

SUBJECT TO SENATE APPROVAL

MINUTES OF THE ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY-FOURTH PLENARY SESSION
OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

March 24, 1987

Chair Wedeen called the session to order promptly at 7:00 p.m. in Room 1700 at the Graduate School and University Center. Senators Amendolia, Barbanel, Baumrin, Baxter, Binder, Bleyman, Bohigian, Boylan, Brower, Canate, B. Cohen, Constantinides, Cooper, Cravzow, Davidson, Denitch, Depas, Donleavy, Donoghue, Donovan, Galub, Geach, Gerber, Ginsberg, Gluck, Gram, Greenbaum, Grossman, Hayon, Henderson, Huang, Jaffe, Jiji, Kirkland, La Rubbio, Lytra, Matthews, McCullers, Muehlig, Otte, Parkhurst, Riley, Rosen, Segal, Seguire, Shaffer, Sohmer, Speidel, Stern, Taylor, Thaxton, Waldinger, Wasser, White, Zades, Zaneteas, and Zarin and Alternate Senators Blanks, B. Ginsberg, Glass, Sessions, and Youkeles were present. Alternate Senator Elect Suri also attended. Senators Bank, Danziger, Gura, Hernandez-Miyares, Lea, Litke, Muller, Picken, Plissner, Rovira, Sheridan, Simor, Timoni, Trefousse, Walter, and Yousef were excused. Chancellor Joseph S. Murphy and Dr. Ellis, Executive Director, also attended. President Joel Segall (Baruch) was the guest speaker.

I. Approval of the Proposed Tentative Agenda: The proposed tentative agenda was approved by motion duly made, seconded and adopted unanimously.

II. Approval of the Minutes of the 153rd Plenary Session (February 24, 1987): The minutes were approved by motion duly made, seconded and unanimously adopted with one correction - Senator Constantinides (Brooklyn) was present.

III. Communications from the Chair: Chair Wedeen said that ordinarily her communications were distributed in writing but that she would have some oral communications this evening. She had returned only two hours prior to the session from New Orleans where she had attended the meetings of the Association of Governing Boards - the national association of Boards of Trustees of colleges and universities. The meetings had begun on Sunday, March 22 and had concluded the afternoon of March 24. The initial session - a dinner - had as speaker Theodore Hesburgh, President of Notre Dame University. Father Hesburgh, she noted, has been president of an institution longer than any other president, has received some 110 Honorary Degrees and serves on the Boards of 36 institutions. He is, she added, revered by many and is well versed in matters of governance. He directed his remarks to a discussion of the governance body at Notre Dame. Chair Wedeen noted in an aside that, of course, governance to this group meant the relationship between governing boards and presidents and did not mean what the Senate was accustomed to associate governance with. The Notre Dame board has 50 members who among them have contributed \$30 million to the University. Father Hesburgh's criteria for Board members, as he enunciated them to the meeting, are work, wealth, and wisdom. On Monday, March 23 the sessions opened with a keynote speech by Louis Cabot, President of the Brookings Institution. He spoke to the need for higher education institutions to define their own mission and priorities and then keep them in mind so that their planning was directed towards them. It was necessary for institutions to keep an eye to themselves, he suggested, lest they find themselves "Bennettized." The subsequent meetings on March 23, the Chair continued, were panel discussions of various topics. Those she attended were: 1) Growing Part-time Enrollment in which the importance of high quality education for students in an institution's off-campus and adult education programs was stressed with the point being made that faculty involved in such programs needed to be rewarded since they were not usually considered significant because they worked with part-time students. The panelists made the point also that colleges should accept working with part-time students as one of their missions and not regard such work as community service or a means of acquiring additional FTE's. They made clear that 40% of the student population comprises part-time students and of those

60% are female; 2) The Crisis in Teaching which was devoted almost in its entirety to a summary of the Carnegie Report with which the Senate is familiar; and 3) Community College Governance in a Political Environment at which President Brown (Bronx) advised that in handling issues with governing bodies it is important to analyze, communicate, and cooperate. Finally, Chair Wedeen said she thought the conference significant and found most of the papers good.

Chair Wedeen spoke next of a request from the New York Council for the Humanities seeking University support for its effort to secure some funding from the State. The Council, she explained, was an important force in providing support for humanities programs and had made numerous grants to CUNY programs at the Graduate Center and in the other colleges. Examples of such programs were The Graduate Center's pioneering symposia on "Women and the Arts", the Center for Jewish Studies' conferences on Jewish migration, Hunter College's Brookdale Center's lecture/radio series on late-life creativity, and the American Social History Project's program to spread its work to labor and community groups throughout the country. The Council's financial support has been federal funds awarded by the National Endowment for the Humanities and private contributions. It does not now receive state assistance. Because the reductions in the federal budget have meant cutbacks in the federal funds available for awards at the same time as demands on its resources have increased, the Council is now actively seeking state support. Chair Wedeen suggested that other members of the Senate might comment and amplify her information and Senator Wasser (English, Staten Island) spoke to the value of the Council's work with which he was familiar and urged its support in this effort. Chair Wedeen said that the Council asked for letters to the Governor, State Senators Rappleyea and Ohrenstein and Speaker Miller urging its support and suggested that members of the Senate might wish to write. Those wishing to do so, she said, might obtain the addressees' names, titles, addresses from the Senate Office. Asked whether a motion was in order, she responded in the affirmative and a motion was duly made and seconded to empower the Executive Committee in the name of the Senate to communicate with the Governor and the legislative leadership urging support for the Council. The motion was adopted unanimously.

Chair Wedeen informed the body that her other communications were available in writing on the rear table in the room.

IV. Reports of Faculty Members of Board of Trustees' Committees: Chair Wedeen advised the Senate that these were available in writing on the rear table in the room.

V. Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Structure and Procedures: Professor Baumrin (Philosophy, Graduate School), chairman of the Committee, reminded the body that the question before it was the adoption of the report of his committee approved at the November 1986 session and the February 1987 session as "standing rules of the Senate". He reminded the Senate that at the February session he had told it he did not know what that meant; therefore, he had looked it up and was now prepared to speak to the subject. He had consulted the original Roberts Rules of Order (p.268) which defined "Standing Rules" as follows: "Standing Rules should contain only such rules as may be adopted without previous notice by a majority vote at any business meeting. The vote on their adoption or their amendment before or after adoption may be reconsidered. At any meeting they may be suspended by a majority vote, or they may be amended or rescinded by a two-thirds vote. If notice of the proposed action was given at a previous meeting or in the call for this meeting they may be amended or rescinded by a majority vote. As a majority may suspend any of them for that meeting these rules do not interfere with the freedom of any meeting and therefore require no notice in order to adopt them. Generally they are not adopted at the organization of a society but from time to time as needed. Sometimes the Bylaws of a society are called standing rules but it is better to follow the usual classification of rules as given in this section. The following is an

example of a standing rule: Resolved: that the meetings of this society from April 1 to September 30 shall be at 7:30 p.m. and during the rest of the year at 8 p.m. Now, in the revised Roberts Rules of Order which doesn't take the issue of standing rules very seriously at all, and I have discovered now that the revised book is really just a commentary on the original, maybe you knew that all along, but I didn't know that, says, in Article 9, under a classification "Constitutions, Bylaws, Rules of Order, Standing Rules" -- "In addition to the Constitution, Bylaws and Rules of Order in nearly every society resolutions of a permanent nature are occasionally adopted which are binding on the society until they are rescinded or modified. These are called Standing Rules and can be adopted by a majority vote at any meeting. After they have been adopted they cannot be modified at the same session except by a reconsideration. At any future session they can be suspended, modified, or rescinded by a majority vote. The standing rules, then, comprise those rules of a society which have been adopted like ordinary resolutions without the previous notice etc. required for the Bylaws, and consequently future sessions of the society are at liberty to terminate them whenever they please. No standing rule or other resolution can be adopted which conflicts with the constitution, bylaws, or rules of order." All of which I think means that they are permanent rules that can be overridden at any meeting by a majority vote but are in force unless so moved to override. The issue about reconsideration doesn't come up because those meetings are now in the past and we don't come up to the question of reconsideration. So the rules with respect to them are rather weak and my personal opinion, given what I've read, is that I don't think it amounts to very much if we adopt them as standing rules. They're just the weakest form of bylaws that you have because they don't require prior notice in order to override.

To a request to move adoption of these approved procedures as standing rules, Professor Baumrin said that such a motion was already on the floor and had been seconded. Discussion was in order. There was brief discussion and the question was called. The motion was then put to a vote and adopted. A request to the Executive Director to provide a copy of the Charter, the By-laws, and the Standing Rules to all incoming Senators and to those already in the body who wished them was made.

VI. Guest Speaker: President Joel Segall (Baruch College): Chair Wedeen introduced President Segall noting that he had been at Baruch for a decade. His degrees had come originally from the University of Chicago and he had taught there and at the Royal College of Science and Technology, Stanford University and the University of Washington. He had then gone to Washington as Deputy Assistant Secretary for Tax Policy in the Treasury Department and had subsequently served as Deputy Undersecretary for International Affairs in the Department of Labor. On behalf of the Senate the Chair welcomed President Segall.

President Segall said that he was pleased to be with the Senate. Baruch College, he said, is best known for its School of Business and Public Administration and I think the reason for that is that it is the largest in the country, that's by head count. It may be second or third in terms of full time students. But there's always been some uneasiness about the role of the study of business in the college and that is what I want to talk about with you tonight.

When I first started to teach about 150 years ago, it was considered good sport for students and faculty in the humanities and sciences to poke a little fun at the greedy money-grubbers who studied and who taught the business subjects. We were regarded as less worthy; our pursuits as less noble; and our subject matter less demanding than could be found in, say, the natural and social sciences. At best we were patronized, tarred as we were with the trade school brush. And there was some validity to those allegations.

At best we were patronized, tarred as we were with the trade school brush. And there was some validity to those allegations. Too much of what passed for knowledge in those days was anecdotal, vague, hortatory, frequently self-contradictory, and far from what was generally believed absolutely useless for vocational purposes. We learned, for example, that business firms should probably borrow, but not too much, that a stable dividend policy pleased some stockholders but not others, that the efficient production of automobiles was uniquely American and stemmed mainly from our teenagers' preoccupation with things mechanical, that a reasonable investment policy could involve buying at the harmonic mean and selling at the arithmetic mean, and that means, of course, buying low and selling high, but no one told us how to do this. And, in the words of Frank Knight, the problem was not that we didn't know much. The problem was that we knew so much that wasn't true. We did learn some things. We learned rather more than we wanted to know about statistics. We learned less microeconomic theory than we should have and we had a pretty good introduction to classical monetary theory and macroeconomics. Now this was about the time when the case study method of the Harvard Business School blossomed and became the standard for business education in the graduate schools and in many undergraduate schools. The basic idea was that students would be confronted with business problems taken from the real world. The student would put himself in the place of the real manager and receive all the data and information accessible to the real manager. The student was called upon to identify the problem, reject the irrelevant data, and arrive at a solution. The solution rested with the student, not the professor, and that, you see, was perfectly consistent with the psychotherapy most popular at the time. The professor played no role except to develop, write, and maybe publish the cases. He also had to keep the class discussions from getting out of hand or drifting into dead ends. No student and no solution could ever be wrong. And the students loved it. Classes were exciting, preparation was meticulous, the debates were intense. Also, I think, the students got pretty useful experience in writing up cases and having the writing corrected by professional readers. The method developed, I think, from the use of cases in the law schools, with one major difference. In law, the cases are the knowledge and the cases are the theory. And that is not true in the study of business. Now, you may be thinking that I have no great affection for case study in business, and if that is what you are thinking why then you are absolutely right. My own thinking is that you cannot replicate a business situation in the college - the case is bound to be only a pale reflection of reality. If there is something to teach, the thing to do is to teach it. And, I suppose that is why I have from time to time used cases in my own teaching.

In the late 1950's a couple of block busters hit the business field. Two studies, one sponsored by the Ford Foundation and the other by Carnegie, criticized business schools for inadequate academic standards. The courses were descriptive rather than analytical, faculties were not doing research, fewer than 40% had Ph.D.'s at that time, and many schools had a strictly vocational orientation. In one unpublished Ford Foundation memorandum - this was an internal memo - the study of business, which was described as the restless and uncertain giant of higher education, was characterized by a quote: "unimaginative non-theoretical faculties teaching from descriptive, practice-oriented texts to classes of second-rate, vocationally-minded students." As a consequence the Ford Foundation threw a lot of money into business education in an effort to upgrade the curriculum and the faculties - especially in the graduate programs. And the results were remarkable. The business schools hired researchers who were trained in fields outside of business, Ph.D.'s in business were turned out in much greater numbers, research facilities flourished, and, best of all, the subject matter in business schools came to rest more and more on foundations drawn from economics and the behavioral sciences.

I will give you one example. Economics had been dabbling in capital theory for over 100 years. There was a school of Austrian economists who had their own particular views on capital and capital formation, and a school of English economists with different views, but the theory just sat there with the conflicts unresolved, and very little in the way of empirical implication or testing. But with the injection of the Ford money, the finance specialists in the business schools took the stagnant capital theory, expanded it, refined it, and made it into an elegant and powerful tool of analysis with significant implications for the study of business. You may remember that a little bit ago, you may not remember, I mentioned the problem of how much debt a firm should have - I said some, but not too much. The theory now tells us that the amount of debt the firm has has nothing to do with the value of the firm. And the same theory tells us much the same for dividend policy - it has little impact on stockholders. Investment portfolio theory evolved mainly from the marriage of the theory of finance with statistics and the great work of Harry Markowitz who is now a faculty member at Baruch College. And from the Markowitz portfolio theory was developed the capital asset pricing model which is the theory of equilibrium evaluation which tells us among lots of things that stock prices have no useful history. Well, in the same way that economics has informed the study of finance, psychology, sociology and anthropology have informed the study of marketing, management, and even accounting, where researchers have begun to look at tribal behavior and corporate personalities. Mathematicians have begun drifting into the field, particularly in computer science, and so has one physicist who wrote a nearly unintelligible paper, to me unintelligible, "Brownian Motion in the Stock Market". This is not to suggest that all business studies are now coherent disciplines. They are not. Marketing, for example, still consists of a set of problems. Product choice, market choice, pricing, communication, logistics and so on. Each of these problem areas may be better understood in the light of principles drawn from the behavioral sciences but there is as yet no single underlying theory that tells us how to treat the problem areas. In that sense, marketing is more like the practice of medicine than it is of finance. Still, I think it is reasonable to conclude that the study of business rests mainly on theories drawn from the social sciences and that the study of business is certainly academically respectable. Its research is very highly valued and there is an enormous scholarly literature. And yet the number of authorities who look down their noses at us continues to be substantial. Part of that stems, I think, from the extraordinary growth of business majors. In the Carnegie Foundation's recently published book, College: The Undergraduate Experience in America, we learn that the push toward career-related education has come to dominate most campuses and during the past 15 years has dramatically increased. Again, the percentage of baccalaureate degrees awarded in Business, Computer Science, Engineering, Health Professions increased while the percentage of degrees awarded in traditional liberal arts fields went down. And again, the shift toward business and away from liberal arts has been described as the new vocationalism in higher education. Actually the growth of the MBA degree has been even more dramatic. In this academic year, 1986-87, the colleges and universities in this country will award over 70,000 MBA degrees. The same source reports that about half of the faculty surveyed "said that undergraduate education in America would be improved if there were less emphasis on specialized training and more on liberal education."

Let me review the bidding, so to speak. In general, the study of business in the colleges has been deplored because it is 1) too vocationally oriented, 2) not sufficiently demanding, and 3) crowding out the liberal arts. The first seems to me flimsy; the second is ambiguous; and the third I don't know what to do about. The objection of vocational orientation seems to me flimsy because colleges have always had a vocational orientation. At one time Oxford, Cambridge, the Universities of Paris and Bologna offered only four programs. They were law, medicine, theology and the arts. And of those four, three of them were explicitly vocational. Students wanted jobs and that was mainly why they went to college. The notion that business study is not sufficiently demanding is probably empirically incorrect in view of the prerequisites, including math prerequisite, and the extraordinarily high rates of failure in business schools.

In addition, I suggest that the concept of difficulty is itself in difficulty. Nothing is difficult to people who are able and there are clearly more people able to solve a complex problem in physics than can run a mile in four minutes. It's hard to get a handle on this subject. The problem of the crowding out of liberal arts is a problem. I hate to see it and I really don't believe it will continue. Still, there is a danger, and there is no easy solution except perhaps to integrate the study of liberal arts with professional study. We have been trying to do that at Baruch College. We have research centers which draw on different disciplines from the schools we have at the college. We use joint teaching, joint programs, and we've done this for many years with more or less success. I presume we shall continue. There is one encouraging circumstance and that is that Baruch College's School of Liberal Arts and Sciences is now larger in terms of number of faculty than our School of Business. But the reason for that I have always supposed is that our business majors must take two full years of liberal arts and sciences before we allow them to take a business course. So perhaps that isn't all that surprising. But what bothers me particularly is the changing nature of the criticism. In a recent book, In Search of Excellence, by Peters and Waterman, we learn that business schools are deficient because they encourage quantitative analysis, the numerative rationalist approach, the detailed analytical justification for all decisions. Now I read that as meaning an intellectual, academic approach. And from the United States Secretary of Commerce Malcolm Baldrige, "Business school students all want to go up in the ivory tower instead of getting down on the factory floor." So we seem to have come a long way from the 1950's when we did not fit the academic mold because we were too vocational to the more recent criticism that we fit the academic mold only too well and are not sufficiently vocational. That is, our students are no longer greedy money-grubbers, they have become number-crunching nerds. I infer that business schools will always be criticized - they are either too vocational or not vocational enough. And, if that cycle is ever damped, I imagine we will hear more loudly that profit is a dirty word, that greed is dirtier still, that businessmen hate dogs and children and have been known to cheat at bridge. In all candor, I think that criticism helpful and we are better off if we are required to reexamine every so often, what we do for a living.

Thank you. I will be happy to answer any questions.

President Segall then responded to the following questions from the floor: 1) Professor Wasser - "The dispute a few years ago on the validity of business education has now been transferred to teacher education and has since disappeared from the business major. Is the mixture of business and liberal arts the answer?"/ I don't know if it is the answer but I think the stuff now done in undergraduate business education involves analysis - that stuff is rigorous and tough and therefore it is hard to distinguish. It is clear to me that there was a time when a CPA was the only profession open to a Bachelor degree graduate in business but now there is graduate business education too although the CPA is still important. 2) Professor Cooper (History, Staten Island) - "I was pleased to hear you refer to the original universities. But I think that you understated two of the four areas that were taught because the fallout from them was that they accidentally trained critics of society and thus preserved a similarity to the liberal arts. At Staten Island the students enrolled in the business program have a poor background in the liberal arts and that will not be enriched by their college experience. They know little about history and nothing about the Second or Third World, for example. What happens at Baruch College? Do they learn by forcing liberal arts analysis?"/ At Baruch students are taught about the Second and Third World in International Trade, for example. The real question is one of values and through critical analysis of existing institutions there is a critical analysis of values. They are taught too, for example, through microeconomics. The first two years of the college experience can be very important. It is easy to defend the view that students should be literate in everything but the trouble is that if you adopt that view, it will

able because then you should say men should know all. One has to know some, not all. We give what we can in the liberal arts and sciences and make the business courses rigorous.

Chair Wedeen thanked President Segall and noted that she thought it was apparent that he had a very receptive audience, that he did teach the Senate something.

VJ. Chancellor's Report: Chair Wedeen presented the Chancellor and stated that one teacher after another was very welcome at the Senate, that it was at the receptive end rather than the podium end this evening and therefore invited the Chancellor to take the podium.

Chancellor Murphy asked whether the Senate really wanted to know who the Luddites were. Well, he continued, as a matter of fact in France they were in the 18th century and in England in the 17th - it took a hundred years for the Industrial Revolution to manage to... Interruptions from the audience were voiced. Professors Wasser and Cooper disagreed with the dates given by the Chancellor as did others. Chancellor Murphy resumed saying - 18th or 19th, I think, but the audience still objected. At this point Chair Wedeen intervened and said the Senate had its own expert - Professor Cooper. Professor Cooper insisted on 19th century. The Chancellor then resumed stating that Ned Ludd, the original Ned Ludd from which the word Luddite comes was he believed 17th century. The disagreement continued and the Chancellor reiterated that he was going back to the history of where the word came from and continued that Ned Ludd was 17th century in England and that in Lyon in the 18th he thought correct. He was prepared to look it up, however. A further intervention suggested that Ludd was 18th century but the Chancellor retaliated that that could not be if one spoke of Ned Ludd the person and insisted that he had to be earlier. Chair Wedeen suggested that that was the Chancellor's homework. [Ed. Note: In 1779 Ned Ludd broke two frames in his employer's shop. The Luddites themselves were active in the period 1811-1816.]

Chancellor Murphy then said he felt it incumbent upon him to make some comments on President Segall's speech and his justification for business and a business education and on the artful, sophisticated way in which he was able to offset criticisms of business administration education by suggesting that the critics didn't agree among themselves as to what was wrong with it and what its shortcomings were. He thought, the Chancellor continued, that the real issue to be faced was the notion of whether or not it was an appropriate thing to teach people the skills necessary to be able to enhance the degree to which profits could be made by industries and corporations - profits that were often made as the result of the more systematic and more efficient exploitation of the labor of others. Moreover, he continued, a good piece of that kind of education depended upon a kind of assistance and complicity in the degradation of work generally in a society in which goods were produced merely for the sake of extending their consumption and merely for the sake of creating conditions for their consumption and therefore for the profits to be gained from the labor involved in their production and consumption and, more importantly the revulsion of self that came from work that had no other good other than the production of such goods. [Laughter from the audience.]

The Chancellor then went on to his agenda and said that as a matter of fact he agreed with President Segall, that the University needed Baruch badly judging by the fact that it was now the most popular institution in the University. He suggested that it would end up that Baruch would be feeding everyone in the University. He then stated that as those Senators who read The New York Times were aware there was as yet no agreement on the tax cut in Albany. One had the sad sight of the Governor and the Republican Senate and the Democratic Assembly falling all over each other to see how big that tax cut was going to be. He presumed that the assumption was that things were going so well for people of the State of New York that it would now be possible to give back some of the surpluses to the people who presumably earned them and paid them and so everyone had agreed to a tax cut although they could not decide on what

its magnitude would be. Once there was agreement then how much money would be available for the support of services throughout the state including education and higher education would be known. The Chancellor said that he doubted that there would be a signed bill by April 1, which was the objective, and suggested the possibility of April 7 or 8. He added that if there were no budget bill by the 9th University personnel would be paid in script so that he hoped there would be in fact a budget sometime before the ninth of April. This budget, he added, was being cut largely by the graduates of business schools with masters' degrees in business administration - though there were probably not nearly as many Baruch MBA's as upstate MBA's.

He said that a group of University people had visited legislators and staff in Albany last week and had presented essentially the University's priorities once again in about as explicit a way as they could - the community college state aid portion which is a big and important issue, the graduate and research portion which is another issue for the University, another important issue - four year status and State funding of Medgar Evers, the position restorations which are marginal, and some new building openings that would require additional personnel, the retention programs which the University placed some fairly significant priorities on, and the additional capital items that the Senate knew about- a building at Queens and one at York and a gym for Lehman that the University has been trying to get for years and which might be possible since Lehman had won the basketball tournament this year.

Those Senators who were veterans, the Chancellor said, knew that the State Budget is usually in place by April Fool's Day and then the University addressed itself to the City side of the budget. The University has started to do this already with the City Council and Board of Estimate. Testimony had been provided those bodies about what the University will require for the community colleges and it was working once again to try to keep the state aid for the community colleges that the University got in its hands. With reference to the state aid the University received, he explained, it was reduced year after year by the City once it came to the University.

The Chancellor said also that those Senators who were interested in such matters would want to know that that morning he had an opportunity to give the keynote speech at the Conference Board on Pay Equity attended by a number of people in corporations. He was a little surprised and taken aback to notice that pay equity, that is to say that women ought to receive 100 per cent the same amount of money that men do for the same work is an issue in corporations and businesses in the private sector in the United States and, he said, there were many who have taken the position that it may not be possible to reach such goals. At present women in the world created by the kind of people that President Segall had described received something like \$.67 on every dollar. No one would hold President Segall personally responsible for that, the Chancellor said, but that amount was up about \$.17 from 1940 he believed when women received something like \$.50 on the dollar. Calculated at the present rate of progress, he continued, women would receive the same salary that men did in 147 years. Those interested in his speech, he said, could ask for a copy. He said that he could sound pretty arrogant at this point since the Melani settlement had now provided the University with tangible and concrete evidence that it does not discriminate and, indeed, if it were alleged to discriminate against women in matters of salary there was a mechanism in place to overcome and adjudicate such disputes.

Once the budget was adopted, Chancellor Murphy continued, the Legislature continue to sit and then the University's major focus would be aid to part-time students. It had managed to get a bill through the Legislature seven years ago that provided aid to part-time students under the tuition assistance program but it had not been subscribed to

because prohibitions on its use had been or at least the price of its use had been very high - namely, any student who didn't successfully complete the course was a student whose tuition had to be refunded to the state by the college that had awarded the money. Some of the colleges - the ones with constituencies where this would be the most useful, where the students tended to be part-time and the poorest had used the least amount of that money. The University was therefore trying to get the bill rewritten again but he said he had a hunch the University should probably just go ahead and give the money and then see what happened. If, in fact, he added, we did have a big deficit deal with it at some other later time. Otherwise, the University would just be underutilizing the program. The University was also looking to improve financial aid to graduate students, he continued, although once again it had managed last year to get the amount of money available for that purpose doubled from \$600 to \$1200 and it was not being used. Graduate students were not applying for it though there was reason to believe that there were substantial numbers of them who would qualify for it. Something was happening, he opined, even if they were unaware of it which was the most likely or that CUNY's graduate students were richer than it thought, which was unlikely. Moreover, he continued, the University would seek the elimination of the \$200 reduction in undergraduate tuition assistance for students in their third and fourth years of the baccalaureate program - sometimes known as the upper cut- which was something the University had been trying to do for a number of years and had not yet succeeded.

Chancellor Murphy also reported that there had been a number of searches that had gone on and had been going on and had either reported in or were still hard at work and there would be announcements to be made within the next few days for Deputy Chancellor and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. Searches were continuing, he said, though they were about to conclude, for the Law School Dean and for a President for Hostos College, so he was hoping that in the not too distant future but before the end of the semester all of these four senior administrative appointments would have been made.

The Chancellor said he wished to thank the Senate for participating in the work of the Robert J. Kibbee Awards Committee. Apparently, he added, the Committee had enthusiastically endorsed the nomination of Basil Patterson. He supported that and would bring it to the Board. As everyone knew, Basil Patterson was the former Secretary of State of New York, Deputy Mayor of New York City, former State Senator, and had served as Vice Chairman of the Friends of the City University of New York. That nomination would go forward to the Board at its March meeting.

The Chancellor reported too that he had the opportunity last week to attend the Medgar Evers' Founders Day dinner and listen to Congressman Bill Gray who was now third ranking member of Congress and chairman of the Budget Committee. He was enormously impressive, especially on the subject of Pell Grants and on the Department of Education and the failure of the Department of Education to act on behalf of issues that were of interest to the University. It seemed pretty clear that if he lasted a few more budget years he might become Speaker of the Congress. He would be the first black speaker he thought in the history of the country or certainly since Reconstruction.

Finally, the Chancellor said, age was beginning to catch up with him and as each year went by his value must increase because he'd been invited to talk about McCarthyism since he lived through that period along with a lot of people in the room but not everybody in the room. He would be speaking on that subject on April 9 at Brooklyn College and he would welcome comments, suggestions, paragraphs, citations, books written by people in the room and perhaps, more importantly, experiences endured on the subject, and he promised to find a way to incorporate it. The University had a long history, starting back he guessed with - well, probably for a long time. His earliest recollections

of it were oddly enough the Rapp-Coudert Commission of 1941 - he recalled just about the time that it was not possible for Bertrand Russell to be appointed Visiting Professor of Philosophy at City College.

Chancellor Murphy said that that completed his report and he would respond to any questions anyone wanted to raise.

1) Professor Greenbaum (History, Queensborough) - "I want to return to a subject I raised a number of years ago - the question of the CUNY B.A. and having the Senate responsible for the CUNY BA. The fact that the Senate does not have the responsibility for the CUNY BA and the fact that we have a CUNY BA Committee is presenting problems with retaining the integrity of the CUNY BA having to do with the Local 802 program. I don't want to get into too many details here because most people are not aware of it, but the Local 802 program does not follow the course distribution of the CUNY BA. The CUNY BA Committee voted that all new entrants into this program follow the course distribution, and we have been stopped from implementing this by the Provost of the Graduate School. Now, had this - the power of a faculty - been given to the University Faculty Senate for this program, I don't think we would have been having this problem right now."/ You say Local 802's program does not follow the course distribution of the CUNY BA program? Professor Greenbaum - "Yes."/ It has been stopped, so why...Professor Greenbaum intervened - "No, no, it has not...we made an attempt to stop this program's violating the course distribution which was in place a long time ago and we were stopped from doing it this year."/ You mean the Provost has come out publicly on behalf of the violation? Professor Greenbaum responded - "No, he has intervened, created a committee he appointed to study it, and the word I hear is that the committee is going to report a program that is not consistent with the current course distribution."/ I see. I will make note of it and look into it. I am unaware of it. 2) Professor Cooper - "Some of us are grateful for the fact that you reestablished the evaluation of presidents as a process in the University; others in the room don't know they're grateful for it but they are. Our gratitude would increase indeed if we had some way of finding out what the results are going to be. Could you tell us if this is going to remain a state secret, top priority, leaked through various people in various offices, rumors? In other words, is there going to be any systematic feedback to the people who are most affected by the functioning and performance of presidents after they get angry at their evaluation?"/ There is, somewhere, a description of what is to happen to these, and we will follow that. Either that, I can't remember what it is off hand, but I'll find out what it is and report. The easiest thing is to have two editions, an expurgated edition [laughter] ...I'll follow the Board, I know the Board...this is all spelled out in great detail and we will follow whatever it is, but I can't recall off hand what it is. 3) Professor Baumrin - "I didn't know anything about the current state of the CUNY BA, so there are two things I want to say: first, a comment about that: Five years ago the University Committee on the CUNY BA under the chairmanship of President Lynch [Ed. Note: President Goldstein (Kingsborough) chaired the CUNY BA Task Force; President Lynch chaired a sub-committee of the Task Force on which Professor Baumrin served.] I was a member of that committee and that final report was forwarded to the Chancellor's Office for action and apparently it's not been acted on but the major issue there is the authority for the CUNY BA under the Charter of the University Faculty Senate belongs to the University Faculty Senate and not to the Graduate School - that's clear. And if it's not clear, it can be made clear by simply reading it. We are responsible for University-wide programs and not according the Senate the authority in these matters has been a political decision, and there's no reason for the Senate to agree to it. My question, however, has nothing to do with it. On the question of aid to graduate students, there had been early in the year the hope that it would be rather substantial. And then somewhat later the rumor, at least it came to me, that it wasn't going to be so substantial. Are you anticipating that it's going to be in the non-substantial range still, or is it possible that there's going to be some increased aid?"/ I think, I mean there's no point in trying to guess. We're

will try very hard to get many more and larger fellowships, and they've asked us now, the various staff people up there have asked us, what we have in mind. Under the whole initiative right now, there are two items: there is the graduate student fellowship item you just referred to and there is the scientific equipment item, the other piece. Those are really the only two things on the table. So we think our requests are modest - at least in terms of the University. As to how much money we'll actually get for each I don't know, but we'll know, so why guess. We will continue to try hard. I know the President of the Graduate School is up there and I know that a number of presidents from the various colleges have been up there pressing the case and have all included the Graduate School portion of our request in their lobbying efforts and we'll know something within the next few weeks. 4) Professor Wasser - "I wonder, Chancellor, if you would acquaint the Senate briefly with the speech you made at the Western Association of Graduate Schools which I found a very interesting and unique argument as it worked out and I doubt if the Senate is aware of this. I don't know how widely it was reported, but I wonder if you in two or three sentences if you could tell us your main point there."/ Well, it might be more useful if I simply made it available, if anybody wanted to read it. [Ed. Note: The Chancellor's speech urging educators to enhance access to graduate education and to develop a new political theory to guide the nation during transition is available through the Senate Office to members of the Senate; it is available through the Chancellor's Office to other recipients of the Senate minutes.] 5) Professor Stern (Physics, New York City Tech) - "I just wanted to answer Professor Cooper's question. At New York City Tech the presidential evaluation is available to faculty members."/ So that is fairly consistent with our Board Bylaws. I've only seen two of these so far - New York City Tech and City. I haven't seen Staten Island. I don't think it's been written. 6) Professor Grossman (Education, City) - "First I want to correct the impression that I wrongly gave last time when I asked for lines. I did not mean to say City College - I meant City University. I really mean that. And I wanted to just add, perhaps this is rhetorical, my concern about the priority for full time budget lines. I am concerned, I was speaking from my own experience at City College School of Education where we have many retirements, early retirements plus regular ones, and we did not get enough lines to replace. I am not speaking about my particular department - just general distribution. I am a little worried that we are an aging faculty - I include myself, having passed the half-century mark a few years ago - and I am afraid that if this pattern continues where retirements are not replaced or are replaced at a fraction of those who retire, we are going to dwindle and we are not going to be replacing faculty with new people coming in, with a continuum of changing ideas, hopefully, but with new young people. Many of us were young once too and came in with fresh ideas. I don't like to see the University dying in that sense. I'm sure many of us are alert and hard working and stay alive and so forth but we need more people and more ideas. A university is the faculty. We need more young people coming in as faculty members and I'm making a plea, I hope I'm stating it properly this time - more full time lines for City University generally in our budget. Thank you."/ There are numbers around as to how these lines were redistributed and where they went and we can provide you with that. If you have the impression that none of these lines came back to the institution, that's not correct. They did, for the most part. Now, how they got used once they got back there I can't say. I mean the data's there but essentially that's a decision that got made at some college. 7) Professor Zarin (English, Lehman) - "Chancellor, I'd like to return to a subject I raised last time when I asked about the sort of reading of the entrails in terms of the downgrading of the position in assessment and basic skills at the Central Office and you suggested that we wait and see about that. But I think it's not a question of waiting and seeing about the future. As far as I understand it now, the budget for that area has been cut back severely in the Office of Academic Affairs and the staffing at the Instructional Resource Center has been cut back. The released time for faculty members doing research in that area has been cut back. Now, all of these things have

happened already and I think it's out of this context that we're asking again for more than assertions that the University is still interested in this area. We are concerned; we are supposed to be an open access university. In order to make that work, in order to make it possible for Baruch's first two year students to make it through to their last two years, and I assure you that's a pattern of the entire University, we must have support for these areas. Yet it can be documented that the support has been cut back. And so I ask you to come to us not on the spot but with some real information about the plans for the future. We cannot wait for a person who will be new to the University to figure out how to argue for this, or indeed what our needs are. Surely that person no matter how hard she hits the ground and how fast she runs is not going to know enough in the next academic year. So that in order for you to make the right budgetary requests and so on, I think we need some answers a little bit more quickly than waiting for the new Vice Chancellor to be the proponent for this as quickly as we need some help. So could you report to us on this at some fairly nearby meeting, next month let's say. Thank you.

8) Professor Bohigian (Mathematics, John Jay) - "I'd like to begin the question with a comment that I saw and I assume was accurate in the report of the University Faculty Senate that Professor Lea puts out that the City University was looking into moving its central offices to Brooklyn because of an expansion possibility in the future, and so they were checking out space allocations there. I hope the people doing the analyses are not the same people who gave you data about 147 years to equalize the pay rates because doing it on a linear basis, unless I made a mistake, I'm getting about 91 years, doing it on a compounded basis I'm getting about 63 years."/Thanks. It will come as a great comfort to the women in the audience...

Chair Wedeen thanked Chancellor Murphy.

There being no further business there was a motion to adjourn and the session adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Jean Ellis
Executive Director