

SUBJECT TO SENATE APPROVAL

MINUTES OF THE ONE HUNDRED AND SIXTY-FIRST PLENARY SESSION
OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

January 26, 1988

Chair Wedeen called the session to order at 7:15 p.m. in Room 207 at the Graduate School and University Center. Present were: Senators Alsop, Baxter, Binder, Bohigian, Brady, Brower, Carro-Kowalczyk, B. Cohen, Cooper, Cravzow, B. Gerber, Greenbaum, Gura, Hayon, Henderson, Huang, Jaffe, Jiji, King, MacLennan, McCall, Parkhurst, Picken, Riley, Rodriguez, Sohmer, Stern, Umolu, Vines, Wasser, White, Yousef, and Zaneteas; Alternate Senators Forstall, Ladimer, and Selvadurai. Senators Bank, Baumrin, Boylan, Davidson, Depas, R. Gerber, Lea, Muller, Plissner, Sheridan, Simor, Stroup and Walter were excused. Heads of Campus Faculty Governance Bodies Gura (Brooklyn) and Sohmer (City) also attended. Chancellor Murphy and Dr. Ellis, UFS Executive Director, also attended. Vice Chancellor for Budget and Finance Vivona also attended.

I. Approval of the Tentative Agenda: Chair Wedeen welcomed those attending on this frigid night to the first meeting of the New Year and asked for approval of the proposed agenda. Motion to approve was duly made, seconded, and passed by acclamation.

II. Approval of the Minutes of the 160th Plenary Session (December 15, 1987): Chair Wedeen asked for a motion to approve. Motion was duly made and seconded and the minutes were adopted with the following additions and corrections indicated by the Executive Director: Professor Wasser asked that the written communications be corrected to include those events that he attended at the Chair's request: 1) On November 17, the Adult Student Recognition Ceremony, the Trustees' farewell reception for President Shalala (Hunter) on December 7, and the Substance Abuse Early Intervention Training Project Program on December 15. Senator Wasser was present also at the Reception in Honor of Faculty on November 24. Professor Bohigian was present at the 158th Plenary Session on October 20.

III. Communications from the Chair: Chair Wedeen reminded the body that, as is customary, her report and those of faculty members of Board Committees were available in writing on the materials table at the session. She reminded the body also that, again as usual, she would report now those matters or issues which had developed too late to be printed or required discussion at the session. There was one such issue this evening, she continued, the final meeting of the Board's Ad Hoc Task Force on Education Programs and Curriculum Impact last Tuesday, January 19. The Task Force considered another draft of its report - one that embodied some changes based on the campus reports submitted on the distributed draft report. The meeting was a three and one-half hour session with three hours devoted to discussion of numbers 2 and 3 of the 21 recommendations. Those items dealt with the options to be permitted in Education programs and the capping of the number of Education credits to be permitted. The revised recommendation 2 added a third alternative, a co-major, and the revised recommendation 3 added two alternatives in the number of permissible credits in Education. One member of the Task Force, said Chair Wedeen, adding that she thought it permissible to report, said that the individual had read the reports from the colleges and very few referred to the two disputed items, so that one might expect faculty opposition to die down and added that, in any event, the trustees had the power to do this. Chair Wedeen said that she too had received copies of the reports from the colleges and her reading of them suggested that many did deal with the disputed issues. There were 10 Task Force members present and the final vote on recommendation 2 was 7 for the original version, 3 for the revised version; on recommendation 3, 7 for the original version, 3 for the revised version; and on

the full document, 7 for the original draft and 3 negative votes. The three "no" votes were those of the three faculty members, including herself as faculty member rather than trustee. The result therefore was a clear division between the trustee and presidential members of the Task Force and the faculty. The timetable on the report is now that it will go to the Board Committee on Academic Policy, Program, and Research at its March 1 meeting, thence to the Board agenda for the March 21 Public Meeting and the Board Public Hearing on that agenda on March 16. Because there were new members present at the current session, Chair Wedeen explained further that standard procedures for program approval called for consideration of those proposals by the Committee. If the Committee approved, the proposal was then forwarded to the full Board for approval and adoption. The Hearing provided an opportunity for other members of the University and the public to testify on items the Board would consider. The Hearing and Public Meeting were held at Board Headquarters, 535 East 80th Street, Room 104 at 4 p.m. and 4:30 p.m. respectively on the specified dates. Because of faculty concern with the issue as demonstrated by the action of all campus governance bodies in the colleges to adopt resolutions comparable to that passed by the University Faculty Senate by unanimous vote with one exception, and because support in the form of resolutions adopted unanimously or without dissent had come from other Universities such as SUNY, Ohio State and NYU, the Executive Committee was pursuing the issue. The Committee had not yet met to discuss the most recent developments but had scheduled such a discussion for its February 2 meeting. The members had spoken informally, however, and advanced a number of suggested actions. Later on this evening's agenda there would be an opportunity for the Plenary to present its suggestions and comments for the leadership's consideration. Chair Wedeen outlined then the actions suggested to date by the Executive Committee members.

IV. Reports of Faculty Members of Board of Trustees' Committees: The reports were available in writing at the session. (Copy attached to the Minutes).

V. Guest Speaker: Vice Chancellor for Budget and Finance Joseph Vivona: "Briefing on the Governor's Executive Budget, 1988-89." Chair Wedeen welcomed the Vice Chancellor and said he needed no introduction to this body to provide his annual briefing on the Executive Budget. Vice Chancellor Vivona said he was pleased to be with the faculty and proceeded to his report.

On the Capital Budget he said it was a good one. The senior college operating budget was a mixed bag, however. There was modest expansion in several projects, in funding the contract, but some reductions too. For the community colleges the outlook is poor and they are in an eroding situation.

Three overriding factors affected the budget, he continued. State expenditures were subject to an overall spending cap - the New York version of California's "Proposition 13". This means that only a limited growth each year is permitted. Therefore, meeting the requirements in terms of funding the collective bargaining agreements means a limitation of funds for other purposes. The largest reduction due to this overall cap is scheduled to come in October 1988.

Specifically on the senior colleges, he said, on the positive side there are the following: there is no tuition increase, \$44 million is provided to fund the PSC contract and the other contracts will be funded when settled. On the negative side there is a 12% reduction (amounting to \$2.1 million) in temporary services. The State has accepted the proposed Medgar Evers senior college status (equated to \$13.1 million) but a legislative appropriation is needed to fund the cost. So far as the capital project approved for Medgar Evers, he added, it will

continue to be treated as a community college project with the City and State each contributing 50% of the funding. There is a continuation budget for the Medical School thus insuring the status of Sophie Davis. The dark cloud over the budget is related to OTPS funding. The normal costs of inflation were not fully funded. There was a modest increase in the graduate initiative with the addition of \$1.6 million made up of \$1.1 million in State support and an additional tax on indirect cost recoveries by the Research Foundation of \$.5 million. There was also funding for two items in remediation - a \$193,000 increase in the Pre-freshman Summer Basic Skills Program and \$250,000 for the Prefreshman Intersession Skills Program. There is also an increase in instructional equipment and the Calandra Institute, formerly the Italian-American Institute, received a \$300,000 increase. There is also a reduction in teaching and support positions of 11 positions that are not currently vacant. 57 positions for new building openings are funded; there are three additional positions for the Law School and 5 for the engineering initiative. \$550,000 is provided for programs to aid the disabled - a \$125,000 increase. There is no funding for certain priority items: 1) student support services and 2) teacher education support services.

So far as the community colleges are concerned there are no changes. The formula is unchanged so there is \$1.8 million support there. Also specific items were eliminated so that overall the funding is down \$4.4 million. Whether there will be help from the Legislature on the community colleges is not certain and there will also be City reductions so the outlook is not good.

There are some adjustments too in aid to part-time students and some other items.

We are now in the 30 day amendment period usually reserved for technical adjustments but sometimes it is possible to secure other changes too. Then it will be turned over to the Legislation for appropriation of funds.

Vice Chancellor Vivona then agreed to respond to the following questions and comments from the floor: 1) Professor Sohmer (Mathematics, City) - "What is the rationale for the centralization of adjunct funds and other monies in a hemorrhaging towards 80th Street?"/ We requested decentralization of those monies this year but it is the wisdom of the State Budget Division to keep consolidation in the belief that enrollment changes can be met in this way. The same is true with respect to funding for organized research and some other items. It is true that lump sum funding is the fashion - it is of some use but I wouldn't describe it as a hemorrhaging towards 80th Street. 2) Professor Greenbaum (History, Queensborough) - "With the deductions in depleting the resources of the community colleges do you expect the share going to administrative costs affects those deductions?"/ I can't answer that question. The model allocates the funds to instructional uses, if a college has chosen to overfund administration it can. Professor Greenbaum further said - "When an administration can't find funds for tutorials where one finds the administration increased?" 3) Dr. Ladimer (Community Medicine, Mt. Sinai) - "You said there was a modest increase in the Medical School - since Sophie Davis is merged with the Medical School how does that work out?"/ Currently we are preparing recommendations to the Board on the continuation budget and among them is budget security in terms of Sophie Davis which provides the first two years of medical education and with respect to the last two years, funding for last year's jobs. 4) Professor Jaffe (Science, Borough Manhattan) - "Has everyone who has to sign off on the contract, done so? And if so, when can we expect to see the money?"/ The PSC contract's definitive budget will be voted on at this session, so that the money should be seen shortly thereafter for the senior colleges. With respect to

the community colleges the Mayor's budget should appear eventually, but it may take several months until you see the money. 5) Professor Picken (Romance Languages, Queens) - "Could you review the Graduate Initiative with us?"/ I probably should provide the detailed distribution of funds which accounts for the allocation which gives the lion's share to a) an increase in graduate student aid, b) the cost of Grad Fellows, c) funding for faculty and faculty support through a buyback, d) an increase in organized research and e) equipment increases. Next year we will request new positions for the Graduate School and an increase in graduate student aid. Professor Picken further asked - "Is the breakdown available?"/ Yes. 6) Professor Wasser - "What are the increased funds for the Calandra Institute for?"/ Counseling and, I think, some research activities and some positions. The positions are first. Professor Umolu (Humanities, Medgar Evers) - "With the eroding of enrollment and the elimination of special items especially with respect to Medgar Evers does that mean their elimination or limitation?"/ We have to go to the Legislature on them but that is not an unusual procedure for the State deliberately not to fund some items in the expectation that they will be taken care of on the legislative side.

Chair Wedeen thanked the Vice Chancellor who agreed to respond to additional questions in writing if they were forwarded to him through the Senate Office.

VI. Chancellor's Report: Chair Wedeen wished the Chancellor a good New Year and welcomed him. Chancellor Murphy responded in kind and gave his report. The day - his and the Chair's, he said, began with a Breakfast for the Police Cadet Program. It was gratifying to see the number of young people enrolled in the program and learn of the kind of studies they were pursuing. It held out the promise of a differently prepared Police Force. He noted then that it is Budget Season and commented on it. It has been five years, he said, since there has been a tuition increase and the Governor in a recent appearance had commented that by the 20th century one might expect to see a return to free tuition at this rate. The Governor had spoken also of a program that was the Chancellor's kind of program. It is called the Liberty Scholarship Program and one does not have to pay for it for five years. It is for current 7th graders so that in five years the City and State will guarantee the opportunity for a four year degree if the student is poor enough for TAP and Pell grants and the dollars to make up the difference for attendance at one of the SUNY colleges. It is projected at costing \$40 million in five years. If I were a clever 8th grader it would make sense to stay back a year and qualify. So far as the capital program is concerned, we are well funded in this area though it is hard to figure the programs that were turned down. Some initiatives were not funded that seemed important. [There is a hiatus here due to the unavoidable, though brief absence of the minute taker.]

Chancellor Murphy spoke also of the University's collaborative programs and noted that the New York Times is conducting a national survey of such efforts which is due to appear shortly. CCNY, it is reported, will be shown to lead the country in some respects which should earn the University some good media coverage. He spoke next of the matter of the presidential searches currently underway saying that he could not say much on the subject - the Senate would get better reports from others who were privy to better information on them than he. He did note, however, that in this area he and the Senate Chair whom he assumed spoke for the Senate had taken the same position. It was the matter of employing professional search groups to present candidates for consideration. It was his view that this was a poor practice, very expensive and conducted by persons who were not privy to the college's community. He and the Chair agreed on this and it was his hope that she and the Senate would not now deviate from that position. He thought that the members of a University-based search team should be prepared to make the necessary inquiries to obtain information about prospective candidates or remove themselves

from the team.

The Chancellor then responded to the following questions and comments from the floor. 1) Professor Greenbaum - "At the last NYSUT meeting the Governor said he was in favor of free tuition. Do you think this was meant philosophically? What I really wanted to ask relates to the issue of Graduate School Professors and Distinguished Professors lines being assigned in spite of the reductions. When Woodrow Wilson was president of Princeton University the question arose concerning his thinking on whether there should be a separate Graduate School or whether it should be closely tied to the undergraduate college and he took the position that it should be separate. Is that your position?/ The assignment of professorships and Distinguished Professorships to the Graduate School in particular was not sought. In fact a review of the distribution indicates that they are evenly distributed. But the energy of the department chairman, deans et al. has an effect. The uneven distribution you perceive is due to the varying effort of those persons in recruiting and seeking lines. In some ways it is not good, for example, using those positions to pay a person more money and have them as executive officers. My idea is that they should teach throughout the University - in the senior and community colleges - even if based at the Graduate School. 2) With respect to a question about Medgar Evers and the fact that when it was made a community college it was hard to get enough students and the same was true again, Chancellor Murphy responded that the faculty was good and the college overall was good. There is a mindset with respect to the college's quality because of the troubles it has experienced with its leadership and community relations but those troubles have little to do with the faculty and its production of students and quality. It is not good to have so long period of bad publicity creating the impression that the college is not good. Its new building will increase enrollment now and the community needs the college and the college can do for that community what few can. The only college in our system that is comparable, in terms of having an arrested constituency, that is one that doesn't really have very many options, is Hostos, since after all, if you're going to go to a bilingual college there aren't all that many around. If you're a single mother in the middle of Brooklyn, you haven't many options if you want to become employable and you want a job and you want to do it in the fastest possible time and in a place that's sufficiently flexible so that it doesn't push you out as a result of having established arbitrary barriers to exclude you - that's a wonderful place. And in a community with 600,000 people, there ought to be enough to fill that college twice or three times over and I think that's what's going to happen. Finally, at the moment at any rate, the college has mature and very human leadership. It is on an acting basis, but I think people have come to appreciate how nice it is to have someone like Vice Chancellor Corbie who's been Acting President, and I'm hopeful that the search process, which I think is being chaired by a very good person, Brenda White, who lives in the community and understands the college and has paid a lot of attention to it, that we will recruit a first-class person for that job. I have high hopes for the college - I think its best years are ahead of it. 3) Professor Cooper - "I'm afraid to risk inspiring your sarcasm juices, but I'll do it anyway. In the eighteenth century the Catholic Church was known as the center of outdoor relief for the impoverished aristocracy. The twentieth century I think it's 80th Street. Here I have a report in front of me from the committee I sat on in the beginning of the month which provided a variety of exceptions in order to employ two former college presidents and one former chancellor at various pieces of CUNY, raising all kinds of exceptions for University Professors. Now I see on January 26 in the Communications from the Chair, that the Office of Academic Affairs has created a new post for ex-President Jay C. Chunn [Medgar Evers]. My question is, what can I do, without having to become a college president, to qualify for this form of outdoor relief, since clearly I'm not very good at teaching, etc. anymore."/ I don't want to comment on that, Sandi. The

last reference, as a matter of fact, it's not as it seems. It is a bureaucratic convenience and in the not too distant future some other seeming aberration will occur which will correct this on the principle that two aberrations create a certain kind of normality. At which point the whole thing will get clear to you and then you won't be distressed any longer. Professor Cooper said - "Meanwhile we could use the money for adjuncts." 4) Professor Wasser - "I have really two questions, if I may, quite different. One is that in the report in The Times of excerpts of the Governor's Budget, we suddenly see a long paragraph by the Governor speaking about wishing to make SUNY a first-rate research institution. The second paragraph has to do with the great quality of undergraduate education. Down below then it says CUNY. In that paragraph it says CUNY builds buildings, and we're going to give more money. Well, that bothered me, that juxtaposition, and I just wondered what you made of it, that we build buildings and SUNY builds first-rate research institutions and first-rate undergraduate programs. Would you hold that, if there is a comment or explanation. The second question is quite different. There seems to be a growing complexity about this whole matter of retirement policy, if indeed we have one, as enunciated by the Board. I've asked various questions of people getting different answers. One answer, with respect to the prohibition about tenured professors seems to be '92 or '93. According to Ira Bloom, I guess it's really '93. At the same time these are the complexities and I wish you would address them. One, apparently a number of presidents are at least thinking about the fact they might well continue beyond seventy - that is, you see, the tenured professor, they can give up that part, but there's nothing that says a president can't continue beyond seventy. Indeed, there have been some waivers, there's even one waiver, as I recall, a former president and University Professor now will continue as a University Professor at least to the age of 72. That's a waiver. On the other hand, there's also the statement made with respect to professors that even within the prohibition to '92 or '93, that a professor somehow can continue. He will not get pension credit, but if his college wishes to employ him at a salary a year at a time. Well, all this adds up, it seems to me, to complexity and certain contradictions. I just wondered whether you would be proposing a resolution to the Board on retirement policy with respect to administrators, with respect to professors, even within this period of '92-'93, before '92-'93, so that again this University doesn't wait, so to speak, until the prohibition lapses and supposing that then everything falls into place. I would like to see, in a sense, that the Chancellor take an initiative with respect to defining retirement policy. So those are my two questions: the explanation of the Times' contraposition of the two excerpts, and whether you would be pressing for a clear statement with respect to retirement policy for administrators and professors."/

With regard to the New York Times article, I think you read too much into it. Actually, in dollar terms, the City University of New York came out a little better than the State University and the funding for the so-called Graduate Initiative, which started last year and had a three or five range to it, continues in our budget. So, it was either the way in which the speech was written initially or the way in which the New York Times reported it. I can't comment since I can't even recall having read the article in The New York Times. Secondly, as far as the issue of retirement is concerned, as you know, I have been opposed to the notion of mandatory retirement for professors on the grounds simply that is the only group of people selected out of everybody in the universe to be retired automatically. I didn't even think about the legitimacy of the other, that is to say whether it should apply to doctors, lawyers and Congressmen and all kinds of other people, but I objected on the grounds that it applied to or was made to apply to tenured professors. In fact, I took a public position on this. As I recall I went down and talked to Senator Pepper who sponsored the legislation. I got criticized bitterly

by a whole group of very important administrators ranging from Derek Bok to William Friday, who were very upset at the fact that I gave the Senator an opportunity, because he could point to me as the only one who said, "these guys are only doing it to save money." And, in fact, Bok encountered me at one of these meetings and said, "You really think that we at Harvard did this only to save money?" I said, "No, no, no, I didn't mean Harvard, I meant some of your other institutions, and if you tell me that there's no other college or university administrator to whom this thought did not occur, then I'll withdraw my point." He wasn't prepared to speak for anybody else, and he "fumphed" it. Do you know what that is? It's something they teach you at Harvard, I think. It was sort of typical of the problem. These people now really want the opportunity to sort of discard people in what I consider to be an arbitrary way. Now, I don't mind arbitrary rules if they apply to everybody, but I don't like arbitrary rules arbitrarily applied. So I opposed it and I continue to oppose it. As to the other constituency, I think that a university has an obligation to consider strategies for retirement as well as the reward system appropriate to its chief executive officers, academic officers. I think that it ought to have a policy - we have a policy. It's not a very good one and we're looking to that policy and re-examining it and that is happening. To answer your specific question - and I'm not now in a position to go to the Board with any proposals. I would like to go to the Board with a proposal because I would like to have an understanding, so that we don't go through our annual humiliation of somebody, because something was done for them or not done for them. Anything, it seems to me, that reduces humiliation as a general principle is a desirable thing, so I will probably do that. 5) Professor Huang (Educational Technology, York) - "I have some questions about the Research Foundation. Does that fall under your supervision, I suppose, Chancellor? I have been directing a grant project over many years, and I have experienced the Research Foundation procedures which I don't really see quite how they can to continue to operate on this. One is with the purchasing procedure which is really quite slow - it has not improved over the years. I know there was the attempt made to improve the purchasing procedure at one point. As of this moment I really think it needs a lot more improvement in that. Second, as a Project Director, we have to certify employees' work bi-weekly, every other Thursday, we have to certify the employees' to the following Friday. Really, I don't understand this. Maybe you would like to speak on this." / Rather than having me try to explain it, why don't we try to cure it if it's a problem. Could I ask you to write a letter to me personally, raising these two issues, and I will get answers to them. 6) Professor Jaffe - "You mentioned earlier on that both you and Professor Wedeen felt the same way about the use of outside search, executive search firms, for presidential searches. I have two questions related to that. One, do you feel the same in relation to using those firms for searches for deans, and, secondly, since these funds are not necessarily appropriated, where do the funds come from? Is it discretionary funds?" / I don't know where the colleges are getting the monies from. In anticipation of our doing something like that, which we've decided at least for the time being not to do, that would have been soft money. I imagine that's the case at the colleges as well. But if we were to go into the search firm hiring business, I guess I would look for a tax levy source for the money, because it gets expensive. It is expensive. These people charge money for doing what all of us do for nothing and they're not cheap. Professor Jaffe further asked - "Do you feel the same about individual colleges using these firms for searches for deans?" / I don't like them. It may be subjective but I have reasons for it. As I said, I don't think search firms know very much about the culture of a college or university. I talk to them - I used to talk to them a lot. Now I try not to talk to them at all. I tried not to talk to them before. I know the names of some persons they may be calling about, mostly because they ask such stupid questions that reveal the fact that they don't know. I mean our common culture is something we all share. We don't know how to describe it exactly. We sure know when someone is not a participant in it. So they reveal that early and

quickly enough. Then you've got this nagging sense of how am I supposed to explain to this uninformed person, this person not initiated into this cult I'm in, use words and concepts so that I can get him to go away believing what it is that I want him to believe. I'm very old-fashioned about it also. Modern management techniques would require the use - no corporation would think of going out and hiring a corporate executive other than through a search firm. But what are we hiring? The extent to which we're turned by circumstances we don't control into being corporate executive like is bad enough without encouraging others to bring us corporate executives. I don't know of any appointments made that we couldn't have made ourselves. The last search firm around here went out and hired a dean, hired him from across the street. It amounts to a combination of laziness and insecurity. It is conceivable that those who want an outside firm in some of these searches are simply not getting good enough service from the University staff. There I think a legitimate claim can be made, and I think it can be addressed. We have no full-time head-hunting types because it didn't occur to me that there was much sense in refusing to have an outside firm do it and build an inside bureaucracy to do it.

Chair Wedeen thanked the Chancellor.

VII. New Business: Chair Wedeen then moved to new business and returned to two items - one dropped earlier because of the speakers' arrival and an explanation of one of the points raised in the reports of the Chancellor and Vice Chancellor. The items previously discussed concerned the action of the Board Ad Hoc Task Force on Education Programs and Curriculum Impact. The Chair now opened the floor to comment and suggestions from the floor on this matter.

Senators and Alternate Senators expressed a number of views and outlined several suggestions to be taken under advisement by the Executive Committee. Among the views expressed were the following: concern based on conversations with Board members that some Trustees consider themselves academics because some have had something to do with the schools in the past many years, usually at the elementary level and believe they know what ought to be taught; therefore it was important to demonstrate the faculty's concern with the procedure followed; concern that care be taken not to appear foolish or frivolous in the eyes of the rest of the city if the faculty's opposition and/or action got publicity through the media since it would be difficult to clarify the issue to non-academics; the fact that the issue of teacher education was a difficult one to address since the history of teacher education could be perceived as silly. The truth one day was tomorrow's error and yesterday's error was today's truth was a theme running through the history of teacher education and that for many faculty the area of teacher education was one they could not feel as strongly about as history or physics, for example; concern that the Task Force report was not based on a degree of thought, investigation and research faculty were used to employ in proposing change and thus offered no really substantive change in place of what it was proposing to abandon; a desire for the Executive Committee to lay out a program of action for the faculty; the belief that when the AAUP was really a powerful force actions such as this would get the institution black-listed. The overriding concern was the precedent this action might establish in terms of the Board dealing in the same manner with other disciplines.

Possible courses of action suggested included specific activities the faculty might undertake in convincing the Board of its continuing opposition to the procedure followed, including legal action. Chair Wedeen said that all of the suggestions and comments would be reviewed by the Executive Committee and brought back to the full Senate at the next Plenary Session for implementation.

A motion to adjourn was made and passed and the body adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Jean Ellis
Executive Director