

SUBJECT TO SENATE APPROVAL

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

February 23, 1988

Chair Wedeen called the session to order at 7:20 p.m. in Room 207 at the Graduate School and University Center. Present were: Senators Aaronson, Bank, Barbanel, Baumrin, Baxter, Beheshti, Berkowitz, Binder, Bishop, Bleyman, Bohigian, Boylan, Brady, Brower, Buianouckas, Canate, Carro-Kowalczyk, B. Cohen, Cooper, Cravzow, Dannenberg, Danziger, Davidson, Donoghue, Eisenberg, Feldman, Galub, B. Gerber, Ginsberg, Gram, Greenbaum, Grossman, Gura, Hayon, Henderson, Huang, Jaffe, Jiji, Karan, La Rubbio, Loetterle, MacLennan, Matthews, McCullers, Meyers, Moyne, Oldham, Otte, Parkhurst, Picken, Rodway, Schulman, Shaffer, Sheridan, Simor, Sohmer, Stern, Stroup, Taylor, Trefousse, Umolu, Wasser, Wedeen, White, Wurmfeld, Zades, and Zarin; Alternate Senators Anderson, Geach, Hill, and Schuyler. Senators Lytra, Muller, Plissner, Riley, Segal, and Zaneteas were excused. Heads of Faculty Governance Bodies Boylan (Queens), Brauch (La Guardia), Gura (Brooklyn), Hodges (Hunter), Sohmer (City) and Zades (Staten Island) also attended. Chancellor Murphy and Mrs. Joanne Bronstein, UFS Senior Administrative Assistant, also attended.

I. Approval of the Tentative Agenda: Chair Wedeen welcomed the Senate. She asked if the mike were connected, and said the reason we're being so fussy tonight is because Dr. Jean Ellis, our Executive Director, who has always taken our meetings so accurately and copiously, is ill and is not here with us tonight. It's the first meeting she's missed in her twelve-and-a-half years with us. We have a very able substitute in Mrs. Joanne Bronstein, but in order to be sure that our meeting minutes are kept the way they always have been produced in the past, please, when you speak, come up to the mike, give your name and your school so that we can then transcribe it into accurate minutes. I call this meeting then to order. The tentative agenda is before you. Do I hear a motion for approval? Motion approved.

II. Approval of the Minutes of the 161st Plenary Session (January 26, 1988): Chair Wedeen asked for a motion to approve. Professor White (Geology, Hunter) said: "I have a question about the report of a committee, Faculty, Staff and Administration. It says, 'former Queens College President Cohen to the Ph.D. program in Geology and Geography.' If there is such a program I would love to be informed about it, because I'm in the Department of Geology and Geography at Hunter. To my knowledge there is no Ph.D. in Geology and Geography. There's a Ph.D. in Earth and Environmental Sciences. So I would really like to know what the appointment was." Chair Wedeen asked Professor Cooper (History, Staten Island), member of the Board Committee on Faculty, Staff, and Administration, to explain. Professor Cooper said "Yes, it's the set from the last meeting. Frankly, I'm mystified, because that phrase Geology and Geography to my knowledge...I'm not absolutely certain of this, may not have been on the FSA agenda when we got the original agenda. At the FSA meeting I challenged several of these University Professorship appointments for former presidents on different grounds. I don't think they care what departments they're appointed in." Chair Wedeen said that if further details were available, they will be provided. Professor Cooper further stated, "I'm told down here it is the study of Atlantis. I apologize for not knowing where that phrase comes from. I'll have to go back and look at the original agenda which I don't have with me. I think the issue, however, is slightly different, and that is the question of using these University Professorships as generously as is done." Chair Wedeen asked Professor Baumrin (Philosophy, Graduate School) if he could clear up the confusion. Professor Baumrin replied that he could not but would add to the confusion. He said, "It's possible for the Board and the President of Queens College to appoint Professor Cohen to the Department of Geology and Geography at Queens College, but they can't appoint him to the

Doctoral Faculty of Earth and Environmental Sciences Program. That's up to the faculty membership of the Research Committee or the Executive Committee of that Department and not to the Board. So there's something even more mystical going on." Professor White said, "There certainly is something mystical going on. I have a question of the Chancellor. He made some very cryptic comments last time. I'd like this pursued." Chair Wedeen said we will look that up and get back to you and certainly feel free to ask the Chancellor when he arrives. He is expected here this evening. [N.B. Professor Cohen's appointment is in the Department of Geology and Geography, Hunter College.] Professor Bleyman (Science, Baruch) said, "I have a question on the administrative designation of Jay C. Chunn. Someone told me that was not at the Central Office, but at Hunter College. Is that true? [N.B. The appointment is at the Central Office.] There was much laughter, and a senator suggested "maybe he's in Atlantis also." Chair Wedeen asked for a motion, and the minutes were approved with the following additions: Senators Crump (KCC) and Shaffer (Hunter) were present at the 161 Plenary Session (January 26, 1988).

III. Communications from the Chair: Chair Wedeen said that she thought one of the reasons that we look so well-populated tonight is that not only are we here in great numbers from the Faculty Senate, but we have guests - the leaders of the faculty governances on the various college campuses. So I welcome you from all the people here in the Senate and I'm glad that we have an opportunity not only to meet with you but to work together. Will those who are here because they are part of the Council of Campus Faculty Governance Heads just please raise your hands to let us know just who you are, and which colleges? The reason for the Council meeting just before this session was to discuss the Task Force on Education Report. The group met in order to solidify some of the ideas that this group has concerning whatever efforts they can make in order to impress upon the Trustees the feelings and reactions of the faculties on the various campuses on the issues of faculty curriculum and faculty departments. The group that met today was a follow-up of the discussion we had had earlier this month where the leaders of the various campuses felt there were several things that as leaders should be instituted immediately. First of all, on the various campuses now, petitions are being drawn up and signed by as many faculty members as possible to bring forth again our sincere displeasure and wish for the Board to understand that it is for the faculty to create curriculum, for the Board to pass on it or not pass on it, and for a faculty to determine the number of credits in a discipline, and that the traditional and rightful place of curriculum-making and implementation rests with the faculties. In addition, the group decided this evening to jointly sign and send a statement concerning the problem we're facing to The New York Times and any other papers we feel appropriate. Arrangements are being made at this time to have large numbers from the various campuses appear at the Board hearing of March 16 at 4 o'clock in Room 104 at 535 East 80th Street, the Board headquarters, for two purposes: 1) for those people who wish to speak on the issue to have an opportunity to be heard by the Board, and as you know, speakers are limited to no more than three minutes, and 2) large numbers of faculty and students are being asked to come down and plan on coming down in order to show the support of the faculty in this matter. Now, several things have transpired since I last met with you, and perhaps I can fill you in. There is a question? Professor Shaffer (Library, Hunter): "I still have never seen a copy of this report, and I am a member of the Hunter College Senate, which is supposed to vote on any changes in curriculum." Chair Wedeen stated that she had not yet seen the final document herself - either as the leader of this group or as a Trustee. What had occurred after the various colleges had received copies of the document for their reactions - all these pieces and responses went back to the Task Force Chair who then referred it to a staff in order to review and collate and put together the results read

from the various reports. On the basis of these findings, another draft was created. There were some corrections, some additions, some changes. When this revised document came before the Task Force, I think I reported that back to you at that time, the changes were thrown out at that point, the three faculty members voting for the changes which opened up the area of prerogative back to the faculty. The document, subsequent to that, was never distributed, so that no one, as far as I know, any Trustee or any member of any force, has seen it. The plan, at that point, as was stated at that meeting, was that this document, which was passed by the Task Force, at that meeting, was then to be referred over to the Academic Affairs Committee which meets the evening of March 1. The latest communication I received from the Chairman of the Board of Trustees this past weekend and Monday was that the document is now not going to be referred to that Committee Monday night but instead will be going to a Long Range Planning Committee of the Board. We can pick up the discussion at that point - I see the Chancellor has just come and I don't want to hold him back, so that we can get back to the sequence as best we have it and give opportunity for further discussion. So if you will, we'll close it here for a moment and introduce Chancellor Murphy.

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. Chancellor's Report. Chancellor Murphy said he'd like to begin his report to the Senate by indicating that yesterday we gave our annual testimony in Albany before the joint committees, the Senate Finance Committee and the Assembly Ways and Means Committee. It's an annual affair. The Assembly's Ways and Means Committee is now chaired by Saul Weperin of Queens, and the Senate Finance Committee continues to be chaired, as it has been for the past several years, by Senator Marchi of Staten Island. The testimony is available for those who are interested in seeing it. It covers essentially those items in the asking budget that were not funded by the Executive Budget. I did make special note of several things that were high on our list. I once again indicated to them that the return of four-year status to Medgar Evers College was an issue of importance to us and there were a number of others. Actually, the longest discussion came about as a result of questions raised by Assemblyman Sullivan about the City's reduction in state aid, he asking what I thought ought to be done. I indicated to him some mechanism has to be fashioned that will allow the Legislature to be assured that the money that it appropriates to the community colleges actually ends up with the community colleges. It's been the practice of the City, as you know, to discount that by about 50 per cent or less, and we're looking for ways of getting around the City's reprehensible practice. At the moment the cuts anticipated in the community college budget are very substantial. There are some \$4.5 million in the PEG reductions that we've indicated were in the budget before. Essentially these are under-collected revenues, partly as a result of diminished enrollments at community colleges, and a \$3 million add-on to that, making a close to \$8 million cut in the community college budget for the next year. It might even be higher. The additional \$3 million coming about as a result of the Mayor's warning that if the pension bill were passed by the Legislature, that services in New York would be reduced, and presumably he believes that services that we offer in the University will be reduced by \$3 million. It's not a good sign at the moment, and we will know more as time goes on, but I continue to be concerned, as I've indicated to you here in the past, that the community college budget is not in good shape. The tone of the hearing generally - I must say that this was well-received by the legislators, that is to say they did not at all mind hearing another government criticized, but their ability to be able to do something about that is still unclear. I guess if they really are determined, something can be done.

In the past, when such cuts have occurred in the local aids out of the budget with the Board of Education, measures were taken. In one year it was called the Stavisky Bill which in fact was a kind of...it only lasted for one year, perhaps two, it was a kind of mechanism put in place by the Legislature to maintain a level of effort by the City so that the amounts of money appropriated by the Legislature would actually go for the intended purpose. What's been happening throughout the State is fairly interesting. The local aid side of the budget which provides money for Boards of Education throughout the various communities in the State of New York has been increasing dramatically. As it increases dramatically it's been used as a device for decreasing what would otherwise be substantial increases in real estate and village taxes in these various communities. So the State allocation, the State appropriation which is based largely on State income taxes, is replacing real estate taxes. Of course, this has social and public implications. It means, in effect, that all of us who pay income taxes are now beginning to pay for some of us who pay real estate taxes at a lower rate of pay. It's not, strictly speaking, as democratic, I think, as we would like to think our government works in the State. The Legislature has a big problem here, because this has been going on now for some time, and the eloquent and dramatic claims that have been made by the Governor are technically true. A lot more money has been appropriated for education than at any other time in the history of the State, especially the Boards of Education, but including the universities at the community college level, and at community colleges throughout the State. The truth is it doesn't reach the entities for which that money was intended. So they have a problem and I assume that they're going to deal with it and provide some restorations to the Executive Budget as well. The Board of Trustees will be in Albany on February 29 for their annual trip to meet with legislative leadership and make as strong a case as they can for the City University budget. We expect that the State Budget will be adopted on March 31. I guess there's a historic expectation that the budget will be acted on in a timely way. The law requires April 1 action in an election year, that is to say it's required every year, but the Legislature has the power to freeze the clock. Something God apparently can't do, the Legislature of New York can do. Except in an election year, when they presumably need to come back to their various communities and tell us how much they've done for us so that we will send them back to Albany. It seems to me to be an awful peculiar reward for doing good. As far as the City is concerned, we've met with the Mayor. We've talked a bit about what the community colleges have been doing in the City. I must say the presidents of the colleges have been making strong representation of the contributions that individual colleges have been making to the Mayor. We've established some business alliances with the community. We've taken, in effect, industry leaders and businesses that have been associated with community colleges in one way or another and tried to get them to act politically on our behalf, and there is some indication that some of them will do that. We've not had as much success, I think, with businesses speaking out, since it appears to be contrary to their best interests to say to the Mayor that they want more money appropriated for the community colleges, knowing that they would presumably then have to pay the money, although my experience generally with corporations has been that the contradiction has not made itself felt. They're perfectly willing to make an argument for both lower taxes and more services. But then there were major philosophers in the history of philosophy who squared the circle, I believe - an equally difficult task. We expect that this year we will look to the Board of Estimate and the City Council for assistance. Remarkably enough, and I don't know what this means, but this year for the first time in seven years, the President's budget, which appeared last week, actually includes an appropriation for Pell Grants, prescribes an increase in Pell Grants, actually raises it, and includes funding for less than half-time or part-time students, taking one or two, less than half-time, courses. We never expected to see this. I must say the City University nationally played a major role in this, and I'm pleased to say that we

were cited by those who welcomed seeing this in the President's budget as having had something to do with it, although it's hard to imagine that resolutions passed by this University were actually acted upon personally by President Reagan. We had an affair this morning at City Hall celebrating the Student Mentor Program and I think we gave a t-shirt to Councilman Herbert Berman, who's the chairman of the Education Committee, who's helped to provide some of the dollars that we've used to underwrite the Mentor Program. It was a very touching ceremony. I think you know something about that program, where University students who've been recruited for the purpose of establishing some kind of personal relationship with high school students who are on the threshold of dropping out, trying to persuade them that they ought to stay in school, that there's a relationship between being educated and being successfully educated, and some hope for outcome in their own lives. I guess we got some press coverage for it, at least I heard something on the radio this afternoon. Finally, and I might end with this, the Chairman has referred the recommendations that have come from the various presidential, Board committees, as well as the Senate committees, on pluralism, to the whole Board, and given the Senate's interest in the subject, and the Senate has expressed itself on previous occasions on this document, which essentially outlines things we might be doing to encourage the consciousness of the pluralistic nature of our institution and of our constituencies and of ourselves, that the Senate will add its voice in support of establishing a number of different administrative and academic mechanisms to advance that. And finally, the Chairman has also recommended that the Task Force on Teacher Education be submitted, rather than to the Academic Affairs Committee, to the Long Range Planning Committee, which consists of himself as Chairman, as well as the chairmen of the various committees of the Board of Trustees, for consideration. I believe a week from today is when that Committee meets. And that, of course, is in reference to the document which you are all aware of and which the Chairman, I think, was discussing when I arrived. That concludes my report. I would be happy to respond to whatever questions anybody would like to raise at this time.

Chancellor Murphy then responded to the following questions and comments from the floor. 1) Professor Shaffer (Library, Hunter) - "We are not aware of the document. I said this before." Chair Wedeen added, "The statement that was made before you arrived was that the appropriate committee on his campus has never seen the document that is now under discussion because there's a new draft and a revised document and that has not been in his hands. I explained that it hasn't been in any of our hands to date. I have not seen a completed form of the revised document either."/ It's got a very bright red cover. 2) Professor White (Geology, Hunter) - "Sir, if I may, I'd like to refer back to something that you talked with us about last month. A question was asked of you about appointments of past presidents, and in our minutes and in my recollection your response was 'it is a bureaucratic convenience and in the not-too-distant-future some other seeming aberration which will correct this on the principle that two aberrations create a certain kind of normality.'"/ Did I say that? Professor White further said - "It's beautiful! Now I wonder if you could explain it to me."/ I haven't the foggiest idea what you're referring to, or what that means. Professor White further said: "Well, I'm with you part of the way. I don't understand what it means either. As I understand it, there were exceptions made to the appointment, well, the appointments were made with exceptions for former presidents Cohen and Chunn, and the question was raised last month as far as why was this done. And what really triggers my question is when is the other shoe going to drop. This is what I read in your response. That we should expect something to happen about either one or both of these people, and I'd like to know if this is the time for us to hear about it."/ I know of nothing publicly that is to happen to these people, and I'm not in a position to offer a comment. 3) Professor Baumrin (Philosophy, Graduate School) -

"Can you tell the title that the Cohen appointment was?" Professor White added - "That Professor Cohen was appointed to the Ph.D. Program in Geology and Geography, and to our knowledge there is no Ph.D. Program in Geology and Geography."/ What is the question? How is it possible to be appointed to a program that doesn't exist? Professor White further added - "Oh no, I was just jolted into reading it. My real question was, listening to you last month, I was expecting the other shoe to drop. I was expecting to hear something else as far as relating to one of these two men. My understanding was that Saul Cohen was appointed as a Professor of Geography at Hunter College. I don't understand this Ph.D. program. But there's something going on - I want to know if there's something going on as far as a Ph.D. Program in Geography."/ Ah. If that's the question, there is nothing going on so far as I know about a Ph.D. Program in Geography. Professor Bohigian (Mathematics, John Jay) interjected - "No gold discovered on 80th Street?"/ If there were, we would share it with you.

4) Professor Berkowitz (Political Science, Brooklyn) - "I'd like to return to the budget, if I may. In addition to the cuts for the community colleges, apparently the Governor's Budget has totally eliminated the monies for a number of very important initiatives that were contained in your budget request, including Worker Education, which I am very much concerned with. I'm wondering if you can give us an assessment of what the probabilities are that the Legislature can be induced to restore those monies."/ Well, you know we go through this tangle every year. I'm not sure what its purpose is. It's existed since 1979 and it continues to be practiced by the Legislature and by the Governor. Each year the Governor issues an Executive Budget. Sometime between the issuance of that budget and the adoption of a State budget by the Legislature, the Legislature adds back items into the budget that it specifically wants to see supported, representing activities that the Legislature has been asked to support or unilaterally has expressed its interest in supporting. The following year we put it in our asking budget, since these programs have an on-going life, and the Governor removes them again since he's disassociated from them, they're not his, and the Legislature does once again what it's done in the past. This gives a precarious life to some of our enterprises except that it goes on year after year that way. Occasionally, the Governor will reach in and fund some program that the Legislature took the initiative on, almost removing the initiative from the Legislature. He did that this year in the establishment of a Center for Italian-American Studies, in which he unilaterally and quite unexpectedly funded that program, even though earlier on it had been a Legislative initiative. So I presume that the Legislature will replace monies for those programs that it has assumed responsibility for in the past and I expect that Worker Education will be funded at a higher level than it's been in the past. As you know, we've made Worker Education a high priority issue for the University. I personally take a great interest in it. I would like to see it funded. I'd like to see those programs grow and flourish, and I'm sure they will. I think the Legislature will put the money back in.

5) Professor Wasser (English, Staten Island) - "What's the state of the decision on proposals for tenure in the Law School? That is, I read The Times and it indicates, is this correct?, that both the President of Queens and yourself have, in a sense, denied two of the six. Is that the state of it?"/ The governance, which is an interim and temporary governance arrangement, but agreed to, and in fact, last year insisted upon by the Law School, calls for the following: when the President of the College and the Dean of the Law School are in agreement with regard to tenure recommendations, presumably reflecting a committee recommendation, the set-up at Queens having its P&B, it formally goes through the Board of Trustees, and I convey it to the Board of Trustees. Of the six candidates for tenure at the Law School, four were recommended by both the President and the Dean and have gone forward and presumably will be on the March Calendar for the Board of Trustees to act on. The

governance calls for a different role where there is disagreement, in this case where the Dean recommended and the President does not recommend, or vice versa, the Chancellor is obligated to make a determination as to whether to recommend or not to recommend for tenure. And it is correct that in the two cases in dispute I did not recommend to the Board - tenure. 6) Professor Baumrin - "What's going on with the medical school?"/ As you know, last Spring, two things occurred. You know, there is an easy way to answer this, a very easy, short way, I can shrug, or, I'm afraid the way I'm about to answer it. You really want me to.... Last Spring, remember, we have a seven-year program, a proposal originally was for a seven-year program. It suffered, this plan of ours, last year, from simplicity, it suffered from elegance, it suffered from rationality. It was simply to take a working program called Sophie David program, a five-year program at City College that was nationally renowned, and an excellent program of its kind, which took people out of high school, gave them five years of undergraduate and graduate work in medicine, and then sent them off to medical schools for the last two years and they had a kind of integrated B.A./M.D. program, in which it was not possible for people to enter during that seven-year period. You began at the beginning of it and you came out at the end of it. It was dedicated to increasing the number of minority physicians in the State, which as anyone who looks at the numbers realizes is regrettably low, and it was a program that was working. We had run into difficulties with accreditation for a series of arcane reasons which even this extended explanation simply will not make reference to, other than the reference just made. We sought to give this program a kind of legitimacy and permanence by establishing a City University of New York M.D. Program, that is to say, a City University of New York Medical School, which required that we link the last two years with an ongoing hospital, since the last two years of the physician's training apparently is a clerkship in a hospital. We did that with Long Island Jewish Hospital which itself was a training hospital and had functioned as a University Hospital for the Medical School at Stonybrook. Its involvement with Stonybrook, however, had diminished as a result of Stonybrook's construction of a primary University Hospital out on Long Island, in which the State invested something in excess of a hundred million dollars initially. I say initially because, as a footnote, it was built like a lot of other buildings, whereby the State requires an additional outlay of about 20 per cent of the total cost each year to maintain the original investment. Consequently, we were able to put these two existing entities together and made a proposal for the offering of an M.D. degree. However, a variety of different disputes erupted. Motives became clouded, accusations began to fly fast and furiously, there were mendacious political forces at work, and the thing fell apart on us. It fell apart for reasons I don't want to go into, it would require that I attribute motivations to people and in the absence of psychoanalytic data I can only suggest that not everybody played as virtuously with us as we did with them. The result was that we were left with the splinters of a plan and an instruction to go back and try to put it together again, and that's what we've been trying to do. We're trying now to link community hospitals in Queens, remembering that the Legislature passed a resolution saying that the objective of this exercise was twofold: first, to contribute to the increase in the number of minority physicians in New York State, but also to increase the quality of medical care available to the people in the Borough of Queens. Queens was an exceptional problem, because unlike any other borough, except for Staten Island, it did not have a university-connected hospital and it is widely asserted and apparently believed that the quality of care available in a university hospital is apparently superior to that available in non-university hospitals. We're now in the process of trying to take existing community hospitals in Queens, link them together, and with the assistance of existing medical schools over a period of five or seven years, under contract to us, assist us in putting together the residencies, which have to be accredited residencies and clerkships, that is to say, the hiring of faculty and the structuring of the program in the existing community hospitals to warrant our seeking accreditation for this

arrangement. We are at work doing that. Lest anyone believe that we've wasted our last five-and-one-half years in quest of this unapproachable goal or ideal arrangement, it ought to be noted that the by-product of all this effort has been probably one of the most richly funded pre-medical/medical programs in America, that the Sophie David program which five or six years ago, I think, had 13 lines connected with it, now has three times that number, and is an excellent program, certainly by any standard. We continue to do what we're trying to do, which is to establish this medical entity, although I can tell you, that like a lot of other things in life, if we had any idea of how difficult it was going to be to bring it about, we might have thought a little bit more deeply, having initiated it in the first instance. But we haven't failed until we give up. 7) Professor Sohmer (Mathematics, City) - "I'm not going to talk about Medical School. You folks have some kind of an advanced Vice Chancellor in charge of construction. I forget his title. Senior. That's it. And we have a campus which is getting a lot of construction and somehow between us and you we are faced with an impossible situation, because we sent down some proposals which were foolish and you people concurred and are now funding them. And the difficulty we have basically is that about a third of our actual possible space is going off-line simultaneously because we have, with your concurrence - the Board's concurrence - contracts going out, to just reconstruct roughly, a third or almost a half of our square footage all at the same time. Now, why is it that with all the controls and all of the smart things that happen, this is permitted by 80th Street?" / I guess, Bernie, if we filtered out all the foolish proposals you sent us, there would be nothing for us at 80th St. to do. Thanks alot.

III. Communications from the Chair (continued): Chair Wedeen continued, we're all great at diagnosis, it's prognosis we have trouble with. Getting back to the point we were at earlier this evening, as the Chancellor mentioned to you, the nature of the committee meeting on the Educational Task Force Committee was changed. These negotiations have been going on, if you want to call it negotiations, maybe conversations, between your faculty leaders and the appropriate trustees, for some time now, so that one thing we know will not happen that we were fearful of at the close of the last Task Force Committee meeting when it was stated that that report which you so rightly stated wasn't seen by you or by anybody else was going to go directly from the Task Force, with corrections from the floor, over to Academic Policy, with the hope as things that do come before Academic Policy to therefore appear before the Board to be mandated, to be turned back to the colleges so that each college would be instructed to have these 21 points in operational form on the campuses by September of 1989. I think some understanding prevailed, and it is now going to the Long Range Planning Committee instead, next Tuesday night. Translated, what does this mean? One step has been slowed down. How slowed down, frankly I ask, I asked again last night, does this mean it can still come up as something to be voted on at the next Board meeting? Because it was pointed out, as some of you do know, and for the benefit of those of you who do not know, there have been actions taken and opinions elicited since we met last time. For example, in the last week, Professor Wasser and myself met with Dr. Polishook and Mr. Cantor of the PSC. The PSC will now completely endorse the faculty and Senate stand on the Task Force statement. Also, as of last week, papers were filed, only filed at this point, with the AAUP for a possible censure of The City University Board's action. Also as well, as all of us know, we're invited to speak on March 16 at the hearing, and as I mentioned earlier, the various faculty leaders are encouraging and making provisions for large numbers of faculty and students to hear and attend these hearings. The New York Times education reporter stated that he would be at the meeting to cover it too. And since there seem to be problems here, arising in process more than content - the content has never been anything that any of us have discussed - it was the decision made this weekend to not have the report go directly from the Task Force to Academic

Affairs or to this Long Range Planning Committee. However, when I asked the question last night, does that mean it will not appear on the March agenda, that was not answered directly. It may or may not be contingent upon what the Long Range Committee decides to do next Tuesday night. To know what is actually on the agenda, the dates on that, the agenda items for a meeting will appear sometime between March 4 and March 7. Therefore, it was the feeling of the faculty leaders and the Executive Committee and lots of us, that it is necessary to proceed as if it was going to be an item at the Board for the March 21 meeting. So we have asked everyone who wishes to speak to now call the Chairman of the Board of Trustees' secretary and make an appointment to speak. The phone number is 212-794-5450. If you call and make an appointment, as to speak on the item, if it appears on the agenda, re the Task Force on Education. Also, it would be advisable to call in to the Senate Office, which is 212-794-5538 and leave with us the name of the person and the phone number in case it does not appear on the agenda so that we can call you and let you know to cancel. You won't have to come down and waste a trip. But right now, because nothing was given to me yesterday or today that I can transmit to you to state that one of the many options which were placed before us as possible negotiating items were accepted that would in any way change what seems to be the request of the Task Force at this point. The plan is to please proceed, as we had planned. And if there are any other suggestions at this point, please make them. Incidentally, for your information, the group, the Council of Faculty Leaders, has drawn up a statement which will be signed by all faculty leaders, and transmitted to The New York Times. The individual statements that are being signed by large groups of faculties on each campus are being transmitted to the Chairman of the Board of Trustees and all the members on the Board of Trustees because, as the Chancellor told you, although the Long Range Planning Committee consists of the chairs of the six committees, your representative, me, and the student representative, all other Board members were invited to attend. We feel it would be most persuasive, if at all possible, whatever influence and opinion we could share with the members of the Board were shared before that meeting of next Tuesday night. Now, may I open it to any questions or comments? Does anyone here who was at the meeting we had an hour ago wish to add anything further? In response to a question from the floor, "Are the rallies still in effect?" Chair Wedeen replied, yes. Asked about what possible alternative there might be, the Chair indicated that one of the possible alternatives that she has put on the table was the possibility that the Chairman, who asked for this Task Force and the report, receive the Task Force Report and then share it with his or the Board's approval, endorsement, strong approval, whatever they wish to say about it, and share it therefore by distributing it to all colleges, the faculties and the presidents, with the statement that this is the work of the Task Force, this is the opinion of the Board, and they would like to let the faculty know the reactions of this Task Force, and to let the individual colleges then proceed as the college faculty on each campus so wishes, and report back to the Board what they plan on doing. Since we are all interested in the topic, it isn't a matter that someone is trying to fight where we're going, it's the process that is objectionable. So to ask the campuses what they plan on doing, what they are doing, to improve Teacher Education, and to instruct the campuses to come as closely as they can to the result, to the suggestions made by the Task Force Committee. In other words, this is their recommendation, but the ball is in the hands of the faculty on the individual campuses. As far as other communications from the Chair, as you know, other than those items which I feel have come in late or are of particular import, I write them out and they are at the back of the room. This is also true for the various committee reports. There is one meeting that I attended last evening that I did not write up because it was last evening, but it was a routine Board of Trustees' meeting, and therefore there's nothing that

I think of great necessity for me to discuss with you now. It will appear in the next set of minutes. Professor Bohigian (History, Staten Island) asked: "I'm not sure. I might have misread what you said regarding the plan for teacher education. I hope we're not saying tonight that it's the means that they are using to implement a plan that we object to, otherwise we are generally in favor of their approach to reforming teacher education. I think we ought to be very very careful. What we must do of course is to graciously accept or receive the report and then study it and report back, but no more than that..." Chair Wedeen replied that her statement was actually to the Chairman, that it's your report, you can write anything you want about it, but it is not for the Board to go ahead and say we mandate it for the faculties, it's for you and your Board, if you approve of this, to share it with the faculties, ask the faculties their reactions, their plans. We can all say we are mutually interested in any way enhancing, benefitting, improving teacher education, but it's up to the individual faculties on each campus to decide which way they will do it. I asked for it to be pulled so it doesn't get mandated at all. It went as far as getting pulled from that committee and moved over to the other. What does this mean? I don't know. It means it's still open, it's not getting mandated, Tuesday night - will it happen the next night or a month later? I don't know. I can't give you anything further than that, other than it's being held. But in the light of being held, in order to be certain that we don't find that three days later or a week later, that it appears on the Board minutes for the meeting, it was the best thinking that we could get together here with faculty leaders, that we proceed as we had planned for the 16th. If there is any change that this document does not become a mandated Board document, we can be in touch with everyone and see what we wish to do then. Professor Bohigian further stated: "I've heard no statement from the Chancellor on his position on this, although I've been told that he stands by Edith Everett, but I haven't heard him express himself on this. The other thing is, I sat here again, entertained by his 15 minutes of witticism, which seems to be a pattern now. We really aren't informed very much but we do have a lot of chuckling when he comes each month. Yet he mentions the Mentor Program, part of which involves asking faculty to help improve the schools of New York City and the teaching process. I find it ironic that we are called upon to help reform public school education and yet we are ignored when it comes to reforming and revising our own programs of teacher education. There's some irony to that." Chair Wedeen replied, the first item, about asking the Chancellor where he stands on this report, the Executive Committee did ask that question, when the Chancellor meets with us at executive session. Does anyone from the Executive Committee wish to summarize what occurred when that question was asked? Sandi? Professor Cooper said she was trying to remember the euphemisms - "I think we were generally told that any segment of the University community has the right to propose curricular revision. Wasn't that one part of it? And that was the theme - was there much else? - that since any segment has the right to propose curricular revision and pursue it to the bloody conclusion, then it didn't behoove him to tell the Board Task Force not to do what they were doing." Professor Picken (Romance Languages, Queens) added - "We also had a review of his difficulties with the departments of education at Queens when he was President of Queens College." Professor Bohigian further asked - "Did anyone point out to the Chancellor that when he refers to any member of the community with respect to the curriculum, it has to be a faculty group? That particular item is reserved for the faculty, it's one of their few governance items, and it does not apply to any members of the University group." Professor Baumrin said - "So we thought. But it turned out when we tried to track down the actual words somewhere, the actual words didn't exist. And although one or two of us were morally certain that it was in the City College Charter, either there was no City College Charter or we couldn't find the City College Charter. We did find it and it's not in the City College Charter, so it isn't there. So it's the

responsibility of the faculty, but it's not exclusive. The fact is that the faculty can do that, but it doesn't say that anybody else cannot do that. He's taking the position, or the Board's taking the position, or they're jointly taking the position, that it's not an exclusive right of the faculty, and therefore belongs to anybody like administrators or the Board of Higher Education, Board of Trustees, and therefore that's what the issue is. The issue really is that there's some silence...." Professor Bohigian said - "Turnaround is fair play. Let's find out those items that are not covered exclusively under administrative mandate and let's start doing it, including their salaries." Professor Cooper said - "I don't want to start a cake sale to pay their salaries. I do recall in 1976 having a one-on-one with the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Timothy Healy, on the nature of the authority of his office to close down Master's programs, and we lost. He closed a great many of them down, or on his recommendation a great many of them were closed down, without a lot of faculty participation, but with a considerable amount of Presidential choral speaking, 'Yes, we will do it.' So there is a kind of, I don't know if I should even say this, maybe the tape should get erased for the last 18 seconds...I just wonder whether or not that isn't a precedent for this authority. There is a certain fuzzy gray area. We understand the Bylaws of the Board say the faculty are responsible for curriculum, and it's on that understanding that we have proceeded." Professor Wasser said: "There are two things that I want to mention. One, that the Senate has dealt with in the past and it keeps coming up. On these committees that evolve out of the Task Force, once again, faculty may be on them, but the assumption is that the Presidents appoint the faculty. Time and time again, the Senate has made this case strongly, and sometimes partially wins and generally loses, but the fact of the matter is that faculty members on such committees should be selected by faculty governance bodies. The second thing, I'm not sure that this is what the Chancellor was referring to, but I hope someone will enlighten me. What on earth did the Chancellor mean when he was referring to pluralism, a report on pluralism, and that somehow the Chairman of the Board is going to be responsive to it? I have no idea what he meant, and does anybody know?" Chair Wedeen said, I wouldn't attempt it. You'd have to ask him, not me, what he meant. Professor Sohmer said: "Well, I'm not going to enlighten you, I'm just going to inform you. The City College Senate passed a statement about the fact that we are a vastly complex ethnic entity, and it has all kinds of virtuous statements in it, and our President carried it down to the Council of Presidents, and they said that's a delightful statement and we'll adopt it, and now I suppose that's what they're talking about." Professor Grossman (Elementary Education, City) - "We've been talking about faculty rights with curriculum, but my faculty at the City College School of Education is also concerned with the issue of the Task Force recommending that there not be a major at the undergraduate level. Can anyone clarify whether or not the Board of Trustees can mandate that too?" Chair Wedeen responded that all our investigations seem to point to the fact that a Board can do just about anything it wishes to do. Therefore, it becomes incumbent upon us, I think, as a faculty, to express our wishes and our strengths and our desires as a group that by tradition and by expertise, have always decided which disciplines were worthy of being a major. It was decided upon, not only by the members of that discipline, but by the entire college community of a particular unit, and therefore there are some in some colleges and not in another, that it was up to the individual college to decide the number of credits in any particular discipline and these were therefore out of the area and the province of the Board of Trustees. Therefore, we are hopeful also that the people who are heads of the Schools or Departments of Education will speak on the 16th with their particular viewpoint as well as others with the larger and total concept in mind." Professor Grossman: "I'm very happy to hear that position expressed. Thank you." Chair Wedeen reiterated if you wish to speak, call for an appointment.

Professor Wasser said: "There are, really, serious issues, in a sense. I think you recall at previous meetings, questions came up. The Chancellor, I feel, I guess I can say this, has not really shown leadership in this whole matter. I think, perhaps, by design. Maybe there are indirect ways of operating as a leader. Who am I to say? And maybe his are more subtle and more effective than those I can imagine. But the fact is that on such a matter, which certainly is debatable, one thing that came out in our Executive Committee meeting was when Shirley was raising an issue, the Chancellor denied that Education is a discipline. Now that's a debatable matter because it brings up all kinds of consequences. And I guess it is debatable but the point is there is no way of discussing it with him. He asserts this and that's as far as we can get in trying to get from him some kind of statement with respect to this whole matter. And to this date, and I've been in on a number of discussions, I've not really heard his opinion, except past history - what he did at Queens - and denying certain aspects to...I really don't know what his opinion is on all these matters of reform of education and the like, and I don't really know what his position is with respect to trustees and faculty prerogatives."

Professor Davidson (Computer Information Services, LaGuardia): "There was a meeting today of CLAC - I represent you on that body. On March 7 and 8 there will be a mass trip to Albany by our colleagues throughout the University to ask for enhancements to the budget as presented by the Governor and also to ask for additional items that had not been there before, also to ask for restoration of items. You heard the Chancellor present a rather bleak picture for the budget this year, and if you are asked to serve as a representative for your college, I urge you to do so. The Senate has documentation on what the University is looking for and we would be happy to provide it for back-up to that information to anybody who intends to go to Albany on March 7 and 8.

Since there was no new business, upon motion made and seconded, the session was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Joanne Bronstein
UFS Senior Administrative Assistant