

MINUTES OF THE SIXTY-FOURTH PLENARY SESSION OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

January 18, 1977

The meeting was called to order by the Chairman, Dr. David Valinsky, at 6:40 p.m. in Room 207 at the Graduate Center. All members were present except Professors Abramson, Adickes, Aurbach, Auslander, Baumrin, Bieler, Bindler, Bressler, Briloff, Brostoff, Brown, Bryant, Burton, Ceccarelli, D'Adamo, Dash, Diamond, Dierlam, Donno, Dreiling, Eisen, Elster, Fried, Galub, Gilbert, Glasser, Greenbaum, Handler, Hill, Howard, Karfunkel, Klarfeld, Krich, Kriegel, Lea, Leiter, Lipschutz, Lutz, Marcinek, Martin, Nash, Nwasike, Page, Panes, Paster, Patterson, Petratos, Price, Raab, Ringel, Robbins, V. Roberts, Rothman, Schram, Shmidman, Silver, Soskind, Uretsky, Walsh, Wilson, and Zimmerman. Professors Bellush, Corbiere-Gille, Hernandez-Miyares, and Yousef were excused. Professors Nachtsheim (AAUP CUNY Council) and Zeller (PSC) were present. Chancellor Robert J. Kibbee and Dr. Jean Ellis also attended.

I. Approval of the Tentative Agenda: The tentative agenda was approved.

II. Approval of the Minutes of the 63rd Plenary Session: The minutes of the 63rd Plenary Session were approved as circulated.

III. Communications from the Chairman: After wishing all members a very Happy New Year and congratulating those present on their fortitude, Dr. Valinsky reported the following BHE activities: (1) the Committee on Long-Range Planning has been meeting on a regular basis to address the future of the University. In particular, discussion has focused on the 33 page document submitted by the Chancellor and mentioned in the press. The document is now in the process of being distributed to the entire University community at the suggestion of the UFS Executive Committee. (2) An item of special interest to the UFS appears on the BHE Calendar for January 24, 1977. The item concerns the trimester and states, "Resolved: That the Board rescind the resolution (Calendar 10, April 5, 1976) directing the Chancellor to implement a trimester calendar system." The resolution was recommended by the Council of Presidents and represents a successful conclusion to the hard work of the UFS last year to argue the case against a mandatory trimester calendar. (3) On January 11, the full BHE met with the Mayor, Mr. Zuccotti, and Mr. Kummerfeld. After a presentation by the Chairman, Mr. Jacobs, the Mayor indicated that the City was not anxious to see the University destroyed, that the City was engaged in discussions with the State concerning the funding of the University, but that the situation was unresolved.

Professor Valinsky then reported on the meetings between the Executive Committees of the University Faculty Senates of SUNY and CUNY held in New York on January 14 and 15. The meetings were highly successful in the opinion of the two groups. The liaison member from the Faculty Council of the SUNY community colleges did not attend but a meeting has been arranged for January 26 to be attended by the President of the SUNY Senate, the President of the Faculty Council of the community colleges, and the Chairman of the CUNY UFS. The discussions held last week were fruitful not only in terms of permitting the two groups to know each other better but also in terms of concrete decisions reached and actions taken. The two groups agreed, first of all, to present a joint statement to the Wessell Commission at its hearings in Buffalo on Monday, January 24. The statement will focus on the distinctive role of public higher education, its importance to the State of New York, and the cooperative efforts being undertaken by the two faculties of the two systems of public higher education in New York. In addition

we have set up joint sub-committees to explore three areas of immediate importance: (1) political action; (2) budget; and (3) long-range and master-planning. The effort in political action will be two-fold: the two groups will direct their energies towards educating the legislature and those whom they represent to the importance of the public sector in higher education and the many functions it performs and will emphasize the need to establish priorities in the allocation of public funds so that the health of the public sector is insured. An open letter will be transmitted to the governor with copies to members of the legislature and the city council discussing these issues. The two groups will also each organize local lobbying efforts on each campus of both university systems to pursue issues with members of the legislature who represent the districts where the campuses are located. The advantage to this division is that CUNY tends to have contacts with democratic members and SUNY with republican legislators. While funding will not be the primary thrust of the effort, the need for adequate and equitable funding to permit the universities to carry out their missions will not be neglected. On the budget question the intent is to learn the budget process as presently organized in each system, to examine the kinds of modelling on which the universities' budgets are based, and, in our own case, to follow this up by making specific recommendations about the CUNY budget process. In the area of long-range and master-planning what we want to do is to analyse the master plans of each institution with a view to noting overlaps and gaps, to suggest our own plan for meeting them, and, hopefully, to insure faculty input -- even in terms of developing our own plans -- into the amendments to the master plans due in 1978. This group will also be working on the question of faculty exchanges and on enlarging the present SUNY faculty discussion seminars that draw together faculty from the various SUNY units for discussion of topics of interest in their disciplines to include CUNY faculty.

Finally, the two Executive Committees agreed to continue meeting on a regular basis. As a result, representatives from the CUNY Executive Committee will attend the next plenary session of the SUNY Senate to be held in Syracuse February 4 and 5. Following the presentation of the Wessell Commission report to the Governor, the groups will meet again.

Dr. Valinsky also announced that the Senate's written document elaborating the principles enunciated in the oral testimony presented to the Wessell Commission at its Public Hearing on January 6, 1977 was nearing completion. He informed the Senate that the Executive Committee would hold an open hearing on the document on January 26, 1977 from 9:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m. in Room 424 at the Graduate Center. The Committee's intent is to hear commentary directed towards the arguments in the testimony with a view to considering revisions before final submission of the written document.

III. Report of the Budget Committee: Professor Leonard (Lehman), chairman of the Budget Committee announced that the report distributed to members of the Senate was a preliminary one and that the Committee invited comments on it.

Professor Roberts (Lehman) moved that the Senate receive the preliminary report. His motion being seconded discussion was opened. Professor Roberts asked with reference to the Committee's recommendations on page 7 of the Report whether the Committee had thought of ways to carry out the second recommendation. / The Committee is discussing the matter. Professor Ehrenpreis (Bronx Community) stated that, as a member of former Budget Committees, he wished to express appreciation for the succinct and uniform nature of the Report. Professor Trefousse (Graduate School) suggested that recommendation 4 on page 7 should include a

reference to the teaching load differential between CUNY and SUNY in order to strengthen the argument being advanced./ There are many variables in calculating teaching load and the only yardstick that has been used is faculty/student ratio. Such factors as number of preparations and others have not been considered. Professor Cammett (John Jay) commented that the Report was well done but suggested that a more effective way of presenting the contrast might be to refer to number of credits generated which often proved to be a better measure than student/faculty ratio. Professor Ferentz (Brooklyn) stated that each time comparisons between SUNY and CUNY were discussed, one was tempted to do what shouldn't be done politically. Emphasizing the difference in teaching load, for example, will serve to increase the teaching load at SUNY. It is unwise to show the Legislature how to cut budgets. He said too that facts were needed to show why CUNY was a few hundred dollars higher in salary. He stressed in his comments the idea that the real point was the size of the pie not how it was split. Professor Ehrenpreis (Bronx Community) said that if one compared salaries at the community colleges in the state system in the New York City area it was possible to find a salary differential that favored the state system. Salaries at CUNY are lower than at Westchester Community College, Nassau Community College, and the Fashion Institute of Technology. He said that Professor Ferentz's points were good but that it was necessary for CUNY to stand on its own feet to protect salaries. He suggested too that the Report include information on the teaching load in the private sector and raise the question of productivity. Professor Hogg (Queens) asked a point of information. Where were instructional supplies included in Schedule II of the Report?/ In the first line. Professor Hogg further asked whether the Committee could get separate figures for this item./ Yes. But what purpose would that serve? Professor Hogg said that he was under the impression that SUNY was favored in this respect. Professor Spinger (Brooklyn) suggested that the Committee add another column to the schedule to provide data on the privates. He noted also a possible discrepancy in the figures on faculty/student ratio on page 5 when compared with the figures currently being used by the University. Professor Zeller (PSC) said she would stress the importance of having available figures on the privates. Professor Milentijevic (City) moved to call the question. Her motion was seconded and passed unanimously. On the question the vote was unanimously in the affirmative. Professor Davidson (LaGuardia) rose to a point of information, asking whether on the question concerning funding to private institutions anyone had tested the constitutionality of such funding since he knew that such funding in K-12 had been tested and found unconstitutional./ A chorus of responses informing Professor Davidson that he was mistaken greeted the question.

IV. Report of the Graduate Affairs Committee: Professor Caws (Hunter), chairman, explained that the material distributed was not so much a report as a statement of principles to be presented to the Wessell Commission. In testifying to the Commission wearing his hat as chairman of the Graduate Policy Council, Professor Caws said he had tried to raise the twin questions of what we ought to be like and what we might have to be like. He had stressed the first rather than the effects of cuts. He took responsibility for any lapses in the argument or data in the document now before the Senate. Professor Fifer (Hunter), Secretary of the UFS, moved that the report be received. His motion having been seconded discussion was opened. Professor Raskin (Brooklyn) said that her reaction was to the tone of the document. For example, the first sentence in the third paragraph seemed overly defensive and not precise. Graduate work existed prior to the organization of the Graduate Center. As a member of the doctoral faculty, she would speak for the undergraduate faculty and suggest that the underlining be removed. Professor Roberts (Lehman) said he wished to speak to the same issue and in particular to the statement that people came and stayed in the University because of the graduate programs. Professor Cowan (New York City Community) yielded to Professor Cole

(New York City Community). Professor Cole said that she too had a problem with the tone of the Report. She was in favor of graduate education but she questioned the presumption on pages 3-4 that colleagues who don't set foot in the Graduate Center have no contact with each other and don't feel the need for that contact. She knew that many who did not serve on the doctoral faculty have the same feelings. I would imagine that there are other university-wide organizations too but this was directed to the Graduate School. Professor Stansky (Baruch) asked whether the statement on page 4 concerning funding couldn't be turned around and used against CUNY. She suggested the words "most other universities". Professor Ehrenpreis (Bronx Community) said he wished to second the comments already made concerning colleagues in other branches of the University. It was perfectly possible for faculty to receive the same intellectual stimulus elsewhere than at the Graduate Center. For example, of the members of the CUNY faculties who were on the program at the American Historical Association meetings in December very few were from the Graduate School although there were a substantial number of CUNY people on the program. Productivity, action, and intellectual stimulus were not to be found at the Graduate Center alone. Nevertheless, he said he was entirely in agreement that CUNY could not be a real university without a Graduate School that was adequately funded, staffed, etc. Professor Cooper (COSI-St. George) suggested that the underlining throughout the Report be removed as a tactic. Professor Cowan (New York City Community) offered two suggestions: (1) what troubles me is not the underlining or the use of qualifying words but the fact that the assumptions made in the Report are false. Someone who sees it from her point of view, Professor Cowan said, should meet with the Committee and revise the Report; (2) the Graduate Center has failed to serve as an intellectual center for the University. Therefore, the same group that revises the Report should sit down with recommendations on how it may be a university center. There is in the University, after all, a large student population who look at education as a way to achieve decency. Professor Cowan also reminded the Senate that she was not opposed to graduate education since, although she is not a member of CUNY's graduate faculty, she teaches graduate courses in another university.

Professor Valinsky interjected that the committee that had prepared the Report was constituted by vote of the Plenary Session, that it had been set up by the Executive Committee to include broad representation. The Committee was charged with being asked to discuss the importance of graduate work. When the point was reached of incorporating the report in the document for the Wessell Commission the Executive Committee would be in a position to bring out the principle that we are working towards an integrated university.

Professor Nowinski (Hostos Community) commented on the statement on page 3 concerning the graduate center as what holds the University together and suggested that the following be substituted, "is the awareness that there exists a center where faculty of all units within CUNY may if so desired offer as a seminar in which individual or collective scholarship in which to test the fruits of his/her contemporary research may be presented, discussed and shared." Professor Nowinski said that she had been told by her dean that this was possible. Professor Harvey (Queens) reminded the Senate that there were programs on campuses too; that there was no contact, for example, between people in physics and the Center. Professor Caws said the Report referred to graduate programs not to the Graduate Center. Professor Ornstein (Mt. Sinai) said that he thought people were upset for the wrong reason. The report spoke of a "center" not the "Center". He said too that criticism that is not specific was inappropriate. He suggested that criticisms be explicit or that they be ignored. If the issue is important the comment should be explicit.

Professor Valinsky once again assured the Plenary that the Report had been requested by the Executive Committee and the Committee had been charged to argue the case for graduate education at CUNY. In the context of the total Senate document its arguments would be balanced by arguments for other programs drawn from the Reports of other Senate committees.

Professor Lederman (Baruch) said that she had an explicit comment to make. There were a number of groups that had grown up within the University whose interest was in how to educate groups. For example, there was the CUNY Association of Writing Supervisors. There was also a group of teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages. Groups such as these provide intellectual stimulation.

Professor Ferentz (Brooklyn) moved to table the agenda item since the Chancellor had arrived. His motion was made with the understanding that the item would be removed following the completion of the Chancellor's Report. The motion was seconded and passed without discussion.

V. Chancellor's Report: Chancellor Kibbee announced the following: (1) Mr. Peter Maas has resigned from the BHE; (2) President Goldstein is recovering from the heart attack that he suffered on December 24 and estimates that he should be back at the job, at least on a part-time basis, within four weeks; (3) over the past two months a committee of the Trustees of SUNY and CUNY has been meeting at six week intervals to discuss common problems, ways of cooperation, etc. They have recognized that there are areas in which cooperation is possible and that they can take a common stance in behalf of public higher education. To date, they have concentrated on cooperation, on the role of public higher education, on master planning. They have agreed to consult on budget matters at the time budgets are to be submitted. They have also agreed to present a common front before the Wessell Commission. Their next meeting will take place the last week in January.

On the matter of the Governor's budget due to be released on January 19 the Chancellor said that there was some good and some bad for CUNY in the budget. The good is that the Governor has proposed that the State pay 75% of the net cost of the senior colleges since this means a city contribution of 25% that would amount to only \$52 to \$53 million. The City, of course, has said that it has no dollars so there is a funding problem but apparently that problem is moving towards some sort of resolution. Conferences are taking place between the city and state. The BHE met with the Mayor and some of his aides on January 11. The meeting was requested by the BHE for the purpose of laying out their concern about the future of the University if there is no support from the City. The Mayor made no promises; it would therefore be unwise to hold out any hope but he did indicate that there were \$20 million on the capital side of the budget in funds for the University that might be used for operating costs of the senior colleges. He also said that after the Governor's budget had been released, he would evaluate the situation.

On the Governor's side the proposal he is making is basically last year's budget with decreases based on losses in enrollment. The University's analysis of the proposed budget is not complete because it is presented in ways that are unfamiliar but the estimate is that it means \$455 million although it says \$465 million. This is so because of the funding of the community colleges and the assumptions it makes on city funding. The budget is put together in various ways and most of the loss in the senior colleges in programmatic terms amounts to about \$8 million less. Rentals are taken out as are other things that do not have a programmatic effect. Also there is an annualization of faculty positions. There will be more information after the people at the CUNY Budget office analyse the

budget and put it into a more familiar framework.

Chancellor Kibbee then responded to the following questions submitted in writing: 1) Professor Bellush (City) - "Do you have anything to report on plans for coordination with District Council 37 or other civic organizations?"/ As it happens, I have. I had an initial meeting this morning with the President of our local and the political coordinator for DC 37 and we sketched out areas for cooperation. We agreed to cooperate on an effort to mobilize for the budget. There was also an opportunity to clear up certain concerns that they had. 2) Professor Nowinski (Hostos) - "My local Senator, Carl McCall, has written to me that he's recently joined the 'Committee to Save CUNY, of which the former Mayor Wagner is a member. May we please have: a) complete, and/or, exact title of this Committee; b) progress report of this group."/ The name of the committee is Friends of CUNY. Its set up includes primarily prominent citizens, civic leaders and the like rather than political leaders. It is chaired by former Mayor Wagner and co-chaired by Bess Meyerson and Basil Patterson. They are gathering as distinguished and diverse a membership as they can. The intent is to use their good offices and names for the University, to seek independent funding, and to improve the budget.

Chancellor Kibbee then responded to the following questions from the floor. 1) Professor Leonard (Lehman) - "In the Governor's budget presentation is there an estimate of the city contribution?"/ This is the budget for the senior colleges which is set at \$308 million. Then the State will pick up 75% of the net. It is expected and hoped that the City will contribute the other 25%. 2) Professor Caws (Hunter) - "The figure of \$455 million is \$37 million short of the request, if I understand correctly, and of that \$455 million \$30 to \$35 million is dubious so that the real gap is \$64 to \$69 million."/ Yes from our budget submission and \$50 million from the present budget. 3) Professor Cammett (John Jay) - "Along the same line, is there any provision for increments in the budget?"/ Those were in this year's. They don't say anything specifically but there were provisions this year - if we get the contract through the EFCB. Professor Cammett further asked - "Could you repeat what you said about the \$8 million?"/ That is the amount of programmatic decrease from where we are today, i.e. \$471 million. The programmatic part is a decrease in personnel and services; the rest is not. 4) Professor Zeller (PSC) - "Under the formula how does the funding of the community colleges compare with the present?"/ Two things are not clear. If the City puts in the same amount as last year then the budget will not be less than this year. Professor Zeller further asked - "No matter what the enrollment?"/ There may be a difference of \$1000 or \$2000 because of some difference in state aid but not in City aid. 5) Professor Miller (Kingsborough Community) - "I have been curious for some time about the function of the employment service for retrenched faculty, especially in view of the ads, as in last Sunday's Times, for positions in the City University."/ I can tell you how it is supposed to work. All vacancies are reported to a clearing house. With that the Central Office office is supposed to provide the place where the vacancy occurs with a list of eligibles in order of seniority - first tenured, then CCEs, then others in reverse order of dismissal. The college then relates that information to the action it is taking and if it does not hire anyone from the list it is supposed to provide an explanation. Professor Miller further asked - "Does the Central Office office contact the retrenched individual directly?"/ No. The University provides a list but the individual must apply for the job. There has been some discussion with the Union on this matter but I haven't looked into it recently. 6) Professor Roberts (Lehman) - "There have been persistent reports in the Village Voice, the New York Times, etc. that there are \$40 million locked in by the Mayor, is the \$20 million you mentioned that or what?" Or is the whole thing a lot of hot air?"/ I thought it was hot air for a long time. I heard about it but not from the Mayor. The Mayor does have about \$40 million in the capital

budget - the \$20 million I mentioned and \$20 million in the construction fund. If City Hall said something about \$40 million in the capital budget, it could have been misinterpreted. \$20 million is not usable; the other \$20 million is real.

7) Professor Ferentz (Brooklyn) - "Can your office make the CUNY/SUNY community college parts available soon?"/ On Thursday. Professor Ferentz further asked - "Can you look in your crystal ball and predict the month or the year when the EFCB will act on our contract?"/ It is hard because it is not clear why they have not acted. First it seemed to be a question of their wanting more information; then, problems related to the teachers' contract. I am not familiar enough with the nuances of their communiques to know which is true. I think the contract is supported by the staff of the EFCB. Then, there was a period when the State Budget Office was very interested for some reason but that is over. I keep thinking it will be agreed to at each meeting but they seem to get involved with other things.

8) Professor Davidson (La Guardia) - "I should like to make an observation and then ask a question. The observation is that if they hold off too much longer we will be at the point where negotiations for a new contract will have begun without the old having taken effect. The question is: Does the Ingler formula for providing community college funds still hold and are the funds programmatic or flat based on FTEs regardless of programs?"/ There are incremental costs for labs, increases or compensation for remediation and the like. There was a state revision last year. The basic part is whether there is free opportunity or not plus additions such as whether or not there is a student/faculty ratio of x (18 or so which provides an extra \$35 per student), a certain level of taxation on real property which adds another \$35; and there is a technical supplement based on the number of underprepared students of the total. The formula works out to the state's contribution being about 40%. For purposes of funding the community colleges are treated as a single unit. The money doesn't go directly to the institutions. The University gets a lump sum which it distributes.

9) Professor Gosselin (Bronx Community) - "It has been reported that you are distributing a document on the future of the University. Is that correct?"/ Yes. In late November a document was prepared outlining the budget situation etc. I submitted that document to the BHE as a discussion paper since it included a speculative discussion of policy alternatives concerning enrollment, structure etc. Professor Gosselin asked when faculty might expect to receive the document. The Chancellor replied, "By the end of the week."

10) Professor Sohmer (City) - "Has a decision been made on the student population for next year?"/ There are no reasonable estimates yet since applications continue through January. The allocation system was discussed on three occasions by the Central Administration Committee of the BHE and the basic decision was to leave the system unchanged in its outlines. There will be minor changes in the caps assigned to colleges, e.g. an increase in allocations to Queens and Brooklyn; in the event that City, Hunter or Baruch have more than their caps permit, a 10% increase will be allowed; and provision for the Chancellor to authorize a limited number of direct admissions in the other senior colleges. Since there is no fundamental change, no action is required.

11) Professor Quinn (Brooklyn) - "One point on which everyone in CUNY and probably in SUNY is united is in disapproval of the large amount of funding available to the privates. My question concerns tactics: in conducting a public campaign for CUNY, is it wise to attack the amount given to the privates or if ours comes, should we say good luck to others?"/ I don't think it is useful or politic to attack the money given to the privates which is of three kinds: the Bundy money which is direct aid and amounts to some \$59 million; IAP which is indirect and is available to all qualified students; and aid to dental and medical education. There is no value in attacking that money at the moment but I will be willing to raise the question if CUNY is cut and the others get increases. I might also if they don't get cut too.

12) Professor Jarrett (Brooklyn) - "I take it that the Wagner et al. committee is part of the mobilization program. Are there representatives of the BHE and/or the faculty of CUNY working with that committee?"

And what has happened to the mobilization?"/ Representatives of the BHE are working with the Friends of the City University and there is also a principal advisor who is a faculty member. At the present time the mobilization effort is in the process of trying to organize the campuses to create action-oriented committees to expand influence into the communities surrounding the colleges and persuade them to support the independence and city orientation and city contribution to the City University. At the same time efforts are being made through different operations within the University - through the UFS, the University Student Senate, the PSC, DC 37 - in ways appropriate for them as well as an effort to involve civic organizations on a city-wide basis, such as the Committee for Public Higher Education. There is an effort to develop noise in connection with the Mayor, the Borough Presidents, the Board of Estimate, the City Council, State legislators et al. The early thrust, however, is towards the City. Professor Jarrett further asked whether there were plans to use television./ I don't know whether we can afford it. 13) Professor Gruenebaum (Brooklyn) - "What are the specific caps for Brooklyn and Queens?"/ Somewhere around 2400 to 2600. 14) Professor Roman (Hostos Community) - " You stated at the first session of the UFS that I attended this fall that you would not propose closing any of the units of the University. Do you still stand by that statement?"/ Yes. When I did so last year it proved to be less than successful and politically counter-productive. I didn't want to jump in again and I am not going to lead off on such a proposal. I can't say what may happen eventually, but at the moment the answer is no. 15) Professor Cooper (COSI - St. George) - " At what budget point would reappraisal be needed? Is \$460 million too low or could it be distributed?"/ If we are free to we probably could distribute it but the way it is written it is a senior college problem. I don't know if we can solve it by distributing funds in the normal ways but maybe we can without altering the structure. We may have to think of program changes within units rather than closing or merger. 17) Professor Pauling (John Jay) - "Since it looks as though there will probably be more state support than city will there be a reconstitution of the BHE?"/ Ultimately, but not necessarily at this point. It is a question that will flow out of the Wessell Commission report. Since this Board was given a three year life in the legislation at some point there will be a reconstitution.

IV. Report of the Graduate Affairs Committee (Continued): A motion to remove agenda item IV from the table was made, seconded and passed. Discussion on the report of the Graduate Affairs Committee therefore resumed.

Professor Miller (Kingsborough) said that she was interested in the section on page 5 that characterized the University as a think tank. Are there examples, she asked. Professor Caws, who had resumed the podium, said that there was an appendix reference to such examples. Professor Wu (Queens) opined that he thought the necessity of graduate programs could be defined without mentioning that they were the only means of attracting distinguished faculty./ We have learned a lot from this discussion and will be making changes in the language of the Report. I think the point you raise can be worked out. Professor Wu further commented that the argument would be more convincing concerning the think tank if there were figures to document the revenue generated./ It is largely financed by grant money and is not that much but we have tried to indicate its usefulness to the City. Professor Roberts (Lehman) commented that the reference on page 3 to the success of CUNY PHDs in finding employment was rather sketchily supported by data in the appendix. Is there any way of supplying comparable figures for other PHDs?/ The reason the data are sketchy is that we had to scramble to assemble what information we have. Professor Leonard (Lehman) said that the report stated that the graduate programs were a means of attracting faculty. What about students? Various ACE studies indicate that the presence of graduate programs attracts students. Perhaps that should be

stated somewhere. Professor Quinn (Brooklyn) said his comment had the same intention, to strengthen the argument. If the statement on p. 5 was an empty boast he questioned the wisdom of including it./ We could hedge perhaps. Professor Cammett (John Jay) commented that the loans of faculty to the Graduate School by the colleges yielded a small return to the colleges, that, in fact, they sometimes meant a cut for the college according to fiscal experts. Shouldn't there be lines to compensate?

VI. Other Committee Reports: Professor Wedeen (Brooklyn) outlined the main points in the SGS committee report indicating that it was based on what data the committee was able to find and on a questionnaire survey of part-time students. The Committee had noted that the part-time student had special problems as a result of the retrenchments which had cut the number of courses available to him/her, had limited the use of libraries, had virtually eliminated counseling services. In addition, the part-time student has special financial problems as a result of the imposition of tuition since he/she is not eligible for TAP and the eligibility rules for CAP differ from those for TAP. Possibly the decline in the number of part-time students could be traced to these special problems. The Committee noted, however, that no hard data were yet available.

Since the report had not yet been distributed to the membership it was agreed to postpone discussion of it until the next Plenary Session.

Professor Cooper reported for the Committee on University Structure and Development. She pointed out that the Committee is still seeking information and would welcome the submission of material by anyone who had been part of any group that studied the budget percentages allocated to instructional and administrative cost. They would also like information about any administrator from the Central Office who had been reassigned to a college campus.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Gordon Fifer
Secretary