

Prof. J. Kibbee
Felt

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

February 21, 1978

The meeting was called to order at 6:45 p.m. by the Chairman, Professor David Valinsky in the Third Floor Studio at the Graduate Center. All members were present except Professors Abramson, Anderson, Bryant, Buder, Dreiling, Eisen, Elster, Gilbert, Greenbaum, Harvey, Klarfeld, Krich, Leiter, Lekachman, Leonard, Levy, Lutz, Montalvo, Nash, Portner, Robbins, Rootenberg, Rothman, Ruttenberg, Sacks, Santoro, Schwartz, Silver, Spinninger, Toback, Uretsky, and Yousef. Professors Bard, T. Brown, Ceccarelli, Gosselin, Magnus, Nowinski, Patterson, Petratos, V. Roberts, Stevens, Timoni, and Wedeen. Professor Nachtsheim (AAUP liaison) and Zeller (PSC liaison) were present. Chancellor Robert J. Kibbee and Dr. Jean Ellis also attended.

- I. Approval of the Tentative Agenda: The tentative agenda was approved with the following change: item 3 to item 5 ; item 4 to item 3; item 5 to item 4.
- II. Approval of the Minutes of the 72nd Plenary Session: The minutes were approved with the following corrections: p. 6, l. 9 education programs; p. 6, l. 31 be 1.77.
- III. Election of Member-at-Large of the Executive Committee: Professor Valinsky announced the appointment of Professor Ornstein (Mt. Sinai) as parliamentarian to replace Professor Gruenebaum (Brooklyn) who has had to resign from the Senate. Professor Valinsky thanked Professor Gruenebaum for his service not only as parliamentarian but as chairman of the UFS committee on elections and organization during the past two years.

Professor Valinsky announced too that Professor Leonard (Lehman) had had to resign from his position on the Executive Committee and thanked him for his work during the past semester. Professor Leonard will continue as a member of the Lehman College delegation. The Nominating Committee report was made by Professor Milentijevic (City) and Professor Wasser (COSI) was offered as the nominee for member-at-large of the Executive Committee. There being no other nominations the Secretary was directed to cast a single ballot for Professor Wasser.

IV. Chancellor's Report: Chancellor Kibbee reported on the University Budget. He said that the senior college budgets were reduced by an absolute figure of \$8.4 million but that figure included \$3.1 million in fringe benefits which have no programmatic effect and \$1 million in deannualization costs which also have no programmatic effect. Therefore, the net reduction is about \$4 million. Of that, some is covered by the \$2.2 million lump sum included in the Executive Budget to forestall loss of faculty. A good part of the reduction, the Chancellor said, was in the area of operations and maintenance of the physical plants. The Supplemental Request is therefore being prepared to focus chiefly on that area and on enhancement of OTPS with selective proposal in other areas on both the instructional and non-instructional sides. The reason for this is that in drawing up the budget the State Budget Office tried to protect the instructional side more than the non-instructional side since they had to live with a number given them by the Governor's office.

Chancellor Kibbee said that the situation with respect to the community college budget is a different matter. The operating budget for the current year is \$152 million. For next year there are a number of items that tend

to affect that budget and if all of them come to pass there will be a serious problem. On the good side is the fact that there has been a slight change in the formula as well as an anticipated increase in enrollment and those two items together will produce about \$2.2 million additional revenue. The bad news is fivefold: 1) there is an increase of \$1.5 million in fringe benefit costs to be borne by the community colleges; this does not represent actual cost but rather reflects a more careful definition by the State Budget Office of the division of fringe benefit costs between the senior and community colleges; 2) there is also a change in the division of costs for the Central Office and University Programs budget. The division was 83/17 when the Chancellor came. On the basis of recommendations made over the years there came to be more of a division on the basis of enrollment and that was determined as 70/30 in the past. Because of changes in enrollment this year the State Budget Office has ruled that costs should be divided 60/40 for 1978-79 and this imposes an increased cost of \$2.2 million on the community colleges. The total increase up to this point is \$3.7 million. 3) For the first time the University must bear the cost of unemployment compensation; this was forced on us a year ago. In the senior colleges this cost is taken care of because of the State Budget Office's attitude on it, viz. that it is a fringe benefit and funds are provided for it; but the community colleges receive their State funding on a per student formula and therefore the \$2 million in costs for unemployment compensation must be borne by the University and the City; 4) the division of costs for the College of Staten Island is also being handled differently this year and \$1.4 million of the community college part of the COSI budget formerly borne by the State must now be borne by the City; 5) On top of these there is the question of what the City is going to do. There is talk of reducing the City's budget by some \$174 billion as its share of closing the budget gap with the State and Federal government doing the rest. If that happened we do not know to what extent it would be applied to the community colleges but it would mean additional reductions and would also offset any increase in the technical supplement included in the State funding formula and calculated to produce part of the \$2.2 additional revenue.

If all of these things happened, the Chancellor continued, and anticipated additional enrollment in the community colleges had to be absorbed the worst of all possible worlds would come upon us. The University is going to try to approach the problem in two ways: 1) we are going to try to get \$2 or \$3 million in the State Supplemental Request by seeking a save harmless provision on the shift in funding within COSI and on support for the Central Office functions; and 2) we are going to work to get unemployment insurance paid and an increase in support for fringe benefits. We are in the process of preparing an extensive document in cooperation with the colleges on the importance of the colleges to the City in the hope of maintaining if not improving the City contribution. Since there is also dissatisfaction among the community colleges upstate there is also the possibility of additional changes in the formula.

The Chancellor said that he would be going to Albany for a presentation to the Higher Education Committee of the Assembly on Wednesday, February 22 and that he would also be meeting with the State Budget Director and with Mr. Dullea in the Governor's Office to elicit support on the changes being sought. He did not feel sure of support from the executive side since so far as the community colleges are concerned they say it is a matter of local sponsorship and that is because of the problems throughout the State if the city community colleges were treated differently.

The Chancellor then reported on the status of the various construction pro-

jects. The Hunter College project is bogged down by the City's lack of willingness to give approval to go ahead. There is an agreement between the Governor and the Mayor on how to give money for amortization costs that would mean a \$10 million savings for the City and they are going to try to tie that in with construction. There has been a little movement on the renovation at Hostos Community College though the results of that movement are unknown. A visitation was made by representatives of the Mayor and the City Budget Office and they indicated a disposition to move ahead if they can do so without affecting the rationale they have offered for holding up the Hunter project. There is some good news and that is that the building that now houses the Hunter School of Nursing has at length been turned over to the BHE. Part of that building was held by the Health and Hospitals Corporation and there has been a running battle for several years on the issue of ownership. A week or so ago a letter from the Corporation Counsel of the City of New York was received stating that control of the property lay with the BHE. This will now allow Hunter to have all of its Health Science programs together in one location. There has also been some activity in relation to Borough of Manhattan Community College. Discussions have been held with the Board of Education concerning a major New York City High School - Washington Irving - where it is apparent that underenrollment exists. Because it appeared that it would be economically as well as educationally advantageous to gather together BMCC's programs negotiations were begun. There have been two conversations so far with representatives of the Chancellor of the school system and also meetings with the Borough President of Manhattan, the Comptroller, the President of the City Council and the Mayor's people to plant the seeds of the economic advantage to the City since it would eliminate the very high rental costs of BMCC. There is some reluctance on the part of the school system since it would mean relocating some 2,000 students. Nevertheless, the utilization of Washington Irving is about 55% making it the lowest in the City.

The Chancellor reported also on the revision of the SEEK Guidelines. He reviewed the history of the revision reminding the Senate that there have been three draft proposals to date. He announced that the EEO committee of the BHE was holding a hearing on the proposed Guidelines on February 23 and hoped on the basis of that hearing to make a final review of the proposal so that it might be placed on the BHE Calendar in March.

Chancellor Kibbee announced that a pilot administration of the competency tests has been begun. The results of that pilot administration he hoped to be able to report on at the next meeting of the Senate. He shared with the Senate the information that he had looked over the tests and taken the reading and mathematics exams although not the writing test. He said that it was hoped to have a full operation of the testing program for the September class.

There are about 11,000 new students for the spring term, the Chancellor reported, which is 1,500 to 2,000 fewer than last year but a number that compares favorably with previous years. The explanation may be that the February entrants last year were a larger group because they included students who instead of enrolling in the Fall waited because of the imposition of tuition and the generally unsettled state of the University. In reference to next year's applicants the Chancellor said that the first phase allocation would take place next week. The pool is down about 3,000 applicants but it is anticipated that there will be little or no change in enrollments. He reported too that there was an increase in the number of transfer students with advanced standing.

The Chancellor also reviewed the state of the various searches in progress.

There are three active searches for presidents at Queens, New York City Community College and Hostos Community College. Queens is the furthest along and by the end of the week seven candidates will have visited the campus, those on the short list. Next week the committee will meet with the Chancellor who will then recommend candidates to the BHE for decision. At NYCCC the advertising has been completed, the campus committee is in the process of paper screening and interviewing should begin soon. The search at Hostos has just begun.

Finally, the Chancellor announced that the BHE's evaluation of presidents and the Chancellor would begin shortly. The committees have been selected and the dates set so that there will be evaluations in March and April of the presidents of Brooklyn, Hunter, Kingsborough, and La Guardia and of the Chancellor.

Chancellor Kibbee then responded to the following questions from the floor: 1) Professor Shmidman (BMCC) - "Concerning the discussions about new facilities for my college I wonder whether the Board is satisfied that there is adequate space at Washington Irving. Have they been there recently? So far as I can judge there are no facilities for example, for faculty offices."/ We recognize that Washington Irving is not fully capable of accommodating the college and are exploring the possibility of finding additional facilities near by for such things as faculty offices. Nevertheless, it seems that Washington Irving and nearby other facilities would represent a step forward on a short term basis in terms of BMCC's present facilities and costs. 2) Professor Cooper (COSI) - "I thought I hear you say in reference to COSI's budget that the State had decided to divide it in the way it is presented in the Executive Budget. How do you reconcile that with the University Budget Request that included a \$1.4 million cut in COSI's budget?"/ The State had talked to us about how they wanted to divide the budget; that they would determine how much was upper division expense and would pay 75% of that. So it was really the State. 3) Professor Wakatama (Medgar Evers) - "When you talked about a supplementary budget request for the senior colleges Medgar Evers is by definition a community college but by function a senior college so how are the monies shared?"/ The request will be put in very specific terms and will say so much for this college for this purpose. The budget comes down from the State not as a lump sum but as a reflection of the Budget Director's determination of the colleges' needs. It wouldn't affect Medgar Evers; what would is the community college budget. We put that together by determining student/faculty ratios, staffing patterns, OMP etc. If the budget is reduced, since it was put together in a rational way we would take x% of that; we would subtract x from the appropriate allocation which would make it inappropriate. 4) Professor Roberts (Lehman) - "I wonder whether you might say a few things on planning on the part of the State and the City looking forward perhaps for five years. What kind of long-range, say five year commitments, can we expect from them? Have they developed any?"/ Not really. The City's fiscal plan for the next four years calls for gradual absorption of the senior college costs by the State - 85% in the first year, 90% in the second, 95% in the third and 100% in the fourth. This was supposedly worked out between the City and State but presumably the State didn't accept it although they did accept a change in the payment for construction costs. I suppose it reflects a judgment by the State about what they are ready to accept at this point. So far as the City is concerned, the present administration has been in office so short a time it is hard to tell. They have been thinking about other things. They haven't been ready to take an interest in the University on a philosophical level. But they need to present a budget by April and they have accepted the idea that they no longer control how much they will put into the senior colleges. One doesn't know at the moment whether the State is giving serious thought to changes in the University - its structure, governance, etc.

This is an election year and getting into an argument is not what they're looking for. People around the Governor may be giving thought to these matters and if they are able to get the Governor interested they might come up with a proposal for the next legislative session. Also, the present BHE's term of office ends on June 30, 1979 so some action will have to be taken then. People are considering issues but I don't think anyone is close to a firm plan. The City really hasn't given it any thought and the State is putting it off. 5) Professor Page (City) - " I have been absent unexcused 21 times so I really am entitled to 21 questions but I shall confine myself to one. The recent article in the Saturday Review by Dean Gross of City College has created considerable interest. President Marshak was annoyed about it and I understand that a letter from him will appear in the next issue of the Saturday Review. In that letter the President says that he is writing ' on behalf of the entire City College community'. He says the entire community but when he was asked in the City College Faculty Senate meeting whether he had consulted the faculty his response was 'no'. I think that he should have a slap on the wrist for that. Furthermore concerning the bio-medical program at City College - there has been a reduction of the City College budget but \$1 million was added to the bio-medical program budget. The students in that program don't come from New York; they're not required to work in New York after graduation. The sole reason for their being taken seems to be for the greater glory of Marshak./ The \$1 million was not added to the bio-medical program budget; it was substituted for soft money. At the beginning of the program it was agreed that tax-levy money would be substituted for the soft money that was used to launch it. Professor Page further said - "I can't go along with that explanation. Because from the outset tax-levy support was provided for the program. Also the Executive Budget includes a provision that provides a green light for the President to go ahead and add additional funds to the program if needed. I can't see the reason for that and I think something should be done about it. 6) Professor Roman (Hostos)- "Can you comment on the rumor that there are to be no promotion committees at Bronx Community College, Hunter, and Hostos Community College this year?"/ I have never heard it. Furthermore, there is no possibility that it could be true. Under the By-Laws there must be P&B committees. How many promotions will be passed on is another matter. Professor Roman further asked - "In the administration of the competency tests will there be any provision for ESL students?"/ I think so. 7) Professor Ehrenpreis (Bronx Community) - " As a member of the Bronx Community College P&B Committee I can say that our calendar calls for consideration of promotions this spring. I wanted to ask two questions. First in relation to the community college budgets. Sometime back the University contemplated the establishment of comprehensive colleges and thought in terms of development of the community colleges into comprehensive colleges. I realize it is not likely that this could be done in the original manner because of the budget but does the Central Office or the BHE consider the possibility of combining the weaker community colleges and senior colleges into comprehensive units to be funded by the State?"/ We need to be careful. Aside from the merits of such action the realities are that the funding doesn't change because of changes we make. They would have to go through as master plan amendments to be approved by the Regents and the Governor and the Governor is not stupid. He is not going to permit that. We are not in a position to just call something something. Professor Ehrenpreis further asked - " The City of New York is apparently contemplating a massive single unit type of collective bargaining arrangement. How do we fit in to such an arrangement?"/ To the extent that persons employed by the University are represented by DC 37 and other non-professional unions they will be dealt with as part of the general bargaining. There is no way in which the PSC can get involved since the City of New York is not the employer. The BHE is the employer. Professor Zeller, liaison member from the PSC, said that

the PSC has requested to sit in with the six municipal unions as an observer.

8) Professor Baumrin (Lehman) - "I was impressed by Professor Page's presentation but troubled by a number of points he raises concerning the bio-medical program and I wonder whether someone might not look into the possibility of the graduates of that program doing some work in the City of New York. My question is this: Imagine a legislative body - a faculty deliberative body of some college somewhere - expressing disapproval of its leadership; imagine if it happened here. I wonder if you could tell us how the BHE should receive such information and how they might handle it?"/ I guess it would depend. As you know the BHE has instituted procedures for evaluating the Presidents and the Chancellor and they will be carrying out those evaluations continuously at the rate of 3 or 4 a year. I would imagine that in a case where such an evaluation had just been done or was soon upcoming the response would be - in the case of the recently completed, if the BHE had accepted the external evaluation it would not go back and redo it; if it were an upcoming evaluation the BHE would wait for that and see that whatever input was there was made clearly known. Then they would deal with whatever the evaluators said and what the Chancellor said and would deal with that in some decent and non-descriptive way. If there were a case where no evaluation was around there are two possibilities - 1) they could institute an out-of-phase evaluation or 2) they could ask the Chancellor to investigate and report back to them. Then, they would have to decide whether the charges were not well taken or whether to recommend a change.

9) Professor Diamond (NYCCC) - " I am not at City College but by a quirk of circumstances I have been involved indirectly in the bio-medical program. I have learned that in the last few rounds of the National Boards the City College fellows wound up high on the list considering all the factors. Furthermore, if you add up the years the program has been in operation you know that the first class hasn't graduated yet. Also, the other day I checked out the list of foundations that have given to this program and found that if the program had not been there they would not have given the funds so that the college would not have got them or been able to use them.

10) Professor Davidson (La Guardia) - " About the end of January or early February we received a series of missives from 80th Street concerning a hiring freeze. They gave the date of January 25 and said that one couldn't employ anyone not on the payroll prior to that date. My questions are these: 1) What if you need to hire new adjuncts? What do we do; 2) Since the University has gone through its non-reappointments, retirements, etc., what do we do in September in those institutions where there are not drastic reductions? What about hiring faculty?"/ In response to your first question my understanding is that this does not apply to adjuncts or to hourly employees only to full-time employees. In response to the second that problem is now being worked out. The fact is that when the Mayor said this he said it in a general way and indicated that it would not be the same for all offices. Our Budget people had discussions with the appropriate persons today and hopefully they will be able to work this out. I can't tell you precisely what you do in any particular case but I can say that the number of instructional lines affected by the freeze is less than 7 in any college.

11) Professor Wasser (COSI) - " In this comparison of SUNY and CUNY that we received it is clear that in several categories SUNY does better than we do re: student/faculty ratios. Is there any way to work towards achieving parity in this area?"/ The graduate programs are a very special case because of differences in the way they are put together at SUNY and CUNY. The real problem is how you count third level students. The Governor's Budget Office made their interpretation of what percentage they were of full-time students which reduced the number of full-time students considerably. They would probably argue that they were in a sense treating us on a parity basis - that the difference is in the number of students and not in the ratios. My understanding is: at SUNY they are 25%; we tried for a higher figure; the Budget Office recalculated. They don't fully understand our

graduate students but they are becoming more knowledgeable. 12) Professor Ferentz (Brooklyn) - "My question falls in the locking the barn door category - but within the next eight years might it be possible for the University to get its act together concerning what to do in the event of snow. There were news releases emanating from the stations we have been told to listen to and not one word about the City University. It seems not too much to expect that one person at 80th Street might get in touch with the three stations and provide the information."/ We do have a procedure. The general principle is that the decision is a college one. I violated that principle in this case by just saying the City University is closed. The reason it was done that way was the nature of the storm but most storms are not of this type. The problem is that there are differences in terms of reaching the colleges so we ask the President to make his own evaluation. We will try to work out a system that reflects the principle that some storms will be handled on a university-wide basis and others locally and that it will depend on the magnitude of the storm. 13) Professor Yuster (Queensborough) - "Drastic economic, social and ecological changes have taken place in the City and some colleges have communicated proposals on curriculum to the BHE to reflect those changes. Also in the 71st Plenary Session you said we're in a stabilized condition. Therefore, do you think the BHE might begin acting on some of those proposals?"/ They have been acting on some proposals. Fewer have been submitted and the Board has been slow in dealing with them partly because it is involved in a Long-Range Planning operation. The Board has tried not to take action unless there is a very compelling reason for so doing. There is not quite a moratorium but a spirit of being a little chary until there is some agreement on institutional scope etc. 14) Professor Milentijevic (City) - "Chancellor Kibbee, my question deals with the funding of the Biomedical Program at City College as mandated in the Governor's Budget. Let me first say that I am very pleased to hear a statement of praise for the Biomedical Program from a colleague from another CUNY campus. The Biomedical Program is a pioneering one and a very valuable program that has attracted national recognition and support. It is also a very expensive program. One point raised by Professor Page reflects a perception shared by other faculty members at City College that at this time of budget cuts the costly Biomedical program is being protected and expanded at the expense of the rest of the College, a perception that other academic programs are suffering greater cuts so that the Biomedical Program can be maintained. You are correct in stating that the increased state funding for the Program is reflected in a lump sum of \$500,000 given to City College specifically for that program, thereby raising the tax levy funding of the Program to \$1.017 million. You are also aware that while President Marshak requested \$850,000, the Governor's budget falls short of this request by \$350,000, but at the same time mandates that: 'If, during 1978-79, additional outside funding terminates, tax levy resources from within the total senior college programs' budget will be made available to offset the loss.' In view of the recent article by Dean Gross in the Saturday Review and the negative impact which this article is having on fund-raising efforts at City College, the University may very well be faced with the problem of having to provide a sizable sum of money for the Biomedical Program from the operating budgets of the senior colleges. Should you be faced with this problem, how do you propose to deal with it?"/ To really answer your question I have to be long, and I have to tell some stories out of school. You are right that the City University request was for \$850,000 for the substitution of tax-levy for soft funds. The Budget Office had a problem, however. After they had agreed upon the budget they thought they had put the \$500,000 in - but they hadn't and that was a problem for them since they had to ask the Governor for more money. They got agreement to that but they also recognized that the amount of soft money lost might be greater. They are not saying that we can collect from the other colleges or other parts of City College. They know and we know that there are portions

of the budget that are unexpendable - there is \$1.5 million for rental and energy costs and we can use only the amount equal to actual costs; there is \$2 million to cushion the blows of attrition and we don't expect to have to use all of it since the faculty is already reduced; we also know there is an excess in SEEK stipends. Therefore, if we can demonstrate to them that x amount had to be absorbed, they would allow us to spend some of these other monies that are now unexpendable.

V. Communications from the Chairman: Professor Valinsky welcomed Professor Quinn who was resuming his seat after a leave of absence. He announced the following: 1) The University Faculty Senate Newsletter complete with a new logo and format reached the campuses on February 21. Distribution was delayed due to an interruption in the Central Office Print Shop's operations as a result of the snows that brought flooding and closing and illness. Professor Valinsky said that he thought that the Senate, once it had the chance to see the publication, would join him in thanking Professors Dolciani (Hunter) and Lea (Lehman) and Dr. Ellis for producing so handsome and informative an issue. Dr. Valinsky also drew the Senate's attention to the article on Presidential Evaluations and announced the following changes made after the issue had gone to press: One member of the team evaluating President Kneller (Brooklyn) - President Ketter of SUNY-Buffalo has been replaced by Frederick Jackson, Director of the Big Ten Universities and the University of Chicago; and one member of the team evaluating President Wexler (Hunter) - Professor Suzanne Keller, Princeton University, has been replaced by Professor Fred Pellegrino, Yale University. The Hunter Evaluation has also been put off from March to April. 2) The Executive Committees of the Council of Presidents and of the University Faculty Senate met on January 11. Another meeting will take place in early March when discussion will focus on responses to the question "What can the University project to convince the public or publics it confronts that it is important to maintain CUNY as an integrated whole?" ; 3) The UFS Ad Hoc Legal Committee's report concerning the retrenchment guidelines and revisions of them is just about complete. A working session which will be attended by the Committee, the UFS leadership, the Chancellor and the Vice-Chancellor for Legal Affairs and members of her staff will take place soon. 4) A session of the Senate at which Deputy Mayor Badillo will be the guest speaker is also in process. The plan is to discuss with him the mutual concerns of the faculty and the City in the future of CUNY. 5) A third draft of the proposed new guidelines on SEEK has been circulated since the last Plenary and the EEO committee of the BHE plans to hold an open hearing on the document on Thursday, February 23, from 1:00 p.m. to 6:30 p.m. in Room 104 at the BHE. There will be a statement on the proposal on behalf of the UFS focusing on the need to provide an active involvement of both SEEK and non-SEEK faculty in the development of the academic plan on each campus and pointing out the deficiencies in the proposed Guidelines in this respect. The deficiencies in terms of safeguards to protect the rights of faculty in cases of transfer of personnel are also discussed in the UFS statement. The recommendation is that the guidelines include a specific provision requiring the presidents to work with a committee of SEEK and non-SEEK faculty selected in the same manner as college curriculum and P&B committees and not by the president to develop the academic plan and determine the need for transfers of personnel.

Professor Valinsky spoke too of the concern expressed by the Executive Committee in a letter to the Chancellor concerning the import of a series of proposals that have emerged in recent weeks: one concerning the rate of progress provisions of the retention standards and one concerning the revision of admissions standards. Taken in conjunction with the new proposal on SEEK

these documents seem to imply a pattern of policy revision that may affect both academic quality and the reputation of CUNY. The UFS member of the BHE Committee on Academic Affairs persuaded that committee not to consider the proposal on revision of the retention standards until it had been reviewed by the faculty and our letter urges the Chancellor not to permit action on the revision of admission standards until the faculty has been consulted. Dr. Valinsky then read the letter to the Chancellor to the Plenary.

At the request of the BHE Committee on Fiscal Affairs the Executive Committee of the UFS is appointing an ad hoc advisory committee on the University's Endowment made up of faculty knowledgeable in the area of finance. The request seems to indicate an increasing willingness on the part of the BHE and the Central Administration to work with faculty through the UFS, said Professor Valinsky.

Professor Valinsky also pointed out that, in the same vein, the UFS is increasingly serving as a conduit for communication between the BHE and the Central Administration and local faculty governance groups. During the past month the UFS has disseminated material to heads of local faculty governance bodies at the request of the Secretary to the BHE and has also arranged a meeting with the Chancellor for the Monitoring Committee of Brooklyn College's Faculty Council at the request of the Council. Since the UFS is available, as the Chancellor pointed out at an earlier Plenary this year, as an alternate route for faculty bodies to approach the Central Administration and BHE in the event that a president does not fulfill that role, we are also suggesting that faculty governance bodies routinely include the UFS on the mailing list to receive copies of their minutes.

Finally, Professor Valinsky reminded the Plenary that the chairman and vice-chairman of the UFS meet regularly with the Chancellor and are therefore in a position to bring to his attention matters referred to them. The Chancellor's membership in the Senate and on its Executive Committee facilitates communication also and since the designation of the Chairman of the UFS as an ex-officio member of the BHE, communications between the faculty and the governing board have also become regularized.

VI. Discussion of Evaluation of Senior Administrators: Professor Valinsky said that since four presidents - the presidents of Brooklyn College, Hunter College, Kingsborough Community College, and La Guardia Community College as well as the Chancellor were scheduled to be evaluated by the BHE during the months of March and April and since the teams making those evaluations are made up entirely of persons from outside the University, it seemed necessary for the Senate to address the question of how to secure faculty input into the evaluations and especially to determine what recommendations might be made concerning opportunities for faculty participation during the teams' on-campus visits. He outlines three areas for thought and discussion: 1) What does the UFS want the Chancellor to do to insure that there is faculty input and that the input comes from duly-elected faculty bodies? 2) What does the faculty need to do to provide responsible information to the evaluators? and 3) What role should the UFS and UFS Delegations play in the process?

Professor Valinsky then opened the questions to discussion. A number of questions were raised such as the following: Who names the teams? Who develops the calendar for the teams' on-campus visits; which faculty are to see the teams; what time is set aside for interviews with faculty in relation to the total time spent on campus? It was suggested that the UFS should address itself to developing guidelines for a formal procedure for faculty input and that advice should be

sought from members who served on college evaluation teams. Professor Brostoff, chairman of the Brooklyn College Faculty Council's committee on the review of administrators, was asked to share information about the procedures in use by his committee. Professor Brostoff explained that the committee had been elected from a large slate three years ago and was a standing committee of the Council. The members of the Committee serve for staggered terms. The Committee developed a set of procedures to be used in evaluation of the senior administrators at the college, i.e. all deans who had held their positions for three or more years, the president and vice-president if they had held their positions for five or more years. The committee was charged by the faculty to carry out the evaluation and to report back to the Faculty Council. Since at the time the committee was set up the BHE had no policy on evaluation of administrators, it was agreed to conduct the evaluations of deans as an "in-house" procedure and to forward the reports on the president and vice-president, once received by the Council, to the BHE and the Chancellor. The areas to be assessed were: 1) academic and administrative leadership; 2) relationships to faculty and students; to individual departments and chairpersons; and to other administrators; 3) curriculum (development, innovation, etc.); 4) personnel decisions; 5) budget preparation; 6) administrative appointments; 7) counseling operations; 8) special programs.

In the course of the discussion it was finally agreed that an ad hoc committee should be set up immediately to develop a set of procedures for use in the upcoming evaluations and that a more permanent set of guidelines could then be developed using the experience of this first round of visitations.

Professor Milentijevic (City) said that she would like to express her personal sense of appreciation to the committee of Brooklyn College for undertaking and performing the very difficult task of evaluating the academic leadership and performance of their President. On the basis of the evaluation which the Committee submitted after two years of hard and dedicated work, the Faculty Council at Brooklyn College passed a vote of no confidence in President Kneller. She said that she thought the UFS ought to recognize the difficult situation in which the Brooklyn faculty finds itself, for it is not easy for the faculty of a college to stand up to its president. Indeed, it takes a great deal of personal courage, she continued, professional integrity, and commitment to the institution and its educational mission to do what the Brooklyn College faculty has done. She said that she wished to communicate to the UFS's colleagues at Brooklyn the Senate's awareness of the importance of their actions.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Radmila Milentijevic
Secretary