

UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE SPRING 2006 CONFERENCE
Friday April 7, 2006
9:30 a.m.

How Satisfied is the CUNY Faculty? – The Faculty Experience Survey

John Jay College, 445 W. 59th St
2nd Floor, All Purpose Room

9:30 a.m. – Sign-in and Greetings

Greetings:

Chair, Susan O'Malley- Welcome to the UFS Spring conference. I am so pleased that this is finally happening. The idea for this survey happened the very first 3 or 4 months of which I was chair of the UFS. So finally the results are compiled and it's starting to be taken very seriously and Dean will tell us about that. I like the title 'How Satisfied is the CUNY Faculty?' and this is what we will find out. To start the day Basil Wilson, the Provost of John Jay College will give us greetings. President Travis is teaching, a worthy occupation for Friday morning. Anyway, Provost Wilson.

Provost Basil Wilson (John Jay College) - Good morning. We're extremely happy that the members of the University Faculty Senate have again chosen John Jay College to hold this conference. I am particularly pleased that you are actively looking at the Faculty Survey. In many ways it is paradoxical that you're having this conference at John Jay College as John Jay scored perhaps the lowest in terms of the dissatisfaction of its faculty on the survey. I think that overall the John Jay College faculty did not score well. Why I think it's quite interesting is that in terms of student surveys, John Jay College students score quite high in terms of their satisfaction at the college. So we really have an interesting disjunction here in that there is certainly some level of faculty dissatisfaction and there is a high level of student satisfaction. One of the things I wanted to mention is that I sort of want to salute the University Faculty Senate because this is a form of outcome assessment. I think the University has recognized the value of outcome assessment in terms of improving its work. We've been struggling with outcome assessments since 1997 and I think we're finally making some headway in terms of both

student and faculty outcomes and we've certainly learned a lot from this faculty survey. One of the things that I want to really point out is that in the 16 years that I've been involved in the recruitment of faculty, one of the things that I've observed, certainly in the last two years is how much the market is changing and I think that in order for CUNY to attract the best and the brightest it will have to be certain of ways to improve its delivery of services and ensure that its faculty are in fact satisfied when they do come to the City University of New York. We took great pride at John Jay College for many, many years that most of us who came never left and we referred to each other as 'lifers' in the same way that prisoners get life sentences; at this criminal justice college many of the faculty see themselves as lifers. But that is radically changing in terms of the new market and we will in fact digest the survey and I hope that we can improve the satisfaction rate of John Jay faculty. I want to thank you for choosing John Jay to have this outcome assessment of the CUNY faculty and I hope your deliberations are exceedingly fruitful and I just want to mention in closing that this evening we're going to be having the memorial service for the John Jay College student who was murdered, Imette St. Guillen, so if you are still around at that time you are welcome to attend the memorial service which will be held in our theater in the T building. Thank you kindly and I hope you have a successful conference. Thank you.

Chair O'Malley- Now we have David Crook who is University Dean for Institutional Research & Assessment and was a big supporter of the survey from the get-go.

Dean David Crook (University Dean for Institutional Research & Assessment) - Thank you Susan. I'm very pleased to join you this morning for your discussion of the UFS Faculty Experience Survey. I must admit though as something of a data professional not to mention a sociologist, at this moment I feel a strong urge to pinch myself. This morning we're about to take part in a most unusual event, a large public discussion of an important issue thoroughly informed by a piece of serious social scientific research. How often have we seen this recently in public life? Not to mention CUNY. Susan O'Malley and the Faculty Senate deserve a great deal of credit for making this event happen. Susan recognized the need for such a survey long ago, and with the assistance of her colleagues,

especially Dean, saw it through to completion. Thanks to this project we have some important new information, data that we at CUNY have never had before. As you may be aware, for many years the University has conducted the Student Experience Survey. In fact, as we speak the 2006 edition is on its way to a sample of about 17,000 undergraduate students at CUNY. That survey asks about a variety of experiences including, coursework, interactions with faculty, the quality of student services and the physical environment on campus. It may come as no surprise to you that our students expressed frustration with some familiar aspects of life at CUNY, particularly those linked to a lack of resources. Some of the sore points are: an inability, particularly at some of the colleges, to register for the courses that they need to graduate; another persistent complaint is insufficient academic advisement. By the way, they too have something to say about the cafeterias, parking and restrooms. Nevertheless, the large majority are very positive about their experiences here at CUNY and most would not attend any other college than their own if they could start over as first year students. Now, thanks to the Faculty Senate we have good information, not only about student experience but also about faculty experiences. As you will see in the discussions to follow, most full-time faculty members say that in general they are satisfied with their teaching position at CUNY. However the survey also reveals some areas of great concern, including issues of shared governance and access to information, release time for research and the size of the work load, class size, classroom and office space, and library holdings all are key points of high dissatisfaction ratings. The data make it clear that faculty satisfaction varies widely across CUNY colleges. I can assure you that the Chancellery has reviewed these results with care and takes them very seriously. Discussion of the results has begun and will continue both internally and with the campuses. As members of a great university we are dedicated to building knowledge about our world and conveying it to our students. To guide this enterprise we must not neglect knowledge about ourselves, rather we must cultivate it and let it inform our policies and practices. To this end I support and applaud this first UFS Faculty Experience Survey and stand ready to lend assistance to the Senate in fielding future surveys. That goes for me and my office and any kind of logistical support that we can offer. Thanks, and have a good conference.

Chair O'Malley- Thank you. In all fairness the idea for the survey, and that's why it says genesis down there, is Karen Kaplowitz so I think she should say something- a few sentences. Then we should applaud because when she said it to me I said "What?" and then I said "Oh yeah, let's do it."

Genesis:

Professor Karen Kaplowitz (English, John Jay College) - Thank you Susan. In the beginning I was fascinated by the Student Experience Survey that David Crook just talked about and that has been presented to the Board of Trustees Committee on Student Affairs whenever the survey has been done, showing the importance with which the Chancellery and the Board of Trustees treats the survey and the survey results and the experiences and the perceptions of the experiences of the students. So that was one factor. Then there was the Chronicle of Higher Education which as you know every year has survey results and I always wondered what our faculty would say about the questions there. Then Chancellor Goldstein became chancellor of the University and he established, as we know, performance measures for the Presidents and interestingly and appropriately, I thought, one of the performance measures was the satisfaction of the students. How the students scored at each campus on the Student Experience Survey. I thought that if what the students say matters in evaluating the Presidents then certainly what the faculty say should matter. So I spoke to Susan and she thought it was a wonderful idea to establish a survey and we presented it to the UFS executive committee, which thought it was a great idea. I wrote a resolution, because that is our way, and presented it to the University Faculty Senate which unanimously endorsed this resolution to create a survey and to propose to the Chancellor that the survey results be included in the performance measures of the Presidents. There were other reasons though that I thought it was important to have such a survey. First of all, I think it is important for all of our colleagues to know what we think, both our colleagues in the administration and our colleagues on the faculty. I think it's a reality check for each of us either as a corrective or as a validation of our own perceptions. I hope that as a result of the survey results there will be more faculty involvement in governance and that there will be more speaking up and speaking out

because now on each campus there is a collective voice through the survey results and so when a faculty leader says something it's not resented or argued that that is that one person's perception but rather the perception of the faculty, if that person is representing accurately the perception of the faculty. Ultimately I think that the importance of the survey is to enhance the educational experience of our students, the effectiveness of our colleges and our own experiences as faculty and so I'm very pleased and I think that Susan did a fabulous job in actually getting this done, putting together a wonderful group and Dean Savage, Ken [Sherrill?], Alfred Levine, Susan and I were the non-social scientists there but we were kind of the reality check of whether these questions were answerable from our perspective and we are grateful that so many faculty responded and we're sure that when this is reiterated next year there'll be an even greater response because the faculty will have seen how seriously the results are taken. So, thank you all and especially thank you Susan, Dean, Ken and Alfred.

Chair O'Malley- OK, now Dean Savage. Dean is a Professor of Sociology at Queens College and he also knows what he's doing about surveys. I also want to mention his students, [Biata Breg?] and [Laurie Ah?] and [Biata] is doing a Master's thesis on, and here she is! She's doing a Master's thesis on this very survey. All right Dean, I also want to say two things, one is Provosts are asking for more information, more tables, which Dean might mention and various committees are meeting with administrators with the results and talking about the survey and the problems at campuses.

Background and Summary:

Professor Dean Savage (Sociology, Queens College) – Well this is something that actually turned out to succeed beyond our imaginations. It turned out to be a lot of work, it turned out also that some of the things were done in a way that's less than perfect. I shutter to imagine what a real data hound like Manfred Kuechler from Hunter who's here today might actually say were he to review many of our techniques and kind of initiatives as we went through the whole thing. But bear with us on the first go around, this has actually turned out to be a survey that worked. In your handouts, on the yellow handout

you have the tables that most of you have seen already. They were presented at the plenary on December 6 at the University Faculty Senate. There are some new ones which I'd like to comment on just briefly and to start on that, go to Table 13 and finally we have the response rates, I finally got around to calculating those and you will see that there is, on balance, an average of 1/3 of the faculty who received questionnaires in the mail, in their mailboxes actually handed back the surveys. Now this is kind of an underestimate of the response rate because the faculty listing that we received from Central included all of those people on leave so to all of the faculty who were on leave, it went to their faculty mailboxes, most of them of course were staying as far away from the campus as they could during that time and they didn't receive it. I did receive one survey from Paris in late May; the person said they'd just received it so there are some cases in which the response rate is higher than it actually seems. The response rate is pretty standard mid 20's to kind of mid 30's. There are a couple of exceptions, York College at 41, Queens College at 48, why the exceptions? My claim is that at Queens I know we pushed very, very hard, the 48% response rate at Queens is the result of what is possible I think if the Faculty Governance people on the campus get behind the survey and push hard you will have a much higher response rate. Having said that, there don't seem to be very many patterns in colleges with high response rates being more satisfied or less satisfied. If you wanted to go ahead and make a guess, which is all it would be, about what happens as you dip more deeply into the cohort, what happens when you have larger response rates, my own guess would be that you're starting to dip into less satisfied people. There is an alternate theory which is that at some campuses people are so unhappy that the outraged people, the most dissatisfied ones, leap to respond to a survey like this. I find that somewhat harder to accept. But in any case, we don't know and the answer is that in the next survey to go ahead and push hard and try to get that response rate increased to the 50% level, at which point I think we'll be getting quite a good look at what faculty satisfaction is. If you turn the page to check on how accurate the responses seem when we compare the responses from the survey people to the overall characteristics, the demographic characteristics of CUNY as a whole you'll see that in terms of rank, a very close match, in terms of gender, women are slightly more likely to respond, in terms of race/ethnic a slight under representation of minority faculty members. But, by and large

it's a fairly good fit and so I think if we increase the response rate and if people realize, as Karen said, that this is something that people are paying attention to I think we're going to see a much higher response next time around. If you turn that page to Table 15, what we did, and we screwed it up, but what we tried to do is borrow questions from an established national survey of post-secondary faculty. They've done surveys in 1988, 1993, 1998, and 2004, 1999 and 2004 and we slipped a little bit here and when we were putting the questionnaire together we didn't include mainly the questions from 2004, those are the ones that we really wanted to have to have a contemporaneous comparison so what we have is mainly from 1999. So what you're seeing here are a number of questions from 1999. If you look at those items, what you see, taking CUNY as an institution compared to this representative national sample of 16,000 faculty, really a good representative sample of what full-time faculty in the United States think; you'll see that we don't do well. CUNY comes out less well by every measure except one and that is our excellent secretarial support. Go figure, who knew, and I don't really know quite what that's about, sometimes you say that there is some static in the data perhaps. But remember that at many of the two year campuses, there was a lot of real praise for the secretarial support. Kingsborough loves their secretaries; they can't stop talking about how great their support is. That may be a part of what's going on, I don't know, and then when we go to the questions on satisfaction with making decisions about course load, course content, technology, support for improvement of teaching and workload, we don't do well there either and there we've got a couple of comparisons from 1999 and also comparisons from 2004 and so the message is in terms of comparisons, control over what we teach in our courses, we're fine, everybody in the country is fine on that score. Administrators don't have the energy or the time to reach in and tell us what to teach in our courses. **Unidentified Speaker-** [off-mic comment] / Professor Savage- It's coming, OK Sandy. I think that they're going to find that it's a little harder than they think We'll just call up David Horowitz and ask him./ Unidentified Speaker- [off-mic comment]/ Professor Savage- It's everybody, I can't give you the numbers right now but it's in there, all of it's in there. We have an expert here on the National Survey of Post-Secondary Faculty, maybe we just unleash her on this project and go ahead and.../ Unidentified Speaker- [off-mic comment] / Professor Savage- And I think another thing to do would

be to go ahead and break it down by two-year and four-year and doctoral and go ahead and make specific comparisons and maybe take comprehensive urban colleges and do those comparisons, maybe our natural comparison group is Wayne State or something like that and then we'd see how things are. But you know what, if we look at the results from the national survey of student experience which is this survey that all CUNY campuses participated in asking how engaged our undergraduates are in their education, a wonderful kind of effort that I really recommend everybody become familiar with, they have a new faculty complement that they call the [FSSE?] the Faculty Survey of Student Engagement, what do the faculty think about the degree to which their students are actually engaged in their education and CUNY colleges don't come out well, even when you do the comparison with similar kinds of colleges. So, we do have a set of problems that we need to address. For the time being, point taken, absolutely right, in theory we would have had these detailed comparisons here, but in part when I realized that we had messed up, that I had messed up in terms of choosing the comparison questions, I said "OK, let's just toss it out there, it's water under the bridge, let's get a real crack team together for the next effort and let's make it better." Now if you go on to the last page, these are data that I don't believe in very much but I'm putting them out there because we've got them. The surveys in 1999 included questions on what would be the most important factors in your decision to leave if you did decide to leave CUNY. These are expressions of intent; they are not expressions of "I'm actually on the job market right now." What is most effective would be, I think, expressions of who actually left; now there would be data that would get people's attention. If you look down the list here you can see the detailed information at the bottom from the national survey in 1999 and you can see comparisons with Queens College, by campus and the patterns here are [part to parcel?] it's quite difficult to figure out exactly what's going on. In any case what we do notice by rank is that our junior faculty are more actively considering leaving. In some campuses as many as 40% of Assistant Professors are saying that they're going to be on the job market in the next year. This is a concern for us as people recognize everywhere that our salaries are no longer competitive. We're losing people we would in the past have been able to hire so I think one of the things that the survey might focus on in the future is what our junior faculty really are thinking and feeling in terms of how rooted

they're going to be. It may be, as Provost Wilson said, that in the past many people thought of themselves as lifers, but the market is changing. Public higher education is no longer competitive with private education and CUNY public higher education is less and less competitive with other public higher education and so we're going to work on that. In terms of what the survey's going to do in the future, one we've got the attention of the Chancellor, we've got the attention of the Presidents and Provosts offices around the system. I've been getting calls from assistants to the Provosts or assistants to the Presidents, they want the data, they want the details and I've had to say no on occasion, you can't have the detailed data because that's confidential, we have to respect IRB regulations in confidentiality. They have a hard time getting the message sometimes. It's the Senate's survey and we went ahead and worked on that. David had a good suggestion, David said we should share this data in a more worked out form with the campuses so that people can have them on hand and so they can ask themselves certain kinds of questions, anonymizing the data in a way that they might be out there for further analysis might be a useful thing to do. We have to have a discussion with the Executive Committee of the Senate on the degree to which we want to release the data. The widest possible dissemination is very, very much in our interest. Yes / Unidentified Speaker- [off-mic comment] / Professor Savage- The question is, there is a question in Table 5 about are you satisfied with the availability of research assistants and we included that question because it was in the National Survey and we know perfectly well that research assistants, you see them at the Grad. Center and occasionally certain grad programs send a research assistant to the campuses but you're right we don't see them at all and for that matter they don't see them that often nationally, the data on the national faculty satisfaction is pretty low. There is a question that we'll have to ask ourselves "Should we keep this one in?" or is it too remote from our experience to merit increasing or should we keep it in to keep the pressure on. / Unidentified Speaker- [off-mic comment] / Professor Savage- We'll keep it in, but one of the things that is always a trade off here, when you're doing a survey and you want to take advantage of the comparison with this wonderful national survey that has a marvelous, representative national sample and a high response rate, 80+% response rate you want to keep the wording exactly the same and so it's a trade off. I would vote, in general, for keeping the wording exactly the same

so we can see where we stack up in terms of national baseline data, something that does persuade administrators is to say, “Oh, and by the way, compare these numbers with the national baseline data conducted by...” / Unidentified Speaker- [off-mic comment] / Professor Savage- I think we need to maybe move on to the workshop phase. These are questions I think are appropriate for the workshops. /Chair O’Malley- We did struggle over this question a lot in the committee and Dean finally persuaded me that we really have to look at that national survey and do a comparison because that’s the way we draw attention and also get much more credibility. Anyway, time for the workshops. First, thank you Dean. Will the people for the first panel come up?

10:00 a.m. - Panels

First Panel- (10:00 a.m. – 10:45 a.m.) Overall Faculty Satisfaction

Professor Sandi Cooper (History, College of Staten Island) - Good morning everybody, can everybody hear me? I’m Sandi Cooper from the College of Staten Island, the Graduate School and the Executive Committee of the University Faculty Senate representing a college which is practically plumb in the middle of this survey for its overall numbers. I guess that’s why I’m sitting here in the middle. We have 45 minutes on this panel to review the overall faculty satisfaction piece of the survey; the members of the panel include people from the extreme ends of the survey, happy types and the other. I am going to introduce them in the order that they are listed on your program, happiness first, and ask them to please confine themselves to 10 or 12 minutes, I think that will give us some time. The two over here from Kingsborough have to divide 10 or 12 minutes, either they sit on each other’s lap or they speak in unison. The first speaker Terrence Martell from Baruch represents the happiest of our campuses, the most satisfied and would you like to begin please?

Professor Terrence Martell (Weissman Center for International Business, Baruch College) - As Faculty Senate President at Baruch I take complete and total credit for the outstanding results here. I’ll speak to this, but I want to speak going forward to some results. When we got this survey of course I noticed right away that we were happiest with our restrooms and that led to a whole series of interesting events including giving

the Chief Administrative Officer a “King of the Commode” Award at a Faculty Senate. The President before the current President put the Faculty Senate on the Cabinet; but that cabinet was like a 20 person cabinet. President Waldron kept the idea but shrunk the cabinet so as the Faculty Senate President I sit on the cabinet with the four deans, three VP’s and the President. That is a completely important piece of information because it allows me at the highest level to directly, at the highest level, reflect faculty concerns. When I got this survey’s results I had a presentation with the Faculty Senate, shared it with the Baruch Cabinet with the idea of encouraging attention to the particular items that could be addressed immediately and quickly. I want to read to you the cover paragraph that President Waldron wrote to the cabinet in transmitting the survey results. I don’t want you to think we have this great relationship, because she treats me as if I was on the Arts & Science faculty of Harvard University; there is a certain dynamic tension in terms of our relationship. Having said that, “While I am pleased that Baruch College Faculty are the most satisfied within the CUNY system, there are areas of concern regarding the availability of research and teaching assistants, sabbatical availability, class size and secretarial support that merit further discussion. I believe we have already increased sabbatical availability,” true “and increased support of graduate assistantship,” true, “since the survey was conducted but we certainly need to do more. As we move forward with our strategic plan which raises many of these issues we need to be creative to address faculty concerns.” So my first point is, if you’ve got a positive interaction focusing on faculty needs, you are far more likely to take a document like this, identify things that have got to be fixed, or at least worked on, none of these things are going to be fixed but all we want is continuous and constant improvement. So the President and I sat down and decided, and by the way, I don’t think Dean Savage has been thanked enough. I really think this information is critical. President Waldron was very concerned about the respect shown the faculty by administration. I, however, was not concerned about that at all. I don’t care about respect, I care about resources. For the next year or two we’re focusing on improving our scores in the research area. In light of the questions, it’s interesting that the questions are actually driving the issues that are being addressed, which is a subtle but very, very important thing to remember. Basic research equipment, laboratory research space and supplies, availability of research assistants, availability of

release time for research, administrative support for intellectual life and the availability of sabbaticals form a set of issues that we're going to focus on. Now to me the answer obviously is going to come out in a year or two or three or four in terms of higher numbers. But in the interim I'm going to want to see money moved in the direction of more teaching assistants, money moved in the direction of more sabbaticals so that you can actually come back to your faculty senate and say "It's not that our numbers went up, it's that based on management's response to faculty needs we now see more money for this and more money for that." Objective and quantifiable, maybe that's because it's Baruch, objective, quantifiable things that you can report back and hopefully lead to an increased quality of life. That's enough for me. / Professor Cooper- Thank you very much. Our next speaker is Phil Pecorino of one of the happy two community colleges; this is beginning to feel like Jeremy Bentham's *Calculus of Pain and Pleasure*.

Professor Philip Pecorino (Social Sciences Department, Queensborough Community College) - It seems to disturb Sandi that some of us might be described as being happy so I'll alleviate you, I'm not happy. It's a relative judgment that we're happy, if you look at some of our responses, we're just above 50% and I don't think a 50% satisfaction rate is really happy. I'll mention relativity in a moment. I guess I'm invited to try to explain the results at Queensborough and my honest answer is, I don't know. As Dean said there are a lot of things we just have to guess at. I don't know who responded to this survey but I know we're in the average of 110 out of 270 people. I don't know the breakdown for Queensborough but Dean says University wide it's about the same as the university wide distribution. OK, I can go with that, but how representative the folks are at Queensborough who responded, that I don't know. At Queensborough, I guess the reason for my being here is that the faculty report, it's their perception that there is a large degree of control over what they do with regard to curriculum, courses, departmental work, college wide service and they think they have great opportunities to involve themselves with governance through a variety of mechanisms, and they report that there is effective individual and collective involvement with academic integrity issues, academic freedom and academic standing. They have this perception that the administration is aware of the faculty and has great respect for the faculty and the role

that the faculty should play in the development of curricular instruction, the awarding of degrees, setting and maintaining standards and involvement in shared governance. Much of the perception of the faculty is the result of experiences that they have within their own departments. As I interviewed people most of their ideas of the college are based on their home environment, and that means their departments. Much of what's going on there is because of the chairpersons reflecting the general tone of the entire college. So the administration sets out some policies and practices and sets a tone and then that filters into the departments. I think that what is also influencing these perceptions, are the existence of the governance structures and mechanisms that do these things. They promote respect, concern and desire for faculty involvement. They support the continuation of the culture in the shared governance that we have and they permit faculty to enter into key positions. Before I go further I've got to get back to that relativity thing. There's two things you should know, one, when this survey was given out we had just been under two and a half years of a new president after 30 years with President [Smeller?], so the new President coming changed the culture of the college, set a different tone and people believed things were possible that weren't possible before. Faculty Academic Initiatives were starting to expand rapidly and we went from a time when the status quo was *de summum bonum* to a time when the President was saying "OK, I'm willing to try things, what have you got on your mind?" Not that he was trying everything but it was just the fact that we were allowed to make some motion or talk about making motion was a great relief and a lot of people were very happy about that. The other idea about relativity as applied to Queensborough is this, before we were known as "the happy campus," we were known as the one way out there in the east, in Republican land and very conservative and I think that's still pretty much the case. We are satisfied relative to what we expect. If we expect less and get less we're going to be a relatively higher satisfied faculty. I'll take as one illustration, we reported out 52% of the people who responded were satisfied with being told about the budget. That was 20 points above the CUNY mean. What the heck does that mean? We get very little information about the budget and less is even requested by the faculty. We don't have any governance structure that asks for it or reviews it so most of the people on my campus are satisfied with the very little information that we get about the budget because they don't expect any more;

and 52% is not like a happy quotient that we met in the first place. I keep that in mind in making this report, I was more interested in trying to figure out what contributed to where we were relatively higher so that maybe we could expand on that and maybe other people could review it and we could compare them and what have you. This is what I came up with, after, of course I'm there 33 years, I'm going to think about that but I interviewed about eight people who were there 2-3 years, 20 years, 30 years and 40 years, and I asked them, and an administrator, Vice President of Operations, why do you think these results came out? Based on those interviews and my own experience I put this together. These are hypotheses Dean. I think the results are attributed to a combination of four factors: the structures that we have in place through our governance system and what have you, the mechanisms that effectuate the structures' operation, the personalities of the people involved in key positions and the long history we've had of primarily faculty working together. When you've got all of those in the right combination I think you're likely to get higher rates of satisfaction. When you're missing those, and [if you are/ a few are] missing all four it would be miraculous to have a high rate of satisfaction. What do I mean by structures? Our governance plan, the faculty by-laws, the governance body by-laws, we have a college advisory planning committee where we all come together with the President and we have a labor management committee. These structures were set up after the Board said "[let] you all write governance plans" and we had a President who got in deep doo-doo with the Board because he called police onto campus and we had a kind of detente where the President said, "for the next 30 years or as long as I'm here, I'll take care of my side of the house, you take care of yours." His side meant the budget which we hardly ever hear about and the faculty wrote up some pretty nice governance, revisions and by-laws for the faculty and by-laws for the Senate, so that's how we were able to achieve that kind of laissez-faire the President had said "leave me alone, don't give me anymore trouble." We got him to the AAUP and Queensborough was censured so recovering from that he wanted us to just be happy, relatively speaking. The mechanisms we have to make that work are committees of the faculty, committees of the governing body, administrative units, task forces, search committees. I'm surprised that often people bring up, "Do you have faculty on search committees?" I don't think our President would ever put together a search committee without a faculty member present

on it, for all searches that they do of any significance. As far as the personalities, we have governance leaders and administrators setting the tone where they contribute greatly to the sense of collegiality, we had a high score in that area. Faculty leaders have a dedication to the common welfare of the institution, this is important. There are no faculty leaders that are out for self-aggrandizement or to enjoy the exercise of power on our campus, so we don't end up with the types of problems and blockages that that can lead to, and we have respect for one another and tend not to hold grudges. We're more importantly going to work together, the history and traditions are there over 30 years with the governance structures working the way they have and we are actively trying to prevent anything that disturbs the collegiality. The perception of the younger faculty I interviewed was that they were happy that they had a job and a campus with parking, these were very good. They wanted more office space but they were very, very happy that in their departments and among their colleagues outside the department they were respected and encouraged for what they were doing, people had a genuine interest and to the degree that we could we support, to the degree that we could, their research and particularly their participation in academic initiatives. At our campus we don't have as many resources as anybody would like, which is the CUNY story, but we also get the impression that when resources become available we are involved in a discussion, though not the final decision, as to how they get allocated, where it bears on the academic program, which is what most faculty care about. In conclusion, I think that whatever degree of happiness we have, if it is happiness, is a result of the structures, the mechanisms, the personalities and our history. / Professor Cooper- I should not have used the Anglo-Saxon, I should have used the Latinized satisfaction as opposed to happy, excuse me. All right, the twins from Kingsborough. According to my list, Susan Farrell is first and then, oh you're first, OK, this is wrong. I guess you can take about five and a half minutes.

Professor Frances Kraljik (History Department, Kingsborough Community College)- Actually in preparing to come here today Susan and I were discussing and deciding whether or not we would share this story with you, but in light of being described as happy and satisfied, I will, because it is kind of funny and we have different takes on it. We were just evaluated by Middle States so we ourselves were doing incredible numbers

of surveys for our own faculty chairs, etc. The story I wanted to tell you was that one of the members of the panel that came to Kingsborough, and I should also tell you that we passed all of our standards. One of the members of the panel was addressing the faculty and commented and said [tape flip] and we thought, "What is he talking about that we're some sort of zombies walking around as this happy faculty?" To hear that term here disturbs me also, Susan didn't take it so badly, he took it as "This place is great" and I'm telling you this panel left they were happy, they thought they were wonderful, it was a wonderful place. As I said we got great reviews for this new evaluation proceeding, the way it goes. My point is, when looking at this data, where I see the difference that Kingsborough stands out, is first of all our location is very different and our campus from everyone else within CUNY. We're surrounded by water on three sides, I think there is something calming about that, I don't think we need Kool-Aid but I think there is something about the setting that makes for a different environment. When I look at the difference, it's interesting, the areas in which Kingsborough exceeds the CUNY mean, all have to do with physical setting. The first thing that we're ahead of everyone else is parking, if you can give people a parking place they're happy. We have parking, maintenance of the physical plant is another one where our campus is very well maintained, it's very clean, graffiti appears one day and it's gone the next. We have that and also a very strong feeling of security, that this is a campus that you can walk around safely, you can be there at night, any time of the day, walk to the parking lots and go from one building to another and not feel unsafe or in danger. The other thing is that we also seem to score well on our personal computers and our Local Area Network. We have been getting those kinds of supplies, most of us have our own offices, some people share but there usually are enough office spaces around [core?] people. These are the kinds of things that we do well in. When we get to the other areas, we're not necessarily doing any better than anybody else. As a matter of fact our rate of response to this survey was only 37%, it's good but it's not great. We also have as other places have had, people who have been there for a very long time, myself included, Susan can speak to that, we have a lot of people who have been there a long time. I think that adds also to a sense of satisfaction and to a sense of collegiality. On our campus, to reiterate what was just said by Phil, our communication with new faculty members and the existing faculty members within

departments is very good. That's something that the chairs have tried to maintain. If anything, what that might have led to is that some of the chairs are really known as taking care of the faculty, they take care of them. When some people have left, there has been a big crisis around, "who's going to take care of us?" There's going to be a new person to step in to do that, which is an interesting observation. The other thing that I did want to say is that we've also had presidents that have had tremendous desire to make certain that Kingsborough was number one. I'm sure you all know Leon Goldstein, or have heard of him, he referred to us as the Harvard of community colleges. Subsequent presidents who have come, I think they know they're coming to a solid institution so they're pushing to make it even better so that they can make their mark, how we improved it and what have we done. So in reaction to this survey, when this came out I forwarded it to President Peruggi, with a note saying, "You should be very pleased how well Kingsborough has done and where we are." I got a response back immediately saying, "I want to meet with you because there are areas that we are not doing well." That was an interesting take, I took one position and he took another. We have had a meeting along with our Faculty Senator to discuss areas in which we did not do so well, our bookstore was terrible, needless to say the bookstore manager has been fired. There is a new bookstore manager so that there are not problems with textbooks and that type of thing. Also, I think the administration was on top of a lot of these issues that were being made by faculty in this survey because Middle States was coming. So they were very aware that these weaknesses would come up so they wanted to feel that they were addressing them. Some of them are in the process of being addressed right now. You raised the question of budget, we don't have any budget information, we had a budget committee, the chair of which took great pride in saying, and "We never met." That's in the process of being changed and reevaluated, so this has helped us, in that sense, to bring these issues to the forefront. I think I've exceeded my time, sorry.

Professor Susan Farrell (Behavioral Sciences, Kingsborough Community College) - Thanks Fran. A couple of things, to go back to the point of perception, I think that is a very important thing to keep in mind. What people perceive and what actually is going on may not always agree. Many of our faculty at Kingsborough do have this perception that in fact, one new faculty member, she's been there barely a year has said that she thought

she'd died and gone to heaven. She's taught at several other CUNY campuses and, in fact, although she had the chance to be hired full-time at one or two others, she chose Kingsborough, even though it was further away from her home and she'd have to travel longer because she felt really happy there. I agree with Fran, I think the water has something to do with it, or the Kool-Aid; though our cafeteria doesn't score that well. That's another thing, our President, who is still fairly new has been very responsive to the survey, immediately and is even looking to put a search out for new people to run the cafeteria and to really change things. Anything that she saw that was dissatisfaction she has responded to and I think that makes the difference for many of the faculty that they filled this survey out and something may be happening. Though you see that we had a fairly low response rate but on the other side of things, some of the faculty that has been there the longest, although they're lifers, are some of the ones that complain the most. When you talk to them individually, nothing ever seems to make them happy, but this may be true of a number of people who have been there a long time. On the other hand, there are people who have been there a very long time who are really, really satisfied and they wouldn't go any place else. When I talk to them and ask them, "Why did you come here? Why are you here? Why did you stay?" Some of them had opportunities to go to other places, and they said they stayed, one, again, because of the beach, but two, also because they really seem to be engaged with the students, a high level of engagement with the students. Either they say their students, like themselves when they were students, that they're the first to go to college, that they didn't have an opportunity unless they had gone to a community college and they feel that by teaching at a community college they're kind of giving back to the community and that seems to be a fairly general response. I think that adds to the general feeling of satisfaction that you're actually feeling like you're doing something, even though it's difficult and even though it can be highly frustrating at times. Some of the other issues that we found high satisfaction on, that Fran mentioned, I think are due to our chairs. We have chairs who are responsive, who really go to bat for their faculty and when we had for about three years a President who wasn't working out, the chairs fought, I mean they literally fought this battle against the President in order to, essentially, and some of the chairs will tell you that they felt instrumental in getting him out because they felt he was doing harm to the college. Our

chairs are very, very pivotal in how satisfied the faculty are, including our part-timers. One of the things that Middle States found is that our part-timers are extremely happy as well. Again, despite the fact that they're running from college to college, they seem to find very receptive chairs, most chairs invite the part-timers to the departmental meetings, listen to them, get input from the adjuncts as well and in an informal survey done on our own campus by our Faculty Senator who is an adjunct from Kingsborough showed a high degree of satisfaction from the adjuncts. I think as far as our technology goes we never had any before, in the last three or four years so the fact that we have anything makes us very, very happy. I think those are some of the things to enlarge on what Fran said that add to the satisfaction of the faculty at Kingsborough. Thank you. / Professor Cooper- Thank you both very much. Our last speaker who will shift the tone, my guess is, is Joan Tronto from Hunter.

Professor Joan Tronto (Political Science, Hunter College) – Good morning, I've entitled my remarks with apologies to Anthony [Nooley?] "What Kind of School am I?" At Hunter College, the PR machine has not decided how to spin the UFS survey, which shows a fairly discontented faculty. You've seen the numbers, only 24% were satisfied with faculty influence on college policies, only 25% were satisfied with the effectiveness of shared governance. Only 59% were satisfied with administrative support for academic freedom, which I consider to be very low, especially when 31% said they were dissatisfied. Indeed, although I gave a copy of the survey to the acting Provost in November, the President doesn't really speak to me, and the Administrative Committee of the Senate meets with the President around once a month, though we have mentioned it several times the President hasn't said anything about this report. I did however receive an email this morning about how we turned up in Princeton Review's *Best Values in Colleges*. There is a PR machine, but it doesn't really care about us. It may be that, in fairness to them, we've had other issues to deal with. We've had a huge dispute, as you know about the report of our Committee on Academic Freedom. Our administration has been absolutely intransigent about the Perez ruling, yesterday the President's Council while sitting in a meeting that was reviewing the bylaws from the Nursing Department said that she'd have to check with Rick Schaeffer because she thought that the

Departmental Curriculum Committee was subject to the Open Meetings Law. I mean this is intransigent; so they've been buys and they haven't really focused on this yet, I don't think they will. I want to raise a more theoretical question about what the survey means. Here I'm echoing something Phil's already said. It is possible of course that what faculty mean by satisfaction will vary. It obviously depends upon what your expectations are when you say you're satisfied. If we don't know what people's expectations are, how can we know what their levels of satisfaction mean? I don't want to try to answer the question of whether the faculties on every campus have similar expectations about collegiality, quality of departmental life, where although 56% of Hunter faculty were satisfied, the 41% who said their dissatisfied is certainly concerning, or expectations of shared governance. About information on the Budget by the way, we check in at 17%; this after we have publicly and very loudly asked that information on the Budget be made available. Here we have to thank Manfred Kuechler for an extraordinary effort in foiling the Administration last March 10th. A year and almost a month later we have not yet received answers for all of the questions that we raised then. Although, they have, because Manfred tells me what is available to other people through the UFS, I have started asking them for specific documents, and every time we've asked for a specific document, we've received it. Sometimes it's five months late but we've begun to receive the documents. Now, I think this is a difficult and important question for us to raise on a more theoretical level, that is, what are our expectations and do we have similar expectations throughout the university. If we don't, how do we talk about that as a faculty? So my practical suggestion is that we use our Faculty Survey to discover not only levels of satisfaction but also levels of expectation and maybe there's a way for us to do that in the next round. Now let me make a less practical point, let me play devil's advocate. I ask that I be called a responder rather than a reporter on this panel. Let me provoke discussion by making this outrageous claim: The very fact that the University is using surveys to find out what we think is a disturbing answer to my title question, what kind of school am I? In a document called assessing the faculty's role in shared governance, implications of AAUP standards, 1997, the AAUP pointed out that different types of institutions place different weight on the faculty's role. Among research institutions the expectations are that faculty will be involved and consulted on matters of

concern to them, but that mainly they will not be burdened with too much service so that they can do their research. But, at the moment when resources are tough, they start screaming and the administration had better respond. At Liberal Arts institutions, faculty expect to be widely consulted and deeply involved in decision making, they spend a lot of time on service. Only at comprehensive institutions and institutions with lesser ambitions for greatness do faculty not have an expectation of involvement. In other words, the more the faculty expects that they are being asked to do great things, the more the faculty feels that they should be involved in governance. The better the faculty, the more involved in governance, that is what AAUP finds looking at different types of institutions and although it's my gloss, I think it's an accurate one. The more the faculty feels that they are being asked to do great things, the more involved they should be in making the decisions of the institution. To me, one of the interesting things about Hunter where I've resided now for 24 years is that there is in fact a split in the way we might classify and think about the college. On the one hand, Hunter is a research institution of really high, high caliber. We drew in over \$40 million in research grants a year, that's a lot of research that is going on. On the other hand we have a Phi Beta Kappa chapter, we've had it since 1920, there aren't more than 300 or so in the entire country and they're given to liberal arts colleges. We just got a grant from the Mellon Foundation, if you look at Mellon's distinction they list us under liberal arts colleges as the reason or where they gave us the money. So the college has an identity both as a research institution and as a liberal arts college. Having been chair of the Senate for three years and involved in faculty governance for very long, I suddenly realized that in fact part of the reason for this, one of the things about Hunter that's interesting is one of the reasons Hunter's worked in the past is that faculty from these groups both participate in the way that they think is appropriate given who they are. We have a faculty some of whom think of the institution as a research institution and some of who think of the institution as a liberal arts college. They make their participation in college governance as is appropriate. By the Carnegie classifications though we're not either of those things, we're a comprehensive institution and if our faculty operated the way faculties operate at comprehensive institutions, we would act the way the President would hope we would act instead of the way we do, which is to ask that we actually have a large voice in the college. Regardless

of which these visions of the institution is true, both of them suggest that we have very high expectations about faculty governance and that may explain why the discontent at Hunter is so high. The survey remains only one tool for evaluating the faculty role. A survey by its nature is a snapshot and I hope that it won't lead us to think that top-down management performance measure models, which can be massaged and described in different ways becomes a substitute for genuine faculty governance. Albert Hirschman talked about institutions in decline, although you can generalize it to any institution in which people are dissatisfied, and he made the wonderful distinction that there are three options people have when they are dissatisfied, exit, voice, loyalty; I think that this is a really useful category for us to talk about. Increasingly exit options are going to be considered among the faculty in CUNY, in the past we didn't but now we do. Loyalty options are "you know everything's fine." I think our President uses the distribution of resources in a way to gain loyalty, it was a statement by one of her [counsel/council? Not sure which one] at a Senate meeting where basically she said, "People have received resources and they've still spoken out against us." Apparently I was so angry that I was breathing into the mic in the front of the room and they couldn't even pick up what she said on the front mic, they had to use the back mic to figure out what she was then saying. Voice is the one thing that we need to really focus on. So here's my one question: Does a faculty survey increase faculty voice? This is Karen's hope and it's what she said. Or, is it a tool to measure exit strategies and costs or can it be a tool for fostering greater loyalty. One final thing, if we think of ourselves as the kind of institution that CUNY claims that we are, we should be taking shared governance more seriously, if we're not it shows that there is a disconnection between our mission and the structure and function of the institution. Or, it shows something extraneous to the nature of the institution is driving decisions about governance. Let's make the case to the Chancellor and to our Presidents that in a great university faculty governance is alive, well, rewarded, respected and taken seriously and let's use that as the framework to think about the survey. / Professor Cooper- Susan do we have a couple of minutes so we can take questions? Because it's supposed...yes, Alfred / Unidentified Speaker- Off mic comment, First of all I want to thank Dean for including this question because this was very, very helpful in that this was not measuring satisfaction, it really is measuring expectation. Think about it,

“these are the factors important in deciding to leave CUNY,” it’s saying what you want. The one area that really deviates from the National is the last one “greater chance to do research,” nationwide the statistic is 32% which is consistent with every study that only 1/3 of faculty nationwide are involved in research. At CUNY it’s 51% and if we look, leaving the Graduate Center out and we look at the other campuses, the two campuses with the highest rating on that are Hunter and CSI at 64% that roughly 2/3 of the faculty at Hunter would like greater chance to do research. This is one area where we have the information that you’ve all been asking for. / Professor Cooper- Why don’t you just come up and line up next to the microphone so that I don’t do this in an unfair fashion depending on where my eyesight flopped.

Professor Dennis Bakewicz (Physical & Biological Sciences, NYC College of Technology) - I have a question for Joan. Since you come from a college that is budgetarily oppressed, how much of a factor do you think that plays in the overall satisfaction rating and especially with regard to the fact that the colleges are differentially funded and therefore you’re going to find differences just based on that? What priority level do you give in determining the degree to which we characterize satisfaction with the understanding, obviously, that schools that get less money might be missing things that are going to cause problems and concerns and dissatisfaction? / Professor Tronto- It’s not a question only about the budget, the question was about information about the budget when it’s only after we’ve had a huge fight that a practice that was routine a few years ago, of distributing to all the chairs the amount of revenue, of OTPS money that is given to each department, that used to be just done and then it stopped. We asked for it, the President made it into a huge issue, said she would give it to the chairs but not to us. I told the chairs they should thank Manfred that they got it at all, and by the way they didn’t get it this year, that was the big fight we had last year. It’s more about a question of expectation, here it isn’t about the resources because we don’t even know how they’re distributed, we don’t know how lines are assigned, but if you don’t have resources at least you want respect about the resources that do exist and that’s not happening. I can’t answer the question more directly.

Professor Jamal Manassah (Computer Science & Electrical Engineering, City College)-

Two comments, one is that effectively the governance, when we're talking about governance I think it's very important that the truth be brought out that on different campuses the governance is different. I think that is a great factor in many instances of how the assessment is being made. The second point is about the budget, I don't think the problem is ever going to be resolved on campuses with regard to the budget. The numbers exist centrally and there is no reason why the University Faculty Senate cannot choose its way to have basically these numbers disseminated with respect to all colleges. I know for a fact that those numbers exist, I know they have been completely tabulated and with the press of a button to print those numbers can be made [at eight years straight??] When we're talking also about the budget I would like colleagues here not to forget that the real money that is at the disposal of the President is not what gets to be given from the tax levy budget, most of the money comes from other pockets and that's where the deep secrets are and this is where, effectively, the real numbers have to be known. / Professor Martell- If you look at our governance documents at Baruch I would venture to say that the Baruch College Faculty Senate has the least to do. The power at Baruch resides in the school faculty, that's where the decisions are made. Our Faculty Senate has always been more of an opportunity for sharing information. Maybe out of that tradition there is a different result, but I will tell you that the Baruch College Faculty Senate gets the same budget presentation that the cabinet gets and they see the all funds budget, I'm not saying we know everything because I don't think anyone knows everything in the CUNY budgeting system, but having said that, I think there's opportunities to insist upon getting a dialogue going. If you don't know what the numbers are you'll never have a way of influencing where the numbers go.

Marcia Newfield (PSC Vice President for Part Time Personnel)- I just want to say that in this conversation about the budget it reminds me of women about their husbands and male partners' relationship to money that thirty years ago you couldn't even get a bank account or a loan and you didn't know anything. Now women have come to educate themselves and realize that not only can they control their own household finances but that they can be an influence on policies and on boards and as shareholders, etc. It seems

to me that the universities and the colleges are starting to grow up and realize that they can't live in a paternalistic or hierarchical system and have someone else take care of the money because that's not why they went to college or graduate school, to not have to worry, they have to worry, that's my point. The other point that I want to make is that although the adjunct situation, I know you're all aware of it and there's a letter on the table there that adjuncts drafted. I just want to give some concrete numbers, Baruch (as of two semesters ago) Baruch had 492 full-timers and about 460 part-timers. Kingsborough had 311 full time faculty and over 450 part-timers. Queensborough had 272 full-timers and about 450 part-timers and Hunter had 620 full-timers and 780 part-timers. This is just to the people here, just to understand that although these figures, it's certainly a phenomenal opportunity here to find out in detail what the situation is and I understand that you don't have money, and we'll try to do something better next time. In terms of the satisfaction rates, I think you'd find a very different story, including the treatment of Department Chairs vis-à-vis part-timers in the things that are not economic.

Chair Susan O'Malley (Chair University Faculty Senate, English, Kingsborough) - First I want to speak to what Joan said, the worry not to put everything in outcome assessments and measurements. When we first talked about doing this survey I was fairly nervous that we were playing the Chancellor's own game but it seemed to me more important to do it than not to do it. I was riding down with the Chancellor to Kingsborough he said, "I know your college" and then he cited about eight different scores. "I know your score on the CPE, on the Nursing this..." and he just read them all off, "I know your college" by eight figures. I said, "I find that offensive, there's a lot more going on than that." Then one thing about Kingsborough and the water, fine, but part of the setting is that it removes you from the discourse of the university and in fact the governing plans of Kingsborough is one of the weakest plans that I've seen sitting in this position. It's curious; your removal makes you expectations quite different, and also the paternalism for many years of Leon Goldstein. / Professor Cooper – Phil Pecorino has asked to say something. / [Unknown speaker, female, NOT Phil Pecorino, probably Professor Farrell] I just wanted to follow up with what Susan said and you know as I said as I mentioned there is something to be said for this removal geographically as well as

under President Goldstein, this really paternalistic thing that faculty were taken care of, and we never even experienced a lot of the problems during the downturn at CUNY when faculty were let go, he managed to save almost every single faculty member in some manner, shape or form, including Fran. Let me just follow up on one thing that Susan said about our faculty governance. It said that we were fairly satisfied with it, but we have no faculty council or faculty senate, there's no separate body for the faculty to even talk about themselves. We have a college council with representatives from the faculty, the administration, the staff and the students but there's no separate faculty council. To me it is amazing that this came out as being satisfied, I don't know what it means. / [Professor Pecorino] – I think it still has a lot to do with what you expect. If you never ask for the budget you're not so unhappy not to have it to look at, but based on a couple of things Joan said I want to make these two points. I'm not prone to intoxication over much of anything, least this survey, but if you go to the AAUP site, those of you interested in governance, they have a checklist for what the traits are of an effective senate and an evaluation of shared governance. When I filled that out I said that we've got a lot of room for improvement and constant improvement at that, but I don't think my colleagues would fill it out the same way that I do. That survey I'd like to see Dean, and I don't think we ever will, is a survey asking them "How satisfied do you think your faculty are with: A, B, C, D: How satisfied are you with those things?" Only twice have I ever participated in such a thing with administrators and Whoa! there was a big discrepancy between the way they look at things and the way we do. The last time we tried it on my campus was with regards to Affirmative Action, we had an instrument that was asking to evaluate your campus in many ways related to [acceptance?] and we had eight faculty fill that out, leaders, and we scored it very low. The administration refused to even fill it out and discuss it. That's the survey I'd like to see. / Professor Cooper- I want to close by thanking the panelists and the audience and adding an editorial comment that I was not asked to include. As long as we're suggesting improvements and other ways, not improvements necessarily but other ways of conducting this survey, it is my deepest hope that before I depart for another university, a survey of this sort is conducted in the central administration. / Chair O'Malley- OK, panel 2 please come up, and thank you, I found it very informative. [TAPE CHANGE] OK, let's get started, Stefan.

Second Panel- (10:45 a.m. – 11:45 a.m.) Shared Governance, Administrative Respect for Faculty, and Faculty Influence on Policies

Professor Stefan Baumrin (Philosophy Department, Graduate School & University Center) – It’s nice to see you all here. We have a terrific group of people to entertain you and we’re going to start. You know that the title of this is Shared Governance, etc. A topic that is extraordinarily unpopular with the administration but it is pretty much at the heart of the Faculty Experience Survey. We’re going to start with Professor Lowe of Queens College. [Unclear]

Professor Elizabeth Lowe (Family, Nutrition & Exercise Sciences, Queens College) - We’re pretty happy with shared governance, we were second from the top on this particular one. The Academic Senate at Queens College was formed in 1971, so we just figured out we are at our 25th anniversary this year. It consists of 60 faculty, 32 of whom are departmental representatives and 28 are at large reps. 30 students so we have a 2:1 ratio of faculty to students. We have the same number of alternates, theoretically, in actuality at the moment we don’t have a full contingency, which makes a bit of a problem with the Perez ruling. We had a very exciting meeting yesterday, I was drained afterwards but we did actually pass part of our new general education reform. By the end of the meeting we were without a quorum and had to stop, so there are problems there. Queens College in addition to this body has a college wide P & B, which is made up of the 32 department chairs plus the Provost and the President. So we have two bodies that allow for governance at Queens College, probably contributing to the fact that we are fairly pleased with it. I remember when our President came into the very first Academic Senate meeting that he attended when he was first on campus. He proceeded to try to get a voting card and we informed him, “No sir, you don’t have a vote.” And he looked very shocked. So the deans and the vice presidents, the president, all of the administrators are welcome at our meetings but they don’t vote. Again, that may have something to do with why we’re happy. There is also some cross-fertilization between the two governing bodies. The Chair of the Academic Senate sits ex-officio on the college wide P & B, and the President of the Executive Committee of the P & B sits ex-officio on the Executive

Committee of the Senate so that keeps the lines of communication open as well.

Yesterday, when we were doing this general education thing, it's noteworthy I think to see that the President stayed for the entire meeting. Usually, when he's invited as a guest speaker he does his thing and leaves; he stayed there, he was very interested in the outcome. Shared governance is alive at Queens College. Not totally well in the sense that we don't have a full contingency of 90 senators and 90 alternates. Did you want to comment about the other two items or are you going to do that later? OK, to say something about the respect shown by college administrators to faculty we rated fifth and almost tied with Kingsborough for fourth, but we had twice as many respondents. There's a pervasive notion at Queens College that the divisional Deans are supportive. The divisional meetings with the chairs are held once a month and the Deans' doors, at least my Dean's door, is always open, I don't need an appointment, I can waltz in there any time of the day. I try not to abuse that privilege, but his door is always open. At the college wide P & B, the President runs this meeting and one of the things that he started doing this year, which I think is very positive, is he gives us a few minutes to brag about our departments. So the opportunity is there to say "So and so got this grant, so and so was awarded with this, we have this exhibit coming up and so on." This is a very smart idea because it really allows people to shine. This information doesn't stop in that room, it's being taken down very carefully by one of the administrators who then makes sure that it's publicized on campus, so credit is given for these little brags. As long as the administration goes through the proper channels, the faculty are pretty happy. If there's an attempt to circumvent the process there is a huge response. I have a pretty good relationship with the President, but one time, I think in his over-eagerness to do something, he had gotten some money and wanted to name a building and he was going through the channels and he had asked the Campus Environment Committee to consider this and bring it to the Senate and it had not yet gone through all of those channels and I saw it written up in one of our publications and I went immediately and talked to him and I said, "Sir, this hasn't gone through the channels yet." Both he and the college lawyer were all over themselves apologizing and it never happened again. I don't think that was a malicious move on his part, I think it was more an over-eagerness on his part to get on with things. When this sort of thing happens people do jump immediately. Faculty

influence on college policies, we were tied for third for most satisfied with New York Tech. The one area that was rated fairly low was “Influence on the Budget.” It’s sort of interesting that for the first time this year, it immediately came out to all the chairs saying “Get your recommendations in for OTPS, for adjuncts, for new lines you might want.” I was like “Whoa!” I never had to do this before, this is my second year as chair of a department, so that was something that I don’t know if it came as a direct result of this survey, but it was the first time we’ve ever had to do it. I think I’m finished.

Professor Andrea McArdle (Law Department, CUNY Law School at Queens College) – At Queens College, it’s actually quite a separate institution I must say. To what do I attribute the fact that CUNY Law scores were 54% above the CUNY mean. Can you hear me now? [Extended silence, off mic conversation] 71% of responses that showed satisfaction, a high level or at least a level of satisfaction, concerning respect shown to faculty by the administration. So I think these are considered to be generally positive responses. I just want to preface my remarks with the note that I am always somewhat cautious about drawing inferences from survey data, especially in the case of the Law School when slightly less than one half of our very small faculty responded, there were 14 responses, our faculty numbers in the mid-30’s so I just wanted to make that note. If I am to offer some explanation for the attitudes that seem to be emerging from the data, I think I can back this up with some of my own experience and some of my anecdotal discussions with colleagues, I think I’d have to say that it’s probably the social justice mission of the Law School. Our endlessly interesting and very hardworking students who are drawn to that mission and the curriculum we’ve developed that reflects the mission that may account for generally positive responses to the survey. I don’t know if the survey captures all aspects of our experience because there’s much that I can share about where we’re lacking in resources and that affects our experience as well. The mission connects to everything that we do and I think that perhaps more than other law schools it’s fair to say that we have a shared set of values that connect to the mission and that keep us connected and focused. Compared to other units of the university, our salaries may be somewhat higher, I’m going to mention that right up front, get that on the table. Vis-à-vis other law schools we are lower paid and we work harder and longer hours and

that's born out by the national data. We are really a very teaching intensive faculty which is not characteristic of law faculty. We are deeply involved in governance; we have many opportunities to weigh in, to talk through a set of issues or concerns. We are after all a community of lawyers so we're nothing if not a faculty that is committed to talk and discussion and dissection and debate. So there's much discussion that goes on and a great deal of participation. Interestingly, I think some would say that there is too much time devoted to meetings and discussion and one of the other relevant response ratings for this panel is "Effectiveness of Shared Governance" and there we were somewhat lower; only 36% of the responses were satisfied or very satisfied. I think that's probably a function more of the fact that there's a sense in the faculty that it takes time to make decisions and to implement decisions. We're a relatively young institution, we actually opened our doors in 1983, our first graduating class was 1986. A number of our current faculty, a critical mass I'd say, we're part of the architects of the Law School; thinking about how we were going to craft a curriculum and thinking about how we were going to articulate the mission. It's wonderful to have those individuals as active parts of the faculty still, but any decision that we make always harks back to the beginning because people were there who remember the decisions that were made in the beginning. I think as a result changes come slowly to the Law School, because we kind of have to relive what happened at the beginning because so many people have present memories of that. An example of where I think our sense of participation and mission can be illustrated recently is that we've gone through a dean search and it was an intense period of activity in the Law School. Given the relatively high teaching and service demands that made a difference to the quality of everyday life during the month of February, I can remember. I think everyone willingly wanted to participate in whatever way they were called upon to do so because they thought that, "Well, the stakes are high and it matters for us to be participating." The other thing that I neglected to mention earlier is that we don't have a separate Faculty Senate, we meet as a faculty as a whole and that's because we're so small, so I guess you could say that we have a sense of direct democracy because we're voting on everything directly, we also have a small P & B which includes the Dean and four members of the faculty. I would probably stop there and just reiterate that where we're strongest, I think is in the shared sense of mission, that social justice mission, that

distinguishes us from the majority of law schools. We sense that we're under-resourced, not only in areas of physical plant, I think you'll notice that our lowest rating was, unlike Baruch, our lowest rating was in restrooms, parking space, classroom space, those were the areas where we suffered the most, but I think we kind of suffer that gladly and willingly because the mission has carried us through. One other area where I think the faculty are looking for additional resources is scholarship support. Again, to give you a sense of where we rank in comparison to other law schools, the norm in law schools is to provide a certain amount for research assistants and to provide summer stipends to do scholarship and that doesn't exist at the law school. Our salaries are, I think, less than 2/3 of the national norm. To give you a picture of where we are vis-à-vis other law schools, we are below the norm in all significant areas but our unique mission explains the generally positive responses in the survey. I'd be happy to take some questions at the end of the panel.

Professor Emily Tai (History, Queensborough Community College)- I need to reiterate something that was said at the earlier panel and was just mentioned in connection with the Law School, which is the question of self-select, in terms of how the survey is done. What I've been aware of as somebody who has been involved in community college issues nationally is what an exception the community colleges within the CUNY system are in terms of the number of Ph.D. faculty that they have. They are well, well over the national average which is about 20-22%, the community colleges that have Ph.D.'s in the CUNY system, by contrast are somewhere between 50 and 65%. I think that that may contribute to the high levels of satisfaction that are being reported at our community college campuses in this survey. Because within the larger national system, community college individuals, instructors who have Ph.D.'s in academic subjects sometimes report being isolated, being frustrated by the fact that they can't do research. It's absolutely true that within the CUNY system, we're all very hard working and we don't always have the time we'd like to get our work done but that's in the CUNY system, within an atmosphere of being surrounded by colleagues who can share the same perspective because we're all trying to get our work done and we're all very engaged by our research. We feel that there is a kind of a cohort support. I think also that when you look at the

cohort nationally, Ph.D.'s who decide to teach in community colleges are often extremely animated by conviction to a much higher level, that is that we really want to give back to our communities, we want to reach out to the students who are having the most difficulty getting through because of economic factors or academic factors and we made a commitment that that's one of the ways that we want to use our doctoral training. That also, I think, contributes to our high level of satisfaction. When we came to the community colleges with Ph.D.'s we made a real decision so our satisfaction with our jobs sort of reflects the fact that we made that decision. So I just want to put that into a parentheses here, to sort of piggy back on what Dr. Pecorino said earlier. On Queensborough's campus, now of course we have this lovely high rate of satisfaction, and there are a couple of things going on that I wanted to address very quickly, the mission [select], governance structure and showing respect for faculty. Let me talk about the mission first. We had a mission revision when we had a new president and that whole process of rewriting the mission was a process in which all faculty were involved, our Vice President drafted something with the faculty committee, it was then vetted in a series of campus wide meetings to which all faculty were invited. People stood up who were not necessarily members of the academic senate and said, "We need to think about this" or "we need to add this." Stuff got thought about, stuff got edited, and stuff got changed. There was a real sense that the mission reflected what we all thought about what we were doing and what we cared about. Similarly, where there have been administrative initiatives to revisit the curriculum or think about reflecting what we're doing on our campus, particularly in the areas of the General Education Inquiry, or in the areas of assessment; Queensborough came a little late to assessment by comparison with other community colleges nationally, but once we got on the horse we started riding fast. The interesting thing was that faculty were involved, again from the ground up; there was a committee that was equally composed of deans and faculty members. They developed a set of general education objectives, they talked about how they were going to implement those general objectives in the classroom, we've had a really strong emphasis on a faculty driven assessment. So, again, there's the sense that at the level of shaping curriculum faculty are involved and it's not just our academic faculty but also our professional faculty in electrical technology and business and nursing, which is where we have very

strong para-professional programs, so that's one aspect. In terms of our governance structure, we have a Faculty Senate; it meets the second Tuesday of every month. I'm the secretary so I'm supposed to take attendance and I can tell you that most people show up, including our president, and the only reason they don't show up is because they were sick, or there was some family emergency. It's a well attended senate and there's a tremendous amount of interest. We have 80 members overall, 41 of whom are faculty, 16 of whom are elected department chairs; so the department chairs play a very, very important representative role in representing their faculty within the faculty senate. They also play that role in that several of the chairs are represented on our faculty executive committee which discusses issues within the faculty such as academic freedom issues, such as other issues that come up. We also have a college wide P & B in which the chairs are represented and a college advisory committee in which chairs are heavily represented. At every level the President is touching base with people who represent the faculty and who take that representation responsibility very seriously. On our Academic Senate we also have [COT's], we also have student members, and recently we added [ATO's] to the Faculty Senate. What was interesting was that when we did that there was a wide discussion within the senate about doing it. The faculty were very supportive to the [ATO's] so that the collegiality issue on our campus is not just one that involves the faculty, it also spreads out and reaches out to absorb the administration and the people who are involved in running the daily business of the college, but who are not actually instructional staff. The last thing that I wanted to cover was the question of showing respect for faculty. We had a new president who came in who was a Ph.D. in an academic subject, in biology, but he had worked on other community college campuses and there was a little bit of an adjustment period. But what was interesting was that he immediately jumped in and began to recognize the credentials of our faculty and, of course I'm hugely biased, but I've got some colleagues who are really shining members of their field and who do a great deal of scholarship, who bring in grant money, who get a lot done. He immediately set out to recognize their accomplishments; he set up a faculty scholarship award that is given out in a campus wide meeting that recognizes people who are particularly outstanding. He also has gone through a great deal of trouble to reach out to people who have made enormous strides as teachers. I'm particularly thinking of the

chair of our chemistry faculty who fought a huge, decade long battle within his field to recognize the research contributions of students at the Freshman and Sophomore level and finally got them into the American Chemical Association, got them doing presentations, got them involved in research in their field so that some of them are doing quite exciting things in bio-chemical research now and the President nominated him for the Carnegie Award and he won it. There's a real pro-active commitment on the part of the President and his administration to recognize what faculty are doing; he sees that a very instrumental element in implementing assessment on our campus. He wants us not just to engage in assessment in our classrooms but to report it in terms of pedagogical research and he's indicated that he's prepared to recognize that as an element and factor in promotion and tenure. There's a real partnership going on and I think that one of the ways that's demonstrated is in the way that our governance system works. We have a steering committee that sets the agenda for every senate meeting monthly, we meet with the President and the President talks about our agenda, he can't put anything on the agenda without talking to us about it first so it has to be a cooperative issue. Then, when it comes down to the Senate meeting, the President presides over the Senate rather than a member of the faculty but he only votes to break a tie and, trust me, that never happens, so that he's presiding over it without being a voting member, he's always showing his courtesy for the members of the faculty and so shared governance begins with what's in the by-laws and also is implemented at the collegiality level, at the level of what happens in every meeting. We see it in action whenever we go to a Senate meeting.

Professor Marissa Moran ([Law Department], New York City College of Technology) - Good morning, I'm an Associate Professor at City Tech, New York City College of Technology, and I've been there working full time as a faculty member since 1998 so I am honored to be on this panel, this esteemed panel, of faculty and to be in this room with you. As a disclaimer, I am an attorney and when I was in college my major was Economics. I was an econ major, but I raise that not to state that I am an expert on statistical data or interpretation, but more so to explain that when I look at data and how I analyze data, I generally raise more questions than come up with answers and that's, I guess, by virtue of my training. In any event, I will state that I had the opportunity and I

was fortunate enough to attend one of these UFS senate conferences last fall, November 11, right in this room where Dean Savage had distributed and I first learned about this survey, the Faculty Satisfaction Survey. I teach on Fridays, like I do today, so you'll see me rushing off to class later but I had the opportunity, since it was a Friday, to go right back to my college, Xerox it immediately and as any good Professor would do, slap on a memo, attach a memo to it and give a little blurb, or summation of the survey, and I hand delivered it to my President, the Provost and to the Academic Deans so they had it hot off the press. They thanked me and I did receive an email from our President stating that he was glad that I attended and had gotten this report and brought it to his attention and he had much respect and admiration for Dean Savage's work, which I did share with Dean prior to this panel discussion. On that note, what I'd like to say too is that even though this was true and everybody thanked me for the report, back to my disclaimers, I don't wish to sit here and tell you that I'm speaking on behalf of anybody but myself, although there are a group of people, my institutional advisement wisdom people that I go to at my college campus and I do speak to on matters such as these; but my exposure to the administration has been through my involvement on College Council more recently as an executive member due to the virtue of me being chair of the legislative committee for the last two years. I started out as a member, became secretary, went through the ranks and now have been chairing the committee for the last two years and if you note, I'm really down for the governance part of this workshop later on so please attend it, I look to your wisdom as well and I will share what I've gone through on that. In any event, putting this into perspective of where we were when the survey was done, it really was a time of transition, a time of change. Spring 2005, we had just gotten a new college President, our former Provost was still provost on the campus at that time, until the end of December 2004 so we were truly a college in transition and when I analyze the facts and look at the data, honestly I have to give credit to prior and present administration because in these categories that our panel was asked to speak on, Shared Governance, Administrative Respect for Faculty, Faculty Influence on Policies, City Tech has been rated, we're either 2 or 3, or tied for third, we're in the top third on this and again I think both administrations because of the timing of the survey have to share in the credit, I'm on the positive panel so that's great, we have to share in the credit with them. Also on that note,

again although I'm new to being on the Executive Board of College Council and therefore more in the mix with administrators than I was during the prior administration, because I keep in close contact with the members of our faculty who have served, because I'm interested in governance, I have been told and I did observe just as a plain vanilla faculty member that our prior administrators were very receptive to faculty, they did have the stated, as our present administration does, that they do have an open door policy and that it has been honored both with the past administration and the present administration. More particularly, our past administration had almost 100% attendance rate at almost every faculty function. They were really present and supportive of faculty. What I've observed now being on the executive panel of our college governance is that we've been having meetings with our President, not just the Chair and Vice-chair of our College Council but the entire Executive Board where policies and issues about shared governance are discussed. I'm hoping to see many of you at the workshop on the plans for changes in governance and I thank you.

Professor Philip Leonhard (Sociology, City College) – The reference he made, do I need a title for my talk. If I needed a title for my talk it would probably be “The View from the Bottom.” As you know, from the 19 units of the City University the average score for City College is at the bottom. It is at the bottom for the three items this panel is addressing. Did I want to be here to tell you that? No. Did I want to start my talk with the usual statement, “It's a pleasure to be with you today?” It is not. I could tell you why we're at the bottom, why we're so unhappy, but I'm not. I'm going to be very disagreeable aren't I? Let me tell you what we're doing as a result of knowing that we're at the bottom, cause I don't want to come back next year and give this talk again, I want someone else to do it next year. We got the results and circulated them on campus, not a lot of excitement or interest among the faculty but a kind of growing realization that took weeks for people to realize that not only were they unhappy but that the other people they ate with in the Faculty Dining Room were probably just as unhappy as they were. The one consequence was that people's experiences as persons became validated more collectively. That made it possible to do a couple of things that we've begun to do. First of all, we went to the administration and said, “What did you think of the results?” We

didn't have the privilege of our administrators coming to us and saying, "There are a few things that we're not doing so well on, how can we help you out?" We didn't hear that. We finally sat down with the President and Senior Vice President, my first question was, "Mr. President, what do you think of the results?" he said, "Well, it seems the faculty are basically satisfied." So we not only started at the bottom in ranking but we've been down at the bottom in terms of the ability to communicate and do something about it. That was a couple of months ago. Let me tell you some of the things we've been doing: we've been organizing ourselves. Within this setting I had asked the chairs of three of the standing Senate Committees, where they discuss issues that are most important to the survey results, Academic Freedom and Faculty Interests, chaired by Diane Sank, who's with us today, Educational Policy Committee, College-Wide Resources Committee, those three chairs met with their committees, in turn we as a group, the three chairs and myself, met with the senior administrators, the President, the two Senior Vice Presidents we began a talk, the talk began of course with the statement that, "I think the faculty are basically satisfied." The talk was very defensive on their part, "We're not sure the results are valid...Not everybody participated...It's only the people who were unhappy that responded." The first meeting barely went to the point where we could say that we have begun a dialogue. At another meeting, the chairs of the three committees were there, the President was not there, I was not there, [a deliberate choice??], my sense was, "I don't show unless the President shows." That was a little more productive, the Senior Vice Presidents began to acknowledge that there might be some things they could do. That more information about budgeting might go to the College Wide Resources Committee, [unclear] notions from the Provost that maybe he might have some [faults] when he comes to the Faculty Senate and he says that if the faculty doesn't do this, that, and the other thing that he wants, he's going to start taking some "Draconian measures," that's one of his favorite terms. At another meeting which occurred Monday of this week, in this case the President showed, the three committee chairs showed, Senior Vice President showed, we were a little worried about this one, because they invited us out to dinner at a nice restaurant. At first we weren't sure whether we should go and then we weren't sure whether we should be paying for ourselves or not, we let them pay, that opened up a little more. We began to talk a little bit about the problems with communication, began to talk

a little bit about the problem of respect. On other fronts, at our Senate meeting, the last Senate meeting, we noticed that they were beginning to say some nice things about some faculty members, in terms of their accomplishments. We recognized that they were beginning to talk about some ways at the commencement exercises a more prominent role might be given to faculty that we wouldn't necessarily be showing up just as bodies in gowns that sat there. In fact, one of the things that's being talked about, [unclear] talking with the Chief of Staff or the President is that the Faculty comes in after the platform committee comes in and that when the Faculty comes in [tape flip] the past traditions, the people who have been with the college for 30 or 40 years be recognized. We're beginning to talk about what are essentially baby steps. I think at this point those are the steps that we can take, that we can build confidence on their part and on our part in the taking of steps and that over a long haul, we at City College are going to be able to do with the larger faculty experience the same thing that we are always feeling we can do in just about any other context. There's enormous pride at City College, we walk into an academic setting and we strut, we know we're good from our past, we know we're good from our present. We need to feel that way on our campus, in the same way we feel it when we go off and we've got a long way to go. Thank you. / Professor Baumrin- Thank you very much. [Off mic conversation, unclear] Finally, Professor Nancy Oley of Medgar Evers College.

Professor Nancy Oley (Psychology, Medgar Evers College) – Good Afternoon, can everybody hear me? I'm a Seinfeldian soft-talker. I have the dubious distinction of being in the list of unhappy campuses and I never dreamed that I would be competing with my colleague at City for who was the worst off. I also never thought I'd be confessing to my prayers last night that there would be a blizzard so I wouldn't have to come today. But, now, nobody's laughing. In any case, I'm a 20 year veteran of Medgar Evers College and Medgar Evers had something like 17% of its scores above the CUNY mean in terms of faculty satisfaction. The area where we were 20 to 30 points below everybody else was really the area of college culture; things like Faculty Influence on College Policy, Access to Information About the Budget, Effectiveness of Shared Governance, Administrative Support for Academic Freedom, Respect Shown to Faculty by Administration,

Administrative Support for Academic Integrity plus a whole bunch of other things. I wanted to thank Dean and Susan for their efforts on our behalf with this survey; it really was wonderful for us on two counts. One was, I came to realize I was not going crazy, in other words, it validated my own personal experiences at the college to know that others shared my view of how things weren't going very well and also it initiated some positive changes which I'll just briefly touch on. Apparently, the news got out to our President before it ever reached me, because within two weeks of the survey being semi-published we were called, we being the Faculty Senate Executive Body, was called in to meet with the President. The significance of that was that he had refused to meet with us for a year and a half, so that was a good sign; we began to discuss the instrument and what we could do about it. I then found that I was placed on every single committee set up to look at tenure, to look at [assign time]. Every single committee, I thought it was a design to kill me and thereby silence me. He also put me on the dais and asked me to make a small presentation at convocation, which is unheard of. I'm still waiting for the day when the faculty sit on the stage and not all of the administrators during these events, but you know you can't ask for too much all at once. We did set up, we organized ourselves to have an Academic Freedom Governance and Integrity Committee it's been slow to operate but we're gaining some momentum there and we thank Phil Pecorino for coming to us in January for a faculty development workshop to talk about academic freedom and we have just completed a laborious process of revising our own little governance plan. I say little because the group that I represent at Faculty Senate is not the governing body of the college, we are a shadow organization. The governing body of the college is the College Council that embodies all of the wonderful principles of democracy; it includes alumni, community people, students, staff, administrators in large numbers and faculty, including chairs and other elected representatives. Sometimes the faculty on a good day have a slight majority of the vote, and the President does preside over that body, so we're a shadow group trying to encourage the College Council to do the right thing. In any case, I was asked by Susan to comment on why we think we did poorly on this survey so I'll take a stab at it. For those of you who don't know about Medgar Evers, we are probably one of the youngest schools, less than 40 years old, we are probably one of the smallest, last time I checked I think we had the smallest budget. Apparently, we are always told

that we are underfunded and we are undersized, according to state law. We do serve the central Brooklyn community which has changed over the years. We are one of the last to abandon open admissions at CUNY, we are a comprehensive senior college and that's a good profile of who we are. I thought at first blush that one of the reasons we were so unhappy was that we had a lack of resources, and maybe we are the worst in terms of not having chalk, paper, toilet paper, copying facilities, research labs, instructional labs, you name it we don't really have it. I understand from listening to the rest of you that that's pretty common to many, many campuses. So I thought a little bit more about it and our faculty are used to doing without. We're very accepting of scarcity as many of you, I'm sure, are. Our college started in the basement of churches, we're used to doing with very little and our students reward us by being extremely grateful for whatever we offer them. On those two counts I just didn't think that resources were the major issues and furthermore, some new data which we received recently suggest that Medgar Evers faculty are the least likely of all of you to want to get a job someplace else. My interpretation of that is that we have a faculty that has an extraordinary commitment to the mission of our institution, despite the day to day struggle for basic things like chalk, paper, erasers and toilet paper. Perhaps the problem is the nature of the faculty, I thought about that. Who are our faculty? My observation over 20 years is that they are a group extraordinarily committed to social justice, social change, many people have been involved their whole lives in actively opposing oppression in all of its forms. They are very pro-democratic process, witness our College Council made up of all different types of individuals at the campus and many of them still have the idealism that they came with when they first started at the college and it's a feisty faculty in that they have forced the resignation of two former presidents in their 40 year history. This is not a passive group of faculty, but that to me didn't explain the ratings that they gave. So then I said, what about the nature of the administration? It occurred to me that we take pretty much for granted the idea that shared governance is the appropriate and good thing in colleges and universities, but this is not universally true around the country. There are some areas of the country where really the hierarchical, top-down, paternalistic management style is the style of response. I came to the conclusion that at Medgar Evers, and it's kind of odd, those of you that are social scientists will see that I'm using the same constructs to

explain the opposite data but so be it, our low scores in particular reflected a unique tension between the cultures of the administration and the faculty. I think that the faculty really bristles at the lack of input, information and control over decisions, small and large, that affect their daily lives; the budget of course being one of those. There have been repeated failures of government structure to operate as it's supposed to, wonderful structure but it's not operating the way it's supposed to, and someone mentioned circumvention of process being an issue on their campus. I think there is a pervasive perception of injustice and unfairness in the treatment of faculty both in terms of resources and in terms of privilege at the campus. There certainly has been direct interference and indirect interference with the work of the faculty and its governing attempts with the Faculty Senate. There has also been a fear of retaliation for dissent or complaint. Let me say that that's my theory about why we are at the bottom of the pole, we have many of the factors that we share with the rest of you, but we have some unique characteristics that I think put us there. I'd like to end on a positive note, that we have started a process of change; hopefully it will not end when Middle States walks off campus next year. Thank you very much. / Chair O'Malley- What I want to say is that Dean is going to come up and just say something, but then I'm going to say that once Dean speaks it makes sense to get food and to go to the workshops with your food. But first let Dean speak and then I'll announce where the workshops are. / Professor Savage- This has been really an enormously instructive set of speeches for me. One of the things that I kept thinking is that it may be that the campuses that have actually the least satisfied faculty are going to be benefiting the most from this and in particular one of the things that Susan has started on the faculty governance list that I think should be spread around a little bit more is that we should be sharing information about best practices throughout the university, we're involved in the middle of an enormous ongoing social experiment, some places are doing things that have satisfied faculty as the result. Other places maybe didn't quite know that there was another way that it was being done somewhere in CUNY and one of the things I heard just now, the platform committee at Queens College, the majority of people on the platform are faculty. There's a suggestion that you might actually pass around, why would they not be on the platform? And there are other things; there are some things that we're not going to be able to do much about. I

was talking with Terrance about the senselessness about going ahead and pushing hard to improve the parking situation at Baruch, there's no percentage in that. Pick on things that you can do something about, focus on those and then let's let the administrations know that we're coming back with the next faculty survey and they have time, they've been given advance notice, they have time and we can go ahead and actually continue this, they have a chance to go ahead and make things turn out better. / Unidentified Speaker [Professor Baumrin?] I thought first of all there might be a few fairly general questions that you want to address to the panel and I wanted to say one thing about the Perez decision as it affects the issue of shared governance. The survey preceded the Perez decision and the consequence of the Perez decision in causing administrative panic in dealing with questions of curriculum and the granting of degrees, they don't really care about us but they have to get those two things done. Means that they are much more not only sensitive but also savvy about the way in which the various governance plans in the university are structured and how they might have to be changed. In that regard, they actually have to think about the faculty and whether they take the faculty particularly seriously or not, that's a local campus issue but they do have to think about us with respect to the question of revision, because the revisions have to go through the college governances and they have to have a quorum and they have to go to the board. In a certain sense, to my mind a very interesting feature of the 2005 survey is the fact that it's pre-Perez and the post-Perez survey may be significantly different. It may not be, but it might be. Now if there are any general questions.

Professor Manfred Kuechler (Sociology, Hunter College) – I would like the panel to address the question of what, in their view, is the relative importance of the [formal] structure, what the faculty rights are on paper that for instance, Hunter has a very strong senate that is formally dominated by faculty, they are 60% faculty and 5% administrators and the role of the President, the person of the President, the style of the President and specifically I was interested in the comments by Professor Leonhard about City and I wonder if what he describes there is just a product of the last 5 years. I think President Williams has been there for the last 5 years and specifically interested for me at Hunter, because Williams was the unanimous choice to become the Hunter President until we

were told that he was way too expensive and we couldn't afford that. He emerged a few weeks later as the President at City. The general question really is, how important is the formal paper structure and how important is the person and the style of the President? / [Professor Leonhard?] – We have the paper structure; the governance document for the Faculty Senate at City College indicates a body which is very strong. Does a governance document make for good governance? Compare the Soviet Constitution under Stalin with the situation in the Soviet Union, it didn't need any [unclear] amendment, it already had one in it. If what you do on the campus is at least build the structure, because the structure's not in the document, one of the things I viewed as my responsibility as the current chair of the Faculty Senate, I have two of my predecessors here today, is to rebuild the structure from the ground up; to create functioning committees that do things, that have information, that bring decisions to the main body. / Professor Baumrin- Two other people here have lived through administrative changes so that they can reflect on Professor Kuechler's question. Professor Moran? / Professor Moran- Basically, I think it's like driving; you have your rules on paper and then you have the rules of the road if you want to survive. From what I understand looking at governance and the changes that we're now doing at our college and the proposals that are being stated, in fact, on a very positive note we've had one change that just was approved this Tuesday by our college body overwhelmingly, one 'No' even under Perez, 74 'Yes', where our college laboratory technicians are now being represented at the department level and have a vote on reappointment, tenure etc. From what I understand and there are still some provisions that have to be taken out, that reference that our President used to chair College Council, since I've been there that has not been the case, it has always been a faculty member chairing. Our President does speak, as yours does, he is slated for our agenda, so does our Provost, a lot of information, what I've found, because I am not chair, but as a faculty member a lot of information is told to chairs during many, many meetings and they hear it over and over again and if the chair is not efficient in getting that to the faculty members the first time we're learning things, perhaps, is at College Council when all of this is told to us as a body. Also, during this revision plan we've been told about and I've heard from other faculty members about maybe doing a Senate or an off-shoot and then have a main body. Right now though, the sentiment at the college is to keep us as a

whole, we like all being together even though we disagree and sometimes get into sparring matches, in the end because we're vocal and able to let it all out whether in committees, in these standing committees or then right on council floor, we hear things and we can respond to it. I think it's a matter of open and fair disclosure and discussion. Right now we have that feeling on campus and I just hope it continues. / Unannounced Speaker [Professor Oley?]- I'll try to answer the question carefully. You only have to look at the United States Senate to understand that use of the rules can allow manipulation of the results, so even though one has a very fine structure on paper it is possible to subvert that structure by knowing or using the rules. I must say that if our governance body had a minority of faculty I would be concerned. There are some who've raised the issue of whether the President should chair the organization, that's another possible way to change the structure that might make faculty happier; but our biggest problem has been subversion of what's on paper and I wanted to suggest that perhaps management style plays a role in how the role of the chair of the College Council is enacted. Thank you.

Professor Sandi Cooper (History Department, College of Staten Island) – Half a question, it's mostly a negative comment. I have been troubled for a while at some colleges and [centrally, mostly centrally] which seems to set a model for some of the Presidents, by the ability of the administration to circumvent all official governance and committees by cherry-picking among the faculty to create committees that will come up with the outcomes desired, in part, by providing these people with reassigned time or other goodies. This has been especially a troubling issue for the University Faculty Senate which for all of its prestige has been very badly battered by the Academic Affairs Vice Chancellor and I think the model percolates down. I honestly don't have an answer, I am not ready to stand up at this microphone and say "I have a list," I'm almost ready, but I'm trying to get us to think, maybe collaboratively of ways in which we can reach our colleagues and point out to them that there are existing governance arrangements and that what they are doing is no good for anybody. Most of them ought to be able to see this and I absolutely don't know how to do it because they all, if you do approach a couple of them they start giving you the speech about this is a country of individualists, this isn't

the Soviet Union, every time I say something it's because I come from the Soviet Union or represent it, they say "We have a right to do this." In any case the issue that really troubles me is that with all of the good work of everybody in this room and everybody who is not in this room but still does good work, we can be easily undermined by this. I find it so demoralizing and I see it increasing, every scientist in the University at the moment has a stake in what's going on and what happens to one, in my view, can happen to anyone. We have a serious obligation to stand up for our rights, wait till you see this new report from 80th Street on retention and how it outlines and lists, so called "Killer Courses." We haven't distributed this widely yet, I don't know if we're allowed to, but here is an intrusion on academic freedom if I ever saw one, among other things and these policies that come out of this group that have no faculty up there, or if they do they were faculty once it's long history, are pushed on the campus administrations because of the power of the purse and we end up with all kinds of collaborative folk who are supporting things. It seems to me that we need to find a way to stop. This is not true, I'm sure, at every campus but it's true at enough places and it's true centrally. / Chair O'Malley- Absolutely. I hope Perez gives us some power, because the governance body on campus is the policy making body, *not* the task force appointed by the President, and that we have to lead, it seems to me, with Perez. Now, the next speaker, first say your name but also say the good news.

Professor Alberta Grossman (Developmental Skills, BMCC)- I'm Alberta Grossman, adjunct Assistant Professor at Borough of Manhattan Community College where I've been since 1990 and for the last 10 years I've been on a governance committee. Adjuncts are not allowed to be on the current faculty council, but the people on the committee to redo the governance plan were chosen for their position and one of the things the faculty council wanted to consider in part because of the Middle States was the role of adjuncts in governance. I don't want to go into a the whole long thing. We've just passed in March after 10 years, the last 3 years of which we've actually been looking word by word at the plan, under the guidance of our Parliamentarian who insists that this is the way to do it, we have looked at a plan. We will have a bi-cameral body, actually Staten Island's plan helped us get to there and that was so that we could have a totally faculty body. It's going

to be called the Academic Senate because there is a certain reluctance to call people like adjuncts “faculty.” The other is the College Council. / Chair O’Malley- Congratulations, you did it! / Professor Grossman- We did it. A lot of questions and I just want to direct the issue of the Perez decision to this involvement of adjuncts because those of us who have been working very hard as adjuncts have a right to sit on the body and there will be an adjunct from every department with 40 or more adjuncts and then shared representation for other departments. We are now looking and saying, “Okay, but what about the adjuncts? Will they stand up and want to serve on this body?” I just want to put a question before the UFS about the next survey for instance, what about a survey of adjuncts because I think many of these questions would be answered negatively, because there is no involvement, adjuncts like me who came in thinking, “Oh, I have a Ph.D., I’ve been teaching already for 15 years, I know something.” I expected to be accepted as a performer. Actually at best it was tolerated, at worst it was actively discouraged or ignored and so there’s a lot to be done. Marsha set the stage by telling you how many adjuncts there are compared to full-timers at BMCC; there are more than twice as many adjuncts but the people aren’t involved. Those of us who wish to be involved are discouraged from that and I think that the UFS has got to address that. Because there are adjuncts in different governance bodies and because of this decision, I think this is a good time to look at those issues. / Chair O’Malley- The next survey will include adjuncts and we will do it somehow. Right Dean? It may have to be two different surveys or a separate page for adjuncts within the survey. The other thing is that there is an adjunct or [CLT?] rep from each college on the University Faculty Senate although a number of the positions are not filled and we should do something about that. Next question.

Professor Dennis Bakewicz (Physical & Biological Sciences, NYC College of Technology)- In looking at the data for my college I couldn’t help seeing what looks like a contradiction, in that in general satisfaction City Tech was at the bottom but when you look at things like Shared Governance, Respect for the Faculty, Collegiality we’re all the way up at the tops. Just wondered what your thoughts were on that glaring contradiction. / [Professor Moran?] – Faculty, Faculty, Faculty, I think the reason the top are the top is because of our faculty members, I really do. / Chair O’Malley- I also think, because you

saw Kingsborough way on top and a lot of it was the buildings, the maintenance, all of those questions. Whereas a lot of the faculty questions were not as high, and we do know that at your college if you walk through, sometimes the buildings and the maintenance and all of those things and the labs and all are not quite what they ought to be although they're getting better. / Unannounced Speaker [Professor Baumrin?]- My non-data insight is that brouhaha on teaching load makes virtually everybody on your faculty unhappy. It goes off not only with respect to the President or the administration of the college, just they're bloody unhappy and who are they going to look to the Chancellor or the PSC. But what do I know? That's probably what it is. / Professor Bakewicz- Just to follow up one other question, I think it was mentioned before, I think it was Nancy, that in terms of facilities there are some colleges that have gotten very used to doing without for a long time. I think we've come to tolerate this to an extent that is dangerous. I know that those colleges are very loyal, their faculty put up with a lot of nonsense, but I think that that could become dangerous when the loyalty exceeds common sense and we don't speak up about the things that we absolutely need to get done. / Chair O'Malley- OK, I think what makes sense now, let me announce where the workshops are: Revising One's Governance Plan, with Al Levine and Marissa Moran is in 2506, Faculty Role in Searching for New Administrators with Sandi Cooper, who may have left, and Bernie Sohmer, who is here, is 2507, Reviving Active Faculty Governance Participation, Sally Mettler and myself 2508, and Suggestions for Next Year's Faculty Experience Survey, Dean Savage in this room. But I think what might make sense is if we got food and those of you who can stay for the workshops, and I hope many of you can, then we eat and those who can come back fine, but maybe you could put something in writing and hand it in at the end. OK, any questions? All right. Go eat and enjoy the workshops.

[Tape Change]

Unknown Speaker- ...we must rely on our own opinions and please seek them out. Thank you. / Chair O'Malley- OK, next, Reviving Governance, Phil.

Professor Philip Pecorino (Social Sciences Department, Queensborough Community College) - OK, on all of our campuses we have the problem of how do we get faculty involved in governance and particularly the senior faculty and those with tenure. We

know that junior faculty get involved because it's important for them to show that they have some college service, but they shy away from the more important committees, the ones where maybe they're exposed to maybe disagreeing with the people who have a vote on the P & B, when they come up for promotion and tenure. So we thought of the following measures although we don't know how effective they would be it probably would be helpful to: 1) Have a statement from the President about how important it is to have faculty involved in college service and how it will be valued and recognized by the President and the administration. 2) A statement from the department chairs saying how they likewise will value and recognize college service when they sit on the P & B and review the individual cases that come before them. But if they're going to say that they recognize and value college service then the head of the governance body, the faculty leaders should create some kind of recognition, an award perhaps, each year for members of the community who have contributed so much over the years. They can't give release time, they can't give stipends, but they can at least give formal recognition of appreciation for what members of the faculty have done and maybe are continuing to do with regard to participation and governance. Next would be a strong encouragement that all department chairs in their annual evaluations encourage faculty to participate. Finally, and this I'll be working on at Queensborough, we're just about in position to do it, make sure that the leaders of the governance bodies publicize in a very visible way how the committees and other units of the governance system have produced an impact, have made a change, made a difference in the life of the college over the previous year. Directly or indirectly with fanfare or without, committees do, sometimes, produce some changes so that the faculty will get the idea that serving on committees is not just a line on their resumes, that they can make a difference. Beyond that, sure it would be great to have release time and stipends for participation and college service but it's not highly likely that we'll get that. These other things, I think, are doable it might establish as a group a best practice for encouraging faculty involvement in governance. / Chair O'Malley- Andrea you want to say something? Good. This is the Conducting Searches on Campus.

Professor Andrea McArdle (Law Department, CUNY Law School at Queens College)-
Again, we recognize that the Law School's experience can be somewhat sui generis because we are so small but we did go through a dean search recently, we're still awaiting the results of that search, but what we discussed was the way we approach the process. It was important for faculty, although we're not going to have a determining vote, to become pro-active from the beginning. We had a series of meetings in which the members of the faculty decided to reflect on what were our strengths, what were the things that identified the school in a particular way, how did we want to be identified, what we saw as challenges. We had a series of discussions and out of those discussions came a list of what we would want to prioritize in our search. Those conversations and those priorities really found their way into the search piece that was eventually put together when we were more actively seeking out dean candidates and we chose members of our faculty to be our representatives on the search committee. Those members of the committee saw their role as educating the other members of the committee, the other members of the Board of Trustees for example and the members of the administration about what our particular needs would be, to make sure that they had a sense of why we were unique as a law school and in terms of where we were at this particular juncture, what type of dean candidate would be most suitable for us. I think the idea of getting the faculty to think, reflect, articulate what the needs and challenges and priorities are really helped to inform the direction of the search thereafter. Again, the experience is going to be different at different schools, perhaps it was easier to mobilize our faculty because we're so small. We also, here's the other thing that we did, we were encouraged to think of people that we would imagine would be ideal deans, even if these persons would not realistically consider being dean at CUNY, we were encouraged to come up with wish lists. We all did that and we discussed why such a person would be wonderful and if we couldn't get that person, who else with those qualities could we imagine and that would also help to inform the way we were evaluating the candidates who came before us. It was a way in which we could help to inform the search because we were so deeply implicated in thinking about who we were, where we were in our trajectory, intellectually and professionally and how we could somehow impact the search. That's just the experience from one campus and that's what we discussed in our

group. Thank you. / Off mic question / Professor McArdle- We did not, we discussed that but we ended up not using an outside firm. / Off mic question / Professor McArdle- How did we disseminate the existence of a ... OK, a couple of ways we had a formal ad which was placed in various newspapers and publications where law academics and lawyers would likely see it. We also, once we generated, actually we did a couple of things, we had a wish list and then the committee members collated that list and anybody whose name was mentioned was ultimately contacted and invited to apply. In some instances, people who were never even considering being dean were suddenly hearing about the deanship at the law school and I think it's probably accurate to say that some people who ended up applying and became serious candidates hadn't even thought about us at all, and hadn't thought about being dean. The personal outreach by members of our committee engaged and intrigued some of the candidates, to make them think that this would be a particularly challenging and interesting and compelling place to work, so I think you can see that the personal engagement and involvement of our faculty members in the process because we have such a stake in it is, I think, what made the difference. We did work with 80th Street but the energy came from the faculty. It was the sense that this is going to be critical and it could affect the direction of the law school for the next 7-10 years so that we ought to take responsibility for it. / Off mic question / Professor McArdle- I don't know for sure, I think probably at least one and probably at least two of the three finalists came from faculty suggestions. As I say, that brings a sense of empowerment when you can see the consequences of the initiatives that you begin so I want to encourage people, when it comes time for you to have a significant search and I know it's much more complicated with a larger school. One of the things we did, in our research we contacted faculty from John Jay, we wanted to get a sense because they had recently gone through a search, and we invited one member of this faculty who was on the committee to come speak with us so that we would also have some sense of the process. We tried to do as much homework as we could, sensing that we were going to otherwise be at a disadvantage because we weren't going to be [meritably??] in control of the process and we needed to have the experience of other CUNY colleagues to help us. It was a commitment of time for the faculty for sure but I think we all feel it's well worth

it. No one would want to do less, given what's at stake. / Chair O'Malley- Thank you. And Dean, next year's survey.

Professor Dean Savage (Sociology, Queens College) - Well we decided that we should do another survey and the second thing is that we thought it would be nice to have some care in selecting the questions to go ahead and be sure that all respondents would be competent to answer. There were perhaps some questions on the current survey that some faculty members were not really knowledgeable enough to go ahead and have an informed opinion about. One of the ways of dealing with this would be to respond to another suggestion which is that we would have more behavioral items, what actually happens, what actually occurs on your campus. One suggestion, just to give an example is "Do you have a computer?" and two, "How old is your computer?" It would be nice to have data like that to find out where the patches are of old, outmoded computers and then hold those people's feet to the fire so they'll go ahead and get it fixed. A third one is that we would have a competent pool of survey experts to go ahead and work on constructing this new survey with additional faculty input, but we're already benefiting from Manfred Kuechler's presence and he says "OK, obviously the way to go next time is to do a web based survey." Here's what that would permit, first of all we in this mail survey we did a one shot mailing, no way of knowing who responded, can't afford to do a follow-up because you'd have to send it to everybody, and so we just did a one shot—killed the response rate. A web-based survey, you go ahead and send out to e-mail address listings, which we would have to assemble before hand, but that's a doable task, full-time, part-time alike and send an email message with an encrypted little thing. You click on it, you go to the off CUNY website and you go ahead and fill out the questionnaire. You check a box, full-time or part-time, if you check the part-time box all of a sudden a lot of the questions about research assistant support disappear, the questions that are relevant to part-time faculty appear. Asking a particular subset of questions to department chairs or faculty governance leaders is another possibility. We would then know who had responded and who had not responded and we could send a second nudge or a third nudge or a tenth nudge or an *nth* nudge in order to continue to try to get the response rate up. The consequence would be that we are going to have a much higher response rate.

We're going to have much wider and broader and deeper participation and we got very enthusiastic just talking to each other. / Chair O'Malley- Thank you so much I think it was a wonderful conference. Any final questions? All right, there will be proceedings, because it was transcribed and all of this will be available to you. Thank you so much, I learned a lot.