit facetious here, all right? And they take excess credits because they need to raise their GPA, and they don't have "a simple desire to explore academic byways."

Now, it's absolutely critical that you pay attention and listen to that, okay? Because the report, brilliantly in my view, tries to maneuver

around a very key question. Do any of our students take excess credits because they're intellectually curious? Do any of our students take excess credits because they like a particular faculty member? Do any of our students take excess credits because they've grown, matured, changed and realized that there are more things in life besides history. Sorry!

Now, I understand why it's important to reach a conclusion that all credits are excess and no credits are taken because the student is engaged in intellectual pursuits. Because the report does not control for it. And if the Chancellor was here, and I hate to put words in his mouth, but I would ask him, as a statistician, what happens when you don't control for a key variable? The report does not attempt to control for the existence of intellectual growth, or curiosity among our transfer students, even though there is a reliable, readily available, though crude, proxy variable, okay?

By the way, I like this report. I'm singling out recommendations that I think need to be seriously thought about before we move down that path. This is a report that's going to launch a thousand ships, all right? Before those ships get going, I want people to think about some of the issues. There are four other recommendations in this report point that I'm not even raising, which we *ought* to move forward on. So this is an important piece of work, and I think it's artfully done to maneuver around issues that simply are not addressed.

I went and looked at the graduation data. If the concern is the cost of transfer fees or excess credits, then where is the discussion of the transfer graduation fees? If excess credits are a concern, then the four-year transfer graduation rate should be below the six-year graduation rate.

There's the four-year graduation rate. The reason 2003 is used is because it corresponds to June 2009. That's the six-year freshman graduation rate, and you can see it ranges from 60.3% at Baruch, down to 5.3% percent at Medgar Evers, with numbers varying in between.

What about the four-year transfer graduation rate? Now, if you look at this, in each case, what do you see?

GROUP: Higher rates.

PROFESSOR MARTELL: Higher rates. In all cases, higher; in some cases, multiples higher. In most cases, if we saw this percentage increase, we'd put out a press release. Right? So, in no way should we consider these anything less than significant differences. Interestingly, the report acknowledges this higher student transfer graduation rate: "Students who take on the challenge of moving from one college to another tend to be determined and persistent, qualities that are reflected in their somewhat

higher graduation rates, than students who begin at CUNY community colleges.” Well, I question what “somewhat” means, but after that sentence on page one, graduation rates do not show up again. All right.

So what do we do here? I wanted to look at some data, so I computed the mean four-year transfer graduation rate, and the difference for each college from that mean. I computed, and this was not so easy to do, I computed the general education requirements for each of the 11 baccalaureate colleges, right? And if there were choices, I used the higher number, right? So I wanted the bias toward the higher number. I then took the means of those, and the differences for each of those. And there they are. All right? And then I did a simple correlation, understand, simple correlation, small sample, lots of issues. Correlation coefficient is, what? Point four seven. What does that mean? Next one.

Higher graduation rates are associated with higher number of required general education credits. Next one. Lower graduation rates are associated with lower numbers of required graduation credits.

Let’s go. Here’s your bar chart. That looks pretty. The next one. Here’s a scatter diagram. I plotted the number of courses required, the difference in the number of courses required by college, against the graduation rates. And, it looks like you got a line right through the middle in the axis, right? I mean, that’s kind of looks like, we could argue about it, but there certainly seems to be some relation.

I understand correlation is not causality, but I also understand: ignore the picture at your own peril. There are things going on that may lead to higher required numbers of courses that also appear to be positively associated with rapidity with which you get through the program. And that rapidity of course is the bigger driver of tuition cost and the opportunity cost of lost income. If something occurs that extends graduation rates, it has two costs associated with it. One is the direct tuition of cost and the second, and certainly larger, is the opportunity cost foregone by now being able to be employed. Those would dwarf the \$4 million that I show. They would dwarf the \$72 million that I showed.

My conclusion is, there is insufficient data in this report, in my view, to support a wholesale re-jiggling of general core requirements, because I think more analysis needs to be done.

Now, again, I do not want to be critical, seriously. You put something on paper, you put it out there, it’s out there and you’ve got, you know, and it’s not so easy to get some of these done. There are significant issues with transfer policy. We should be working on them. But I’m not prepared to concede right now that the solution to that is pick one out four

courses, history, sociology, anthropology, psychology. I don't want to go there and I don't want to go down that path unless there's convincing, compelling evidence that would support it. I don't see that evidence.

After this get reviewed by my colleagues, I will be happy to distribute this. Thank you.

CHAIR COOPER: One more short report from a member of the Executive Committee, and then we're open. This is Emily Tai, History, Queensborough.

PROFESSOR TAI: First of all, on my own campus of Queensborough Community College, we do have a foreign language requirement. And some of the things that happen around that articulation process we have to mediate with our senior colleagues. But we do that. We sit down in articulation agreements and we make some very successful ones, which is one of the reasons I came at this issue with a certain bias towards faculty-mediated articulation agreements between particular campuses as an optimal way of addressing the problem that does exist.

Another point is I just wanted to refer to our colleague, Dean Savage, didn't you do some research about how well the students were doing at Queens? Could you summarize that in a sentence?

PROFESSOR SAVAGE: I constructed a list of students who started at Queensborough or Nassau, or LaGuardia, who graduated with honors, 3.5 or better, and I ship it to people like yourself at the community colleges, who hopefully circulate it widely.

PROFESSOR TAI: Yes, and we had students who often finished in better shape than students who had started at Queens as freshmen. So that was something that was very gratifying to us. Not a surprise when you looked at some of the names. But the other thing that I found very striking in the transfer report, was the modeling around two particular university systems that were mentioned as sort of things that CUNY might like to look at as models. One of them was SUNY, and one of them was Georgia. And so I spent my weekend tooling about on the Internet but I couldn't even figure out the SUNY system. Didn't make any sense to me at all. I mean, the thing is you go in and you put in the name of the course, and then you try and get the senior campus. And things pop up, but never the name of a particular course, and for the life of me, I don't know how faculty advisors on SUNY campuses figure this out in order to advise their students properly. And I'm going to go back and speak to some of our SUNY community college colleagues, but at the moment I'm completely baffled.

The University of Georgia system was a little bit easier to

figure out, but equally disquieting. They've organized six learning goals, as learning outcomes that are then become these umbrella areas into which what they call sub-learning goals are comprehended. So they have a learning goal E, which is Social Sciences, which comprehends in its learning outcome, I'm just reading from the website: Students have the ability to describe how historical, economic, political and spatial relationships develop, persist and change. Students have the ability to articulate the complexity of human behavior as a function of the community and diversity within groups. So if I understand correctly, this is a learning goal that comprehends the fields of history, political science, economics, and geography. The difficulty is it eats six credits. Six credits. So that would be disquieting. Now, it should be disquieting to everybody but me, because I'm an historian and I think everybody should really be learning history. So then I went back and I looked more on the website, and the website talks about the possible courses you can take to fulfill this learning goal. And guess what, they're all history courses. They're history courses in U.S. history, in one semester and two semester increments; Western Civ, one semester, two semester flavor; World Civ, one semester, two semester flavor. However, then, I'm not done, the learning goals that are the sub-field of E, are as follows: the U.S. Perspective, students understand the history of the U.S. and can see the effect of this history on contemporary culture. And there's a whole lot, a whole bunch of bullets after that.

Then the second one is Global Perspective, which talks about students' becoming engaged and informed global citizens, although with nary a mention of history. And then, finally, a really, really long one, Learning Goal III, Critical Thinking.

So all of that in six credits, basically taking two history survey courses when you're going to barrel through at best the 250 years of American history and, at worst, heavens knows how many millennia of world history, and you're going to do this in six credits. And then, never mind learning economics and sociology, or geography, or political science, except in the way in which, you know, as historians we like to think those are comprehended in the field of history!

The entirely partisan part of me thinks to myself, well, of course, CUNY faculty can do better than that. But the real substantive issue is one that I think should be the takeaway here, which is that when you create interdisciplinary categories for learning outcomes, it's not just that you slight disciplines, it's that you slight genuine areas of knowledge that our students need to have control over if they are to become informed political citizens, and skilled practitioners of whatever field they choose, even if it's—economics!

EVC LOGUE: Let me just say that despite what you might

think, we really do appreciate these comments. They're very useful. This is the first we had heard any of these comments. We very much look forward to seeing the written version of Professor Martell's remarks. Oh, thank you. I thought it wasn't to be released until—

PROFESSOR MARTELL: It's not released by you!

EVC LOGUE: OK...it might not surprise you that some of the things we kind of disagree a little bit with! Let me just point out one thing, the tables, the one on the graduation rates of the freshman versus the transfers. There's a problem in the way you analyzed the data there because you were comparing people who started as freshmen and their graduation rates with transfer students. You need to compare juniors who started as freshmen and their graduation rates with transfer students or something comparable, the same number of credits.

PROFESSOR MARTELL: Whoa...the six year graduation rate for freshmen and the four year graduation rate for transfers should both equate to - -

EVC LOGUE: Okay, but with freshmen, some people drop out the first year. Sophomore year, more people drop out. So that's already happened with the transfer students.

PROFESSOR MARTELL: Right.

EVC LOGUE: Right, but it hasn't happened with the ones when you take a freshman cohort.

PROFESSOR MARTELL: Right.

EVC LOGUE: So you need to take a cohort of people who, say, have had 60 credits at their native college and are still there and compared their graduation rates to transfer students who came in with 60 credits. And when you do that, you will find a much higher graduation rate in your native students than you did if you do it that way. So anyway, I'll just mention that one and now other questions, comments?

PROFESSOR REMLER: I want to talk again about the excess credits because I think there was something implicit in what Terry was saying that wasn't explicit. That's a concern. I think we all agree that the goal of an education is students who have skills and knowledge, communication ability, numeracy, analytical thinking, as well as knowledge of their specific major. And the unfortunate fact, I think we don't all agree on, is that many of our students are behind where we would like them to be. And that's not just things that they can make up with developmental

learning. There are much more serious levels of being behind. And this focus on excess credit I think has the implicit idea that those students can magically make up this time. It takes more time to catch up. One of the most difficult things I see in students is they “have to” finish in a certain amount of time and they're trying to make up for years of lack of learning. So I think trying to push a system where you don't have people taking more time where they take courses and develop their communications and their numeracy and their analytical thinking and so on is mistaken, and that if we push too hard, the final amount of education could be compromised. I think that was implicit in what Terry said but I really wanted to make it explicit.

EVC LOGUE: In looking at the data, some of our most selective colleges -- where the students are coming in the most prepared -- have as many excess credits as anywhere else . There are examples of large majors, which when the major is combined with the core curriculum, the total number of credits is just about seven short of the total number of credits for the degree. So it's very easy in a situation like that to go over.

PROFESSOR REMLER: Yes. I'm not saying there aren't other things to work on. I think that's wonderful. But I think that just because people who are admitted to some of the most select senior colleges don't have the room...we all know we have very crude admissions criteria. There are many things about students and what they know that we can't see in their grades and their SATs.

EVC LOGUE: You know we could say that all of our students should have 140 credit degrees. We haven't done that. That's not what the State wants. It's 120 credit degree and that's what financial aid will pay for. So I think it's our job to try to get the education in, in 120 credits.

PROFESSOR TALARICO: One point I'd like to make that I didn't see in either one of the reports: when TIPPS was originally instituted and I was involved in that as the chair of the department because we had to do the evaluation of the courses from all the other CUNY campuses, one of the things that I don't see taken into consideration in these reports is the fact that in a lot of instances where we wanted to be able to accept certain courses as applicable toward either our Gen Ed, or in our case the foreign language majors, we weren't allowed to because our college didn't have the right preface in SIMs in order to be able to – well, you gave the example of the Chinese course that one college offers it, another college doesn't. **EVC LOGUE:** That's the whole course matching system. **PROFESSOR TALARICO:** Yes. So we wound up having to designate courses as blanket credit, general elective—which we didn't necessarily want to do. But we had to because they said, "Well, the system won't allow it." I mean I think we need to look at the system and I fear for what CUNYFirst has in store for us.

PROFESSOR BRASS: I am in the school of engineering and so it seems to be a slightly different world because we have much less general education, and so I am worried about a proposal of some general rule about the amount of general education which would blow up our curriculum. And so we're suggesting that students in the beginning of their studies should spread out and do many different general education things. We preach to all of our students that it is important to get involved with their subject, their major, and to join a research group and if the students spend all the beginning years doing things unrelated to their major, then they don't have the qualification to get involved with anything and everyone's speaking about STEM education says how important it is, and undergraduate research, and so I think that this is a bad idea to tell them to take first all the liberal arts stuff.

EVC LOGUE: What some systems have done because of that sort of comment is to have different general education requirements if you're a STEM major. And so that's something for us to think about.

PROFESSOR CRAIN: I think more credits could be given to the students who are coming into the senior colleges. I think that really could be done. But I have a governance question. The idea of CUNY Central deciding things like divisions and the size of the general education and the learning outcomes -- I don't think you can do that, I don't think you can mandate that. You could make recommendations but I think each campus's faculty has the authority to determine its own curriculum and also the amount of credits toward graduation and so on. If CUNY Central thinks that they're going to do that, there's going to be a legal fight over that because I the local campus autonomy with respect to the faculty determining the curriculum has to be maintained.

EVC LOGUE: Well, we won't do anything we can't do.

MR. CRAIN: Okay. But you could make recommendations but I don't think you can try to unify the system. I don't think that's a good idea to try to unify the system.

EVC LOGUE: As I said, our goal is to allow as much flexibility and individuality as possible but not have the students be penalized.

PROFESSOR COWAN: I was very pleased to see this report when it came out. When we discussed it in the CUE Council, the same figure of \$72 million generated a lot of discussion as well. I wanted to point out one thing in response to Professor Tai's comments which is that we've just spent ten years or so around the campus employing different models of

Gen Ed, distribution models, core models, and so if I understand you correctly, that work is now being swept away? **EVC LOGUE:** No.

PROFESSOR COWAN: We're talking about a larger kind of framework?

EVC LOGUE: Right. **PROFESSOR COWAN:** So I wanted to sort of emphasize that. I also wanted to say that I think getting away from the course by course evaluation is obviously a wonderful idea. Certainly I've dealt with plenty of, if I may, intractable department chairs who just patently refused to take courses from such institutions as Harvard which was one I came across, which was rather comical. But I wanted to say one of the issues that comes out of the report that I think is sort of crucial is math. It seems that we've spent a lot of time and energy around the university in the last ten years or so looking at English and developmental English and composition and trying to get students to attack that immediately, but it seems that we haven't had the same systemic emphasis on math. It's been kind of fragmentary. In some places, people are doing it but for example, at my campus at Kingsborough, we find students who are almost done who are in the honors program who haven't even done their basic math yet. And so I'm wondering if there is going to be a more systemic push to get students to do their math right off the bat because nationally and locally, we know the ramifications of this. **EVC LOGUE:** We're working on that right now. There's another report, which I've given to Sandi. Didn't I give it to you, the math remediation report? Okay. Well, I'll give you that one, too. One of the recommendations in it is students should start their math right away and they should proceed with no breaks. And we've been working closely with the Math Discipline Council on these things. They're very much in agreement. We're going to be doing some other things. We're going to be allowing students who take the Compass to use a calculator, but that's a whole long story. But we are working a lot on math. We've actually had a big initiative on math for the past couple years. Maybe it hasn't reached you but we have ten quasi-experimental studies going on at different campuses looking at techniques to improve math education. We're looking at the policies that move student through math and we're trying to do a lot. But--and I'm heartened by your interest in that subject.

PROFESSOR VOZICK: On your trip to Albany, I congratulate you. And I want to just remind folks, the historians, that in Albany in 1759, there was an Albany plan of union put out by the founding fathers, after extended conversation with the Haudenosaunee, who were the people of the long house. We call them the Iroquois. They call themselves the Haudenosaunee, who understood about confederation between different types of people to produce a union, which lead to the United States. We have analogous problems within our university and I think you're trying to tackle them and I congratulate you on that. Now I think we have an issue here with all the numbers about excess costs and excess credits, which has gotten so much attention here, and I believe that it's being handled with good intent. But on the other hand, I do think that the numbers become

misleading because they lead us, because we see numbers, to emphasize the quantitative and have excess confidence instead of real understanding. And the issues that we're dealing with are extremely human and most complex. I did a program on personal biology and academic biology in two colleges in my courses to try to find out what my students were experiencing at the same time as when they were learning. And the issues that came up were deaths in the family, I'm serious, sickness--personal sicknesses, right, extreme economic problems, huge psychological--I'm talking about a third to half of my class was going through traumatic lives and one normally might not know that. And so I'm saying therefore we have to proceed with great, how to say it, spiritual caution to not let our intellectual skills dominate our understanding. In the early days of understanding ecology, there was something created called the law of unintended consequences. If you try to make a change in an ecosystem, you discover that things that you didn't expect will happen and I think that is a thing for us to keep in mind. And lastly I want to say on the adjunct issue, the adjuncts are extremely important in this area because they have the majority of face to face contact with the students. And the adjuncts, as to the best of my knowledge, are widely ignorant about the whole range of issues you're discussing. There's nothing in their training. There's no support for them about this. There's no recognition that it's better for the university if they know more about it. There's very little sensibility. The courses become made more rigid in order to make transfer more easy. I understand the logic of that but it cuts into our balance between education and training. There are a lot of different issues here that require a deeper level of inquiry than I've heard so far, although I respect all the players.

PROFESSOR CONWAY: Point of order. I'd like to find out if there's a way, going forward, that we can, *a la* Twitter, limit questions to a certain number of "characters"? **CHAIR COOPER:** We did have such a rule. It seems to be honored more in the breach than in the recognition.

PROFESSOR AUGUST: All around the country we know that students change their majors many times before they know where they're going. Well, students who enter community college don't have the faintest idea of what college is or a major is or anything. They're forced to declare a major immediately and begin courses in those majors. And then they find out they can't take the courses. That's not what they want. They didn't know. And a lot of the excess courses that they take are attributed to that but also, they're also not that useful. They don't teach them how to write. They don't teach them how to do math. And I just wonder why it's so necessary for them to declare a major? **EVC LOGUE:** We actually do not agree with that and we think that's something we can get changed, right?

ASSOCIATE UNIVERSITY PROVOST JULIA WRIGLEY:
It's actually not a regulation. A CUNY regulation does not require

declaring a major. **PROFESSOR AUGUST:** Well, if that understanding could possibly be communicated to the people at the colleges. **CHAIR COOPER:** May I just interrupt? When community colleges were created in the 1950s, one of the first individuals who set one up was Morris Meister, who had been principal of Bronx Science, and he made it clear to people that there were two reasons. One was for late bloomers, and the other was for two year completion programs to get into the work force. There was no mention of majors in any of them. It was never my understanding that there should be majors. Now I could be wrong about that but I'm talking historically.

PROFESSOR AUGUST: The second thing is these articulation agreements. I've been involved with a new linguistics program that we put into our community college which is terrific for the students. They like it but for each course, we need a separate articulation agreement with every single college and we just can't do it. So the students become penalized when they take these courses. It just doesn't seem useful for anybody to have that kind of system.

PROFESSOR MCCORMICK: Have you addressed any of the non-academic extra credits that some community college students accrue in terms of internships, co-ops and those sorts of things--that often are not transferrable to the four year schools? **EVC LOGUE:** I guess no, we haven't looked at that. **PROFESSOR MCCORMICK:** I was just curious. Then my other point is on your comparison chart between the six-year graduation rate. Does that presume that the students that started at a community college got through community college and entered a four-year school within two years? So it doesn't include the ones that might be three or four years? **PROFESSOR MARTELL:** That's correct. **PROFESSOR MCCORMICK:** Okay. Also, while I completely agree that many students take extra courses because they find something that inspires them, I also see the opposite which is where students who feel that they may be passionate about something are hesitant to explore it because they don't want to take the extra course. So that--to me, that argues in favor of a little bit more flexibility to take a class that doesn't end up going anywhere. So that's just the other side of the coin.

PROFESSOR PECORINO: We heard mention of a degree of underpreparedness among some of our students. They can enter our community colleges and satisfy all the credits, form a close relationship with a professor who becomes their advisor, and totally sincerely they want to become an A, B or C, and that professor says, "You know, as you go onto the four year college, although you've got all these courses, you in particular really need this course and this course." "But professor, I've already satisfied my requirements in column G." "I know but you could really use these courses if you wanted to get going quickly with a solid

foundation and succeed at the four-year college."

If we put the phrase "excessive," meaning over and above, it's got a negative connotation. It really does. And I've seen cases where excessive is quite justified. So without an analysis that would separate, for lack of a better word at this time, the bad excessive from the good excessive, I can't accept just because it's excessive that it's something that we need to start launching ships to go and defeat. Thank you.

EVC LOGUE: Okay. I'll just say I think we're hearing a diversity of opinions here that have to do with flexibility, versus required, versus exploration, versus you need to take *this* because you will learn this. These are always the discussions about the subject.

PROFESSOR MOORE: I'm a counselor so I do advise students. The fact that students that get their degree at a two-year college, at a community college, versus the students that attend a two-year college or a community college and don't get their degree, and the fact that their courses are evaluated so differently is just I think a basic question of unfairness. It's not right for courses to be accepted as satisfying the requirements or the Gen Ed requirements in one case and not the other. And it's logically inconsistent as well.

PROFESSOR SAVAGE: I really like the report, and it's a problem that I've been concerned with for some time myself. When I looked at the number of Queens College students who had more than 120 credits who were still enrolled in the college last fall, there were more than 1,000. So I checked every semester and there it was. And so, Terrence, you make a mistake when you talk about every student may be taking just one extra course. Half of our students are out of there on 120. They're out the door. You look at the others, you'd see 140, 150, 160 credits. Those people need help. That's where the concept of opportunity cost really becomes important.

But there's one other thing that had not been included in this report, a little surprising to me, and that is did anybody go ahead and look at what the consequences were of having taken certain course of study at the two-year colleges for success in the four-year colleges? One of the reasons why a lot of colleges don't accept certain courses is they say that's not our course. It's not good enough. Our students really are not going to be able-- those students are not going to be able to perform. There was no analysis of this. So I'll offer, for whatever it's worth, my own attempt to resolve this question with a group of people who are majoring in the field of sociology. And what I found, I took a whole bunch of students and I did several hundred. I went through transcripts. I almost became Cliff Adelman in terms of losing my eyeballs to transcript analysis, and what I found was

that it didn't seem to make very much difference. Now our major is not a heavily sequenced one but in any case, what completely swamped the whole question was the quality of the student. We have an incredible range of students at Queens College. We have people who could be attending very selective colleges and we have people who are somehow going to manage to ooze through in a way that really I don't even want to think about it some days. And what happens is if you get the good students, they can go through the courses. I found one person taking all four required sociology courses in the same semester and they got B average in everything.

EVC LOGUE: Actually we have looked at the kind of thing you're talking about in another context, and I'd like to explain that and, also, tell you a little story. The other day I was at a meeting that had a good number of presidents at it. One of them who was a senior college president. We started on this transfer subject and one of them who's a senior college president said, "The problem is that when students come to us from one of the community colleges, their courses they've taken just aren't taught with the same amount of rigor as they are at our college." And this president happened to be sitting next to a community college president who we practically had to restrain from strangling the first president. Arguing had started and loud voices and so I said, "May I contribute some data to this discussion?" And they said, "Yes." So I said we had done an analysis in math because math is easier to see because it's sequential. And what this analysis showed is that—now this is on average across the whole system—if a student is taking calculus at a senior college and you look and you see how the students do in calculus depending on whether they took the preceding course, which would be college algebra, from a community college and transferred in, or whether they took college algebra at that senior college, it turns out that the students who took it at the community college, on average, do better. So all right. One piece of data with one discipline.

PROFESSOR BAUMRIN: I'm particularly concerned about the question of faculty groups allegedly deciding on learning goals unless the faculty governance leaders or the university faculty senate determine those groups and not the central administration. The question of shaping the future curriculum of the university, which is what have we been talking about, really depends if you intend to adhere to the decisions of a group about what the learning goals are supposed to be on the faculty determining the learning goals. That's just a comment.

PROFESSOR PHILLIP: We, at Lehman College, have always had the impression that the community colleges were doing a better job of educating our undergraduates because the transfer students do so much better. It's only this evening that I realize that, wow, the community colleges have had their own drop outs on the way of getting there and that only their best do come us. But I will still maintain that the community

colleges do a great job because I think they do.

The question I have though is twofold. One is there obviously are differences between high credit majors and low credit majors when you're talking about articulation. And any policy is going to have a different effect on high credit majors, such as in the natural sciences and engineering and in low credit majors, which I won't mention. So that's a question.

The other question is you mentioned states that mandate articulation. So as a faculty advisor, I often get students who study nursing at a community college and at the senior college they say oh, I can be a physician. They change to a pre-med curriculum. Of course, all the courses, while having the same names, almost identically the same names, have different content and different numbers of semesters for each course. Do these states make it illegal for those students to switch majors or do they mandate that the courses be transferred even though the contents are different and the volume and quantity by a factor of two?

ASSOCIATE UNIVERSITY PROVOST JULIA WRIGLEY: I don't think any state mandates that courses which are radically different have to be accepted in the same major. That would be unacceptable and I don't think anyone contemplates such a thing. So generally speaking, university systems do have a simplified Gen Ed framework. I think it's very unusual for different colleges in a system to have radically different numbers of credits in Gen Ed as CUNY does. But generally also, the faculty are the ones who decide what will articulate in entering the major. That is a faculty responsibility and I don't know any state where that's going to be taken away from the faculty.

PROFESSOR DALGLISH: It sounds like your report and what you've been doing responding to mostly tonight is in the financial realm. You're concerned with saving the student money and getting them out at 120 credits. Is that correct? That's most of your concern. **EVC LOGUE:** Yes, but I don't know that I would call that all financial. **PROFESSOR DALGLISH:** But it is a financial concern—that you don't want the student to spend more money than they need to. **EVC LOGUE:** Part of it is, yes. **PROFESSOR DALGLISH:** And on the other side, you know that excessive is not bad, and that we need to allow for discovery and exploration and answering curiosity. The other thing I've been hearing is that some of the computer systems need to be corrected, the computer system CUNYFirst. But also, how about approaching the system of grants funding for that student who ends up having, you know, 20 credits short and they already have 120 credits and they're not graduated yet and they can't get any loans or any future grants. Can we change that system so it helps that student rather than penalizing them for having explored? **EVC LOGUE:** I think

it's unbelievably, exceedingly unlikely that we could get money for students taking more than 120 credits. In fact, what's happened in at least one state is that campuses--this was California, right? **ASSOCIATE UNIVERSITY PROVOST JULIA WRIGLEY:** California, Florida, a lot of states, Wisconsin. Wisconsin decided to patrol excess credits because they said it's a state expenditure and actually there's an interesting report you'll find online about how they did it at the University of Wisconsin. It didn't kill intellectual curiosity. It just made clearer the economic realities. **EVC LOGUE:** But some states have actually taken tuition away from campuses that was for courses that were in excess of 120 credits. **PROFESSOR DALGLISH:** What I see happening sociologically here in our country is the rich can afford to explore, to be more humane citizens in the end so that you know you could have a surgeon who's operated on you who's also a virtuoso on the cello, who knows something else other than just his medicine. So it's a shame that we can't approach that system out there of student loans and grants for those students rather than penalizing them just because they don't have the money. **EVC LOGUE:** I agree.

PROFESSOR PETERS: I think that one of the things we should consider is university systems. I think the faculty can evaluate credits, and I've had things bounced back to me from the registrar that I've evaluated. The faculty can do these calls but sometimes the administrative process kicks it back into our face, and it gets very tiresome and in actually some cases the student gives up. So I think that's something we can do to get this thing done. I mean that's part of the process.

PROFESSOR CROSSMAN: At John Jay we've been undergoing a Gen Ed reform process for the past few years, based on learning objectives, and I think it's moving forward in that direction. There are also disciplinary concerns and squabbles about making sure our students have a specific essential knowledge, but at the same time there are a lot of different things that can fulfill that specific knowledge. You can get critical thinking through lots of different avenues.

The other thing is that CUNY has always no money, and part of what happens when that's the case is that everybody fights over their dinner, and there may be some instances where instead of fighting over our dinner and having 57 Gen Ed credits here and 67 there and 25 there and 40 there, there may be places where we can be a little more concise and work together a little bit more so that it does facilitate transfer or movement for our students. And it's not a bad thing.

CHAIR COOPER: In a college such as mine and others I've looked at, a senior college which requires two years of lab science, two years of language unless a student can demonstrate facility, et cetera, and the community college requires one year or none. We were told when the

board passed that 1999 policy that even with the AA or AS degree, the receiving college could require the completion of those Gen Ed courses. **EVC LOGUE:** One course. **CHAIR COOPER:** Then we were told that we had to cut our graduation from 128 to 120 and 64 or 68 to 60, just approximately at the same time. Faculty responded by the sense that an attack was mounted on the quality of what they considered necessary for the degree, both on the two and four year colleges. And so, we were then told, this a predecessor in your position, that we could petition to have some degrees go to 128 for the baccalaureate, and I don't know about the two years students whether they were allowed also to increase graduation. So that the messages that have come down have not necessarily been quite straightforward. If a senior college, according to this report, is to be permitted to create its own graduation requirements and then it is expected not to, then somebody is going to have to come up with a way of aligning this disparity. This isn't the first time we've encountered this.

In the past, we have attempted to organize discipline councils in some of the basic areas to do at least the job, as the language people started out doing twenty-some years ago, of lining up what looked like the basic requirements in languages. It's easier to do this in some fields than others. We may have to go back to do some of that but I honestly don't think it's going to address the issue you're talking about.

In any case, I thank everybody for coming. I hope everyone has a wonderful holiday and I'm waiting--before I ask for the motion to adjourn, I would just point out something. Professor Baumrin has been correctly pointing us to an article in the *Chronicle* on the shadow scholar. This individual was interviewed last night on Nightline and those of you who know how to do this computer stuff can get it on YouTube. You won't see who the mystery man is. You will see a tantalizing silhouette with curly hair and an interviewer. It's not exactly an in-depth thing but it is a frightening wake up call because almost no faculty who are interviewed at the end of this could figure out which was the phony paper they had graded! Sorry.