

SUBJECT TO SENATE APPROVAL

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

December 18, 1979

Professor Burton (Brooklyn, History), chairman, called the session to order at 7:05 p.m. in Room 207 at the Graduate Center. All members were present except Professors Abramson, Adomeit, Beheshti, Bloom, Bohigian, Bullard, Ceccarelli, Cunningham, Dreiling, Gerber, Goldstone, Hartle, Julio, Levitan, Lyons, Marcinek, Montalvo, Nash, Orustein, Pearson, Pennington, Riley, Roberts, Rootenberg, Ruttenger, Sacks, Santoro, Santos, Snyder, Timoni, Wakatama, Whack and Yuster. Professor Cooper was excused. Professors Nachtsheim and Zeller, liaison members from the AAUP and PSC respectively, attended. President Leon M. Goldstein, Kingsborough Community College, and Dr. Jean Ellis also attended.

I. Approval of the Tentative Agenda: The tentative agenda was approved with the following revision: Item 7 Chancellor's Report was subsumed in item 6 since the Chancellor was unable to attend the session and had deputized President Goldstein to present his report. A resolution submitted by the Academic Freedom Committee concerning the appointment of members to the Board of Trustees was added as Item 7.

II. Approval of the Minutes of the 88th Plenary Session (November 20, 1979): The minutes were approved with the following corrections: In the heading "MINUTES OF THE EIGHTY-EIGHTH PLENARY SESSION" and Item II: "Approval of the Minutes of the 87th Plenary Session (October 16, 1979)".

III. Communications from the Chairman: Professor Burton introduced the following new Senators: Professor Alvin Bachman (City College, Physics); Professor Peter Basquin (Hunter College, Music) and Professor Bernice Baxter (Hunter College, Academic Skills).

Professor Burton also asked for and received approval from the Senate of a request from the Executive Committee that heads of faculty governing bodies on the campuses be invited to attend Plenary Sessions of the Senate on a regular basis. Professor Aisop, head of the Academic Senate at Queens College, was again introduced to the members since he was in attendance.

The long awaited move of the Senate Office to new quarters in Rooms 513, 522 and 524 at 535 East 80 Street took place during the week of December 10, Professor Burton reported. The Senate's telephone number, 794-5538, is unchanged. Although somewhat smaller than the former quarters, the new offices have a decided advantage in terms of cleanliness, heat, and view. Professor Burton invited members to visit and to remember that the office was theirs. The final tasks to make the move complete such as the installation of permanent telephone equipment should be finished soon and it is hoped to hold a housewarming early in the New Year.

Dr. Burton informed the members that the Senate Newsletter's December issue had been published and was on its way to the campuses thanks to the effort and efficiency of the editor, Professor Lea (Lehman, English). She asked that members prod their campus mailrooms to distribute the issue before the Holiday recess. The Directory of Historians in the City University of New York, a project undertaken by the Senate with the support of the Chancellor, has also been published and distributed to the members of the University's history faculties. The project, Professor Burton explained, was intended to serve more than one purpose: to provide a handy reference tool for members of history departments and all others seeking to

use the resources of City University's history faculty and also to provide a model which other disciplines might wish to adopt. Finally, Professor Burton noted the publication of a revised edition of the Handbook of the Budgetary Process in the City University to bring the manual up-to-date and to make it available to those persons who requested copies after the first edition and printing was exhausted.

There will be a Borough Hearing of the Board of Trustees on January 17, 1980 from 5 to 8 p.m. to be held at the Queens Borough Hall. These hearings are mandated under the 1979 legislation for the City University, Professor Burton explained, and are intended to provide a forum for discussion of higher education issues by members of the University community and the public. Professor Burton urged that members of the faculty especially those of colleges located in Queens attend the session and speak to issues of concern to them and their colleagues in the college or University. She said that the Senate Office would serve as a conduit for those wishing to be placed on the Speakers List at the hearing.

Professor Burton then reported on recent developments concerning the Research Foundation. Noting that the Foundation has been a concern of the Senate for the last several years and that members of the Senate and of the Faculty Advisory Council had been working on proposals for restructuring the Foundation and its Board of Directors, Dr. Burton said that those proposals were now going forward and that details of the plans should be available soon. She noted also that at the 87th Plenary the chairman of the Board of Directors of the Foundation, Mr. David Ashe, and the Executive Director, Mr. Gerald Graze, had appeared to discuss the Foundation with the Senate. That session has proved to be especially useful in forwarding the effort to restructure the Foundation since it provided an opportunity for the Chancellor to learn at first hand of the faculty's sentiments. In terms of progress towards the restructuring Professor Burton said the Foundation's Board of Directors will be happy to accept the resignation of the Executive Director and Mr. Graze will be leaving his post by July 1. It is hoped that this will be one element in dissipating some of the miseries the Foundation has inflicted on researchers in the University. When she learned that the replacement of the Executive Director was in the offing, Professor Burton continued, she had written to the Chancellor suggesting a format for the Search Committee that was to be constituted and suggesting that since the faculty are responsible for bringing in so large a proportion of the grant money in the University, faculty should constitute 50% of the Committee. To date the Chancellor has not replied to that letter, possibly because he has been busy with other searches, Professor Burton continued. This week Professor Burton had learned that Mr. Ashe has appointed a Search Committee composed of several presidents and one faculty member. There have been indications of willingness by Mr. Ashe to add an additional faculty member or two, but, said Dr. Burton, the concern is not with the numbers but with the procedures followed in setting up the Committee. There is a need for a Committee that will be responsive to the concerns of the faculty. Therefore, upon learning of the arbitrary manner in which the Search Committee was established, she had spoken with the Chancellor and the Faculty Advisory Council had communicated its concern to Mr. Ashe. Now, she concluded, the intent was to pursue the matter with the Chancellor and the Advisory Council.

On the matter of the Hunter Search the Board met in Executive Session on December 17 without reaching a definitive conclusion, as everyone knows from the full accounts published in the daily papers. There are, as the newspapers have reported, four finalists and three of the four have been ranked acceptable by the faculty and the students while the fourth has been ranked unacceptable. Professor Burton's concern at the December 17 meeting of the Board was that there

-3-

might be an effort to appoint someone contrary to the wishes of the faculty. The Executive Committee had raised this matter with Mr. Robinson at their meeting with him last February concerning search procedures and he had given assurances that this would not be done. Nothing was put in writing, however; thus, the concern arose. As it turned out, however, no one of the four finalists could achieve the requisite number of votes since the legislation requires a majority of the membership of the Board, in this instance 9 of the 17 members, even though not all the seats may be filled. It was therefore decided that between now and December 31, the date fixed for the expiration of the terms of the current members of the Board an informal poll would be taken and, if it appeared that there were nine votes for one of the candidates, the Board would be called into session. Professor Burton said that in her opinion there was little chance of that happening.

The problem with the Hunter Search, Professor Burton said, was of concern because of the larger issue it raised of search procedures in general. No one is very satisfied with a public search such as that for the Hunter president. The publicity in the media meant that it became difficult to find persons who were willing to be candidates and that unwillingness reduced the number of persons in the possible pool of applicants. There was a problem of confidentiality and of conducting a professional search as well as the need to have faculty participation in the search. Suggestions or comments on ways to revise procedures to accomplish these ends would be welcome, Professor Burton said, and should be given to her or to another member of the Executive Committee which would be discussing the matter in the near future.

Professor Rossabi (Borough Manhattan, Physical Education) asked whether the Senate might not do something to insure that the Search Committee for an Executive Director of the Research Committee was appropriately constituted. Professor Jiji, chairman of the Faculty Advisory Council, suggested that a resolution from the Senate might well reinforce the views already expressed in a letter from the Council to the Chairman of the Board of the Foundation. Professor Jiji's suggestion won unanimous approval and Dr. Burton suggested that a resolution might be drafted while the meeting proceeded with the other items on the agenda and the draft resolution brought to the floor at a later point on the agenda. Her suggestion was also accepted.

IV. Report of the Research Committee: Professor Jiji (City, Engineering), chairman of the Senate Research Committee, noted that his committee had distributed a written report and that his presentation would be in the form of a supplement to that report. Since the Committee's report dealt with the procedures followed this year when the Guidelines on the University Committee on Research passed by the Senate in May 1979 were implemented for the first time, Professor Jiji said it might be useful to recall the former practice in constituting the University Committee. In the past, he said, he had served on that Committee and when his term expired, he was asked to name a successor and had supplied the name of a colleague. When that colleague's term expired, he, in turn, was asked to name a successor and had named another colleague. All of which, suggested Professor Jiji, had a quasi Biblical ring akin to Abraham begat Isaac and Isaac begat Jacob and so forth. There was also a modern name for this procedure, he continued, but the process resulted in a University Committee on Research that was narrowly based and limited in relation to the research community in the University. The new guidelines which grew out of the Senate's concern with the procedures being followed had produced the results noted in the Senate Research Committee's report, and it was hoped that as the new procedures became familiar there would be a larger pool of applicants especially from those colleges with very few nominees

In addition, Professor Jiji said, it was hoped that the Committee's recommendations would be implemented. Professor Speidel (Queens, Earth and Environmental Science), vice-chair of the Committee, stated that the Senate should also be apprised of the fact that in selecting the persons to be appointed to the University Committee the Chancellor did not take the first ranked nominee in all cases. Professor Speidel asked whether there was an explanation for this - were the appointees chosen for strength or to achieve some kind of balance or for some other reason. Professor Jiji replied that he did not know but that he could state that all of the nominees selected by the Committee were considered strong.

V. Report of the Budget Committee: Professor Ercolano (Baruch, Mathematics), presented an interim report on behalf of the Committee. He stated that in order to obtain the information on the budget process in the colleges to fulfill the Committee's charge it had been decided that each member would address a letter to his president noting the Chancellor's mandate on consultation with faculty and requesting information on the implementation of that mandate. The replies, Professor Ercolano said, covered a broad spectrum. They ranged from the reply received by the member from Medgar Evers College, Professor Edwards (Humanities) which said that the information sought was public information and could be found in two documents pertaining to the college's self-study to the reply Professor Ercolano received from his own president. The latter detailed a series of steps taken by the president and other members of the Baruch administration to involve faculty in the development of the college budget and pointed out the difficulty that arose given the timeframe within which the college was required to prepare its request. Professor Ercolano then responded to questions and comments by members of the Senate. Professor Lea (Lehman, English) suggested that instead of confining the Committee's inquiries to those colleges which were represented on the Committee, it might prove more fruitful to have a comprehensive survey. He suggested that the heads of governance bodies at the colleges be contacted concerning their position in relation to the budget process. Professor Ercolano replied that a sampling seemed in order as a beginning and afforded the committee's members the opportunity to compare the presidents' replies with their own experience. Professor Baumrin (Lehman, Philosophy) reminded the Senate that in a previous year the Executive Director had circularized all of the presidents and heads of governance bodies and that contrary to Professor Lea's expectations the replies had not proved very useful. Professor Speidel interjected that he knew that a proposal had been made that the Senate serve as a mechanism for bringing together the heads of the governance bodies at the colleges and that the Executive Committee was reviewing that proposal. He expressed the view that he hoped the Executive Committee would bring a favorable recommendation on that proposal to the Senate. Professor Burton advised Professor Speidel that the Executive Committee was at present dealing with the problem created by the fact that not all of the college governing bodies were headed by faculty and was therefore seeking to identify the ranking faculty person on those bodies. Once this was done the Committee could move forward along the lines suggested. Professor Sohmer (City, Mathematics) said that perhaps the better course for the Budget Committee to follow would be to create a process which might then be disseminated to the colleges for input and to seek a way of dealing with the problem of turnaround time. In the ensuing discussion Professor Davidson (LaGuardia, Business) suggested that the faculty might have abdicated a role assigned very specifically in the University's Bylaws, viz. the responsibility in P&B committees not only for the "P" but also the "B" and that perhaps the Committee should recommend that the faculty and administrations follow the Bylaws.

VI. Resolution on the Search Committee for An Executive Director of the Research Foundation: Professor Valinsky (Baruch, Statistics), member of the Faculty

Advisory Council to the Research Foundation, offered a draft resolution and moved its adoption. In the discussion that followed Professor Valinsky accepted an amendment offered by Professor Rossabi to clarify the definition of "faculty" in the first "Resolved" and an amendment offered by Professor Baumrin to clarify the second "Resolved". After the question was called, the resolution was put to a vote and adopted unanimously. (Copy attached to the minutes).

Vii. President Goldstein, Kingsborough Community College: Professor Burton introduced President Goldstein as a true representative of the City University and a good friend of the Senate. A graduate of New York City Community College, City College and Brooklyn College, President Goldstein has been president of Kingsborough Community College since 1971. He served the University before that as a University Dean and also held the posts of Dean of the College and Dean of Faculty at New York Community College. Testimony to President Goldstein's position as friend of the Senate, Professor Burton said, was the body's lack of restraint in carrying on its business in his presence.

President Goldstein acknowledged the chairman's introduction saying that he did feel at home and saw in the session a resemblance to the meetings of the College Council at his own college. He said that he had been speaking a good deal about the community colleges in general and his own institution in particular and their problems and therefore thought he might summarize for the Senate some of the problems of the University and try to put them in some perspective as well as offer some options for the future. It was his belief that to assume that the University's problems would be resolved by some external force was a mistake, for it was clear from the press that there was a lack of support in the City for the University. He further believes that self criticism is important and that faculty and administration have a common interest in the survival of the University and should therefore address their concerns together.

President Goldstein outlined the University's problems as he perceives them as follows: first of all, there is the problem of the public image of what the University is and what we are supposed to do. Unless that problem is addressed, he cautioned, it will continue to plague us. The reasons for the problem are several - there is the concept of open admissions and the lack of public support for it with the result that it has a divisive effect. What needs to be done, President Goldstein suggested, is to indicate that the community colleges serve a specific function and that the senior colleges are different from them in terms of admissions and programs. A second problem grows out of the fact that the University is experiencing a decline in enrollment and therefore has more and more tenured faculty members. This has been true for some time but especially since the holocaust of 1975. The problem that must be confronted is what the University is going to do with tenured faculty in one area and students in another. These are, President Goldstein asserted, matters requiring early consideration - in advance of their reaching crisis proportions. He noted that we should have learned from the 1975-76 experience that it must never happen again. Thought needs to be given to retraining, to some form of transfer system or some colleges will be fighting for survival instead of planning for the future.

The third problem discussed by President Goldstein was that of faculty morale which he noted was not news to the Senate. There is also a problem of administrative morale, he said, for administrators like himself are growing tired of dealing with the problems of budget and fiscal affairs that beset the colleges every year. No president accepted his post in order to preside over

the dismemberment of an institution. The presidents' motivation is to build and to think positively of ways to serve the students and the City and this area of morale requires prompt attention. Still another concern of President Goldstein is in the area of the University's programs and curricula. Here there are Task Forces at work but the question remains to be seen whether their recommendations will be acceptable to the colleges and to the University. The problem is that such groups often find that what is needed is more rather than seeking to find ways of doing the job as well with less staff. The program area, President Goldstein characterized as an interesting one because at the same time that the University is going to lose thousands of students, it must keep alive in terms of what it is doing. Thus, there is a need for new and changing programs in spite of the enrollment decline. In President Goldstein's opinion this must be accepted and advanced in spite of the decline in students or the University will stagnate and be unable to serve those students who come to it. The whole problem is thus tricky.

Facilities is yet another problem area. Although there is certain movement in this area some of which it is clear is tinged politically or educationally there is a need to determine whether the State is prepared to build what a university of distinction needs and deserves. Vigilance is essential in this area and the determination to fight for what the University thinks necessary. The University must identify its friends and its enemies. At this stage it is evident that there is an attack on CUNY from some quarters in the City. There is also the whole public/private fight for funds from the State exemplified by the increase in Bundy aid which resembles the Lockheed scandal according to President Goldstein. New York State, he reminded the Senate, gives more aid to the private colleges than the other 49 states combines and the omnibus bill which included the increase in Bundy aid of \$49 million simply increased that contribution. The bill was held back until the last days of the Legislative Session to insure that the Bundy funds would be awarded. President Goldstein made clear his dissatisfaction with the Bundy aid. It would be different, he said, if the money went to needy students but instead it goes to private institutions which he pointed out are private, not independent. Furthermore, those institutions educate students from outside the State who then return to their home states and do not contribute to New York's tax rolls or betterment. That there might be money for some marginal institutions is understandable, President Goldstein continued, but not Bundy aid. The grants are unreasonable, he asserted, given the problems of City University's community colleges.

There is also a need according to President Goldstein to review the mission and objectives of City University's institutions in order to define our needs and to have accepted what our relationship is as a University. There is a need to see how faculties can relate to each other outside the existing mechanisms such as the Senate. We need to decide whether we are a University or a federation of colleges. It is correct to say that during the 1975 crisis the approach of each unit was to look out for its own interests and there were few people with a University perspective. Thus, we need to address this issue beforehand or we will have 1984 before we are prepared for it.

President Goldstein then spoke of a number of areas in which he thought the University might start moving suggesting that he did not intend to propose solutions but to outline areas for dialogue out of which solutions might evolve. First of all, he said, the University might begin not to view itself as parochially as in the past. We draw students from New York City now, why not draw them regionally or nationally. Both the state system in California and that in Ohio have out of state students. The need to consider drawing on an applicant pool less limited

geographically is necessary if we wish to maintain a university that is one of quality and excellence. We cannot do that unless we have both a faculty and a student body of high academic standing. We must look for them and compete for them outside of New York City. Both the demography of the City and the exodus from it are working against us. Therefore, I think it essential that we put on the table the question of who we serve and that we make an investment in seeking those we wish to serve. President Goldstein also said that the question of the University's faculty resources and how they serve the City is one to which lip service has been paid but which has not been given the needed attention it deserves. If the University is to receive local and State support, then it must make the public service component evident. In addition, the fact that the City University faculty is one that works as hard if not harder than those in the private sector must be publicized. A third point, the president continued, is to make known how the University helps the City in economic development and revitalization, to let the public understand this in terms of the students we graduate, the jobs they get, the fact that they are found on the tax rolls and not on welfare. All this must be the University's message to the public as well as the human services aspect of what the University offers those who come to it. For example, said President Goldstein, most of the graduates of our community colleges double their family's income within two years after receiving their degrees. That there is a distinction between the University's community and senior colleges is a fact, he suggested, that should be viewed as a positive rather than a negative characteristic. He did not think there is merit in trying to be what one is not and noted that as a community college president serving underprepared students he did not feel diminished but enhanced. He said that a good hard look at the statistics is needed because they would show that the students who graduate from the community colleges and go on to the senior colleges are well aware that the University is not homogeneous. This issue, he concluded, is one that must be dealt with in a rational way in spite of its sensitivity.

The fourth area identified by President Goldstein for consideration is the University's relationship with the Board of Education. Characterizing that relationship as a quagmire in one sense in that the University wants to help the school system as demonstrated by the fact that many of the colleges are "adopting" local schools, for example, but at the same time the University needs to regard itself and to be regarded as a University. In addition, President Goldstein advised vigilance in relation to the University's new Board, noting that it was not necessarily in periods when the most distinguished persons sat on the Board that the University flourished. What is important, he suggested, is to have a Board composed of persons who have a University perspective rather than a parochial view. The members of the Board must not be advocates for special interests but must have a concern for the University and it is essential that new members be oriented to this view. Stating that he was very much concerned about the recent articles in the press on presidential searches which discussed them in terms of political interference and the advocacy of candidates on the basis of race, sex, ethnicity and the like without any mention of quality so that the impression was created that identifications of such factors was made and then they became the basis for the search rather than the qualities that ought to be sought in a college president.

The sixth and final point that President Goldstein made was that one of the University's best kept secrets is that open admissions and open access are at an end. What we have, he suggested, is a program in name only for all practical purposes. Given the present student/faculty ratio the University can not provide the services of the equality of opportunity that many were excited about

when the program was initiated. The University can not be an avenue of upward mobility when it can not respond to its students needs. The funding of the University makes it impossible to be what we are supposed to be and the future would indicate that unless the trend of budget cuts is reversed, open admissions is dead.

President Goldstein concluded his remarks by expressing his pleasure and pride in having been asked to address the Senate and noted that he felt that he was among colleagues. He then responded to the following questions and comments from the floor.

1) Professor Lea (Lehman, English) - "I have never had the opportunity to hear you speak before and would like you to know that in my judgment you are what is called a Mensch. I have a special affection for CUNY because I too am one of its graduates. You have put forward many ideas that are worth thinking about and I wonder what you think about the relationship between our senior colleges and community colleges. As a faculty member at Lehman College I encounter many students who have come to us from community colleges - primarily Bronx Community College and Hostos - and not a few of them are not properly prepared for upper level studies. Is there a need for a liaison between the colleges so that transfer students may not only survive but flourish?"/ I think you are correct. There are students who are passed through our community colleges who are under-prepared for upper level work and the same is sometimes true at the senior colleges as well. For whatever reason this has happened the time for honesty has arrived. I applaud the competency test as a step in the right direction. That will set a standard that will force administrators and faculty to meet. There is another side to the issue, too. The community college students have to come a long way to meet the standards established; they come to us, many of them, reading at a fifth or sixth grade level and have been brought to tenth or eleventh grade by the time they graduate but one cannot view the University in isolation. Many students who come fearful of what they will find in college succeed at the community colleges and overcome their initial timidity. They need the same kind of nurturing at the senior colleges, however - at least on the basis of what our graduates tell us at Kingsborough of their experiences in making the adjustment to the senior colleges. The community colleges must see that transfer students are equipped academically to cope with upper level work but the senior colleges must have a sensitivity to such students and their needs. It is worth noting also that at the opposite end from the community college that passes students through is one of our community colleges which has a graduate rate of only 8 or 10% because of the number who drop out. 2) Professor Fried (Brooklyn, Chemistry) - "I too wish to congratulate you on your remarks and to say that I agree with you. I wonder whether you have an opinion on the following: I have tried to find out about the projections of student enrollment and how they have been computed but if we are to have the 60 to 70,000 students the projections indicate how can we justify having 19 units?"/ One of the things we have gotten used to is the fact that colleges must be tremendously large - a few years ago Brooklyn College was the largest in the state; seven of our nine community colleges are larger than all but one or two others in the state and they are the largest in the nation. One can have quality with 5-to 6,000 FTE's, however. The point of how to justify that is well taken. I think there is a need for a realistic approach and a spelling out of what is going to be and what we are trying to do. The facilities plan that has been laid out suggests a substantial change. Nonetheless construction is necessary to serve the needs of the present no matter the numbers. If one looks at some of our colleges such as Borough Manhattan and Hostos we know they are substandard - and the more so if one looks at the units of the State University. Have you ever seen or are you familiar with the State College at Buffalo's new



facility? Our entire construction program calls for an expenditure of \$600 million; the cost of Buffalo is \$1 billion for one unit. 3) Professor Speidel (Queens, Earth and Environmental Science) - "With regard to your Bundy aid comment president-in-exile Sawhill has said that the privates can educate cheaper than we can. I think it is a shame for us not to have you tell us what you think you have accomplished at Kingsborough Community College. Also, with reference to your comments on the University are we a University and with regard to our community colleges and in comparing our community colleges and our senior colleges what are the differences?"/ With regard to Kingsborough I find it difficult to talk about it as positively as I would like but I think its strength lies mainly in the relationship and trust between the faculty and members of the administration and the ease of communication among constituent groups. It has been my privilege to work with committed and dedicated people and I have tried to keep them informed and received their responses on steps we should take. We may disagree on decisions but we do so with respect. We are also blessed with an outstanding location. We were lucky and I was able to look forward and move ahead by taking advantage of an opportunity that came to us. Therefore, when the crunch came our construction was almost finished. We have 70 acres not half an acre like our sisters. A third strength of Kingsborough is that we have a highly credentialed faculty that stays around and works with students who thus feel there are people who care and our followup studies of graduates indicate our success. The quality of instruction is another strength. In terms of a University and how the colleges should relate to each other I think we should speak factually rather than wishfully. I don't think the University should try to be something that it is not. I think we should see the problems and try to fend off untoward results. For example, when the trimester was suggested during the 1975-76 crisis every college rejected it and rightly so. On the other hand at Kingsborough we looked for a different calendar and came up with our present arrangement of 12-6-12-6. That calendar enables us to produce more FTEs; our students still pay tuition only twice each year and our faculty can work for extra compensation since they are required to teach only the two twelve week terms. I don't think you can break the hold of one college to another but I think we should put on the table the reality of students going to a college. At four senior colleges that are lumped together in the Long Range Planning document, which is a public document, one of those colleges is very prestigious and it has 40% of its students in the 65th percentile or lower in terms of high school graduation average, 30% above and 30% unknown. That suggests something, I think. There are other colleges with very different statistics so perhaps we should be looking for a three not a two tier system. That may be heretical but one can't avoid facts. We have an opportunity to move closer together not further apart. Perhaps we should look at the University in terms of disciplines not departments; perhaps we can move people then. There is no systematic approach now; there is no idea of a University faculty. This is true in terms of resources too. Perhaps we should not have a second or third generation computer on every campus. There are a number of areas for doing things in common. 4) Professor Grossman (City, Education) - "I too want to tell you how much I appreciated your comments. You referred to the Chancellor's Task Forces that are looking at a number of areas. Can you tell us what is happening with them? There is not that much information. I have heard from one member of the Foreign Language Task Force that they are coming up with some good recommendations but rather than speak to what I really don't know specifically I should say that the Task Forces are winding down and their recommendations will be forthcoming shortly. 5) Professor Baumrin (Lehman, Philosophy) - "I have an anti-visionary question. Can you give us a first hand view of possible future horrors in relation to the budget?"/ As Chairman of the Presidents Committee on Fiscal Affairs I think we should consider a meeting of the Council of Presidents Committee on Fiscal Affairs and the Senate Executive Committee at which we might discuss the issue of faculty participation in the budget process

On the budget picture itself I can report that in the senior colleges 185 lines have been taken back by the State. That means that of the 400 lines we have vacant now - and I don't know why they are vacant - City University must return 185 unfilled. SUNY must return 485. That is the situation with regard to the position freeze. So far as the budget request is concerned Mr. Villette in the State Budget Office has indicated that things are rough but there is no feeling that there will be any major problems for the senior colleges.

With respect to the community colleges the situation is a lot worse since their budget is tied to the City and its problems. Therefore, they are experiencing problems with no end in sight. The City has developed what they call the PEG plan for two years and we have had to provide impact statements on the effects of those projected cuts on each of our community colleges. What lies ahead is a \$2.1 million cut for next year. To this must be added the \$3 million audit disallowance from this year, \$1.5 million because the City says it may need it, an additional \$2.5 which added to the \$2.1 means a cut of some \$9 million all in personal services without taking into account additional cuts that may be made in OTPS. What has happened is that the City has moved the student/faculty ratio to 24 to 1. Thus, it is important to deal with any individual that we can. The Chancellor will be addressing the problem with the City on Friday and on Thursday, the Chancellor, Vice Chancellor Posman and I will be meeting with City Council President Bellamy. 6) Professor Gosselin (Bronx Community, English) - "I had occasion recently to hear Herbert Blenstock speak at the City Club in a rather upbeat manner on the City, stating that it is in a good position for the 80's. His comments were predicated on a skilled labor force. If that is the City's salvation why is it so difficult to persuade the City that City University is worth preserving?" / When Mayor Koch came to Kingsborough for his Open Forum all of the questions except those that were plants dealt with garbage collection, transportation and crime on the streets. That indicates that the citizens have placed a low priority on higher education and we need to face this. Furthermore, the Mayor responds to everyday issues. When the question of City University came up he attacked the individual who asked the question. We can only speculate on the reasons for this. The Mayor is a graduate of NYC, NYU is in his home district, President Sawhill is his friend. Also, the Mayor has a perception that does not include teaching underprepared students. Thirdly, there are people in the University who, in my opinion, supported the wrong person in the last campaign. Professor Burton interjected that perhaps raising the citizens' consciousness was a function of the borough hearings of the Board and an additional reason why faculty must be there and persuade others to do so since these events would be covered in the media. 7) Professor Quinn (Brooklyn, English) - "Since tuition was imposed and we have had increasing inflation and rising unemployment how has the ratio between the two year vocational program students and those who go on to a four year program and if the newspapers are correct concerning the increase in students in vocational programs how do you see that change?" / I have looked at the statistics which indicate that about 60% of the students enter the community colleges and that community college transfers to the senior colleges constitute part of the freshman class there. I do not believe there is such a thing as terminal education, however. One reason for the shift now may be the national trend of students to move towards career, job oriented programs. In any case a decline in both will take place because of the birthrate but that decline need not be as great as the predictions indicate. People can come who have not yet been tapped. For example, we have had large numbers of GED holders at Kingsborough who have found the experience meaningful - in one year of the 600 recipients of the GED 200 entered Kingsborough. 8) Professor Toback (Kingsborough, Student Development) - "You reminded us of the horrors of 1975-76 when most of the colleges were forced to retrench but this

was not true at Kingsborough. You must have had some strategy that permitted you to avoid retrenching and I wonder what it was?"/ The University mandate was to move into as many full-time positions as possible; at Kingsborough it was to move into as many part-time positions as possible. I believed that we were facing a crisis and imposed a job freeze three years before the crisis came; therefore, we were able to keep our full-time people in the crisis. The strategy was a combination of good thinking and luck. In terms of the future it is a problem facing not just Kingsborough but the University. We have gone through to the bone, to the marrow now and the limb is about to be cut off. There is no way to have instruction without dropping full-time faculty, tenured in some instances. Just as in 1975 if we wait until June or July and don't take the initiative we will be in someone else's hands. I will close with this statement. When we went from a budget of \$530 million to \$470 million plus tuition we had to urge people to pass that budget because it meant our survival. Had we gone in earlier with a plan we could have taken the initiative but people said it was the same crisis as always and we were going to be bailed out but they were wrong. I am saying this because of the problems I have outlined and my belief that we need to take the initiative.

Professor Burton thanked President Goldstein on behalf of the Senate.

VIII. Proposed Resolution of the Academic Freedom Committee: Professor Wu (Queens, Classical Languages), chairman of the Academic Freedom Committee, moved the adoption of the proposed resolution on appointments to the Board of Trustees of the City University. The motion was seconded and following a brief discussion the question was called and the resolution was adopted unanimously. (Copy attached).

The session was adjourned at 9:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Henry Wasser, Secretary