

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

January 10, 1978

The meeting was called to order at 6:50 p.m. in Room 207 at the Graduate Center by the Chairman, Professor David Valinsky. All members were present except Professors Abramson, Anderson, Bard, Berger, Brostoff, T. Brown, Bryant, Buder, Caws, Ceccarelli, Charney, Diamond, Dierlam, Dreiling, Ehrenpreis, Elster, Gilbert, Greenbaum, Harvey, Hogg, Hunte, Klarfeld, Krich, Leiter, Lekachman, Leonard, Levy, Lutz, Magnus, Marcinek, Martin, Nash, S. Page, Paster, Patterson, Petratos, Peyre, Pinciss, Ratensky, Rempson, Robbins, V. Roberts, Rootenberg, Rothman, Rustow, Santoro, Schwartz, Silver, Toback, Uretsky, and Zimmerman. Professors E. Brown, Dolciani, Hernandez-Miyares, Karfunkel, Raskin, Ringel, Wakatama, and Yousef were excused. Professor Campbell, liaison member (PSC), attended. Chancellor Robert J. Kibbee and Dr. Jean Ellis also attended.

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

II. Approval of the Minutes of the 71st Plenary Session: The minutes were approved with the following correction: Professor Peyre's absence was excused.

III. Communications from the Chairman: Professor Valinsky introduced the following new Senators: Professors Gloria Waldman (York) and Richard Yuster (Queensborough Community). He announced that the Executive Committee of the UFS would meet with the Executive Committee of the Council of Presidents at the request of the Chancellor on January 11. Presidents Goldstein, Lief, Schmeiler, Segall, Shenker, Volpe and Wexler serve on that Committee. Dr. Valinsky said that it was the hope of the UFS leadership that the meeting would be the first of a continuing series of discussions.

Dr. Valinsky also reported that the BHE Committee on Central Administration was reviewing a set of guidelines to implement its policy on evaluation of presidents. He said that he had reiterated the Senate's opposition to the structure of that evaluation process and to the composition of the evaluation teams. He also criticized the guidelines for implementation because of a failure to include safeguards that would insure access by the team to information developed independently of that provided by the president and his staff and for limiting the team's on-campus visit to a period of three days. He had suggested that the adequacy of the information received by the team would depend almost entirely on the chairman of the team. Dr. Valinsky had also suggested that to make the process an on-going one there should be a mandate that use be made of materials developed over a period of time by University and campus groups.

Dr. Valinsky next related the developments concerning the proposed SEEK guidelines that had occurred since the last Plenary session: 1) the Executive Committee and members of the Ad Hoc Committee on SEEK met twice to discuss the proposed guidelines and develop a UFS statement on them. The concerns expressed at the last Plenary were reviewed and the substance of the Senate's reactions was transmitted to the Chancellor; 2) the Executive Committee obtained data suggesting that the impact of the proposed guidelines would have a substantial effect on only a limited number of departments; 3) a new set of guidelines has just been circulated and is being reviewed by the EEO committee of the BHE. A preliminary study of the revisions suggests that several changes responsive to our concerns have been included. In particular, the revised version includes provision for faculty input in the development of the academic plan, provision for flexibility in the areas of merging curricula and transfer of personnel, additional safeguards for faculty who may be transferred from

SEEK to academic departments and vice-versa, and an implementation date of September, 1978; 4) we have also learned that there will be a public hearing on the guidelines, possibly later this month. At that time, there will be a statement on behalf of the Senate outlining the principles that we deem essential to insure that SEEK provides a valuable educational experience for students enrolled in the program. For example, the active involvement of faculty, both SEEK and non-SEEK, in the development of all aspects of the program and especially in the design of the academic and fiscal plans; and the development of safeguards to protect the rights of both SEEK and non-SEEK faculty in the event of changes involving transfer of personnel. Dr. Valinsky also said that, if time permitted, copies of the guidelines would be distributed in time for Senators to respond before the hearing; in any case copies of the guidelines will be distributed.

Dr. Valinsky announced that the Executive Committees of the CUNY and SUNY Faculty Senates would hold their next joint meeting in Albany on Monday, January 23. At that time they will meet with Senator John Marchi to discuss the state of public higher education in New York placing special emphasis on the two Senates' conviction that increasingly the State is providing monies to the privates at the expense of the public institutions.

IV. Discussion of Cooperative Education, Recruitment, and Fund-Raising: Dr. Valinsky introduced the agenda item, explaining that the Senate was pleased to have as its guest President Joseph Shenker of La Guardia Community College. Since, in spite of the difficulties most CUNY units are suffering at this time, La Guardia has witnessed a sharp increase in enrollment, it seemed to the Senate leadership that President Shenker and his college must be doing something right. In particular, three facets of the college might be responsible for the college's success: cooperative education, recruitment, and fund-raising.

Dr. Valinsky then presented President Shenker to the Plenary, explaining that he was a graduate of Hunter College where he majored in Economics and Psychology, had a master's degree from Hunter in Economics, and held an Ed.D. in Higher Education Administration from Teacher's College, Columbia University. President Shenker, Dr. Valinsky, continued, was appointed to the presidency of La Guardia in April 1970 and before that time had served as acting President of Kingsborough Community College, Dean of Community College Affairs at CUNY, and had filled a number of other posts in the University's Central Administration.

President Shenker thanked the Senate for its invitation and said that he had decided that there was no way to describe the various facets of La Guardia he had been asked to address in a single, lengthy presentation. Instead, therefore, he had chosen to have a series of short presentations by himself and members of his staff who had accompanied him. After the presentations, he, his staff, and the La Guardia Senators would be happy to respond to questions. He then introduced the Deans who had accompanied him, explaining that each presentation would be related to the Dean's function in the college: Dean Harry N. Heinemann, Dean for Cooperative Education; Dean Martin G. Moed, Dean of Faculty; and Dean Augusta Kappner, Dean of Continuing Education, were then introduced.

President Shenker explained that La Guardia is a cooperative education college and that that designation might mean something different from a college with a cooperative education program: 1) at La Guardia, the college, its structure, its curriculum, its calendar were all based on the fact that it is a cooperative education college and 2) in the area of grants, at La Guardia most of the grants received were in program monies, i.e. to serve populations rather than to be research-oriented. At present, \$2.8 million of La Guardia's \$10 million operating budget comes from grant monies.

Dean Heinemann expanded on President Shenker's remarks concerning La Guardia's status as a cooperative education college. Translated into practical terms, he said, that means that all undergraduates must complete three thirteen week cooperative education experiences to earn a degree. Thus, cooperative education is not an end in itself but an educational strategy and time and resources are devoted to integrating the work experiences into the classroom activity. Getting a job is a means to accomplish certain goals: 1) the field experience provides the opportunity to reality test the student's experience in the classroom and to reality test his/her career choices; 2) it is a vehicle to understand the environment of work and thus has important educational outcomes; 3) it is a process which provides the opportunity for students to mature, to be exposed to various role models, etc. Thus, the classroom plus the work experience develop skills which become the tools to supply the cognitive background that permits the graduate to succeed. Dean Heinemann also said that if one asked how the cooperative education approach affected the educational process, whether it did make a difference, the response of both students and graduates is "yes". If one looks at graduates' performance in the labor market - about 50% of the college's graduates are employed and are earning a median income of \$8,300 which is \$200 higher than the median family income of freshmen attending the college; they are employed in New York City and in the field of their career choice. On the basis of data now coming in on the classes of '74 and '75 it appears that the graduates are moving up in the organizations which employ them. Therefore, Dean Heinemann continued, the college believes it has established something positive in the way of a track record with New York City employers. The college has also collected data on transfer students, i.e. those who enter the senior units of the University and the data here suggest that La Guardia graduates do very well. The data are soft but indicate that the transfers carry through.

Dean Martin Moed then spoke to the broader implications of the cooperative education model at La Guardia, suggesting that it created an important experience for students by giving them a chance to consider careers, internships, jobs to which they would otherwise not have had the opportunity to be exposed. From the point of view of the college, about two years ago, the question of the effect, if any, of the cooperative education model on the classroom work became important. The literature on cooperative education suggests that it does have an effect but when the faculty at La Guardia were asked whether there was a difference, their response was "no, not different from elsewhere." The college thus realized that although the notion of linkage between the classroom and the work experience had potential, it was at that time mere rhetoric. They therefore set out to deal with the problem and framed the following question for investigation: "Can the cooperative education experience enrich the classroom? And if so, how?" A pilot program that included 14 people, 7 cooperative education people and 7 academic people was developed and out of that came the notion that is known as TAR - Teaching, Application, Relationship. The conclusion was reached that if one could conceptualize the workplace as a laboratory it would be a place where one could build on the experience taught in the classroom. Just as in other laboratories, however, there was a need to prepare students by telling them what to do, what was the purpose of the observations they were expected to make, etc. After three years of preparation the program has now been launched and students are going out for the first time on programs related to the classroom experience. Each student has a manual, a kind of workbook, to prepare him/her for the internship; there is a cooperative education manual; and there is a field workbook. In addition, each student meets with his/her coop adviser or a faculty member once a week to review his experience. The job experience, Dean Moed pointed out, created a host of issues to explore in the area of human relationships. Furthermore, the question of student satisfaction with the experience could be related through such discussion

with the question of whether that satisfaction (or lack of satisfaction) was related to the way in which the organization for which he/she works perceives satisfaction. Dean Moed then described in some detail the TAR book and plan for Introduction to Social Science in order to clarify the general description he had offered.

Turning to the subject of recruitment, Dean Moed said he was not sure it was carried out very differently at La Guardia from other CUNY institutions. There is a faculty-administration recruiting committee that serves as a policy-making body and coordinating link for the recruitment process. In addition, the process depends heavily on faculty who go to college nights, for example. The college maintains close ties with guidance counselors in the high schools and makes use of personal contact, newsletters, various printed materials as well as the development of articulation links. So far as advertising is concerned, the college has used radio advertising to some advantage. This year for the second time it is using rock stations and has learned that 65% of the freshman class heard the advertising although that is not necessarily the reason they came to La Guardia. The radio spots are tied in with the time for filing applications. Finally, when La Guardia's first choices are sent to the college by the Office of Admission Services, there is a phonathon. Faculty talk to students and their parents and tell them about the college. The last activity, it is believed, may explain the college's high show rates.

Dean Moed also referred to La Guardia's Middle College high school, a program operated in cooperation with the Board of Education, that brings students in the 10th grade and above to the campus and serves to integrate the high school and college experience.

Dean Augusta Kappner then spoke on fund-raising. She emphasized that grant money was used to provide released time for faculty but that its primary thrust was to help maintain the quality of the college's programs. For example, the programs in bilingual education, in dietary techniques, and TAR were all able to begin because of outside funding. Another important thrust in the use of grant monies was to reach populations bypassed by others or by La Guardia, e.g. veterans, women reentering the labor force, city workers, the deaf and handicapped. Most of the college's grants are funded by federal or state programs. The college has determined that the most effective approach in seeking grant monies is to work with community agencies and pool resources. This is the pattern that was followed in developing the college's program for the deaf which was launched through one government grant, one foundation grant, and one corporation grant.

Dean Kappner described in some detail the college's program for the deaf and how it grew and also its program for inmates and correctional officers in the Queens House of Detention. Finally, she explained La Guardia's family day care program. In each case she made clear how the college became aware of the population seeking educational resources, how a program was launched to serve that population's needs, how other populations related to the original one then sought to join and how working with community agencies the college was able to develop programs responsive to the needs expressed and also to secure grant funding for them. She stressed that throughout the college's fund-raising effort was directed towards enriching, building, developing a project into a program.

President Shenker then summed up the presentations, saying that the reason for La Guardia's success, in his opinion, is the fact that people at his college work very hard - faculty, administration, and students.

A question and answer period followed in which a number of points were raised, such as the extent to which humanistic values were explored in what sounded like a

curriculum with a strong practical and utilitarian emphasis; what proportion of courses in the two year curriculum were academically oriented; the extent to which liberal arts and social science faculty were useful in the cooperative part of the program; the distinction between the two major kinds of internship offered students; the relationship of counselling staff to the program; the extent of retrenchment and the effect of that process on a student body being educated for jobs; the amount of time demanded of faculty to meet their commitment to the college's mission.

V. Chancellor's Report: Chancellor Kibbee reported the following: 1) on the Budget - The Executive Budget will be released on January 17 and at that time the University will know what the Governor has done for or to it. The Chancellor has been given a preview of the budget but has been sworn to silence. He did say that it is uneven in effect; in some cases it will be disappointing; in others not but on the whole it is not the disastrous kind of budget received in recent years. There are some problems that will have to be faced. He pointed out too that the community college budget is a city-oriented one and will have to await the Mayor's Executive Budget - not due for several months - before it is known. The Governor's Executive Budget includes the State's allocation to the community colleges based on a formula that is slightly improved but the totality of the community college budget will not be discovered until the city's comes out. 2) The Seek Guidelines have been revised and the EEO Committee of the BHE is reviewing them. There will be a Public Hearing on them during the week of January 23. 3) On Construction: The Chancellor referred to the media reports on the Hunter College project and said that although the University had obtained approval from the State for going ahead with the project, the City which has to pay about \$3 million in debt service had not agreed and had, as was known from the press, asked for a delay until the University's master plan on construction was available. The BHE considers the recent events to mark a temporary slowdown in resumption of construction. They have not taken the decision as final but are continuing to try to jar the Hunter project loose. 4) Budget Controls: This area, the Chancellor said, may not be familiar to faculty but is an on-going concern of the University administration. The University's revenue which consists of student fees and tuition is subject to constant monitoring. There are some problems due to the rate of collection required by the State which is extremely high as a result of the way in which the State treats accounts receivable and that in turn puts a burden on the University in terms of collecting current revenue fixing the rate at about 98%. This has affected tuition payment deferrals and has created problems for students. A second problem results on the budgetary side from the new system of clearing payments through the State and the result is that the University is running behind in some cases. There are also problems in filling vacancies which are subject to the Vacancy Control provisions of the State. 5) Reorganization of the Central Office: A set of proposals on reorganization of the Central Office has been discussed briefly with the BHE Committee on Central Administration and will be put forward within the next few weeks.

Chancellor Kibbee then responded to the following question presented in writing: Professor Lea (Lehman) - " You will have observed that the matter of non-literate public school teachers and principals in the NYC system continues to receive a great deal of attention in the press and on television, and the guess of some of us is that the matter will make headlines for quite some time to come. On Sunday last, for example, the city's Deputy Mayor for Education, Herman Badillo, a CUNY ally, said he was profoundly troubled about the allegations and intends to look into them. He emphasized that all public school teachers and principals have to have, minimally, a baccalaureate degree. The fear of some of us is that CUNY, which over the past few years has certified as competent through the graduation process not a few teachers now working in the city system, may eventually find itself charged with having graduated incompetents. We can predict, I think, that a movement towards a thorough investiga-

tion of the issue will follow the January 19th Stavisky hearings into the allegations. My questions are these: Do you think it worth CUNY's while to have a representative attend the Stavisky hearings as an observer, to hear what is said, to judge the implications of what is said? Second, what preparations, if any, are we making to stave off any possible attack on CUNY's educational standards, an attack that, if conducted only in the press at this time, might seriously jeopardize the financial support we hope to receive from the city and the state? And third, are we, in light of these recent changes, doing anything to evaluate all our teacher-education problems, to be sure they are, and will remain, above reproach?"/ I have heard the charges. I appeared on a radio program the Sunday before last with then Congressman Badillo who has a program at 8:30 a.m. Sunday morning and that Sunday was New Year's Day which may explain why it was not reported in the press. In any case, he raised the question and asked my impression. Certainly, no one can argue that we need more illiterate teachers but I think the term "literate" is not being used in the usual sense. I think there is a question about the level of literacy to be expected of high school teachers and also I think there is a question in relation to persons for whom English is a second language and who may be perfectly "literate" in their first language. Also there is the question raised by the fact that in the process of decentralization opportunities arose for teachers to be chosen who don't come off the lists. The University hasn't really looked into this question of whether they have been turned out by us because we have enough confidence in the University's programs to expect that our graduates would not fall into that category. I do agree that this is the kind of investigation that will get a wide coverage in the press.

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

- 1) Professor Baumrin (Lehman) - " I wouldn't want to ask you to divulge what you have been sworn not to divulge but could we perhaps talk about your feelings. On learning about the Budget on a scale of say 1 to 10 with 1 representing desperation and 10, elation could you say what you would have felt in predicting what you were going to learn as compared with what you learned by a difference of 1?"/ My differential would be -1.77, possibly because I too have optimism.
- 2) Professor Spinger (Brooklyn) - "If 7 were a breadbox, would you say it is greater than 7?"/ It depends on where you are. There are differentials in the budget.
- 3) Professor Valinsky (Baruch) - "What is the basis on which they determine their budget?"/ The State Budget Office is sophisticated; I would give them an 8 on a scale of 1 to 10. What they've done is to divorce completely the question from the two state systems and to leave it to us to make our own comparisons. What they have tried to do is to take an approach to the instructional side that is programmatic but the criteria are not entirely clear and on the other categories in the budget they are not clear at all. The impression I have is that they had a number they had to meet. There was a careful and reasonable analysis on the instructional side but then on the other things there was a distortion of the model to satisfy the number. This means that on the supplemental we will have to introduce rationality.
- 4) Professor Milentijevic (City) - " My question concerns the Koch/Goldin letter of December 26 concerning the ability of the University to produce master plans. What troubles me especially is the part about the private institutions. Not only are we to deal with our problems but to do so in relation to the "excellent" private institutions in New York. How do we deal with this?"/ I don't think we can respond the way the Mayor stated it. I don't know the master plan of the privates, nor how to get it nor do I think the Mayor will get it. He'll have to deal with that once we produce what we produce. Professor Milentijevic further asked -"Since we are dealing with politicians - in December Senator Leichtner launched a real attack on the way CUNY collected tuition, used it, etc. What was your feeling about his attack?"/ I haven't heard about it. We have had some problems but they are largely concentrated in one institution.
- 5) Professor Davidson (La Guardia) - " Have you any ideas to give us concerning how we stand in relationship to the EFCB since the new Mayor has chosen to reevaluate the new UFT contract until his people have a chance to review it. We

are in January now and contract negotiations have been completed for some four or five months. We did so well in the negotiations in relation to coming to terms that it seems unfortunate now to have this long delay. Is there any way to get the contract out?"/ I can't answer that. We sent the contract and its financial implications to the City even before it had been formally adopted. In return, they sent us a long, involved set of papers to complete as part of their analysis of the contract. How much our contract might get tied in with that of the UFT I don't know but if the issues are similar we may get caught up in it. Since the new Mayor is going to want to have a look at it in any case he may not have a choice. We have always had an agreement with the State concerning their willingness to meet their part of the funding of a new contract. 6) Professor Nowinski (Hostos) - " Have you any updated information to give us on the renovation - since you chose to term it renovation not construction - of the Hostos building on Grand Concourse?"/ I know that it was discussed when President Wexler and I met with the State people about the Hunter project and the State expressed interest in it. A week or so later, however, we received word that they didn't know about the City's position. 7) Professor Roman (Hostos) - " Do you have anything new to report on the status of the English and Math exams for transfer to the senior colleges? Is anything being done for the ESL student in terms of the exam?"/ The Committees have been meeting and the Reading Committee has submitted its report; the final reports from the other committees were not received until last week. There is a report from Dean Rosenstock on the status of the exams and I will be happy to make it available to you. 8) Professor Wasser (College of Staten Island) - " The University was involved in discussion about possible consolidation of programs some months ago and I wondered whether there has been any movement on this. What has happened in terms of foreign language? Or does further activity in this area await the appointment of a new Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs?"/ There is movement to some extent - to the extent that there are statements in the Long-Range Planning reports being developed by the BHE. Whatever comes out of the discussions will not be done instantaneously, however. What we intend is to try to work out something that will be workable and acceptable. 9) Professor Sohmer (City) - " What effect do you think the Presidents' going to Albany to discuss the funds needed for running their enterprise might have with respect to the imposition of Vacancy Decontrol provisions on hiring especially in the senior colleges?"/ Their idea of a disaster and ours is not a common one. They look at the stuff we submit but say no. Partly it is the State's fault. We have been in constant discussion for a year. They ask us our priorities and we state them but they don't necessarily accept them. It is a real scene but one that is not going to be continuous. Where the difficulty lies is in the conflict between our being what they want and their believing what we say.

VI. Discussion of CAP: Dr. Valinsky then introduced Mr. Brian Kanzaki, Legislative Director of the University Student Senate. Mr. Kanzaki then outlined for the Plenary the history of the CAP program at CUNY and reminded the Senate that at its December meeting the Director of Financial Aid had discussed the technical aspects of the program. Mr. Kanzaki addressed the major portion of his remarks to current joint efforts by the UFS and USS to secure aid for part-time students and outlined possible future approaches.

Mr. Kanzaki explained that the University had made some changes in the current program of aid to part-time students largely because the terms under which it was being conducted were so restrictive that much of the money allocated for the purpose was not spent. Therefore, the University is now going to double retroactively the aid granted for the Fall term and to do the same in the Spring term. The doubling will affect grants already made to students and will not increase the number of students receiving aid.

The ACUSNY proposal was then outlined by Mr. Kanzaki. Specifically, the portion of that proposal that deals with financial aid for part-time students asks for aid for students who have completed a minimum of 30 credits towards the degree and that re-

quirement makes the proposal objectionable. In addition, Mr. Kanzaki said that it was doubtful that the \$3 million included in the CUNY Budget Request for aid to part-time students would be included in the Executive Budget. Even though an effort will be made to obtain those funds through the Supplemental Budget, the amount available for aid to part-time students will not approach the amount available in 1976-77 under the original CAP program.

Mr. Kanzaki also explained some of the special problems for students created by the loss of CAP in the senior colleges and the reduction of CAP in the community colleges. One problem is that in order to qualify for TAP students must be full-time. Some part-time students have therefore become full-time students which means that instead of being able to attend two nights a week and take 8 credits, they must attend classes four nights a week to take a third course. This is the straw that breaks the camel's back, said Mr. Kanzaki, because of the time commitment which disrupts family life etc.

Mr. Kanzaki said that he thought the UFS and USS must fight together to maximize aid to part-time students. He said that there is no inevitability of enrollment declines, that there is a pool of students that should be supported.

A question and answer period followed in which the possibility of using reading courses to convert part-time to full-time students was discussed and in which the possibility of weekend classes was raised. On the former it was indicated that each campus has its own policy or program and that those students who needed reading courses also needed the Lebensraum in which to take them. On the question of weekend classes there was support since this might be a very important component of the working student's educational needs. One problem might lie in the difficulty of offering sufficient work on weekends to permit completion of a degree in a field of choice and therefore, said Mr. Kanzaki, some thought might be given to the possibility of developing something analagous to the CUNY BA. Finally, the possibility of alegislative approach to the solution of the problem was raised and it was indicated that the USS is working in concert with SASU (the SUNY counterpart) in this area but they regard it as an uphill battle even though there are two pieces of legislation that have been introduced. One of these is deficient because it really provides more funds for the privates, the other includes a formula for graduating aid in relation to courses.

The importance of trying to do some consciousness raising among faculty on the problem was stressed by Professor Burton who also suggested that discussion might also include the possibility of reversing those policies which prohibited employment of students on campus.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Radmila Milentijevic
Secretary