

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

April 28, 1987

Chair Wedeen called the session to order at 7:15 p.m. in Room 1700 at the Graduate School and University Center. Senators Ballabon, Bank, Baxter, Binder, Bleyman, Bohigian, Boylan, Brower, Buianouckas, Canate, B. Cohen, Cooper, Cravzow, Davidson, Depas, Donleavy, Galub, Gerber, T. Ginsberg, Gram, Greenbaum, Gura, Hayon, Henderson, Hernandez-Miyares, Huang, Jaffe, Jiji, Karan, Kirkland, Lea, Matthews, McCall, Muehlig, Otte, Picken, Riley, Rose, Rosen, Schlesinger, Segal, Seguine, Sheridan, Sohmer, Stern, Taylor, Thaxton, Timoni, Trefousse, Waldinger, Wasser, Weiss, Zades, Zaneteas, and Zarin; Alternate Senators Baker, Blanks, De Moose, B. Ginsberg, Glass, Levitan, Rowan, and Sessions; and Senator-Elect Carro-Kowalczyk were present. Senators Baumrin, Danziger, Gluck, Litke, Muller, Plissner, Simor, Walter, and Yousef were excused. Heads or representatives of local faculty governance bodies Boylan (Queens), Ginsberg (Borough Manhattan), Gura (Brooklyn), Sohmer (City), and Thaxton (Medgar Evers); Chancellor Joseph S. Murphy, and UFS Executive Director Ellis also attended.

- I. Approval of the Proposed Tentative Agenda: The proposed tentative agenda was moved, seconded and adopted as distributed.
- II. Approval of the Minutes of the One Hundred Fifty-Fourth Plenary Session (March 24, 1987): The minutes were moved and seconded as distributed. Professor Cooper (History, Staten Island) reserved the right to review her statement as attributed in the minutes and to offer corrections at a future date. It was agreed that Professor Cooper might offer the correction to the Executive Director and with Dr. Ellis' agreement make the change. If there were not agreement the matter would be referred to the Plenary at the 156th Session (May 19, 1987). The question was called and the minutes were adopted as distributed subject to Professor Cooper's reservation.
- III. Communications from the Chair: Chair Wedeen noted that her communications were available in writing on the table at the rear of the room.
- IV. Reports of Faculty Members of Board of Trustees' Committees: The reports were distributed in writing on the table at the rear of the room.
- V. Proposed Statement of the University Faculty Senate on Racism: Chair Wedeen stated that the Executive Committee wished to offer this statement for the Senate's consideration. The Committee has been discussing the statement for some time and felt that the current attention focused on college campuses made it especially appropriate for the faculty to adopt. She noted that the text of the statement had been circulated to the membership by mail with other materials for the session and called for a motion to approve the statement. The motion was made and seconded and the chair then called for discussion.

Professor Cooper (History, Staten Island) said that her colleague, Professor Yousef (Mechanical Engineering, Staten Island) who was not present tonight due to the need to substitute for another member of his department, had asked her to offer an amendment to the statement on his behalf. She then proposed the amendment, viz. the addition of a fifth "bullet", "to make a greater commitment to affirmative action results and processes." The amendment was moved and seconded. Discussion on the amendment included a proposal that "results" was an inappropriate term and that it be revised and "goals" be substituted. Professor Cooper accepted the pro-

posed revision and the question was called on the amendment. The amendment was adopted by a voice vote. Discussion returned to the main motion with general approval voiced. The question was called and the statement was adopted by an overwhelming majority with two negative votes and two abstentions. The four dissenting ballots were, as the Senators who cast them noted, due to language not content. Professor Binder (History, Staten Island) asked that the statement be circulated to the University Board and administration as well as to every member of the University's faculty and to the media. He further requested that a cover letter be prepared and forwarded to the presidents of the CUNY colleges requesting that they report to the Senate the actions taken by them to implement the statement. Professor Donleavy (Special Services to Education, Lehman) suggested that the Senate sponsor the first annual conference described in the statement. The question of timing and cost of distribution of the statement to the entire faculty was discussed with the possibility of including it in the forthcoming proximate mailing of the UFS Newsletter, scheduled for the week of May 4, suggested and with the Chair's statement that she would seek financial support from the Chancellor to make the mailing possible within the limits of the Senate's budget. She also stated that the Executive Committee would consider Professor Donleavy's suggestion at its next meeting.

VI. Proposed Resolution of the University Faculty Senate on the CUNY Baccalaureate Program: Chair Wedeen noted that the proposed resolution had been mailed to the membership with the other materials for the session. She asked Executive Committee member-at-large Greenbaum (History, Queensborough), also member of the University Committee on the CUNY Baccalaureate Program, to present the resolution. Adoption of the resolution was moved and seconded and Professor Greenbaum introduced it by summarizing the events that led to its proposal as well as the derivation of the issue of the program's governance and the history of the Senate's negotiations with the Chancellor and the Graduate School administration on the matter. Discussion on the motion included numerous questions about the program and its operation and on the mechanisms by which the Senate might act as the governing body of the program. Chair Wedeen and Professor Greenbaum responded to the questions and the chair explained the analogy between the role of a college faculty as defined by the Bylaws to the role proposed for the Senate to assume as the governance body of the Program. Professor Greenbaum explained to the body that repeated requests by him and others at Plenary Sessions to the Chancellor on the issue had elicited the Chancellor's promise to look into the matter but he had not communicated with the Senate on the results of those inquiries. Further, a current difficulty with the Local 802, Musicians' Union program, that came about as a result of the University Committee's decision last year to require degree candidates in that program to meet the same core requirements as other degree candidates in the program had been negated by the President of the Graduate School who had appointed a committee of his own to review the action of the University Committee.

Because questions from the body indicated a possible lack of background information on the part of many members Professor Davidson moved to table the motion. His motion was ruled out of order on advice to the chair that he had discussed the question prior to stating his motion. Professor Lea then moved to table. When put to a vote, the motion to table was defeated.

The question was then called on the main motion. The motion was put to a vote and adopted by an overwhelming majority.

VII. Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Priorities: Chair Wedeen introduced Professor Baxter (Academic Skills, Hunter), chair of the Committee, to present the report. Professor Baxter noted that the report had been distributed in the mailing of materials prior to the session and that the committee's final report did not differ substantially

from the Interim Report presented by the Committee. Professor Baxter said she would be happy to entertain a motion on the report. The adoption of the report was moved and seconded. Professor Baxter asked for discussion on the motion. There was no discussion and a motion to call the question was made, seconded, and adopted unanimously. The main motion was then adopted unanimously.

Chair Wedeen said that the Senate had completed its business scheduled prior to the Chancellor's Report more rapidly than anticipated. As a result, since the Chancellor had been asked to arrive at a later hour than usual to permit the Senate to dispatch its other business, there were now two options for the Senate. The Chancellor planned to arrive at 8:30. If members looked at their watches, they could see that time remained when the Senate could either pick up pieces of business that it thought of import - several people had said along the way they wished the Senate had time to discuss, or another option was to say the body was sorry and adjourn. She did not think the latter appropriate. Another option was to take a break. The Chair would now entertain suggestions, she continued. Were there any areas that the body felt should come up and was there an opportunity to discuss these at this time. She did not mean make work. If there were something that the members feel seriously that they would like for the Senate to take up at this time or should it take a break. Were there any suggestions, she asked. Professor Canate (Mathematics, Hostos) suggested that it might consider the issue of English only. It seemed to him that it was getting very close to the State of New York. For people that have difficulties with the language, he continued, it seemed to him that the Senate should be considering the issue very seriously. Chair Wedeen said that it was something that some states have taken a vote on, that English is the official language of a particular state and she said that the issue had come up at different borough hearings. There were people at the hearings who had come to argue against New York taking the same stand. She thought California and some of the other states have taken that English is the official language of that particular state and therefore mandated as the only language in the public school system of that particular state. She asked whether there was any other issue that anyone wished to discuss other than as a statement. The chair then took a vote on how many wished to discuss the issue raised by Professor Canate but Professor Canate said that he had just wanted to apprise the Senate of it. It was suggested then that the moment for legislation on the issue to be proposed in New York was very close and that postponing it to September might be too late since there was consideration in the State Assembly already of a proposition of some kind. Chair Wedeen asked whether there was a motion of some sort and if so what it was or what suggestion was there. Before a motion was offered, it was further suggested that the issue was serious but that there ought to be some kind of study by talking with people in the area to get some kind of language that was appropriate rather than to discuss a motion of sentiment now. The setting up of a special committee to consider the issue and bring an appropriate resolution was suggested therefore. The Chair then asked whether there were any other comments on this subject and asked for other new business since there were no further comments on the issue of English only. Professor Binder (History, Staten Island) addressed himself to the Annual Report of the Senate's Library Committee, distributed with the materials for the meeting and said that he had noticed that for the second consecutive year the report reflected the frustration of the chairman in its inability to carry out its charge. He therefore urged the Executive Committee to look into this continuing problem and if necessary that the Chair of the Senate meet with the Council of Head Librarians to discuss the matter. The Chair asked whether anyone from the Library Committee wished to speak to this and Professor Sessions (Library, Staten Island) indicated her desire to so. Professor Sessions said that she was aware of the continuing difficulties of the Senate committee but that she thought the problems in the two years were different. With respect to this year, she said, that one problem was the Committee's choice of whom to poll on the questions it wished answered since its questionnaire was

directed to heads of faculty college library committees and many colleges did not have functioning committees. Further, the question put - whether people favored an elected or appointed chief librarian was more simplistic sounding than in fact. Professor Sessions pointed out other difficulties in the structure of the questionnaire circulated and recommended that the way for the Senate Committee to accomplish something would be to work with Professor Myrick, the University Associate Dean for Libraries, at 80th Street. The Chairman of the Committee, Professor Lea (English, Lehman) suggested that it might have been helpful if Professor Sessions had communicated her suggestions to the Committee prior to this evening. He said too that there seemed to be a paranoia abroad among faculty and librarians, but particularly librarians, who seemed to think the committee had a hidden agenda. The Committee was trying to help the libraries in any way it could. In return, it found an absolute lack of cooperation on the part of a significant number of librarians. Professor Zarin (English, Lehman) supported Professor Lea's remarks and added that she did not wish to continue her efforts and those of her colleagues on the committee if the librarians were going to continue to criticize their efforts instead of making suggestions and providing information that might assist the committee's work.

Professor Thaxton (Health Sciences, Medgar Evers) moved to adjourn and his motion was seconded. The chair said that before the vote was taken she would like to interject that it was the Senate's fault that the Chancellor had not yet arrived and that she wished to impress this on the body before the vote. The Senate always has an agenda item for New Business and never had time for it. The present proceedings might be what the Senate wanted as New Business or not but it was what it was stuck with tonight. She then called for a vote on the motion. The motion was defeated and the chair suggested that Professor Thaxton would have to remain for a while.

Chair Wedeen suggested that when Senators were asked their committee preferences for 1987-88 some might wish to join the Library Committee because if they did not like what had happened before so that they might help straighten out the difficulties. Professor Cooper (History, Staten Island) said that she wished to remind the Senate that the Executive Committee in a previous year had abolished the Library Committee based on various repeated reports that the people could not accomplish their purpose. It was the will of the body then that forced the Executive Committee to reinstate the Committee. She suggested that lacking historical memory the Senate acts schizophrenically.

Professor Donleavy (Special Services to Education, Lehman), having been recognized by the Chair, said that she thought it would be important to study the CUNY library system because some librarians had indicated to her that they had a very difficult job. She suggested that the Senate might invite a Chief Librarian to speak to it. She then raised a question about the issue of the Brooklyn College Faculty Council's action with respect to an honorary degree for Bishop Mugavero. She said that many faculty - especially those who were Roman Catholic like herself - were very troubled by the reports they had from the media. Chair Wedeen then spoke to the issue since the chair of the Brooklyn Faculty Council, Professor Gura, had left and she was a member of the Council's Steering Committee and knew there were other Brooklyn Senators still present who were members of the Faculty Council. She then reviewed what had taken place at the Council's meeting last month and noted that there were four candidates whom the Council was asked to consider. Senator Trefousse (History, Brooklyn) was present this evening was chair of the committee at Brooklyn that brought four names for honorary degrees to the Council. When the four names were mentioned, there was a question from the floor as to an article in The New York Times several months before concerning the Bishop's stand on homosexuality. The person who asked that question then recounted his memory of the contents. At the Council meeting the Bishop's vita was not at hand and although

there was discussion it was rather sketchy with various members volunteering bits of information about the Bishop and his activities. There were few facts volunteered but one speaker suggested that it seemed that in awarding the degree the College which stood and had always stood for open access for all peoples would be honoring some one who did not. There was a request for additional information on the Bishop and a motion was made to delete the Bishop's name from the list at this meeting. The motion was seconded and there were statements that indicated a lack of sufficient knowledge of either the many social work activities and good things the Bishop had done for the Borough of Brooklyn or his stand on homosexuality to vote on his candidacy without additional information. By secret ballot the Bishop's name was deleted by seven votes. The Steering Committee met immediately following the Faculty Council and the three candidates who were approved by the Council were forwarded and it was decided to obtain the needed information about Bishop Mugavero to permit Council members to vote on his candidacy in an informed manner and then to place his name before the Council again at its May 5 meeting. That, Chair Wedeen, said was what happened.

Members of the Senate then raised various questions about the procedures followed in relation to the awarding of honorary degrees. One Senator said that he thought the fault lay with the CUNY Presidents who forwarded the names of candidates for degrees prior to faculty approval. Chair Wedeen explained that since Brooklyn College required the presence of persons receiving honorary degrees its governance plan provided for the President's determining whether or not proposed candidates would be present. Some Senators wished to debate the issue of the right or wrong of the Brooklyn Council's action but such a debate was ruled out of order. The issue of academic freedom and freedom of religion was voiced too. In addition, the fact that Brooklyn was not alone in requiring the presence of degree candidates at commencement was noted as was the fact that final approval of candidates was the province of the Board of Trustees. Finally, the comments in the press attributed to the Mayor, the Chairman of the Board, and the Bishop with respect to the Brooklyn faculty produced strong objections from the Senate.

Chair Wedeen then asked for other issues Senators might wish to address at this time and since no one wished to raise such an issue suggested that having now completed agenda item VIII New Business and fifteen minutes remained until the Chancellor's scheduled arrival a brief recess be declared.

IX. Chancellor's Report: Chair Wedeen called the Senate back into session and introduced Chancellor Murphy. The Chancellor said that had he known the Senate didn't have anything else to do, he would have come earlier. He said that it seemed to him that it might be appropriate to turn things around a little bit, and that he had a few questions he would like to ask. He added that the Senate thought he was just going to ask them and then wait for anybody at random to respond. He had a better idea. Well, he continued, there's been a lot of talk in the last few years in higher education generally and we've taken sort of a position though it hasn't been an established policy position about the business of mandatory retirement. He was curious he said to know how people felt about it. He has listened to all kinds of arguments about mandatory retirement. The rule up until recently was very simple - anyone with tenure who reached the age of 70 had to retire. Now, he said, it's highly discriminatory on the face of it, because it does not speak to a number of issues. It does not speak to the actual physical and intellectual and academic condition of the individual - only to an arbitrary thing like age. Secondly, it selects out only one population, namely tenured college professors and no others, which is on the face of it discriminatory. There are those, he stated, who argue it's necessary because it is the only way the system will be able to bring new people into it, given the fact that our faculty's not likely to grow dramatically in the next decade. On the other hand, there's some question

there, because we may actually be looking at a faculty shortage if, indeed, sufficiently large numbers of faculty do retire in the early '90's as some predictions have it. And then, he said, the law just recently was changed which now says that the individual and the University can make up its own rules. Now, most universities are going to have mandatory retirement. There is no Board policy in place as of this moment calling for people to retire at the age of 70. So, it's not just simply a moot issue or just for general discussion, but sooner or later something's going to have to get done. There is a strong body of opinion on both sides though everybody wishes somehow the problem would go away. Or maybe everybody who's not 70 wishes the prospect wouldn't arrive. I don't know. On the other hand, the alternative to it's a good thing -- we'll get rid of a lot of dead wood, though I don't know why first of all human beings should be referred to as dead wood, or why anybody believes there's more dead wood in our business than there is in the Congress or in surgery...or certainly the Presidency. But there it may be in the minds of some a virtue. So it's unclear and a lot of people can see a lot of different kinds of arguments and I kind of would like to ask you what your thoughts are about it.

Professor Bohigian (Mathematics, John Jay) asked - "Did you say there was currently no policy about mandatory retirement?"/ There's no Board policy on the subject of mandatory retirement. Right now we are processing papers of people reaching the age of 70 who have tenure because that's what we've been doing. I suspect if it's challenged in the courts right now the thing would crumble if anyone were to challenge it. I'm not sure about that. Someone might say it's not legal until the Board acts on a policy but there's no policy proposal before the Board and there's no one now who's rushing to put one there. The only thing now that mandates retirement at 70 as far as I can see is the pension system. And the lawyers are quarreling about whether that's in fact the case. So it's quite ambiguous right now. Professor Bohigian further asked - "If a person attained the age of 70, are you saying that because there's no Board policy, presumably they could continue teaching; however, they would be forced to receive retirement pay?"/ Well, that's unclear. What happens now is that a piece of paper gets filled out by someone at the college when you're reaching the age of 70 who forwards it to the retirement board and the retirement board says congratulations, as of next December 1 or whatever you're retired and now we're going to tell you what we're going to do for you and the union has organized every year a very interesting seminar to tell you how to spend retirement. Listen, let me tell you, I've been to some of these seminars, and they are terrific. So right now if someone were to say, how dare you process that paper, I don't know what's going to happen. But I'm not raising the practical question of what exactly the mechanisms are, I'm raising the theoretical question -- what does the University Faculty Senate believe with regard to the issue of early retirement or what are individual opinions?

Professor Donleavy (Special Services to Education, Lehman) - "Wasn't there something recently about..."/ See, this is what you get...you ask a question. Professor Donleavy resumed - "the State Law, you can work beyond 70. I know, I come just under it, so I have to retire at 70 under the law as it stands, but what about that law?"/ The law does not stand. Federal law now no longer requires mandatory retirement for tenured professors. Professor Donleavy further asked - "Is there a phase-in-period ?"/ There is a phase-in period - '92 I believe. I think there are some very serious questions to be raised here, but the kinds of technical questions that sooner or later will get raised, the legalistic kinds of questions, are not the interesting ones. What are more interesting, it seems to me, are the theoretical questions, and the questions of fairness, questions of morality, questions of greater magnitude that it seems to me ought to precede the practical. After all we are asking now a question about whether it's right or wrong, should or shouldn't be the case, whether we ought or

ought not to do this, which is the moral question, and not legalistic or narrow interpretations of the law. Because I don't know them and I can't answer them. It comes up only because there is a muddle. Professor Donleavy further said - "I'd suggest that we begin to do a bit of research about professors, about their life experience, because when you think of them as a body of people, they keep their brains active. I mean how many of them do suffer from Alzheimer's or early senility and we should collect demographic data too."/ That's not a bad idea. That's an interesting response. Professor Ginsberg (Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, Kingsborough) - "A few years back I did my doctoral dissertation in retirement. And there is information about professors, and there's a lot of information available. Basically, we seem to have a concept that it's an either/or thing. And it needn't be that. A person can retire to or can retire from things. And these things have to be considered. So, if somebody is 70 and ill, they may select to retire. And, you know, just get on with their life. Or they may want to stay on a three-quarters basis or three-fifths basis. Why can't that be an available option? An interesting point that came up recently though was that often younger professors are very willing to dump the older professors so that they can get on with their careers. TIAA is hurting badly because by the year 2000, I think, you all know a fifth of our population in America today will be people over 65. So we have to consider. There's a lot of things involved, finances is a very critical issue here, and I can't answer your whole question, but perhaps I think what we have to do is start thinking about it and all the ramifications. And it is true that there are lots of studies that say that the brain like any other instrument has to be used to maintain itself. It's muscle." Professor Greenbaum (History, Queensborough) - "I think one of the problems of giving an age to retirement is that we assume all people are entirely similar. If my father, who was a baker, continued to work until he was the age of 70, he wouldn't be 84 now. He never would have made it. But the kind of work we do gives us a kind of maturity, and I think it enhances our performance in the classroom -- if we don't stultify -- and most of us don't. And, I think in the nature of our work the age 70 has no meaning whatsoever. I don't know what age would have any meaning -- but I think the age of 70 has no meaning whatsoever."/ Actually, I've seen data on bakers, and they live a long time. They live a long time; they exercise more than we do; they probably have a better diet than we do; and, I think, they enjoy life more than we do. Professor Greenbaum further said - "My father retired at 66. The year after he retired he looked 10 years younger than his last year at work. That's hard work. Professor Gram (Economics, Queens) - "It would seem to me that the problem would have to be faced differently in different fields. In my own field, for example, all the cockeyed ideas come from young economists. In mathematics, it's my understanding, that the best work always comes from younger people. In music perhaps it's quite different. So, I would hate to see a general policy that applied to every professor."/ Isn't that an interesting response. Do it by discipline. Professor McCall (Compensatory Programs, Baruch) - "I also think that one of the differences that needs to be considered are gender differences, because I do not believe that in the U.S, still, for many women, life does not begin until 40, and because life does not begin until 40, these women do not attain the same status and pay as men. They also live longer than men, so that a later retirement may be more appropriate for women to the University,"/ Sex and discipline. I'm going to need a computer program for this. Professor Cooper (History, Staten Island) - "So far you have sex and discipline."/ And now it's going to be ideology. Professor Cooper further said - "Money - you're wrong. About ten years ago in France the socialists or somebody before them concocted the notion of making jobs for younger steel workers by taking the older ones and offering them early retirement - one-way fares to Algeria, or part-time jobs, and part pension. I have heard faculty say, 'I'd love to retire and teach one course at 65 - 66.' And, I think if there was some way in which we could do something about adjunct work and make that more available, even not in the same college, but around the University, you might get a lot of people a few years older than myself really not wanting to wait until 70, but get out earlier. But they would like to have a partial

hand in the classroom. I don't know how much effect that would have on the money you get from Social Security or what - I really don't know the numbers. In the French case, it was a total disaster. All the steel is now imported from Brazil - so that's not a good model." Professor Binder (History, Staten Island) - "It seems that we've discussed certain alternatives. Either you teach or you retire, or you retire and teach part-time. But it seems to me that there are many other alternatives, and let's talk about opportunities to utilize people in their senior years in the colleges. They have skills other than those of appearing before the classroom that should be utilized. Senior faculty should be utilized, for example, in curriculum development. Certain kinds of teaching with administrative responsibilities - planning responsibilities. I think we have to look at how we could best utilize the experience and the skills of our senior faculty in ways that go beyond, really, in the classroom or in retirement."/ A good idea. Professor Bohigian (Mathematics, John Jay) - "Just a little equal time on the fact about mathematicians. The greatest mathematician who ever lived - Karl Friedrich Gauss, was productive into his 80th year and beyond. So you've got to be careful with generalizations. They simply don't hold. But I think the key issue is funding and you should look at the situation when a person is eligible to retire -- what their retirement funds are going to be, what their social security is going to be - what their tax obligations would be - how much money they would need to maintain their standard of living as they have determined. It obviously will not be a full salary so if you can obtain, as was mentioned previously, some figure - two-fifths the salary, three-fifths the salary, that would equal what they were getting prior to retirement - that might be an excellent way to phase it in - if they were offered that amount, would they be willing to retire. I think before you do anything else, that's the key issue to look at - the amount of bucks that would be available to the person beyond age 70. And then you could have a natural phase-in for people beyond that particular age." Professor Donoghue further said - "I think you need to think of it systematically because how does it affect the younger faculty when they're leaving at the top? And you have to look at it organizationally. You have to really look too at how long tenure is going to last. And there are different ways that people are going to profess in the future. I think that might be helpful. Because to retire at 70 - that's really our right if it's a Federal law that we all don't have to if we don't want to. We should all be subject to the same law that applies in the rest of the country." [Side comment from the audience] "We should all wait until we're 70 years of age to make that decision."/ As a matter of fact, on the practical issue of money, there's a large number of people approaching retirement now who are working for nothing or next to nothing or very close to nothing if they were in the New York City or State retirement systems. Those of us who are in TIAA are not doing quite as well, but those patterns will change over the years. I want to thank you very much for this selection of views. Some of them I certainly had not thought of before as considerations and I will give some more thought to those.

Chancellor Murphy said there was another issue that he'd like to have some opinions about. He said that he'd been getting a little defensive about the fact that he'd sort of without making a big deal about it put a few dollars more into the Graduate School in the last few years than he had in the past. He had just reread the 1979 Regents' recommendations, he continued, and it said, "there shall be community colleges, there shall be senior colleges," and all the stuff that went into the 1979 legislation that re-created, re-formed, re-shaped the University and there was a sentence in there, "and there shall be a small graduate school." The Chancellor further said that the CUNY Graduate School is still quite small - that he was talking about fewer than 3,000 candidates for the Ph. D., although technically if one counted all the M.A. candidates and graduate degree candidates among all the colleges around the system he was talking in excess of 20,000-22,000 people in graduate school. But, he said, the Ph.D. programs are still fairly small and he had no intention at any point of increasing that number, except that it had occurred to him at some

point that there were a lot of opportunities when he looked at the assessments made of the quality of CUNY's Ph.D. programs across the board. Out of the 20-some programs that were assessed, not all of them were - the art history program wasn't looked at and it certainly would come in the first dozen or so, partly because it was new and partly because it was hard to compare it to anything because its emphasis is Modern and American Art. CUNY would still, he said, probably come in second to NYU but he guessed in the top ten or 12 or 15 in the country. It wasn't looked at. There were a number of other programs, he continued, like that: Computer Science was too new, although he thought CUNY would do pretty well when that program got assessed. He did not know when that would be, the Chancellor added. There were a few others like that, he said, that were just not looked at. Of the ones looked at CUNY did well but some areas were disappointing. Chancellor Murphy opined that he was terribly disappointed in Economics. It seemed to him inconceivable that the University with its tradition in the Social Sciences should not have done better in Economics. Political Science did well; History did well; and, of course, four of our departments, five of our departments, ranked in the top ten nationally in quality of faculty. He actually looked at quality of faculty, he said and explained that there were three lines in the assessment: improvement, quality of faculty, and the way in which the place was perceived - image - or something like that. It was interesting that when one looked at image, that the image and quality of faculty did not correlate. If one looked at quality of faculty alone there were more public institutions in the top ten than there were privates, or about the same number. If one looked at it from the point of view of perception image of quality, there were many more private institutions. So, the survey actually revealed what everyone knows that private institutions actually looked better in people's eyes somehow than public institutions. It's a sort of identification with the aggressor, he said, since one has to assume that most of those who were asked to assess the value of these Ph.D. programs were actually products of public institutions which produce more Ph.D's than private institutions. So, he said to the Senate, "you're still looking over the fence, folks. Things are better for the publics in terms of their quality, and yet they admire privates."

The Chancellor resumed his explanation of the additional funding of the Graduate School and said that the thought was a very simple thought: it was, look, for the sake of a relatively small investment with a few centralized lines, one might be able to make a few appointments that would bring a few of the departments that lag behind a little bit further up. Although he certainly did not have the power to make any such decisions, he gave it to the appropriate persons to make. The alternative was for the Graduate School to take some of the programs that were very good but not quite reaching national prominence, make a few good appointments there and have national prominence. Frankly, he said, it carried the University a long way. Again to the Senate he spoke, saying, "Look, everybody in this room knows that 90% of these judgments are just sheer nonsense, and I don't even for a moment pretend that they have much more substance than that. But it's terribly important nonsense - and it is nonsense widely believed by people. And, when you're out in the larger world and don't know the difference between, say, a professor who has made a great reputation producing - I don't know - lots of textbooks as opposed to someone who has written five articles, every one of which has been a major breakthrough. And there are some instances of that, even in the profession, where there's a tendency to weigh the stuff more carefully. One of the Social Science Research councils that looked at the Social Science Ph.D.s's actually counted pages. City College's Economics Department really looked bad, because it was only six pages that year, but I don't know where the pages were published. For all I know they were in Deuteronomy..." [Laughter] So, leave alone whether there's any substance. I know there's someone going to stand up and say it's all garbage. But -- sometimes garbage makes the news, as you may have noticed." The Chancellor said that it was his sense that his having added funding at the Graduate School was a good thing for the University to have done.

He emphasized that this investment had been very modest, much more modest than he might have wanted to have made. There had been grumblings about it, however. So the Chancellor said he'd like to hear a little bit from people who thought it wasn't such a terrific idea or indeed from people who thought it was. [There was no response.] The Chancellor asked whether that meant that no one gave a damn. Chair Wedeen suggested that the Chancellor might supply a few more facts before people could respond. The Chancellor said that he thought he had managed to get some twenty additional lines into the Graduate School, i.e. teaching lines, and some additional support lines which weren't much. Professor Bohigian said - "There is absolutely no question at all that you cannot have a university of higher education without a competent and expanded graduate program. I mean we would not be a university of any note without a graduate program. And whatever funds are available that will not take away from undergraduate programs, etc., if you can get them into the graduate area, that's fine. That's terrific. That's one of those things that's probably better than mother and apple pie. You've just got to have a graduate program of substance. Otherwise, we're in trouble."/ That's correct.

Professor Wasser (English, Staten Island) - "If I may be permitted, I'd like to go back to your previous question, then I'll go on the next, since I didn't have my shot at the retirement. I think what's very important is how retired professors are treated, and in our University, they're treated very badly. They're not given an office, they're not given secretarial help, they're not given anything. It's only the rare bird that's given an office, it's usually the past president of a particular college. Simply add that to the list. On this question, I would like to look at results. I would say that the people brought in that I'm aware of in the social sciences here, as Executive Officers, have really brought stimulation to the program. I am particularly familiar with the ones in Sociology, Political Science, Theatre Arts, and I think in that particular case the added line has more than brought the reward that you contemplated when it was awarded to the Graduate School."/Great, good to hear that. I believe that's true, incidentally, and I should say for the record that the union has made very persuasive arguments, a number of them, on behalf of retired professors and we just had a conversation today with some members of the union leadership which asked that we pay special attention to the treatment of retired professors. Now, as far as providing office space is concerned, we have professors who spent their entire career in the University without having adequate office space. You would probably give them a coronary if you gave them an office after they retired. Professor Wasser further said - "What we do is give them a corner of the president's office." Professor Binder said - "While I certainly agree that we want to strengthen our graduate programs here at the City University, I wish to remind us all that when the graduate program or the doctoral programs were established, it was argued quite reasonably, that these would not only serve the Ph. D. students, but, in the end, would enrich undergraduate teaching as well. I think one of the concerns of many of us is that not all the lines be given to the Graduate School exclusively, and there seems to be a tendency in this direction. We hope that we can continue to attract bright, able scholars to our undergraduate colleges, holding up the very likely possibility that they will have the opportunity to teach in our graduate programs of the doctoral faculty as well."/ If there's any real concern there, the last time I looked at the numbers 270 lines came from the campuses to the Graduate School. The Graduate School had about 30 central lines, and I believe 10 or 12 of them were in mathematics, and they were there right from the beginning. So, you're talking about very few people. Now, there are some central lines that were also put in there, but I doubt, now don't hold me to this, but I doubt that the central lines are much more, if as many as, 15% of the total. [An unidentified voice - "But there's concern about a trend though."/ Sure, I understand that.

[Note: There are 80 teaching lines assigned to the Graduate School for central appointments in 1986-87.]

Professor Sohmer (Mathematics, City) then asked - "There is a subject that has confused me now for roughly six months -"/That's all? Professor Sohmer resumed - "No, it's not unique. Could you explain flexibility that comes without money?"/ Actually, it's the best kind of flexibility. Professor Sohmer - "I understand."/ We have the same problem. Flexibility was never anything this University sought out at the State level. If you recall, historically, it was the State University that made a compelling effort with the Legislature to put something in place called greater flexibility. You may even recall some of their public relations at the time included things like getting lowest bid on a kidney transplant - for the kidney. They got the Legislature to pass a number of regulation changes that allowed for greater ease of moving money around from one campus to another, and within a campus, from one purpose to another. We always had flexibility. We never had lined-out budgets. Our campuses in this University never had to go to Albany for every expenditure the way they did at Oneonta or New Paltz or places like that. When we got flexibility as a policy for the whole State we started getting amounts of money - actually it happened before flexibility was actually put in place by the Division of the Budget, they started giving us lump sums, and we divvied up the lump sums and gave them to the colleges, essentially on the basis of a formula or past practice of whatever. We continue to do that. Now what happened this past year was, and I assume this is what you are addressing - is that the lines were lined-out so that each individual campus had lines for faculty, but insufficient dollars to hire against those lines. Now that did happen this year because the collective bargaining was never fully funded by the State. Now, we are presently in this fiscal year which ends June 30 actually spending at a level which presumes the collective bargaining increase being in the budget. If indeed it is not we are going to overrun our budget by some amount. And it will be the State's responsibility since they're the ones who guessed that there was enough money in the budget to cover the collective bargaining increases. Either it'll get rolled over into the next year or they will have to use some other accounting device which funds those lines. Now, if you're asking how much flexibility an individual college has as a result of increased flexibility...Professor Sohmer said - "You keep answering questions I didn't ask. Let me ask the question again. I mean they're very interesting, I didn't know some of this stuff." Actually, I much prefer answering my questions to yours. Professor Sohmer reiterated - "I have no doubt. The Chancellor has some lines which he every now and then drops graciously on a campus, and my understanding is that frequently they arrive on the campus empty of any money at all."/ That's the first I hear of it. First of all, I didn't know I had lines I gave to campuses. Secondly, I didn't know the word line had a meaning if it didn't have cash attached to it. Professor Sohmer again said - "That's why I'm asking this question."/You've got to have a specific example in mind. Professor Sohmer - "Well, one specific example is a replacement line we received for a Chancellor's fellow which arrived back on campus empty of money."/Do you know the City College's budget? Professor Sohmer - "Yes."/ How much is it? Professor Sohmer - "Oh, I've got it written down in my little black book, but I don't have it. It's big bucks, I know."/ 60 million dollars a year. Professor Sohmer - "And we don't have enough money." / What are you witching me over - a graduate assistant. Professor Sohmer - "It's not a graduate assistant."/What? Professor Sohmer - "\$58,000."/ Who are we talking about? Oh, you're talking about the Chancellor's Professor. You didn't get the money? Professor Sohmer - "That's what I said. No."/Well, we'll see to it that you get the money. [Laughter]. By the way, are you sure the college didn't get the money and spend it the way it wanted to spend the money, and maybe didn't it go back to the department you're asking the question... Professor Sohmer said - "Oh, I'm sure it didn't go back to the department. I'm also sure, I'm pretty sure, since I usually get lied to by everybody, that I check things. So the answer is yes. I'm pretty sure we didn't get the money. "/ I'll check it out. Professor Sohmer - "OK. Now, will the same thing happen next year?" Professor Wedeen interjected - "If not, you'll ask the question again."/ If not,

you'll remind me. Professor Lea (English, Lehman) - "Chancellor, I'd like to go back to your first question about mandatory retirement, as Henry [Professor Wasser] did, merely to say that I think we should be all for mandatory retirement, so long as it's voluntary. I should also like to mention the fact that I am a CUNY Ph. D. alumnus, for better or worse, and I believe that our Graduate School should be the best it possibly can be, and it should be as inexpensive as it could possibly be, because there are many fine people, scholars, who would not be able to get a Ph. D. without the existence of this Graduate Center, and I'm one of those people."/ Thank you. Well, I don't want to keep people any longer, why don't I respond at this point. I'm grateful for the responses I've gotten to the two questions I've asked. I'll respond to anything from the floor. Chair Wedeen asked if there were any other questions. There were none. The Chancellor thanked the Senate.

There being no other business a motion to adjourn brought the session to a close.

Respectfully submitted,

Jean Ellis