

BHE
minutes
Faculty Senate

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

April 27, 1976

Professor David Valinsky, the Chairman, called the meeting to order at 6:45 p.m. in the Auditorium at the Graduate Center. All members were present except Professors Abramson, Aurbach, Auslander, Berenson, Bindler, T. Brown, Ceccarelli, Diamond, Donno, Eichmann, Elster, Fifer, Frazier, Gelfand, H. Gilbert, Goldstein, Gross, Harvey, Hillery, Hogg, Howard, Hunte, Krich, Kriegel, Leiter, Lipschutz, Loughrey, Milberg-Kaye, Munitz, Nwasike, Ornstein, Page, Patterson, Pauling, Pinciss, I. Polishook, S. Polishook, Prager, Rietz, Schram, Scott, Shmidman, Silver, Soskind, Spinger, Uretsky, Volkomer, Walsh, Williams, Wilson, and Zalusky. Chancellor Robert J. Kibbee and Dr. Jean Ellis also attended.

I. Approval of the Tentative Agenda: The tentative agenda was approved with the following amendments: the addition of item 4a "Proposed Resolution on Liberal Arts", the substitution of item 8 as item 5a and of item 5 as item 5b.

II. Approval of the Minutes of the 57th Plenary Session: The minutes were approved with the following corrections: (1) page 8, line 12 "15 credits and who, if they are transferred..." and (2) page 11, line 46 "mind but what I read concerning the liberal arts at the surviving senior colleges was based on a view that, in the kindest word I can think of, is benighted..."

III. Communications from the Chairman: Professor Valinsky told the Senate of the death on April 26, 1976 of Professor Carl Boyer, Brooklyn College, member of the Senate and of its Executive Committee. He then read a Memorial resolution for Professor Boyer (Copy attached) which was approved unanimously by the Senate and the Secretary was instructed to forward it to Professor Boyer's family. After a minute's silence in Professor Boyer's memory, the session continued.

Professor Valinsky announced his intent to keep his communications on developments within the University brief so as not to repeat what the Chancellor might report and to add to them, if there were matters to be reported which were not covered by the Chancellor. He then reported that since the last Plenary and during the spring recess the Senate leadership had continued to keep in touch with developments affecting the University through discussions with the Chancellor, with various political leaders such as Deputy-Mayor Zuccotti, Assemblyman Landes and others. The Executive Committee met with Dr. Frank Macchiarola of the Emergency Financial Control Board on April 8 and is considering the possibility of another trip to Albany. Professor Valinsky also announced that the full cost of the March 16th trip had not yet been repaid and that Dr. Ellis, who had advanced the necessary funds personally, would appreciate receiving additional checks in the amount of \$4 from those who had not yet contributed.

The Chairman reported that the BHE meeting of April 5, as the Senate knew, had resulted in a series of resolutions for restructuring the University. The text of the resolutions actually passed by the Board was included in each Senator's packet at the Plenary. The next issue of the Senate Newsletter, which would be at the colleges by the end of the week, contains commentary on some of the resolutions.

The BHE meeting of April 26 had two items on the agenda of special interest to the Senate -- Calendar No. 7 "Faculty Retrenchment Guidelines" and Calendar No. 8 "Designation of a President." Copies of the Guidelines and of Professor

Valinsky's statement to the Board have been distributed to the members of the Senate. The text of Professor's Valinsky's Statement on Calendar No. 8 is attached to the minutes. On a motion made by Mr. D'Angelo, the Retrenchment Guidelines item was tabled until the May meeting with the understanding that discussion and consultation would take place with staff. President Volpe was designated as the president of Richmond-Staten Island in spite of numerous speakers who, like Dr. Valinsky, protested the BHE's procedures in this area. Dr. Valinsky also explained that the Chairman of the BHE had said that the search for a president of Bronx Community College - Hostos Community College would continue and that one student and one faculty member from Hostos would be added to the committee.

Professor Valinsky reminded the Senate that the Plenary on May 18 would be the organizational meeting of the Senate. Elections would take place for Chairman and Vice-Chairman for two year terms, Secretary and Treasurer for one-year terms and for five members of the Executive Committee for one-year terms each.

On the question of the furlough Professor Valinsky stated that it was his understanding that the PSC's Executive Committee was meeting simultaneously with the Senate to discuss results of the contract negotiations with the Chancellor and the BHE. Although he did not know details, Professor Valinsky understood that the furlough negotiations deal with the concept of a two week deferment subject to a number of qualifying conditions. The supposition is that if such a deferment is agreed upon, the State will come forward with additional monies for the other two weeks. Because the Chancellor has been attacked by various members of the BHE for his decision to designate the week of April 12 as a Holiday Closing and postpone the furlough since it was his feeling that the negotiations with the union and the State warranted such a decision, it would be appropriate to note the Senate's appreciation of his decision.

Professor Adickes, Staten Island Community College, stated that she was pleased with Dr. Valinsky's statement concerning the Designation of a President for Richmond-Staten Island and with the thrust of that statement but she wondered why the Staten Island delegation had not been contacted and asked to be the Senate's spokespersons in this matter. Professor Valinsky suggested that, if such had been the wish of the delegation, it would have been possible for them to contact the Senate Office.

Professor Schneider, York College, asked for clarification of the Brooklyn College action in relation to the furlough. Professor Gruenebaum explained that Brooklyn College's spring recess had been scheduled to begin on Wednesday, April 14 and to last through April 25. When the Chancellor announced the Holiday Closing it had been decided to close on April 12 and 13 and to add two days to the end of the term. The other three days in that week were taken care of because Brooklyn opened the college year three days earlier than the rest of the University.

Professor Paster, City College, suggested that it might be well to note that the AAUP had begun a formal investigation of retrenchment at CUNY and was soliciting information concerning violations of academic freedom and due process from members of the University. Professor Valinsky stated that the forthcoming Senate Newsletter contained an announcement of the AAUP action.

IV. Chancellor's Report: Chancellor Kibbee prefaced his report with an apology for his absence from the Senate for the past two months, explaining that he had missed the first of the Plenary Sessions held in that period on purpose because he was engaged in negotiations and discussions which would have required

him to reply evasively to questions. The second he had missed because the date had been changed to a time when he had a previous obligation.

Chancellor Kibbee reported the following: (1) The Governor has named a new member of the BHE to replace Mr. Williams. He is Francis Kilcoyne, former president of Brooklyn College, and will take his seat on the BHE as soon as his appointment is approved by the Senate; (2) CUNY has become "the mother of presidents" with the appointment of Dr. Riddle to University of Illinois at Chicago Circle now followed by President Birenbaum's appointment to the presidency of Antioch and Vice-Chancellor Healy's to Georgetown University. The Chancellor stated that he hoped this was just the beginning since such appointments speak well for the University when persons in the ranks of CUNY take positions of such distinction; (3) the quality of CUNY faculty and students is attested by a number of awards recently announced -- of 350 Guggenheim Fellowships, 9 were awarded to CUNY faculty and 5 to Queens College alone, tying CUNY for fifth place behind Berkeley, Harvard, Stanford and Princeton; 3 CUNY faculty members, 1 at Richmond who was also awarded a Guggenheim, and 2 at City received Rockefeller Foundation grants in the Humanities; of 70 Regents medical and dental awards for further study, 8 were given to CUNY students, tying the University with Harvard for second place behind Cornell; of the Lehman Fellowships for graduate study 4 winners and 5 alternates were CUNY students. Finally, Professor Irving Howe's scholarly work was reaching the top of the best-seller list in the category of general books and thus bringing the author both fame and fortune.

The Chancellor reported on two matters he believed to be of interest to the Senate: (1) on the report in the press that the University would not be able to meet its April payroll he explained the background, as follows -- the EFCB had decided a month ago to place the University on a monthly allocation without consulting the University to determine how it spent its funds. As a result, the University exceeded its allotment by \$1 million in March. In April the amount is smaller. The Chancellor has received a call from the Director of the Budget, however, informing him that the allocation had been revised to permit payment of the University's expenses and that the Comptroller had been notified to release the funds. This, said the Chancellor, may not be the last word, but it is the latest word on the subject. (2) On the budget for next year -- this is still a matter of intense negotiation. The Governor and his staff have met with the Democratic leaders of the Senate; a subsequent meeting was held by the Governor's staff with City officials; then another meeting between the Governor and the Mayor took place. On April 26 representatives of the Mayor and the Governor met with the Chairman of the BHE and the Chancellor to discuss the University's budget allocation. At its informal meeting following the Public Meeting on April 26 the BHE discussed the question of tuition and issued a statement to the effect that the Board had taken up the question, that it felt it did not have the specific information needed concerning the level of funding and requested a meeting with the Mayor and the Governor at which time they would take up "summarily" the question of whether tuition was needed or not. For the past two weeks there has been an accelerated pace to the discussions. The ultimate outcome is still uncertain but there is hope for a resolution within the next ten days to two weeks. There will be an announcement by the Mayor later this week on the effects on city agencies of the Stavisky Bill. That announcement will include a reference to further cuts in the CUNY budget; the Chancellor has been assured, however, that this time the reference is not to real cuts but rather to making public the drastic effects which implementation of the Stavisky Bill might have.

The Chancellor then responded to the following questions submitted in writing: Professor Behr, Queensborough Community College - "With regard to your newly an-

nounced policy concerning the passing of examinations to enter the Junior Year: 1) Who will make up the exams?; 2) Who will administer and grade them?; 3) When will they go into effect?; 4) What level of competency will they check?; 5) For those who fail, will CUNY provide remedial services?; 6) Will these students be allowed to continue their education at CUNY as non-matriculated fee paying students?; 7) When will these students be allowed to re-take the tests?"/

I was surprised at the play given that part of the restructuring proposals in the press this weekend. My impression is that on Sundays, unless there is a disaster such as an airplane crash, news is a problem. Therefore, it is the practice for reporters to watch TV and then to begin to create news. I had participated ten days ago in a taped program, "Like It Is", and in the course of that discussion the resolutions on retention of students were mentioned. What I think will happen is that the University will prepare an examination to test skills for moving from lower division programs to upper division. Of the questions asked here I don't know that I can answer them definitively. We will try to use an examination which already exists and which has been normalized on the basis of a population comparable to that of New York City. It will be a University-wide exam but will be administered by the individual colleges. The level of competency has not been determined yet but we are not going to express it in terms of grade levels; we will determine the skills needed and the score which indicates those skills. We haven't determined what will happen to those who fail; perhaps, the University will provide an opportunity for them to improve or they may be given the opportunity to do so on their own. The question of whether they will be permitted to continue as non-matriculated students will have to be judged in the context of whether there is a difference in the fee structure for matriculated and non-matriculated students. All students will be given the opportunity to retake the test after a reasonable interlude -- perhaps semester by semester. 2) Professor Ehrenpreis, Bronx Community College - "I have it on good authority that you and the Chairman of the Board met with a group of legislators plus the Borough President of the Bronx on Thursday, April 22 and that Senator Garcia proposed that he would get through the Legislature a bill providing sufficient monies -- some \$3 million -- to keep Hostos Community College open. If this is so, why don't you and the Chairman of the BHE accept the offer and keep Hostos open?"/ The Chairman and I did meet with such a group which included also representatives from the community. We discussed the future of Hostos and such a proposal was made, though the amount was \$3.7 million, I believe. We were asked what our response would be. My response was that if the \$3.7 million were designated for Hostos Community College, then, as law-abiding citizens, the Chairman and I would obey the law. On the other hand, if the Legislature simply increased their appropriation by \$3.7 million, I couldn't promise to use those monies for Hostos. The question is not what will we do with the extra monies but how to reduce additional cuts. I couldn't agree to take on additional expenditures unless monies were specifically designated. Professor Ehrenpreis further asked - "Are you planning to set up a Task Force to effect the merger between Bronx Community College and Hostos Community College and, if so, are you willing to assure us that you will include faculty representatives from each of those institutions on the Task Force?"/ I am not setting up a Task Force. I am sending out a directive which says that one individual has been set up to be the executive authority for planning the merger together with an Executive Committee to be named by the Chancellor. That committee will consist of an administrative representative from the institution other than the one of the individual designated to be the executive authority, one senior administrator from a community college not affected by mergers, and one senior administrator from the Central Office. There will be charges to the Executive Committee and they will be authorized to create Task Forces or Committees made up of representatives of both institutions to work out the problems of the merger. I will do the same thing in the case of the colleges to be federated and something similar, though somewhat different, in the case of John Jay. 3) Professor Johansson, Queensborough Community College -

"With regard to the new policy on withdrawals, when will this go into effect? How will incompletes be handled?"/ These questions seem a little too vague to handle. The idea is to limit the use of the Incomplete so that it would be given only for legitimate reasons which faculty could determine but in any case it would have to be removed the next semester and, if not, after that it becomes an "F". On withdrawals the idea is to cut down the time the student could exercise that privilege without penalty. I plan to ask the Faculty Senate to provide people to work out the details of the whole retention process. We will deal first with the mergers because the time is short and the work large. Then we will try to get to the implementation of the other BHE resolutions as quickly as we can, but I don't think it will be this semester.

Chancellor Kibbee then responded to the following questions from the floor:

1) Professor Mapp, New York Community College - "It is my assumption that the State Legislature recently approved the Governor's Executive Budget which changed the funding formulas in effect for the community colleges and that the change would result in approximately \$96 per FTE less. Can you confirm this, and, if so, can you explain what the Central Office is planning to do to turn this around and what the prognosis is for turning it around?"/ The Governor's budget did make the change of \$96 per FTE which I believe is an 11% or 12% diminution in funding. In the past the formula limited the State contribution to a maximum of 40% and the University has suffered because of this because the 40% would provide more than the formula. We have been hindered more by the 40% than the formula because of the cut in City funds. We are working to have it changed back to what it was previously. The Legislature is not close to its Supplemental Budget decisions yet, although active measures are being taken by both SUNY and CUNY and by the local governments which sponsor the community colleges to secure a change. The last are probably more effective than we are.

2) Professor Gosselin, Bronx Community College - "I have some interest in the details of the merger of Bronx Community College and Hostos Community College, as you know. Did I understand you to say that the President of one was to be the Executive Director and that there would be an administrative officer from each on the Executive Committee?"/ The Committee would have three members in addition to the Executive authority. Professor Gosselin further asked - "Is there no provision for direct faculty participation then?"/ The Executive Committee is to set up the timetable for actions which must be taken to provide for implementation of the merger and to be sure that there will be people to cover those kinds of actions that have to be taken. I have asked them to provide a set of actions to be taken, a timetable and a procedure for dealing with them. There will be a large input of faculty at various stages but not in this group. Professor Gosselin further asked - "How does this affect the Search Committee? And what would the extreme limits of the timetable be?"/ I hope the work will start within the next week or ten days; I am prepared to name the people. The Search is a different matter and the BHE has agreed to continue it and will add Hostos people to the committee. There would be no chance for the new President to get involved over the next two months; further, the University is not prepared to name a new president over the next two months. The new president will join whenever he or she becomes available, although it is possible that it may not be until it is all over.

3) Professor Milentijevic, City College - "You have given us a lot of important information but you have been silent on the negotiations concerning a contract. I wonder whether you could comment on the negotiations even if you must be evasive. Also, President Marshak has come out with a plan for retrenchment which has been widely publicized. How do you think that publicity would help or harm him?"/ It is no secret that the union representatives and I are actively engaged and very close to agreement. I must be a little evasive but an agreement with the union, provided the PSC ratified it, would be a vital portion of the agreement with the City and State for dealing

with the University's problems. The PSC has been statesmanlike in its dealings, we have had honest differences but we have been able to resolve them. I hope, although the timing is difficult, to get everything to fall into place over the next three or four weeks. In reply to your second question, you may recall that in November I sent a letter to the presidents asking them to plan their budgets for the next fiscal year at a level 10% below that for this year. I did this because of the \$55 million cut the solutions for which were unhappy and not repeatable and we needed a more permanent plan. That is what President Marshak has done. Whether it helps or hurts to publicize it is a matter of judgment. It hurts only in the sense that people may misinterpret what the cuts mean. The question came up on the Channel 13 program in which I participated in this form: how do you respond if someone says, "If a president can make the cut, it must have been fat." Then, I think, one has to say that you can't really cut but, in fact, you have to because the University doesn't raise its own money. I think President Marshak is doing what he has to -- showing what has to be done to meet different budget levels, if he has to. It does have a hazard but it is a chance one has to take because in this way one has planned reduction rather than having to cut in a quick, non-consultative way. 4) Professor Paster, City College - "I would like to address myself to some specifics in the retrenchment proposals. One item deals with the elimination of Psychological and Sociological Foundations of Education from the School of Education and the transfer of those courses to departments of psychology and sociology in the School of Liberal Arts. It seems strange in a professional school to eliminate foundations courses and I am concerned about this from several points of view -- from the point of view of educational quality, in relation to the preparation of teachers for urban areas, in relation to faculty and student anxieties. There is a serious question of whether a remote department should handle foundation work for a professional school. There is also the possibility of accrediting associations removing the School's accreditation."/ It's not really fair to ask me this kind of question. It is a matter which has to be fought out on campus. There are possible things I could say but I'm not familiar with the details and I think it should be fought out on campus. 5) Professor Wakatama, Medgar Evers College - "I'm sure you're aware of the fact that, as a result of restructuring, many people are being affected who have been working in a department for five years and who are coming up for tenure. How are you going to handle that situation?"/ I can't answer in specific terms; personally, I will try to honor tenure in the University to the best of my ability. So far as the question of those people who do not have tenure is concerned, there is no reason to presuppose that all those coming up for tenure would achieve it under the normal process. Some do; some don't. The same process will take place, I imagine, during the coming year. Lines may be reduced and that will preclude persons from getting tenure who might otherwise have done so; the restructuring may also result in some people not getting tenure who otherwise would have done so. 5) Professor Baumrin, Lehman College - "Some time ago I had occasion to lecture you on the demoralization of the faculty and I did the same thing with the Chairman of the BHE last fall. My concern now is with future students in the University. It might be admirable to reduce the size of the student body but I wonder about the rationale of changing the rules and the deadline."/ There has always been a deadline and it is stated on the application blank as January 15, if I remember correctly. In the past the University has ignored that fact and has admitted students through June or July. There was a discussion in the Board last year concerning the observation of deadlines when they found out that the deadlines were often extended by administrative decisions. The counsellors were advised that the deadlines would be observed this year but decreases in the number of people on counselling staffs plus problems in getting the word out led to the decision to extend the deadline to March 1 and then to April 30. One may argue the merits of deadlines but they are what the BHE wants and that is what we are going to do. The decision to set various levels

was mine and it was accepted by the BHE. The University has been bottom heavy for some time and upper division students have not constituted more than about 25%. In terms of trying to grapple with the University's problems, we have tried to differentiate among the kinds of programs and levels to which students are admissible. The requirements have reduced the senior college population -- but unevenly. The impact has been heaviest where institutions had admitted students in the past with lesser preparation than might be expected for four year college programs. My proposals did have a rationale, although they did in some cases reduce the number of students. For example, an institution which admitted 1000 in the past may find that there are only 250 qualified now. The proposals do suggest that the senior colleges should have comparable standards. 7) Professor Bressler, Richmond College - " I should like some further clarification of the Executive Committees for merged institutions. The last time you were here you said there were some generic questions to be answered. Tonight you seemed to gloss over those questions. Will you have the same plan for the Richmond-Staten Island federation as for Bronx-Hostos?"/ I didn't mean to gloss over anything. Since there is a president in this case he will be the Executive Authority and the Committee will be composed of a senior administrator from Staten Island Community College, a senior administrator from an institution not involved in a merger and a senior person from the Central Office. Professor Bressler further asked, "You said something about a timetable and its relationship to the committee and so forth. It sounds as though this were a temporary governance committee. In that situation how do you justify not having any faculty representation on the committee?"/ I don't consider it a governance body because there is no institution before September 1976. This is something resembling the way in which we established colleges originally. It is a paper organization for an institution coming into being. It will try to take the two institutions and relate them to each other in many, many ways. They will determine the technical kinds of problems that have to be dealt with. The Executive Committee is there to pinpoint the problems -- the things that have to be done -- then to create committees to do these things. It will also try to put into a time framework how these things will be done. Not everything can be done by September 1; they will have to identify those things which will take longer to do and to set up committees to deal with them. It is like setting up an institution even though the two exist. It is not a governance authority; it is not going to determine programs, etc. but get the two institutions together. Professor Bressler further asked, "Just as there are faculty on Search Committees couldn't there be faculty representatives on this committee?"/ There could be but I wanted to keep the committee small and neat and to be able to monitor it easily. 8) Professor Burton, Brooklyn College - " I should like to change the subject and ask you about the trimester. The Faculty Council at Brooklyn College voted today that it found the trimester calendar unsuited and unacceptable to Brooklyn College. I have read the resolution carefully and it seems somewhat ambiguous but doesn't it permit you to be flexible on this matter?"/ The form and the timing are flexible but the mandate is there. I am willing to be flexible and who knows what may happen between now and September 1977 when the trimester is supposed to be in place. The resolution says that there should be some form of the trimester by that date and I suppose I will go ahead on that premise with the full realization that things can change.

Professor Arons, City College, moved to alter the agenda to make item 7, Preliminary Report of the Task Force on Implications of Mergers, the next item of business because of the importance of that item. The motion was seconded and passed with one dissenting vote and four abstentions.

Professor Valinsky stated that he would complete the Communications as pro-

mised and then move to the next item on the agenda. He then responded to questions as follows: 1) Professor Gosselin, Bronx Community College - "You've been speaking to legislators and others, do you feel that there is a real commitment on their part to preserve the City University?"/ No one can be certain, but last Wednesday the Governor's people met with the Governor and with the Democratic leadership -- Senator Chrenstein and Assemblyman Steingut and also Assemblyman Landes -- to discuss the plan passed by the BHE on April 5. Following that meeting there was a meeting of the Governor's people with City people and that was followed by a meeting with the Chairman of the BHE and the Chancellor. Yesterday the Governor met with leaders of the Republican side of the Legislature. Presumably, they are alerting all of these people to the action the Governor is going to take. We have heard in many ways that they are committed to preserving the University. It is said that once the University is stabilized -- perhaps in a year's time -- the Governor is going to appoint a Blue Ribbon Commission to take a look at higher education in New York State. They are trying to give enough time to work something out on restructuring. We have been more encouraged in the past two weeks since, for example, two leading people have invited us to speak with them and that seems to be an indication that they are getting on the bandwagon. 2) Professor Dierlam, Queens College - "I would like, if I may, to report on the recent meeting of Nassau County residents who are members of the CUNY faculty with Assemblyman Landes. There is a fairly large pressure group of University people in his district. His answers on progress were gloomy; he predicted that within three years there would be a 25% cut. He also said and repeated several times that local New York City assemblymen have higher education low on their lists of priorities and he thought that pressure from New York City voters on local assemblymen would help."/ Yes, the report was that he was rather gloomy on that occasion, but after that we received a very pleasant, positive letter. We have also had a report that he has changed his position on faculty participation in governance. 3) Professor Birenbaum, New York City Community College - "With the impending imposition of tuition and the new admissions policy that limits admissions can you state what your opinion is on the question of CUNY and SUNY joining?"/ That is one of the questions we want to discuss. When we met with Senator Stafford, he expressed an understanding of our position that a merged CUNY-SUNY can't work, that it would be non-cost effective because of its size. Professor Birenbaum commented, "But after all of the cuts it's not going to be so immense."/ Yes, it will. The idea that the State is going to take some of the senior colleges is not being voiced by the Governor's people who are thinking in terms of a separate system. That is why it is important for us to discuss the document in item 5 on the agenda. I'm not saying we're out of the woods but there seems reason to be slightly more optimistic. There is also movement in the discussions on governance. 4) Professor Brillhoff, Baruch College - "During the time that I have been here I heard a response to a colleague asking about people who were coming up for tenure and what I heard was an obfuscating or less than moral or ethical response. Has the Executive Committee demanded to be part of the deliberations on what the University is going to do concerning tenure? Will those in endangered institutions be considered on an equal basis? Will the Executive Committee insist on being part of the deliberations?"/ Yes. The next item on the agenda will make that clear and the Chancellor is already aware of our concern in this area.

IV a. Preliminary Report of the Task Force on the Implications of Mergers:

Professor Baumrin, chairman of the Task Force, reported that the Task Force had convened for the first time on April 9 and had had three subsequent meetings. Its Preliminary report had been completed too late to have ready in reproduced form for distribution to the Plenary. It would be mailed to the membership within the next few days, however. Before reading the report to the

Plenary, Professor Baumrin gave a brief summary of how the Task Force had proceeded in its work. It was guided in part by the report of the two University Faculty Senate members of the Chancellor's Task Force on the Implications of Mergers which it hoped the Chancellor would read. It had then tried to formulate guidelines not simply for the mergers already announced but for any merger which might take place. Professor Baumrin then read the report which was based on the principle of heavy faculty involvement in the merger process and which dealt with the areas of governance, college-wide policy-making during transition (to be handled by a Transitional Institutional Policy Committee -- TIPC), transitional departmental P & B's (DTPBC), the implementation timetable, tenure, curriculum and programs.

During the lengthy discussion which followed the presentation of the Task Force's report the following points were made: 1) that the TIPC proposed in the Senate Task Force's report might well serve as a substitute for the Chancellor's Executive Committee and that the Senate's Executive Committee should immediately negotiate with the Chancellor for that substitution; 2) that it was difficult to discuss the details of the report without copies and without having been able to study it; 3) that the urgency of the situation required immediate action by the Senate on the document; 4) that the Chancellor's proposals and those of the Senate were not mutually exclusive and might operate in a sequential fashion, thus eliminating the need for immediate action.

A motion was made and seconded to accept the Task Force document as its report and discussion continued. Questions were then raised on the following points: 1) the method of selection of the TIPC; 2) the composition of the TIPC, in particular the distribution of membership between the merging institutions; 3) the failure to exclude from the panels of faculty eligible to serve on DTPB's faculty from other merging institutions; 4) the inclusion of the qualifier "senior" to describe the administrators who might be included in an institution's delegation to the TIPC. Amendments were offered (1) to alter the method of selecting the members of the TIPC; (2) to include the qualifier "non-merging" to describe the institutions from which the panels of potential outside members of the DTPB's might be selected; (3) to strike the qualifier "senior" in the provision limiting the number of administrators to be included in an institution's delegation to the TIPC. The first amendment was defeated; the other two amendments were accepted by the Task Force.

Professor Baumrin was asked to clarify certain points too: whether these guidelines were intended for use in cases of merged departments as well as merged institutions; whether it was intended for the DTPB's to have curriculum-making power; and why it was necessary to include outside members on the DTPB's. Professor Baumrin responded that the guidelines were not intended for use in cases of consolidation of programs or departments and Professor Valinsky added that another Senate Committee would be charged with that responsibility. It was not intended for the DTPB's to have curriculum-making power but rather for them to determine which courses should be offered initially. The need for outside members was to provide the objectivity which might be required in evaluating members to be part of the new department. The provision in the report to place all discontinued members on preferred eligible lists was considered an inadequate provision by one member.

A substitute motion was offered to adopt the report in principle subject to modification of details. The motion was seconded and passed by majority vote.

On a motion duly made and seconded the Chairman adjourned the meeting at 9:50p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Ann M. Burton, Secretary