

SUBJECT TO SENATE APPROVAL

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

September 26, 1989

Chair Wedeen called the session to order at 7:10 p.m. in room 207 of the Graduate School and University Center. Present were Senators Aaronson, Allaire, Barbanel, Barley, Baumrin, Baxter, Beaton, Beheshti, Bishop, Bohigian, Brady, Brenner, Broido, Bronars, Brooks, Brugnola, Buianouckas, Carro-Kowalczyk, Cohen, Cooper, Cyril, Danziger, Davidson, Davis E., Davis R., Donleavy, Donoghue, Frisz, Galub, Geach, Gerber, Greenbaum, Grossman, Gura, Hill, Kaplan, Kaufman, Knoop, Lundeen, Manassah, Markoe, Matthews, McCall, Muehlig, O'Malley, Otte, Parkhurst, Picken, Plissner, Schuyler, Selvadurai, Shaffer, Shogan, Speidel, Squitieri, Stern, Stroup, Trefousse, Vogt, Washburn, Westrem, White, Yousef, Zades, Zaneteas, Zarin, Zinberg, Alternate Senators Caudle, Immergut, Meier, O'Riordan, Panzarino, Muzio, Svitak, and Taylor. Senators Binder, Bleyman, Cantwell, Depas, Keopfer, MacLennan, Simor, Sohmer, and Sullivan were excused. Also attending were heads of Campus Faculty Governance bodies Chabora (Baruch), Frisz (Queens), Galub (Bronx), Gura (Brooklyn), Mineka (Lehman) and Zades (COSI). Chancellor Joseph S. Murphy, University Faculty Senate Acting Executive Director Hoffacker and Administrative Assistant Pasela also attended.

- I. Approval of the Proposed Tentative Agenda. Chair Wedeen asked for a motion to approve the proposed Tentative Agenda. The motion was made, seconded, and adopted.
- II. Approval of the Minutes of the 174th Plenary Session (May 16, 1989). Chair Wedeen asked for a motion to approve the Minutes. The motion was made, seconded, and adopted.
- III. Communications from the Chair. Chair Wedeen noted that she had sent out a report over the summer and that there was no additional written report. However, she did wish to comment on two recent activities. First, Chair Wedeen attended the annual conference of the Association of Community College Trustees. A major theme of the conference was that goal setting and long-range planning were the primary responsibilities of the Trustees, especially considering that trustees are in office longer than a president. The Chair attended a one-half day "Academy on Board Ethics" which focused on how trustees can improve their skills in resolving dilemmas. A panel on board/president relationships discussed sources of board information and the extent to which boards should vote differently from administrative recommendations (one panelist noted that boards "rubber stamp" 98 percent of presidential recommendations). A session on Urban Colleges focused on retention and remediation, two of the primary issues being addressed in CUNY. Chair Wedeen noted that, throughout the conference, she heard no mention of faculty role in governance, and suggested that CUNY faculty had a "more definitive role" than was available to most colleagues in other institutions. Second, the Chair reported on the September Board of Trustees meeting. Vice-Chair Everett chaired the session and introduced new Trustees

Stanley Fink and Michael Del Guidice and Presidents Edison O. Jackson of Medgar Evers and Raymond C. Bowen of LaGuardia. She announced that Chair Murphy had formed an Ad Hoc Committee on terms of office for presidents. Trustee Tam announced that the week of October 30th would commemorate the recent tragedy in China with programs on each campus. Following the regular meeting, Chancellor Joe Murphy announced the appointment of Michael Solomon as General Counsel and Acting Vice Chancellor for Legal Affairs and the retirements of President Lief (Lehman) effective August 31, 1989, and President Proshansky (Graduate School and University Center) effective July 31, 1991. Finally, the Chair announced the Board of Trustees Manhattan Borough Hearing on September 27th in the Blue Room at City Hall, and invited Senators and other interested faculty to attend.

IV. Report of the Chancellor. Chair Wedeen then introduced Chancellor Murphy. The Chancellor then began his report: I have a number of announcements to make and then I will answer your questions. We've gotten some flash enrollment figures on enrollment in the University. This year we will exceed 193,000 students -- a larger number of students than we've had in the University since the 1970's -- and all indicators are that enrollment will continue to grow at about 3% a year. Actually, this is the highest number of students enrolled since 1977. I will be circulating to the various colleges the enrollment breakdown and what the numbers are, and in what programs and so on. I would like also to, rather than read these two joint statements -- perhaps I will read the first paragraph of each -- and then ask it be submitted to the Secretary, -- these statements are a little long. They'll be in the minutes, so why don't I submit them. They are joint statements, in both cases, by Chair James P. Murphy, Chair of the Board of Trustees and Chancellor Joseph S. Murphy, City University of New York, and in both cases announcing retirements; In one case Harold Proshansky, President of the Graduate School and University Center, and in the other Leonard Lief, President of Herbert Lehman College in the Bronx since 1968; both with profound gratitude and appreciation for exemplary service to the college, the University, and the people of New York. And then it goes on, in each case, to recount the strides each institution made during the course of the stewardship of these two Presidents, both long-serving. I believe 21 years in the case of one and 17 in the other. There will be ample opportunity in both cases, I think, for the community to express to each their appreciation for many years of long service, and the procedures to be put in place for determining their successors will be described at some later date when Chair Murphy decides what they will be and who will serve on the committees. As you know, the Board bylaw provides a very clearly defined process for establishing search committees which involves faculty from this body, and undoubtedly the procedures of the Board will be followed. I should mention that in the case of President Lief who is retiring at the age of 65, there will be undoubtedly expressions of disapprobation expressed by some with regard to President Lief's future. He has been asked to serve as Director of the University Press. I know this is grating since the committee existed to recruit a director for the Press and that was put on a back burner because the tax levy dollars were unavailable to sustain a Press. I have been eager to have a

Press for some time. Fortunately, I think I reflect the desire of the vast majority of the people in the University who have felt the absence of the University Press, since virtually every university in the country has one. I felt even more vindicated on our collective behalf at reading an article in The New York Times Sunday, in the Book Review section, commenting about the fact that university presses, at a time when commercial presses refuse to publish manuscripts that are non-profit generating, have taken up the slack. However, I want to make something clear about this appointment. The appointment comes in the most embryonic days of the press. The appointment is for a three-year period, not to exceed a three-year period, and will be supported by soft monies rather than tax levy dollars. In consultation with the appropriate people, I determined that it will be an appropriate appointment to make at this time, and that I wouldn't be violating any procedures, at least grossly. For those who feel as though I've treaded on interests of theirs, I apologize. I think this is the best way to proceed at this time in establishment of the press. I believe also that President Lief is eminently qualified among the few in our system with administrative positions who have a genuine and serious academic background as most of you know who know him. He rose to the ranks of professor and provost before becoming a president, and was in fact professor of English at Hunter for a number of years. He knows a good deal about the business. This press as presently conceived will be an umbrella organization under which other presses will be organized, including the feminist press which is presently linked to the City University of New York, and I am hopeful that we are going to be able to establish a series of presses under the general label of City University of New York Press, not unlike to say Oxford Press which has a series of different presses, sometimes determined by subject matter -- or in the case of Harvard Press which has other presses. There will be, if this thing works right, ample opportunity for professional persons to find career opportunities in the press, and clearly there will be a successor to the founding director of the press as time goes on. No doubt, those of you who feel strongly about this will find this to be a flimsy explanation for what has occurred, and I apologize for that as well. If I could have offered something more than a flimsy explanation, clearly I would have done so.

With regard to another issue that I have not acted on yet, and I intend to: it has to do with the committee to be established for study procedures that would be appropriate to governing the establishment and disestablishment of departments. As we all recall, there are still unhealed wounds that go back to the events that occurred in the last two years, and there are strong feelings among faculty to which I'm about to try to respond, that unilateral and unhibited actions by administrative authorities in the University over the establishing and disestablishing of departments, without there being some clearly understood guidelines, may not be the best way to proceed. I will, therefore, ask within the next few weeks for the establishment of a committee consisting of, at the very least, a president, trustee, faculty member -- I don't appoint trustees, obviously, and this would require that the Chair of the Board do so -- and that such a group or committee would be established on an ad hoc basis to deal with this one issue, namely procedures appropriate to establishing and disestablishing departments.

This is an effort, obviously, to respond to those who have felt that the absence of such procedures hangs like a sword over the career aspirations, and perhaps even disciplinary identities, of those who might suffer from budgetary or other kinds of cutbacks in the future. As Professor Wedeen has indicated to me privately, dealing with this issue at a time when the University appears to be a fairly -- I don't even know what word to describe that we're not in a crisis. What's the word? Stable. What a remarkable condition to find oneself in. Perhaps this is as good a time as any to deal with the issue.

You will want to know that the Board unanimously approved a Five-Year Plan the other day. This may come as a surprise to some who believe five-year plans ought to be subject to wide discussion, but please recall that the Five-Year Plan we were obliged to produce in a relatively short period of time was a requirement put on us in July by the State Legislature in the Budget Bill which obliges us to submit to the State Legislature and the Division of the Budget of the Governor's office, a five-year plan for the University by October 2nd. The State University was obliged to provide the same document. They did not go for board approval, but have simply submitted a 5-year plan. We have shamelessly built on the 1988 plan, which is a public document which has been approved and gone through all the usual complicated procedures, and finally completed this document after several meetings of the Long-Range Planning Committee and representatives of this Body have deliberated with the Long-Range Planning Committee in the preparation of this Plan. It also requires that it receive the approval -- or at least that we consult with -- something called the Management Advisory Committee. This is a device, established by the Governor last year and put also in legislation in the budget bill, of seven or eight persons not associated with the University other than the fact that some of them are graduates who are presumed to have management ability, who would seek to encourage us and instruct us in management procedures that would enable us to save money or spend money in a more intelligent way. We put a list of people together, we thought, in a thoughtful way, and included people like Stephen Berger, Director of the Port Authority, Sandy Feldman, President of the Teacher's Union, Sam Ehrenhalt, who is the Commissioner of U.S. Labor Statistics. The Chair is Percy Sutton, former Borough President of Manhattan and presently in business. We did not, as some wag suggested, ask the President of the Texas Savings & Loan Association, or Lockheed, or any other major corporations with surplus management talent to join the group. This group will presumably have a look at the Plan as well on Monday -- which is the 2nd, I think -- and the Plan will be submitted on time.

We are pleased, as Professor Wedeen has indicated, that two new Board members, people of stature and known to people in this room who have paid attention to politics in New York State; Stanley Fink, former Speaker of the Assembly, has joined the Board of Trustees; and Michael Del Guidice, former Secretary to the Governor, has also joined the Board. These are two very powerful appointments. They join now, the most recent

appointment made in the Spring, Calvin Pressley who is head of The Mission Society -- Reverend Calvin Pressley -- who is also a powerful addition to the Board. We continue to have one vacancy which is supposed to go to a Staten Island resident who graduated from a community college -- that's the way the law reads. Now the resident of Staten Island need not be a graduate of Staten Island Community College, but has to be a graduate of a community college, presumably in the City University of New York. We're looking for one now, and we'll find one who fits the format and hopefully the Board will be brought up to full membership. It's a non-paying job.

I ought to say -- and all of this is obvious and probably doesn't need to be said -- but just let me mention this. Whenever the University directs its attention to one set of issues, there is some other set of issues to which it is not directing its attention. It seems as though we have little time this fall to pay attention to what everyone else in our town is -- namely transitions occurring as there are gradual shifts in power and influence in our town, and that is in the process of happening. I have personally discussed these with people before, have seen them coming for a long time -- I personally welcome them -- and I think these are changes that are important in the University and I think that they are welcome and that they will rejuvenate us in ways which will enhance the University and its future and its prospects. Obviously, this is going to show itself in the leadership of the various institutions within the University. Obviously, it is going to show itself in a lot of other ways as well. We are, as I look across this audience of familiar faces, an aging group, which can of course be said even of my daughter's kindergarten class. It's a truism. But the fact is that the faculty of the University is getting older -- we are getting older -- we are presumably charged as every faculty is with the task of starting to designate, train, educate, acculturate, and socialize the next generation of faculty. I hope that this will be one of the major areas of direction this body will take and that the University will take, understanding that -- quite to my surprise and without looking for the number -- today the City University of New York has 5% of the total number of black students attending college in America. That's an extraordinary number; 50,000 full-time black undergraduates in this University as opposed to a total of somewhat fewer than 1,000,000 nationwide attending the 3,000 colleges and universities in the United States. We are a very substantial producer of the next generation of minority scholars, children of immigrants of minorities of other people hitherto not brought into our ranks, and for me at any rate, this presents an extraordinary opportunity to renew ourselves in our professions and in our disciplines, and I hope that this will be, as I said, an area to which we will address our attention. Clearly the nature of the leadership the University in the future ought to be of a sort that believes that this is an important issue and uses the institution to enhance this goal. Having said that, I will mention only one or two or three other quick items. There was a groundbreaking ceremony for the College of Staten Island buildings last week. It did not rain; it was very hot; it was a very successful event. Everyone at Staten Island was there, I guess, and the Governor was warmly received by an audience which fully appreciated that the State was about

ready to invest some \$400 million in construction of the new campus. I mention this number because I want the record to show the real number of \$400 million. The Governor mentioned a quarter of a billion which is really \$250 million, which is \$150 million less than we're going to spend, but it is, I suspect, \$150 million more than he wants to, so he deliberately evaded the issue of the cost of what this enterprise will actually come to. On a serious note, it is being built, for those of you who know the history of Willowbrook, it is being built on the grounds of Willowbrook -- a place where there is a particularly unfortunate and painful history, and I suppose the symbolism of it all was not lost on most of the people who were there. The Governor was charming and eloquent and we hope committed to the real tab for the cost of this place. We have established a mechanism to raise funds for those who have suffered as a result of Hurricane Hugo, and there are people on individual campuses who will be coordinating that -- Bob Jefferson, University Dean for Student Affairs, is the city-wide coordinator -- and I hope that people will contribute. There is no reason why I should trouble you with trivial details -- for example, the first salvo in the annual budget fight has already been fired by the outgoing Mayor. He has argued that the Colliseum, for example, if not sold immediately will result in a loss in city revenues of about a little less than \$300 million, and that this will have a catastrophic effect on the city and so forth. I can assure you that this is just the beginning of a long and protracted budget season -- the kind we are all familiar with -- and I will not make comments on that at this time. This concludes my remarks and I will answer whatever questions anyone wants to raise.

Professor Cooper (History, College of Staten Island) - "You're probably unaware of the fact that I have served on two of your search committees, and on both of these search committees we have come to the end, that is my colleagues on the committee and I have spent hours reading vitae and interviewing people, and then we are dismissed, and you appoint somebody who was never involved in the original search, which makes me feel as though I've wasted a lot of time. The second one of the committees I've served on was looking for a director of the University Press, and we had at the end of our search some very interesting candidates. What are the affirmative action ramifications of the fact that all of these people applied for the job through public advertising, and that a short list was drawn up which we did not interview because of the budget consideration?" /Affirmative action guidelines provide that there are at least three different ways in which I am going to defend myself. The first is that it is a temporary appointment, a three-year appointment. Affirmative action guidelines allow for temporary appointments without the use of affirmative action processes. Secondly, they provide also for an exceptional circumstance in which a candidate of unusual ability presents themselves and justifies the appointment. Thirdly, it is a soft money appointment. I don't want to make light of the fact that good people were recruited -- I looked at the vitae, they were brought to me, they were all talked to at an earlier date, and we had to indicate to them that we did not have tax levy dollars available. There is a sense in which hiring people on soft money is a very precarious enterprise and I would have been reluctant to do that if it weren't for this particular occasion. We could not have used tax levy money. We've got someone taking the position for whom the long-term security and career issue doesn't arise,

and it seems as though this is not as awful as it might have appeared when you first looked at it. Professor Mineka (Math & Computer Science, Lehman) - "I would just like to comment, Chancellor Murphy, that I don't think you've read Dr. Lief's vita thoroughly because I think a year before he became President at Lehman he was an Assistant Professor. He has indeed had an unusual career. I do want to say that people at Lehman are a little bit in a state of shock because we really expected that the presidential appointment was like a cardinal -- for life -- and my question is, does this presage a change in the system? Is there going to be, for instance, a system whereby presidents are evaluated in the future under some sort of review? We would like to know, for instance, will, with our next president, we as faculty have to evaluate him/her or will somebody else evaluate them? Will there be any sort of annual review of presidential operations and so on?" /The ambiguities surrounding length of term, service and so forth on presidents is an ambiguity that the Board recognizes ought to be dealt with, and Chair Murphy has established a committee, and I can't recall offhand who has been asked to serve as chair. There is a committee. It is a Board committee and has been asked to examine procedures for determining tenure, compensation and so forth for presidents in the City University. This issue arises now for the first time ever for a variety of reasons. First there used to be, before changing the law, mandatory retirement age -- there was one culturally recognized and then there was one legally established, and then there was one legally removed for all categories of persons except tenured faculty and members at the age of 70. As you know, I'm one of the few people who continue to oppose that on the grounds that if it doesn't apply to anybody else it ought not to apply to faculty, and I continue to oppose that, and I think it's wrong for faculty with tenure to be singled out. And, in fact, even mandatory retirement age disappears, I believe, in 1993. Its extension was demanded by a lot of people and it's out the window, and it doesn't apply to the University. Since age is taken away as a consideration, some other criteria or basis for periodically re-examining the executives, senior executives, and so forth, presidents of the system had to be put in place. None has been. The issue, you will recall, in the 70's was that no one served more than 4-5 years in these jobs, nationally. I think the national average was about 4 years. It was relatively brief. The jobs were thankless and arduous, sometimes even dangerous. Certainly people with established reputations were not interested in these kinds of jobs, and that's when a lot of these appointments were made, including mine. As my colleagues at Queens will tell you, Murphy got the job because nobody else wanted it. Circumstances changed and the job is a little bit easier to have, a little more prestigious, more desirable. Then the University found itself without a system for dealing with it, and there is now an effort being made to put a system in place that is different than what we have. There are, at the very margins in every university and in every institution or college, constant shifts in the way in which power gets distributed -- usually boards, presidents, faculty, sometimes, and in some places, even students. I would say, across the country, the power has been shifting toward boards of trustees in many colleges and universities during the last ten years, and I'm not speaking just of the City University. This

has made, I believe, presidents more powerful in a lot of institutions. I don't believe this is a surprise to anybody. For me, the metaphor was the controller's strike and, from then on, power tended to become too centralized at the top in every aspect of life. Now it looks as though there is a bit of softening with that. Power is going to get redistributed in ways I can't predict and don't know. Clearly the way in which that is going to work out and, once again, it will be very much on the margins, will depend upon the effort and political energy of people involved and the degree to which they feel strongly enough and will act politically cleverly enough and powerfully enough and influentially enough in order to get a bigger piece of the pie. Professor Mineka further stated that - "I think from a faculty point of view there is also the issue of accountability rather than just a distribution of power -- concern that there is not enough accountability on the part of presidents to someone whether it's faculty or trustees or whoever."/Well, they are not separate, I guess. The issue of accountability, I think, has to do with who evaluates presidents. That's been an issue in this Body and in the University for a long time and I believe that's being addressed now by this Committee. Professor Muehlig (Business Administration, Medgar Evers) - "What is the status of the acquisition of the sanitation garage next to Medgar Evers and the accommodation of that space to classroom use?"/ It's not a lack of will, and I will attempt to report back at the next Plenary. Professor Manassah (Electrical Engineering, City) - "I understand that we were unsuccessful in getting a grant for a Center for Science and Engineering, although it wasn't because of lack of trying. My understanding was that the University did try to seek such a center and was turned down. Now could you bring us up-to-date on that? Do you plan to resubmit, and if you plan to resubmit, what do you see as the role of the faculty in terms of defining such a center in a way that probably could make it more fundable?"/ It is my intention to resubmit, and the processes are presently underway. It is impossible to submit a proposal without substantial faculty involvement, without the faculty essentially authoring the proposal. It is my understanding that we are in process of doing that. Professor Manassah - "Who is in the process of doing that?"/ I have seen paper and I can't tell you who is doing that. I know that I'm talking to both Presidents Harleston and LeClerc at City and Hunter, and have a meeting with them in the next seven or eight days in which they are going to fill me in as to their efforts to handle this. Professor Aaronson (Biology, Queens) - "Chancellor Murphy, could you comment on the status of the report of the working committee on Science and Technology? Is that going to be made public?"/ I just received it this past week. I started going through it. It looks like a very substantial and comprehensive document. I will read it for next class, I'll come back, and you'll examine me. Professor McCall (Compensatory Education, Baruch) - "I find that five percent figure you gave on black students in America, of all the black students in American universities, interesting. Can you tell me if we are also five percent of the faculty at City University, or are we a higher figure?"/ I have data on numbers of full-time black faculty by institution. I don't have it for the University off the top of my head,



but I will provide that. Professor McCall - "I have a related comment or question. I think it is good that we are having a conference on various campuses related to the situation that occurred in China over the summer. I also find it interesting that that was done without a study, without a commission, without a task force. Yet when there are equally, I think, outrageous incidents going on within the city, within the City University also, to wit the incident with Yousef Hawkins and four of the perpetrators of that incident were City University students, that, in fact, nothing is being done, or commented on this. I asked a similar question last year at this time in terms of what was happening at the University on racism. You told me there was a Task Force on Pluralism. So can you at least tell me what the actions are going to be in relation to racism?"/ There is a document that has been produced since you asked me that question. There has been a commission on pluralism in the University. It was an attempt to collect all the efforts made by all the individual colleges and compile them in a single document. Among the different recommendations that are made in that document there is one that has to do with curriculum, and that may be one that you have some particular interest in. I'll certainly provide you with both pieces of information if the Secretary would be so kind as to tell how to do that so I can get them to you. Professor Broido (Chemistry, Graduate School) - "As a member of the Vice Chancellor's Task Force on Science, Engineering, Technology and Mathematics, to follow up on the question the one before last, can your remarks be interpreted as meaning that it will be at least a month until any decision as to the disposition of that report will be made? In other words, should we interpret your remarks as saying it will be at least a month before you read that before" -- The Chancellor interjected -- /Oh, I see, because you meet monthly? Professor Broido continued - "What is really going to happen to that on a more timely basis if you could answer that? Or what time scale do you see for your reaction to that report?"/ I will respond to the questions that you ask to the Executive Committee at the next meeting which should be a week hence. Is that right? [Chair Wedeen responded no, and the correct date is given two weeks hence.] See, I was ready to come to class even sooner. [The Chancellor returns comments to Professor Broido.] Then by October 10th. Professor Mohamed Yousef (Mechanical Technology, College of Staten Island) - "First of all, I just want to note for the record that your attendance at our function and your remarks, which were very eloquent and very well received, were equal to the Governor's, and I was really glad to see you there with us on Staten Island. Now having said that, there is a question that has been in mind for a while and I am glad Professor Cooper brought it up in some fashion; namely the question of the appointment of President Lief to that Press position. Now, your answers, and I'm not suggesting that it is your intent or your philosophy, but it seems to be an example, if you will, to the entire City University system to look for loopholes to avoid affirmative action. For example, the Chancellor's Report coming out of my college may have something like 26 out of 28 appointments being substitute lines, and a nice asterisk down there saying no affirmative action because these are substitute appointments. Now, one wonders really, whether this idea of finding every possible, if you will, exception to the rule now is to be our rule. Now, I say that to you because I have access to, as you

probably know, to other chancellors reports from other units, and when I examine them in general it seems to be a very high percentage of these are so called substitute appointments. I am not suggesting that the faculties involved with the deans and the presidents and so forth are all avoiding affirmative action. All I'm suggesting is that it looks like there is no real serious attempt to really put in place people with a view that affirmative action is something to actually follow rather than those who say -- well, there is here soft money so it is not really under affirmative action. I think I express myself enough for you to perhaps answer, and if you like to get some statistics, I'll be happy to share some of your reports with you about what the percentages are."/ If the comment is directed toward the policy of affirmative action and the University's efforts to implement affirmative action policy, and that this particular action with regard to the University Press is a bad signal to send because it reflects artfulness rather than sincerity, I apologize for that. It seems that one can do nine virtuous things and one awful one, and it is the one awful one, of course, that one is reminded of. That may be the case in this instance. I don't mean it with regard to the particular instance, but with regard to the metaphorical meaning you were conveying. I guess I really want to say two things. First, I don't know how to be more committed to affirmative action. I don't believe that the particular example that you make reference to with regard to substitute appointments is as severe a criticism as you can make of both the process or the administration of the institution with regard to that. Professor Yousef added - "I prefer milder criticisms myself, usually."/ I understand that, and I think it might have been a weak case for you to have made. There are stronger cases to be made. Professor Yousef noted - "Fine, I'll be happy to have you make the stronger cases."/ The strongest case, and you know it, is what's the outcome and has the University succeeded? If you look at the numbers of women, blacks, Hispanics, and other covered groups in the last five years, then you begin to appreciate that the University has made substantial strides in affirmative action, but the base of faculty is very large and the number of changes relatively small. The result is that the base changes. The overall numbers in a faculty don't look very impressive at all, and they don't, but if you look at what we have achieved in a relatively short period of time, it is easy to anticipate that in a long run, and in not that all a long run, there will be major changes in the way in which our faculties are constituted. Incidentally, some of this is the result of good will and real affirmative action, where people are, in fact, determined because of moral commitment or an ideological commitment or a political commitment to advance affirmative action as the right, just, moral, correct thing to do. Some is because people have been forced into that kind of situation. Some is despite resistance to it and a lot of affirmative action that ought to have occurred doesn't occur because there are successful resistances to it. There are lots of things that can go on to the extent that one is able, and I'm not about to make all kinds of assessments about one or another peoples sincerity about affirmative action. But if one looks at what we have done in the last five years in the University, it is clear that affirmative action has brought about substantial changes in the University's constitution. It fails in certain

categories but, if you look at what we have accomplished, it is very little and that is because the Ph.D. production is so low. One of the things that we ought to be really dedicating our energy to is the fact that within our University we graduate 20,000 people a year and we've got lots of undergraduate talent coming out of this University, and we are not successfully recruiting them into our Ph.D. programs. Consequently, we are not building the kind of farm teams necessary to make our major league faculty look more representative and more reflective of what affirmative action would require of us. We have got to address that. We will have to overcome resistance to it. This is the policy of the University. It is in the law. The law reads that the justification for having a separate University system apart from the State University of New York in New York City is to advance the principles of affirmative action. There is no question as to the importance of it. I regret that it even comes up as an issue because we ought to take it for granted, but if it isn't working, and it is a problem, and it is going to continue to be until we begin to produce more people who can join us, which is the way I started my comments tonight. The second comment I want to make, you know for better or for worse, people have served in this institution for long periods of time. I am referring now to presidents who have been, some of them, in office for long periods of time. They have given whatever it is they have had to give. I have always been intrigued by the remark, when someone says, 'I have given him or I have given her the best years of my life.' I always wonder what was the other partner doing. Holding back the best years of their lives? Everybody is living this life together. We all are together in this and we ought to take into account our brothers and sisters who have done administrative jobs; jobs that are properly objects of contempt. I mean, I understand your contempt for administrators. Professor Yousef commented - "I do not have any contempt for you."/ I want to have a record somehow that the University has been, in my view, well served by a number of very conscientious, hard working, dedicated, sincere men and women who have taken jobs of this sort that we have described as presidents and other senior administrative positions. There will come moments, rare moments, when we will have an opportunity to say something kind about them and I hope we will take advantage of those moments. Professor Yousef - "One comment is that it is not coincidental that when you look at those very high percentages, those appointees are not members of minorities or women. In other words, if they were, then they would not have mentioned they were substitute appointments. My suggestion to you -- and I appreciate your candor in answering Professor Cooper's question. That kind of comment, I guess, a vice president at the college, or a dean, or whatever, or a president would say, 'well, okay, maybe I'll just say I'm sorry. I'll just do it.' I think that the University is making tremendous strides and I am very happy about, in all sincerity, the women, but I don't think we're making similar progress for blacks or Hispanics. I don't happen to be fortunate enough to be one of them or either of them, but I am just saying that I think there is a tendency to move it slower than it should, given the nature of New York City. That's all I'm suggesting."/ I think you're right. Professor Caudle (Psychology, College of Staten Island) - "My question concerns articulation. You touched on this issue when you mentioned the importance of recruiting our own students

into our graduate programs which is certainly part of being a University. During the past several years, University-wide task forces in the academic disciplines have submitted recommendations to address issues on articulation among the units of CUNY. I was involved in this as co-chair of Psychology Task Force. To-date, as far as I can tell, very little action has been taken to implement any of these recommendations. Could you bring us up-to-date on the current status of the articulation efforts and whatever actions are being taken with regard to those task force reports?"/ The Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs just brought the issue to the attention of the Council of Presidents. We have had a discussion on the subject of re-examining, once again, the language defining the policy, examining some of the problems various task forces have brought to our attention, and also whether or not some of the language is ambiguous, and whether there might need to be clarification. I believe that is presently under discussion and that there will be some action taken. Professor Caudle added - "I would just like to remind you that those task forces do stand ready and willing to work with the Chancellor and with 80th Street in working out ways to implement a recommendation. We will be happy to continue the process of working with you."/ Articulation will remain, obviously, and ongoing concern requiring continual review of our practices of comparability in terms of classes, credits and institutional offerings. We have to do that. Articulation is in the law. We have to pursue it, both because it is required by the law and also because it is required if we were to have this one single unitarian entity called the University. You may be sure that any enterprise that inhibits articulation, or anything that gets in the way, has to be removed. Professor Caudle - "Thank you." Professor Gerber (English, Brooklyn) - "It is not that I am dismissing the issue of affirmative action; I serve on the Faculty Senate Affirmative Action Committee, but it seems to me that underlying some of the changes that we are seeing is really a golden parachute. At a time when the City University is seeing tremendous budgetary constraints, when we are discussing the lack of new faculty to reinvigorate the curriculum and the energy level at the University, it would seem that a considerable sum of money is being expended upon people who would normally reach their retirement and in any other situation would simply retire the way faculty retire. I mean they would even have travel leave, but not two or three year appointments so that not only are they getting increased salaries for the remaining year, but then, of course, the pensions are a corollary of that. My question to you is, is this management committee that was supposed to be supervising our way of managing ourselves, is this one of the issues they are going to be looking at?"/ Yes. Professor Speidel (Geology, Queens) - "Chancellor Murphy, you do yourself a great disservice. There are many of us, well some of us, well a few of us, who felt that you were superbly qualified to be president of Queens College."/ I have to think about that. Professor Speidel - "I guess I have a concern that I have voiced several times within your administration and I see it happening again. I think it is truly ironic that you raise this question about graduate recruitment, and specifically within graduate education within the sciences. Certainly leaving aside some of the rather bad publicity that has occurred within the last couple of months between you and President Proshansky with

regard to the Graduate School, I think that some of the concerns I have can be expressed fairly quickly. You say that you are very much in favor of graduate education. Indeed, I think that it was two years ago, if not three years ago, that graduate education was the number one priority put together in your budget. Unfortunately, when it comes down to what is finally present in money, the things that are cut are those that would go to deal with the infrastructure, the repairs, the equipment, the supply money, the OTPS money, because you have always been very consistent that OTPS money goes before people money. Secondly, the money that is used specifically for graduate fellows; you have always been very explicit that part-time people go before full-time people. The two things when added together -- the fact that what we are focusing on within the sciences, and I would hesitate to speak about the other disciplines, but certainly within the sciences the combination of starving it, of not replacing technical people, of not putting in money for laboratories, for equipment, for all sorts of different things and not providing specifically money for graduate students -- means that, in effect, your statement that we should move forward and do all of this graduate recruitment and be as good as we can is really a meaningless statement."/ Well, Professor Speidel, I don't know whether there is a question, but there are two statements you made of equal truth value. First, I have never engaged publicly with any president, and there has not been suggestion that I have and I have not. Consequentially, any reference to any public debate with a president, any president, is false. The second proposition -- it is true that the tendency of particular institutions has been to cut OTPS before people. I am sure everybody in the room probably appreciates that decision as the University has made it over the years. The commitment to graduate education is best witnessed by the numbers of dollars that have been allocated for graduate education. You're quite right when you say it was a number one priority. You neglected to point out that lots of lines, dollars, fellowships, and so forth, were in fact allocated to institutions when the dollars were forthcoming. It wasn't as though we misspent it or spent it someplace else. We gave it to the institutions for the purposes intended. The best evidence that the University's activity in the sciences is not the awful kind of condition that you describe, but in the degree to which the Research Foundation has been flourishing, the percentage of its revenues that are used for serious research, and the amounts of money some institutions and some faculty have been able to generate to do their research. I believe that at many institutions in the country the vast bulk of the research that is done in the sciences is with dollars that have been generated in that fashion. Some progress has been made on that front, at least in two areas. If the question, were you to have asked it is, is it sufficient? Well, you know the answer as well as I do. It is never enough. It is never enough in the sciences. Are we paying as much attention as perhaps we ought to in trying to get more? Some questions were raised about how well we do in getting State dollars. Not as well as we ought to have done. Will there be other opportunities to correct that? There are constant opportunities, but our growth in the sciences, as you know, is very much a function of the success and ability of faculty to be able to manage to generate the dollars necessary to do the research they do. Lots of faculty in our University do that. Professor Baumrin (Philosophy, Graduate School) -

"I ran into Professor Sohmer on the north wall and he said he wasn't coming, and he asked me to ask a series of questions, most of which I forgot. I remember one of them. The ones I forgot were tough -- they were about buildings and grounds and all sorts of things, profligate spending of State tax money. You mentioned, and he mentioned, that there was an increase in enrollment; an unanticipated increase in enrollment. As you probably know, a great many sections were not run this semester because we let go adjunct faculty and other individuals who teach for us in order to make up for the budget shortfall, and the way he put his question was, which I didn't think was the best way of putting it, what were you intending to do about funding Shakespeare 2 in the spring semester, given the fact that there are a number of people who didn't get into Shakespeare 1 in the first semester and there won't be any sections in the second semester. There is a problem about the fact that a lot of the money was allocated to the first semester and because of the usual fall-off, we have more students and we are likely to have more students the second semester. What about an interim increase in funding?"/ Bernie Sohmer actually asked a question in which he made reference to Shakespeare? We're hoping that our agreement with the State which had to do with disposition of surplus fees, that is to say fees not budgeted but anticipated as a result of over-enrollment, might be available, so there might be some monies available during the course of the budget year that we hadn't anticipated and that we can use for those purposes. That's the specific answer to the specific question. Now, give that answer to Bernie, and if he doesn't like it, send him back to me. Professor Stroup (Philosophy, John Jay) - "You've told us that you're a strong defender of affirmative action and we know also that you're a strong defender of political democracy, so I wonder what you think of a proposal to have affirmative action officers at colleges elected by their appropriate constituencies -- that is so-called protected groups rather appointed by the presidents?"/ I hadn't thought about it. I guess I have to. I wouldn't know how to answer that off the top of my head without giving it some thought. It's not an obvious answer. The answer is harder than the asking of the question. For example, influence on campus, or whatever. Professor Trefousse (History, Brooklyn) - "Chancellor Murphy, you just said you never had an engagement or something like that with any of the presidents. Would you be so kind therefore to give us the background of the recent article in The New York Times concerning the alleged controversy between you and President Proshansky?"/ I think it was a completely unfortunate depiction of a dispute. I consider that the article was wrong. The article, if you read it carefully, attributed nothing to me, and that I said nothing of any consequence. In fact, I had no discussion whatever, nor did any of my principals, with the reporter. The reporter made a story up on the basis of the statements he got from all kinds of people; but not from me. Professor Broido (Chemistry, Graduate School) - "I hate to follow up again on this, but I'd like to say that while I appreciate that there has been a growth of the research potential in the sciences as reflected in the monies that the sciences are bringing into the Research Foundation, those monies in no way reflect the state of science in the University. Just because more money is

coming in does not mean our research capabilities are wonderful, by any means. I also would like to point out that it's wrong to link the state of science solely to research capabilities, and I do think that the full state of science in the University is amply discussed in the Task Force Report alluded to earlier."/ I look forward to it with all the greater eagerness.

Chair Wedeen thanked the Chancellor.

V. Reports of Faculty Members of Board of Trustees' Committees. Chair Wedeen noted that written copies of the reports were available in the back of the room and that the members were available for questions.

VI. Proposed Resolution on Chinese Students. Professor Picken (Romance Languages, Queens) presented the proposed resolution for the Executive Committee which was seconded. Professor Kaplan (Biology, Queens) commended the Executive Committee on the resolution and moved to add a Resolved which would indicate the individuals/organizations to receive copies of the resolution. After discussion, the amendment passed. Professor Speidel (Earth & Environ. Science, Queens) then moved to delete the first Resolved. The amendment was seconded. Substantial discussion then followed focusing on the meaning of the Resolved which might call for Chinese students currently in the United States to return to China and a sense that contacts should never be fully broken off. After the question was called, the motion to delete was approved. Professor Bohigian (Mathematics, John Jay) then moved that the words "area of" be put in front of "Tiananmen Square" for greater accuracy. The motion was seconded. After debate, Professor Davidson (Computer Info. Services, LaGuardia) moved to close the debate on all items before the House. The motion was seconded and carried. Professor Bohigian's amendment was then defeated. The Resolution as amended was then passed without dissent.

VII. Proposed Resolution on the Executive Compensation Plan. Professor Cooper (History, College of Staten Island) presented the proposed resolution for the Executive Committee which was then seconded. She noted that the proposed resolution built upon the October 1987 Resolution which was attached. Senators noted that the explanation did not mesh with the Resolves and that the explanation might be turned into Whereases. Professor Parkhurst (Speech, Brooklyn) moved to split the motion into three parts, one for each Resolved. The motion was seconded and, after debate, failed. Professor Bohigian moved that 50 percent of all administrative lines at the colleges and in the central administration be returned to the classroom. The amendment was seconded. Professor Danziger (English, Hunter) moved to return the proposed resolution to the Executive Committee. The motion was seconded. Professor Davidson moved to close debate on all issues before the House. The motion was seconded and failed. The question was called on the motion to recommit and the motion carried.

VIII. Nominations and Election of UFS Standing Committees, 1989-90. Chair Wedeen noted the addition of Professor Caudle (Psychology, College of Staten Island) to the Academic Policy slate. The slate was moved, seconded, and approved.

IX. New Business. Professor Danziger brought to the attention of the Senate a recent mailing from the Academy for the Humanities and Sciences, and invited colleagues to support the program through joining the Academy and attending upcoming events. Professor Muzio (Biological Science, Kingsborough Community) commented on the inadequacy of arrangements at the Graduate Center and requested that the Executive Committee pursue the issue. Chair Wedeen noted that the Executive Committee was very concerned and that steps were being taken to remedy the situation. Professor Frisz (Student Personnel, Queens) questioned how a debate was conducted from the floor and suggested that Senators form a line at the mike to be recognized. Chair Wedeen noted that the Vice Chair kept a list of Senators to be recognized which served the same function as queuing at the mike.

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 9:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Bruce Hoffacker  
Acting Executive Director