

SUBJECT TO UFS APPROVAL

MINUTES OF THE EIGHTIETH PLENARY SESSION OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE  
OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

December 19, 1978

The session was called to order at 7:05 p.m. by the Chairman, Professor Ann M. Burton in Room 207 at the Graduate Center. All members were present except Professors Bard, Beitler, Berger, Bloom, Brodsky, Caccarelli, Corbiere-Gille, D'Amico, Davidson, Diamond, Dolciani, Dreiling, Fifer, Kurfunkel, Lenoir, Levitan, Marcinek, Martin, McLani, Montalvo, Movesian, Page, Ratensky, Robbins, Rothman, Ruttenberg, Sacks, Santoro, Schulman, Seiger, Silver, Spingier, Timoni, Toback, Uretsky, Waldman, and Yuster. Professors Behesti, Coren, Hernandez-Miyares and Hunte were excused. Liaison members Professor Nachtseheim (AAUP) and Zeller (PSC) also attended. Chancellor Robert J. Kibbee, President Saul B. Cohen (Queens) and Dr. Jean Ellis also attended.

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

II. Approval of the Minutes of the 79th Plenary Session (November 21, 1978): The minutes were approved as circulated.

III. Communications from the Chairman: Professor Burton said that most of her communications were included in the written report distributed to members (copy attached) but that several other events had occurred too recently to be recorded in that report. She introduced Professor Victor Shapiro (Brooklyn, Education), a new Senator, and announced that Professor Gloria Waldman (York, Spanish) was to be congratulated on completing her Ph.D. She noted that Professor Beryl Hunte (BMCC, Mathematics) who has been absent due to recent eye surgery is recovering slowly and said that she was certain all wished Professor Hunte well and awaited her return anxiously.

Professor Burton concluded her announcements with an addition to her written report on the Research Foundation. She informed the Senate that members who wished to review the report of the Committee on Restructuring the Foundation might do so, according to a report she had received, in the office of Ms. Linda Sitar, Grants Officer at Brooklyn College. At a meeting on the Brooklyn campus on December 18 Ms. Sitar had informed the participants that President Kneller had given her the report with instructions to urge interested persons to review it. Professor Burton noted that the report was considered confidential in some quarters but that she was communicating this information at the request of a member of the Faculty Advisory Council to the Research Foundation who had attended the Brooklyn meeting. Professor Valinsky (Baruch, Statistics), a member of the Committee that drafted the report, noted for the record that the report was now obsolete.

Professor Burton alerted members to the fact that Harold Howe II's report to the City administration on CUNY had been tendered to the Mayor on December 15. Copies of the text of that report were distributed to members of the Senate at the opening of the Plenary Session. The report, Professor Burton suggested, should be reviewed by members and would provide a basis for discussion at a future session, possibly at the January meeting. Members who had questions about the report were urged to call the Senate office.

Professor Burton reported too that the Board of Higher Education would be meeting with Governor Carcy at his New York office on Wednesday, December 20. At that time the BHE planned to discuss three principal items: its concerns about the stability of the University and its sense that the Governor's recent statements, first reported in the New York Times as rumor but confirmed in a

press conference reported in the Times, Sunday, December 17, might have increased the feelings of instability albeit the Governor may not have had any intent to damage the University; the question of funding since there have been reports that to anticipate full funding of the senior colleges immediately does not coincide with planning in Albany; and governance to express again the view that CUNY's board should be independent and should have some continuity of membership and to review possible structuring of the new Board.

Professor Burton then turned to the subject of the Senate's role as the representative body of the faculty at the university level. She called members attention to the comments of the Select Committee for Evaluation of the Chancellor whose report was submitted to the BHE last summer and distributed to the Senate prior to this meeting concerning the faculty's participation in university level decision and policy making, noting that pages 9ff in the Report were her reference. The evaluators had stressed the need for real faculty participation rather than pro forma presence and had urged the creation of a mechanism to insure such meaningful input. They had pointed to the Senate as the appropriate body on which to rely for such a mechanism and had suggested that:

Possibly a smaller advisory council elected by the Senate could serve as a kind of faculty instrument whose participation would be routine in much the same way that the Chancellor's cabinet is used. (p.9)

During the summer and fall the Executive Committee of the Senate and the Chancellor had been discussing ways of implementing the recommendations of the Committee and the Chancellor had suggested:

One possibility in developing such an idea would be to have a designated faculty liaison to each of the areas headed by a Vice-Chancellor or a Deputy to the Chancellor with whom the Vice-Chancellor and members of his or her staff would meet say bi-weekly. That group would then meet with the Chancellor, at least monthly or at such time as substantive decisions were being made.

Keeping in mind the clear mandate in the BHE Bylaws that makes academic policy a responsibility of the faculty, the Executive Committee had reviewed these suggestions and had agreed that the cabinet idea might be tested this spring since it was possible to put it in place easily. Both the Chancellor and the Senate leaders agreed that the cabinet concept should be reviewed after this test period.

Professor Burton outlined the mechanism of the faculty cabinet as follows: each of the BHE Committees on which faculty representatives serve in the place of the UFS Chairman who is an ex-officio member of all committees of the Board is staffed by a Vice-Chancellor. Therefore, a liaison of sorts has already been established between the faculty representative and the Vice-Chancellor although the relationship has been based on joint attendance at committee meetings rather than on meaningful exchange prior to the meetings. The faculty cabinet concept makes possible discussion between the faculty representative and Vice-Chancellor prior to meetings and the development of policy with faculty participation. The liaison will be established first between each of the Vice-Chancellors and a member of the Executive Committee of the UFS who serves as faculty repre-

ative to the BHE Committee staffed by that Vice-Chancellor. It will be extended when needed to others in the Central Administration responsible for areas of concern to faculty. Meetings between the faculty member and the Vice-Chancellor will be supplemented by monthly meetings with the Chancellor, the Chairman of the Senate, the faculty cabinet members, and the Vice-Chancellors whose areas constitute agenda items for that meeting. The agenda will be set by the Chancellor and the Chairman of the Senate.

Professor Burton stated also that the development of this mechanism must be considered the result of the efforts over the years by the Senate and its officers and especially its immediate past Chairman, Professor David Valinsky, to make real the Bylaw role and responsibilities of the Senate.

In concluding her communications Professor Burton announced that thanks to several colleges, the last of which was the College of Staten Island, the Senate had received a Christmas present in the form of the ratification of the amendment to Article VI of the Charter. Ratification by the faculty governance bodies in accordance with the provisions of the Charter made possible rational restructuring of the Senate's committees.

IV. Reports of Faculty Representatives to BHE Committees: The reports of the faculty representatives to BHE Committees were distributed in written form (copy attached to these minutes). Professor Gosselin (Bronx CC, English), vice-chairman of the UFS and faculty representative to the BHE Committee on Facilities Planning and Management, noted that the written report was superseded by the most recent action of the Committee. That action provided for the moving forward on the situation in respect to Borough Manhattan Community College by the approval given to rental of space in the McGraw Hill/GHI building on West 42 Street to provide consolidated quarters for the college until its permanent facility was completed.

V. Reports of Senate Committees: Professor Joe Rempson (Bronx CC, Special Educational Services), chairman of the SGS Committee reported that the committee had set three objectives for the year: 1) ascertaining information about services and programs for part-time students at CUNY and developing specific data concerning losses of students, services and programs through distribution of a questionnaire to the various units of the University; 2) trying to disseminate information about innovative ways to attract and retain part-time students through a presentation to a Plenary Session in the early spring; and 3) playing a facilitative, encouraging role in support of legislation on financial aid to part-time students.

Professor Rempson then offered a resolution on financial aid to part-time students for the Senate's consideration. The motion to adopt was seconded. Professor Rempson also noted that on February 15 the USS together with the NYPIRG planned a one-day conference at the Graduate Center to encourage support for the Serrano bill which would provide aid to part-time students and said that his committee thought it would be in order for the UFS to support the conference. On the resolution Professor Lea (Lehman, English) noted that Assemblyman Miller had pointed out early in the current academic year that the privates have about 2200 more part-time students than in past years. Professor Lea therefore speculated that support for financial aid for part-time students might prove a two-edged sword./ The SGS Committee considered that possibility and is aware that legislation providing aid for part-time students could help the privates more than CUNY but practically speaking the question comes down to doing this or nothing. The Committee therefore regards this support as a kind of first step. Professor Roberts (Lehman, English), having stated his support and belief that

such aid was needed, questioned the phrase "adequate support" used in the resolution and asked for clarification or greater precision. The Committee deliberately used the vaguer qualification, believing that this would permit greater flexibility in determining which legislation to support and in adjusting the support given to the proposal. Professor Ehrenpreis (Bronx CC, History) called the question.

The resolution was adopted. (Copy attached to the minutes)

Professor Melvin Ferentz (Brooklyn, Physics), chairman of the Committee on Inter-institutional Relationships, noted that he shared the chair with the Chairman of the Senate, Professor Burton, and credited her with helping the Committee to move forward in spite of his inability to attend all meetings. The Committee had spent some time discussing the desirability of and the planning of a Directory of CUNY faculty. The need for such a Directory is deemed apparent for several reasons: 1) the need of the Senate to find out who are the members of CUNY's faculty and what are their areas of expertise; 2) the fact that such information may be of use to others in the University since no such listing exists. The Committee therefore decided to move forward with the project and hopes to have the Directory available by late spring 1979. The prime raison d'etre for the Directory is to serve the need of the officers to respond to requests for faculty by discipline or expertise. Once the Directory exists it will also be possible to respond more fully to requests from national, state, city groups in search of faculty with special areas of expertise. The inability to do this has in the past resulted in underrepresentation of CUNY in such activities since the search has been diffused through the maze of bureaucracy in the University. The Committee spent time too addressing its very real concerns with questions of privacy and discussing how to put together such a Directory without violating the right of privacy. The solution arrived at takes the form of an authorization to be signed by the faculty member and attached to the questionnaire. Unless the authorization is signed only information in the public domain will be released, i.e. name, college, department. Everyone will be asked to fill out the entire form but the data will not be released. There has also been some discussion on this subject with the Academic Freedom Committee and it is the Committee's belief that the necessary has been done. The Committee will have access to computer tapes maintained by the University and which provide a great deal of information about individual faculty. Those tapes will be used by the UFS committee only for the purpose of obtaining names and addresses so that the forms may be distributed to each faculty member.

Professor Ferentz then explained that the Committee wished to ask the cooperation of the Senate in a "dry run" of the tentative questionnaire it has developed. He then distributed copies of that questionnaire as well as a draft list of disciplines to be used in completing the questionnaire. Senators were asked to complete the form and to record comments, questions, suggestions on the reverse and return to the Executive Director of the Senate. Asked by Professor Zeller whether retired faculty were to be included, Professor Ferentz said that if it were possible to distribute questionnaires to them he thought this would be done.

VI. Presentation by President Saul B. Cohen: Professor Burton stated that the UFS had a tradition, a short tradition dating to 1977-78, of inviting a college president to address one of its Plenary Sessions each year. In 1977-78 President Shenker, LaGuardia Community College, had participated. This year the Executive Committee agreed that the honors should go to a senior college president and had invited the newest CUNY president, Saul B. Cohen of Queens

Allege, to address the Senate. Professor Burton then introduced President Cohen, explaining that perhaps because he was more innocent of the UFS than other CUNY presidents he had accepted the invitation.

President Cohen responded saying that he might be more innocent of this Senate and faculty but not about faculties in general nor for that matter about himself. He explained that he had no Christmas or Chanukah present for the Senate, that, in fact, in light of recent events, Chancellor Kibbee had asked whether he was off President Cohen's Christmas list and the President had replied that he would not send the Chancellor a present but perhaps a card. As President of Queens, he continued, he met also with Borough President Manes and he was constantly reminded by the New York Times of the political tensions that surrounded his appointment. In fact, he had discovered that his being in the news brought him some notoriety - at least to the extent of receiving invitations to apply for other presidencies, though, as yet, no such invitation had been extended by Brooklyn College.

President Cohen then commented that he had found himself warmly welcomed to CUNY, that when asked how things were going he must answer that from his perspective it was still a lot of fun and that, as a newcomer, he might still use that word since his perceptions were different from those outside the University who occupy the limelight as critics of the University and also from those within who accept those attacks on CUNY's academic integrity. It was his experience, President Cohen asserted, that the University Faculty Senate and the Professional Staff Congress were those within the University who were not resigned to accepting those attacks. The outsiders might be divided into two categories - those whose motivation was political or professional rivalry and those who attacked through misguided paternalism. It was the latter group who might be amenable to rational argument whose views he wished to comment upon further.

Rarely, opined President Cohen, had he observed a university system with so negative a press. The press took pains to publicize the opinions of the privates, their activities related to research etc. but never those of CUNY. Last spring, for example, he had attended a meeting in Washington with people from the Department of Education and one of them had remarked that LaGuardia Community College had the best cooperative education program in the country in his opinion - but never is such a view expressed in the New York press. Another example might be found in the recent report of the State Education Department on the decline of New York City high school graduates over the next decade. The interpretation of those data was that the decline was likely to mean that CUNY - all of CUNY - would have to change its mission to that of remediation. Only in an aside was it noted that there was a hope the privates wouldn't neglect that group of students. President Cohen said that he objected to the implications of that report. He questioned whether irrespective of numbers CUNY must assume remediation as its mission by the 1990's. Must we assume that the community colleges won't be able to educate students to transfer to bachelor-degree granting colleges? Must we assume that the senior colleges won't improve on their missions? The thinking reflected in the New York Times article on the SED report implied that there is no place for the intellectually elite in public institutions, that in the name of public policy or finance all the units of CUNY are to be centers of remediation. In his opinion, President Cohen added, there was also reflected in that report and article the shortsightedness that results from tying financing higher education to numbers and a rejection of the idea that smaller size and standards may be related. He noted that some of the best educational institutions in the country have small student bodies, that smaller can be beautiful. He suggested that what

is needed is a reality based fiscal policy, that there is a need to talk about the level of funding in a time of declining enrollments. To put the senior colleges on notice that they must change their mission is misguided, however, and simply encourages the creaming off of minority groups by the privates at a cost to the students that is enormous. If the senior colleges are reduced to shells, he asserted, students will continue to be driven out as they have been since the crisis set in.

President Cohen then turned to the subject of the Howe report. He observed that the report is certainly important for its three basic premises relating to State take-over of senior college funding, to maintaining CUNY as an integrated system, and to having the BHE retain City as well as State representation. He commended the report for bearing down hard on the need to complete construction projects that were begun and then aborted and for forcefully rejecting the argument that private institutions can educate CUNY students more effectively and more cheaply. Nonetheless, he said, there were some areas of concern about the report. The theme of management of contraction which underlies the report gave rise to certain notions with which he disagreed. It is his belief that even in managing contraction one must recognize that there have to be some growth points. He suggested that anyone who did not believe this had only to ask A&P whose approach had been to close stores planning in time to build new ones only to discover when the time came to build that their place had been usurped by others. President Cohen cited as a case in point the report's judgment on creating a law school at Queens. The existence of such a large system as CUNY without a law school demanded explanation. A special advisory task force which included the Dean of Yale Law School, Harold Wellington, and Charles Duncan of Howard University's Law School, both objective analysts, had concluded that a system the size and quality of CUNY should have a law school. The focus should be not on whether there will be jobs but on whether the resources exist to develop a law school.

President Cohen noted that he had reservations about the way in which the report handled the question of funding. The document argues against major disparities between SUNY and CUNY and is then apologetic on the space problem. It fails to attack the assumption that CUNY can offer quality education at low cost. It doesn't deal with the question of aid for part-time students and it asks what can be done to control the tendency of CUNY and SUNY to overbuild. The impression such a question leaves is a false one. In addition, President Cohen said that some of the suggestions in the report such as the one on transferability came from a philosophy dominated by disillusionment with centralization and characterized them as shopworn 1960's prescriptions for the problems of the 1980's. He pointed out that the consultant from Pear, Marwick, Mitchell would solve the space problem at CUNY by sending students from one unit to another while noting possible constraints on the very solution he proposed such as the differences in program offerings, the curtailment of student freedom of choice and then dismissing those constraints as not "critical". President Cohen's summary evaluation of the consultant's study was that he was happy that CUNY did not pay for such a study.

President Cohen said that he did not believe that he or persons in the University were oblivious to what is happening in America today and to higher education. There is a recognition that the Pax Americana is at end, that America must learn to share power; there is recognition that the end of superabundance is at hand and that that circumstance has come about with remarkable speed and represents a coming international economic adjustment leading to a lower living standard, and all kinds of economic consequences. It means a lot of hard things that will have to be faced. It also means an end of the peculiarly American custom of

tical log-rolling whereby we enjoyed providing all things to all people. Era has come when choices must be made and this is especially true in regard to health and higher education. CUNY knows this since it was the first to experience the fiscal reality of these times and to face the dilemma of choice. The Howe report, however, stresses that all must be served but not well served. The important questions that are not addressed include how to improve the quality of education, how to attract students, how to engage in not stifle competition, how to reach and satisfy the needs of talented students and a productive faculty. The tradeoffs are simply not addressed in the report. At Queens College the president said they are beginning to look at such questions. They recognize as do others at CUNY that we are all in one boat and that it is a competitive boat. They recognize too that the agendas are common agendas. The University welcomes competition with SUNY but will have to face the disparity between the two systems. The legislature too will have to face priorities. As President Cohen views the situation the units of CUNY must be maintained and there must be undergraduate programs that lead to graduate programs; otherwise there will be tremendous competition. The hope is that CUNY will engage in competing for the very bright students because the alternative is a return to the narrow elitism that once characterized higher education or de-development of the system built up in New York and either of those alternatives spells the end of the American dream.

VII. Chancellor's Report: Noting that a few events of significance had occurred since the last meeting of the UFS, Chancellor Kibbee said that his report might be longer than he wished. He observed that he had heard President Cohen's critique of the Howe report and wished to approach the document from the perspective of what was possible in the context within which the report was developed. From that perspective it might be said that there were several components to the report. First, the central issues: mission, independence and integrity and on these it seemed that it would have been hard for the University to have written anything stronger than what "Doc" Howe came down with. In addition, there were Howe's important statements reaffirming the quality of CUNY. All of these seem to have had a positive effect on the Mayor's position vis-a-vis the University. A second component of the report deals with construction and there one has a mixed bag. In taking up the questions which the University deemed of high priority the report validated the University's position. It noted that the priorities were well placed; that the needs are there. Beyond that the part on construction is more vague and on long-range needs it is ambivalent. Although the report indicates that the facilities are poor it is not clear on what should be done or when. That part is mixed although in the long run it may be the least important part. The net effect of the report, said the Chancellor, is that in certain areas the Mayor has responded quickly, notably to the recommendations on Hostos Community College, Bronx Community College and Borough Manhattan Community College by moving towards implementing the recommendations. The actual bonds for Hostos and Bronx Community are being prepared for sale in the next few weeks. The situation with respect to BMCC is more complex since it combines short and long-term problems. The Mayor has not responded to the long-term aspect of the BMCC situation although Howe made specific recommendations there.

The Chancellor also commented on a second report - a draft document by the State Education Department for the Board of Regents. No action has been taken on that report although it is expected that at their January meeting the Regents will make some statement about CUNY and higher education in New York. This report in terms of mission and so forth is solidly on the side of the University and the Howe report. It does contain a few wild things, however, which hopefully will be removed before the final draft, e.g. the suggestion that under the BHE there be separate boards for each community college. The problem here is that unlike the

other community colleges in the State, the CUNY ones do not have different communities but a common one; thus there is but one sponsor. Furthermore, the report does not offer a definition of the powers of the individual boards in relation to those of the central board. The Chancellor said that he would envision a situation which would be chaotic and characterized by unadulterated bickering. There was also a second recommendation that was gratuitous, i.e. that in future labor relations for the senior colleges be handled by the State and for the community colleges by the City of New York. In summary, the Chancellor said that both documents - the Howe report and the SED report - addressed the central issues of most immediate concern to the University and did so in a manner that was solidly affirmative.

Turning to the question of the Budget, Chancellor Kibbee stated that in so far as the senior college budget is concerned it is now being considered by the State for inclusion in the State Executive Budget which is scheduled to be unveiled February 1, 1979. There is not much to report at this point because there is a "dark period" in effect - one that runs this year from about November 1 to January 1. This "dark period" is standard in the State budget process and is the time when the Executive and the Budget Office are doing their own thing with what the University has requested. Early in January the Chancellor will be told what decisions have been reached and at that point he is given the opportunity to make suggestions for changes.

On the community college side there are concerns both short-term and long-range. The short term concern results from the fact that the community colleges are being asked to maintain a reserve based on a 90% rate of collection of revenue from students. For some this is a real reserve and the money can be used when the revenue is collected; for some where it is clear that the revenue collected won't reach the budgeted amounts the reserve requirement will mean a need to absorb a budget cut through cutting costs. A second aspect of the community college problem is the result of the audit disallowances for 1973-74 and 1974-75. The disallowances arose because of the problem of substantiating the presence of students for whom the University received funds from the State. The disallowances won't affect those years because the City then maintained a fund to cover such disallowances and certain other claims but the City has now ordered the University, beginning in 1977-78, to maintain a fund to cover such disallowances and the size needed is estimated at as much as \$10 million. The community colleges are being required to build up that fund over the next four years and to put into it this year \$1.25 million. Therefore, the community college budget is being reduced by that amount. The cost of that fund has been distributed among the community colleges in amounts paralleling the percentage of the total community college budget allocated to each unit. This has placed the community colleges in a very difficult position especially since the requirement was imposed in the middle of an academic year. Two attempts are being made to alleviate the effects of this. First, the University is requesting some downside protection from the State Budget Office. The request is based on the following: The University loses \$900 in state aid and \$775 in tuition for each student lost but it is clear that it does not lose that full amount of obligation. The most that can be expected is that the cost of instruction for the student is lost. The University is therefore arguing that only half of the State aid should be recovered and hopefully SUNY is joining CUNY in this argument. The second effort to alleviate the problem is to demonstrate to the City that the loss of technical students is larger than the number budgeted and that those monies should be made available. If these efforts are successful, the monies could be used to offset the losses due to audit disallowances and loss of revenue from tuition.

The long term problem is greater, the Chancellor continued. There is the



ed for larger sums for the audit disallowance fund; the City is readjusting its budget and it is unreasonable to expect the University to be free from the effects of those further cuts; and a slight loss of students is projected. The University is doing several things to try to counteract the effects of these factors: 1) it is seeking downside protection from the State; 2) it is trying to demonstrate that the audit disallowances are going to be substantially smaller than projected (this is based on an outside audit which the University has had performed for a recent year); and 3) it is seeking a change in the funding formula that will mean a smaller loss of monies for each student lost and which will also help to reduce the loss from audit disallowances.

In the area of governance the Chancellor reported that both the Howe report and the draft document prepared for the Regents as well as testimony at the Miller Assembly Higher Education Committee hearings all pointed towards support for an independent governing board for CUNY. In addition, the Mayor of New York's statement at the Miller hearings spoke in behalf of an independent University with an integrated structure and Governor Carey has reiterated his campaign statements pledging to maintain the autonomy of CUNY. Meetings with key legislators have indicated that among them too there is support for the University position, i.e. for the independence of City University. Thus, all of these influences which could have been negative appear to be lining up in support of independence.

Chancellor Kibbee and President Cohen then responded to the following questions from the floor. 1) Professor Lea (Lehman, English) - "Chancellor Kibbee, I saw your interview on Channel 13 with Marilyn Berger recently and was impressed because it is the kind of thing we have been hoping would occur. What I would like to know is whether your office is making more of an effort this year to develop that kind of publicity?" / Yes. We have employed a woman who has experience in television and in higher educational institutions' public relations and she has been instrumental in getting me and members of the CUNY faculty on programs when requests identifying special needs are received. A good deal of work has been done with some success. I have a report on this which I shall be happy to share with your chairman and she may do what she wishes with it. Professor Lea then asked President Cohen - "In the first part of your report you cast us as the victims of the press. Could you tell us what are two or three of the things that have been done that ought not to have been and what should have been done?" / I'm not a good commentator on the past years though I am convinced that many of the things no one could have done anything about. I think it is clear that your first question points to the kind of area that we need to promote - things such as the Gambino piece in the New York Times. I think too of a recent discussion at a Council of Presidents meeting when the Chancellor referred to the Distinguished Professors program and I wondered whether any attempt had been made to get that series of lectures on public TV. I think it would be worth a good deal and that one needs to be prepared for more in this area. 2) Professor Roman (Hostos, Social Science) - "We at Hostos feel extreme consternation at the approval by the Board of Regents of a new branch of the College of New Rochelle to be opened in the South Bronx virtually at our doorstep. We were extremely disturbed at the report that your attitude was neutral and we were very angry that our Acting President did not warn us that this might be coming. It seems obvious to us, given our many problems, that there is some kind of move to destroy us. What we would like to know are the following: Did you in fact take a neutral posture and, if so, why? How do you see the future of Hostos in the light of this development? What can be done to reverse this decision of the Regents?" / Everyone was taken aback because no one knew much about this plan. Your Acting President didn't warn you because he didn't know about it and he did oppose it very strongly in a letter to the Regents. I took a neutral stand because I thought that there couldn't be too

much education in the South Bronx. I didn't think that a program of so special a nature offered by so small an institution would have much effect on CUNY. an area so devastated I could not oppose any educational opportunity. Finally, in response to your last question, I doubt that you can get a reversal. President Cohen added that this underscored the competition of which he had spoken. He did not think that CUNY had been permitted to compete on equal grounds with other institutions in the State and he based this, for example, on the amount of graduate tuition the University is required to charge and the limitations on offering off-campus programs in certain settings. He noted that at Queens a request is about to be made for permission to set up an environmental program outside the borough, a program which has been sought by the Nassau county community in which it would operate and which Queens has the resources to offer. 3) Professor Lutz (Brooklyn, Economics) - "Thank you, President Cohen, for your optimistic view. You said you were having fun and I imagine this is the result of the fact that you are still a bridegroom. Once you understand that under the BHE Bylaws faculty are assigned responsibility for curriculum, for certifying students for degrees etc. and that presidents are charged with responsibility for budgeting, soon you are going to have less fun because you will have to become an executioner - a hatchet man - and decide what to cut. How do you think you will deal with that?"/ I had one Christmas present early - when I arrived at Queens last summer - I was given the budget for SEEK which included a 25% cut in the midst of a controversy over new guidelines for the program. The problem thus was to restructure the program and to make it an integrated one. We have done it even though in the process I was accused of following the guidelines too slavishly and also of ignoring them in sensitive areas. As I stated before, I believe firmly that the priority must be that where you have real identifiable strength that is where the monies must be put. Professor Lutz then asked the Chancellor the following - "What do you mean when you speak of audit disallowances? I am an accountant and I am not familiar with the term."/ You are lucky because it doesn't apply to the senior colleges. This is based on the fact that the University received money from the State for a certain number of students, e.g. we sent in a report that we had 60,000 students, got funding for that number, and then the State asks that we demonstrate how many of those hypothetical 60,000 students were in attendance after the third week of class. If there is no hard evidence that the student was dropped after the third week then it is assumed by the State audit that the drop took place before. Their position is that the money was gotten under false pretences and must therefore be returned. There are other things too - the Ingler formula according to which money is allocated includes a base amount plus certain other factors - the student/faculty ratio and the number of disadvantaged students - if one cannot demonstrate that the students were there then those monies are disallowed too. Part of this is our own fault, to the record-keeping but part is due to decisions by the auditors on how to judge and those decisions are in certain instances excessively harsh. 4) Professor Gosselin (Bronx CC, English) - "I would like to ask for a clarification and then I have a question. On the clarification: what is the status of some of the other highest priority items dealt with in the Howe report, e.g. La Guardia or Medgar Evers?"/ There has been no movement on these because the Mayor has not responded to the final report yet. In the case of the senior colleges that were priorities, Howe said that they should be activated when the State has taken over 100% of construction costs; so there one has to wait for a decision by the Governor and the Legislature. Professor Gosselin then asked his question - "What can you tell us of the rumored transfer of the dental hygienist and x-ray technician programs from Hostos to New York City Community College?"/ There is no plan to move the dental program that I know of. The situation with respect to the x-ray program is different. New York City Community College which has a radiology program has been looking for faculty for that program and from the applicants they chose the two people who are running the program

Hostos and this has left Hostos without people to teach in the program. The students are to be transferred by decision of Local 1199 which pays their tuition for the program. 5) Professor Nowinski (Hostos, Modern Language) - (Professor Nowinski prefaced her question with a lengthy, impassioned statement) "When will you restore the \$41,000 you first gave Hostos for rental of additional facilities and then withdrew by requiring Hostos to pay those costs out of its operating budget? What is the reply that we can carry back to our colleagues?"/ I don't recall having withdrawn any funds from Hostos. I provided funds for rentals and didn't withdraw any. Hostos is funded in the same way the other community colleges are funded. I think you will find that the amount of money for supportive services at Hostos exceeds the amount for other colleges by 50 to 100% since the costs for these services are there no matter what the number of students. Having said that I recognize that the college has problems that are common to all the community colleges in the system. We don't manufacture money in the Central Office, we just distribute it and we try to do that in a way that is open and with some understanding of the needs of the various institutions. 6) Professor Baumrin (Lehman, Philosophy) - "I was delighted to discover that you were pursuing our old and new China policy and to hear what President Cohen said about Nassau and Suffolk counties. It is a year, however, if I am not mistaken since the equalization of tuition for students from other counties and although I hear that our cultural institutions are tripping all over the State, I thought that the students might come here to partake of those cultural treats. I didn't think the policy was what it seems to be or did I miss something?"/ We don't have a policy for auslanders, we think that the city serves as a magnet to draw students to us. President Cohen added that at Queens a pre-admissions office has been opened and two young people have been hired to work there. They spend most of their time in Queens since most of the schools are there but they are also spending time in Nassau. They don't have enough money for the gas to get them to Suffolk. We think this is going to pay dividends in a couple of years and, as a matter of fact, people at the college are beginning to worry about the parking problem that may result and want me to start making plans for handling it. 7) Professor Burton (Brooklyn, History) - "The Brooklyn College Senate delegation is interested in the area of recruitment of presidents and hopes that the Faculty Senate as a whole takes a lively interest in the issue. Is there going to be an attempt to search actively for a new president for Brooklyn?"/ Yes. The BHE Committee has been put together and the faculty have named their members and the students have been asked to name theirs; in addition there is an alumni representative who has been chosen. The position has been advertised and also letters have been sent to persons who might be in a position to suggest names. We welcome letters from the faculty of any unit as well. Our hope is to begin screening in February. President Cohen added that he had full confidence in the Chancellor's ability to search out presidents. 8) Professor Greenbaum (QCC, History) - "Some of the community colleges have met their enrollment targets and must have teachers to man the classes that are needed for those students. If the cuts are distributed equally that could mean a destructive, downward spiral for the college. What steps are being taken to avert that?"/ We haven't distributed the cuts equally except for the audit disallowances. We have required the setting up of a reserve based on the 90% collection figure. We have the assurance of the City that if the students come the funds will be released; they are therefore set aside, not taken away and those monies would take care of the needed adjuncts. 9) Professor Milberg-Kaye (Lehman, English) - "Chancellor Kibbee, the Freshman Skills Assessment Program has not had a Director for five or six months. Although there is a recruitment process going on, it will be June at the earliest before there is a Director and in the interim there is no Acting Director, no one in the Central Office to whom questions can be directed. This means that there is a grave possibility of errors being made in the conduct of the program, that there can be serious bungling and persons who feel strongly about the program are deeply

concerned. Is it possible to have an Acting Director appointed?"/ I don't know of any reason why not and I shall speak with Vice-Chancellor Roellig about it tomorrow. 10) Professor Sohmer (City, Mathematics) - " Last year in planning the budget request the wisdom of 80th Street dictated that the cuts should be accepted because the State wouldn't dare leave those cuts and then they did. In particular I am thinking of OTPS cuts. I am told now that a phone call was made to my campus concerning the problem we are having with security. Reportedly, the campus was told that if we put up \$100,000 the Budget Office would be dealt with. Is this so?"/ The way it works is that we don't make up the budget request alone. The colleges come in and make presentations to the University; then, the University in discussion with the presidents of the colleges agree on a request to the Budget Office based on the college's priorities not 80 Street's. We do discuss what we think will fly and point out that one is likely to get less than one asks. Then, Albany responds. What we said to your college is that if we got a letter from City College about the horrors taking place in the security area and the need for money if we took that to the Budget Office, they would respond that it was not a high priority in the original request and therefore they did not give it. What I said to your college was you can't say "this, this and this are high and down there is security and then expect monies" but if you are going to say it is so important are you willing to move monies as a sign of your commitment? 11) Professor Cooper (COSI, History) - " There is a very strange relationship perceived at Staten Island and that is that everytime our president visits with you within twenty-four hours there is talk of retrenchment, workload, Professor Cooper's teaching sociology or remedial English but not history and how we can get through to June without retrenchment, furlough, cancelling classes, etc. Is there some way to relieve this situation? If I sound flip, it is only because that is the only way I can deal with the situation. I don't know how to handle it any longer. I know all the cosmic reasons but not the discrete ones and I think you really have no idea of the chaos that besets this institution on a lunar calendar basis. Are we to have 1976 forever?"/ We're between full moons at least and no one at 80th Street has suggested that you teach sociology. The question is a difficult one but I can tell you flatly the college is not going to be closed at any time. There is a problem in dealing with the budget at Staten Island which has been a continual source of discussion between the college and 80th Street. The college says it doesn't have money and 80th Street says that the college has a budget and it is the college's job to decide how to use that budget. The most recent question concerns the second semester and how to offer enough sections to have the students to generate the revenue needed to meet the budget. I can't tell you the resolution only the source of conflict. There are certain givens: no college can overspend its budget and within that one has to make judgments on how the college can live within its budget without getting into a downward spiral. 12) Professor Baumrin (Lehman, Philosophy) - " I recently heard a story told by a Provost which went as follows: if Professor Cooper teaches an extra course in history then Professor Jones who is an historian can teach sociology and then a sociologist can teach accounting and save \$1000 and thus we can save students. The story came from a provost, I know, but if 80th Street doesn't do something to stop this kind of talk, then it will be suspected of supporting it."/ I never believe stories told by provosts. 13) Professor Seeley (QCC, Biological Science) - " We have been told that the audit disallowances are due to the grade WU. Has the BHE rethought the use of that grade?"/ If there is a W on the transcript then the question arises as to when that occurred. Professor Seeley said that W grades were clocked in./ There are two problems: 1) the group who leave without checking out and 2) even when students actually withdraw the slips are often not dated or not kept after a period of time. 14) Professor Lederman (Baruch, English) - "Following up on Professor Milberg-Kaye's question, there is said to have been \$150,000 allocated for the program. Where is it and what are the plans for using it?"/ It isn't

re yet and we are negotiating when it is going to be made available. Professor Lederman further asked whether it did not have to be spent before the end of the year. 15) Professor Roberts (Lehman, English) - "There is a record of WU's. Can't the auditors look at the grade sheets?"/ You may date the WU's on your sheets but not everyone does. What we are doing is trying to identify the students in other ways, e.g. did a student take a test after the third week. The problem is that the record-keeping is sloppy. 16) Professor Roman (Hostos, Social Science) - "Returning to the loss of the x-ray program at Hostos - since the loss would mean a possible loss of students is this kind of raid permissible? And what if the faculty wish to stay?"/ There is no problem if they are staying. There is no formal process of trying to transfer people. On raiding I don't know how I can tell a person who applies for a position and gets it that he can't take it. That would seem horrible interference. We have tried to tighten up the guidelines on this especially in reference to when one college should let the other know but even there the president can't say he won't let a person go.

Professor Burton thanked President Cohen for addressing the Senate. She also noted that members of the Queens College faculty who were members of the College Council had been invited to attend the session and thanked those who had come.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Henry Wasser  
Secretary