

SUBJECT TO SENATE APPROVAL

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

October 20, 1987

Chair Wedeen called the session to order at 7:00 p.m. in the Auditorium at the Graduate School and University Center. Present were: Senators Aaronson, Alsop, Bank, Barbanel, Baumrin, Baxter, Beheshti, Binder, Bleyman, Boylan, A. Brady, Brower, Buianouckas, Canate, Carro-Kowalczyk, B. Cohen, Constantinides, Cooper, Cravats, Cravzow, Crump, Dannenberg, Dauben, Davidson, Depas, Donleavy, Donoghue, Eisenberg, Galub, T. Ginsberg, Greenbaum, Grossman, Gura, Hayon, Henderson, Hernandez-Miyares, Karan, Kirkland, La Rubbio, Lea, Loetterle, Magid, Matthews, McCullers, Meyers, Oldham, Otte, Plissner, Riley, Rodriguez, Rodway, Shaffer, Sheridan, Simor, Sohmer, Speidel, Squitieri, Stern, Taylor, Wasser, White, Yousef, Zades, Zaneteas, and Zarin; Alternate Senators Aldridge, Cantwell, Como, Forstall, Geach, Glass, Lundeen, Sessions, Suri, Thompson, and Youkeles. Excused were Senators B. Gerber, R. Gerber, Huang, Jiji, MacLennan, Picken, Rose, Segal, Stroup, Timoni, Trefousse, Vines, Walter, and Weiss. Heads of Campus Faculty Governance Bodies Boylan (Queens), T. Ginsberg (BMCC), Gura (Brooklyn), Sohmer (City) and Zades (Staten Island) attended as did UFS Executive Director Ellis.

- I. Approval of the Proposed Tentative Agenda: The proposed agenda was approved as circulated.
- II. Approval of the Minutes of the 157th Plenary Session (September 22, 1987): The minutes were approved with the following correction: Professor A. Brady was present.
- III. Communications from the Chair: Chair Wedeen stated that most of her communications were written, as usual, but that there was one item that was still not settled at the time she wrote the notes for the Senate, so she would like to mention it now. There has been a problem at New York City Tech, she explained. It has been with the Presidential Search Committee. Their College Council, she continued, is a council as in some of the colleges, which includes staff and students. A letter had been sent out early to the faculty stating that the College Council had decided the people who would elect the members of the Search Committee. However, if you recall, the statement and rules that we have used for presidential searches [the Guidelines established by the Board of Trustees, March 6, 1979] -- the faculty have elected the faculty members on Presidential Search Committees. When this came to our attention, I immediately called President Schwerin and said that the Council had held an election in which not only faculty voted. She informed me that a letter had gone out from her office and people had not objected at that time. And, therefore, she felt that the College Council was the appropriate body. This matter has had long and extensive discussions take place. I have spoken with Vice Chancellor Bloom who is the staff on this, President Schwerin, and now Deputy Chancellor Mucciolo. It is still under discussion as to how the Search Committee at this particular college will proceed so that I do not have the bottom line. I did express for the Senate our firm belief that only faculty can elect the faculty members. When we have further information, I'll let you know about it.

The rest of my communications are written. [Copy attached to these minutes.]

IV. Reports of Faculty Members of Board of Trustees' Committees: Most of these are available in writing, but there were two meetings that took place too late to be put in under the various reports and so I'd like to recognize the two faculty members on those committees to give brief reports now to bring us up to date. Professor Sohmer (Mathematics, City) added to his written report on the Committee on Student Affairs and Special Programs.

Professor Sohmer explained that it required a little bit of history. About a year or two ago someone thought of the good idea of having centralized placement for students - a centralized placement service which was going to be highly computerized and work brilliantly. There was a Task Force of student deans and people like that who came back and reported that it was a bad idea. The Student Affairs Committee, which has one of our people on it, a President who is non-voting and President Brown of Bronx Community, and several trustees and the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs who served the function of staff was Vice Chancellor Corbie who has subsequently gone on to become Acting President of Medgar Evers, convened last spring and talked about the centralized placement service and again thought that that was a terrible idea and asked that a report come back from Vice Chancellor Corbie's office about what they thought might be a small thing. The report returned and it asked for a \$700,000 budget to have a centralized placement service which anybody in placement knew was not going to be a terribly functional thing. It was sent back again and finally a small report came in which asked for a centralized placement service which would serve some small purposes and which would have a budget of some \$150,000 and in all likelihood would be functional - it just wasn't fleshed out by the committee yet - so it was approved in principle. There was then a discussion with the new CUNY Director of Athletics who used to be Dean of Students and then Director of Athletics at Bronx Community College who is now located at the Voorhees Center and will be the supervisor of various kinds of things which involve tournaments in The City University. Rather strong feelings were expressed about any of the CUNY schools being other than Division III - those schools about whom this is said, note about whom we're speaking.

Chair Wedeen said that Professor Cooper (History, Staten Island), member of the Committee on Faculty, Staff, and Administration had just come from a Special Meeting of that Committee and the Chair thought that rather than have her give parts of the report now, she would ask her Professor Cooper to wait until she presented the proposed resolution on the Executive Compensation Plans.

V. Chancellor's Report: Chair Wedeen said that the Senators would not have Chancellor Murphy there this evening because he was out of town - out of the country, she believed.

VI. Proposed Resolution on Executive Compensation Plans: Chair Wedeen asked Professor Cooper to present the item.

Professor Cooper explained that last month she had been unable to attend the Plenary to do this. She understood that some of the aspects connected to the Executive Compensation Plan were discussed at that time. Tonight, the Senate Executive Committee would very much appreciate the support of the body in passing the proposed resolution, the language of which it submitted to the membership, and, in addition, an amendment to that language, submitted by mail from a Senator and adopted by the proposers of the resolution.

The Senate Executive Committee, Professor Cooper said, has dealt with this issue for some months and has become increasingly concerned that a decision

made about a year and a half ago in the University to pay Deans, particularly Deans, on a different compensation plan than they have historically been paid on, was a decision which was not just going to separate them from us financially but was going to create a new kind of managerial administration. A managerial administration which is not particularly traditional in universities. Some of us who have watched this year closely at our campuses have noticed that certain programs have not reappeared that were around last year and have begun to wonder why the disappearance occurred. It becomes clear that the budgeting of the campuses was more or less the same as it was in preceding years, but did not take into account the increases in salaries. The Deans had been making monies in the forties and fifties and were up to the seventies and low eighties. And in a number of cases we suspect that the Executive Compensation Plan may well have something to do with the disappearance of at least some adjuncts. The pie has not grown. It's being divided a little differently. I was at a meeting of the Faculty, Staff and Administration Committee in the last few hours. It was an Executive Session. I am presumably not at liberty to describe what went on there, because the results of that meeting have not yet passed the Board. But if the minutes are kept carefully here I will just state that at the meeting in the last two hours a further recommendation on increases under the Plan was approved to be sent to the full Board. The protests which I made were really laughed at as I was for making them. Somebody who knows what the numbers are and is not bound by executive confidentiality may take a microphone -- but I am not going to do it.

The resolution the Executive Committee is presenting does not deal with the new numbers. It deals with the preceding schedule. It was sent to you and it demonstrates that deans, presidents, vice chancellors, the deputy chancellor and chancellor have moved ahead in terms of percentages, salary percentage increases in the last few years, in the last year and one-half, I should say, in comparison at an astonishing rate. I am not going to read the numbers to you - you have them in a variety of places. And, yes, in addition to what their preceding salaries were ten years ago. The resolution which we are asking you to pass tonight is amended in the following way: we are asking you to accept the addition of a line in the explanation, but not in the whereas and resolved clauses. We are merely asking the Board of Trustees to review the theory and practice of this Executive Compensation Plan with a view to understanding the impact it will have and is already having on collegiality as well as on educational programs. The sentence we are asking to add to the explanation follows line 11, becomes line 12. And the resolution then reads as amended.

I ask that this body pass this resolution. I move its adoption.

Professor Cooper's motion was seconded. In the discussion that followed a number of editorial additions were suggested and accepted. The issue of wording to make clear that the financial aspects of the Plan were not the point of emphasis but rather the effects on collegiality and educational programs derived from the financial aspects of the Plan that were of concern was stressed.

The question was called and the resolution was adopted unanimously.

VII. Proposed Resolution on Academic Decision-Making: Chair Wedeen asked Professor Baumrin (Philosophy, Graduate School and Lehman) to present the resolution on behalf of the Executive Committee. Professor Baumrin said that he would not preface the presentation with any extensive remarks since

everyone present had been given information about it and would have the opportunity in the debate to learn more. Professor Baumrin then read the proposed resolution as well as an amendment offered by a Senator that had been accepted by the Executive Committee. He then said that because the chair, Professor Wedeen, was on the Task Force on Education Programs and Curriculum Impact and had a rather intimate knowledge of the development of its proposal and a good deal of background, though the Executive Committee had had the opportunity a few weeks ago to discuss the issue with the Vice Chairperson of the Board, he thought the debate would go more smoothly if any questions were directed not to him but to the chair who might then call upon the appropriate person to respond.

The resolution was then moved and seconded and the floor opened to discussion. The Chair was asked to review the development of the Task Force Report reported in The New York Times and she did so. She noted that the members of the Task Force had been invited by the Chairman of the Board and that its composition comprised trustees, presidents, two faculty and two students. It met from April to September. Throughout the meetings many things took place. Consultants were brought in, experts were brought in, reports were delivered of all kinds. There was an opportunity to read them and discuss them. There was a great deal of discussion presenting every sort of policy and every form of program about which members had probably read. Through these discussions and culminating them the members came to the point during the summer when the staff was asked to draw up tentative draft documents. Throughout all the discussions options were left open, many presentations were made, 11 options were left open. It wasn't until the September meeting that it was suggested that the decision the Senate had heard the discussion on on the campuses and was discussing tonight came about - that a major was eliminated as a major and also that the content in a discipline was capped at a certain number of credits. Immediately after that occurred, the Chair continued, she had discussions - private conversations and individual conversations - with one and several trustees attempting to voice what she considered was the faculty view on just the issue, not the content of the report. She put aside the content of the report. She was a member of the Task Force and she would state for the Senate her opinion that there are many very worthwhile suggestions made by this Task Force. What she felt she had to object to and did object to was the fact that a Task Force was recommending to a Board of Trustees the elimination of a major and the capping of a certain number of credits. When it became apparent that this was to become the final draft document she called and made arrangements to sit down for further discussion. She had discussed it at the committee meeting without making any headway. She then tried to discuss it with the chairperson of the Committee. She explained what she felt was a faculty position - that it has always been a prerogative of the faculty on each campus to decide what will be considered a major and also the number of credits in a major. She did explain as forcefully as she could that the faculty did object to the fact that it would be put in the hands of the trustees to make decisions of this kind - that the curriculum and the degree-granting could not be put in the hands of any lay group, of any group, and she stated that the Board of Trustees is appointed - 10 from the Governor and 5 by the Mayor - and, as politics may go so may a university, and that this is one area that had to remain safe - that the academics had to control the academy, that the academics had to decide what should be taught, what was considered important or not important, what should be granted the status of being a major, how many credits it should carry, that suggestions might be made, but not suggestions that took on the role of being mandates, that this was beyond the pale. Many

recommendations were made - undergraduate, graduate, liberal arts, non-liberal arts - but in the end, in the final document, there was no option. The major was not in the document to be discussed. It was a recommendation to be put out. After a great deal of discussion it was agreed that a covering letter would go on the document so the document would get the greatest distribution possible, not just to the Presidents to discuss with their faculty, but, as I had requested, that the Presidents discuss it with their appropriate governance bodies, curriculum bodies, departments. But again I still felt that it was a matter of seeing to it that the faculty on the various campuses had the right to decide where they were going. Because even if this is discussed, and this is called consultation. This document will be released on November 1. We will be given until before Christmas, I don't recall what the date is, December 22 or 23, to respond. Anything that every campus responds will go to the Task Force. The Task Force will then read the responses and evaluate and judge the responses, and then the Task Force will make their recommendations directly to the full Board for a vote. This bypasses departmental and school curriculum committees and anything else that we have long worked to insure. If this isn't an abrogation, really, of academic freedom, I don't know what is. After I had had as many discussions with individual trustees as I possibly could, after the articles that you saw in the Times on a Monday and a Tuesday and when I read the articles and after I had done all the talking I could to present a position and found that I wasn't getting any place, I then agreed to speak with Sam Weiss of the Times to present our position on this, that it is imperative that the faculty rights be safeguarded. That it is imperative that the faculty be permitted to carry out what has always been considered and must be considered as the faculty domain. That the faculty must decide on the content of the various disciplines, because today it is one discipline. This is an important issue. But tomorrow we may decide on another discipline, and if you read the literature, because we were given all the literature that is available now, all the reports to read, you will see that the literature suggests that writing is best taught in the content areas. Subsequently, there are ten votes on that Board from the Governor. You may get a political slant where a Governor, together perhaps with a Mayor, decides what is important to be taught in the colleges, because what is happening is that the Board of Trustees will make the ultimate decision, if this Task Force Report is adopted as it stands, and it is setting a precedent for what can be taught in the colleges, because majors can be eliminated and how many credits can be taught. It can be 20 credits, it can be 40. This is a lay board making these decisions. That is an untenable position. I presented this and I don't know how far we've gotten. However, I feel strongly and I've said it to the Trustees, and I'll say it to you - that I think the faculty feel strongly about this. I know I do. I know that after the initial situation arose when that final document was altered, at the meeting in September, and after it appeared in the paper, I came to the Executive Committee with my own statement asking them if they wished it to go in as mine or with Committee approval. We unanimously agreed that we would come forth to you tonight with a resolution and that we would contact the 18 units and see how much support we could get because it is the only possible way from the grass roots to see if we can maintain what we think and have always thought was really our inalienable right as a faculty to control our own destiny here.

The Senate discussed the proposed resolution and various views were expressed in terms of language to be incorporated in the resolution and speaking to the issue of the Board's role in decision-making. Stress was put on the point that no one denied the Board Task Force the right to make suggestions or recommendations on the curriculum - in the same way as Task Forces and groups throughout the nation might offer suggestions and recommendations, but the right of the faculty

in a university to consider all recommendations, reports, etc. and its experience in a discipline and on those bases formulate its own curriculum proposals was also stressed. The need to preserve the primary role of the faculty in designing what would be taught in a given college was agreed on by all discussants. Professor Wedeen informed the Senate that having served on the Board Task Force she did not have a quarrel with the content of the document as recommendations and she still believed that a good document would come out in the zealously of a good document and getting something done and doing well by the City University and she believed that to be the sincere motivation of all members of the committee. She said there wasn't any intent to be subversive, but in the zealously that members felt to cut out what they had to quickly. Professor Wedeen reiterated her attempt to explain to the Task Force the way in which it was exceeding the appropriate limits in trying to mandate changes without permitting the campus faculty to play their appropriate role in considering and determining the curriculum. Chair Wedeen noted also that she had tried to make clear that she and the Senate as representatives of the faculty were trying to separate the process of determining the curriculum from the content of the report so that the final decisions of the Board would not result in the confusing of one of the issues with the other, i.e. the process of arriving at the decisions and the decisions arrived at, to keep procedural and content issues separate.

After considerable discussion the question was called. Put to a vote the resolution was adopted unanimously. [Copy Attached.]

VI. New Business: Chair Wedeen asked for new business. Professor Hayon (Chemistry, Queens) requested permission to read a communication to the Senate from the Queens College UFS delegation. Chair Wedeen agreed. The communication read:

The Queens College delegation to the University Faculty Senate wishes to convey to the Senate our dismay concerning the remarks regarding Queens College attributed to the Chancellor in The New York Times article on October 11, 1987. The statement makes specific departmental comparisons between CUNY colleges and refers to Queens College as a "nice little undergraduate college."

If reported accurately, we find these remarks erroneous, unnecessary, and certainly most inappropriate in substance and tone for an article inspired by the 50th Anniversary of our College.

We are disappointed that our Chancellor, a former President of Queens College, would take this occasion to introduce divisive comparisons based on what appears to be anecdotal impressions.

We can not understand the inconsistency of the Chancellor who tells us here that we are one system and that we must consider the interests of City University as a whole and then turns around and deliberately creates conflict within that system.

We wish the Senate to know that we consider such egregious statements to be contrary to the reputation of City University as a whole as well as to Queens College individually.

Chair Wedeen thanked Professor Hayon.

Professor Simor (Library, Queens) asked to read a statement on behalf of Senators and Alternate Senators from the various Library Departments of CUNY. Chair Wedeen recognized Professor Simor for that purpose. The statement follows:

Members of the University Faculty Senate who are from the various Library Departments of The City University wish to share with their fellow members and faculty colleagues their deep concern over the proposed PSC/CUNY contract. Specifically, we oppose the provision that would reduce by fully one third annual leave for librarians hired after January 1, 1988.

Librarians, alone among the titles for which the contract proposed a drastic reduction in annual leave, are responsible for scholarly research and publication, for which time is necessary. Librarians depend to a great extent on their annual leave to produce the kind of scholarly output which is expected and required of them for the granting of promotion and tenure. The proposed contract would create a situation in which newly-hired library faculty would find it nearly impossible to succeed at City University. A two-tier system would develop in library departments.

This provision is but one of the several in the proposed contract that are divisive in nature. We see in it the beginning of a dangerous trend. If the faculty allows a part of itself to be sacrificed in this manner at the present time, the process will not end. Further erosion of faculty prerogatives is certain to follow. For this reason, we urge you to vote NO to the PSC/CUNY contract as proposed.

Professor Wedeen thanked Professor Simor. She recognized several Senators who objected in turn to the presentation of the statement because it deals with the contract. She then recognized Professor Sessions (Library, Staten Island) who wished to add to the statement. Chair Wedeen informed Professor Sessions of the Senate's long-standing reluctance to enter into discussion of contract issues since it believed those issues were within the scope of the collective bargaining agent's activity, and not that of the Senate. If the long-standing informal agreement between the two faculty representatives was to be maintained - an agreement that gave the Senate assurance that the collective bargaining agent would respect the role of the Senate in governance and academic decision-making, it seemed important to accept the statement but not hold a discussion of its substance. Professor Sessions relinquished the floor after asking that the UFS Executive Committee consider the matter further.

A request that both Professor Hayon's and Professor Simor's be spread on the minutes was made and accepted.

Since there was no further business a motion to adjourn was made and passed and the session was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Jean Ellis