

MINUTES OF THE EIGHTY-FOURTH PLENARY SESSION OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

May 1, 1979

Professor Ann M. Burton, chairman, called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. in Room 207 at the Graduate Center. All members were present except Professors Abramson, Abreu, Behesti, Beitler, Berger, Brodsky, Bryar, Bullard, Caws, Ceccarelli, Corbiere-Gille, Diesendruck, Dobos, Dreiling, Ehrenpreis, Ferentz, Krich, Lenoir, Levitan, Lutz, Marcinek, Martin, Page, Ratensky, Ringel, Robbins, Rothman, Ruttenberg, Sacks, Santoro, Schulman, Seeley, Seiger, Shapiro, Shmidman, Silver, Toback, Uretsky, and Yuster. Professors Jiji, Melani, Timoni, Valinsky and Yousef were excused. Professor Nachtsheim, liaison member AAUP, attended. Chancellor Robert J. Kibbee and Dr. Jean Ellis also attended.

- I. Approval of the Tentative Agenda: The tentative agenda was approved.
- II. Approval of the Minutes of the 83rd Plenary Session (March 20, 1979): The minutes were approved as circulated.
- III. Communications from the Chairman: Professor Burton reminded the membership that amendments to Articles I - V inclusive and to Article VII of the Charter of the Senate had been sent to the campuses for ratification. She urged members to see to it that the amendments were placed on the agenda of the appropriate local body before the end of the academic year and noted that if the proposed amendment on the agenda of the present Plenary Session were adopted, the work of revising the Charter would have been completed.

Professor Burton announced that the annual organizational meeting of the Senate would be held on May 22. At that session newly elected and reelected Senators will take office and elections for Secretary, Treasurer and five members-at-large of the Executive Committee will be held. She asked that Senators insure that results of elections to college Senate delegations were reported promptly to the Senate Office. She announced also that an orientation meeting for newly elected Senators would be held immediately preceding the organizational meeting on May 22.

The chairman next reported on the hearings held by the Higher Education Committee of the State Assembly on Friday, April 27 concerning the future governance of the University. Assemblyman Siegel, chairman of that committee, has proposed a plan for the University's future which was sent to members of the University Faculty Senate with the materials for the Plenary and testimony was heard on those proposals at the April 27 hearing. Those testifying, Professor Burton continued, included Deputy-Mayor Trimble whose manner, she noted, in contrast to that often adopted by the members of the City administration towards the University, was benign; Council President Bellamy, former Mayor Wagner who spoke for the Friends of the City University and Mr. Stanley Lowell, chairman of the Committee for Public Higher Education. Chancellor Kibbee spoke for the University as did the chairman of the University Faculty Senate and the presidents of some of the colleges. The general tenor of the testimony offered at the hearing was to praise the proposals in terms of their basic thrust and especially for their emphasis on maintaining the integrity of the University. There was concern, however, over some of the detailed provisions of the plan. Her own testimony, Professor Burton said, reflected the position taken by the Senate at the 83rd Plenary as well as discussion of the Siegel proposals by the Executive Committee. As members might learn from the written text of her testimony, two aspects of the proposals on governance were stressed in Professor Burton's oral testimony: the disenfranchisement of the ex-officio members of the Board of Higher

Education and the recommendation that each CUNY college have its own College Council composed of political appointees. In her testimony Professor Burton argued that ex-officio members of groups were entitled to vote unless specifically disenfranchised, that the disenfranchisement made the ex-officio members second class citizens, and that objections in terms of possible conflict of interest were not valid since the Senate was not the collective bargaining agent but was concerned with academic policy-making and that in any action where conflict of interest might exist potentially, the ex-officio member could disqualify himself or herself as did the appointed members of the Board in such cases. Professor Burton noted that the Chancellor in his testimony had supported the request for voting membership for the ex-officio members.

On the issue of local College Councils Professor Burton had recommended that these local advisory boards be structured so as to include representatives from the college community as well as appointees from the external community. Specifically, she had suggested including representatives of the local faculty and student governing bodies, alumni, and a member of the college's administration. In addition, the advisory role of the local board regarding relations between the college and the local community was stressed and the power to appoint presidents was reserved to the central governing board of the University. She recommended that the local boards play the same role in the selection of presidents as members of the local college community, i.e. participation in the consideration of candidates.

Professor Burton told the Senate that she would be leaving the Plenary session somewhat before the conclusion in order to travel to Albany where she would spend the next two days talking with legislators and members of the Governor's staff concerning the future of the University. She alerted the membership to rumors reported in the press that there were some persons thinking in terms of a recommendation to establish separate governing boards for the senior and community colleges and that attempting to verify the validity of that rumor would be one of her aims in Albany. Professor Davidson would join Dr. Burton in Albany to express the Senate's views.

Next Professor Burton called the Senators attention to the information in her written report concerning the proposed Faculty Retraining Program. She reminded the body that she had reported on this proposal at previous meetings and wished to keep the members informed of progress. A Faculty Cabinet meeting is scheduled for May 14 at which final arrangements for the summer project will be completed. In the meantime, she asked that members who wished to suggest personnel to serve as supervisors of workshops in any of the three areas to be studied - academic advisement, institutional research, and budget - or as resource persons should so advise Professor Wasser. She asked too that members alert colleagues to the program and advise Professor Wasser of the names of any faculty members who might be interested in participating as "students".

The final item in Professor Burton's report concerned the possible increase in tuition being sought by the City administration. She reported that on March 28 she had participated in a panel discussion sponsored by the New York Public Interest Research Group and held at Brooklyn College on the topic "The Tuition Increase: Necessary or Needless?". Other panelists included a representative of the Mayor, the chairman of the University Student Senate, the Director of Financial Aid, and the president of the PSC as well as the Executive Director of the Committee for Public Higher Education. Noting that the meeting was held just two days after the Board of Higher Education had been virtually coerced by the Mayor to act on his proposal that the Central Office be housed in the new facility for Borough Manhattan Community College as a condition to his giving approval to that construction, Professor Burton said that her mood on the day of the discussion was not temperate vis-

-vis the City. Her mood was not improved when the Mayor's representative insisted that the proposed tuition increase was entirely the City's proposal and that no other agency was responsible. In her remarks Professor Burton had taken the approach that the City was abandoning the University and making it the victim of repeated attacks as well as cutbacks. At the same time the City took the approach that, as often happened in such circumstances, the University was to be blamed for being a victim. In addition, Dr. Burton had characterized the argument for a tuition increase based on the concept of parity with the State University as an argument based on negative parity since it spoke to a situation in which there was no equity since SUNY's tuition is used for construction and facilities while CUNY's becomes part of the colleges' operating budgets. In addition, she had noted the inadequacy of tuition assistance for CUNY students and had thus addressed the argument that the tuition increase would not constitute a burden on the University's students. To the contrary, Professor Burton had explained, a tuition increase would not be offset by financial assistance but would lead to another example of special hardship for the University's students. The proposal for a tuition increase, she continued, was being vigorously opposed by the University Student Senate who planned a rally in opposition for May 9 at City Hall. The Faculty Senate Executive Committee had discussed possible action by the Senate and had agreed that a resolution expressing support for the students and pledging cooperation was in order. Accordingly, she wished to offer such a resolution to the Senate for its consideration and action.

The proposed resolution on a tuition increase was moved and seconded. After brief discussion the question was called and the resolution was adopted unanimously.

IV. Reports of Faculty Representatives to Board of Higher Education Committees: Professor Cooper (COSI, History), faculty representative to the Committee on Central Administration, reported that the April 10 meeting of that committee had included on its agenda an item submitted for consideration at what she perceived as the eleventh hour. Ordinarily, materials for such meetings were circulated several days in advance of the meeting and this had been the case with the bulk of materials for the April 10 meeting. On the afternoon of April 10 an added item had been sent to her at the Senate Office and since she was at that point at her college and not available to the Office even by telephone, she had first learned of the item when it was offered for consideration at the meeting of the committee. The nature of the item she had found extremely distressing since it called for a waiver of sections of the Bylaws relating to the election of department chairpersons in order to facilitate a reorganization at Hostos Community College. Her position in the meeting had been to oppose such an action vigorously and also to take exception to the manner in which it had been initiated. Immediately following the meeting she had been in touch with members of the Hostos faculty who indicated that they had not spoken earlier with the Senate about this matter since they were not informed of the impending action until the afternoon of the meeting. Since that time, Professor Cooper continued, she had learned that the issue had somehow been resolved so far as the faculty of Hostos was concerned and that the waiver of the Bylaws with respect to their departmental structure had been accepted by them. Her own concern that this action might signal an unfortunate trend remained, however.

Considerable discussion of the issues raised by Professor Cooper's report followed. The chairman and other members of the Executive Committee spoke to the fact that the views expressed in the meeting by Professor Cooper were indeed those of the Senate on the issue of elected chairmen. Professor Burton added that the issue of the Bylaw waiver for Hostos had been mentioned to her prior to the Central Administration committee meeting and her reaction as chairman of the Senate sought. She had expressed the Senate's opposition at that time but had not been

alerted to the decision to include in on the Committee's agenda nor had any member of the Hostos delegation been in touch with her on the matter. Professor Roman (Hostos, Social Science) explained that there was a special need for reorganization at Hostos and that it seemed evident to the faculty of the college that without this waiver the reorganization would have been carried out without any consultation of faculty. As things now stood there was to be a meeting on May 3 to begin discussion of a new governance document for the college to replace the present one which was developed unilaterally by a former Hostos administrator, now fortunately departed for another CUNY college, and submitted to the Board and adopted without discussion with the college community. Now there would be discussion and development of a new governance structure. In addition, the time period permitted under the Bylaw waiver was to be even further limited by the college. In the course of the discussion a number of questions were raised and concerns expressed. Why had this action been brought first to the Board before the faculty on the campus had been consulted or informed? Why had the Hostos faculty agreed to the action? Was this a precedent setting action to be followed in the case of other new presidents and what might be the effect of the action on the three presidents now being sought? Who had advised the college's faculty that the action was inevitable and therefore persuaded them to accept it? On the last point Professor Roman noted that it was the union which had given this opinion and advice and not the Senate leadership. On the other issues deep concern was expressed. Professor Wasser (COSI, Humanities) observed that he was troubled by this issue and by the reasons given to explain it when he had raised the question with the Chancellor at an Executive Committee meeting, viz. that there were problems at Hostos and the president needed a free hand to resolve them. He observed also that the action seemed to alert the faculties to a danger to be looked for. He thought that in a sense the older senior colleges did have a set of procedures of a democratic nature that were part of their tradition and that this was not always true of community colleges - that this was a fact of the total higher education spectrum and not CUNY alone. In the community colleges there was often an authoritarian pattern of which the faculty was not even aware. His concern was that this might lead to a restraint on the democratic procedures in the senior colleges whereas in his view it is precisely the reverse that is needed. Professor Sohmer (City, Mathematics) said that the entire action seemed to him to be bizarre and carried through with undue haste since, in his opinion, a suspension of the Bylaws was not an action to be undertaken lightly. Professor Baumrin (Lehman, Philosophy) speculated on how this could have happened and why it was done without forewarning and why a suspension could be undertaken with this haste when two meetings were required to amend or adopt Bylaws. Professor Cooper expressed consternation at the ease with which the Board members of the Committee accepted the president's explanation of the action and her own dissatisfaction with the haste for action. Professor Gosselin (Bronx Community, English) noted that the incident did serve to point to a function of the University Faculty Senate, viz. to underline the fact that it is a place to which the faculty of a college can come when embattled and find assistance. In this instance there would have been greater activity on the part of the Senate leadership if the Hostos faculty had sought such support but without such a request the Senate did not intervene.

Professor Stefan Baumrin, faculty representative to the Fiscal Affairs Committee of the Board, reported on its activities. There have been two subjects of real significance that have come before the Committee in recent meetings, he said: a review of the University's security arrangements which is still underway and the culmination of a two year discussion of investment policy. With respect to the latter Professor Baumrin reported that it was two years since the suggestion had been made that there might be faculty input into the investment policy with respect to the approximately \$25 million endowment of the University. When that suggestion was agreed to Professor Gerald Pogue (Baruch, Economics and Finance) whose name was

suggested by Professor Valinsky, then chairman of the Senate, had been asked to undertake a study of the policy. Professor Pogue had done this and had brought his report and recommendations to the Board Committee. He had suggested a risk/benefit formula to be followed. His work was warmly received and the Vice-Chancellor for Finance promptly moved ahead to implement the recommendations. In that sense, noted Professor Baumrin, that the policy was implemented without further consultation the Vice-Chancellor's zeal might have been excessive. Nonetheless, he continued, the important point, he thought, was that it recognized faculty participation in the development of the investment policy of the University.

Professor Gosselin, faculty representative to the Committee on Facilities and Planning, said there had been no new developments since his written report but that he wished to yield to Professor Quinn (Brooklyn, English) for a report on a situation developing there that might become an issue for the Board committee. Professor Quinn prefaced his account with the statement that in spite of a drop in enrollment Brooklyn College still had major space problems especially in relation to the Schools of Humanities and Social Science and to staff rooms. Despite this the college had received a request from the local elementary school (P.S. 152) for use of facilities at the college. The school is overcrowded and sought the use of eight classrooms plus space for support staff to be set aside for its use. The president of Brooklyn College as an outgoing president did not wish to make this decision unilaterally, Professor Quinn continued, and therefore appointed a Task Force of faculty to consider the request. The Task Force recommended that the request be denied and the president so informed the district school board. The issue, it now seems, is of sufficient consequence to have warranted intervention by Chancellor Macchiarola and the Borough President and reportedly the matter has now been referred to the Chancellor of the University. Professor Quinn noted in response to a question from Professor Greenbaum (Queensborough, History) that the request for space was not the result of a joint undertaking with the Brooklyn School of Education as sometimes had occurred at other units. In fact, in all the years that the college and the school have been in close proximity there has been no arrangement for joint undertakings in the area of curriculum etc. Without question the school's need for space continues but the issue is rather clouded at this stage.

V. Proposed Amendment to Article VIII of the Charter of the University Faculty Senate: Professor Ornstein, chairman of the Committee on Elections and Organization, presented a revised version of the amendment to Article VIII of the Charter and moved its adoption. Professor Roberts (Lehman, English) offered the following amendment to the language in the footnote, viz. to insert the phrase "either by the entire faculty acting as a collective body or" between the verb "shall be carried out" and the phrase "by means of...". After brief discussion the amendment in language was adopted and after further brief discussion the proposed amendment to the Charter was adopted.

VI. Chancellor's Report: Chancellor Kibbee made the following announcements of personnel actions: Vice-Chancellor Mary Bass has left the University to become Inspector General of the Department of Commerce. A Search Committee which includes University Faculty Senate representation has been formed to recommend a new candidate for that post. In the interim Ms. Paula Leavitt, a long-time member of the Department of Legal Affairs, has been named Acting Vice-Chancellor. In addition, Mr. Robin Elliott has assumed the post of Deputy to the Chancellor for University Relations.

Concerning the presidential searches in progress Chancellor Kibbee reported as follows: the Brooklyn College search has reached the campus interview stage - two candidates have been to the campus already, a third is being interviewed on

May 1 and 2 and a fourth on May 4 and 5. A meeting has been set for May 10 when the campus groups will report their evaluations of the candidates to the Search Committee and the Chancellor; the City College Search Committee is screening candidates and is preparing to interview selected persons; the Hunter Committee is still at the screening stage. Chancellor Kibbee noted also that Dr. Goldin has relinquished the chair of the Hunter Committee although he continues to serve as a member of the Committee and the chair has been assumed by Mr. Robinson.

The Chancellor then summarized the most significant points in the City's Executive Budget announced April 26 and offered to arrange for a full briefing for the Senate Executive Committee and other interested members by Vice-Chancellor Posman and his staff. According to the Chancellor Kibbee the salient points are as follows: The budget for the current year after all of the changes was \$162 million for the community colleges. To arrive at the base budget on which to project next year's budget certain one shot pieces in this year's final figure were deducted (monies for certain rentals, for the Central Office and for miscellaneous items) leaving \$161.5 million. The University projected that it needed a budget of \$173 million for next year - \$12 million more than this year-in order to keep up with the current budget. The City has included \$169.1 million in the Executive Budget or \$4.3 million less than the projected need. (The "shortfall" includes \$2.5 million in audit disallowances, \$900, 000 deannualization monies and miscellaneous other deductions). In addition, the budget includes \$6.3 million in additional revenue from the tuition increase for lower division students which the City projects. If these two amounts are added the budget provides \$10.6 million less than the University projects as the need for next year.

In relation to the freshman allocation figures the Chancellor said that the second phase allocations had been made in mid-April and that there had been 33,992 applications, an increase of 850 over last year. The increase, he suggested, was probably meaningless, however, since the allocation figures were based on applications up to a date later than the one used last year. It would be fairer to say that the figures are roughly the same as last year and that the pool is approximately the same as last year.

Chancellor Kibbee reported also on the University's Supplemental Budget request which totals \$17 million - \$10 million for the senior colleges and \$7 million for the community colleges. The latter reflects sought-for changes in the formula base plus increases in the amounts for technical students and disadvantaged students. The upstate community colleges are pursuing the same changes so it is anticipated that both groups will appear before the legislature in concert. The SUNY Board is not seeking the changes for reasons that the Chancellor described as "technical". Chancellor Kibbee reminded the Senate that the Supplemental Request consisted of things one asked for but seldom got to the extent of the request; therefore, he cautioned against anticipation that the University might receive the full \$17 million additional.

The Chancellor then addressed the issue of the future governance of the University stating that within the next six to eight weeks that question would be under debate and legislation adopted. He anticipates that action on the legislation should occur sometime between the last week in May and the third week in June. In the meantime, he said, the parameters of that debate were being formed. The Siegel proposal is now being put into legislative language and should be introduced this week or next. The proposal, he said, constituted a good beginning, was sound on the basic issues but included a few troublesome aspects that would come under discussion during the next weeks. The Senate Higher Education Committee is having discussions on the subject but has not yet formulated a proposal although the staff is working on a

possible bill which will probably not differ radically from that of the Assembly Committee. There will probably be some differences to allow for negotiations between the two houses but it is also possible that the changes will be negotiated prior to its submission. Lying in wait down on the second floor of the Capitol, the Chancellor continued, is the Governor's proposal. The staff and people around the Executive Office are known to be developing a comprehensive bill but the dimensions of that bill are not known although it is rumored that there are divisive elements included in it. The possibilities with respect to that proposal seem to be the following: if there is substantial legislative agreement, then it seems unlikely that the Governor will propose his bill. Instead he may use the time to negotiate changes in the legislative proposals. Thus, the Chancellor concluded there is one card on the table, a couple in people's hand or up sleeves and all will be played in the next weeks. Then will come the thrust and parry stage and hopefully the University will come out of it with the University all together and City-oriented.

In concluding his report the Chancellor recalled that at the previous session he had been asked about the differences between applications for the senior and community colleges when he reported on the allocation figures. The allocations to the community colleges are down about 2.5% and those to the senior colleges are up about 1%. As reported previously, the University-wide difference is 1%; therefore the totals do not appear to be significant. He was also asked about the reading Task Force and why its membership did not include persons in that area. A check of the membership of the Task Force, he reported, reveals that five members, a majority, are involved in teaching or administering such programs and that the other members are involved in English as a Second Language or are English teachers to whom reading would appear to have some meaning.

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

1) Professor Lea (Lehman, English) - " I should like to preface my question by stating that I am not talking about illiteracy. There have been a number of rumors since October that the skills figures are being fudged by the colleges and that there has been pressure from the administration that this be done. Have you heard these rumors? Has Dean Lyons heard them? And what do you or he intend to do about them now that you've heard them?"/ I haven't heard them nor has Dean Lyons so far as I know but I would be surprised if they were not around. I think that these are questions that one has to be very careful about and that one has to be careful in how they are administered in that they require protecting against arranging the reporting so that one appears other than one is. We have the figures as of Fall '78 for entering freshmen and I see no reason why these should not be available to the University Faculty Senate. They are now being written up in a report but I can tell you that predictably they show that the students read better than they compute and that the writing scores are volatile. The last is so because those tests are scored by different individuals and the grading can not help but be somewhat subjective or at least variable. We are willing to do something about this but are having some problems especially with the suggestion that grading be done centrally and those problems are logistical. It is certainly something we need to keep an eye on. I shall ask Dean Lyons about the rumors and see if he can pursue them and develop a mechanism to insure accurate reporting.

2) Professor Gosselin (Bronx Community, English) - " To the best of my knowledge the situation with respect to the construction for Borough Manhattan is static. Can you tell us what the status of the negotiations is?"/ The City is drafting a letter asking the appropriate authority to proceed with the sale of bonds. Essentially, the letter is to give the Mayor's approval of the project. We have asked that the letter be written so that it will pass muster before it is sent because if the wrong letter is sent we may get hung up. The City has agreed to clear the letter with the bond counsel for the Dormitory Authority and that agreement was reached late Friday afternoon last. The City is

now having discussions with the Dormitory Authority but how long it will take the bond counsels to mull over the proposed letter is not sure. Professor Gosselin further asked - "Will that include the Central Office proposal?"/ That is the issue. The letter must be written so that the location of the Central Office is not a condition and that is very tricky but we have to be sure it is done so as not to interfere with the bond sale. 3) Professor Greenbaum (Queensborough, History) "What do you think are the possibilities of New York City Community College becoming New York Technical College and thereby effecting a \$4 million savings?"/ The chances I would put at 50/50 at least. The question of whether that would relieve the City of anything or whether the relief would go to our benefit is not clear. Probably it would have to be negotiated. 4) Professor Grossman (City, Education) - "There are Task Forces in six areas as well as a Graduate Task Force. Is there an underlying purpose to these Task Forces and is there any overlap in their efforts?"/ If there is an underlying theme it is to improve the University. There are differences in the work being undertaken by the Task Forces. Some are to develop a careful statement of the condition of libraries, scientific equipment, etc. in the University which will be used as evaluative instruments to support arguments for a consistent program to bring those services up to standard. Others such as the graduate Task force are different. The graduate one is more a question of taking a new, comprehensive look at masters programs. Others are more specifically directed to ways to use our resources better and they are looking at programs which are especially expensive or which have enrollment problems. 5) Professor Davidson (La Guardia, Business) - " You spoke about the Supplemental Budget Request which was formulated to present to the Legislature. When you outlined the \$10 million for the senior colleges and \$7 million for the community colleges did you also have a specific breakdown for each of these units and a rationale that was presented so that we, as representatives of individual colleges, can present that information and argument to the legislature?"/ For the community colleges what we are asking is that the base amount be increased from \$750 to \$825 and that the dollar amounts for technical and disadvantaged students be revised upwards. For the senior colleges it is somewhat different. There are some monies for things we consider errors in preparing the Executive budget, e.g. not all of the money for the contract or for some changes made by the Comptroller's Office during the year; some of the request is for University-wide issues such as Temporary Service Funds for all the colleges; there are also monies for increases in OTPS based on the argument that what has been given doesn't reflect inflationary increases in costs; the rest are specific to needs of the individual colleges. I will be happy to provide you with the details of the Request. There is, in fact, a meeting Thursday of CLAC and they will have a sheet there to distribute on the what and why of the request. 6) Professor Baumrin (Lehman, Philosophy) - " I won't ask about the disposition of the presidential evaluations although I am still interested in that subject. I heard something about an eleventh hour submission by some college official requesting a Bylaw waiver of Article IX not for a specific disposition but rather for suspension of a substantive part of the governance provisions for the whole college for a time. It seemed extraordinary since I heard it after the fact and perhaps if one did not hear such things after the fact one would not hear that the faculty member who sits on the Board committee that received this eleventh hour request shot it down from the hip. Wouldn't you think that the ordinary procedures for suspension, i.e. two meetings would be necessary?"/ The first part of your statement is Catalinian, I think. The request was not that much of a surprize. It couldn't have come sooner since the president making it took over only in mid-March and had you reviewed the situation and had you been at the Executive Committee meeting and not left before this was discussed you might not have been so surprized. Bylaw waivers do not require the same procedures as changes in the Bylaws. It is not unusual. This one had been discussed on the campus by faculty who didn't think it was that bad. We discussed it with the PSC as we are always careful to do and they didn't think it was so bad. Professor Baumrin further said that in point of fact it did concern the faculty, that

what had been said earlier was a repudiation of what the Chancellor was now saying. What was happening affects the heart of the college. In addition, not long ago a member of the Board pointed to Hostos' search as a precedent for Brooklyn, City and Hunter. Therefore, one might be concerned that their new presidents would do the same thing. 7) Professor Wasser (COSI, Humanities) - "Is it true that the four year agricultural colleges in SUNY are held to a limit on those who may enter a non-technical program, e.g. 10%?" / I am sure there is some limit on the number of liberal arts majors but I don't think it must be 10% necessarily. If New York City Community College does become New York Technical College, that will be a matter on which we will seek assurance. 8) Professor Raskin (Brooklyn, Psychology) - "I have a question which is not weighty but is one of concern. I read in the Times and the Post about a request for raises for some 200 employees of the University - a request which aroused not only the Mayor but many friends of CUNY. It seems to me that the University has a self-destructive urge, am I wrong? If this is indeed so - that such a request was made - what is the justification for it and would you comment on the timeliness of such a request?" / There is no such thing as a good time to talk about raises; there is always some reason why it is inappropriate. What you refer to is not yet a proposal. In conversations with the State Budget Office we were advised that the Governor and the Legislature were getting ready to pass a pay plan for State employees on the managerial level and that after that was done a similar plan would be enacted for SUNY and after that they expected one to apply to CUNY too. I therefore prepared a document showing what would happen to 253 individuals with the rank of assistant dean and up under such a plan. Also and unfortunately in my particular operation there are ways in which things pass to the Mayor's Office in a fairly direct route; thus, the Mayor got the document. There may be reasons for the general public to be irate but for the Mayor it is a cavalier gesture since two months after he took office he did precisely what our document speaks to. I applauded his action then because I feel that he and we need people on the managerial level who are well equipped to handle their jobs and who need to be compensated in appropriate ways. We are now in the process of finding presidents for our colleges and we know that our salaries for presidents are in the middle of those throughout the country. I have no embarrassment about asking that people in major positions be paid comparable salaries to others in comparable positions. 9) Professor Cooper (COSI, History) - "For my own information - is there any regulation or official position concerning the process of selecting administrators on campus? Is there any mechanism by which the Central Administration exercises control over that process? Somehow one has the feeling that it is illegal for such persons simply to be appointed." / I don't know that it is illegal; there are instances of persons being moved from one position to another; it depends on the nature of the position. In most cases of Vice-Presidents for Administration, for example, there is a search; so far as Business Manager and the like are concerned, if you can locate a first class person, I don't know that a search is necessary. I believe that there should be one for major academic and administrative offices but that in fairly technical fields it is not necessary - and it certainly is not illegal. 10) Professor D'Amico (Queensborough, Health, Physical Education) - "Do you have any plans concerning the community college allocations in the event that there is a decline in enrollment as there was last fall?" / We are developing a model now - one that is not necessarily closely related to the amount of funding. The State Budget Office, in arriving at the senior college budgets, develops approximate student/faculty ratios for clusters of disciplines and divide those numbers into the FTE number and come up with appropriate staffing. They add that up and get the instructional budget. Then they try to develop a support budget relative to the size of the institution and things related to that. What we are trying to do is to set up different formulae, ratios for each community college and then distribute the cuts accordingly across the board in the event of a community college budget cut but our plan does not anticipate any great changes. 11) Professor Roberts (Lehman, English) -

" How can you insure that there are accurate counts of students?"/ We used outside auditors and new procedures for clearer documentation to cut down on state disallowances on our enrollment and thus budget but a spot audit by the State of three CUNY colleges showed higher disallowances than our own audit. 12) Professor Sohmer (City, Mathematics) - " What will happen in four months for Borough Manhattan, i.e. by September?" / Borough Manhattan will still be in its present facilities in September. 13) Professor Roman (Hostos, Social Science) - " The faculty was consulted about Hostos' suspension of the Bylaws but did not approve. Why was the suspension necessary? That is of Section 9, a-e?"/ The president felt there was a need to reorganize. We are asking the new president to do a lot of things and were willing to provide the support she thought she needed. 14) Professor Baumrin (Lehman, Philosophy) - " You have explained audit disallowances to us a number of times as has Vice-Chancellor Posman but I didn't get anything from my Provost nor did any of my colleagues on the subject. Maybe some of the 732 Deans you mentioned could write such a letter."/ There are only 253 persons. You haven't heard anything because it is not an issue in the senior colleges. There is a relationship between enrollment and funding but in the community colleges that is a 1:1 relationship. The money from the state in the senior college budgets is made up on perceptions and at the end the Budget Office comes out with a student/faculty ratio . That is the result not the driving force of the process. There is a memo concerning attendance coming but we are short of deans at your college. We are doing this although there is not a direct relationship there are some mumblings that the State wants to do an audit and that might make one wary.

VII. Reports of Standing Committees: Professor Rempson (Bronx Community College, Special Educational Services), chairman of the SGS Committee, reported that the Committee had set three goals this year: to gather data on programs and services for part-time students; to press for financial aid for part-time students; and to disseminate information that might be useful. In pursuing the first goal the Committee distributed a questionnaire to all units and received ten responses. Analysis of those responses suggests that the Committee's hunch was correct - that there has been a decline in programs and services for part-time students and that that decline has been significant. In addition, there has been a decline in enrollment which has justified a decline in programs and services so that there is a cyclical effect. On the second goal the Committee's chairman made presentations before a State Legislative Committee and before a Regional Commission on Federal Aid to Higher Education; members of the Committee also participated in a conference held at the Graduate Center to pressure the legislature to extend TAP to part-time students. The efforts of the Committee in pursuit of the third goal were not successful largely because they did not have the monies necessary. The Committee has also developed recommendations for next year, viz. to get persons from Albany to make presentations on this and to join in a state-wide coalition on it; to make a study of full-time students who are forced to become part-time and to aske the Executive Committee to take appropriate steps to disseminate the results of the Committee's work.

Professor Pike (Graduate School, Comparative Literature), chairman of the Graduate Affairs Committee, reported that his Committee had undertaken two major tasks this year: they had served as a conduit to Vice-Chancellor Roellig's committee to select nominees for the Schweitzer and Einstein chairs through membership on that committee and of the eight nominees finally submitted, two were University Faculty Senate nominees. In addition, the Committee was participating on the University Task Force to review the guidelines for master's programs. The Task Force's charge was vague at the outset but in the course of the meetings it is beginning to crystalize. The Task Force is composed of provosts from colleges where there are master's programs and there is thus substantive input into the Task Force's work. The basic idea is to

prevent the kind of one man slaughter that was attempted previously. The Task Force is setting up guidelines to follow in looking at programs. The faculty input to the Task Force's work has been substantial and it appears that the final recommendation will include one that the committee to be set up to supervise the establishment, disestablishment or consolidation of master's programs shall include the Chairman and one additional member of the Graduate Affairs Committee of the Senate.

Professor Davidson (LaGuardia, Business) suggested that these and other reports on the agenda might be discussed and explored at the next Plenary Session and that it might now be appropriate to adjourn. The chair which was now held by Professor Gosselin, vice-chairman of the Senate, accepted the suggestion. The meeting was adjourned at 9:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Henry Wasser
Secretary