

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

October 18, 1977

The meeting was called to order at 6:45p.m. by the Chairman, Dr. David Valinsky, in Room 207 at the Graduate School. All members were present except Professors Abramson, Anderson, T. Brown, Buder, D'Adamo, Diamond, Donno, Dreiling, Elster, Gilbert, Harvey, Hogg, Klarfeld, Krich, Lea, Leiter, Lekachman, Lerr, Lutz, Marcinek, Montalvo, Nash, S. Page, Panes, Paster, Patterson, Pinciss, Ratensky, Robbins, Rootenberg, Rothman, Santoro, Scheider, Silver, Toback, Uretsky, Wakatama, Waren, and Yousef. Professors E. Brown, Davidson, Dierlam, Karfunkel, Magnus, Ringel, V. Roberts, Rustow, Stevens were excused. Chancellor Robert J. Kibbee and Dr. Jean Ellis also attended. Professor Nactsheim, AAUP liaison, was present too.

- I. Approval of the Tentative Agenda: The tentative agenda was approved.
- II. Approval of the Minutes of the 68th Plenary Session and of the Special Plenary of October 4: The minutes of the 68th Plenary were approved with the following corrections: Professor ~~Karfunkel~~ was excused. The minutes of the Special Plenary of October 4 were approved with the following corrections: Professors Davidson and Karfunkel were excused.
- III. Chancellor's Report: Chancellor Kibbee announced the following: (1) The Mayor has appointed Ms. Joan Maynard to replace Ms. Harriet Michel on the BHE. Ms. Michel has resigned from the BHE to accept a position with the Carter Administration; (2) The Governor is expected to make an appointment to replace Mr. Maas who resigned from the BHE last spring sometime in the near future; (3) the award of the Nobel Prize for Medicine to Dr. Rosalyn Yalow brings to five the number of Nobel prize winners who are CUNY alumni/ae and permits the University to claim 4% of the living Nobel Laureates as products of CUNY colleges.

On the budget the Chancellor said there was little new to report except that at the present stage in the process the presidents of the colleges were meeting with the State Budget Office people in Albany and the last of those meetings would take place next week. On November 4 a full dress hearing for the University as a whole was scheduled and in mid-November the BHE would conduct a public hearing on the Budget Request for 1978-79. It is anticipated that the final Budget Request will be adopted by the BHE at its public meeting on November 21. The presidents of the community colleges will meet with the Chancellor and the CUNY Budget Director on October 20 to discuss their budgets. Present indications are that the community college request will be about \$30 million than the current budget. The Chancellor reported too that he and the CUNY Budget Director had had an initial meeting with the UFS Budget Advisory Group and anticipated several more before adoption of the final Budget Request.

The Chancellor reported on construction activities within the University, reminding the Senate of the renewal of construction at Lehman College as a result of a successful sale of bonds by the Dormitory Authority. He announced that ten days ago an additional Dormitory Bond issue of some \$82 million had been sold and that most of that funding was designated for use to complete the North Academic Complex at City College. In January the Authority hoped to have another issue the proceeds of which would be used for the remainder of the construction projects begun and interrupted by the City's fiscal crisis.

The Guidelines for a Testing Program, the Chancellor said, were nearing completion and would be issued within the next few weeks. He said too that work was well underway on preparing new Guidelines for SEEK. Meetings had been held on these

with the presidents, with directors of SEEK programs as well as SEEK students, and with directors and students of College Discovery programs. A meeting had also been held with a group of non-SEEK faculty designated by the UFS. A proposed set of guidelines was now being drawn up and on November 9 an all parties Conference of the University Community would be held on that proposal.

On October 18 the administrative heads of CUNY and SUNY met to draw up an agenda for the November 23 meeting of the Joint Board Committee. That group also reviewed the activities of the joint faculty groups and the joint presidential committee.

On enrollment the Chancellor reported that the University was now close to having final figures. The most current flash reports from the colleges reveal the following data: 1) the freshman headcount is about 4,000 (13%) higher than last year's figure and comes to 33,500; 2) there is a considerable increase in the number of advanced standing transfers too; 3) applications by advanced standing transfers rose 20%; 4) the overall estimated actual full-time FTEs for Fall 1977 are 120,300 and the estimated actual part-time FTEs is 22,800 undergraduates; there are 4,150 estimated actual full-time graduate students and 4,500 estimated part-time FTE graduate students which represents in terms of full-time students less than a 1% increase. The increase in FTEs is all in the community colleges there being a 4.4% decrease in the senior colleges and a 5% increase in the community colleges. The largest decrease was in part-time students with a loss of some 3,000 FTEs in the senior colleges and 2,000 FTEs in the community colleges. Thus, there are 5,500 fewer overall. The graduate full-time FTEs are approximately the same as last year with a decrease of only 48 students; part-time graduate FTEs reveal a loss of 1,000 FTEs. The losses are not evenly distributed throughout the University and the greatest increase was at La Guardia Community College. The loss in part-time students is common throughout the University as is the loss of part-time graduate students. The largest decrease in full-time FTEs was at Lehman College and in the upper division of College of Staten Island although the lower division of the College of Staten Island showed an increase. The figures, the Chancellor reiterated, are not final but are close to the final ones.

The Chancellor then responded to the following question submitted in writing: Professor Milentijevic (City) - "We have been told that an agreement has been worked out by the public and private institutions that are members of ACUSNY to press for increased State appropriations for financial assistance and that a package has been developed to satisfy the special interests of both public and private institutions. In the light of the Governor's statement of October 11 that he is recommending to the Legislature that the ceiling on TAP awards be raised to \$1800 retroactive to include first-time students for this academic year, what do you think the position of the privates will be on the ACUSNY package? Will they continue to support it?"/ The package is not quite worked out although there has been discussion to this point. Each group has its own first priority: the privates want the elimination of the \$200 differential for upper division students; SUNY wants the maximum net taxable income to qualify for a full grant raised from the present \$2000 to \$5000; CUNY's priority is TAP for part-time students. The group is now engaged in the attempt to develop a package and there will be a meeting on October 27 at which the leadership of the three universities will go over what has been put together by their staffs. The point is that in each case everyone benefits. Raising the threshold for the maximum grant will help CUNY students as will the elimination of the differential and TAP for part-time students will help students in all colleges and universities in the state. The problem is to develop a package which will not be so expensive that it turns off the Governor, the Budget

Office and the Legislature. Probably some arrangement to phase in the various aspects of the request will have to be included so that the cost may be kept at a reasonable level.

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

- 1) Professor E. Roberts (Lehman) - "In the Chairman's Report distributed this evening mention is made in the section on Tests for movement from lower to upper division of an exit exam from remedial writing courses. Doesn't this represent a change from the original BHE resolution?"/ Yes. In fact, we are not talking about testing knowledge but rather skill level. There has been considerable discussion concerning a means of validating the University's remedial efforts and that is what the proposed Guidelines represent. If students enter the University with the skills they are expected to have, then they learn whatever they learn. If they do not enter with the expected skills, then the tests will signify that they have completed remediation.
- 2) Professor Solmer (City) - "I learned on my way to this meeting of a problem that has developed in relation to TAP. There is a group of students at my college who received more than \$300 as TAP awards in 1976-77 but who were in the University prior to July 1974 and they are now being back billed by the University because their awards have been recalculated. The total comes to about \$300,000 at my college and I would imagine that it would amount to \$3 million throughout the University. I wonder can you tell us what is being done about this?"/ I will check on it.
- 3) Professor Ehrenpreis (Bronx Community) - "There is one area that was not mentioned in your Report and that concerns the memorandum of understanding of October 5 between the PSC and the Chancellory. Can you shed any light on the contract situation?"/ We have an agreement that represents a series of issues and that is now being drafted into contract language. That should be completed in about a week. Then the document will have to be circulated for ratification by the membership and by the BHE. The major question concerns the funding and that centers on the City and its willingness to put up their part; the State has already indicated a willingness to pay its part. Then, there is the question of EFCB approval but they will not consider it until it is ratified.
- 4) Professor Roman (Hostos Community) - "I have been wondering about the building that was purchased for Hostos Community College and which is in need of renovation before it can be used and I would like to know why the \$80 million bond issue went to City College and the \$4 million needed for Hostos was dropped?"/ It was not dropped; it is an agenda item. It was not included in the recent bond issues because the Lehman agreement, as you know, was worked out between the banks and the Dormitory Authority and both of the issues were senior college issues and we can't mix senior and community colleges in a single bond issue. The State Budget Director has two priorities in construction: 1) to complete those buildings or projects that have been started and 2) to take first those that can be finished first. Lehman was closest to completion, then City. The next one depends on whether there is a senior college bond issue or a community college issue since both Hunter and Borough of Manhattan have projects that have been begun. If the decision is to go for a community college issue then we may try to include others besides Borough Manhattan - possibly Hostos and Bronx Community. We tried to get Hostos included in the federal funds we have received by getting the City to include it but the City didn't want to though Hostos was a natural for those funds since the cost was under \$5 million and it was ready to go - both of those criteria having been established for that funding. Another possibility is that the Hostos building can be included in the capital budget request of the City and State. The Governor's office is interested and if they would be willing to do their share, it would then be a question of convincing the City to include it. There will be attempts to include Hostos in something; it is not forgotten and is a high priority item. So far, the things we've tried haven't worked.
- 5) Professor Brostoff (Brooklyn) - "I left the first Plenary this year

with a feeling of enthusiasm when I heard you speak about the stability in the University. Since then, however, all hell seems to have broken loose. At Brooklyn College we have been told that we are losing 100 lines. Could you shed some light on why Brooklyn is sustaining such a loss and how does it compare with what is happening elsewhere?"/ The point is that Brooklyn has already had its hearing with the State while others have not. At the moment I am a little unclear about the situation since I know only what I have heard on the grapevine. It is true that enrollment is down and that it is expected to decrease still more next year and those losses are reflected in the loss of lines even under the enriched funding formula proposed by the University though not yet accepted by the State. The situation is really unclear, though. Part of the reason is the way the State Budget Office gives out funds; there are two ways: in lines and in money to support those lines. In theory at least the money supports those lines and the lines are based on seven categories used by the State Budget Office. If the money doesn't work out then there can be trouble. If Brooklyn is assigned 981 authorized lines but only 931 or 929 are supported by money then in fact Brooklyn College has 929 FTE lines and not the 981 authorized lines. Now, if, in fact, the 981 authorized lines are being used to reduce to 881 lines, then the cut is only about 38 lines. I will discuss the matter tomorrow morning with the Central Office Budget Director and Brooklyn College. After that I can respond more intelligently. Whether we are talking about bodies or lines makes a difference. There are other possible explanations too. Professor Brostoff further stated that the discussion was indeed in terms of bodies - 100 in all - with one school to lose 35, another 22, another 20 and these were all people on tenure-bearing lines. / I don't understand how it is bodies that are being discussed. I need clarification from the college. 6) Professor Gruenebaum (Brooklyn) - " I was going to ask a question about the skills testing but I shall instead pursue Professor Brostoff's line of inquiry. I don't the reason why we have 929 people on 981 lines but either the University or the State erred in calculating the average salary. Whatever the reason is it seems clear that if the cut is from 981 to 881 lines then it is from 929 bodies to 829 bodies."/ I am just talking hypothetically but the average salaries were data supplied by the colleges and simply transported by the Central Office. Now, if 929 bodies were allowed and they are being reduced, it is the result of a decrease in the number of students but the projected decreases are not enough to call for a 100 line loss although it might mean moving a number of lines. But the 100 lines are not commensurate with the student loss. 7) Professor Rutenberg (York) - "After listening to the discussion about jobs my question may seem inappropriate since it relates to construction; however, at York, the two are close together. Could you tell us what is being done about York?"/ I can't be very specific since we haven't dealt with the order to be followed once those projects that are underway are completed. I have discussed the matter with your president and in my mind it is near the top of the list. 8) Professor Baumrin (Lehman) - "I have a question on Brooklyn College but en passant I might ask whether the intention is to have a checkoff or dues billing for non-members of the union who are being obligated to pay fees. Those who are not members should be billed and not have their money disposed of automatically and there should not be a disposition of their salary without a court order. On the matter of Brooklyn College it sounds like some kind of flim-flam. The UFS provides a forum for outsiders perceiving what sounds like a flim flam. 52 lines don't exist as persons but 50 persons must be cut; it sounds like 50 extra are to be cut to insulate something else at Brooklyn College. It is important for the Central Office to look at the numbers of people. I don't suggest that this is really the case but I have a feeling it is."/ I have to take seriously what you say but I don't know the answer since I haven't seen the details. On the first issue you raise we have had court orders before. 9) Professor Cantwell (Brooklyn) - " Have any actions been taken on the motions concerning the AAUP censure?"/ I can't say that actions

have been taken but there are going to be discussions between the Central Office and the UFS Ad Hoc Legal Committee which I understand has already begun its deliberations. Out of those discussions should come proposals for actions. 10) Professor Ferentz (Brooklyn) - "I can remember last year at one of our meetings complaints being made about presidents taking actions and saying that they were proceeding on orders from the Central Office and that you responded that you could not intervene on the campuses but had to assume that the campuses were doing what they were supposed to be doing. If that is indeed the case, where a campus violates the By-Laws how is the faculty to communicate with the BHE? It is prohibited from doing so except through the president. How do we advise the Central Office?"/ One way is through the Senate. I meet regularly and on an emergency basis with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the UFS and the floor of the Senate is also available. 11) Professor Spinger (Brooklyn) - "I should like to return to the issue of the lines at Brooklyn College. In fact, there are 102 lines that equate to 102 bodies. This is information taken from the sheet that was distributed to us and which I have here. The reduction seems to be based on the projected budget reduction plus an additional contingency. Those sums divided by the actual average salary of those to be let go and the salary is about \$17,000 - that of assistant professors and not an average salary for the college - results in the 102 bodies. There are 20 in the School of Social Science, 34.4 in Science; 22 in education and so forth."/ My knowledge is incomplete and what I am trying to do is hypothesize. But I don't really think we are going to get anywhere here tonight. I have to understand what the situation is. 12) Professor Ferentz apologized for taking the Senate's time with a parochial issue and asked whether the Chancellor would be willing to meet with the Brooklyn College UFS delegation after having met with the Central Office Budget Director and the people at Brooklyn College./ I will try. 13) Professor Ehrenpreis suggested that the proper adjective was "catholic" not "parochial" since the problem being discussed might indeed prove to be one for all the units. 14) Professor Rempson (Bronx Community) - "You alluded before to the Guidelines for Skills Testing. Can you give us a fuller idea now of what is contemplated?"/ There are three questions - reading, writing and mathematical skills - and all students are to be tested in these in an agreed upon way. The university writing test will be scored on campus but the results will be monitored by scrutiny of samples to insure uniformity. Any one of 6 reading tests is to be used and the same is true of mathematics. The tests will be given to all entering students and those who pass will automatically have met the requirement. Those who don't would take the tests again at the end of remedial courses. Passing at that point would indicate that they have finished their remediation. If not, they would continue in remediation. Professor Rempson asked further - "You are not setting any grade level?"/ We are trying to use scores and the decision will be made in consultation with the faculty group on the appropriate scores to be sought. 15) Professor Eisen (Brooklyn College) - "The main reason for Brooklyn College's concern is that the departments have been ordered to make their non-reappointments now. In fact, they have been told that there are to be none this summer and that is why it must be done now."/ I did tell everyone there would be no retrenchment but that doesn't mean that we won't lose any people. We will lose people but on the basis of academic decisions. Professor Eisen further asked - "If you have to lose ten people out of 10 how is that an academic decision?"/ It isn't.

IV. Election of Member-at-Large to Fill the Vacancy on the Executive Committee:

Professor Valinsky reminded the members that the appointment of Professor Edward Mapp (New York City Community) to be Dean of Faculty at Borough of Manhattan Community College had left a vacancy on the Executive Committee. In accordance with the Charter the Chairman had appointed a Nominating Committee consisting of the officers of the Senate and the chairman of the Committee on Elections and Organization

to prepare a slate. In addition, nominations from the floor might be made. Professor Burton, vice-chairman of the UFS, reported for the Nominating Committee. She explained that the Committee had reviewed the composition of the Executive Committee and had determined that the absence of Dr. Mapp created an imbalance between senior and community college representation on that committee. The Nominating Committee therefore wished to propose the name of Professor Roland Gosselin, Bronx Community College, as nominee for the vacancy.

The nomination of Professor Gosselin was seconded. Professor Spinger (Brooklyn) nominated Professor Melvin Ferentz, Brooklyn College. There being no further nominations, nominations were closed.

A tally of the ballots was made by the tellers appointed by the Chairman - Professors Edgar Roberts (Lehman) and Pei-Yi Wu (Queens). Professor Gosselin was declared elected.

Professor Valinsky indicated that the Chairman's Report had been submitted in writing at this Plenary so that the business of the Senate might be completed in good time to permit each of the Standing Committees to hold its organizational meeting. He announced the names of the liaison members of the Committees as well as the assigned meeting places.

Dr. Valinsky also reported briefly to the Senate on the meeting of the Executive Committees of the SUNY and CUNY Faculty Senates on October 14 and said it made clear the commonality of views among the faculty in both systems. He also said that there was joint interest in developing a political document on the future of public higher education. He reported too that the CUNY Faculty Senate Executive Committee at its meeting following the Special Plenary of October 4 had considered the suggestions made concerning its own document on the future. The Committee had agreed that there should, in fact, be two documents: a political one probably to be drafted in conjunction with SUNY, and a second document for CUNY.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jean Ellis