

File

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

September 19, 1978

The session was called to order by the Chairman, Professor Ann M. Burton, at 7:02 p.m. in Room 207 at the Graduate Center. All members were present except Professors Beheshti, Ceccarelli, Corbiere-Gille, Diamond, Dierlam, Dreiling, Greenbaum, Hartle, Krich, Levitan, Levy, Lutz, Martin, Milentijevic, Montalvo, Ornstein, Ratensky, Robbins, Rootenberg, Sacks, Santoro, Schulman, Silver, Spinninger, Timoni, and Uretsky. Professors Brodsky, Brostoff, Wakatama, and Wedeen were excused. Professors Belle Zeller (PSC-liaison) and Richard Nachtsheim (AAUP-liaison) were present. Chancellor Robert J. Kibbee, Vice-Chancellor Dolores Cross and Dr. Jean Ellis also attended.

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

II. Approval of the Minutes of the 76th Plenary Session: The minutes were approved as circulated.

III. Introduction of New Senators: Chairman Burton introduced the following newly elected Senators: Professors Lilia Melani (Brooklyn, English); Marvin Seiger (Hunter, Theater & Cinema); John Lenoir (John Jay, Anthropology); Theodore Abramson (Queens, Elementary Education); Bernard Solomon (Queens, Classical Languages); Manuela Dobos (COSI, History); Lester Keyser (COSI, English); and Valerie Seeley (QCC, Biology). She also welcomed reelected Senator Julian Kaye (Brooklyn, English) and Professor Gordon Fifer (Hunter, Educational Foundations) returning from leave.

IV. Announcement of Liaison Members: Professor Burton announced the following liaison members of UFS delegations: Professors Norma Eisen (Brooklyn, Physics); Bernard Sohmer (City, Mathematics); Selman Berger (John Jay, Chemistry); Edgar Roberts (Lehman, English); Matthew Wakatama (Medgar Evers, Teacher Education); Solena Bryant (Queens, Library); Howard Ruttenberg (York, Philosophy); Sandi Cooper (COSI, History); Morton Bard (Graduate School, Psychology); Michael Shmidman (BMCC, Social Science); Roland Gosselin (Bronx CC, English); Peter Roman (Hostos, Social Science); Julio Hernandez-Miyares (Kingsborough, Foreign Languages); Donald Davidson (La Guardia, Data Processing); Joseph Brogan (NYCC, Biology); and Fran D'Amico (QCC, Health & Physical Education). Professor Burton asked those delegations that have not chosen liaison members to date to do so immediately.

V. Chairman's Report: Professor Burton said that it was her intention to submit a long written report to each Plenary session and to confine her oral report to events too recent to include in the written report or too critical not to be discussed in the session. There were, she continued, two events that she wished to report to the Senate this evening: a joint meeting of representatives of the CUNY and SUNY Faculty Senates and a meeting between three members of the BHE including herself and the City Council President.

Members of the UFS Executive Committee and other Senators who are members of joint CUNY/SUNY UFS committees as well as the Executive Director of the UFS travelled to Albany on Saturday, September 16 to meet with the Executive Committee and other members of the SUNY UFS. The focus of the Executive Committees' discussion was on seizing the initiative in preserving CUNY and SUNY

and in developing support for the public sector. The joint committees are agreed that mere rhetoric will no longer suffice on these issues but that data which support the arguments in their favor must be developed. Accordingly, as a beginning, a short summary sheet detailing the comparative costs to the State of public versus private education is being prepared. The two Executive Committees agreed too to a joint request to Harold Howe II to meet with him concerning his commission from the Mayor of New York to study the relationship between CUNY and SUNY. The committees plan to follow that meeting with a private meeting with Assemblyman Melvin Miller, chairman of the Assembly Committee on Higher Education.

Professor Burton reported too on a meeting that took place September 18 with City Council President Bellamy. On the UFS Chairman's initiative the meeting was arranged and was attended by two other members of the BHE, the vice-chairperson Patricia Carry Stewart and Edith Everett. After reviewing for the Plenary some of the details of the exchange that took place, Professor Burton concluded that perhaps the most important result of the session was the reinforcement it gave to the need for the University to educate public officials concerning its nature and role.

Professor Burton then addressed the subject of the role of the UFS in CUNY. She identified three factors responsible for the UFS leadership's determination to have the University faculty take the initiative in asserting its views. First, she suggested that a reading of the BHE By-Laws called the attention of the leadership to the role assigned the UFS in the University. She quoted from Section 8.14:

There shall be a University Faculty Senate, responsible, subject to the board, for the formulation of policy relating to the academic status, role, rights and freedoms of the faculty, university level educational and instructional matters, and research and scholarly activities of university-wide import...

In addition, Professor Burton said, the report received by the BHE during the summer from the team evaluating the Chancellor not only devoted almost 25% of its comments to information and views suggested to it by the UFS delegation with whom it met but also asserted that the University was not making full use of the faculty as a resource. Further, the team recommended that the Chancellor should establish a means whereby there might be real consultation with faculty and participation by faculty in policy making rather than mere faculty input. Finally, Professor Burton said the new Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Dr. Leonard O. Roellig, had demonstrated in the short time he had been in office that he was indeed faculty-oriented and prepared to take counsel with the Senate. On the basis of these three factors the UFS leadership intended to assert the authority of the University faculty.

Professor Burton next outlined for the Plenary some of the changes being instituted in the Senate Office operation. She, the other officers, and members of the Executive Committee plan to keep regular office hours in the Senate Office and would be advising Senators of that schedule. The Executive Director's staff, Richard Friedman and Carina Quintian, would be assigned to UFS committees to provide staff support. It was hoped that more extensive use of the Senate Office would be made by members of the UFS who would thus have the opportunity to become familiar with the rather unusual setting in which the office is located - the premises were formerly occupied by a private mental hospital. Assuring the Senate that she was not laying the ground for an assessment of the membership, Professor Burton turned to the subject of the UFS budget and noted its limited

size as well as the categories of expenditures for which funds are authorized. As a result, she said, Senators were asked to cooperate by bringing with them to meetings materials sent in advance, by contributing to the cost of sandwiches served as a convenience prior to the Plenary Sessions.

Professor Burton said that the leadership had also taken various steps to alert heads of local faculty governance bodies to problems of concern to the faculty. The UFS has been in touch with them concerning the amendment to the UFS Charter, consultation with faculty in the preparation of budget requests by the presidents, and in connection with the subject of core curricula. Department heads throughout the University have been asked to submit nominations for consideration by the UFS in making nominations to University Committees and to UFS committees. Names of potential nominees to the Faculty Advisory Council of the Research Foundation have been solicited in like manner. Most importantly, Professor Burton continued, the leadership has made visits to several campuses - notably those where facilities problems are most glaring, i.e. Hostos, Borough Manhattan, and York - and intends to make others. It is their wish to visit at the time of stated faculty meetings so that meetings with the faculty as a whole as well as with UFS delegations and other campus leaders may occur. At one point, said Professor Burton, the Executive Committee considered holding Plenary Sessions on various campuses but was forced to abandon that idea because of logistical problems and possible objections by the UFS membership. The UFS Newsletter which is now being published regularly thanks to the enormous effort of Editor, Professor Gordon Lea (Lehman - English), is due on the campuses the first week in October and is another way of reaching out to the faculty who are represented in the Senate. Finally, Professor Burton urged members of UFS delegations to encourage their colleagues to bring problems of university import to them and to the UFS leadership so that efforts might be made to remedy them. At the same time Professor Burton reminded the Senate that it constituted an avenue of approach to the Board and the Central Administration other than through the president but, she cautioned, the UFS had to make certain that problems it took to the BHE or the Chancellor were those that were within the UFS's areas of responsibility and were of more than parochial concern.

Professor Burton closed her communications by noting the leadership's conception of the function of UFS Plenary Sessions. The primary function of these meetings, she said, is to transact UFS business - to receive reports from Standing and other committees and from faculty members to BHE committees. Thus, the successful functioning of the UFS rests on the dedication of its membership, the effort by its committees to complete the tasks assigned them within stated time periods and to demonstrate faculty concern through their efforts. Without the work done by its committees the Senate can not be an effective voice for the University faculty and it was in this spirit that the leadership was prepared to offer to the Senate for approval the slate of Standing Committees at this first Plenary of the academic year. There was much to do in the year ahead, said Professor Burton, but not so much that the faculty could not accomplish it with resolution and hard work.

VI. Reports of Faculty Representatives to BHE Committees: The Chairman announced the following representatives to BHE Committees: Professor Caws (Hunter), Academic Affairs with Professor Burton as alternate; Professor Burton, Central Administration with Professor Cooper (COSI) as alternate; Professor Baumrin (Lehman), Fiscal Affairs with Professor Davidson (LaGuardia) as alternate; Professor Gosselin (Bronx Community), Facilities Planning and Management with Professor Beitler (NYCC) as alternate; Professor Wasser (COSI), Expanded Educational Opportunity with Professor Wakatama as alternate. Professor Burton serves also on the Long-Range Planning

Committee in her capacity as an ex-officio member of the BHE.

Professors Baumrin and Davidson then reported on the June and September meetings of the Fiscal Affairs Committee respectively. Professor Baumrin directed his report to the issue of investment counselling and management - an issue which had come to the forefront of the BHE's attention through his efforts. As a result of his decision when he joined the committee 18 months ago to read the material sent him, Professor Baumrin had discovered that there was in effect no investment policy governing the \$25 million or so in endowment funds. The Fiscal Affairs Committee had agreed at its June 1978 meeting to set up a joint administration, faculty, student committee to develop a set of guidelines on investment policy and Professor Baumrin was named to that committee. There had been a July meeting of the group and a meeting to finalize the Committee's work was scheduled for September 20 so that its recommendations might be placed before the full BHE at its pre-public meeting on September 25. It is to be hoped, Professor Baumrin stated, that the new guidelines will make it possible not only for the University to divest itself of its holdings in South Africa but to obtain counsel whose advice is less abysmal than in the past.

Professor Davidson's report focused on the budget picture as it emerged at the Fiscal Affairs September meeting. He said that the September 11 meeting had been devoted to discussion of the budget picture in toto - for 1978-79 as compared with 1977-78 and for 1979-80 in terms of projections based on the senior college presidents' submissions during summer 1978. The senior colleges' budget for 1978-79 is \$302 million as compared with \$309 million for 1977-78; the community college budget for 1978-79 is \$148.6 million as compared with \$147.2 million for 1977-78; University Management will operate with a budget of \$9.3 million in 1978-79 as compared with \$8.9 million in 1977-78. The total University budget has been decreased by approximately one per cent. In addition, said Professor Davidson, there was discussion of FTE projections for the constituent parts of the University.

Facilities Planning and Management: Professor Gosselin reported on the several meetings of this committee during the summer months. Prior to that report, however, he alerted the Senate to a meeting with some of the gubernatorial candidates that he attended in company with Professors Davidson and Beitler and on the meeting of the Mobilization Coordinating Committee held September 10. He had left both of these meetings with the awareness that the UFS has a great deal to do to convince political leaders of the state of the institution they serve. Professor Gosselin said that the September meeting of the Facilities Planning and Management Committee had been devoted in large part to the problems of Borough Manhattan Community College. Mr. Farley had reported on some 20 sites that had been examined as possible new quarters for BMCC and said that three of these were still under consideration - the old McGraw-Hill, GHI building on West 42 Street, the Robert Hall Building on West 34 Street, and 99 John Street. Problems in connection with each of these sites were discussed but there was acute recognition of the need to find new facilities for the college. Professor Shmidman (BMCC) said that another factor seemed to be that if quarters that were really too good to be temporary were found then new permanent quarters would never be built; thus, the situation was extremely complex because quarters that required extensive renovation for use as temporary ones would be costly - perhaps too much so for temporary ones.

On the question of what was being done about Hostos' situation Professor Gosselin said that apparently City Hall had not responded yet to a request for a meeting on this subject and City Hall was waiting for the Howe report. Pro-

fessor Roman (HCC) asked whether he understood correctly that the City was not ready to commit the needed funds for the renovation of the Grand Concourse building. Professor Gosselin said that people at the Facilities Committee meeting were hopeful at one point that this would be done but were no longer thinking along those lines. Professor Fifer (Hunter) said that having just returned from a year's leave he had the feeling that things had not progressed very much during his absence. It was his feeling that CUNY needed to build a strong University, that CUNY must be careful in supporting weak programs, that it should support only strong programs. Professor Waldman (York) asked what had been said concerning York's facilities. Professor Gosselin said that York was mentioned and that it was reported that the architectural plans had been redesigned so that the rebuilding might progress faster when it got underway.

Expanded Educational Opportunity: Professor Wasser reported on the spring meeting of the committee which was devoted to approval of the Director of SEEK at City College since under the new Guidelines SEEK Directors must be so approved. The September meeting of the committee focused on a paper outlining Vice-Chancellor Cross' concept of her office. It was also reported at that meeting that there were approximately 10,200 students in SEEK of whom about 3000 were new; that it had an effective budget of \$12 to \$13 million (effective because the amount allocated was in fact larger but was unusable); that monitoring attendance was of special concern to the BHE committee as well as the evaluation of programs and the value of tutoring and guidance for SEEK students. This year the Committee will also be concerned with the Board of Regents and SED response to the new Guidelines (the Chancellor and others on his staff indicated some difference of opinion concerning what that response might be - the Chancellor thinks there might be approval problems; others don't. In addition, College Discovery is to be discovered by the committee this year. Professor Sohmer (City) asked whether there had been any discussion of the meaning of the guidelines in terms of moving people and was told in reply that the Vice-Chancellor is looking in to that matter.

Central Administration: Professor Burton reported that there had been no September meeting. The June meeting took up a number of items - administrative appointments at the colleges, activities fees; rental payments by the presidents for housing - the last having been brought to the full BHE as a resolution at the June public meeting. Most of the meeting was devoted to dealing with disciplinary actions and of these the most complex was the Perez case. That case was laid over by the Committee for consideration by the full BHE in its informal meeting and was not resolved until the August meeting of the BHE.

VII. Discussion of AAUP Censure: Professor Burton asked Professor Galub (BxCC) who has chaired the UFS Ad Hoc Committee on Legal Affairs since its inception in 1975 to report on the progress of its work in connection with the AAUP censure of the University. Professor Galub recalled for the Senate the fact that the committee had developed a draft of viable procedures and a comprehensive plan for retrenchment, budget emergencies etc. and had given that report to the Chancellor and Vice-Chancellor for Legal Affairs in the early spring of 1978. A meeting among committee members, the Chancellor and the Vice-Chancellor had elicited what Professor Galub deemed some fairly cogent reactions to the proposed revision of the guidelines and had led to the committee's request that they be given a full statement in writing of the University's position for the purpose of negotiation and to enable the committee to come up with a document that might then be discussed by the Senate. So far this response has not been forthcoming; the committee is still awaiting it. The committee is ready to proceed, however, and to report on its progress. It can not operate in a vacuum, however. Possibly, Professor Galub

added the Chancellor's decision to devolve the issue on Vice-Chancellor Roellig may have cleared up the matter of the delay since the Vice-Chancellor would be meeting with the Committee within a fortnight. Professor Keyser (COSI) said that he had been involved in a number of cases of AAUP censure and the resolution of those cases always involved the agreement of the aggrieved parties who were in a sense the parties of the first part. Were there plans to obtain the agreement of the aggrieved CUNY parties to any resolution of the censure of CUNY? Professor Galub said that he was not prepared to offer a totally responsive reply. He could say that his committee has been in touch with the AAUP counsel for the Northeastern district but he did not think that his committee's function was to come up with a settlement. The situation is a multi-sided one; the UFS proposals may not go down as a settlement of the censure issue but it was thought that they would at least advance questions so that a viable plan might be offered. Professor Baumrin (Lehman), also a member of the committee, said that he thought their position was to provide one of the fulcrums for the AAUP to consider. Professor Ehrenpreis (BxCC) said that given the position of the University in terms of budget etc. true redress seems impossible. To him there is a question of whether to try to lift the censure. Under the cloud of censure the Chancellor has moved to limit retrenchment; if it is lifted he may find a way out of not retrenching. In that sense moving to lift censure is gambling with the lives of those who are still here. Professor Keyser further stated that the AAUP works only by reverencing and that it was his opinion that CUNY's faculty was not making the censure work, that the University's ads did not carry the legend that this was a censured institution. He would like to see departments refrain from hiring until the commitment to cancelled contracts had been met. He would like to see people not recruited to teach at CUNY but discouraged from coming to the University -- that is the only remedy available. Professor Davidson (LaGuardia) opined that he hoped his colleague from COSI was speaking tongue in cheek. In fact, CUNY was doing the opposite and trying to portray itself as a University of high standards and quality. If the faculty were to do what was suggested it would be making sure that more colleagues joined the unemployment lines, that more students were without instructors. Professor Galub said that his committee's proposals did not take the two approaches outlined by previous speakers but a more cautious one. Professor Baumrin further stated that he too did not know whether the earlier remarks were made tongue in cheek but he hoped not. In the spirit of the Senate as a deliberative body it was good to hear opinions worthy of support expressed. He wished to point out that a request for preferential hiring or rehiring had been made and there had been some commitment received from the Central Administration but no such commitment from any campus or department. The system had not worked because the faculty was not puchy, perhaps the Senate might have the Executive Committee remind people about rehiring on a preferential basis. Professor Zeller (PSC liaison) said that she wished to call attention to the fact that Queensborough had been on the censure list for a period before the general censure and that that censure had now been lifted because of the censure of the University. Professor Valinsky (Baruch) reminded the Senate of the action of the UFS at the BHE concerning proposed remedies. At the first meeting of the present BHE in August 1976 he, as chairman of the UFS and ex-officio member of the BHE, had asked for the development of titles for the retrenched persons, permission to use University facilities some minimal benefits. There had been serious discussion of these proposals by the then new BHE but the net effect was that the proposals were lost in the welter of business before the board and nothing was offered the retrenched persons. It was a point well taken that something should have been done. Professor Waldman (York) said that she had a colleague who had compiled a dossier from presidents refusing to hire the person because as a retrenchee who was slated to become tenured in September 1976 the person would have to be given tenure if rehired. Professor Cooper (COSI) said that she had spoken to the point of preferential

rehearing a number of times and had pointed out the impossibility of obtaining the list that was supposedly being maintained in the Central Office. She wondered whether it might not be possible to get that list from the Chancellor's office and circulate it. Professor Nachtsheim (AAUP liaison) said that he did not think the AAUP would lift the censure without some redress being offered the retrenchees and that he could say with some certainty that the CUNY Council would not approve lifting it without redress.

VIII. Approval of the Slate of Standing Committees: Professor Burton moved to the next item of business, the approval of the proposed slate of Standing Committees. It was moved, seconded and passed that the slate be adopted with the changes offered by the chair (correction of typographical errors and the addition of members whose committee requests were received after the slate was circulated). Professor Roman (HCC) asked whether there were a mechanism whereby committee members or committees that failed to carry out their responsibilities might be replaced. Professor Burton responded that since the effectiveness of the Senate rested on its committees and the reputation of the Senate rested on its effectiveness the Executive Committee would see to it that the charges were carried out. A brief recess followed to permit Standing Committee chairmen to meet with the members of their committees and make plans for initial full dress meetings.

IX. Chancellor's Report: Chancellor Kibbee welcomed the Senate back. He then made several announcements about changes in personnel: 1) Mr. Gault has resigned from the BHE in order to accept a position as an adviser to the Mayor; thus there are now two vacancies on the BHE; 2) Vice-Chancellor Meng who held his post for the past six years has resigned to become president of the Culinary Institute of America; 3) two new presidents took up their duties during the summer - President Saul Cohen at Queens College and Ursula C. Schwerin, New York City Community College; 4) there are three new Vice-Chancellors in the Central Office: Vice-Chancellor Leonard O. Roellig, vice-chancellor for Academic Affairs; Vice-Chancellor for Faculty and Staff Relations Richard C. Catalano, formerly Secretary to the BHE, and Vice-Chancellor Dolores Cross in the Office of Student Affairs and Special Programs; 5) Finally, Mr. Jack Sullivan has resigned as Director of University Relations and a search for a new Director of University Relations is in progress.

Chancellor Kibbee spoke briefly to the subject of enrollment, stating that the final count is not in. He said that it had been anticipated that enrollment in the community colleges would remain level and would decrease slightly in the senior colleges. Freshman allocations had been made in about the same way as last year. There had been a significant increase in the number of transfer students - a percentage rather than a numerical increase but the first indications on enrollment overall suggest that the community colleges are down somewhat; there is no usable information from the senior colleges yet since they seem to continue enrolling students well into the semester. On budget the Chancellor said there is not much difference. For 1978-79 it will be \$479 million with \$307 million for the senior colleges and \$152 million for the community colleges (the latter is up a little due to an increase in the City contribution) the former is down a little but the percentage decrease is less than the decrease in enrollment. On the supplementary budget the Chancellor said it was floating around Albany. There was word that the Legislature would come back next week but that was not certain. The Supplemental Budget is, of course, the Governor's budget and the Legislature has to decide what to do with it. The Governor had \$4.5 million in it for CUNY of which a little over \$1 million is of programmatic use. Part is for unemployment insurance costs which the University must pay for the first time; part for renovation projects. There is hope for an increase for the community colleges as a result of a statewide request for a change in the community college funding formula

through an increase in the base amount from \$705 per FTE to \$750 per FTE. If this is included by the Legislature it would mean \$2.5 million more for the community colleges. The Chancellor also said that there had been some noise in the City re: wage and hiring freezes, that the Mayor's order applies to city agencies and although he has made a statement about asking cooperation of other agencies but to date no word has been received by the BHE or the Chancellor from the Mayor.

Concerning the status of the contracts the Chancellor said that the contract between the PSC and the BHE for 1977-78 was still outstanding. The State had immediately agreed to it but the City has not until now. There is a 98.7% chance that it will be on the EFCB agenda at its meeting next week and that it will be passed but that has been the case before. There has been no activity or action on the DC 37 contract but the Mayor should be moving that along some time in October or early November.

The Chancellor also said that so far as the City Council residency law is concerned that requires city employees to live in the City if they are newly hired and prohibits those who do not now live outside the City from moving out in future the application of that law to employees of the Board of Education and BHE is now being contested in the courts. It is the University's Counsel's opinion - it is really a technical matter of law that it should not apply. The BHE Committee on Central Administration will reexamine the question. In the Chancellor's opinion it is not in the best interest of the University.

Finally, the Chancellor said that it seems to him that this is a watershed year in the history of the University in terms of there being some final determination of the governance and funding of the University. The 1976 law which gave CUNY funding, set up the Wessell Commission etc. provided for an interim BHE whose tenure would end in June 1979. The thought was that the Wessell Commission would deal with the future governance etc. The difficulty is that Wessell fell like a wet brick. So, we are left with the part of the law that said the BHE will be out of business in June and there will have to a legislative act to make other arrangements. I believe that there will be noises starting this spring; in fact, there have been some already. The Mayor's letter to Doc Howe includes as one possible option the spinning off of part of the University to the privates or the State and that suggests that the Mayor is willing to consider that option. I have had some preliminary discussion with the BHE and have prepared a paper suggesting that the board come out itself with a statement and not respond to others' plans. It is not just Howe but Assemblyman Miller too and the Regents may be expected to have something to say on the subject and the incumbent Governor if reelected will have something to say. All of these I do not anticipate will be to our liking or in our interest or that of the city.

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

- 1) Professor Roman (HCC) - "What is the status of the renovation at the building on the Grand Concourse owned by Hostos since the report on the lack of City commitment ; also what is the status of the plans for a permanent facility for the college?"/ On the first question: the renovation is a week to week matter; it is a high priority item and something to be dealt with outside the larger issue of construction and we thought we had made that point to the City. There have been starts and stops on the issue of breaking it out of the larger picture. We put in a request on what steps would be required to do this and were told to write an appropriate letter to the appropriate person. The impetus for this was that a meeting of the Public Facilities Control Board was scheduled this week in Albany. The letter was not sent and we don't know whether it will be. We have struggled with the Mayor's office to get it released but he has taken the position in the

past that all will be dealt with together. In response to the second question the statement in the Master Plan is phrased in that way because it seemed clear that there was to be a major redevelopment effort in the South Bronx and it seemed that Hostos should be included in that. This is so because the University does have a stranglehold on a piece of land in the middle of the South Bronx and something would have to be done about that. In any case the University will do what it can. Professor Roman further stated that he had studied every plan for redevelopment in the South Bronx and had found no mention of higher education in any of them. 2) Professor Lea (Lehman) - " I want to ask about a matter over which I think you do have some control. I was pleased with your letter to the Daily News and your awareness of the perception of the University in the press. Part of the problem, I think, are the statements from members of your staff, for example, the statement by Vice-Chancellor Meng on admissions saying that students must be admitted or there would be massive layoffs and the statement by Dean Rosenstock concerning Skills Assessment in which he said that one-half of the incoming students would be out within two years and thus gave the taxpayer the impression of wastage. What is the policy at 80th Street that permits this kind of statement to be issued? Is there not a way to control such statements?"/ I don't want this to sound like an answer but you might note that Vice-Chancellor Meng is no longer with us. Personally I don't believe they said what they are quoted as having said. I think it may have in his case at least been an interpretation. In the case of Dean Rosenstock he was probably pointing to historical fact that within two years half of the students who enroll are gone. Part of that is due to a lack of skills or a failure to develop skills, part is due to their leaving because they want to do something else rather than go to college. It is not dishonest nor a waste of money. I think one year of college is good, two are better and I don't think we have to adjust our policy just because the taxpayer cannot see that. 3) Professor Quinn (Brooklyn) - " I have a question concerning the last stage in the evaluation of presidents. After the evaluation reports are submitted to the BHE and if the BHE finds the president's performance satisfactory is there a formal expression of that finding -- is it recorded in the minutes, for example or is it that by lack of action the Board implies that the performance has been found satisfactory?"/ I think the latter. There is no provision in the policy adopted by the BHE that at the end the board will do anything in particular. They have taken no formal action on any of the reports. There has been comment in the informal session and they have indicated to the Chancellor the actions they would like him to take, for example, in remedying administrative weaknesses that may have emerged. They do not take, have not taken, nor do I anticipate that they will take formal actions. 4) Professor Baumrin (Lehman) - " I should like to depart from my normal relationship with you to say that I enjoyed your letter to the Mayor and look forward to many others like it. I should like to ask whether the funding for the 1977-78 and 1978-79 contracts which doesn't appear in the budgets has been taken care of in some other way."/ If they are not funded, they are not taken care of. You may have noted that in the Executive Budgets there were many footnotes stating that monies would be available for the contracts. We have in writing that the 1978-79 portion is to be provided by the State. We have come to recognize that the Budget Office has ways of hedging its bets. Last year you may recall a Vacancy Freeze was imposed but in the end what happened is that the University was unable to expend close to \$6 million allocated to the senior colleges (there were also unspendable monies for SEEK but those we all knew about). \$3.3 million of that \$6 million could have been spent however. It now turns out that the dollars not spent covered the 1977-78 share of the contract. They now say they will pay and they now have the money. How the 1978-79 contract is to be paid is not clear yet; so beware. 5) Professor Miranda - " Is there any possibility that the money withheld in 1976 from our paychecks will be repaid?"/ The way that agreement was phrased the money was payable in July 1978 provided certain conditions were met, e.g. that the City's budget was in balance, that the City

be able to sell its securities in the open market, etc. You may recall too that this issue was raised in the course of the recent negotiations and the City interpreted it to mean that if the monies could not be paid in July 1978 the obligation was ended. Eventually it was sent to arbitration and the arbiters found for the unions, that the monies are due until the conditions are met. 6) Professor Cooper (COSI) - "To go back to the issue of the evaluation of presidents. Are those reports available to concerned faculty on each campus?"/ The reports are made to the BHE not to the faculty; they are not public documents. I often wonder whether there are documents in this University that remain confidential if they are of any significant interest. I have already read a story in the Daily News on one report and on my comments on it. 7) Professor Gosselin (BxCC) - "I have heard of your proposal to change the status of NYCC to that of an agricultural and technical college and I wonder how that might affect the status of technical programs in other community colleges."/ That proposal was made for two reasons: 1) NYCC has the largest proportion of students enrolled in technical programs therefore I thought it might be treated as an urban agricultural and technical college since it serves much the same function as the state agricultural and technical colleges and 2) since it might offer financing advantages for the city because the amount from them would be less than if it were a community college. Facilities would also be treated similarly. Those are the reasons and I don't think it will affect the other community colleges which would continue to be treated as are the community colleges all over the state. 8) Professor Roberts - "Yesterday classes began on my campus and when my colleagues got together one colleague who is a senior member and whom I shall not name said that he wanted to hear some good news for the faculty. I couldn't think of any, can you?"/ I don't know what the threshold of joy is for the faculty but I think as a matter of fact that I am willing to bet that the two contracts will be funded and that some remuneration past due will be paid during this first term. I can't say exactly when but it is going to happen. The other relatively happy thing is that I don't anticipate any large and monumental surprises that will shake us and in the sense of the faculty's desire for stability I can say that things should be quieter and more stable. In any case, it is good to know you are back and there to greet each other. 9) Professor Coren (NYCC) - "If the proposal re: NYCC should come to fruition what do you envision as the future of the liberal arts there?"/ There is no idea of limiting it to a technical school; therefore, I wouldn't anticipate any significant changes. 10) Professor Baumrin (Lehman) - "Under what funding were the evaluations of the presidents pursued so that the reports may be treated as memoranda and not as public documents?"/ People can attempt under the sunshine law to have them made public documents but I think they will be considered confidential memoranda. Therefore, you have two choices: via the courts or surreptitious means.

X. Vice-Chancellor Cross: Chancellor Kibbee then introduced Vice-Chancellor Cross. He said that the University community including the UFS and people on the campuses had spent a considerable amount of time last year developing the new SEEK guidelines. There was also a concern that there be a new look at what the University is doing in SEEK in order to produce better results and to straighten out a number of nagging administrative problems that brought unfavorable publicity and produced snags in the program's operations. The Guidelines were adopted in the late spring 1978; at the same time it was decided to create a position with two major functions: to gather student services into one office and to work with special programs. To that end a Search Committee was established last spring which went through hundreds of resumes and finally presented three names to the Chancellor for him to make a choice. It was the Chancellor's good fortune, he said, that my view and that of the Committee was identical as to the person to lead the implementation of the SEEK guidelines as well as take on and operate student activities. Dr. Dolores Cross is that person. She is a

graduate of Seton Hall University in New Jersey and holds a PhD from the University of Michigan. She served most recently as Director of Teacher Education at the Claremont Graduate School and formerly headed the MAT Programs at Northwestern University. She has written and spoken in these areas and on multicultural education and experiences. She has a tremendous capacity for work, a strong and organized mind, a talent for putting things together as well as a sensitivity in dealing with people which she has demonstrated already in working with the presidents; she is also interested in the programs she administers and in their interrelationships with other programs. I am happy to introduce to you one of the newest and brightest of our Vice-Chancellors.

Vice-Chancellor Cross thanked Chancellor Kibbee for his gracious introduction. She said that when she arrived and realized that she would be talking to a faculty group that she would have to redirect the kind of discussions she had been having since arriving at CUNY. Indeed, one of the things she had missed since her arrival during the summer was talking about faculty and what was happening with faculty. In her years at Northwestern and the Claremont Colleges there had been considerable discussion about mission. She had been impressed at CUNY with the clear sense of mission as an urban institution. Vice-Chancellor Cross further stated that she had not prepared a formal presentation for this first meeting with the faculty but would like to discuss briefly her perception of how her job might be organized and how her office might operate. The job, she said, is constructed in such a way that the units reporting to her provide information that can be coordinated so that lines and boundaries can be diminished; what she has been trying to do here is to articulate what people in Special Programs are doing within and outside CUNY. Her office, she said, led to her participation in the Chancellor's cabinet and that provided the opportunity to share with the other Vice-Chancellors her concerns re: students as well as other matters. The academic plans of the colleges have taken much time and she has been working with the colleges on these. At the Chancellor's initial meetings with the presidents she began this job. She has had input in terms of where people are in relation to the Guidelines and she plans to provide for monitoring of the program. In addition, she is involved with budget and is working on College Discovery and possible approaches to changes in that program.

Vice-Chancellor Cross said she would prefer to respond to questions at this point. 1) Professor Lea (Lehman) - "I have a question about the new Guidelines. When they were issued we applauded the face-to-face interviews to evaluate motivation of students seeking admission. It is reported that these are not being held on some campuses and I wondered whether you knew why?"/ What I find is that the Guidelines were issued so late that many were prevented from implementing them fukky but I hope that will change. 2) Professor Sohmer (City) - "Have you had the chance to consider the paragraph on transfer of faculty which many of us found very disturbing in these guidelines? Is there an interpretation of it?"/ We haven't done any transfers and there is no interpretation that I know of. Chancellor Kibbee interjected that an attempt was being made to minimize the transfers; there were some in compensatory programs but the intent is that these become part of regular departments and it is possible that there may be some transfers there. To the best of his knowledge, he said, that hasn't happened. 3) Professor Fifer (Hunter) - "On this point- the SEEK program at my college has been moved into our division and there are some people teaching in it whom I would like to have teach in my department but I have been told that they can't unless I repay every cent because the budget of SEEK is so restrictive. How can I do this?"/ It may be a unique situation for Hunter but on some campuses their faculty teach in both and it is the intent of the guidelines to seek integration. Chancellor Kibbee again interjected that one thing to be remembered is that the law says SEEK money is to

be used for SEEK students and where there are mixed groups of students then some estimate is made of the portion being used for each group. We would like to encourage SEEK faculty to teach in the cognate departments but that portion would require expenditure by the college. Professor Fifer further asked - "Whom should my Business Manager consult?" 4) Professor Rempson - "Do you have any definite plans to establish new College Discovery Guidelines this year and if so what plans?"/ One of the people in my office is in charge of making recommendations re: changes and those will be shared with the presidents and the directors of College Discovery - one might be that there be a Task Force. 5) Professor Baumrin - "In your position as Vice-Chancellor in charge of admissions do you have any plans to attract students from the rest of the State or from out-of-state?"/ That unit is not part of my umbrella now; not until the first of the year. Professor Baumrin further asked where admissions were now and was told they had been part of Vice-Chancellor Meng's operation. 6) Professor Seeley (QCC) - "Under the Office of Student Affairs who is in charge of retention standards?"/ In the interim Vice-Chancellor Roellig is handling that, as well as admissions. Since the BHE just approved the SEEK guidelines and the EEO Committee is monitoring the campus development many decisions need to be made. Therefore, we have set up a liaison relationship with admissions and financial aid for the present and are really engaged in defining what people are doing. In the other areas this has not been done yet. 7) Professor Lederman - "Do you plan to evaluate the programs at the campuses, are you asking for data from them, etc.?" / We are conducting three studies: 1) a study of dropouts; a study of remediation for College Discovery and SEEK; and we are asking each college to explain its plan for monitoring students' achievement. We have a unique capacity for research in the Office and we are trying to do what we can handle. 8) Professor Wasser - "That was the question I was going to ask. I would also like to know whether you think that beefing up the central research function is the way to go? In the retrenchment that went on the campuses had their research capacity cut and therefore it would have to be centralized if for no other reason than that the central operation could be disinterested." / That is an area that is being addressed by a Task Force on Research and Evaluation. There are inquiries being made concerning the capacity for undertaking such research and what may be available in the way of grants for that purpose. There is a proposal in the 1979-80 Budget Request that speaks to that point. We are also looking at the campuses and the Central Office staff to find out what capacities we have. A Task Force is looking at these questions.

Professor Burton thanked Vice-Chancellor Cross for coming to meet the UFS and for her presentation. The meeting was adjourned at 9:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Henry Wasser
Secretary