

MINUTES OF THE FIFTY-SEVENTH PLENARY SESSION OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE  
OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

March 23, 1976

Professor David Valinsky, the Chairman, called the meeting to order at 6:40 p.m. in the Third Floor Music Studio at the Graduate School. All members were present except Professors Abramson, Anderson, Arons, Auslander, Bailey, Berenson, Brand, Bressler, Buder, Diamond, Donno, Elster, Frazier, H. Gilbert, Goldstein, Gross, Harvey, Hillery, Hunte, James, Krich, Kriegel, Leiter, Lipschutz, Loughrey, Manshel, Martin, McClean, Milentijevic, Munitz, Nash, Page, Pauling, Pinciss, S. Polishook, Prager, Rietz, Scott, Nwasike, Shmidman, Soskind, Uretsky, Walsh, Williams, and Zalusky. Professors E. Brown, De Comminges, Dierlam and Ehrenpreis were excused. Deputy-Chancellor Seymour Hyman and Dr. Jean Ellis also attended.

I. Approval of the Tentative Agenda: The agenda was approved with the following emendations: Item 5 was stricken from the agenda; Item 4 A, a resolution proposed by Professor Ferentz, Brooklyn College, was added.

II. Approval of the Minutes of the 56th Plenary Session: The minutes of the 56th Plenary Session were approved as circulated.

III. Communications from the Chairman: Professor Valinsky reported that the Board of Higher Education at its meeting on March 22 adopted with one dissenting vote - that of Mr. D'Angelo - the following resolution on furlough:

RESOLVED, that, notwithstanding a resolution entitled Closing of Facilities, adopted February 23, 1976 (Calendar No. 4), the period April 12 through April 18, 1976 may be designated by the Chancellor as a payless furlough period for faculty and staff, pursuant to a resolution entitled Retrenchment, adopted December 15, 1976 (Calendar No. 5) and subject to such terms and conditions relating to the implementation of such furlough as shall be promulgated by the Chancellor.

The Senate, the PSC, and District Council 37 all spoke at the meeting and asked that action not be taken on the resolution, arguing that adoption might impede state action on "windfall" monies and that the PSC was meeting with Deputy-Mayor Zuccotti on possible deferment. The BHE's position nevertheless remained that adoption of the resolution did not preclude further negotiation to avert implementation, since the resolution had been revised since it was first placed on the Calendar. Originally, the resolution had two resolveds, one repealing the previous resolution on Closing of Facilities; the other designating the period April 12 through April 18 as a payless furlough. The PSC, the Board and the Chancellor are continuing to negotiate for funds and deferral. Professor Valinsky asked whether either Professor Zeller or Professor I. Polishook wished to add anything; both declined.

Professor Valinsky stated that a second item of special interest to faculty had been presented at the March 22 meeting. Just before adjournment the Chairman of the BHE announced that a letter had just been received from the Mayor, asking that the BHE follow the City's lead in serving notice of an intention to withdraw from the Social Security System in March 1978. There was heated discussion between the Board and the Mayor's representatives on this request with Mr. D'Angelo again speaking forcefully for the protection of employees. No

action was taken at the formal meeting, but, Professor Valinsky speculated, given the attitude of the BHE in comparable situations, one might expect that in the informal or executive session the decision to go along with the City was taken.

Professor Valinsky also reported on a meeting of the Executive Committee with the Chancellor on March 19. The meeting was called at the Chancellor's request to discuss the trimester. The Executive Committee, in turn, welcomed the opportunity to present its views on that subject and on the BHE's furlough resolution to the Chancellor. The meeting was one in which there was a toe-to-toe confrontation with the members of the Committee vigorously attacking both the trimester and the furlough resolution. Members reiterated the Senate's repudiation of the Task Force report on the trimester and pressed the position expressed in the Minority Report and in the Senate Statement at the BHE's Public Hearing on March 8. The emphasis was placed on the inadequacy of the data in the report, the lack of sound educational planning, and the lack of wisdom in attempting even an experimental calendar change at this juncture when the University is in a state of flux. On the furlough the Committee argued vehemently against the adoption of such a resolution at this time and reviewed the reasons for that belief: the fact that such action might interfere with reception of monies to relieve the situation and that the matter was an item under negotiation. Professor Valinsky said that the persuasiveness of the Committee's arguments was evidently not great although they may have had some influence on the alteration of the BHE resolution on furlough and might affect the form which the decision on calendar change took.

Professor Silver, City College, asked whether Professor Valinsky's remarks about not adopting a furlough resolution at this time implied that the Senate was willing to accept the furlough at some time because he personally was not. Professor Valinsky replied that this was not the intent, that the Executive Committee remained firmly opposed to the furlough for all of the reasons detailed on previous occasions.

Professor Valinsky then reported on the status of the Kibbee plan. The BHE has been meeting in closed session to discuss the plan and the Governor's representatives, Drs. Hollander and Dullea, have been attending those sessions. There is evidently a new figure in the picture too, Mr. Berger, new Executive Director of the Emergency Financial Control Board, who is said to have attended last Friday's meeting of the BHE and to have asked for the plan to be submitted to him by Wednesday, March 24. So far as we know, although Mr. Williams, Mrs. Bird and Mrs. Quinones held a press conference last evening to declare their opposition to the admissions proposal and to offer their plan for restructuring the University, a consensus is being reached by the BHE. At the press conference a statement was read proposing the following:

We believe that the University should be a single academically and administratively consolidated educational institution, with various campuses of the one institution responding to the special needs of a changing urban population. Each of these campuses should reflect the educational mission, philosophy, and standards, established by a strong - central university administration.

Professor Silver, City College, commented that he did not agree with the first part of the statement, that CUNY's role was not to be a community college but to educate people. He did agree, however, that there should be mergers of the colleges but he thought the solution to the University's problems would be to get rid of the BHE and the central administration and just let people teach.

Professor Valinsky resumed his communications, stating that the details of the consensus reached by the BHE were not yet known. He reported that the Senate leadership had taken part in the Public Hearing on the plan on March 8 and had submitted a written document to the BHE detailing the views of the Senate on various aspects of the plan. He explained that because each speaker was limited to a three minute presentation, four places on the agenda had been requested and granted. He had addressed the subject of reorganizing college structures, Professor Evelyn Handler had spoken to the consolidation of programs, Professor Mapp to the Trimester and Professor Shahn to the section on admissions and retention. The statements made at the hearings are being circulated to the members of the Senate. The four Senate representatives had been given places early on the agenda of the Hearing which lasted until 3 A.M. Other Senators such as Professor Auslander, Professor Greenbaum and Professor Zimmerman had been assigned to the 9:00 p.m. to 11:00 p.m. time slot which became 3:00 a.m. Therefore, their statements had been submitted in writing.

Professor Valinsky next reported on the March 16th trip to Albany. He explained that approximately forty members of the Senate had participated - 28 travelling on the Senate bus, the rest by private car or school bus. The nucleus of the Senate group was the Senate's Crisis Committee. The trip, said Professor Valinsky, was productive chiefly because the group had prearranged appointments with several public officials. The leadership met with Senator Stafford, Chairman of the Senate Higher Education Committee; Assemblyman Landes, chairman of the Higher Education Committee in the Assembly; Dr. Henrik Dullea, special assistant to the Governor; and with Mr. Paul Contiguglio, a principal member of Senator Anderson's staff. Other members of the Senate delegation met with State Senators Bellamy, Burstein, Galiber, Goodman, Ohrenstein, and Owens and with Mr. Henry Reuss, the Higher Education adviser to the Senate Finance Committee and a member of Senator Marchi's staff. In addition, a group met with Assemblyman DeSalvio. A meeting had also been arranged with a representative of the State Education Department, Dr. Alvin Lierheimer, to discuss the academic implications of the furlough. As things turned out that meeting was joined by Dr. Hollander. The Senate's thinking about the academic implications of the furlough was confirmed in the discussion and a letter was promised to the Senate putting the statements made on paper. Because of Dr. Hollander's presence the discussion was expanded to include the plan for restructuring too. Finally, some members of the group contacted their own elected representatives to the State Legislature and succeeded in speaking with them.

In the opinion of those who took part the trip was a valuable exercise. Although it is difficult to summarize all that was said and done there were a few general points that emerged, as follows: (1) there is no uniform pattern of thought concerning the University in the minds of the legislators whom the members of the Senate met. While some legislators expressed set opinions concerning CUNY's future as well as its immediate problems, the majority indicated that they had a limited knowledge of the University and its problems. The Senate group was especially impressed by the interest of those who professed to know little about CUNY in learning more. The group also noted that this was especially true of the Republican members of the Legislature with whom they spoke. (2) It also seemed clear that some legislators at least are looking favorably on an increased role for the State in relation to CUNY. (3) There was pretty general reassurance that, although specific amounts were not mentioned, monies were being set aside to help with the University's short-term problems. (4) Just as the legislators' minds are not yet fixed on the future direction which the University should take, it became increasingly apparent that they are somewhat bewildered by the inability of the University to articulate its desires clearly. As a result of the trip and the de-briefing session held during the five and one-half hour trip home Professor Valinsky explained the leadership thought it important

for a statement to be prepared delineating the general principles and line of development which the Senate considers central to the future development of the University. This statement could then be used as a basis for discussion with other political leaders.

Professor Valinsky also reminded the members of the Senate that the trip had to be paid for by voluntary contributions of members. Since the costs had been advanced by the Senate's Executive Officer, Jean Ellis, members who had not yet contributed were asked to send a check for \$4 drawn to her order to the Senate Office.

Professor Adickes, Staten Island Community College, asked whether the leadership planned to make future visits themselves or to include other members of the Senate. Professor Valinsky replied that the experience of March 16 had confirmed the Executive Committee's belief that it was important to involve as many members of the Senate as possible in this activity. Therefore, as future meetings were arranged, members would be asked to participate. Professor Paster, City College, stated that he thought some additions might be made to the overall gleanings from the Albany trip. In particular he wished to report on a meeting with Dr. Wolf, Senator Ohrenstein's assistant who had qualified his remarks as follows: (1) Dr. Wolf had stated that people in Albany had tried to get statistical evidence concerning the shortage in funds in the University but were unable to obtain the data; (2) from research conducted by his own staff Dr. Wolf had obtained some data on the number of projected applicants to the University. Dr. Wolf had stated that he thought approximately 60% of the Kibbee proposal would be implemented, 20% of the Regents plan for the City University and 20% of the final plan would be derived from legislative input. He had also expressed concern about violations in expenditures for the SEEK program. Finally, Dr. Wolf had indicated that the legislature would probably act on two things - the windfall and restructuring. Professor Paster asked whether there appeared to be any response from the BHE on the questions raised by Dr. Wolf. Professor Valinsky replied that he did not know but would surmise that if Dr. Wolf was aware of problems in the data, Drs. Hollander and Dullea were also aware of them.

Professor Valinsky announced that, although it was still hoped that it might not be necessary to merge units, the Executive Committee had decided to establish a University Faculty Senate Task Force on the Implications of Mergers. The theory behind that action is that since there are many complex issues to be resolved if there are mergers, that it would be wise to be prepared in the event that the plan finally adopted includes mergers. Professor Galub, Bronx Community College, has been asked to chair the Committee since he has already done some work in this area as a result of his membership on the Chancellor's Task Force on Consolidation of Units.

Professor Zimmerman, Staten Island Community College, asked whether the Senate had any group that was coordinating activities in the current situation, a group with a member from each campus. Professor Valinsky replied that this was one of the functions of the Crisis Committee which has been meeting once a week. Professor Zimmerman said that he believed such activities were very important. Professor Valinsky further explained that one of the objectives of the Crisis Committee was to develop smaller committees on each campus composed of faculty, students and perhaps administrators to work together.

Professor Valinsky also announced the establishment of a Publications Committee to assist in expediting regular publication of a Senate Newsletter. The Committee will be chaired by Professor Roberts, Lehman College, who will maintain liaison with the Executive Committee and will include Professor Melvin

Zrentz, Brooklyn College, and Professor Roland Gosselin, Bronx Community College. Professor Silver, City College, asked why Professor Stanley Page, City College, had not been included on the Committee. Professor Valinsky explained that it had been decided to have only a small group at this point. Professor Silver questioned the right of the Executive Committee to set up and appoint members to committees without obtaining approval from the full Senate. The Parliamentarian called Professor Silver's attention to the provisions of the Senate's Charter on the subject of committees and committee membership.

Professor Valinsky also announced a change of date for the April Plenary.

Because the planned date, April 20, is a religious holiday the Plenary will be held on April 6.

IV. Chancellor's Report: In the absence of the Chancellor Deputy-Chancellor Seymour Hyman reported for him. Deputy-Chancellor Hyman advised the Senate that he did not have any prepared remarks, but that he thought and hoped that all members have been watching the various activities relating to the University which have taken place to date. He commented that the public meeting of the BHE on Monday, March 22 had not involved action on the plan for the University but that subsequent to the public meeting a special meeting of the BHE was held. At that time the Board approved a resolution which provides notice to the Social Security Administration that the University may withdraw from the plan in two years time.

Deputy-Chancellor Hyman then responded to the following questions submitted in writing. (1) Professor Knight, Hostos Community College - "In the event that the unthinkable becomes a reality and Hostos is consolidated with another college, what provisions will be made for tenured and non-tenured faculty? If they will not be guaranteed positions within the university, it seems unreasonably cruel to lay them off without sufficient time to find a job for next September. It is ironic that those who were non-reappointed may be in a better position because they were notified before last December." / Before answering, I might comment on the phrasing which seems to put a number of argumentative propositions. I should say that I agree with Professor Knight that if tenured and non-tenured faculty are laid off, that would be cruel and that, if they are laid off without notice, that would be cruel too and that such practices should be avoided. So much for motherhood. In terms of reality, however, there is no precedent for merging two faculties in the City University structure. The State Education Law is written clearly, if one reads it as a product of thinking about a college organized in departments, but it does not embrace the concept of a multiversity and thus offers no guidance in this matter. I don't know the Board's decisions but some people including myself are inclined to recommend that tenure be respected in terms of a merger. The rights of tenure in the case of transfers - and I mean "rights" not "rites" have not been defined, however. We have been experiencing dismay and upset and a list of promises broken and I, personally, would not like to break these promises. There is another question, however. If we do it this way, and School B is to be merged with School A, then the tenured people from School B will bump the untenured people from A. So we come down to a poor choice of who loses his/her livelihood. There is no good answer. Furthermore, it is possible that even after the merger of units that it will come to pass that a given department, division etc. will have more tenured personnel than can handle the programs. Thus, there is no absolute guarantee that it may not happen that tenured people are dismissed. (2) Professor Wu, Queens College - "Would the Board of Higher Education approve sabbaticals at half pay for the entire academic year?" / I think that procedure has been going on under the theory that it represents a no cost operation because if the person granted the leave is receiving a high enough salary, he/she can be replaced by

someone at half the salary. So far as I know, that policy will continue. Professor Jochowitz, Richmond College - "If the Board votes to merge certain campuses, when will the mergers go into effect, and what can the faculty do now to facilitate the implementation of mergers?" / Such mergers as eventually are ordered I presume will go into effect, at least so far as being ordered, in September 1976. The implications will depend on the complexity of the situation. If we know which mergers are to take place, some of us in the Central Office and perhaps some of you will be looking at various factors later this spring or summer - factors such as the size of the student body, who gets notice, etc. The situation is complex and confused and since this is a new situation we don't really know how to do it. (4) Professor Haber - " In the New York Times of February 26 you are quoted as follows in regard to the proposal that full-time faculty teach the third semester of a new trimester schedule at lower adjunct pay scales: ' It is also advantageous to the university because the teaching is not being done by hit-and-run adjuncts and because it provides continuity in committee work and other aspects of the university.' The Chairperson of the SGS Committee of this body wrote to you, asking, if you were quoted correctly by The Times, that you offer the adjuncts of this university an immediate, unequivocal, and public apology for the use of the expression "hit-and-run" in reference to them. There are adjuncts in this university who have served in that capacity for 30 years, 25 years and similar periods. Many of them have rendered a lifetime of additional service beyond their teaching responsibility without the rewards and advantages such service confers on full-time colleagues." / It is true I received such a letter and, in all candor, I do not know exactly what I said in the course of my brief discussion with The Times. What you read, The New York Times printed, but, as you well know, there is sometimes a lack of congruence in what The Times prints. If I said that, I am prepared to apologize because it was said in an unthinking conversation. I am sorry if among your colleagues there are some who took umbrage. There was no intent to malign adjunct personnel and I am prepared to offer any form of apology you wish. Now, if we address the facts, we have some real problems. What I was trying to get at, although I was not intending to use The Times as a vehicle, is this: if there are some members of our faculty who, for whatever reason of their own, wish to teach in a third trimester, not necessarily in the summer, and just as members of the regular faculty now teach in the evening or summer sessions - if there are those persons, this opportunity would be available to them. They might substitute for adjunct personnel who are not long-term members of the staff. I am not talking about that group of adjuncts but graduate students or someone employed in any old way and who does not participate in all of the multitudinous things that faculty on the regular staff do. I am sorry if this disturbs you but I feel that, all other things being equal, that category of adjuncts is better replaced by members of the regular faculty.

Deputy-Chancellor Hyman then responded to the following questions from the floor. (1) Professor Trefousse, Graduate School - "In reference to the trimester you have proposed, I have three questions: 1) How in the presence of a financial crisis can you propose a cut in the number of days worked for faculty? 2) How do you justify telescoping the semester? 3) Is it contemplated that in the future faculty will be asked to teach all three trimesters at their present salary?" / 1) There is no fiscal relationship to the first proposal. Classroom time will remain approximately the same under a 12 week trimester since it will follow a 60 minute instead of a 50 minute class scheme. 2) I agree completely that compression is a negative feature of the plan. I have often thought that this was a poor feature of our slipping from a 16 week semester to a 14 week semester. 3) No intelligent person expects the CUNY faculty to accept a 150% increase in work load at no change in compensation. There is no such expectation. I think it should be made clear that I have agreed concerning the negative impact of one thing in the plan and there are other things wrong with it. But there are other

savings which are right, and a decision has to be made yes or no. I have come to the conclusion in weighing the pros and cons of the trimester that on balance the plan has benefits over the long-range, say five years. I am certain that not all of you would come to the same conclusion. (2) Professor Mapp, New York City Community College - "I hope you have brought your crystal ball with you this evening because the answer to this question may require it. I know that the Board and State officials are looking at the Chancellor's plan which calls for a budget of approximately \$500 million. I have also heard that the budget or funds available are much less, about \$400 million or so. I have heard that the modifications in the plan which may be made will preclude even the savings the Chancellor had in mind. On the basis of your information, which is certainly a lot better than ours, is there a discrepancy?" / You attend the same Fiscal Affairs meetings I do and I think you know the situation as well as I. There is no hard information that you lack and what you describe is correct. If the plan were adopted in toto and the optimistic estimated savings were achieved, there would be a gap between what we are now told would be our funding for next year. Dr. Goldin said as much at the Public Meeting last night. We must not let that dismay us, however, because we are in a political confrontation. The politics has blown all the fuses of the educational situation. It means that if, as, and when the Board puts together a consensus, it will be the Board's proposal to the Governor who will say 'I can't fund that' or 'I can', 'Happy New Year' or something else, but I hope he says something. Then the plan will come back, gap or no gap. Then, if we can survive the trauma of doing what is necessary for next year, we can look forward to the next \$100 million cut for '77-'78 and amputate another limb. In terms of trying to meet what is now known about the budget we have the literally impossible task of dealing with what we are now told is the level for '77-'78 with a budget in which there are \$0 for the senior colleges because the City has said you will have \$0 which the State matches according to present formulas. And the matching funds for \$0 are \$0. (3) Professor Baumrin, Lehman College - "I know you will not be surprised at questions concerning the trimester and I do not know whether what I have is a statement or a question but I have spoken to a number of faculty, reasonable men who can't say 'yes' or 'no' but I haven't found any who find any merit in your proposal. I read the majority report of the Task Force and found no merit in it. I have been told that the University of Pittsburgh operates successfully under a trimester but I have seen no data to confirm that statement. I do know that very few faculty of any prominence would work a third trimester. I do not know what will happen with chairmen, P & B Committees and the like, though that may not be important since we may not have any. But I do ask 'What is the point?' To save money? To get rid of adjuncts? To get rid of the Graduate School? What are the merits and can you make reasonable men see them? Tell us and let us decide." / I respect your opinion, you have a right not to like something. The trimester is rather complicated. The Committee Report didn't go into a great deal of depth. Furthermore, we are not in a position to provide everything to everyone although the materials received by the Committee were more extensive. The things you said concerning unfortunate practices are true but we don't know whether they have anything to do with the trimester. We haven't seen any evidence, you say. What evidence? If the trimester were implemented totally throughout the University it should be possible within reason and without absolutely uniform registration to save 10% of the the space now used and 10% of the space would be one million square feet. If we could then take advantage of the fact that we are a complex not a single campus institution, we can accumulate space and that will produce savings. On a single campus the trimester results in a release of classrooms during certain hours; in a complex of campuses one accumulates the space. Then, by having not just the instructional staff but the students stay where you have space you can shut down units and save all of the space and save a lot of dollars. If you save that way you are able to pay for additional instruction. You pay faculty salaries where the students are. You have the possibility of having the budget of college A increase because of in-



creased work load while that of College B goes to zero and this is a major consideration. Basically there is a better utilization of physical facilities, not an increased intensity of use but it is spread out. One has more students but a lower concentration of students. In terms of replacing adjuncts, the trimester is not designed for this purpose. It just so happens that the trimester would make it possible to offer full-time faculty additional teaching but they do not have to accept it. Adjuncts can continue then. (4) Professor Wakatama, Medgar Evers College - "Can we assume that the restructuring has not been well thought out when the proposals, as indicated by some of the answers you have given concerning faculty, are incomplete? If so, what is going to happen to students, for example, to those who are about to finish but who lack perhaps 15 credits and who if they are transferred may have their credits affected? Would they have to take longer to graduate?"/ Yes, you are right that the plan is not thought out in many major directions, but there has not been nor will there be the opportunity for such careful planning. A great deal is going to be done on the wing. I tell you that because it is the truth, because the way our lives are there is no way we can have two years to design a plan and then implement it. I wouldn't have done it this way and you wouldn't have nor do people except under stress - and that is just a normal pattern of human behavior. Now, concerning the students. I am surprised at the phrasing of your question. When has there been any reason to think that we are not going to protect the student body? None of them is going to have a door slammed, none is going to find so unfriendly a faculty that he/she is unable to complete a degree. Not the faculty or the students or the Board will permit that. I know I won't. There may be some displacement and unpleasantness, I am sure. But that may have to be. Students may have to get off at a different subway stop; they may have to work in different surroundings, but, after all, we are in bad trouble and I am not sure these things would be such a catastrophe. (5) Professor Jarrett, Brooklyn College - "One of the great traditions of this University, a tradition which has contributed to its successful competition, academic quality and faculty guidance is the tradition of tenure which has been worked out so diligently for so many years, having the principles which underlie the system refined to a point where we can be proud. When we say there are no precedents for mergers of colleges, we recognize that there are no precedents for dealing with tenured faculty in such institutions. Is there a difference now in what the word, the practice and the tradition really mean? Does tenure mean to CUNY what in the past we thought it meant?"/ For myself I don't think I have changed my attitude towards tenure. We are in accord on the meaning of what tenure is intended to mean: the protection of academic freedom and additionally a form of job security. Speaking not for myself, I expect that will be the path the BHE will follow. I can't promise to deliver them, but I think they will. But that means that the newer, younger people the representatives of the affirmative action program to the extent that we have had any success with that program will suffer more from this policy than from one which does not protect tenure. There are no questions before us which are good all the way. Everything is a two-edged sword. I come down on one edge of the sword: protect tenure, but I know this has negative effects and meaning for others. (6) Professor Gosselin, Bronx Community College - "I recognize that we are trying to be compassionate but we do have problems concerning the retrenchment guidelines and the implementation of dismissals to the extent that we may be subject to censure by the AAUP. We prepared a report on this subject and I wonder whether there has been any activity of the BHE, the Chancellery et al. to deal with what we suggested?"/ There was a discussion on that subject in the Chancellor's cabinet and it seemed possible for nearly all of those suggestions to be accepted and incorporated. Professor Gosselin further asked - "Is anything being done to monitor the way in which the Retrenchment process is being carried out?"/ Yes, we are monitoring the way in which faculty are receiving termination notices. Professor Valinsky interjected that he had received some feedback from the Vice-Chancellor for Legal Affairs who had told him that the report was very well written and thought-out but that she could not accept any of the recommendations. He reported that he knew too that the Retrenchment Guidelines were now



ing gone over in the Council of Presidents and believed that the Senate's suggestions should be treated seriously. Deputy-Chancellor Hyman replied that there may be some reason General Counsel has for refusing to change today, but added that the Guidelines do expire. On the question of monitoring, he added, the Chancellery receives reports from the colleges on who is being terminated, how it is being done and also an ethnic breakdown is supplied. (7) Professor Gelfand, Queens College - "What is the current status of the tuition question?" Politically, it would be better not to talk about it. It is perfectly clear to all concerned that the Commissioner of Education and the Deputy-Commissioner, our long-term friend and fellow employee, think the University should charge tuition. So do a lot of other people. Last night three members of the BHE took the trouble to say that they would sooner see tuition imposed or charged than see open admissions changed. One needs more than that to understand their thinking but that's the statement they made. If one turns to the facts, you come down to the following: 1. There is no indication from any substantial political person that the City and/or the State would maintain their level of effort after tuition was imposed. There is no reason to believe that the monies would be available for additional educational functions. At present the only thing we can believe is that if the University puts itself in the position of tax-collector, it would have to remit those taxes to the City Treasury. The Chairman of the BHE and others are aware of the situation and are convinced that tuition must be the last piece of the puzzle to be put in place. Tuition must be considered in the context of charges in addition to some funding level. 2. Free tuition has been a social policy of this City since 1847; it has been repeatedly endorsed and supported by elected officials; it was established by referendum. Some members of the BHE think it would be improper for that policy to be overturned by an appointed Board. Political officials can and may do this but to pressure them, the BHE, into this action does not seem appropriate. (8) Professor Ferentz, Brooklyn College - "Perhaps it is unfair to remind ourselves of happier days when the faculty felt it had something in common with the top floor of 80th Street, that we were working together to build a better university. But I can remember in those days the Chancellor and the Deputy-Chancellor speaking to the question of multiple positions and getting rid of them. The perception now is that times are harder and that on the top floor at 80th Street what little zeal there was for building a stronger university is evaporating. The request for an increase in load has meant a 50% to 100% increase for junior faculty. I think probably we are in a political situation and the faculty no longer perceive leadership of the University in the position of protecting what little good remains. Those in labs can not do in 12 weeks what they do in 14; those in remediation can not accomplish the same things. In terms of trimester savings, they would seem to come from two sources: closing campuses and having faculty teach at adjunct rates. If the BHE is unwilling to close campuses, then the savings will be in empty classrooms. Also, one wonders whether there are capital funds put aside to permit operating on a twelve month basis." There are two corrections I would make, one minor and one major. The minor one is that in the days of which you are speaking we were on the 3rd floor at 80th Street not the top floor since the 6th and 7th floors were added later. The major correction is very important. In all of the conversations, discussions, arguments and agreements about multiple positions the question was related to overtime work during the regular session not to summer session because the concept was one of overload and overtime. The problem was to defend a 12 hour load for those who said they shouldn't be asked to do more but who were teaching 3 or 6 hours at night. But in comparing that to the trimester one has apples and oranges because it is not that kind of overload that results from the trimester. We are talking about teaching the year round. Many of our young people go scrambling now to find a way to earn more money as soon as the academic year ends, and they find what they can find. To the extent that they can get research support they are encouraged to pursue research but some meet their needs by going into the classroom not the lab. In terms of labs on a 12 week schedule, I think 14 is better than 12 and 16 better than 14. But I would support thinking in terms of a continuous period with a little bit of free-

dom. You don't have to be bound by the 12 weeks in every course; why not have those courses that won't fit flop over and be as flexible as we have to be? For example, one might take the last 4 weeks of the trimester of 12 weeks and include two labs a week. In any case I don't think you should regard it as an insuperable object. I reject the arguments that I am receiving from registrars that they need two weeks for registration. As Dean of the Graduate School of Engineering at City College I found I could do a mail registration. I might add that I went to school in the summer before the advent of air-conditioning and it was probably unpleasant but I can't get too upset about telling the student body that they have to do what they want to do - get an education - within certain conditions. (9) Professor Bieler, York College - "How did the Chancellor's office take into account demographic projections for the City in proposing that there should be in Queens one senior college and 2 community colleges rather than 2 senior colleges and 1 community college?"/ Units are not established to produce equitable areas of population. They are not like the high school distribution although that kind of proposal was made by the Vice-Chairman of the BHE last night. He would have colleges with no Presidents and his proposal is as remarkably a destructive suggestion as I have heard for this University. Some community colleges and some senior colleges have developed strong local ties and this is good but others have a city-wide posture. The BHE did decide to distribute the colleges among the boroughs and any extreme proposal would have poor acceptance but otherwise the location of colleges does not get decided by demography. (10) Professor Handler, Hunter College - "It has come to our attention that the BHE will take action on the Kibbee plan but not in public session. It is not clear, however, what the form of the consensus will be or how the Governor's people will deal with it. What timetable is going to be adhered to? How is the plan going to be presented? Is it going first to the Emergency Financial Control Board and then to the Governor? Will it come back to the BHE and will there be another hearing before a vote? Will there be additional input?"/ I don't know very much about it. The Board will produce some kind of consensus of its opinions on the plan and other things. It will attach an estimate of the \$ values which will then be transmitted by the Governor's representatives to the Governor. In terms of Mr. Berger's ultimatum of last Friday, it didn't strike a very responsive chord. Mr. Berger seems to be a very aggressive, intelligent young man. Having been appointed as Executive Director of the Emergency Financial Control Board, he appeared Friday at the BHE meeting and adopted the posture of 'I was born yesterday, give me your plan by Wednesday A.M. and I will try to defend you'. His relationship to what will happen does not seem to be very substantial, however. I don't think the consensus will go first to the EFCB but to the Governor. Professor Handler further asked - "Then, the BHE will not approve the plan in public session until it is approved by the Governor?"/ It has to be a matter of negotiation. Professor Handler further asked - "What you are really saying is that at some time after all the agreements are reached the BHE's plan will be made public without input from the faculty and others?"/ I don't know what will happen beyond the next few days. There will be negotiation, I think. I don't know whether there is an inclination for a hearing or not but it doesn't look likely. (11) Professor Ferentz, Brooklyn College, - "Are you not saying that at this point it is an exercise in futility to address the BHE or the Chancellor but go to the Governor if you want a hearing?"/ There is a time when deliberation comes to an end. It may be temporary but there must be a decision point. Concerning going to the Governor, everyone is involved in replanning - as I put it, restructuring the City University is the latest cottage industry in New York. Everyone is taking a piece home and bringing back a piece. But I think that process is coming to a rapid end. (12) Professor Milberg-Kaye, Lehman College - "In order for the trimester to work, about 1/3 of the students must attend in each segment. If they don't want to do this, will you compel them to and how?"/ Students will be offered the opportunity to choose the trimesters in which they attend. If there is an inadequate number of volunteers, attendance in certain trimesters will be made a condition of admission. (13) Professor T. Brown, Queens College - "The primary

Support for the Majority Report is that it will produce sizable savings, \$60 million, I think was the figure, over a period of time. Could you give us a better breakdown of the dollar amount? For example, next year, university-wide what would be the saving in terms of space and faculty?" / There would be no savings of faculty unless there were a reduction of student enrollment. The target savings are \$40 million not \$60 million. It is difficult to tell how much would be saved in the first year since it is possible that very little would be implemented and it is bound to take once around the cycle before the effects are felt. In the first year I would project no savings or negative savings; in the second year the savings would depend on how fast the problems were solved. (14) Professor Gruenebaum, Brooklyn College - "We have heard that we overspent \$2.5 million in some month, could you tell us about this?" / The Budget Director of the City has a number he considers to be the dollar size of our budget. From this he subtracted the amount vouchered for in the first six months of the current year and he then wrote down a dollar amount for January, February, March, April, May and June. For February the University exceeded the amount he wrote down by \$2.3 million. His total excludes the \$87 million reduction and also the \$55 to \$60 million which includes the furlough. It also excludes \$10 million for other things, e.g. the shortfall of income from the colleges due to inefficiency in collecting fees. I met with him yesterday evening with Professor I. Polishook and others. We were told then that we don't have enough in the March allotment to meet the March 31st payroll. I don't know what he will do or what will happen with the furlough. And there is something else he wanted to know: did the PSC really mean it would agree to an \$11 million deferment of salary? If the PSC agreed, the City officials were ready to go and get \$28 or \$31 million in windfall monies which together with the \$11 million would meet the gap. The PSC said that they would accept deferred salary as part of a total union agreement with increases in the second year. The City officials were appreciative of the fact that the BHE could not today agree to give salary increases today, but that that might become possible in the future. It is not possible today so the City is not able to go to the State. But if we are short in March we will be even shorter in April. Professor Gruenebaum further asked - "Can we make two assumptions: that the amount set aside from now until to June is the same for each month?" / No, the amounts vary. Professor Gruenebaum - "that clearly there were some cuts made in February and the gap shouldn't increase?" / We are spending at a rate which exceeds the Budget Director's figures. (15) Professor Stansky, Baruch College - "I have been listening to the discussion of the trimester and listening to the fact that full-time faculty cannibalizing junior faculty is not possible but that the full-time faculty is shrinking and savings will be effected that way. Is that true?" / It may happen that way but it is not really related to the trimester; it is superimposed on it. I feel that we may have to retrench faculty and that may be so trimester or not. (16) Professor Spinger, Brooklyn College - "In the light of your response to Professor Handler my question may be pointless. I began reading the Chancellor's proposals with an open mind but what I read concerning the liberal arts left me benighted. It was like a surgical operation performed without eyes or at least without ordinary organs of perception. I find it unacceptable. It abides by no notion of the liberal arts that I know. And I wonder about the leadership of this University. Who were the consultants on this? I have my own answer: the Philistines. / I do not know. (17) Professor Zimmerman, Staten Island Community College - "I was happy to hear you say that you were Dean of the Graduate School of Engineering since talking about the Chancellor's document I think you might have some awareness about the section on the technologies, especially the consolidation of technologies at New York City Community College and the movement of others to Queensborough. You and I remember the time when Arthur Grad went around and embodied the results of his visits in a report. That report was carefully read on my campus and remedial action taken, e.g. courses were consolidated, etc. to make certain economies. As a result we now have 7 different curricula handled by 13 faculty members with a

few lab assistants and one department head. The average class size is 1, which is a pretty good size for a lab class. Graduates of these curricula particularly well in finding jobs in the one borough which seems to be growing. What is the justification then for moving all of these to some other borough? And I mean not a smooth justification but a real one."/ I will have to depend on myself to determine my opinion on the question you seem to be asking, 'Why should all of those programs functioning as you describe be transferred to some other location?' I have the feeling that you are talking about something that doesn't exist. I don't know that anyone has proposed that all of those programs be transferred but I do know of a proposal that some programs be shuffled around.

(18) Professor Miller, Kingsborough Community College - "I have two questions. When will commencement be scheduled under the trimester? and Under present conditions of employment faculty are expected to work from September 1 to the day after commencement; what will the trimester mean in terms of contract?"/ One has to think more freely. Commencement will be whenever a college faculty wants to have it. Under the present structure the contract agreement identifies the vacation period in one way; under a different calendar there would be a different definition in the contract. I think you can be sure that the PSC is not going to negotiate away the vacation period and the University won't propose anything like that. To suggest otherwise is to be silly.

(19) Professor Baumrin, Lehman College - "I think I could dispute you on the savings in the Chancellor's plan but you have already indicated in response to Professor Handler that it is getting too late for faculty input. But in response to one topic it doesn't seem appropriate that the relevant arguments didn't convince you. Well, yours don't convince us. If you were properly reasonable you ought to be willing to put it to a referendum of faculty, or the Senate or the College Presidents without pressuring them."/ I don't think we have time and I don't have the inclination to discuss referenda as a means of decision-making. Professor Valinsky stated - "There is one open question. As you know, people refer to the furlough as the faculty tuition plan. Is the \$10 million shortfall in fees going to become the faculty fee plan? Is there someone to hold the Presidents responsible for collecting those fees?"/ I hope so. But I can't tell what future actions may be taken.

Professor Silver, City College, wondered whether the faculty's views on the trimester had really been forcefully communicated. Professor Handler responded that in response to the remarks she was hearing, she thought it should be said that the Executive Committee spent two hours arguing over the trimester in a toe-to-toe discussion with the Chancellor. And, if it were put to a vote by that body, as Professor Silver was suggesting, it would go down 9 to 0. Further, back in October the Chairman and the Vice-Chairman had opposed the proposal and had been fighting it bitterly since October as the Deputy-Chancellor could testify. Professor Silver rejoined that he had been arguing that people outside did not know this. Professor Valinsky responded that they did, that in all of the discussions with Dr. Dullea, Dr. Hollander et al. the faculty's objections had been forcefully communicated and the opposition had also been stated at the BHE's Public Hearing. Professor Briloff, Baruch College asked - "What have you put to the faculty? Who will be the lucky winners and the unlucky losers? Have you given the faculty the opportunity to express their views? Professor Valinsky responded that he had not intended to report on an hour and twenty minute conversation which he had had with the Chancellor which might better be described as a battle concerning the role of the faculty and that of the administration. He would not burden the Senate with what was said because some not very polite language was used. He had made clear, however, that the faculty was listened to but ignored, that they did not have input to this Board. There was no reason why any member of the Senate shouldn't participate as they did in these sessions when they raised questions. The Executive Committee was working seven days a week but they were working as the organ of the Plenary and hoped that the Plenary was a support to their activity. In any meeting it was assumed that the leaders were acting as the representatives of the Senate. In talking with political officials about the future of the University it was impossible to know where impact had been made. One

thing was becoming clear, however. The BHE was not in high esteem with the people to whom the Senate leaders spoke who were discussing the lack in the Board in defending the University. The area of governance was not included in the Kibbee plan but it was not out of the attention of men like Margolis, Hollander and Dullea et al. The work of the leadership is being carried on without shouting because they want to win. One area to which attention was being given had been outlined by the Deputy-Chancellor and that was what to do in case of mergers. It was the leadership's belief that it was important to discuss things in the Plenary Session and air everyone's views so that they might have the Plenary's support.

IV. A Proposed Resolution on Furlough: Professor Ferentz, Brooklyn College, offered a resolution on furlough for consideration by the Senate. (Text attached). Professor Paster, City College, suggested that more than a sense of honor was involved in the furlough that there were educational considerations as well. People were leaving his department because of the academic issues involved. The Chairman of the BHE in his letter to the faculty of March 3 had noted the fact that "a 'furlough' approach also provides time for all of us to bring to the public consciousness...the need for increased State aid both for this year to avoid educational disaster as well as for future years." Professor Paster stated that when he joined the faculty he had not assumed that he was expected to take on the role of a lobbyist but he now found himself being strangled into that role. Professor Ferentz replied that the resolution was an attempt to be moderate in addressing the Chancellor, even though he was not sure there was a point in that. The resolution was intended to convey the idea that though the Senate was not yet prepared to offer a resolution of no confidence this resolution may have a purpose by putting the Chancellor on warning. Professor Trefousse, Graduate School, moved the question. Professor Paster asked whether a resolution did not have to be submitted in writing in order to be considered. Professor Zimmerman, Staten Island Community College, asked whether if that was the rule, the rules could be waived. The Parliamentarian responded that the rules required only that a resolution be submitted in writing if possible. The question was moved and the resolution adopted with one dissenting vote.

V. Committee Reports: Professor Gosselin, Bronx Community College, Chairman of the Academic Freedom Committee, moved the adoption of a resolution on Summary Dismissals prepared by his Committee and circulated to the membership. (Text attached). The resolution was carried unanimously.

Professor Shahn, Hunter College, Chairman of the Senate Task Force on Enrollment, moved that the report circulated by his Committee be received by the Senate at this time. The motion was adopted.

VI. New Business: Professor Trefousse, Graduate School, offered a resolution on the Liberal Arts Curriculum but agreed to withdraw it for the time being after discussion revealed that considerable amendment might be desirable.

The session was adjourned at 9:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Ann M. Burton  
Secretary