

*Fell University Faculty Senate*

MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL PLENARY SESSION OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE  
OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

April 26, 1977

The meeting was called to order at 6:50 p.m. by the Chairman, Professor David Valinsky in Room 207 at the Graduate Center. All members were present except Professors Abramson, Adickes, Anderson, Aurbach, Auslander, Bieler, Bindler, Birenbaum, Briloff, Brown, Buder, Cole, Corbiere-Gille, Cowan, D'Amico, Diamond, Donno, Dreiling, Ehrenpreis, Eichmann, Elster, Gilbert, Gioiella, Glasser, Harvey, Hogg, Howard, Krich, Kriegel, Leiter, Lipschutz, Luther, Lutz, Mapp, Martin, Miller, Nash, Nwasike, Ornstein, Panes, Patterson, Pauling, Price, Ringel, Robbins, Rootenberg, Rothman, Schneider, Shmidman, Soskind, Uretsky, Walsh, Wasser, Wilson. Professors Caws, Hernandez-Miyares, Leonard, and Raab were excused. Professor Nachtsheim (AAUP) and Zeller (PSC), liaison members, attended. Dr. Jean Ellis also attended.

I. Adoption of the Tentative Agenda: The tentative agenda was adopted as circulated.

II. Communications from the Chairman: Dr. Valinsky reported on the current state of the budget as follows. The 1977-78 City Executive Budget was released on April 22, 1977. It authorizes \$498.2 million for the City University. In terms of operating budget the University budget is projected at \$462.9 million - a sum that is \$8.3 million less than the current year. The budget includes the City contribution to the senior colleges of 25% which amounts to \$53.7 million although details of how that will be paid are still being worked out. The City contribution to the community colleges is reduced by \$2.7 million but the overall budget level will increase by \$2.1 million because of a recalculation of projected revenues. The City has also set aside \$3.3 million of additional anticipated community college revenues to be used at the University's discretion to fund a community college CAP program or for the operating budgets of the community colleges. The total University budget is now projected at about \$8 million less than the current year and in programmatic terms at about \$13 million less.

Dr. Valinsky also reported on the joint meeting of the Executive Committees of the University Faculty Senates of SUNY and CUNY on April 16. The meeting focused on a discussion of the Wessell Commission report. Its purpose was to determine the extent to which there was agreement or disagreement in response to the Report. It became clear early in the all-day discussions that there are substantial areas of agreement among the members of both groups. They are united in approving most of the principles enunciated in the report and in their concerns about the Commission's specific recommendations. For example, both groups wonder why the Commission assumes that a change in structure will remedy the problems of the two universities. There was pleasure expressed by both groups that the Commission has recommended parity in funding whether or not the recommendations on structure are adopted. Both groups would like additional information on how, under the structure recommended by the Report, both systems will benefit. There is concern about the bureaucratic structure implicit in the Report and a desire to know more about the mechanisms for articulation between systems and for preserving open access.

The April 16th discussion was viewed by both Committees as preliminary and tentative. Both wished to have an opportunity to consult and deliberate with their own constituencies and to consider all possible options before taking a formal position on the document. Therefore, another meeting is planned for late

May or early June. It is hoped that at that time a joint statement on the future of public higher education in New York may be formulated.

Professor Valinsky also reported on the hearings held on April 22 by Assemblyman Miller, chairman of the Higher Education Committee, on the Wessell Report. The hearings were a fairly well guarded secret with the result that only about a dozen speakers testified. The Senate had learned of the event by accident and informed the Student Senate. Thus, the UFS, the USS, the PSC, and one president were the only CUNY representatives. The Acting Chancellor of the State University, the president of Stony Brook, the Chancellor of the Regents, some presidents of private institutions and representatives of various professional groups such as the certified accountants made up the rest of the list. Professor Bellush (City) said that the Committee on Public Higher Education which had not been informed of the hearings was incensed and he suggested that a letter be sent by the Senate to the Committee Chairman expressing indignation that appropriate notice had not been given. Professor Ferentz (Brooklyn) suggested that this might be appropriate action for the CPHE but that in view of the fact that the Senate had done its homework and learned of the event he did not think it appropriate for the UFS to be the plaintiff. His sentiment was echoed by other speakers although the opinion was also expressed that notification was poorly handled. Professor Valinsky resumed his report stating that the Assemblyman had questioned the need for additional appropriations for CAP on the grounds that the University had funded the program this year out of its budget.

Professor Valinsky also reported on the hearings sponsored by the UFS on April 19 for the University community to testify on the Wessell Report. The event had been well attended with all but two of the colleges represented as well as the Student Senate. The speakers represented college governance bodies and presented a range of opinion on the Report but the majority emphasized concerns regarding the recommendations. The proceedings were taped and are now being transcribed so that the testimony will be available for use in developing a Senate response to the document.

Professor Sohmer rose to a point of personal privilege concerning the election procedures for elections now being conducted for Senate delegations by the various colleges. He asked that the Chairman of the Senate provide each delegation with information on the number of fulltime faculty members and the number of Senators to be elected. Professor Valinsky responded that this would be done.

III. Responses of UFS Committees to the Wessell Report: Dr. Valinsky reminded the Senate that each committee had been asked to develop an analysis of the impact of the Wessell Commission recommendations on its area of competence. He then called for the reports.

Professor Eisen (Brooklyn) reported for the Committee on Undergraduate Affairs. She explained that although the report had been prepared by only four of the ten members of the Committee, those four represented a broad spectrum of institutions and expressed a variety of opinions on the Report's impact. The Committee wished to express strong support for the recommendations in the Report concerning immediate assistance for CUNY in the form of additional funding and for the recommendations on open access and educational opportunity. The Committee believed that a number of questions needed to be raised concerning the Commission's restructuring proposals. This concern was the result of members' belief that the Report did not provide satisfactory answers to a number of questions and therefore raised the question of whether the long-range solution proposed

will in fact contribute to the implementation of the goals stated. Among the concerns expressed by the Committee were the following: 1) that the restructuring would have little effect on opportunities for transfer and on articulation between units within a single university system and would in fact decrease opportunities for transfer and for articulation between units in different systems; 2) that the "smaller and more responsive administrative structure provided by the Empire State University System" in fact lumps together in the Metropolitan Region a greater number of units and a greater number of students than are now included in the entire City University; 3) that one Board of Trustees for the New York City senior colleges in the University of New York will provide a structure biased against those colleges and their students. Finally, the Committee indicated a lack of confidence that parity of funding which is essential to all branches of City University requires a change in structure, or can even be more equitably arrived at by such a change. The Committee believes that much more detail about the new structure must be provided to demonstrate that the major change being proposed will be a real improvement.

Professor Baumrin (Lehman) asked whether reference had been made to the passage on p.38 in the Report concerning regionalization./ No, it is the chart on p. 43 that provides the information about the size of the Metropolitan Region.

In the absence of the Chairman, Professor Leonard (Lehman) Professor Sohmer (City) reported for the Budget Committee. The Committee indicated support for the short-term recommendations of the Commission. They questioned support of the restructuring proposal since no fiscal (or educational) reasons for such a proposal were advanced. They advised study of the impact of cost and bureaucratic management related to the governance structure proposed in the Wessell Report before any such proposal could be carried through. They supported maintenance of a single salary schedule at CUNY - a position which seemed to be refuted in the Report. The Committee also expressed agreement with the recommendation of the Commission that there be parity of funding between CUNY and SUNY, meaning comparable funding of comparable programs. The Budget Committee also suggested guidelines for factors to be considered in carrying out the details of parity funding.

Professor Sohmer added that the Budget Committee had met one and one-half times to develop its statement and that four members of the Committee had participated. Professor Baumrin asked whether in discussing TAP the Committee was referring to the statement on page 2 of the Report./ No, page 4. Professor Greenbaum (Queensborough) asked whether the Committee's support for the 75%/25% formula was for this year?/ Yes. Professor Spinger (Brooklyn) asked about the Committee's statement on the proliferation of administrators. Had the Committee taken into account the Report's recommendation that the Boards have no staff./ Yes but it seemed to us that it was unrealistic to expect a diminution of the central administration - especially if one recalled statements prior to the creation of the City University and subsequent events. Professor Eisen (Brooklyn) asked whether the Committee was recommending an increase in individual TAP awards since the \$1800 recommended by the Commission did not seem meaningful for City University or State University students whose tuition was below that level./ No. We were recommending an increase in the total allotment. Professor Roman (Hostos) asked whether the Committee had considered the proposed limitation on TAP to eight semesters./ Yes but we think that is almost untouchable and there are special arrangements for more than eight semesters for certain programs. Professor Ferentz said that he did not understand the concern about increasing the TAP total allotment since TAP was an entitlement program and the

State was therefore obligated to provide funds for all those eligible./ Our concern stemmed from the information circulating to the effect that the Budget Director of the State is attempting to hold back the University reserve funds this year because the amount needed for TAP awards was underestimated. In effect the State seems to be game-playing on that issue.

Professor Roberts (Lehman) reported for the Library Committee. The Committee noted that the Wessell Report makes no specific mention of the functioning of libraries in the event of a restructuring of CUNY and SUNY. The Committee supports the principle of developing articulation and coordination among the various libraries of CUNY whether restructuring takes place or not. Although nothing is said in the Report concerning libraries the Committee fears that libraries in the two systems recommended by the Commission might go separate ways - a circumstance the Committee deems unfortunate. The Committee would therefore recommend that coordination efforts be continued, that full use of available facilities and services be arranged for students and faculties in all public institutions of higher education in the State, and that parity be developed among the library staffs of the various units.

Professor Roberts added that the report had been prepared by the members of the Library Committee. He also said parenthetically that Assemblyman Miller had stated at the hearings of the Higher Education Committee on April 22 that restructuring was years away. Professor Baumrin asked how the Committee would explain the use of the term "parity" in their recommendation./ CUNY librarians have professorial status; at SUNY each unit negotiates separately. Therefore, we recommend that all be given professorial status. Professor Baumrin suggested that the Committee recommendation might be clarified to make its intent known. Professor Spinger asked whether the professorial status of librarians was unique to CUNY./ No. It is a widespread practice though not a universal one.

Professor Wedeen (Brooklyn), chairman of the SGS Committee reported as follows. The Committee believes that the Wessell Report presents a perceptive and accurate, though brief, statement about part-time students in CUNY. The concern expressed about the problem created by the imposition of tuition and the lack of financial aid for part-time students was welcomed by the Committee as were the Commission's recommendations that financial aid be provided for such students. There was concern on the part of the SGS committee in regard to the conditions of eligibility for financial aid for part-time students in the Wessell proposals, however.

Professor Dash (Hunter) added her comments to the SGS report expressing concern that the Commission's understanding of the problems of SGS students was not accompanied by sufficiently substantive solutions. She stated special concern on the question of eligibility for financial aid and in particular of the effects of the Commission's recommendations on the many women SGS students. Women students were especially affected because with the imposition of tuition many of them were being denied the opportunity to pursue study because of cost and this augmented the problems developed by long-standing prejudice against women's education.

In the absence of the chairman, Professor Caws (Hunter) Professor Brostoff (Brooklyn) reported for the Graduate Affairs Committee. The Committee noted with satisfaction the Commission's recommendation concerning the place of graduate education in the scheme of higher education in the State. In addition, the Committee found the Commission's recommendations constructive and acceptable so far as graduate work is concerned. It questioned the recommendation that there be four boards of trustees for the comprehensive centers in the City since such an ar-

arrangement would make the Graduate School dependent administratively on the colleges and would be a regressive measure. The Committee noted too that the Graduate School would be considerably weakened by being deprived of its faculty presently drawn from Lehman, Baruch and other colleges placed in the Empire State system unless their status were clarified.

Professor Silver (City) objected to the Committee's identification of graduate work with the Graduate School and said he found the justification that a Graduate School was needed to coordinate graduate programs, offered by the Wessell Commission, vague. This was so especially in the light of the praise which the Commission had for the German consortium with Columbia, NYU, and CUNY since there did not seem to be a difference between that consortium and one that might exist among CUNY colleges. / I'm not sure that the comment comes to grips with the Committee's intent. You are aware that there was no intent to preclude offerings by the various schools; rather the report refers to the Charts in the Wessell Commission document concerning boards. Professor Page (City) said that he did not understand the function of the Graduate School, that he did not like that part of the Wessell Report, that it was well known that in his opinion the Graduate Center was a total loss and a waste of money and detracted from the University Centers as they were envisioned in the Wessell document. There seemed to him to be a contradiction present which he speculates is the result of political pressure. Professor Spinger (Brooklyn) asked whether it was a question only of four boards versus one board could not the Graduate School have its own board. / That would make five. Professor Baumrin said that he felt compelled to state that Professor Caws was in a difficult position since he was both chairman of the UFS Graduate Affairs Committee and of the Doctoral Policy Committee. The views expressed here were not those an elite select group but of the Graduate Affairs Committee of the Senate. Two points were raised by the Doctoral Policy Committee that were not raised by the Graduate Affairs Committee and they had to do with the inroads on faculty that might result from implementation of the Wessell Commission recommendations: 1) the loss of faculty from Baruch, Lehman, etc. might weaken some programs and the Doctoral Committee did not see how re-integration of those faculty members was to be effected; 2) the allocation of lines to the senior colleges took place some years ago and has never been redivided so that the newer colleges don't have such lines. The Doctoral Policy Committee is very concerned about this.

Professor Cooper (COSI-St. George) reported for the Committee on University Structure and Development. The Committee expressed support for the Commission's recommendations of additional funding for the University for 1977-78 and of parity in funding for the future. They suggested that an independent firm of accounting/auditing consultants be engaged to develop a uniform budgeting system for SUNY and CUNY to overcome differences in the budget-making process. The Committee offered the following critique of the Commission's proposal on structural changes: 1) the two-tiered system would effectively segregate the faculties from the five newer senior colleges from participation in the Graduate Program; 2) the proposal creates a "two-class" system; 3) the implementation of the proposal would limit student transfer from community institutions to comprehensive centers; 4) the proposal's geographic organization lacks sense; 5) the bureaucracy that would result threatens to be more expensive than the current one; 6) the variety of boards for local regions promises to politicize the governance of the system and make it even more highly competitive than at present thus weakening the educational thrust of the University.

Professor Silver (City) said he did not see why the different systems could not have graduate work. The Commission had praised the consortium in German and he did not see why that could not exist in the two systems. / Such an arrangement re-

quires cooperation. I doubt that such an arrangement would be possible unless people were forced into it. Professor Burton (Brooklyn) added that it was her understanding that the German consortium had grown out of a particular set of circumstances, viz. the Fleming Commission evaluation of the CUNY program was poor so that the program, unfairly, received a low rating while those at NYU and Columbia were rated higher - in the case of Columbia because President McGill had guaranteed replacement of the eminent persons who were retiring with equivalent people. In fact the arrangement is one in which CUNY is salvaging its program. Professor Silver said he found this shocking if true. It is his belief that the University should not look the other way and let things continue the way they are continuing. Professor Spinger (Brooklyn) reminded the Plenary that there was another consortium at the MA level in classics and asked whether the Committee had taken its existence into consideration./ No. Professor D'Adamo (York) said he thought it important to bear in mind that this was a case of battling cost effectiveness and that that lay behind the merging of programs. In the sciences, his area of competence, enrollments were dropping; there are more faculty, for example, in Physics than there are students and the same is true of Biochemistry. The aim of the Wessell proposal as he saw it was to have specific institutions for certain programs and have people from the Graduate Center teach there./ The Commission didn't take those matters into consideration in the opinion of the Committee. The Byzantine bureaucracy was the Commission's chief concern. Professor Cammett (John Jay) said he was disturbed that the discussion was focused only on graduate programs. The Wessell Report included an effort to reduce expenditures in the central administration but no one seems to have spoken to that point. Professor Milentijevic (City) said that the excellence of the German program to which Professor Silver alluded was questionable since the program had not yet been set up and probably would not materialize as a result of roadblocks being thrown up by Columbia to which both NYU and CUNY objected. Professor Silver said that so far as the question of the central administration is concerned he had given up any efforts in that direction.

Professor Stansky (Baruch) reported for the Academic Freedom Committee. The Committee noted with special concern the following: 1) the absolute failure of the Commission to address itself to the legal implications of its recommendations in the area of academic tenure as it exists now in the State and City Universities; 2) the failure to define the criteria upon which retrenchment decisions if they must be made should be based; or to include in their recommendations the requirement and assurance that recognized and accepted standards of due process will be applied in arriving at such decisions. The Academic Freedom Committee believes that the Report focuses exclusively on fiscal matters with no thought to the impact of its recommendations on matters of academic freedom and tenure. The Committee viewed the restructuring proposal as a questionable device to obtain a solution to the problems that beset public higher education in New York. The proposal seems to give the appearance that something is being done without insuring academic excellence and satisfaction of the educational needs of citizens of the State. For these reasons the Academic Freedom Committee would recommend that in the event the proposed reorganization were implemented the "extension principle be applied to tenure rights; the standards and regulations for due process prescribed in portions of the Education law and in the recommended Institutional Regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure of the AAUP be adopted and that thought be given to the impact before acting on the Commission's proposals.

Professor Trefousse said that it was his understanding that one had tenure in one's institution. Since the institutions would continue he questioned the effect on tenure. Professor Wu (Queens) raised the question of the definition of tenure recalling that Acting Vice-Chancellor Brenner had stated in connection

with the "exotic" languages proposal that he imagined that after consolidation the faculty with tenure would be moved from one institution to another and retain their tenure rights, seniority, etc. Professor Silver said he thought the last point cut two ways. With the way our system is administered it reminded him of the story of the Emperor who having been confronted with two contestants awarded the prize to the second for no particular reason. He said he did not see how anything could be worse than what existed and that he thought one might take a chance on a new one in the hope that it would be better because it couldn't be worse. Professor Stansky was also asked whether the Committee had thought about transferability of faculty between systems and the possibility of establishing a mechanism for that purpose. She replied that there might be such a possibility but that it would come into effect only after the City University was wiped out. She also reminded the Plenary that the CUNY faculty was covered by a special section of the Education Law (6206) and that after the University ceased to exist that section would be wiped out. She also asserted that the Committee viewed the restructuring as an opportunity to get rid of tenure. Professor Cooper said that with reference to previous examples of cooperation such as the proposal last year to close five colleges tenure rights had been investigated at that time and found to be non-existent. Now what was being said sounds different. Professor Page said that he felt depressed because underneath the discussion there seemed to be a tone of "where are the warm bodies that we need?" His president had stated that if there were no students it would be hard to keep faculty. Professor Page was pleased at the newspaper reports that there was a movement to bring high school graduates up to at least high school level since in the meantime the University has been making believe that high school students are college students. He thought it was time to get aggressive and say if you want us to be high school teachers then give us as much tenure as they have.

Professor Galub reported for the Committee on Legal Affairs indicating that the Committee had been able to make only a preliminary study of the legal questions arising out of the Wessell Report. Those explorations suggested that the proposals for restructuring might seriously endanger the rights and expectations of faculty in the present City University. Questions arise in connection with tenure, seniority, retrenchments, program terminations, collective negotiations, salaries and working conditions, and fringe benefits. None of these matters is discussed in the Wessell Report even though similar questions arise in connection with faculty in the present State University. The Committee on Legal Affairs considers resolution of these questions essential before restructuring can take place with those relating to collective bargaining to be handled by the respective negotiating agencies. On retrenchments and program terminations in spite of the hope of the Committee that massive reductions such as those in the recent past will not occur it is hoped that the guidelines promulgated by the AAUP in connection with these matters will be invoked.

Professor Nachtsheim, liaison member from the AAUP CUNY Council, offered two observations: 1) in reference to the 1940 Statement of Principles and the attitude of the CUNY administration he believes there has been a massive failure of leadership and that the time is ripe to call the administration to task; 2) with reference to the 1966 Statement on Terminations there is an attitude within CUNY that a favor is being granted when faculty are consulted. He questioned why CUNY faculty have to ask to be consulted when such consultation is a right. There is need for a more militant faculty in his opinion since the Chancellor, the presidents, the Board are not doing their job. Professor Dierlam (Queens) asked whether there was a concrete action Professor Nachtsheim would suggest since he had learned that the Chancellor was ignoring the matter./ I am an ordinary American who always thought he had certain rights. In CUNY, however, academic

freedom was assigned a low priority; money was the most important thing in this University. While academic freedom was of the utmost importance in times of crisis the Chancellor says, "It's nice in theory but it doesn't work in practice." Professor Cammett agreed that there was an excess of authoritarianism in the University. On the question of tenure it was his belief that the faculty had been unassertive. Last April a certain Vice-Chancellor who now will no longer be with the University said that eliminating faculty will save money and so this was done. In many other systems the faculty has more authority. Professor Page said that this was the first session he had attended when he had heard the Senate deal with the nitty-gritty. He suggested that it would be appropriate to offer a resolution asking the Chairman of the Executive Committee to write a letter expressing the view that there had been a failure to observe academic freedom and that actions had been taken in a totalitarian manner and this has led to etc.etc. He would ask that such a letter be composed. Professor Burton stated that she agreed with Professor Nachtsheim. There had been a failure not only in legal matters but also in academic matters. As she understood a university the faculty was supposed to have a predominant voice in academic matters. Each week the Executive Committee of the UFS struggled with this problem. Most recently that struggle related to the Search Committee for a Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs on which the faculty was supposed to constitute 50% of the membership. Last Friday two BHE members arrived at the meeting of that Committee and announced their presence to insure that the Committee observed affirmative action. The members of the Committee considered this insulting but were also disturbed at the imbalance created as the result of the addition of these two members. Therefore, the Chancellor had been asked by the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Senate to put two more faculty members on the Committee He had agreed. Professor Burton also asked that members submit names of persons from within CUNY or outside who were qualified for the post since the deadline on applications was still flexible. Professor Paster (City) opined that the shift to academic freedom was appropriate. Throughout the year that Committee had been meeting in an attempt to come to grips with the violations of academic freedom that had taken place last summer. In so doing they had been informed that they should step lightly or they might engender the wrath of the Chancellor or his crew. Professor Paster said it is his belief that the faculty should take a more dynamic stand. Professor Baumrin stated that he agreed with Professors Nachtsheim, Paster and Cammett that there has been at the minimum a cavalier attitude towards academic freedom, governance, etc. He had recognized this attitude in CUNY from the beginning of his association with the University back in what was referred to as "the good old days." At that time the situation was the worst he had ever encountered and it has not improved. He agreed with the thrust of Professor Page's remarks that a public statement should be made to the Governor on the importance of determination of faculty rights in times of crisis. The UFS has an obligation to be an advocate for academic freedom. Professor Silver asked about the Legal Committee's comments on the continuation of uniform bargaining./ The Committee recognized that there is a special place that collective negotiation agencies have. The Committee therefore did not want to assert any role beyond what it recognized as the province of collective negotiation and thus observe the lines between the PSC and UFS. It was the Committee's view that collective bargaining was a right, though not yet a constitutional one; therefore the Committee wished to recognize its existence and point out possible problems that would have to be handled by the PSC and the State bargaining agencies. Professor Wu said that he was not certain whether he was following the debate with his comment but that it was his opinion that during the transition period there was a need for a watchdog. Bureaucrats could not be permitted to make the decisions because by the time the faculty woke up it would be too late. If he might, he would refer to the situation with



respect to the consolidation of languages. The Senate had been told that the Academic Affairs Committee of the BHE would be making a decision in June and at that point it would be too late for the faculty to voice its opinion./ It is up to the Executive Committee to take action in that area, it would seem. Having a watchdog doesn't contradict the thrust of the Committee's report. We are addressing general principles with a view to examining details later. Professor D'Adamo said that the discussion reminded him of the story of the researcher investigating stimuli to the hunger center in the brain using laboratory animals. One leg was cut off but the animal still made its way to the food; the same thing happened when the second and third legs were removed. When the fourth leg was removed the animal no longer made its way to the food so the researcher concluded that the hunger center was no longer stimulated. In the current situation it seemed that people were interested in cutting down the number of students who could go to the University. City University used to command public support but that support is eroding now because the University has turned its back on the people who need remediation etc. Although we expect people to be behind us at the barricades we seem not willing to do the things professors are supposed to do and take students and help them get an education. Professor Nachtsheim observed that the AAUP Washington Office was much impressed by the work of the Legal Affairs Committee and the Academic Freedom Committee.

Professor Spinger reported for the Faculty Interests Committee. Professor Spinger noted that his committee had been given a special charge for the year, viz. to collect and examine information on alternative models of university systems. The Committee's report therefore included a response to that charge as well as analysis of the structure proposed by the Wessell Commission. Based upon its studies to date the Committee would give general support to the proposal of the Wessell Commission with some reservations and several additional recommendations. Professor Spinger also made clear that the reservations were held as strongly as the general support. The lengthy report of the Committee reviewed the history of both the City University and SUNY and pointed out the need to free the City University from the financial difficulties of the municipal government. The Committee indicated strong support for the recommendations on parity funding but did not feel that this should be separated from a change in structure. The Committee found the Commission's grouping of institutions by institutional type a strength of the proposal but had many reservations growing out of considerations not addressed by the Commission. For example, the Committee saw the need for a planning period, the need for the solution to problems such as what regulations will govern and protect existing provisions for academic tenure, the resolution of differences in salary scales and fringe benefits between the staffs of SUNY and CUNY, resolution of the present differences in workloads especially for full-time instructional staff. The Committee also saw the need for consideration of alternative suggestions for placement of individual units in one or the other of the "new" systems as well as the need for further examination of the statements relating to cooperative efforts in graduate education. It was the Committee's view that the stated aims behind the formation of the two systems proposed were excellent and that the top priority placed upon implementation of access and progression was also good. The principle that "any new funding system must tie costs with activities and specific missions so that policy planning can be united with financial planning" was especially applauded by the Committee.

Professor Greenbaum (Queensborough) asked what members of the Committee supported this report and upon receiving the Chairman's response moved to repudiate the report. Professor Trefousse (Graduate School) stated that such a motion was out of order; that the Senate might refuse to receive a report or not endorse a report was possible. Professor Sohmer opined that he did not

understand the motion, that it was ridiculous to reject a report. Professor Valinsky said that the Senate could decide not to adopt the recommendations in a report but that all reports stand as received. Professor Raskin (Brooklyn) said that she disagreed with many of the points raised in the report but that she considered it a thoughtful analysis and would commend its perception of the problems of the University. Professor Milentijevic said she was curious as to the rationale employed by the Committee in recommending that certain of the newer colleges with graduate programs be moved to the University of New York while omitting others with graduate programs./ I will beg off responding except to say that in the case of the institutions recommended for movement we knew of the PhD program at one and the research activity at the other. Professor Petratos (COSI-Sunnyside) said that he thought he had stood in the Senate a year and a half ago and heard the same kind of discussion as he was hearing now. It was his opinion that the Senate was looking at itself and letting the world go by. He told the Senate then that the University was going to be changed by management. He said he was against this report and would argue that City University be maintained in one unit. We don't have a State structure. Why do we need it? We are unique. Whatever is reported we shouldn't accept. If we try to distinguish between centers we should try to discriminate and should begin to see that the City is changing and so should we. We should try to maintain CUNY as it is. Professor Gosselin (Bronx Community) said he was trying to draw together the threads of the discussion. One model might be as good as another but as one listened to the comments one wonders what is going to be drawing students to the University, what magnet will make CUNY equal to Westchester Community College etc? What one is observing is such tremendous change in the colleges that one wonders what is going to attract students unless they are kept artificially in existence./ What you're saying is nothing will change. Professor Kaye (Brooklyn) said that so far as the Boards are concerned he wondered about the Committee's support for individual boards which he thought would endanger faculty rights. Individual boards would have to be monitored in each unit. Any one of those Boards might violate faculty rights. Proliferation of boards might make it more difficult for them to work with us. Professor Baumrin said that he thought the report thoughtful although he thought it was wrong in some places. He would be very surprized if it didn't turn out that some of the members of the Committee did not agree wholeheartedly with all of the statements. He had one question concerning the points suggested. When it was said that four boards were preferable which would include dismantling of the existing boards what would happen to the Graduate School./ One member of the Committee raised that question; one was partially in agreement. Professor Zimmerman (COSI-Sunnyside) said that he had a question about the comparability of CUNY and SUNY. Isn't it true that SUNY has four centers and CUNY none and doesn't that make a difference to be taken into consideration. Isn't it true also that there is an elitist approach. One notes little difference in it from the elitist and the others, all of CUNY seems pretty good to me; to separate the units would be to do an injustice./ I don't think the analogy of jewels and garbage was made. Professor Dierlam said he thought the report thoughtful though he took exception to certain points. Tentatively he would favor the idea but it was like reading the tea leaves or the entrails. If memory served him from the days when the colleges before CUNY had local committees, those committees seemed to act more effectively than the present Board./ We studied the charts which seemed to mandate more boards. Professor Cooper said that she remembered that as an undergraduate at City College the faculty complained of Tammany Hall influence. Her question concerned the California system. From her understanding there were different admissions standards, different tuition levels etc. for each of the tiers. She wondered under the Wassell proposal what the differences were going to be in admissions, tuition levels, etc. Would CUNY face

the situation where the PSC would be asked to defend different salary levels?/ We didn't address ourselves to the preservation of the PSC. Professor Eisen said that her committee had studied admissions standards, etc. at SUNY and that there were differences between the University Centers as a group and individually and that the same was true of the four year colleges. Professor D'Adamo said that he thought it was right that various points of view should be expressed but he wished to know whether this report would be appended to the final Senate document?/ No. It is clear that in reorganization the question of tenure would have to be examined and that that being broken would enable people to get rid of the most expensive portion of the faculty. It is possible to envision a situation in which John Jay would have to be included - to provide police protection. Professor Roberts (Lehman) reminded the Plenary that the report was still open to adjustment, that nothing was fixed and that the Committee had indicated some reservations as strong as the support as well as the need for a transition period. Professor Cammett said that he had no problem with the report's thoughtfulness and derivateness but he did have reservations about the thoughtfulness of the Wessell Report. He couldn't believe that Nils Wessell whom he knew and respected could put his name to that document. He did not think the Report will be taken seriously because its assumptions are shaky, shakier than the State Budget Office's, e.g. there is no component for remediation, arbitrary grouping of colleges, and no real attempt to grapple with the financial aspect of the plan. Professor Greenbaum said that he had never tried to silence debate, that he had been appalled at what he thought he was hearing. He did not think a parallel should be drawn between CUNY, SUNY and the California systems. The last two had been focused in a certain direction when they were formed. The CUNY colleges were closer to the four University Centers than to SUNY; the CUNY community colleges were different from those in California and SUNY; they were publishing institutions that could not be duplicated. The parallel ignores the uniqueness of CUNY and the benefit it draws from its location in a major center for researchers - New York City./ I agree with the point you are making. Professor Greenbaum then withdrew his resolution.

Professor Valinsky announced 1) Professor Evelyn Handler (Hunter), former vice-chairman of the UFS and long member of the Senate, has been appointed Dean of Science and Mathematics at Hunter College. He asked that the good wishes and congratulations of the Senate be spread on the minutes; 2) the next regular Plenary Session will include elections on the agenda. The Secretary, Treasurer and five members-at-large of the Executive Committee will be elected. The meeting will be held on May 17; 3) the searches for Deputy-Chancellor and Chancellor for Academic Affairs are going forward; the Committees would welcome nominations of persons from within or without the University who have the appropriate qualifications for these posts.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Gordon Fifer  
Secretary