

MINUTES OF THE SEVENTY-FIRST PLENARY SESSION OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

December 13, 1977

The session was called to order at 6:45 p.m. by the Chairman, Professor David Valinsky, in Room 207 at the Graduate Center. All members were present except Professors Abramson, T. Brown, D'Amico, Diamond, Donno, Dreiling, Edwards, Elster, Gilbert, Harvey, Hogg, Johansson, Klarfeld, Krich, Leiter, Lekachman, Leonard, Levy, Magnus, Marcinek, Martin, Montalvo, S. Page, Paster, Patterson, Peyre, Ratensky, Robbins, Rootenberg, Rothman, Rustow, Ruttenberg, Santoro, Silver, and Wakatama. Professors E. Brown, Corbiere-Gille, Nash, Ringel and Yousef were excused. Professor Nachtsheim, AAUP liaison, and Professor Zeller, PSC liaison, were also present. Chancellor Robert J. Kibbee and Dr. Jean Ellis also attended.

- I. Approval of the Tentative Agenda: The tentative agenda was approved.
- II. Approval of the Minutes of the 70th Plenary Session: The minutes were approved with the following correction: page 8 Professor Wasser's reference is to York College not Staten Island.
- III. Communications from the Chairman: Dr. Valinsky reported the following activities of the leadership since the 70th Plenary Session: 1) re: CUNY/SUNY co-operation - The Executive Committees of the Faculty Senates of CUNY and SUNY met again on November 18. The session achieved agreement on the establishment of a joint master-planning committee to be composed of three persons from each university's faculty and one from each administration. The groups will consult with the Master-Planning office in each university and will discuss revisions in each master plan with a view to determining areas in which coordination might be possible. In addition, it was decided to set up a joint long-range planning committee which will include faculty knowledgeable in such areas as demography, data analysis, economic forecasting, etc. The two Executive Committees also discussed the joint document on the mission and goals of public higher education and agreed to name a committee of six to eight distinguished persons from the two universities to draft such a document.

The activities of other joint groups, specifically those of the Boards and the Presidents, were also reviewed from an informational point of view. The Committee of Presidents has proposed creation of a number of task forces - on International Education, Performing Arts, Teacher Education, and Public Service - to explore possible joint activities in these areas. The Task Forces are to be appointed by the respective Chancellors and will include appropriate faculty members from each university. The Faculty Senate Executive Committees agreed that such faculty members should be named from lists submitted by the Faculty Senates and have been in touch with their respective Chancellors on this matter. Chancellor Kibbee has said that he will share the list already submitted by the CUNY presidents with the Faculty Senate and that in future he will ask the Senate to submit lists.

2) re: liaison with the Council of Presidents - Chancellor Kibbee has also said that he will move ahead to establish a permanent liaison mechanism between the Senate and the Council of Presidents through their respective Executive Committees. The Senate Executive Committee believes that the priority item on its agenda for discussion with the Council is the role of faculty in decision-making at the campus level.

3) re: the UFS Ad Hoc Committee on Legal Affairs and revision of the Retrench-

ment Guidelines - the Committee has met regularly and expects to sit down with the Chancellor and his staff immediately after the holiday recess to discuss revision of the retrenchment guidelines. The Committee has met with the leadership of the PSC to review areas of mutual concern arising from the retrenchment process.

4) Re: Long-range Planning - The Chancellor and the Senate Executive Committee, the Budget Advisory Group, and the Chairman of the UFS Committee on University Structure and Development will be having a number of sessions in the next several weeks to discuss long-range planning for the University.

5) The UFS Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities, chaired by Professor Robert Dierlam (Queens) and including Professors E. Brown (Brooklyn) and D. Rustow (Graduate School) has met and outlined the document it is preparing.

Dr. Valinsky also reported on activities of the BHE and the Central Office since the 70th Plenary Session: 1) the BHE Agenda for the Public Meeting of December 19 includes items on presidential housing, the establishment of a new program in international studies at the College of Staten Island, and the appointment of a Deputy Chancellor. Chancellor Kibbee, said Dr. Valinsky, would elaborate these points in his report. The Chancellor would also bring the Senate up to date on the status of the University's Budget Request, construction projects and the like.

Professor Lutz (Brooklyn) asked whether the Ad Hoc Legal Committee would not also meet with representatives of the AADP and was assured by the Chairman that it would.

Professor Karfunkel (New York City Community College) asked the Chairman to introduce the newly elected Senators from that college. Dr. Valinsky introduced Professors Lorraine Beitler and Joseph Brogan.

IV. Election of Secretary of the Senate: Dr. Valinsky explained that the Charter of the Senate requires an election be held for Secretary of the Senate. The reason is the complex situation created by the failure of City College to complete its elections prior to the October 1 deadline. The Nominating Committee had therefore met and was prepared to report to the Plenary.

Professor Burton, vice-chairman of the UFS, reported for the Nominating Committee. The Committee proposed Professor Radmila Milentijevic (City) for Secretary. Professor Ehrenpreis (Bronx Community) moved the re-election of Professor Milentijevic by acclamation. The motion being duly seconded and passed, Professor Milentijevic was declared elected by acclamation.

V. Chancellor's Report: Chancellor Kibbee reported the following items: 1) the resignation of Mr. Figuerca from the BHE; 2) the naming of Mr. Sheftel by Governor Carey (Mr. Sheftel is participating in BHE meetings as an observer until confirmation of his appointment when the Legislature reconvenes); 3) the appointment of acting Vice-Chancellor Egon Brenner as Deputy Chancellor.

On the Budget the Chancellor reported that the present status of the Request was that it was in the discussion stage. The University has been having discussions with the State directed primarily towards verification of data and responding to requests for additional information and has been told that there will be meetings this week with Deputy Budget Director Miller to present its views on the budget, i.e. the budget for the senior colleges. There will then be meetings with the University at which time there will be some opportunity for the University to argue its case. The effect is that instead of waiting until publication of the Executive Budget, as was the case last year, the University will be able to comment

on the proposed Budget somewhat earlier. The Chancellor reported too that the University has met with the Budget Director of the City, i.e. the out-going Budget Director. The Mayor was required to submit a fiscal plan to the EFCB by December 1 and that plan included \$53.4 million for the senior colleges - the same amount as this year - and an amount for the community colleges that equals this year's plus approximately \$6.5 million additional for OTPS. The plan is somewhat favorable to the University since it includes funding for the senior colleges. A meeting is scheduled with Mayor-elect Koch's people for December 15 to discuss the budget and other matters pertaining to the University so that it may be possible to get a sense of where the University is in the new administration's thinking.

The Chancellor reported that in the area of construction the Lehman and CCNY projects were theoretically underway, that the Hunter project was being somewhat delayed as a result of discussion re: whether the University should submit a long-range plan prior to any further construction projects being undertaken or whether, since that plan will not be ready until the last spring at earliest, projects such as Hunter should go forward in the meantime.

Chancellor Kibbee said that the proposed tentative Guidelines for SEEK had been sent to the EEO Committee, had been the subject of a University-wide meeting for commentary and criticism, had been discussed with various individuals and small groups and were now being revised for resubmission to the EEO Committee, hopefully at its January meeting. The Guidelines will be reviewed by the Committee and, depending on its reaction to them, will be sent to the full Board for action at its January or February meeting. The Chancellor said too that it was his sense that, given the importance of the issue, the EEO Committee or the BHE would probably hold a hearing on the Guidelines. Chancellor Kibbee also announced that the EEO Committee had a new chairperson, Mrs. Everett, since the former chairperson, Mr. Figueroa, has resigned.

The status of presidential searches was the next topic discussed by the Chancellor. Those at New York City Community College and at Hostos Community College were in progress; the search at Borough Manhattan is not yet underway since it is a special case; the Queens search is in the interview stage and the candidates have been reduced to four. New York City Community College is expected to begin interviewing this week; Hostos has been somewhat delayed due to changes in the composition of the BHE.

Chancellor Kibbee announced that a series of presidential evaluations as well as an evaluation of the Chancellor were scheduled for this year and that the committees for these were proceeding at a reasonable rate so that they might be expected to make their visits in February or March and submit some report by the end of the spring term.

Finally, the Chancellor announced that he had visited the Kingsborough campus.

Chancellor Kibbee then responded to the following questions submitted in writing: 1) Professor Wakatama (Medgar Evers) - "What is the rationale of putting the SEEK funds under the President and not under the Director of the SEEK program?" and "What is the rationale for limiting the SEEK department to remedial courses, while compensatory courses are under the control of the teaching department?"/ The whole thrust of the SEEK guidelines is directed at removing ambiguities that have been present in the existing guidelines. The first principle is that the program is larger than the department and includes the whole educational experience of SEEK students; therefore, the real responsibility for SEEK rests with the President and the total faculty. Budgeting has always been under the President and will continue

to be there. The Guidelines provide for the preparation of academic and fiscal plans to be submitted by the president and those plans will form the basis for the year's operation of the program. On the allocation of courses between the SEEK department and the academic departments - compensatory courses are regular college work offered in some form that differs from the usual, e.g. they may be elongated. Nevertheless, it is my feeling that they should be taught by the college departments, that there should not be two different groups teaching the same subject. 2) Professor Pinciss (Hunter) - "With reference to the proposal to transfer SEEK department members teaching developmental and compensatory courses into appropriate academic departments: 1) Is the Chancellor aware that this will be detrimental to a number of academic departments, for it will mean that a majority of the voting members of these departments will be concerned exclusively with the teaching of basic classes? In such a situation, it is impossible to build or maintain a strong academic department. 2) Why does the Chancellor feel it necessary to impose a uniform plan on the colleges; cannot the individual colleges submit proposals for linking academic disciplines with SEEK teachers?"/ In response to both questions I might tell you what will be coming out in the second version of the Guidelines. There will be provision for more flexibility on the teaching of remediation as well as more flexibility on developmental courses, though not on compensatory courses. I am collecting information on what is involved in terms of where people are located and am trying to devise a way to protect legitimate interests of people already within departments. We don't want what we do to be overly disruptive though some disruption is probably necessary. 3) Professor Hernandez-Miyares (Kingsborough) - "Could you give us a brief report on the plans for consolidation of some foreign language areas that were contemplated by the Central Office some months ago?" and "Do you favor the reactivation of the CUNY Study Abroad Program or the development of a new International Studies Program?"/ On the first question - we have no active proposal concerning the consolidation of foreign languages although it is a question that continues to interest me, in terms of how to make the best use of the human resources we have. We don't have a proposal but we are continuing to study what kinds of possibilities there are and how they might be implemented. In response to the second question - the Study Abroad Program was dropped last year for financial reasons. We are now in conversation with SUNY on various areas for cooperation and one is International Education. The point of the study that is being made would be whether there is some way to jointly administer such a program. Nothing has reached the decision stage but it is part of the discussion that is going on.

Chancellor Kibbee then responded to the following questions from the floor: 1) Professor Lea (Lehman) - " I should like to ask about an issue that may lead to problems in a few years. Mr. Shanker speaking on the telecast "Newsmakers" recently charged that there were many teachers in the N.Y.C. school system who were below the literacy line and in the discussion that took place reference was made to teachers who were not literate. This seems to go to the heart of the bi-lingual programs. Do you think that some degree of supervision is needed? What screening process is there to insure that graduates going into teaching are literate?/ We know that there are two ways of looking at the bi-lingual programs - what programs should there be for teachers and also what do we want for our own programs of bi-lingual education. We hope that we have the same high standards for bi-lingual as for single language teachers. We are in the process of looking at the total teacher education offerings as part of our long-range planning effort. At the moment quality is peripheral and the focus is on the duplication of programs and possible consolidation. The question is a good one. 2) Professor Roman (Hostos Community) - " Hostos was not mentioned in your comments on construction plans. We have been informed that in order for the Hostos project to be resumed it must be excluded from the State freeze on construction projects at CUNY and that the freeze will not be lifted until there is a long-range

plan. Why not free Hostos from the freeze if Hunter and Lehman are being freed?"/ The Hostos construction is a separate operation, we have been told, since it is a matter of renovation rather than construction. There is not really a freeze except that people said there would be no approval of projects until they saw a total plan. We could see ourselves getting trapped by such an approach. The question was not raised in connection with Lehman because of the banks' decision to underwrite the bonds. The CCNY project raised the question of the long-range plan but it was not pressed. When the Hunter project was raised, the question of the plan was raised again and a tougher attitude was taken so that the question is not settled yet. Hunter's project has not yet been released. We do have an expression of interest from a bank concerning Hostos, however, and we also put the Hostos project in the capital budget request. The Governor's office indicates that they would like to approve it and we don't know whether they will use the renovation as an excuse. So far as a long-range plan is concerned, none is possible until the BHE decides what to do and that will not be available until June, if then. If I were asked, I would say that I am a little optimistic about Hostos. 3) Professor Gosselin (Bronx Community) - " I should like to ask about skills testing. Do you have any news for us about the tests and how do you plan to distribute students in need of remediation throughout the University?"/ On the first - the Policy Committee and committees in each area have been established and they have been meeting to discuss the instruments that will be used in testing. I don't know of anything new beyond that although there may be something I have not yet heard. On the second - under the present Guidelines the number of underprepared students entering the University is not going to decrease in the number of years that are going to make a difference to you or to me. It is possible though that the distribution may be different. There may be fewer and certainly there will be a number needing less remediation. 4) Professor Roberts (Lehman) - " Among the other anxieties that people on my campus have there is the position of Mayor-elect Koch on the residency requirement for city employees. Is there a possibility that since the State funds 75% of the senior college budgets CUNY might be exempt? What do you think may be forthcoming on this issue?"/ The question was raised, of course, by the BHE some years ago by people who were interested in assuring that faculty reside in the City though they were thinking of grandfathering in those already here. Generally there has been a movement around the country on the question of public employees living in the area where they are employed and that has been tried and upheld in the courts. So far as the University is concerned the University would not feel bound by the City rule on the grounds that we are not a mayoral agency - and, of course, it is true that we are partially a state agency. 5) Professor Nowinski (Hostos) - "At our last meeting you said that you would try to find out the rationale behind the naming of the Vice-President for Program Development at our college. Have you a reply for us? And why was the faculty kept ignorant of this appointment?"/ My answer to the second part of your question is no; I can not tell you about the motives of anyone else. To the first part - my understanding is that the person is a lobbyist/grants man who is part-time and whose salary is about that of a second level instructor. He is being paid out of grant money and his assignment is to get money for the college. 6) Professor Baumrin (Lehman) - " Many CUNY programs have been deleted for budgetary reasons and yet it is my understanding that in the case of the Study Abroad program, at least in England, it didn't cost anything. But you said the deletion was justified for financial reasons."/ I don't know about particular programs but what was eliminated was the central operation of the program. We didn't really eliminate study abroad since many of the colleges carry on by themselves. Professor Baumrin further asked - " Is it the case that in the appropriate set of criteria for the evaluation of presidents there is a criterion concerning the extent of consultation they have had on budget etc.?"/ I will share the criteria with you. 7) Professor Ferentz (Brooklyn) - " Both Brooklyn College and Lehman College in their projections

for next year have exceeded the goals projected for them in the Yellow Book for 1985. Is there any thought being given to revising the infamous last page in the Yellow Book?"/ We have to be careful what we say. It is possible to say we have reached our 1990 state in 1976 but that does not mean we can change our base. We are not going to try to con anyone. 8) Professor Eisen (Brooklyn) - " At the meeting that you had with the Brooklyn College Senate delegation there was discussion of this year's budget and a question was raised concerning the adjunct budget for the spring. You said you would explore getting more money for adjuncts with the president and I wonder whether anything has been done on that score?"/ Such a proposal has been worked out and the Central Office people are going to Albany next week to get permission for the college to shift funds. How the State Budget Office is going to respond is not known but I think it will be acceptable to them. 9) Professor Ehrenpreis (Bronx Community) "I am sorry that what I have to ask is not likely to cause levity - it is a question concerning security for the persons of the faculty, the instructional staff, the non-instructional staff, the students, and property. What has moved up from our high schools is not only inadequately trained students but an attitude that causes concern. Recently a faculty member at my college was struck with such force that the student's hand was broken. That incident is not unique. There are adequate safeguards for students but the rights of faculty to be protected from violence are not as clear. I am concerned because of the University's hiring practice in relation to security people and I am concerned whether the Central Office and the BHE are aware of the situation that is becoming more and more chronic, troublesome, and frightening for those who wish to maintain the University."/ I don't know how to answer the question. The University has spent time in various Task Forces to examine security problems and ways to employ personnel. Until now the feeling has been to go with a rented police force except at John Jay. Some things, however, can only be dealt with after the fact. There are certain provisions in the By-laws and the law that are clear to the extent that the college can deal with the problem. There is also the criminal route as part of the civil law. The college can only remove the student and I am certain that such a student would be brought up on charges. Professor Ehrenpreis further stated - "The type of security people we have are inadequate. Wouldn't having our own be more advisable? The amount of money the University loses through vandalism and theft is much more than the cost of an adequate security force."/ Such a force wouldn't reduce theft and vandalism that much. The other alternative is to have a civil service system where inadequate personnel could not be removed. 10) Professor Rempson (Bronx Community) - " Do you anticipate changes for the College Discovery program pursuant to those for SEEK?"/ There will be guidelines for College Discovery too but they will not be identical to those for SEEK since the programs were set up differently, developed differently, etc. 11) Professor Gruenebaum (Brooklyn) - " Have you seen the Graduate School News Report for November? On page 1 there is a large photograph and an article about the Board of Visitors which I understand is an honorific rather than a body with much authority in graduate school affairs; on page 2 there is an article stating that a member of the Doctoral Faculty has been awarded the Nobel Prize. Would you care to comment on the placement of these articles in relation to their relative importance?"/ That report is published by the Graduate School and not by the University. The Board of Visitors, however, is a board put together of reasonably prominent citizens of means who might support the activities of the Graduate School or generate funds for it; so, although they are not important as a policy-making group, they could be important in the total scheme of things. The Nobel prize winner was treated differently by the University and by Hunter College. She is not a graduate of the Graduate School and is, I believe, only peripherally related to the Doctoral Faculty. I do not see anything terribly significant in the articles, however. 12) Professor Page (New York City Community) - " I would appreciate it if you would elucidate your brief commentary on the evaluation of presidents."/ The policy was adopted six months ago by the BHE. There is to be a team made up of ex-

ternal evaluators one of whom is the chairperson of the most recent Middle States Association team. The others are distinguished educators and one is the president of another comparable institution. They will look at most of the things that presidents do. I will be happy to share the information with you including the instructions sent to the teams. Professor Valinsky interjected - "It is correct that they will spend 1 and 1/2 to 3 days on campus, is it not and that the assumption is they will be able to talk with a great variety of groups during that period of time."/Yes. 13) Professor Baumrin (Lehman) - "I assume that you have heard that there is an intent to propose Dr. Yalow as a Distinguished Professor and that you certainly would not be averse to such a proposal. Also, perhaps the way to deal with the Graduate School report is to ask Professor Caws to carry the question to the Graduate Policy Council."

VI. Discussion of Financial Aid for Part-time Students: Professor Valinsky explained that the original intent had been to have Mr. Ed Roberts, chairperson of the University Student Senate, and Mr. Brian Kanzaki, also of the University Student Senate, present to discuss this issue. Unfortunately, they learned that the Search Committee of which they are members is conducting interviews this evening and therefore they are unable to attend. Ms. Helen Birenbaum, newly appointed Director of Financial Aid, former member of the Senate delegation from New York City Community College and of the UFS Executive Committee, had also been asked to attend and fortunately she was present.

Professor Ann M. Burton, vice-chairman of the Senate, reminded the Senate that discussions have been underway for a joint campaign by the Faculty and Student Senates to secure additional funding for financial assistance for part-time students and that the UFS SGS committee is collecting data to be used in this connection. She then welcomed Ms. Birenbaum on behalf of the Senate.

Ms. Birenbaum expressed her pleasure to be with the UFS especially on the very day she had moved into her new office. She then commented on the importance of the part-time student not only at CUNY but throughout the country as enrollment in traditional student population declined. She alluded to the article in the current issue of the Chronicle of Higher Education concerning John F. Kennedy College in California which enrolls only part-time students. She noted too that the private sector spends some \$2.5 billion on part-time learners.

Ms. Birenbaum explained that CUNY demographics reflect an older age group than is common among other part-time student populations with 29 being the average age. 56% of CUNY's part-time students are women and they tend to be older on the average than the male part-time students. A large percentage of CUNY part-time students work. She explained too that there is little financial assistance available to the part-time student. When tuition was imposed the CAP program was instituted by the University to insure that students who wished to could continue to attend the University. CAP made funds available to 21,000 students - 10,000 in the senior colleges and 11,000 in the community colleges. Those students came from the lower income group with a majority having family incomes under \$6000 and 70% being independent.

The present situation, Ms. Birenbaum continued, is that TAP requires full-time attendance. Therefore, without a program of financial aid for part-time students many are forced to go full-time at night and this has an effect on the patterns students can follow in seeking their education. If they are part-time students they can attend two nights a week but if they pursue full-time programs they must attend four nights and this affects the quality of work, their life-style, their academic performance. These effects have been seen in the senior colleges this year where no aid available. The CAP program though greatly reduced continues to be available

to part-time students in the community colleges because the City provided funds for it.

Ms. Birenbaum reminded the Senate of the ACUSNY effort to push for changes in the TAP program for next year so that some aid might be available under TAP for part-time students. She reminded the Senate too that the CUNY Budget Request includes a sum of \$3 million for CAP for 1978-79. Finally, she reminded the Senate the the Office of Financial Aid administers \$100 million in financial aid for CUNY students.

Various questions and comments were then made from the floor. They included speculation on the likelihood of the \$3 million budget request being granted, the differences between this year's CAP program and that of last year, the relationship between the decline in the number of part-time students and the withdrawal of CAP from the senior colleges, the logistics involved in administering the \$100 million budget for financial assistance, administrative costs of the financial aid program, and a plea that students be made aware at the time financial aid checks are issued of the need to attend class even if their receipt of aid does not depend on such attendance.

VII. Discussion of Proposed Guidelines on SEEK: Professor Stansky (Baruch), chairman of the UFS Ad Hoc Committee on SEEK, presented the report of her committee. The committee members are: Professors Lederman (Baruch), Wedeen (Brooklyn), Gioliella (City), Santoro (Hunter), Lea (Lehman), Wakatama (Medgar Evers), Krich (Queens), Hernandez-Miyares (Kingsborough), and Wasser (Staten Island). Professor Stansky noted that the Ad Hoc Committee recognized the need for Guidelines within which the SEEK program might operate and commended the Chancellor in his endeavor to maximize effectiveness of the program while attempting in a period of shrinking educational dollars to minimize its cost. She noted too for the Committee that there were serious academic and administrative questions as well as substantive and procedural issues raised in the present form of the Guidelines. The Committee was constrained, she continued, to endorse a report that did not contain (1) a statement of justification, (2) a statement of probable impact and consequences on current and future operations and (3) a projected timetable. Professor Stansky then detailed the committee's concerns with the Guidelines in their present form. She stated the Committee's specific recommendations as follow: 1) that the University Faculty Senate endorse the overall objectives of the proposed guidelines with the following qualifications: a) that a committee of faculty be constituted to draft guidelines for merging faculties and departments before the SEEK Guidelines are implemented and that such guidelines, if approved, be made part of the SEEK proposal; b) that specific guidance be given the Presidents in the guidelines with respect to faculty input on the academic and fiscal plans (the faculty here include both SEEK and Non-SEEK faculty); c) that specific faculty rights and responsibilities in the area of budget preparation and execution be recognized and included as part of the Chancellor's proposal; d) that express and not merely tacit recognition be given to the responsibility of the faculty in matters of educational and academic policies; 2) that the guidelines be augmented with the addition of the following statements: a) statement of history of the program; b) statement of justification for the proposed changes; c) impact statement on academic and fiscal matters for each campus; d) projected timetable for implementation; 3) that in accordance with the Board's own policy on matters that involve restructuring, a Public Hearing be held on the proposed guidelines to afford all interested persons an opportunity to comment and discuss the guidelines before the Board acts to adopt.

Professor Valinsky explained that the Committee's report was preliminary and based on the tentative guidelines but had been placed on the agenda of the

Plenary so that Senators might comment and make suggestions which might then be incorporated in a final statement by the UFS. The discussion that followed raised a number of issues and concerns. Included among these were: the personnel problem both in relation to SEEK and non-SEEK personnel, the time needed to carry out the drawing up of guidelines as proposed by the Ad Hoc Committee, the differences among units in the administration of SEEK, the integrity of the departments of a college, the differences in qualifications for SEEK and non-SEEK personnel. It was clear from the discussion and comments that the proposals concerning transfer of personnel were of great concern as were budgeting problems.

Professor Valinsky stated that the comments would be reviewed and a proposed statement prepared for the next Plenary Session. The session adjourned at 9:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Radmila Milentijevic
Secretary