

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

September 18, 1979

Professor Ann M. Burton, chairman, called the meeting to order at 7:06 p.m. in Room 207 at the Graduate Center. All members were present except Professors Abramson, Abreu, Adomeit, Barickman, Bloom, Bohigian, Hartle, Levitan, Lyons, Marcinek, Melani, Milentijevic, Nash, Ornstein, Pearson, Riley, Roberts, Rootenberg, Sacks, Santoro, Santos, Seeley, Seiger, Sherover, Spevack, Stevens, Toback, Waldman, Whack and Yuster. Professors Dobos, Keyser, and Morgan were excused. Liaison members Professor Zeller (PSC) and Nachtsheim (AAUP) attended. Chancellor Robert J. Kibbee and Dr. Jean Ellis also attended.

I. Approval of the Tentative Agenda: The tentative agenda was approved with the following amendment by the chair: Item 5 "Reports of Faculty Representatives to Board of Trustees' Committees" was presented in writing and a substitute item "Reports on the Hunter and City College Searches" was substituted.

II. Approval of the Minutes of the 85th Plenary Session (May 22, 1979): The minutes were approved with the following corrections: p. 1 item III, 1. 11 Professor Speidel (Earth and Environmental Science); p. 4, Item IV. A., 1. 22 "said".

III. Communications from the Chairman: Professor Burton welcomed the Senate and introduced the following new members: from Borough Manhattan Community College Professors Lipfert (Mathematics), Rossabi (Physical Education) and Spevack (Science); from Bronx Community College Professor Riley (Chemistry); from Hunter College Professor Barickman (English) serving for Professor Bryar and Professor Fried (Psychology) serving for Professor Dolciani. She congratulated Professor Timoni (La Guardia, Business) on his reelection and welcomed back Professor Coren (NYCC, Biology) who resumed her seat.

Professor Burton extended the Senate's congratulations to the liaison member from the CUNY Council AAUP, Professor Nachtsheim (Kingsborough, History) on his election as President Elect of the New York Conference AAUP.

Noting that schedules of the Plenary Sessions for the year were included in members' packets, Professor Burton announced that Mr. David Ashe, chairman of the Board of Directors of the Research Foundation, would be the guest speaker at the 87th Plenary Session on October 16. Mr. Ashe will be accompanied by the Executive Director of the Foundation, Mr. Gerald Graze. Professor Burton announced that the guest speaker at the Annual Dinner Meeting to be held this year on November 20 would be Professor Morton Cohen (City, English) whose recently published work on Lewis Carroll has been extremely well received.

The Senate Office, Professor Burton stated, was still located in its space in the Central Office annex. She and the staff look forward to the move to new quarters in the Main building, now forecast for October, for many reasons. The new location, she continued, might help ~~eliminate~~ the confusion that sometimes surrounded communications between certain offices there and the Senate. An example of such confusion is the request detailed in the written Chairman's Report for the 86th Plenary concerning nominations to the University Committee on Research. That request was made in a letter which followed the same pattern

as those of past years and thus seemed not to take cognizance of the procedures adopted by the Senate in May. Those procedures, Professor Burton reminded the body, grew out of the Senate's concern that the selection of members and modus operandi of the University Committee on Research were not democratic and, at best, a mystery. It may be that mail forwarded from the present location of the Senate Office does not reach the main building. The Executive Committee has therefore invited the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs to its next meeting to discuss this and other matters of concern about academic policy and procedures in the University.

Dr. Burton next reported that, as detailed in her written report, the disenfranchisement of the faculty member of the Board of Trustees under the 1979 legislation on the governance and financing of the City University had resulted in widespread and continuing expressions of astonishment. Letters and calls had been and continued to be received from faculty and other constituencies in City University as well as from faculty and other groups outside CUNY who had learned of the Legislature's action. The issue would be a principal item on the Senate's agenda this year, Professor Burton said, because it was larger than the question of the vote. In fact, the disenfranchisement of the faculty reflects the issue of the faculty's position in the University community and whether it is to be treated with respect or lack of it. The position of the faculty member of the Board has been made difficult, if not impossible. Since the Board deals with academic matters the faculty member's role is awkward if not demeaned when the student member and others on the Board who lack academic credentials may vote and the only professional does not. The issue affects the role of faculty in this University but it extends beyond the CUNY community. If City University's faculty loses this battle, faculty throughout the nation will lose and will become simply employees of the institutions where they teach. The phrase "the faculty is the university" which has traditionally been applied will indeed vanish from the lexicon of academe. The support which CUNY's faculty has received since the passage of the legislation has come from many legislators, from the University administration and the Board, both collectively and individually, from the AAUP, the Committee on Public Higher Education, from the Student Senate. Since the Senate does not have the funds to maintain a full-time, or even a part-time, lobbyist in Albany, the efforts of outside groups who have put their own lobbyists to work for us are especially helpful. We are grateful for what they have done and what they continue to do.

The Executive Committee, as noted in the written report, have taken a number of steps to remedy this defect in the legislation. In addition, we have asked to be enfranchised on Board committees - an action which the Board could take as a first step towards putting meat on the resolution adopted at the August 6, 1979 meeting. The effort to secure enfranchisement is one we are all going to have to make - not the Senate alone but our colleagues in the colleges as well. We hope, therefore, that you will carry the message back to your campuses and will welcome any help or suggestions you may wish to offer.

It is our understanding that the Legislature will not meet until its regular session is convened in January when a chapter amendment can be introduced to enfranchise the faculty member. As part of the campaign we intend to mount the Executive Committee believes that, although the Senate last year passed a series of points concerning what was then the forthcoming legislation and those points included a faculty vote on the Board, a separate resolution on the issue should be adopted by the Senate.

IV. Proposed Resolution on Faculty Vote on the Board of Trustees: Dr. Burton introduced the Executive Committee's resolution on the faculty vote.

The resolution was seconded. Questions and discussion followed. Asked to explain the phrase "necessary steps", Professor Burton explained that this meant seeing legislators, especially Republican Senators, the leaders in both houses, and securing their support and/or willingness to sponsor the legislation. Questions were also raised about what objections there were among legislators that resulted in the disenfranchisement of the faculty member of the Board. Dr. Burton responded that she had been told that the issue was a possible conflict of interest because of the collective bargaining agreement. Professor Speidel (Queens, Earth and Environmental Science) read excerpts from a letter he had received from his own representative in Albany who described the negotiations between the Senate and the Assembly over the final wording of the legislation as "delicately cautious" and explained the dropping of the faculty vote as the result of those negotiations. Professor Gosselin (Bronx Community, English), vice-chairman of the Senate, reported on the meeting he and Professor Wasser (COSI, English), secretary of the Senate, had with Senator Marchi during the summer. He said that the Senator was more than accepting of the faculty's sense of indignation and insult and had expressed a willingness to introduce a chapter amendment to enfranchise the faculty member of the Board. Senator Marchi had requested the Senate to send him the wording of the amendment which they thought appropriate and this has been done. Professor Nachtsheim (Kingsborough, History), liaison member for the CUNY Council AAUP, commended the Executive Committee for the efforts already made and stated that the AAUP had pledged its support. Professor Yousef (COSI, Mechanical Technology) said that he thought this was a serious issue because of the Yeshiva decision. Professor Burton said that the Executive Committee have heard that this question is being raised in certain circles in the University. The decision, however, she continued, had been researched during the summer by Professor Baumrin (Lehman, Philosophy), treasurer of the Senate, and an attorney. He reported that the decision had to do with private universities and was delivered by a Federal court operating under Federal law since the case involved the NLRB. In New York State, however, one is governed by State law and the way the law operates in this instance federal law does not supercede State law. Therefore, the decision pertains to private not public institutions and it would require an act of Congress followed by an act by the State legislature to alter that situation. Furthermore, even within the terms of the decision the enfranchisement of the faculty member of the Board would not a major effect since the decision stated that the exercise of powers such as those of recommending appointments, promotion and tenure was the basis for classifying the faculty as managerial and ruling in favor of the University and against the NLRB. Thus, CUNY's faculty's responsibilities would raise questions about their status under the Yeshiva decision if it applied to public institutions. Finally, the decision was being appealed and there was widespread expectation that it would be reversed. Professor Baumrin noted that Professor Burton's lay interpretation of the ruling made the essential point that if the faculty engaged in any one of a number of activities in which they are currently involved they would be considered managerial. Professor Zeller, liaison member for the PSC, said that one should not overlook the fact that the issue was also raised that the State University did not have a faculty member of the Board and that it is the parallel with SUNY that legislators consider rather than the state of private institutions. Professor Burton said that this was true but that the Senate must be prepared to add this to the list of times the Legislature brought up the issue of parity when it was convenient and ignored it when it was inconvenient. City University, she said, must argue its own case.

The question was called, the vote taken and the resolution was adopted.

V. Reports on the Hunter and City College Searches: Professor Fifer (Hunter, Educational Foundations), member of the Hunter Search Committee and chair of the

Hunter College Faculty Delegate Assembly, reported on the Hunter Search. Professor Fifer said that he did not know whether he could say much that had not already been reported by the unofficial member of the Search Committee, Sam Weiss of the New York Times. He said, however, that the Committee had worked diligently since February, had reviewed some 125 vitas, had invited 10 candidates to be interviewed at some length and four of those had been asked to come for campus interviews. One of the four withdrew her application but the remaining three saw three faculty groups, college administrators, students, members of the Board, and representatives of the two Hunter campus schools. The views of these groups recommending the candidates in varying degrees were then submitted. While Professor Fifer does not know the precise contents of the reports submitted, he said that a straw vote suggested that none of the candidates was disapproved and all were rated acceptable or better. The reports from the campus were very positive for one candidate, moderately favorable for a second but not favorable for the third. At the August meeting of the Board of Trustees an Acting President was appointed for City College and action on the Hunter presidency was postponed until September. At this juncture the President of Hunter College became upset. She had stated her firm intention to leave her post on August 31 and was concerned that no action had been taken to replace her. Therefore, a special meeting of the Board had been convened on September 4 and as a result an Acting President of Hunter was appointed. The appointment resulted in additional concerns since the designee was unable to take on his tasks immediately. He had assured the campus community that he would do so by September 19. Professor Fifer then said that members of the Senate had undoubtedly seen an allusion in the papers to a letter sent to the chairman of the Board by 11 members of the Hunter Search Committee and faculty. The letter was in fact signed by the faculty members of the Search Committee, one of the student members, the alumni representative, the chairpersons of faculty groups and the vice-chairperson of the faculty. It stated that they knew from previous meetings that all three finalists were approved, highly qualified candidates and that they did not understand why a meeting of the Board was held at which no action was taken. Apparently the Chancellor couldn't get enough votes for one of the candidates and therefore did not wish to recommend that person and the Chancellor did not recommend another candidate because that person had enough votes. This information, Professor Fifer said, was based on conversations with various Board members including the Chairman - conversations that took place subsequent to the meeting. Therefore, the letter was written urging that a decision be made. It stated that the signers believed that there could be a more outstanding candidate who had not yet been considered by the Committee but that that person might never wish to be a candidate for the post. The state of affairs seems now to be that two of the three candidates are still in the running, that the search is being extended, although no one is certain what extending the search means. There is a meeting of the Search Committee called for September 24 after the meeting of the Board. The letter to the Chairman of the Board emphasized that the Search Committee had done its work, that one of the candidates had passed muster and called for an immediate designation of a president. Professor Fifer further said that members of the Senate may have read in the Times of the Chancellor's response to the signers as "ridiculous"; he did not intend to engage in discussion of that, however. The faculty's basic concern is that the college should not be without a President during this crucial period of transition to State control and that their judgment was not given the consideration that was its due. Their concern is with an answer to the question of why no choice was made.

Professor Burton said that the Executive Committee too was concerned about the meaning of the statement that the search was being extended and had raised this question with the Chancellor. Did it mean that there was to be a

new Search? Did reopening the Search mean that it would be readvertised, etc.? She could report that new members had been appointed to the Committee, namely Mr. Maniscalco and Mr. Crowley and Mr. Jacobs had announced his intention to sit in on the meetings as an ex-officio member. Professor Burton will also sit in as an ex-officio member of the Committee and presumably next Monday the Search Committee will decide how to proceed. She said that what happens there will be important since the whole matter of searches is being raised again by the Board and some Board members seem to want a revision of the procedures.

Professor Sohmer (City, Mathematics), a member of the City Search Committee and past head of the City College Faculty Senate, reported that after the general contretemps concerning searches last winter a committee of four Board members, three faculty and two students had been named and that a representative from the Chancellor's office had been designated to sit with the committee - one who felt free to interject comments into the discussion. The Committee had passed around lots of papers, the exact number not known to Professor Sohmer. They had interviewed some 20 to 30 candidates and had sent six to the campus for interviews - one in-house candidate and five outsiders. Several groups were set up on campus to participate in the interviews - there was one for each of City's several schools, groups for the various ethnic groups, one for the Distinguished Professors, an alumni group as well as student groups and administrative representatives. The candidates met with each of these and then, in July, the chairpeople of the groups met with the Search Committee and made recommendations concerning support or non-support for the various candidates. The Committee then met and in what was essentially a unanimous decision agreed that they did not feel ready to recommend a candidate or candidates to the Chancellor and wished the Search to continue. Thus, the search goes on. The Committee is still interviewing, still soliciting applications and intends to continue to do so. Of the six persons invited for campus interviews four are still under consideration and two withdrew - one because she was designated Acting President and that withdrawal was part of the agreement on her designation.

VI. Proposed Slate of University Faculty Senate Committees, 1979-80: The slate was approved with the substitution of Professor Cunningham (Hostos) for Professor Armas (Hostos) on the Facilities Committee.

VII. Report on the Summer Pilot Project in Faculty Development: Professor Henry Wasser, Director of the Pilot Project, told the Senate of the great effort required to launch the project. There was in some circles a lack of clarity on what the Senate proposed to do, on what might be involved; there were no funds on which to draw; the one resource was the goodwill of the Chancellor and the dedication of the participants. Meetings were held with the Faculty Cabinet to set the plans and also meetings were held with the President of the PSC and a member of his Executive Council, Professor Claude Campbell who were concerned that faculty development might be a matter for future negotiation and therefore the project might have to be aborted. That concern laid to rest, the project was finally able to get underway. Professor Wasser reiterated the thanks due to the workshop leaders, Mr. Barry Kaufman, the University Director of Institutional Research, and Mr. Thomas Furcron of the Office of Academic Standards and Advisement, Brooklyn College, whose dedication had made the project a reality. He noted too the thanks due to the persons from various CUNY colleges and from other universities who had given of their time and talents without recompense save for a morning cup of coffee and danish. He expressed the hope that in future released time might be provided participants who had undertaken to complete projects begun this summer during the academic year. Professor Wasser reported also that almost all of the CUNY units were represented in the workshops, that the people involved had varied interests since some saw in the program a

way of getting background in the areas of institutional research and academic advisement while others looked to the workshops as a means of professional development. An important byproduct, Professor Wasser asserted, was the sense of an integrated university which was given the participants.

Professor Wasser said that any ideas for next summer's program would be welcomed and that he hoped next year there would be some funds for compensation of those who participated.

Professor Brogan (NYCC, Biology) who attended one of the workshops asked that a vote of thanks be spread on the minutes for Professor Wasser's own dedication to the project. He was, said Professor Brogan, "the ubiquitous man" sitting in on both workshops, bringing in and serving the daily danish, chairing sessions, and inspiring all who participated.

Professor Burton expressed the thanks of the Senate to the Director and the participants.

VIII. Report of the Expanded Educational Opportunity Committee, 1978-79: In the absence of the Chairman, Professor Cantwell (Brooklyn, Education) whose teaching assignment conflicted with the meeting Professor Bullard (Bronx Community, Student Development) made the Committee's report. The aim of the Committee, she said, was to find a way to provide productive information for the Senate. It became apparent almost at once that the amount of material with which they would have to deal was monumental. The possibility of campus visits was considered but ruled out because the Committee was not certain about the reception they might have and also because the value of talking with the people who had supplied the material was not known. They requested and received the plans presented to the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs and Special Programs and also were able to have access to other information they sought. The material was divided among the members who began an analysis of the plans vis-a-vis the guidelines. Those analyses were submitted with the Committee report to the office of the Senate. The Committee also met with Vice Chancellor Cross and the substance of that discussion was that there was a lot to do. The Vice Chancellor's office was not too ready to provide free access to the materials the Committee sought. In addition, the Committee had an extended meeting with **Dean Lyons** on the Skills Program which is a large issue for SEEK and other open admissions students. There was some unhappiness in the committee re: the selection of the instruments, their validation, what students were being told and there were many questions about the credibility gap that was being created. The Dean assured the Committee that his office was working with all deliberate speed to validate the test results and instruments and that the questions being raised would be addressed more systematically. As the work progressed, the Committee found that their work was paralleling work being done in the Central Office although the two were arriving at different conclusions. It was in the end clear that theirs was an exercise in futility and that if the Committee was to have an impact in terms of a faculty voice it was necessary to be part of the machinery created to discuss and make policy. At the end of May the Committee recommended that it be disbanded unless provision were made for a voice in the policy-making bodies.

In the discussion which followed a number of points were made and queries put. Professor Lea (Lehman, English) asked whether there was a figure on the percentage of SEEK students in the University, whether it was not correct that the new guidelines mandated an interview./ The number is about 10,000 and so far as is known the interview mandated by the guidelines is not yet in place. Professor Cunningham (Hostos, Dental Hygiene) asked about the reliability of the Skills

Tests, noting that Hostos required a 12 on the reading test./ There have been a lot of questions about that. One answer is that 10, 12, etc. are open to interpretation. Professor Sohmer asked whether it is known who has been in charge since last summer?/ No. Professor Burton noted that the Board seemed to be interested in this area and had been pleased to learn that the Senate was setting up an ad hoc committee on remediation with which they might work. Professor Pennington (City, Nursing) asked about the pre-nursing exam being given at City College and it was suggested that her concerns should be expressed to the Academic Affairs Committee.

IX. Chancellor's Report: Chancellor Kibbee welcomed the Senate and said he hoped all would have a good year. The state of the University, he said, is good. Last year the University was engaged in a major political activity having to do with the future of the institution -- its governance, integrity and independence. The legislation passed in June is about 90 to 95% very good and thus the University's effort may be termed a success. It has established the fact that it will remain an independent institution deriving its funding somewhat differently and governed by a Board of Trustees. This gives some sense of stability to the institution since it is unlikely that the issue will be raised again for some time. There are still some concerns in the financial area re: the community colleges and the relative instability of their financing because their crucial funding comes from the City and they are thus subject to the vagaries of the City's financial condition. It is expected that they will continue to have problems concerning establishing reasonable budgets and preventing erosion of personnel. We have entered into some discussion with the community college representatives from SUNY so that we may forward a common package to the State since this technique has proved successful in the past two years. Finally, there is a proposal made last spring by me concerning reexamination of the whole basis for community college funding which we hope may be considered this year although we do not anticipate that it will be enacted for 1980-81.

On the legislative agenda for this year there are a few items besides adequate funding. There are certain leftover issues from the legislation of last year. One is the franchise on the Board for the chair of the University Faculty Senate. The others are securing a reclassification of New York City Community College as an urban technical institution and the reclassification of the College of Staten Island as basically a senior college. These issues were not included in the bill for reasons of simplicity but there is some consensus that they will be dealt with in the next session. There is some chance that the Legislature or at least the Senate will reconvene this winter to confirm some gubernatorial appointments including those to the Board of Trustees of the University but the full Legislature will probably not reconvene until January.

This will also be a year of planning by fiat. It is the year of the quadrennial Master Plan of the Regents which must be submitted by June and during the year we will be trying to develop that plan. Also the new legislation requires a plan the exact nature of which is still being negotiated and that must be submitted for February to the Legislature. We are told by the Assembly leadership that what is sought is a status report on the University rather than a long-term plan but that is still being clarified.

There are also two matters in Washington that are under consideration and of interest to us. There is a revision of the Higher Education Act being undertaken which includes changes in financial aid provisions - BEOG especially. A compromise on that issue which is of concern to both public and private institutions has been worked out. The present legislation provides for an \$1800 maximum grant or one-half the cost whichever is less. The privates have sought

to increase the maximum; the public the percentage. The agreement reached is to increase the maximum to \$2700 over four years and the percentage to 75% over the same period. If the effort is successful, the change will be of considerable benefit to our students. The other matter is one that marks the fruition of a long term effort by us. It is the Urban Grant Program, the authorization of special funding to be used by urban institutions. The provision is now in the Act and we hope to have some modest funding next year.

The Chancellor then reported on construction in the University. He said that last year as part of the legislation for the University a provision was included to move the funding for amortization of bonds for senior college projects from the former 50/50 arrangement to 100% to be paid by the State. This is to be done in two steps: new construction will be 100% amortized by the State and the State will absorb the others over a period of years by reimbursing the City for its contribution. The Mayor, the Chancellor continued, authorized the Borough Manhattan project last spring and in early August the bonds were easily sold so that it is expected that on-site work will resume in December. There have also been meetings between representatives from the State, the Dormitory Authority and the University to firm up the York construction plans and there will be a bond sale in October or November for York and Hunter. Thus, the University is gradually moving back into the construction picture. The work at Lehman is going along well and so is the work at City. The renovation at Hostos is underway despite some technical difficulties that have arisen.

The Chancellor also reported on the searches noting that Dr. Robert Hess had been appointed at Brooklyn College and had assumed his post on July 1. At City and Hunter, he said, the progress is not as good. In the first instance the Search Committee was unable to find consensus and therefore the search has been reopened; in the case of Hunter the situation is similar. The Search Committee and the Chancellor were unable to find enough agreement that all would be satisfied with and that search has also been extended. We hope that within the next months the committee will arrive at a recommendation which I can make to the Board. In the meantime, the Acting President of City, Dr. Chandler, the Acting President of Hunter, President Shenker of La Guardia, and the Acting President of La Guardia, Vice-president Moad have been appointed.

Chancellor Kibbee then responded to the following question submitted in writing: Professor Lea (Lehman, English) - "A number of us are troubled about the apparently stalemated Hunter presidential search, and even more disturbed about the political implications of the controversy that is slowly building around the search issue. Are you in a position to tell us what your reactions are to the pressure being exerted by groups, both within CUNY and outside CUNY, in favor of one or the other candidate, and is it true, as rumored, that the Governor has become involved?"/ When there is any kind of search there are pressures that are going to develop, pressures by people inside and outside the University and they are going to make their feelings known to me and the Trustees. Some of those expressions of feelings are reasonable; some are not. One cannot expect that people who have known candidates over a period of time are not going to have something to say about them. So far as the Governor is concerned I have had no indication or approach from the Governor or anyone close or anyone purporting to represent the Governor. Whether or not such approaches have been made to Board members is a matter of conjecture. I have had a number of political people who have spoken about one or another of the candidates in a perfectly legitimate way, e.g. they know the person and think he's good and so long as the pressures are not threatening to anyone, I think they are okay. I can't say that anyone else has been approached or how since I am not in a position to know that.

The Chancellor then responded to the following questions from the floor. 1) Professor Baumrin (Lehman, Philosophy) - " I have a philosophic question. Last year you kindly investigated the degree of faculty involvement in the budget-making process at various units after the budget requests were solicited. Have you done so this year and, if so, with what results? If not, do you plan to?"/ I checked and found that the letters went out the day of the Plenary but I haven't checked since. I will do so, however. 2) Professor Greenbaum (Queensborough, History) - " I have a mundane but vital question. Are the community college enrollment figures on target?"/ I met with the community college presidents in an all day meeting today and from their reports it would appear that enrollments seem to be or over the targeted number. It may be that a few are better than others but nobody expressed alarm. 3) Professor Cunningham (Hostos, Dental Hygiene) - " I have a statement and a question. At our college the Hostos faculty participated in the budget process but it was difficult under the guidelines. Would you expand on your proposal of last year for funding of community colleges?"/ In response to your statement I can say that the request was submitted in time and I am meeting with your president on it tomorrow. On the question - the proposal had a couple of parts. The way the budget is now put together the City sets the budget and against that the State provides a certain number of dollars per student with provisions for special sums for business programs, for disadvantaged students and for technical programs. The other part of the budget comes from tuition. What is left becomes the City's responsibility. In the last few years the City has changed its contribution during the year and the result has been that the colleges have had to respond to those changes after they have already spent or committed the funds they expected to receive. The change has usually had to be absorbed in the second semester and that has meant the reduction in adjunct teaching which affects the courses offered, the enrollment and consequently the funding from the State. What I have proposed is that it go the other way - that the State establish the budget and agree to take a certain percentage of that - not on a per student basis - which they will guarantee. The rest would come from the local sponsor and tuition with tuition amounting to no more than one-half the remainder after the State's contribution is figured. This would get the community college budget in the shape the senior colleges used to be with what is in effect " a bill the City can't refuse to pay". Furthermore, experience has shown that one has a better chance to talk about substantive issues with the State. This is not possible in the City which is interested only in dollars. 4) Professor Gosselin (Bronx Community, English) - " Has there been a new Director of Skills Assessment and Testing appointed?"/ Yes and I think it is a former Senator, Marie Lederman. Professor Gosselin further asked whether there would be changes in policy . / There will be no changes without discussion with the faculty. 5) Professor Dayton (Queensborough, Health and Physical Education) - "When will we know our budget for this year?"/ The budgets are out and anyone can have the information. 6) Professor Wasser (Staten Island, English) - "Some faculty have spoken about the appointments of Faculty Fellows and they have noticed and wondered why there have been changes which they find disappointing. The Senate had a large part in nominating and pushing for the creation of the Fellows program but the choices seem to have been made without our being consulted. Faculty thought there were to be five but there are three fellows and finally it has been noticed that the three appointees are all in the sciences and that none represents the social sciences or humanities. It seems to me that they should have covered the waterfront. Was there any particular reason for this?"/ I don't think so. The appointment in Nursing is peculiar; it was added because it was covered in costs by the college involved; the others were chosen primarily to be sure there was one from a senior and one from a community college. There was no real reason for the fields. 7) Professor Burton (Brooklyn, History) - "One

Senator mentioned the lack of public procedures in the appointment of the fellows. Over a year ago the Senate recommended procedures for those appointments to you and to the Office of Academic Affairs. We talked them over with you and expressed what remains our concern - that there are no clearly public procedures for such appointments nor criteria stated so that people may know how to go about applying."

X. New Business: Professor Loy (Brooklyn, Foreign Languages) asked that the chair direct or encourage the liaison members of Senate delegations to take the resolution on the Faculty Vote passed by the Senate to their local faculty governing bodies and seek endorsement by those bodies. He so moved and the motion having been seconded and the question called the vote was taken. The motion was unanimously approved.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Henry Wasser
Secretary