

MINUTES OF THE THREE HUNDRED AND FORTY-EIGHTH PLENARY SESSION  
OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE  
OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK  
February 2, 2010

The meeting was called to order by UFS Chair Philipp at 6:30 p.m. in the Multi-Purpose Room at John Jay College. Seventy-three of 124 voting members were present.

**Baruch:** Present – Hill, Martell, Remler, Wine, and Wymbs. Absent – Bazzoni, Ellis, Myers, and Nematollahy. **BMCC:** Present – Conway, Friedman, Genis, Kalogeropoulos, Martinez-Lopez, Persaud, Soto, Vozick, and Alternate d’Erizans. **Bronx CC:** Present – None. Absent – Bandar, Ismail, Prabhu, and Skinner. **Brooklyn:** Present – Bank-Munoz, Bell, Cirasella, Dexter, Massood, Shapiro, and Alternates Jacobson and Tobey. Absent – Duboys, Magliozzo, Morrill, Shortell, and Viscusi. **CCNY:** Present – Crain, Jablonsky, Raj, and Rinard. Absent – Khanbilvardi, Kiely, Lascar, Sank, and Watkins. **CSI:** Present – Cooper, Talarico, Zimmerman, and Alternate Petratos. Absent – Batson, Levine, Klibaner, and Yousef. **CUNY Law School:** Present – Bach. Absent – Rossein. **Graduate School:** Present – Baumrin, Lennon, Nolan, Philipp. Absent – Aguirre-Molina, and Weinstein. **Hostos CC:** Present –Ovtcharenko, Sharma, and Alternate Hubner. Absent – Pimentel. **Hunter:** Present – Baumann, Grossman, Kuhn-Osius, Spark, Strayer, and Young. Absent – Ancona, DeMeo, Guzzetta, Kaye, and Palanda. **John Jay:** Present – Crossman, Dunham, Kaplowitz, Katz, Kubic, and Alternates Benton, Tovar, Cheloukhine, and Tovar. Absent: King-Toler. **Kingsborough CC:** Present – Barnhart, Hume, Ruoff, and Alternate Stubin. Absent – Arliss and Wood. **LaGuardia CC:** Present – Beaky, Lerman, and Shean. Absent – Davidson, Kurzyna, and Mettler. **Lehman:** Present – Carey and Mineka. Absent – Jervis, Larimer, Marianetti, and Maybee. **Medgar Evers:** Present – Reid and Alternate Hope. Absent – Cuffee, Stewart, and Withers. **NYCCT:** Present – Cermele, Horelick, Hounion, Richardson, and Alternate Gelman. Absent: Panayotakis and Woytowich. **Queens:** Present – Savage. Absent – Bird, Brody, Gonzalez, Moore, and Zevin. Vacancies -- 2. **Queensborough CC:** Present – Pecorino, Tai, and Alternates Borrachero and Kuszai. Absent – Barbanel. **York:** Present – Corkery. Absent – Baron, Lewis, and Mawyer.

Eileen Goldmann, Mary Kay Kellogg, Bonnie Nelson, Steve Stearns, Jennifer Sloan, Suzanne Tamang, Shawn Rice, and Alexander Pimentel were guests of the plenary.

**Governance Leaders present:** Carey (Lehman), Hume (Kingsborough), Kaplowitz (John Jay), Martell (Baruch), Raj (CCNY), Savage (Queens), and Tai (QCC) attended. 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 24, 2009: Minutes were approved as distributed.
- III. Reports (Recorded in Reports & Deliberations)
  - A. Chair (oral & written)
  - B. Eileen Goldmann, Director, State Governmental Relations (oral)
  - C. Representatives to Board Committees (written)
  - D. Ydanis Rodriguez, Chair, NYC Council Committee on Higher Education (oral)
  - E. UFS Committee Chairs
    - Bonnie Nelson on Tech Advisory Committee/CUNYFirst (oral)
    - Leslie Jacobson on the Faculty Advisory Council (oral)
  - F. Michael Barnhart on Enrollment Issues (oral)
  - G. Shawn Rice on Proposed Changes to School of Professional Studies Governance Plan (oral)

IV. New Business – There was none.

There being no new business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

William Phipps, Executive Director

REPORTS AND DELIBERATIONS  
OF THE 348th PLENARY SESSION  
OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE  
OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK  
February 2, 2010

**IIIA. Chair Manfred Philipp** – I am happy to welcome you to the 348th plenary session of the Faculty Senate. I'd like to wish you a Happy New Year and says thanks for coming this evening. Is there a motion to approve the agenda? Second? That is approved. Now the minutes? Second? The minutes are approved. The first item is my Chair's report which you have in a written form in your packet. If we have time, I might go over some of the high points, and you certainly can ask me questions. But there is a two-sided, full Chair's report in the packet. The second item, I'd like to welcome two people from the CUNY Albany office, Eileen Goldmann, the director state governmental relations, and Mary Kaye Kellogg. One of the top issues on everybody's agenda right now is the state budget. As you know, the state budget could be in better shape. In fact, a lot of people are wondering why we are not in the middle of retrenchment, given that in other situations that were not quite as bad as this, we did have retrenchment. But we don't, and we're still hiring at a vigorous clip. A lot of this has got to be credited to our people in Albany, mostly important sitting right next to me, that the money flow from Albany has not stopped but is still going strong. Without that money flow, we wouldn't be hiring new faculty as we are almost everywhere in this University. We hope that continues. So right now I'd like to turn this over to Eileen Goldmann and let her tell you how we interact with the state legislature and a little bit about lobbying. She did a presentation to CLAC, the CUNY Legislative Action Council, which has student, faculty, and union representatives on it, the other day.

**IIIB. Eileen Goldmann** – Thank you. I appreciate the opportunity to speak with you. I've been in my current position for about 25 years, so I have a long history with the University, and I've worked with some of you in this room, much to my pleasure. I'm going to quickly do an overview of the state legislative process, and then we will talk about how we lobby, and Mary Kaye will talk about some of our websites. You see on the screen an overview of how we have a breakdown in terms of statistics with the legislature. There are 62 senators, and 150 Assembly members. The State Senate, as you know, is Democratic. It's a very tenuous situation, because it's a 32-30 split, and as you have read in the newspapers we have Senator Monserrate who was convicted of a misdemeanor, but in the past few weeks the Senate under its proposals has decided that he should be ousted. They will bring that resolution to the floor probably next week according to our sources. That would then bring the margin down to 31-30, and anything that has to be passed then every single Democratic member has to be on board. This complicates further because Senator Parker also has a case outstanding, which again could bring the number down to an even split. Fortunately, the courts ruled that Lt. Gov. Ravitch could vote in a tie situation. That was something we did not have a year ago. The other positive thing within the state Senate is the fact that John Sampson from Brooklyn has really taken control of the Senate and has made some changes both in terms of the fiscal staff and legal staff, and is getting the conference much tighter than it had been last year, which was a very difficult year in terms of the fact you didn't know who was in the leadership positions and who to talk to. This becomes extremely important for our lobbying efforts. But let me talk a little further about the current Albany atmosphere. I mentioned the fact that you have the split between the houses and the Democrats and Republicans, but where does this lead us to? It's not so much a Democratic agenda that we look at, but the fact that this year is a statewide election year. All of these assemblymen and senators, the Governor, the Lt. Governor, the Controller, the Attorney General, are all up for reelection this year. It all boils down to who controls the Senate because this is the year in which congressional lines are drawn. The congressional lines, along with the Senate and

assembly lines, are all going to be determined as to who controls each house and how these lines get drawn. When these lines are drawn based on the census this holds the state for 10 years, and which party holds control. When people talk about the importance of holding the Senate, it's not only because of what we are going to be passing in the Senate, but what is going to happen across the state in terms of where we are in congressional lines, who we are sending to Congress. It has a very big trickle down effect, all the way down to the local elections. When we talk about why this is such an important year and why it is so critical that the Democrats hold on, it's the first time they will have held onto a seat in probably 40 or 50 years in terms of being able to control the Senate. That's something we have to keep in mind. The other part of the current atmosphere that is becoming more and more interesting is the fact that the Attorney General, Cuomo, is talking about running for Governor. That then opens the Attorney General spot, and many of the current senators are looking to see if they are going to run in a primary for that office. That now opens up other additional Senate seats, so everything right now is in extreme flux, and when you take a political situation in such flux and then lay over that a budget deficit that is one of the worse we've ever seen in history, it becomes very difficult for the decisions that have to be made to get made. That's just part of what is going on.

Most of you know the key legislators at this point. If you are able to reach out to them, please do so to indicate your support. We will go over that more in a moment.

Let me go over the time line of the budget process in terms of how everything works. Very often I have people come up to me in January, February, or March and say I have a program that would be great. So you think you could push this within the state legislature? But the time line is one that doesn't allow for that in some ways. It's one thing if it's a small item that you perhaps want to go to a local legislator on, but we are asked at the University to start putting our budget together in the beginning of September. We have the budget approved by the Board of Trustees at the November meeting. That then goes to the Governor's office, who comes out with his budget usually the day after Martin Luther King Day. The Governor has 30 days to amend it, and during that time there are budget hearings. Just last week, the Chancellor testified, and the higher education communities testified. So things are now moving quickly in terms of the process. If there is anything you want to get into the budget, you have to go to your presidents or department chairs or whoever right after the summer in order to get it incorporated into the CUNY budget and then be able to move forward. There are very few changes between the point of submission and the Governor's submission of the budget. That's something to keep in mind.

Right now, we're in the 30 day amendment period, when the Governor can come forward and amend his current budget bill. There are only technical amendments. It used to be, under Cuomo and when there was more money, you could go in and say we need a program you didn't fund. But now it's merely technical – if there's a problem with how they lined out an item.

On March 1, the legislature has to come to an agreement on the revenues. That is a very difficult process. Each house brings economists in to figure out just where things are moving. But by statute on March 1 they have to have an agreement. On March 15 they have to agree with the Governor how much money there is, or isn't, to spend. That's when oftentimes if you're in Albany or making rounds to any legislators, they talk about the avails, which is the amount of money the legislature can spend over the Governor's budget. This year, we expect there will be no avails. The only way they will be able to get more money is to cut in other places. What we are watching even in these first two weeks is that they are looking for places to cut, but they are also rejecting some of the Governor's proposals outright. When they do that, they start cutting back even further as to how much money they will have to spend. It's going to be a very, very difficult time. When I talk to the legislators, many of them indicate that they would like to see this budget done by March 26. That's the last day they will be working on the calendar before they break for Passover and Easter. Many of them have said if you cannot get a budget any

better than where we are now, we will make some quick changes to it and get out to the districts to start campaigning and just have to deal with it. That's all well and good, but one of the things that really drives this state legislature almost more than any other state is school aid. School aid gets a tremendous amount of money, and the reason for that is whatever a district does not get in school aid becomes property taxes, and none of these legislators want to see property taxes go up because they are directly blamed for it. As a result, they will try to find someplace to find more school aid to send out to the districts. I expect that as we move through February and March, there will be a close watch on Wall Street to see if more revenues are going to come in. I would expect that if they do not see the revenues coming in the way they would expect them to, they will try to get this budget on time. If they think that by April 15 they will be able to collect more taxes, I would expect this budget is going to go late, probably very late. You'd have to remember that back in December they had a deficit reduction plan, and it took weeks and weeks for them to decide on \$500 million to \$1 billion. We are talking way, way larger than that at this point, and how they are going to deal with that will be very contentious at times.

Let me go a little bit into what we do in terms of advocating. As you know, we have CLAC. On every campus the president appoints his external relations director, and a team will come up to Albany. We at our office look to match up colleges with legislators. We have charts, which we can provide to you, that show how many students are in each legislative district from each college. When we see that John Jay has a huge population from Brooklyn or Staten Island, we then target legislators based on enrollment data, which becomes very effective when you sit in a legislator's office, and they see this is a very large population of people. We also provide them with information on how many students in their district get TAP. There again they see when we have TAP cuts, this is something they are going to have to restore. In addition, we ask people to know their legislator. When you go to visit somebody, know who they are. Get their biography, find out if they've been in the newspaper recently, get committee assignments, and find different ways you can relate to them because in a legislator's mind they often say everything is local. So when you come to them, you should be part of their district or have some way you can connect with them so they will now respond to you. When people come to lobby we ask them to write to the Speaker or Majority Leader and to give the person a copy of that letter, and then I and my staff go back to the senior staff in both houses and say we have letters from 30 legislators asking for a restoration. Then this is something that has to be taken seriously. Both houses are member driven in terms of decision making, so the more we know what has been said, the better we are able to do what we need to do to cover what we need. We also ask that anytime you have an opportunity to have a legislator come to your district or to your campus, please do so. One of the most effective ways we have found to get capital money is through legislator visits to a building, a library, or whatever you need. In addition, they should see some of the students who are working and be able to interrelate with different people and understand this is the group that you are serving. In New York City, it is very difficult. When you are at SUNY and you are the only game in town, the legislators respond very quickly, but if you're in New York City and you've got a hospital across the street that wants money, you've got a business next door and they need something for taxes, so we have a lot of competing interests here in the city that we have to be able to cover.

We do many things now electronically that we never did before, and Mary Kaye will go over some of these in a moment. We have a website that is very extensive in terms of how you go about contacting legislators, finding what the priorities are, what the Chancellor's testimony has been, Gold Sheets to talk about the capital programs we need, and the same thing on the operating side in terms of what we need.

I'm not the one to talk about the budget – we need one of the budget people here for that – but let me just say this is a very difficult budget we are facing. We are facing an \$84.4 million cut on the senior colleges side. Sixty-four million of that is across the board, and \$20 million is the last

minute when the Governor's office decided that was our share of what we need to negotiate with the unions in order to get union give-backs. How we are going to deal with that, we are not sure, and I don't think any agency or college knows how they will deal with that. It's very unfair that you negotiate a contract and now they say they want give-backs afterward. So the Chancellor and his staff are working closely together, talking with the unions, to see just how we are going to deal with this. It's not just the PSC but the Teamsters and all the others. That's just one number to give you. On the community college side, we took a cut based on FTE students of \$285 per student, on top of a \$150 cut we took just in December. Between the two cuts, they have brought us back to 2005 funding levels. You almost can't understand the thinking behind this cut when the community college enrollment has never been higher than it is now. You all know the campuses are bursting at the seams, and this is the one way today in which people are going to turn around the economy, by coming to the community colleges as well as the senior colleges. And there's many more services that people need in terms of just being able to walk through the door. You know yourselves they need faculty support, guidance counselors, library and computer aid. This is a cut that is very disturbing to us. In addition, on TAP they cut the overall award by \$75. They eliminated graduate TAP, which was surprising. As a result, we've got a big program in front of us.

I will briefly mention that we also have tuition policy legislation. The Governor put forward a very extensive program having to do with how we change handling tuition, whether there should be differential tuition. SUNY is asking for that by campus, while our Chancellor is not in favor of that, of having campuses in close proximity start charging different rates. What we are looking at is perhaps more programmatic differences, and we're not even sure how this will play out. There's all sorts of proposals within that to allow for certain procurement purchases to be a little higher – right now, we can only go to \$20,000. If someone needs a piece of equipment for \$25,000, we've got to bid this out to three different bidders, which may take six months. We would like to see the amount you can procure to be a little bit higher so when we try to service what you need, we can do so without such a convoluted process.

The last thing to mention is lobbying laws and compliance. There is a Commission on Public Integrity, which controls what people do for lobbying. I am the coordinator of our filings for the University, and we file many different people based on who the president has put forward. If any of you come to Albany to lobby, you need to notify your president or CLAC representative to let them know you have been there and how much time you spent. All of this has to be reported. Your salaries get prorated, although if you've only come up for a day or two that is very different. There are a couple of key points you much be aware of. There are no gifts allowed of any sort. Gifts are considered to be food. You can't take a legislator out to eat. The only thing you can give them is a cup of coffee or bottle of water. I was told by the Lobby Commission that they consider Dunkin' Donuts coffee, but not Starbucks coffee, to be within the law! We joke about this, but they have been levying fines in the last few months of \$10,000 or \$25,000 per incident. If you have a reception, you can no longer have food when legislators are invited because now you are giving them a gift. You can give them promotional items like pens with the college logo, banners, and those little trinkets that every campus has, but please no gifts. Plaques are allowed, but don't give them tickets to an event. You need to be aware. Please call me if you find yourself in a situation. I'll take questions after Mary Kay goes over our website.

**Mary Kay Kellogg** – Eileen and I have worked together for over 20 years. SupportCUNY.org is something the University started about five years ago to come up with how things have changed technologically. People don't want to sit down and hand write a letter anymore, so we have a website which is a centralized site where a user can go. We have all kinds of resources here, including the University's Budget Request, Chancellor Goldstein's testimony before the Executive Budget Hearing, the preliminary analysis the Budget Office will soon do, and so on.

The most important part of the site is where we differ from SUNY's website or some of the unions' to avoid the appearance of legislators just getting all these form letters we try to offer various options and subject titles so it doesn't appear to be just form letters. We have a faculty and staff letter. We show all the people it's going to – Assembly Higher Ed Committee, Assembly Ways and Means, the Majority Leader who is the head of the Senate, Senate Committee on Finance and Committee on Higher Education, Speaker of the Assembly, and then it goes to your specific Assemblyperson who represents you, as well as your state senator. You can also see the body of the letter, and you have the choice of sending it as is, or you can make it personal to your situation as a faculty member in terms of what you may be struggling with in terms of the stringent budget and not being able to get what you need to teach class. Then you just click to send the message. As you can see, it's an easy way where in five minutes you can send a letter. CUNY Government Relations also has its own website where it lists lots of information. We encourage people to use it as a resource tool. We have all kinds of links to the Public Integrity Commission, a save the date section to show what is coming up with Irish or Italian or Black and Puerto Rican legislative receptions and weekends, and so on. We encourage you to use that. You can access from the CUNY website by going into Administration and click to Government Relations.

**Eileen Goldman**—Let me just mention four events and then I'll end. Next weekend is the New York State Black/Puerto Rican/Hispanic/Asian Legislators Conference that runs from February 12 to 14. That's a good time to come up. We do an educational forum and luncheon at the Albany room that you would all be welcome to. We have on April 16 and 17 the Somos El Futuro, the Hispanic task force. That is exciting because both CUNY and SUNY students come up and do a mock Senate session. They usually take a bill that's controversial, they are each assigned a legislator's position, and you can watch the debate. We have the Irish Legislator's Event Night, which is March 8, and on June 7 is the Italian-American Legislator's Night. Those are all opportunities when you can come up to Albany and in a more casual way get to know the legislators. Any questions?

**Professor Sandi Cooper** – Back in the 90s we were told that we should describe our trip as “educational.” Is that still in force, and does it mitigate the lobbying regulation? **Eileen Goldman** – That's correct. For the most part, if you are doing something educational and not considered lobbying, you don't have to report that but you do have to be careful about the fine line there. I should also say that before this year is out, I expect the lobby laws to change completely. They've become so prohibitive that the legislators are not happy with them, and there is not enough open government, many feel. Since the 90s it has changed, and it will change again.

**Professor Lenore Beaky** – I noticed that all the materials you had up here, and your presentation, are about the state. Since there is an important piece of legislation federally, which passed the House which would change the way student loans are administered and possibly free up money for education – and I notice this was written up in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* and *Inside Higher Ed* today as part of Obama's budget – is there anyone here or I would like to express the concern that we also be down in Washington lobbying on behalf of this legislation, which all of CUNY, including the community colleges, could benefit by a great deal. Here is actual money that's being offered. I don't know if you or anyone here knows about this? **Eileen Goldman** – I can say just briefly that the University does retain one of the top higher education firms in Washington, and they are monitoring this every day. I think the Faculty Senate could organize themselves with some other national groups out there to do more to make sure this all goes through. I agree with you it would be wise for us to be there as well.

**Professor Mike Vozick** – We hear from time to time about the revenue side and its importance. I'm wondering whether the old idea of a stock transfer tax, or we might now call it a financial

transaction tax, is at all on the table and being taken seriously at all? A tiny portion of 1% could yield significant funds. **Eileen Goldman** – It's on the table. Unfortunately with the stock transfer tax, when they were looking at that the stock market was way up there and there was a lot of money to be made with that tax. Right now, that's not the case. I know people are discussing it, but whether that will make it as a proposal, it's too early to tell.

**Chair Philipp** – Thanks to both of you for a very informative presentation. Now let me introduce City Councilman Ydanis Rodriguez, who came originally from the Dominican Republic. He got his BA in political science from City College, and I'm pleased to say he is now chair of the higher education committee of the City Council. We will be talking with him often and are please he is in charge of the committee most relevant to CUNY, especially our community colleges.

**IID. Councilman Ydanis Rodriguez** – Only in this country: I came in 1983 washing dishes at O'Hara's Restaurant, 6th Avenues and West 4th, making \$160 a week for two years until I was able to figure how to go back to school, and then getting into City College and getting my BA in political science and then my master's degree in Bilingual Education, and then teaching at public schools for 14 years, and now serving at the City Council. I have to say thank you to all of you who dedicate your time to prepare the present and future generations of this country. Beside those two degrees, the most important one I got was about activism. I've got to say thank you, Professor Crain, who has been one of my role models that make me proud to look at the rest of the staff and say we have accomplished a lot, but we still have a long road to go. Therefore, my first hearing is most likely to be on the 24th, based on budget cuts. When we went over the major proposal we saw it was close to a \$50 million cut on the community colleges. So we will be doing the best we can to reduce those cuts. We will look at how enrollment went up, and why they are doing it, even if it is legal. I'm not an expert, and I will rely on your expertise. The second hearing mostly likely will be organized about diversity at CUNY. We have to look at how we can bring in the future more black and Latino faculty to CUNY that represent the population we are working with. I hope also we can get the support of this great faculty so we can make a plan and bring more diversity to CUNY. Let's see if we can get the higher education agenda going, knowing I'm just one of the 51 and I'm just part of the coalition working together. Thank you.

**Chair Philipp** – As a faculty member in a department that just hired an African-American chemist, which is just about to hire another professor from Puerto Rico, I can only second what you just said. We're very much behind that. Thanks for coming. Next, Bonnie Nelson is chair of the UFS Technology Advisory Committee to Vice Chancellor Dobrin and Chief Information Officer Brian Cohen, working on issues like CUNYFirst and Blackboard. She doing a great job.

**III. Professor Bonnie Nelson** – This committee was formed by the UFS a year ago, in the spring of 2009. We had our first meeting with Vice Chancellor Dobrin and CIO Cohen last May. It was the end of a very difficult semester with Blackboard not functioning optimally, and in many ways it was an unsatisfactory meeting. We were an advisory committee to Vice Chancellor Dobrin, but he did most of the talking and didn't give us a lot of time to offer any advice to him. I expressed my frustration with this after the meeting to my colleagues, and of course I was asked to chair the committee! It is an excellent committee, though. It consists of Barry Dumas from Baruch, Campbell Dalglish from City College, David Arnow from Brooklyn, Ed Volchok from Queensborough, Manfred Philipp, Morris Hounion from City Tech who is also our liaison to the UFS Committee on Libraries and Technology, also Phil Pecorino from Queensborough, Robert Klibaner from Staten Island, Roberta Brody from the Queens Library School, and Stanley Wine from Baruch. We met in October as a committee to try to organize ourselves and discuss what we wanted to accomplish. We didn't want to duplicate what the UFS Libraries Committee is doing, and we also realize we are not the Committee on Academic

Technology or CAT, which is an administrative committee that is supposed to represent the academics at CIS and centrally. We decided on an agenda, and we also talked about how to get input from the campuses on what is going on there related to IT. Then we met with Allan Dobrin and Brian Cohen on December 21, the last day of the semester and the day before a major snow storm so a number of members couldn't come. Still it was an interesting meeting. I had sent Allan Dobrin the agenda ahead of time, and he expressed some surprise at this, saying it seemed like a different sort of meeting than he was used to. I guess it was, but it was a productive and interesting meeting. The major part was focused on Blackboard, the possible tension between Blackboard centrality in CUNY and faculty innovation. There was much discussion where the faculty strongly defended their right, need, and responsibility to innovate in teaching, and the difficulty of doing this when CUNY was so wedded to a centrally organized Blackboard. Faculty want to experiment with Moodle, Sukhai, Google groups and Google apps, with Cloud computing. The administration argued it was better for students to have one standard platform that they can use in all their classes, and that it's difficult for campus IT to be expected to support different platforms, and that if faculty use something other than CUNY's Blackboard CUNY would be at risk if student information was lost. The faculty would be putting student privacy at risk. They gave an example of a professor who publicly posted a student roster with social security numbers on a public site. Eventually though, the administration said it wasn't CIS' job to discourage faculty from using other systems, and that faculty should use what they need to use, but that the security risks were real and faculty need to be aware of them. We agreed with that. So the conclusion was that there needed to be some sort of statement about the need of faculty to protect personal information at all times of students, and that there might also be ways to use Blackboard as the basic administrative backbone of a learning management system where the student information is kept, but then it can become a portal to other systems and services where faculty could interact with students outside of Blackboard. We agreed to try and work together on these things so that faculty can be innovative in their teaching and not be stifled by central management.

The next item on the agenda was CUNYFirst. We discussed the difficulties that had become evident with the talent acquisition model, which is the new application process, and the reservations that department chairs seemed to have and had expressed about the amount of extra work that seemed to be happening with CUNYFirst. We heard from the faculty how they were trying to deal with this. A lot of what was going on with CUNYFirst was rumor we were hearing third hand, so we weren't exactly sure what was going on. The administration was very concerned that CUNYFirst should work well, that the faculty should not be hostile to it, that if there was too much work for the department chairs that they would find some way to change procedures so things can be dealt with. They don't want a revolt of the faculty against CUNYFirst. They are very committed to making it work. It's a very complex system, and it's very difficult to get it working right, and I believe that since then they have invited Manfred and some others to some CUNYFirst meetings.

The third item on our agenda was independent oversight in developing specifications for contracts. Some members of the committee were concerned that it seemed like every time there was a new contract, Gartner, an IT consulting firm, was involved, that CUNY was wedded to them, and was using them all over. The administration said that might be our perception, but that was not accurate, and that New York State would not allow that to happen because they have very strict rules about procurement and they also use other consulting firms like Exeter and the New York State Technology Advisory Group.

The fourth item was support for CUNY library systems. We expressed the concern that there didn't seem to be sufficient, robust support for the CUNY central library systems. Some projects, a statistical system project in particular, have been stalled for two years. A critical position hasn't been filled for two years. Brian Cohen said the central office has been very

responsive to a petition that was passed by LACUNY in October about the lack of support from CIS, and that they were working to fill the position, and he thought the statistical system was in fact functioning. He was very defensive because he felt they were really trying hard to support this, and since then in fact that position has been filled, but the statistical system is still not functioning. This is something I think will be going on for some while. CUNY CIS is very much involved with CUNYFirst, and they've got a lot on their plate. That's part of why Blackboard has been outsourced. CUNYFirst in fact is outsourced. It's a hosted system, run by Oracle. So CUNY is moving away from having their own systems on their own servers, and it could be that this is the way the library system needs to go as well. The library faculty and the office of library systems is trying to figure out a plan for the libraries to move forward since we can't really get the strong support from the central office to innovate that we need to move forward.

The last item was about decommissioning, or the planning from the time a system is implemented to its eventual demise. That was an interesting discussion that will continue. At the end, I think everyone felt it was a very productive meeting, including Allan Dobrin, and he was open to having more meetings like that. We will hope to get together as a group next time, and then meet with the administration the next time. One interesting thing the Vice Chancellor said at this meeting was that very often administrators on the campus interpret central office guidelines or suggestions as mandates, and then turn around and tell everyone on the campus this is what you must do because the central office says so. We expressed concern, how do we find out in fact it is not a mandate? He was trying to say it's not always the central office that is the bad guy, and they really do want to work with the faculty and get things going.

I also have a question for you that I need guidance on about an issue that has come up. It is at John Jay but may affect everyone. It has to do with the CUNY IT security procedures, which Vice Chancellor Schaffer mentioned in his memo that everyone got today. These procedures are drafted by the central office, have been reviewed by the CUNY IT Steering Committee, but they were not really approved by them. Members of that committee have had some input into changing them. Those procedures stipulate that all users' passwords must be changed every 90 days. They were written to protect student and employee private information so it wouldn't get out to the whole world and CUNY would be liable for the costs of insuring our privacy. There are good reasons to protect private information, but students by definition don't have access to this information, so many of us had assumed that students would not be forced to change their passwords every 90 days. However, on my campus at John Jay the administration did think this applied to students as well, and they insisted that they force students to change their passwords 90 days into the fall semester, which was the Monday before Thanksgiving. The immediate result the library noticed is that students couldn't get to the electronic library resources at the time when they needed to do their papers. We've been going over this at CUNY and had a meeting with Carl Cammarata who is the CUNY security officer who insists this does apply to everybody across all CUNY. Now, as far as I know at the moment, only four campuses are making students do this, but it looks like CUNY will insist that all campuses do so. Right now, students go through the portal for Blackboard, which apparently is not robust enough to enforce this password change, but they do want to change that, so it could be that students accessing Blackboard will have to change their passwords every 90 days. I see a train wreck coming down the line, and I'm not exactly sure where I should take this. I'm seeking your advice. It could be really difficult.

**Professor Stefan Baumrin** – We face this in every hospital in the United States on the question of the privacy of the tissue that might be extracted in surgery, and so what we've been adopting all over, slowly, is blanket consent. So what you need to do is to have a situation where when students enroll in the fall semester they sign a consent that doesn't involve their changing their passwords every 90 days, and then he does not have to worry about privacy.

**Chair Philipp** – Bonnie, thank you for your report. Now I'd like to give an award to a faculty member who deserves an award. If you recall some time back the University went through a process known as the restructuring of the doctoral science programs. This was initiated by the Chancellor and led by one of his vice chancellors and resulted in various task forces which issued reports but never had a vote on those reports. This restructuring went into effect but highly modified, with many of its evil teeth extracted before it went into effect. The question is who extracted some of these evil teeth? I can think of two people. One is Stefan Baumrin, who was heavily involved but he's on the Executive Committee and that's part of his job! But there is another person who was one of the Executive Officers of the programs affected. I have to say all the Executive Officers did an outstanding job defending the integrity of their doctoral programs from assault from the outside, but one of them stood far taller than the rest of them. That person is Gerry Koepl, the former EO of the chemistry doctoral program. The reason we are doing this is because we don't forget people who stand up for the rights of the faculty and academic freedom. So, Gerry, we have a special award for you, a Faculty Governance Leaders medallion, which we generally give to chairs of faculty Senates, and this is the first time we've given one to a person such as Gerry. **Gerry Koepl** – I'd like to thank Stefan and Fred for all their help with the Natural Sciences programs' governance issues. We did all right because of their help.

**Chair Philipp** – We have two more items. One is not on the agenda, which is a report from Michael Barnhart on enrollment trends. But right now we have Leslie Jacobson to give a report on activities by the Faculty Advisory Council to the Research Foundation. She is the chair of that Council and is a member of the Board of Directors of the RF.

**III. Professor Leslie Jacobson** – By way of background, I want to tell you what the Faculty Advisory Council does, since I don't think too many of us are really familiar with it. It's a group of nine active researchers appointed by the Executive Committee of the UFS. We meet regularly with the executive leadership at the RF, and we think that the CUNY faculty are very fortunate to have this conduit. Whenever we have problems, or suggestions to make to the RF about how our research materials could be handled better, we contact them. The members are Andrew Beveridge (Sociology, Queens), Thomas Brennan (Chemistry, BCC), Alexander Couzis (Chemical Engineering, CCNY), Godfrey Gumbs (Physics, Hunter), Fred Naider (Chemistry, CSI), Steven Penrod (Psychology, John Jay), and Edward Rogoff (Management, Zicklin School of Business, Baruch). It's a very good group, and we do have important meetings. In the past few years, the way we got information was to talk to the grants officers, or just through the grapevine when users came to us with problems or suggestions. Now with email, we contact each Principal Investigator every academic year so that everyone knows we exist as a possible resource for them, which helps us develop our agenda for the meetings and topics of discussion with the RF staff. We ask PIs to write back suggesting what kind of problems they might have that need attention of grant administration either at the campus or at the RF level. We also ask for new ideas, which would assist the faculty in grants, and any services, procedures, or policies that can be improved or clarified. What's interesting is that we always get back a dozen or 15 letters. We bring them to the attention of the RF President Richard Rothbard and his staff, and they have been very accommodating. In the last two years at least, the letters for the most part have been very complimentary and the problems are handled in a timely fashion. We got a few letters about problems with PSC-CUNY awards which we referred to the UCRA because they were not about matters within the purview of the RF.

Several items have been brought up by the RF, which might be of concern to some of you who have grants. The staff asked us to tell faculty not to sign any agreements, or hire any subcontractors, without getting RF signoffs first. Not doing so can prove very costly to these contractors. Also, if the PIs do any hiring, they must disclose in advance any faculty

relationships involved, or any personal ownership links to a corporation that might be involved. Otherwise fixing the problems afterward is wasteful and takes too much time. In addition, the RF is seeing more and more, and stricter, program audits. From now on, the RF will not be able to put things through on a researcher's promise of supplying documentation in the future. They will have to insist on complete documentation before payment. Recently, as many of you know, they were in contract negotiations with the staff and it bordered on a question of a strike, but it was settled very amicably, and we thought it was a reasonable agreement. On the good news, research activity is up. It looks like the newly hired faculty are getting more federal grants so indirect costs are up as well. They are trying to prevent lawsuits. They get lawsuits for a variety of reasons: sexual harassment, age discrimination, and wrongful termination. If you have a grant, before you fire anyone, it's very important to talk to the Human Resources people at the RF. Also, because of certain federal requirements, people have to comply with all kinds of training, such as sexual harassment training. So if you have a federal grant, please go online to the RF site and all these compliance issues and other statements you need are there. We have a very good relationship. We meet by ourselves for the first half hour, and then we meet with President Rothbard and his staff. They have always been very accommodating to our needs. All in all, the Council functions very well, and I appreciate the work of my fellow members and the UFS liaison, Bill Phipps.

**Chair Philipp** – Michael Barnhart is our representative on CUNY's Enrollment Management Committee. He always gets an earful about enrollment patterns and how the University is trying to manage that.

**IIIF. Professor Michael Barnhart** – Actually, they call themselves a Council, Manfred. I think they might take umbrage at being called a mere committee! It actually is a large group, including the enrollment managers at all the campuses. They are responsible for overseeing both admissions and financial aid, and making sure there are not too many or too few students on the campus. The Council is chaired by the Dean of the Executive Office, Robert Ptachik. He has visited various of our committees, including our Student Affairs Committee recently. Their purpose obviously is to track enrollment, but also to allow the central office, mostly through moral suasion, to get the campuses to avoid overtaxing themselves one way or another. That is obviously a serious issue now as the main issue is enrollment growth. Right now, they are working with the various phases of processing applications for fall 2010. The latest figures I have from January 8 I put in my written report to the UFS Executive Committee a few days ago, which found its way into Manfred's report, and you can see it's up rather considerably. The most interesting things about the trends we see so far is that every college is reporting significant increases in retention and readmission rates. These are very high. You should understand that every campus has certain enrollment targets. That's the whole point behind enrollment management – you have a target and you try to hit it. The issue here is not so much if they will hit their targets, but will they blow through their targets, which seems quite likely. The problem is that if you go too much above the target you put tremendous strains on college resources, and - especially with these high retention and readmission rates -- you can't admit as many students as you would like. The result is that one way or the other, you will have to tighten admissions. There are some favored strategies for doing this. One way is to try to close the admissions process early. They did this last fall for spring. It's possible they might eliminate some phases. CUNY has a rolling admissions system, which favored us well in the bad old days when we had trouble getting adequate enrollments. It doesn't do us much good now when we are overstaffed. The other strategy is to adjust various admissions standards, particularly readmission standards, to get those numbers down so they can bring in more freshmen, and also transfers. Transfers is the other interesting trend right now. We are seeing enormous increases in transfer applications, especially at the community colleges. You would think it would be into the senior colleges. I looked for the most alarming number I could find, and the one that stood out was LaGuardia

where they have seen a 360% increase in transfer applications for fall 2010 over fall 2009. That means they have gone from about 220 applicants to 796. But that is repeated across all the community colleges, if not so dramatically. There are theories that people are viewing community colleges now as a good economic bargain. We all know that senior colleges have tightened their admissions standards and are continuing to do so, which always will drive some students to the community colleges. Another theory in the Council is that students are looking to pass certain requirements, particularly in math, at a community college where they find it's an easier thing to do. You get a C in a math course there and you place out of testing. Nobody is sure. It all will depend on how many students try to transfer out early from the community colleges into the senior colleges – that will give some indication of whether they are there just trying to fill requirements and that sort of thing. Everybody is convinced though that all enrollment trends are upwards, and will continue. Therefore, you will see increasing resort to the very strategies of limiting enrollment I mentioned before. With regard to those strategies, you can close your admissions early of course, or you can tinker with your admissions requirements or your readmissions requirements. It's clear that colleges are doing this. In fact, it is often the case at the Council that colleges make individual reports, and there was a common trend to say they were doing this. York was one of them, and I asked whether they had actually put that change in readmissions standards through college governance. They had, but the York representative said when they tinker with admissions requirements, that does not need to go through faculty governance. At that point, we got into a general free-for-all on this whole issue, and it turned out that neither Baruch nor Queens runs readmissions requirements through governance, but they do run admissions requirements through their governance bodies. We need to remember, if you read the CUNY governance documents, particularly the CUNY Bylaws, admissions standards (and I would think that includes readmissions standards) and also anything else having to do with the criteria that allow students to enter your college, should have faculty input. I would urge you to be aware of what is going on in your admissions offices, because we do have an issue here. It goes to the heart of our professional responsibilities. There are a few other issues. There was some concern about the possibility we might end up in a California-like situation where students who have completed their work in the community colleges find they have no place in the senior colleges. This was well documented in the news media not long ago. Everyone is concerned about this. I know Manfred has had thoughts and suggestions about this, which I am open to and I think the Council would be open, too.

I had promised the University Registrar Annamarie Bianco that I would mention this: one of the big issues they have is called Commencement of Attendance. This is where you have to document whether your students actually showed up at all. As I understand it, it's very spotty across the University. CUNY has always said we are not an attendance-taking institution. Most then wonder why am I always filling out this attendance sheet? That is for federal classification purposes, but that does not mean you cannot take attendance for other purposes. The Commencement of Attendance allows them to determine what Title IV forms they need to return to the federal government, and there are severe penalties for not complying. That is a duty to ensure we don't trip up the University in this. The other purpose is the so-called COPE Commencement of Attendance, which is for students receiving welfare where their attendance counts as work. If we don't document that they are working, they don't get the money which is a direct disservice to students, and apparently there are some lapses. We should communicate to our colleagues that they need to file these documents.

**Professor Beaky** – At CAPP yesterday, Vice Chancellor Logue was talking about these figures, and I asked whether it was possible that the increase in numbers is really due to students signing up earlier because they knew what happened last year. The answer to that was no. Also, was it possible that students are applying to more than the usual number of colleges, and the answer to that was also no. She seemed to think it was something that is really happening,

not just shifting timeframes or whatever. Now, a question: Do you or does CUNY know whether those students are transferring into community colleges from other community colleges, or from senior colleges? **Professor Barnhart** – They do, but they don't always track it or publish it. My understanding is that in general transfers are 50/50 outside and inside, and that's usually to the senior colleges, but I don't know about the community colleges. I don't think there are any data available, but I think they could collect it from the application forms. I can ask David Crook for that information.

**Professor Vozick** – We are talking about the partial closure or narrowing of open admissions even though that's not the favored language. You're talking about early closure of registration, and increase in readmission standards as the two major shifts. Is there an effort to gather data on ethnicity or income on the people most affected by these changes? **Professor Barnhart** – That's a good question. Actually, it's not registration that they close, but applications. That data could be gathered, but I'm not sure it is. Again, I could ask David Crook to do that if you guys are interested in that. I'm sure the University is concerned about that, because there is a sincere effort not to diminish the diversity of the University. I think the jury is out anyway until we get entirely through the application process also. That will be the summer. **Professor Vozick** – I hope you will follow through assertively. The "you guys" are the communities in New York whose husbands or wives cannot effectively use CUNY.

**Professor William Crain** – This all goes to the heart of our mission, and it sounds like we are fighting reality – the numbers are just too great, we just can't accommodate them all. The question becomes, we are supposed to be open to all people. We should gather data on who is not getting into college, who doesn't have the chance. Your diversity can stay the same, but I'm concerned about any single young person who doesn't get in. We're supposed to be open to everybody, and it sounds like some are not getting the opportunity to go to college, so we have to do things to make sure they do. There is a not-so-hidden agenda at City College to raise SAT scores. They are using this as an opportunity to do so. Study after study indicates SATs don't predict success at the college, but they still push it and twist arms to get faculty to go along with raising the SAT. We know that will block out students of color to the extent you emphasize that. We need a plan to preserve the mission of the University, and not allow it to be diminished, subverted, or undermined. **Professor Barnhart** – What you need to do, on a campus by campus basis, when any issue of admissions standards comes up, the faculty must ask themselves what are the consequence of so doing? One of the issues with swelling enrollments is that higher senior college standards will push more students into the community colleges. You are right. Some who would otherwise have been qualified do not get there.

**Chair Philipp** – Martin Burke is on the agenda, but I don't think he is here. We have an interesting alternative. Shawn Rice is here from the Doctoral Student Council. This will be a student presentation for the first time in a while.

**Professor Baumrin** – It might be the first time since the fiscal crisis. It's a great pleasure for me to help welcome to the Senate a representative of the student body, in this case the chair of the Doctoral Student Council to discuss an issue that the Senate has been intimately involved in.

**III. Shawn Rice** – I'm the Co-chair for Communications, technically. We have a fun tripartite presidency where Suzanne Tamang is one of the others. Thank you for this opportunity. What this probably concerns is something that is noted in this piece of paper, Professor Philipp's report. On the back, it says the School of Professional Studies has removed an interesting clause in its governance, F.2, which stated that revenue generated by the School shall be used for doctoral support to the extent possible. Needless to say, CUNY doctoral students are not funded very well compared to many other schools. On the average, basic funding packages are about

\$8,000 less than NYU per year, and that doesn't bring the health insurance benefits or other student services. When we wrote to him asking about this, and trying I guess to block it, he wrote back to us acknowledging full well the reason why that clause was in there. He said giving excess revenues to support doctoral students seemed right to the Graduate School and University Center and the School of Professional Studies in 2003, when the SPS was created and its bylaws drawn up. At that time, support of doctoral students was so low compared to now as to be a critical concern, and SPS was conceived as a revenue-generating enterprise without comparable student support issues of its own. His argument that he then gave us is that the School of Professional Studies is now something entirely different, and doctoral students don't need this. But as you also see in Professor Philipp's report, it mentions that their CUTRA has funds of over \$600,000 at the moment, and that they've never really given us anything, even though it's been in their governance. This is possibly a missed budget allocation – you could look at it that way, or a renege on a promise, or many other things. But what we're concerned about is actually trying to keep that support. Currently the clause has been removed at the SPS level, but it still has several levels to go through. So we are going to be working to reverse that decision, possibly at another SPS meeting, but at other venues as well such as FSA or the Board of Trustees – we'll actually go there. Besides just informational, I'd ask for any support you can give us on this in any way, whether it's talking to any faculty who are on SPS's board or anywhere else to say that this really isn't that cool.

**Professor Dean Savage** – Do you have any information on the budget for the School of Professional Studies? How much money do they bring in, and how much do they cost? **Chair Philipp** – I don't have it on the tip of my tongue, but I can provide it. It's part of the CUNY budget information packet that we get. **Professor Savage** – Ballpark: are they making money? **Chair Philipp** – Yes. They have a solid CUTRA account. They are making money. In their first year, they did provide the required doctoral student support. After that, they stopped even though they continued to make money.

**Professor Philip Pecorino** – I'm an elected faculty representative to the SPS Council from the faculty of the online BA program. I want to address the students present. Are you aware that, at the time SPS was created, this clause about support for students wasn't simply because of the need. The Dean may be doing a bit of misdirection here in raising a possible explanation for why it was put forward so he could respond as it was no longer needed, which you refute by pointing out the level of support that does exist. But in addition to that reason, it was known that the School of Professional Studies was about to receive considerable support -- infrastructure -- from the entity known as the Graduate School and University Center. It still does receive that support. You can construe your argument that at the time that was worked out, it was in light of that they were supposed to return something to graduate students. The support continues through Human Resources, Payroll, and other areas at the Graduate School and University Center, as well as space, utilities, etc. You might rephrase your presentation to take that into consideration as well.

**Professor Cooper** – I think there are people here probably unaware of the fact that this violation of the commitment to graduate students is not the only way in which the initial charter of SPS has been violated. On almost every issue they have promised, they have done the opposite. They were not supposed to do much more than outside training grants. So, for example, if the school teachers of New York needed a summer institute to relearn some math, that was the SPS role. They were not to give degrees or create courses and programs that competed with our undergraduate degrees. They were not to give certificates but they are now pushing for Master's degrees and a regular campus. The initial funding for this was sucked out of all our continuing ed budgets on every undergraduate campus. The individual in charge of this, the same individual who is running the new community college, is on a roll. He's highly regarded by the

administration at 80<sup>th</sup> Street. He brings in a lot of money, and after 25 years of knowing him I'm perfectly willing to say in the public record he has less respect for academic integrity than anybody I know in that office. Anything that sells and brings in a buck is fine. A university that is claiming on all its bus ads all around the City about its high standards and so forth is harboring what in my view is a joke. When that online program, for example, on Communications and Culture was first produced, I took it around to a batch of faculty who do similar things at other colleges, and there wasn't one chair of any Media or other department who looked at it with anything other than contempt. It didn't matter. I consider this violation of giving support to doctoral students as the last straw. It seems to me we really ought to have a tantrum in public since anything they seem to do in private just flies. Sorry to be so purple with rage, but nothing has gotten me angrier than this thing.

**Professor Jacobson** – I was chair of the Academic Policy Committee at the time the SPS was founded, and if you look at the minutes of our meetings everything that Sandi says about what SPS was supposed to do is true. It was continuing education for various groups, people who need IT or teachers who needed a course. It was not to give degrees, and foremost it was going to provide any excess monies to graduate student support. Basically, that is why we said it's a go.

**Professor Anne Friedman** – I happen to have been the UFS representative on the Committee for Faculty, Staff, and Administration at the time. There were certain agreements made. That's absolutely true. When we called the Chancellor not too long ago on the fact that these promises are being broken, for example duplicating degrees that are on our campuses, his response was "That was then; this is now." I want to bring up the new community college once more. You remember we had a discussion with John Mogulescu back in October. He's heading up that project also. One of the biggest issues we focused on in October, of course since this is the Faculty Senate, was the issue of governance, hiring, full-time and part-time faculty, credentials, academic departments, and elected chairs. We still haven't gotten answers to those questions, and what I'm certainly waiting for with bated breath is the list of people who are going to be on the governance and organizational structure committee for this new community college. That information is supposed to come out shortly. The proof will be in the pudding when we actually see what the structure of this new school will look like. John Mogulescu is a very nice man, and may have very good intentions in spite of what Sandi might think, but the only thing he knows is continuing education and the School of Professional Studies, which has 140 part-time faculty, four full-time faculty, no departments but divisions and division heads who are not faculty and are not elected. I think we really have to pay attention to this as the semester moves on.

**Professor Pecorino** – First, with regard to the SPS changes, when I sat at the Council meeting, the other item about non-duplication came up. I introduced an amendment to replace their removal of the restriction which said only in the case where the governing body of a campus that had a similar program agreed to accept it. There was no second to my amendment, so there was no discussion, and they proceeded to vote on removing the restriction entirely, and the claim was that SPS will then propose programs just like any other college, and the provosts will receive the proposal and object if they want to. But we know that often provosts get it and governance bodies never hear about it, so there is no effective way for the faculty to express their positions on this. We also know that the Chancellor has not explained to the Council of Presidents this removal of the restrictions, so we don't know what their positions are. On the matter of the new community college, I attended a meeting of the Steering Committee, which doesn't vote on anything, in December. A statement was made, bespeaking a kind of naiveness that can support claims that Sandi and Anne made about how this all operates, that in the spring semester there would be a hiring of faculty for the new community college. I am named to that governance group although it hasn't met yet, and I can tell you at the present time at this University faculty

are not hired, they are appointed and only by the Board of Trustees. They can only be appointed to a unit of the University and a name of a department. There is no resolution before the Board to create a new community college. There is no proposal under development to present to the Board. How any faculty member would be appointed, or hired, in this semester for that college – I have no idea what they are talking about. I bring it up because they will, as they announced, attempt to get faculty from the current University faculty. If your colleagues are approached and told that they are seeking to make faculty appointments, you tell them it is not possible. At the most they might get some reassigned time for committee work, but that is nowhere near a guarantee that you're going to get appointed to anything, particularly something that doesn't exist. So it leaves us wondering what is really going on here? The money and attention nationally will produce something. Of that we're fairly sure. But right now this thing is a pig in a poke!

**Professor Cooper** – This business of creating programs that have to be approved at other campuses is a piece of CUNY's practice which is recognized, it seems to me, not in reality. Even if a provost has objections, they are not likely to be made public. Once in a blue moon, a college proposes a degree that another college thinks it has control over, and a little negotiation goes on and then it goes through. By and large, the faculty have no clue about these articulated or connected programs, and what you need to understand is that under CUNY law those courses are transferable to your degrees, even though you had nothing to say about them. So you break your neck trying to create a respectable degree on your home campus, and you have absolutely no control over the student body that is transferred in with a correct claim legally that they have credit for that course or the equivalent. Maybe I'm beating a dead horse, and this is an outmoded attitude. On top of the business that Mike Barnhart mentioned about admissions changes without any governance involvement, these are the two areas where we have professional responsibility. It has to be asserted repeatedly. The Board of Trustees in the 90s agreed after that lawsuit that there would be consultation with the Senate over these matters, and there wouldn't be a loose cannon running around 80<sup>th</sup> Street creating an empire.

**Professor Beaky** – At the Community College Caucus this evening, Anne and I both raised the question of how faculty would be hired for the new community college. What emerged was interesting: they will initially be hired as faculty from existing community colleges. For instance, someone now teaching as an adjunct at LaGuardia would be hired as a LaGuardia faculty member, and then when the new college is created they become members of that college. Who would do the hiring? There would be a CUNY search committee. It's very clear that this new community college is already designed. We're just waiting for them to tell us what it is, but they know. "They" are two planning teams. One was CUNY administrators plus New York City Department of Education administrators. The second, which now exists, is all CUNY administrators. Not one faculty member on either team. The charges of those committees are incredibly detailed. They have pre-planned what is to be "decided" by the committees, so when the report comes out it's not as if those folks really decided. All of those committees are shadow committees. Everything is coming out of the planning teams. I do not expect there will be any departments or any chairs. There will be tenured people, a few, from central administration. The model is SPS and this new way of administering colleges without faculty input, without faculty decision making, or academic freedom. Everything is coming from the planning team.

**Chair Philipp** – I think the academic freedom issues are the first ones to think of. I would be interested in knowing if the hiring is coming from the P & Bs of the community colleges.

**Professor Dahlia Remler** – I was an advisor to the math topics working committee for the new community college. From my small piece, I can say that we were not told what to do. I was an advisor and not heavily active until towards the end, but we spent a lot of time deciding what

was right and best to do for the students. I was incredibly impressed by the innovative things people wanted to do. I want to stress that the way to think about education is not to say, This is what the rules have traditionally said, or This is the way we've always done it before. It's to think what is the best thing to do for our students. A lot has been learned about pedagogy. People in my committee were very knowledgeable and immensely devoted to how to help students learn, particularly the kinds of students who have difficulty learning the kinds of quantitative tasks that are needed for many careers they want to have. So I think you don't want to be locked into the old rules, but to be thinking what is going to most help our students. At least the small piece of the new community college planning that I saw really did that in a way I rarely see in my experience in higher education. **Professor Friedman** – I'm sure the faculty serving on these committees are wonderful, have wonderful minds, and the best of intentions. I have no doubt about that. The question I have is ultimately who has the power. Who makes the choice? At our colleges, ultimately the president makes the decisions. But we have a process of committees. We have curriculum committees in departments, and we take a vote. We have minutes. We bring that vote to the academic Senate and discuss it college-wide. The academic Senate goes to the college council, and ultimately there is a recommendation to the president. There is no voting anywhere in this structure. I specifically asked this to one of the planning committee members. Do these working committees vote? No. Do they have minutes? No. Does the planning committee vote? No. So who makes the decisions? John Mogulescu is the decider. I'm sure these committees will make very good suggestions, or at least the faculty on them. The point is, ultimately we will be told they reached consensus, and they advised me, and so on, and this is what I decided, but there is no real process here beyond a mirage. I don't want anybody to think that I or anybody raising these questions about governance are being critical of our colleagues who are serving on these committees with the best of intentions. I know some of them. But the process is not the kind we are accustomed to, with any rigor. It's made by one person.

**Professor Pecorino** – I respect Dahlia for her contribution. I know several faculty involved in these efforts personally, and I respect their judgments and their sincerity. Here's my concern, which I brought up with this planning committee in December. I've been in the system 39 years. I've chaired the Queensborough curriculum committee 18 of those years, and the Senate for too many years. I know there are rules we have to play by. We have wonderful people in our Basic Skills and Math Department who would love it if we could say to them, Redesign your courses; pay no attention to the State Ed Department or the Board of Regents rules, and come up with what you think would be the most effective way to present this instruction. I'm pretty confident they are going to come back with something that has a good deal of time on task with assistance for students. But those are not what they are permitted to propose. We have an hour credit guideline that we have to follow. The folks putting together this curriculum under the concept for the new community college were not given any of that. They were free to produce some instantiation of the basic concept paper description of possible approaches. Very innovative. So in December I said to Vice Chancellor Lexa Logue that if they get some kind of special dispensation to present this kind of curriculum at the new community college and it proves effective, what about the rest of our community colleges? Couldn't we have the same thing? She said we hope so, but it speaks to the naivens that not one member on the planning team had copies of the regulations from State Ed, the Board of Ed, and the Commissioner's office. I'm just upset that our faculty who are doing these things might get used if in the end they are told it can't be done that way.

**Chair Philipp** – Our committees will continue working on these issues, and at 80<sup>th</sup> Street I am continuing to speak with the actors, trying to get a governance structure for SPS that would be representative, elected, and democratic. That's not something we have now. Please read my report. There are some interesting passages in there. I look forward to your attendance at the

next meeting.