

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

February 15, 1977

In the absence of the chairman who was delayed at a meeting of the Board of Higher Education Professor Ann M. Burton, vice-chairman, called the meeting to order at 6:40 p.m. in Room 207 at the Graduate Center. All members were present except Professors Abramson, Adickes, Anderson, Aurbach, Auslander, Bieler, Bressler, Briloff, Buder, Cowan, D'Adamo, D'Amico, Davidson, Diamond, Donno, Dreiling, Eichmann, Elster, Gilbert, Gioiella, Glasser, Gosselin, Greenbaum, Harvey, Howard, Hunte, Leiter, Lipschutz, Luther, Nwasike, Page, Panes, Price, Raab, Robbins, Rothman, Schneider, Silver, Soskind, Uretsky, and Walsh. Professor Jarrett was excused. Chancellor Robert J. Kibbee and Dr. Jean Ellis also attended.

I. Approval of the Tentative Agenda: The tentative agenda was approved with the addition of item 2 A, Report of the Executive Director.

II. Approval of the Minutes of the 64th Plenary Session: The minutes of the 64th session were approved as circulated.

II. A Report of the Executive Director: Dr. Ellis reported on procedures and policies governing elections to the Senate this year. On the advice of the chairman of the Committee on Elections and Organization, Professor Gruenebaum, the Executive Committee had decided not to recommend charter changes this year but to adopt an interim policy. As a result of the summer retrenchment adjustments in the size of several delegations are necessary. In addition, not all of the delegations have arranged the terms of Senators so that there is appropriate rotation in expiration dates. Therefore, letters have been sent to the colleges with copies to members of Senate delegations informing them of the total number of Senators to which they are entitled under the Charter and suggesting a means of bringing the delegations into conformity with the Charter. Questions are to be directed to Dr. Ellis at the Senate Office. Dr. Ellis also called the membership's attention to the materials on the table at the rear of the room.

III. Reports from Liaison Members of BHE Sub-Committees: Professor Ferentz, Brooklyn College, reported on the Fiscal Affairs Committee. He praised the chairman for his dedication - Mr. D'Angelo had left a sick bed to be certain there was a quorum at the meeting - and then outlined five resolutions on tuition and fees that had been passed by the Committee and would appear on the Board Calendar for February 28. They dealt with: equalization of tuition for out-of-city in-state residents; CAP; chargeback procedures; waiver of fees for senior citizens; and reduction of the Program Change fee from \$20 to \$10. Professor Dierlam (Queens) asked what the chances were of the resolution on equalization of tuition being augmented beyond its simply being passed - would the city and state permit this?/ The University's board determines tuition policy; therefore, neither the city nor state will intervene to alter that policy. Professor Ehrenpreis (Bronx Community) objected to the adoption of this policy on the grounds that it means that the City of New York subsidizes out-of-city residents and therefore places additional tax burdens on New York City residents. Why had the liaison member agreed to this policy?/ The liaison member does not have a vote on the committee; therefore, he neither votes for or against a proposal. In this instance the liaison member did not voice opposition because it seemed to him that the policy was aimed at filling

seats and diminishing the need for dismissal of personnel because of the income associated with filling seats. Professor Ferentz further explained that the income from filling seats was equal to 2/3 of the incremental cost and that the state funding for equated students amounted to more than the additional 1/3. Professor Leonard (Lehman) suggested that this resolution was in line with the thinking that within two years the State would assume 100% of the costs of the senior colleges. Professor Ehrenpreis reiterated his objections, adding that since residents of Albany did not pay for support of the State University he considered the resolution an unfair tax burden on New York City residents who, like himself, had to pay their children's tuition at the City University. Professor Baumrin (Lehman) asked whether Professor Ehrenpreis could deliver the city's 25% contribution to the senior colleges.

Professor Burton (Brooklyn), the liaison member to the Committee on Academic Affairs, reported on the actions taken and planned by that committee. At its last meeting the Committee approved a resolution on consolidation of programs in the Health Sciences. The resolution grew out of recommendations of a Task Force that operated in 1975-76. A large number of associate degree programs recommended for reduction or abolition by the Task Force were discussed, according to the Acting Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs, and then negotiations took place. A number of the programs were paper ones. In addition, the nursing programs in 6 units are to be limited in terms of enrollment although the resolution is not as sweeping as the Task Force's recommendations. Professor Burton raised the question of faculty input on these decisions and advised the Senate that it was extremely important for members to get in touch with her or with the Senate Office if there were matters of academic policy that might need attention. She informed the Senate that consolidations in the language area were now under discussion and recommendations would be made soon. Therefore, the Senate was advised to consult with appropriate people on their respective campuses. The languages designated by the Acting Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs as "esoteric" are Chinese, Hebrew, and Russian. The Committee, at its February 7 meeting, also reviewed the Middle States Evaluation Team's report on LaGuardia Community College and was advised that the CUNY Abroad program is no longer in operation. Professor Nowinski (Hostos) asked whether Professor Burton had the impression that Chinese, Hebrew, and Russian marked only the beginning of activity in the area of languages. Professor Cammett (John Jay) expressed shock that any language could be described as "esoteric". Professor Spiegel (City) observed that this was certainly not true of Hebrew which was associated with the cradle of civilization. Professor Milentijevic (City) stated that the Senate might wish to know that the Acting Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs during the time that he served as Provost at City College had devised a plan to consolidate all languages and that the college was spared the implementation of this plan as a result of the Provost's promotion. Professor Cooper (College of Staten Island) asked which health programs were affected and was told that the information was available from the Senate Office. Professor Fifer (Hunter) said that inquiries to people on his campus had revealed that discussions were indeed taking place concerning the languages mentioned. Professor Nowinski further asked whether Professor Burton or the Acting Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs knew of the position paper developed at a meeting last spring of language teachers. Professor Burton replied for herself in the negative. Professor Roman (Hostos) asked about the list of health science programs being retrenched and how such information was disseminated. Professor Burton said that she thought that if a program on a given campus were threatened, the people on that campus would certainly know about it. Professor Spinninger (Brooklyn) said that he was a chairman in the

Humanities division and it was his impression that the reports people on campus were being asked to prepare did not involve languages alone. Rather they dealt with area studies such as Asian Studies, Judaic Studies, and Russian Studies. Professor Ehrenpreis (Bronx Community) said that the Senate should be aware that the Council of Presidents was aware of the Task Forces set up for consolidations and the like. At his college the President reports regularly on those activities. Therefore, people on his campus have known about the Health Services consolidation for some time and have reacted to it. He is certain that the same thing happened at Hostos. He suggested that Senators should also be aware that consolidations in Engineering Technologies were also being discussed. The place to go for information on the campus is to the President. Professor Sohmer (City) said that he was worried about the mechanics involved in the way things surfaced at Board Committee meetings. He thought that as the representative of the faculty on those committees the liaison member ought to have the committee publicize and insure interaction on issues under consideration. Professor Ferentz pointed out that the Committee agenda was usually the first opportunity provided Board members to know about issues. Professor Sohmer further stated that he thought the proposal should be made that significant issues be treated in the same manner as By-Law changes, i.e. have two readings. Professor Burton indicated that on very important issues there was an attempt to delay action. It was also indicated that the February meeting was not the first time the report on Health Services had been considered by a Board Committee. The report was submitted last spring for the first time and discussions had taken place since then. Professor Cammett (John Jay) said that he thought what was happening in the area of languages ought to be a signal that a movement was developing to threaten the autonomy of the CUNY units, that there must be something else at the end of the tunnel, and that there might be thoughts of eliminating not only programs but units on the part of the Central Administration.

IV. Report of the Budget Committee: Professor Leonard (Lehman) thanked his committee for their work on the report and the Senate Office for preparing copies for the meeting. Because of time pressures not all of the corrections in the text desired by committee members had been incorporated. Therefore, Professor Leonard listed them for the Senate as follows: (1) Page 2, footnote 3, line 3: "students, divided by 15, plus graduate student hours divided by 12."; (2) Page 4, item 4., line 3: "colleges, yet this is not the case in New York City, despite the 80% grade average required for entrance since linguistic and educational handicaps..."; (3) Page 4, Item 5., line 6: delete "undoubtedly"; line 8: delete "undoubtedly"; (4) Page 7, item 4, revise as follows: "The Senate support administrative flexibility in the implementation of the budget."

Professor Ferentz (Brooklyn) moved that he document be received by the Senate. His motion was seconded and discussion took place. Professor Leonard stated that the committee believed the implications of the budget were very important for the Senate to study since they pointed to the implications to the work of the University. For example, the fact that the State's total contribution to the University, even though it proposes to assume 75% of the costs of the senior colleges, is less than it was in 1975-76 or in 1974-75. Professor Cammett asked whether the report indicated the State's optimistic projection on tuition monies. Professor Leonard explained that the \$6 million for CAP was part of the difference; the rest was related to rates of collection. Professor Ornstein (Mt. Sinai) asked whether the report would be distributed outside of the Senate once approved. If so, he suggested that a counter example to the procedure used by the State as outlined in item 5, page 4 would be to state that if CUNY had included Mt. Sinai and counted only the ten City University lines

it would have been just as inappropriate. Professor Ferentz said he would like to add to the explanation of the situation with respect to tuition projections. In principle, the tuition not collected in the fall prevents a student from registering for the spring semester. In fact, this is not true because of a number of factors. The State, however, expects the University to recover accounts receivable from the fall and that the amount to be recovered in the spring will not exceed the amount to be recovered in the fall. Financial people say this is not an unreasonable expectation and that the apparent increase in projection of tuition revenue is not unreasonable. Professor Leonard said he agreed but would add a caveat with respect to the cutting of TAP funds possibly meaning fewer students. Professor Kaye (Brooklyn) said that he hoped the implications of eliminating the CAP program would be stressed since that action would have serious effects on part-time students in the University.

The question was called and the motion to receive the document was passed without dissent.

V. Report of the SGS Committee: Professor Wedeen, chairman of the SGS Committee, reminded the members of the Senate that the report had now been distributed. She was prepared to entertain questions, comments, etc. on the report. In essence, the report stresses the fact that the group who need the University most are being the hardest hit at the present time. Professor Wedeen also reviewed for the Senate the main points made by the Report. She also said that additional responses to the Committee questionnaire had been received. She listed the following as having responded: College of Staten Island, Baruch, Queensborough, Manhattan Community, Queens, Kingsborough, City, John Jay, Brooklyn, York, Hostos, Hunter, Bronx Community, and New York City Community.

A motion was duly made and seconded to receive the report. Discussion then took place. Professor Leonard (Lehman) asked whether the committee was able to develop any information about the future of continuing education - would there be an increase in the number of continuing education students, for example?/ The Committee did not address itself to this question but on the basis of the data in hand the probability was that there would be a loss of students because the cutbacks were greater. The Committee could hypothesize why but had no hard data. Professor Dierlam (queens) said he had attended a meeting of SGS student leaders on his campus and heard the chairman's response to the issues raised. In effect, it amounted to a numbers game since it was easier to cut at night. The problems faced by this group of students was indeed serious. Professor Nowinski (Hostos) asked who answered the questionnaire, i.e. to whom was it addressed./ To the appropriate person in charge of SGS at the unit. Professor Cammett (John Jay) asked whether the data received were accurate./ There has not been an opportunity to check them yet.

The motion to receive the report was passed without dissent.

VI. Chancellor's Report: Chancellor Kibbee explained that he had been delayed at meetings of the Long-Range Planning Committee of the BHE and the Informal Meeting of the BHE. He reported the following: 1) On the budget situation: the Governor's Budget Proposals for the senior colleges begin by reducing the senior college budgets by \$22 million and then provide \$4 million to be given back in OTPS funds at the discretion of the BHE. The reductions include what are termed non-recurring expenses such as leases that expire, salaries paid in July and August 1976 to persons who have since been retrenched. The Budget

Office says these non-recurring expenses amount to \$11.2 million but CUNY fixes the sum at closer to \$7 million. Discussions have been begun with people in Albany in two directions: 1) with the Budget Office itself to clear up technical differences, e.g. leases that are needed for space even though they are due to expire; to clarify the non-recurring expenses, and to take up the larger issue of the conceptual error in arriving at the budget. These discussions have started and will go on. 2) with the Legislature in terms of the inadequacy of the proposed budget. Having spent February 14 in Albany and having spoken with a number of legislators from both sides of the aisle and from both the City and upstate, the Chancellor found the prospects encouraging. There seemed to be a recognition of the tremendous blows suffered by the City University and a feeling that the University shouldn't be forced to absorb additional blows. Since this was an initial discussion it is difficult to get a good reading and it is not possible to predict the eventual outcome.

The Chancellor also announced that he had named a search committee for the Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs and was in the process of naming one for the Deputy-Chancellor. He reported that he had been working with the PSC for the past week on trying to move the contract onto the agenda of the EFCB and get action on it. The joint effort had been harmonious and there was hope that progress might be made rather quickly but there were no definite assurances on that score.

The Chancellor then responded to the following questions from the floor.

1) Professor Milentijevic (City) - "I was encouraged by your remarks concerning the budget. My reason is that on February 8 I was with the PSC in Albany lobbying for the budget request of \$492 million and I attended the hearing of the Assembly Higher Education Committee at which Vice-Chancellor Knerr appeared. When asked by the committee chairman, 'What sum of money would the University be reconciled to?', the Vice-Chancellor replied, '\$465 million would be sufficient.' Pressed by Assemblyman Flanagan not to be shy, the Vice-Chancellor reiterated, '\$465 million.' The Chairman of the committee, Ed Miller, said, 'Wouldn't you need at least \$10 million more?' The Vice-Chancellor said, 'No.' I understand these are not your policies or objectives but I would like to ask what are your efforts geared to - \$492 million or \$465 million? What is the amount you will settle for?"/ The amount that I will settle for is not up to me. We're there to get as much as we can. I think it will be less than \$492 million but we will try to get as much as possible. Although I heard about the hearing you describe, I think you have oversimplified what happened. It was not a simple situation nor was there a simple answer. The question was "What could the University live on?" and that is different from what you suggested. There was also a second part to the answer. If the \$465 million were free we could exist. The University is existing on that now. I think the incident was unfortunate but more complicated than you described. The problem is that we are between the Executive Branch and the Legislature. For the first time we are tied in to the budget process of the State and it is important in those kinds of relationships to maximize the amount of money but not to develop an adversary position. I had a long discussion yesterday with the Budget Office and made clear to them that we couldn't just take what they gave us, that we had to make a battle with the legislature. It is a tricky business, however, and we must recognize that fact. Professor Milentijevic further asked - "In the CUNY Data Book published by the Assembly's Ways and Means Committee there are statements on page 1 and the following pages about the sacrifices and blows absorbed by the University. Nowhere, however, is there anything about the \$14 some million in deferred wages which constitutes the staff's con-

tribution to the University. The Committee staff reports that the data are those supplied by the University. Why wasn't the deferral included in those data?"/ We didn't make up that book and I can't be responsible for what was or was not included in it. Unless it is a CUNY document I cannot be responsible. I can tell them the facts but I can't correct their book. 2) Professor Lea (Lehman) - "I remember last term that in response to a question I put to you, you said you would consider visiting the colleges. Do you have a schedule for those visits? When will you visit Lehman College?"/ I will come when I am invited. I will be visiting the College of Staten Island sometime in the next two weeks and will come to Lehman if asked. 3) Professor Sohmer (City)"Rumor has it that the number of applications for next year is off by 30 to 40% from last year. Is this so and has the allocation policy been modified as a result?"/ I understand that applications are below last year but I do not know the percentage. There is not great concern at this time because it is believed that we are facing a late application process. The absence of high school counselors has had an effect on applications. We think this because it was true of applications for the spring term. In December it looked as though we had only 50% of the applications we had last year but by registration time the difference was 12, 000 instead of 14, 000. We are doing a number of things too: we will make an allocation in March instead of April so that processing can begin at the colleges. This will improve the show rate, we believe since students can use the notice of admission as a conversation piece. We also plan a major effort to hit the high schools once a month to get the applications in. The guess is that this year will be higher than last. On the allocation there will be no change, 4) Professor Caws (Hunter) "The accidental fact that there are vacancies in the positions of Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Deputy-Chancellor suggests a movement for economy. Could the Central Office live with combining those two positions?"/ I have to be careful in answering "Could you live with" questions. As you know, we have reduced the number of Vice-Chancellors by two already and I haven't really given thought to the advantages and disadvantages of combining the posts. I would state though that the roles they play are different. The Deputy-Chancellor's job, hopefully, is to take over the daily operations of dealing with the presidents and vice-chancellors so that the Chancellor may be freed for other activities. The job of the Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs is more specific. 5) Professor Roberts (Lehman) - "I am concerned about the elimination of differentials in tuition. What is the opinion of the BHE in relation to this resolution? Can you explain the process by which the City University is the gainer?"/ It is true this is on the agenda. It was discussed by the BHE today and I saw no opposition so that I don't anticipate that it will not be passed. The reasons the University will be the gainer are these: 1) it seemed that as the State takes a larger share of our funding there should be less distinction; 2) to get money from tuition. It is true that out-of-city residents paid more thus there might be more income, but we believe that lowering the tuition for that group will increase the number of students, especially from Westchester and Nassau and we hope that the increase in numbers will make up for the tuition loss. They will produce revenue from the fact that part of the University's budget is tied to enrollment; 3) the policy will help colleges such as Lehman and others that are on the periphery of the city. 6) Professor Roman (Hostos) "What steps are you taking in cases of clear violations of the Guidelines on Retrenchment, e.g. when deans are being assigned professorial lines but not in specific departments?"/ I have to know about it first. Violations have to be brought on appeal or grievance. Professor Roman further asked, "Are you saying that the Guidelines are not being enforced by you, that you are waiting for people to grieve?"/ I need to know about the situation and know if there is a violation before I can take action. 7) Professor Baumrin (Lehman) - "My question is related to that of Professor Caws. It occurred to me that the structure

of the Central Office in light of the reduced mission, structure, etc. of the University should be reevaluated before appointments were made to the posts of Deputy-Chancellor or Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs."/ The central administration was restructured recently to reduce costs, etc. and I think it has had an equitable part in the retrenchment with a cutback of some 20% in the past 15 to 18 months. Professor Baumrin further asked - "Would it be possible to select or to have selected a faculty review committee to look over the central administration and report its findings?"/ Certainly. I don't mind. If you come up with a proposal, it can be done. 8) Professor Leonard (Lehman) - "It has occurred to me that you may need a public relations officer instead of a Vice-Chancellor. Never has an institution been so hurt and received so little publicity. The University has been hurt in terms of people, libraries, laboratories, curricula, etc. but one sees no evidence that the Central Administration has gathered the facts and put them in manageable form for dissemination. Why not put them together or get an outside group to do it?"/ We probably haven't done enough but there have been a number of compilations and they have been reported in the press. The real effects, however, are reported in an anecdotal fashion. The other problem is getting the media's attention in a less sporadic way. There was a large article in the Times on the budget impact which combined anecdotal material and a statistical compilation but the Times is a national newspaper and is not going to pay attention to us on a day to day basis. Professor Leonard further asked - "Have the data been catalogued for the Wessell Commission and couldn't the facts be made available?"/ Yes. The facts can be made available but we can't write the stories for the papers. They select those facts they want to use. 9) Professor Ferentz (Brooklyn) - "I understand the difficulties in representing the University and living with their opposite numbers in the State Budget Office that Vice-Chancellor Knerr and Mr. Posman have. To send them as the University's representatives might therefore be inappropriate. We have a paid legislative representative who might be more adept at handling the situation. Furthermore, the BHE passed a resolution earlier this year restraining any University official from making any statement in public not in support of the \$492 million budget. The Vice-Chancellor's public statements were therefore clearly in violation of that policy and he ought to have supported that policy."/ I guess that wasn't a question. 10) Professor Karfunkel (New York City Community) - "A number of faculty members who have been retrenched recently have had difficulties dealing with the office of Vice-Chancellor Bass. They have found her insensitive, unresponsive, etc. Could you define her role for us? Is it to protect the administration or the University?"/ The Vice-Chancellor is the legal officer of the BHE responsible for providing them with legal opinions. I have some difficulty in responding to your question. I hope she is not insensitive but I need to know the circumstances to which you refer. 11) Professor Wakatama (Medgar Evers) - "I am concerned with teacher education in the City University. Do you have any inside information on the present status of teacher education? Are there definite proposals for the future?"/ Not yet. A study will be made to determine the extent to which such programs are overly duplicative, excessive in terms of time and money committed to them, etc. We will be doing the same thing as in the health sciences. 12) Professor Nowinski (Hostos) - "It would be helpful if you would comment on 1) your reaction on the near mirror image on the sum to be removed from the City University and to be awarded to the privates; and 2) on the elitist orientation in the choices being made by those who control the future of education in New York City."/ On the first: there has been no significant increase in aid to the privates in recent years - the major amount of the increase has been to students. The other money that the privates receive is the Bundy money and though there was a small increase there it has not significantly changed. On the second: there are people in the City and in the University who view edu-

cation in different ways and the City has its share of elitist views but I don't think the decisions that are being made have anything to do with philosophy. They are based primarily on finance, not social reasons or anything else. They are a fiscal solution to a fiscal problem and are not attuned to any philosophical or social issues, partly because they see in the withdrawal of funds from the University no effect on the programs because of the simplistic idea that the State will take over their support. They don't like to discuss what differences in support might mean. 13) Professor Trefousse (Graduate School) - "In view of the fact that the Mayor has said he wasn't going to support the senior colleges, is it the policy of the City University to make him change his mind and are there any steps being taken to get the Legislature to mandate a City contribution?"/ No one has gone that far yet. If the City doesn't voluntarily make a decision it is a possibility but the Legislature is loath to mandate a contribution especially when the State is overseeing the City's finances and also because it might constitute a violation of the whole concept of home rule. They did do something last year but that was a little different. What they did was to lock in the City contribution but the contribution came first from the City. They did it because of the problem that the Legislature had in bailing the University out last year and they didn't want a repeat of that situation. They are not anxious to do it where there is no City contribution but it is not impossible that things may come to it. 14) Professor Ornstein (Mt. Sinai) - " I want to return to the problem of publicizing our distress. Recently the closing of libraries badly hampered weekend study. Would it be politically useful as well as helpful if the University mandated one library to remain open each weekend in such a way as to get public attention?"/ That sounds reasonable. 15) Professor Raskin (Brooklyn) - "Could you tell us the status of the campaign to mobilize support for City funding the University, especially the senior colleges?"/ There is an effort going forward. Presumably, there are groups on every campus - on some they have not yet gotten off the ground; elsewhere they are very active. Of course, the perception of the mobilization may be more important than the reality. The Legislature is much interested not because of any specific activity but because of the talk. The impression has been created that something is going on in the University with a lot of people who have weight. The statements that were made at hearings of the Higher Education Committee held at the World Trade Center were supportive of the University. It appears that the University could become a campaign issue. Mobilization is still uneven but the general impression is that there is an active campaign that one must be aware of.

VII. Introduction of New Senators: Professor Burton introduced the following new Senators: Professors Harold Ladas, Hunter College; Professor Margaret Magnus, Hunter College. She also introduced Professor Edward Lutz, Brooklyn College, who was attending his first Plenary session, having been prevented from doing so in the fall term because of teaching responsibilities.

VIII. Communications from the Chairman: Professor Valinsky, who had arrived with the Chancellor and resumed the chair, thanked Professor Burton. He then announced the following: 1) Following the open meeting of the Executive Committee on January 26, the final document to be sent to the Wessell Commission on behalf of the Senate was completed. The document was forwarded to the Commission during the first week of February and copies were sent to all members of the UFS, to the BHE, the Chancellor and Vice-Chancellors, college presidents, members of the State Legislature's Finance, Ways and Means, and Higher Education Committees, as well as to Dr. Dullea and Dr. Hollander. There has been some feedback on the document from the Executive Director of the Commission who has told us that he found

it both useful and readable. A meeting with some members of the Commission has also been arranged. 2) The Chancellor has named the following to serve on a Search committee for the Vice-Chancellor of Academic Affairs: President Proshansky, chairman; Acting President Siegel (Queens); Dean Alterman (Queensborough Community); Professor Ann M. Burton (Brooklyn); Professor Seymour Finger (College of Staten Island); and Professor John Mueller (New York City Community).

Professor Valinsky reported on a number of public hearings on CUNY held since the last Plenary Session. On January 24, Professor Burton and the Secretary of the SUNY Faculty Senate appeared before the Wessell Commission in Buffalo for a joint presentation. Copies of the text of that statement have been sent to the members of the UFS. The main points were: to indicate areas in which the Faculty Senates of SUNY and CUNY were collaborating and to delineate the role of public higher education in the State. In addition, a hearing was held by Senator John Marchi, chairman of the State Senate's Finance Committee, on January 28. The purpose was to hear testimony on the Governor's budget proposals for higher education as they affected the City University. Professor Valinsky testified on the UFS's behalf. His statement which has been distributed stressed the inadequacies in the proposal as it related to CUNY and also the inequities in that proposal. Of particular interest at the hearings was Senator Marchi's statement that his administrative assistants are developing a proposal dealing with CAP. The third hearing was held under the auspices of the State Senate's Higher Education Committee and took place on February 3. The speakers on this occasion were all from outside the University and included representatives of the City, the City Congressional and Senatorial delegations, the Governor's office, and the State Education Department. The object was to ferret out what support there was for the problems of the University among these groups. Problems of weather and transportation prevented most of the upstate members from attending - the chairman of the Committee, the vice-chairman and others. The crisis in the City's fiscal situation made it impossible for most officials to attend in person, and the final blow to the success of the hearings was the fact that the Control Board was simultaneously considering the UFT contract. A number of Borough Presidents and representatives of City and Federal officials who spoke did support the University, however.

Professor Valinsky then reviewed recent activities of the BHE. In particular, he reported on the actions of the Committee on Central Administration of which he is a member. A resolution revising Board policy with respect to the candidacy of acting presidents for the permanent post is on the agenda for the February 28 meeting of the BHE. That resolution makes it possible for an acting president to declare his interest in being considered for the post by the Search Committee. Although debate in the informal meeting was not completed there are indications that the resolution will be adopted. A second item is one of particular interest to the UFS. It concerns Guidelines for the Periodic Review and Assessment of the Performance of the Chancellor and Presidents of the City University. There has already been considerable discussion of the proposed Guidelines. The Senate leadership has pressed for inclusion of faculty and student representatives on the evaluation teams and for the mandating of procedures to insure participation by the various constituencies of the University and the colleges in the evaluation process. In spite of strong arguments presented by Professors Burton, Galub, and Brostoff to the Committee, the Committee's chairman and others remain unconvinced. Therefore, a resolution asking for your support has been prepared for consideration at this time.

Professor Burton read the resolution, copies of which had been distributed to the Senate, and moved its adoption. Her motion was seconded. Discussion was strongly in support of the resolution and the position it defined and, following minor editorial emendations, the resolution was unanimously adopted.

IX. Report of the Academic Freedom Committee: Professor Stansky (Baruch), chairperson of the Committee, reported that the group has been meeting regularly, has been looking at the retrenchment procedures and the Guidelines and the implications for academic freedom. They have received various reports of atrocities. Professor Paster (City) is analysing the retrenchment reports with a particular view to ascertaining the extent to which practice differed from what was set forward in the written plan submitted. This is a complicated undertaking since many of the plans were prepared after and not before the fact.

Three principal questions are being addressed: 1) Once the BHE defined the financial exigency in August 1975, what role did the faculty play in retrenchment?; 2) Were the procedures fair, were they uniformly applied?; and 3) Was there a fair method of appeal? As a result of the Committee's study of the history of the retrenchment process as well as case studies, a resolution was prepared for consideration by the UFS. The resolution asks the Board to invoke the AAUP Statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure, especially regulation 4 and copies have been distributed to the Senate membership. The Committee considers the resolution especially important in view of the fact that the Vice-Chancellor for Legal Affairs has stated that academic freedom is not part of the retrenchment process.

Professor Stansky moved adoption of the resolution. Her motion was seconded and discussion took place. It was pointed out that the Vice-Chancellor is counsel to the Board not to the faculty which has no counsel. Professor Lutz (Brooklyn) opined that he favored the resolution for many reasons including the need to disseminate throughout the University the principles enunciated in the Statement. He had been shocked, he said, by the firing under the guise of academic reasons of people who were really being terminated for financial reasons.

The question was called and the resolution was adopted unanimously.

X. New Business: Professor Wu (Queens) asked whether there were any Guidelines for Merger of Programs that were being followed in the various consolidations of programs mentioned earlier in the session. It was his opinion that such Guidelines should be developed immediately since reportedly the Acting Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs had stated that reports would be ready on the following schedule: Teacher Education by April; Modern Languages in the spring; and the Technologies.

A motion to adjourn brought adjournment at 9:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Gordon Fifer
Secretary