

SUBJECT TO SENATE APPROVAL

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

January 30, 1990

Chair Wedeen, called the session to order at 7:10 p.m. in Room 1700A of the Graduate School and University Center. Present were Senators Allaire, Barbanel, Baxter, Berkowitz, Bohigian, Brady Brenner, Bronars, Brooks, Brugnola, Buianouckas, Carro-Kowalczyk, Cooper, Danziger, Davidson, Davis E., Davis R., Donleavy, Donoghue, Eisenberg, Frisz, Gerber, Greenbaum, Gura, Hill, Hough, Jaffe, Kaplan, Kaufman, Knoop, Koepfer, Lidov, Lundeen, Magnus, Manassah, Mandel, Markoe, Matthews, McCall, McCullers, Moore, Muehlig, Otte, Picken, Plissner, Riedler-Berger, Schuyler, Sherrill, Sohmer, Speidel, Stern, Stroup, Trefousse, Umolu, Vogt, Weiss, Westrem, Yousef, Zades, Zaneteas, Zinberg and Alternate Senators Andres, Immergut, Meier, and Svitak. Senators Baumrin, Broido, Grossman, MacLennan, Parkhurst, Selvadurai, Simor, and Washburn were excused. Heads of Faculty Governance Bodies Brauch, Chabora, Frisz, Gura, Sohmer, and Zades also attended. Vice Chancellor for Faculty and Staff Relations Ira Bloom attended as well. Acting Executive Director Hoffacker and Administrative Assistant Pasela also attended.

I. Approval of the Proposed Tentative Agenda: Chair Wedeen asked for a motion to adopt the proposed tentative Agenda. The motion was made, seconded and adopted.

Chair Wedeen then introduced Professor Karen Markoe, Chair of the SUNY Faculty Senate, who was in attendance and requested that she address the Senate later in the session.

II. & III. Approval of the Minutes of the 177th and 178th Plenary Sessions (November 21, 1989 and December 12, 1989): Chair Wedeen asked for a motion to accept the minutes. The motion made and seconded. A question was raised regarding the November 21, 1989, resolution on Administrative Search Procedures. Chair Wedeen agreed to make sure the language reflects the Plenary deliberations. The motion to accept the minutes was approved.

IV. Report of the Chair: Chair Wedeen noted that the majority of her report was available in writing but she wished to report on four additional items which occurred too late for inclusion.

First, at the Hunter College Commencement on Monday, January 29, 1990, an honorary degree was awarded to Dr. Johnetta Cole, President of Spelman College. President Cole is the first such honorary degree recipient nominated by the University Faculty Senate and she was keenly aware of the particular nature of the honor.

Secondly, Chair Wedeen reported on the monthly Board of Trustees' Public Hearing. The single speaker raised the issue of the proposed increase in the repayment provision from \$25,000 to \$75,000 for students in the Sophie Davis medical program who do not meet their two-year public service commitment.

The Board of Trustees meeting on Monday, January 29, 1990, also included discussion of the Sophie Davis program with some Trustees arguing that there were more effective and equitable ways to insure that students meet their obligations. The motion passed on a split vote. The other item which generated discussion was the Lehman/Japan Exchange program which will offer Lehman courses, all taught in English, in Japan, leading to Lehman degrees. No CUNY funds will be used to support the program. Some Trustees raised questions about the accelerated consideration that the program has received. They were informed that the Japanese semester, which begins in April, necessitates action at this time. The program was approved. All other items were passed and the Reports of Faculty Members of Board of Trustees' Committees, available in writing, provide the highlights.

Chair Wedeen then brought the Senate up-to-date on the status of the "F" grade proposal. She noted the letter that had been sent to all campus governance heads, with copies to Senators, reporting on the last meeting of the Board's Academic Policy, Program and Research Committee. However, there is confusion within the Committee as to what is to be presented for review by constituent groups; a single proposal or five options. Since there has been a delay in making the document available, Chair Wedeen has informed the Chair of the Academic Policy Committee that she will request an extension beyond the March 30th deadline previously set, if necessary. The Chair recommended that campus governance bodies begin discussions on the issue in advance of any approved text.

Professor Frisz (Student Personnel, Queens) -- "In terms of what you just told us, I agree that the governing bodies at the individual colleges certainly can't work in a vacuum. Although we have a general idea, it certainly would help to have the specifics that are coming out from the committee, both to respond to them and to come up with proposals. Would it help for this body to pass a resolution requesting an extension?"/ I certainly will honor whatever this body feels. I don't think it will be a problem because I did already mention this to the Chair of the Committee and told her that I will be asking for an extension equivalent to the time denied us.

Professor Speidel (Earth & Environmental Science, Queens) -- "One of things that bothers me is that we have what 20 units within the City University and I'll bet you we have 20 different ways of dealing with F's. And I'll bet you the Board doesn't have the slightest idea what those different ways are. For example, for freshman at Queens College, you do not get an "F", you get an N/C, which is No Credit. This does not affect GPA and does what they are trying to do. One of things that really bothers me about this is that no where have we heard what it is the Board sees as a problem. What is it that they are concerned about? I would be willing to bet also that there are at least half a dozen institutions that have already thought of this and come up with a solution. May I make the suggestion that, because you are a member of this particular Board Committee, it would be appropriate to ask the staff of the Committee to get what is being done, how it is being handled, what the different options are, and why is it necessary for all of us to be peas in a pod?"/ Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Reid-Wallace and her office have put together a document which does attempt to address what you're saying. They do point out some of the differences within the City University. They

do summarize in that two page document what some of the prevalent practices are throughout the country. The staff has attempted to research this as best it could. So when you get the document you have this with it. Professor Sohmer (Mathematics, City) -- "I am not sure I understand why the discussion is taking this form. As a faculty we should take the position that it is inappropriate for the Board to even be considering this. Instead of waiting for what they will present us as options and then we may choose -- I am uninterested in having a mugger offer me shall it be in the belly button or shall it be in the head, I would like to tell him I don't want it either way - it is inappropriate for the Trustees to get down to this kind of detail and usurp the prerogatives of the faculty. They may tell the faculty that they have the attitude that things are not right and what would you like us to do, but it is absolutely lunatic for a Board of Trustees to fiddle with the kind of detail at the campuses which they obviously have every intention of doing. It seems to me a resolution of this body is; 'you shouldn't be doing it at all,' not we prefer option A."/ I can only tell you the part that I have played in this. The argument that Bernie gave you was given by me at great length in the Committee, and I think some of you who have worked with me before know my stand on faculty prerogatives. The Board has a statement from the Vice Chancellor for Legal Affairs that it is within its right and purview to take this action. I explained, as we had in the past, that even if they have the legal right to do it that it was not the way faculty interpreted collegial governance, that faculty would not be mandated and could not be mandated in these areas, that I would go right down the line in objecting it and so would we all, and not on the basis of content. However, I still feel although we may proceed to that resolution ultimately, we may not wish to do it at this point. Also, the letter you received from me said to forward your responses to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, to the Chair of the Committee, and to the Senate Office. At that point we will be, I think, in a somewhat better and stronger position to say what the faculty's feelings really are because then we will have the responses of 18 or 20 campuses as to what is believed to be appropriate on each campus. And so when the Senate takes a stand, it will be a wider stand. Professor Manassah (Engineering, City) -- "Do I understand Professor Sohmer as having made a motion? If you did, I would like to second it." Bernie will you give us your motion? Professor Sohmer -- "The University Faculty Senate of the City University of New York maintains that grading practices for purposes of retention, graduation, and continuation are a prerogative of the faculty which teaches the courses and which recommends for degrees. Therefore, the Board of Trustees may inquire as to practices but should under no circumstances legislate practice. They may legislate general policy." Professor Manassah seconds the motion. Professor Bronars (Elementary Education, Queens) -- "I don't know if there is going to be any opposition but I strongly favor the motion because we have been nibbled at over the past two years that I have been involved in the Senate and we haven't fought. We haven't taken a stand. We have bowed our heads and submitted to all these illegal, or if not illegal in a strict sense, untraditional invasions of faculty prerogative, so I urge a yes vote."/ Any other commentary? Professor Greenbaum (History, Queensborough) -- "I was suppose to introduce a resolution on the "F" grade until the Executive Committee decided it was not going to be introduced at this time. I have a little trouble with the resolution as it is phrased because it speaks about the possibility of the Board setting policy. They can define policy anyway they want and then call whatever resolution they come up with a change in policy. I don't recall exactly the way it was phrased but, I do think that the latter part of that should be eliminated."/ May I take the prerogative of the Chair now and say the reason that the Executive Committee, a majority of the Executive Committee, decided not to go forward with a

resolution at this time is that we did not have a document to have a resolution about. Therefore we felt it was appropriate to keep the body as informed as possible but not jump the gun. There was mixed opinion on that point. Professor Greenbaum -- "The very fact that they are considering this is improper and it is that consideration that we should be opposing. They really have no power..." / Professor Frisz -- "I would like to move that we postpone acting on this motion until the next meeting of the Senate. I would like it to be written in such a way that it is strong, that it has a good sense of the body, that we know what we want to say, that all members can read it. I don't think it is going to make a difference if we do it at the February meeting because this is not going to be acted on prior to March anyway and I am never very comfortable when these kinds of important motions are written on the floor without the document being available. So I move for postponement and I hope there is a second to it." / The motion is seconded. Do we have discussion on the motion to postpone? Professor Sherill (Political Science, Hunter) -- "It seems to me that we have a choice between two motions. One is a motion which basically says how dare you do such a thing and the other is motion that says don't you dare do such a thing. It seems to me that we are a hell of a lot better off acting first rather than second." / We have a motion before us to postpone. All those in favor of postponing the motion, those opposed? The motion to postpone is carried.

Are there any other comments or questions? Professor Cooper (History, Staten Island) -- "I want to backtrack to the report you made about Lehman College's program in Japan with a question and a comment. You said that some Board members were distressed that this program was put through so fast. I wonder if any faculty at Lehman were aware of the fact that this thing was being developed during the time it was being developed? Secondly, who is giving the degree? Is it Lehman? Lehman is giving a degree to students it never sees in another country with faculty it has never hired?" / I could not give you any of the particulars as to the document that was worked out because apparently not everything is even worked out even at this point. Let me call on Vice Chancellor Bloom who is aware of the particulars of the program. Vice Chancellor Ira Bloom -- "The concept is that the program in Japan will be taught by Lehman faculty or faculty appointed by the various personnel and budget committees of Lehman College. The courses will be the equivalent of regular Lehman courses and the regular Lehman curriculum. The recommendations for retention, progress and graduation will be made by the faculty of Lehman College based upon its assessment of student progress. There are, in fact, 15 or so Lehman faculty who are signed up, as I understand, to begin the program when it starts in April and there seems a fair amount of enthusiasm among the Lehman faculty for the program." / Any other comments or questions? Professor Gura (Speech, Brooklyn) -- "I was curious whether, with respect to the Lehman program, the Lehman governance body ever approved the offering of this program?" / Not that I know of. Professor Gura added -- "Well, we have members of the Lehman College faculty here. Could they tell us whether in fact they did that?" Professor Westrem (English, Lehman) -- "I know of no faculty committee or organization that approved the program and the first that I as a faculty member at Lehman knew about the program was a couple of months ago, this was just before the winter break, when a general questionnaire was circulated to determine who was interested in joining a program and going to Japan for next academic year." Professor Donleavy (Special Services in Education, Lehman) -- "I confirm what Professor Westrem has said. I have no knowledge of it and I didn't even get the form to fill out because I would love to go to Japan." Professor Cooper -- "The reason I raised the question is that I happen to be aware, by accident, of several overseas programs which have been arranged by college administrators which are giving credit from the

college where the President or the Dean sign the contracts. There seems to be some kind of transfer of funds. I have yet to understand that part of it at all, but it appears to have nothing to do with the faculty. The courses are usually courses which are listed in your college, taught by your home college faculty, and were I an outside evaluator stumbling across this I would at least ask questions. It simply does not look clean. It may be. No faculty ever seems to know what is going on. Some do. There are always a few faculty that do know somehow, but in general, the governing bodies, those involved in such silly things as curriculum committees or those of us who have in fact taught overseas and know a little bit about teaching and living overseas, always seem to be bypassed in these processes. There are several national organizations in this country which seem to sponsor American-type colleges abroad in remote and exotic locations and I am not entirely sure how the financing of all of this works except that I notice that the colleges which have signed up for these programs have presidents who take round the world trips at least twice a year. There seems to be a curious correlation between these degree granting programs and globe-trotting CUNY administrators." Professor Berkowitz (Chemistry, Graduate School) -- "Referring to the 'F' grade, there are two subjects. One is the power of the Board to mandate changes in programs or to make changes in transcripts. The other is the sentiments of the academic Senate vis-a-vis the removal of F's from transcripts. We have addressed the first problem. We have not addressed the second. If, perhaps, the Board were to take the stance that they are legally capable of dictating transcript practices, then we are left flapping our wings with no result. It seems to me that the Executive Committee should also consider ways and means of expressing the sentiments of the University Faculty Senate, whatever they may be; hopefully negative vis-a-vis removal of F's from transcripts."/ Just by way of explanation for some members here who may be newer to the Senate than others. A similar question as Board prerogative, Board rights, and faculty areas of concern and mandating to faculty came up about three years ago as to the possibility of some departments not having the right to offer certain degrees. I think we came out a lot stronger and, in a way, much more collegial by the time the process had gone through the various stages. We asked for legal counsel or legal opinion from the Vice Chancellor on this. The legal opinion came out the same -- the Board has right to do almost anything. The question therefore never is whether the Board has the right to do it by Bylaw, but whether a Board should do it. Is the Board in a position, or should they be in a position, to mandate to faculty in those areas which the faculty deem closest and most significant to their own lives? In the previous case, the final decision of the Board, which was a change in opinion, was that they would strongly urge the faculty, but the mandate was removed. Some of us saw the "F" grade issue proceeding in a similar manner and that is why we felt, most of us felt, it was not time to jump now. As to the content of the issue, I know I separated the two. Specifically, the option of having the "F" grade expunged is no longer an option because according to the regulations from the registrars, you are not allowed to remove a grade. You cannot expunge a grade from a legal document.

IX. New Business: New York City Technical College Nursing Program: At this point, Professor Lundeen (Nursing, City) requested a Special Order of Business to discuss the change in grading standards for Nursing students at New York City Technical College. The order was approved.

Professor Lundeen reported that, due to the large number of Nursing students who had failed courses, faculty had lowered the pass grade from 75 to 70. However, the action was reportedly taken only after bullying and

harassment of faculty. A motion was made, seconded, and passed to have the Executive Committee investigate the issue and report back at the next Plenary.

VI. Chancellor's Report: Chair Wedeen reported that Chancellor Murphy was unable to attend the meeting but that he had entrusted Vice Chancellor Ira Bloom with his report. She then introduced Vice Chancellor Bloom.

The Vice Chancellor reported that University officials had met with Mayor Dinkins and the Deputy Mayors to discuss the community college budget. The proposed cut for 1990-91 of \$17.6 million has been reduced to \$12 million and reduced again to \$9 million. At this point, there is support from the City for early retirement. The new administration appears very supportive of the University. The University is also working to insure that all State aid increases are passed through and City percentage reductions are made on a base of City funding only. As to the State budget, the Governor's proposal is in the 30 day amendment period. A major outstanding issue is the State's desire to shift financial responsibility for A.A. degree programs at John Jay and New York City Technical College to the City. The University has taken the position that such a shift would be inconsistent with principles adopted by all parties in 1979. The University is also working to overturn programmatic cuts at City College in worker education, the Sophie Davis Medical School and engineering equipment purchases. Shifting the John Jay lease and restoration of legislative initiatives are also being discussed. In summary, the University's position is not bad.

Professor Brooks (French, Graduate School) -- "You made reference to the early retirement proposal. Could you give us some details about that?"/Yes. The Governor's Executive Budget includes a provision supporting the first year, 3.2 million dollar cost of the retirement incentive initiative and this is a significant boost to the prospects of the program. It does, and I have to say this as a matter of caution, have a long way to go. A program bill is submitted by the Governor to the Legislature. It has to be adopted by the Legislature and various things can happen in the course of its travels. The University is pushing very hard for it and I think it has passed a significant first hurdle by being funded in the Governor's Executive Budget proposal. Professor Manassah (Engineering, City) -- "You mentioned that there were some cuts in the Executive Budget that pertain to City. What was the total University cut in the Executive Budget and what percentage of the total does the City cut represent?"/I can't tell you that off hand, but the City College cuts, except for the engineering equipment cut which was \$375,000, affect discrete programs within the college: the Worker Education program; the Sophie Davis Program; and the developing City University Medical School. The major parts of the City cuts were associated with those programs not with the college in general.

Professor Wedeen/ I will request that all future questions pertaining to the budget be held for the next meeting. At that point we will have Vice Chancellor Vivona here for the specific purpose of discussing the budget. Professor Donleavy (Special Services in Education, Lehman) -- "In the Five Year Plan it states under the heading Pluralism and Diversity, [Executive Summary page ix] 'The ethnic and racial diversity of the University is a source of pride and a challenge. During the next five years, the University plans a number of activities ranging from the review of the curriculum in relation to issues of race and gender to redouble efforts regarding affirmative action.' I would appreciate any information you have about plans that might be in place for this and what relationship your office would have

to affirmative action?"/That is what I intend to talk about later. Professor Donleavy -- "Then I have another question. It has also come to the attention of our committee that some adjunct lines are being translated into permanent positions. If this true, how will affirmative action be applied and verified?"/What is happening is part of the University's proposed budget is to increase the number of full-time positions and reduce the number of adjuncts by moving some adjunct funding to support full-time positions. The recruitment for those full-time positions will go on in the same manner as recruitment for any available faculty position. I am about, in fact, to issue a reminder to the colleges, which will probably go out tomorrow, that the period of recruitment for a full-time faculty position under the University's academic personnel practices which go back to 1976, is an academic year process. What we have started to see occasionally is the short circuiting of that process by shorter recruitment periods. We will insist that a full-fledged and termed search, reflecting the nature of the position, be held for each available full-time faculty position. In the interim, colleges may fill such available positions either on a substitute or visiting basis. One of the things that I would like to encourage is more use of visiting positions to fill available full-time lines during the periods when searches are underway. City University uses the visiting professorship, visiting assistant professorship, to a much lesser degree than most other major universities around the country and I think it is something that needs to be given more attention. Professor Gerber (English, Brooklyn) -- "I have a concern regarding the early retirement proposal. Have you undertaken any kind of study that would analyze the number of positions that would be terminated through early retirement as compared to those that would be replaced by junior faculty and therefore be more open to affirmative action searches?"/The answer is yes in two ways. First, I think it is important to note that the University's proposal includes one to one replacement for those positions held by people who opt for the retirement incentive. As was the case with the 1984-86 early retirement program, positions will likely move both among the colleges and within the colleges. So there is not an assurance that a particular position vacated will remain exactly where it was. But our experience with 1984-86 initiative, which we have documented fairly carefully, is that the replacements for the retirees represented the protected groups in about twice the number as the retirees. Looking at the potential retirees in what would be the 1990-91 program, we would certainly make every effort to see that the same type of result occurs. Professor Jaffe (Science, BMCC) -- "When a position in administration; Dean, Associate Dean, Assistant Dean, 80th Street administrators, is filled on a temporary basis as an acting 'blank,' does that position then have to go through search and affirmative action procedures?"/ Yes, unless there is special justification. Professor Matthews (Mathematics, Hunter) -- "I note that you mentioned that the City University does not use the visiting professor title. Is it usual practice to have someone come as a visiting professor, say in a spring semester, with intent of bringing the person on board regularly in the fall?"/ If the position is being filled in the fall on a "regular" basis there would have to be a search. The visitor certainly could be a candidate for the position, but the nature of the visiting position is such that the person has to have an affiliation with another institution or another vocation. For example, an artist or a musician may not be with an another institution of higher education. The visiting position reflects the notion that we are borrowing someone for a limited period of time from another employer or vocation. That person certainly could be a candidate in the full search, subject to affirmative action procedures. Visitors are often used as a way of testing, in many universities, for a full-time position. Someone would be invited for a semester or a year to serve as a visiting faculty member and if everybody agreed that he/she was a rousing

success the person would be invited to remain. But I think the point here is that we are insisting that there be a full-fledged search for a vacant faculty position; a visitor or substitute certainly could be candidate. Professor Speidel (Earth & Environmental Sciences, Queens) -- "I would like to turn onto a slightly different track. The impression that I had the last time this kind of thing was offered was that it wasn't the faculty who took advantage of it; it was the staff. I do not think Queens is unique in the particular age group of the support staff, but we took a very deep body blow the last time. Quite frankly, I am not especially concerned about the loss of faculty so much as I am concerned about the loss of support staff. It is the support staff who allow us to do the things that we are hired to do. I certainly would like to hear how you plan to deal with the fact that many of these people are going to take advantage of it." / Several of your points are well taken. In the 1984-86 early retirement program, approximately 19% of the eligible faculty within the City University took advantage of the program whereas in some of the support titles, particularly in the Gittleson series, about a third of the eligible people took advantage of the program. Professor Speidel -- "... and the lab techs." / Yes, and the lab techs. But the group taking advantage of it in greatest proportion to eligibility was the Gittleson staff. One of the reasons for the long lead time in our proposal is to allow a period to determine who will opt to take the program and to train successors to those people in a more orderly manner than we have in the past. Professor Speidel -- "Is the age group such that this will occur again?" / We have done a number of analyses of the various work force groups and it is likely. There are some very key people in the support titles.

VII. Invited Guest: Vice Chancellor for Faculty and Staff Relations Ira Bloom: I have come with a battery of statistics which I frankly do not really want to present. I have made periodic reports to the Board's Committee on Faculty, Staff and Administration on which your representative sits. I will be making another report next month. I think there are several points that are very important to the University's Affirmative Action Program. I think we need to look at affirmative action within the City University in both the shorter term and the longer term. If I may start with the longer term, I think in one sense it becomes the more serious aspect of the problem. A number of national studies, with which I am sure many of you are familiar, project an increasing number of faculty vacancies from 1995 and for the 20 year period beyond, attributable by different authors to different reasons (the Shuster study, the Bowen Study). I think the general agreement is that there will be a very significant turnover of full-time faculty positions within universities. On the other side of this equation is the continuing lack of interest among our students in pursuing doctoral work and academic careers; particularly a lack of interest among minority students in pursuing academic careers. For example, there are studies of the number of U.S. students in the hard sciences and engineering doctoral programs and the number of minority students within that cohort is not promising. One of the key things we are going to be trying to do over the next several years is initiate a series of programs on the campuses, and this will only be able to happen with considerable support from the faculty, to encourage our own undergraduate students to pursue academic careers. One of the things that I think has happened is that many faculty here came in during what was a very difficult period, when jobs were very hard to come by. I think that these faculty have perhaps not encouraged our undergraduates to pursue academic careers but rather have encouraged them to pursue careers in the professions which are more lucrative, at least initially, and permit quicker completion -- law school in a finite three years, business school, an MBA, is a finite year or

two years, -- whereas doctoral work and a dissertation can have a kind of infinite quality to it. I think we have among our undergraduates one of the largest pools of successful minority students anywhere in the country. If these students are not going to seek academic careers we will have a set of problems both in filling available faculty positions and increasing the diversity, both here in the City University and everywhere else. I think that is something that needs a lot of thought and a lot of concentration. It is one of the points that we made in the Five Year Plan which was quoted before. A student graduating in June 1990, even under ideal circumstances, is not likely to earn a doctoral degree until 1995 and that is the time when we will start to need very substantial numbers of faculty members to fill available positions. We need act now to assure ourselves that we will have a supply of successors beginning in the next five to ten years. I think this is an element of affirmative action that is often overlooked by looking at the short term rather than the long term.

We are also doing a number of things to try to address the ongoing issues of faculty recruitment and increasing the applicant pool with the goal of increasing the diversity of the faculty within the University. As I mentioned a few minutes ago, we are going to again remind everyone that filling a faculty position is a process that by Board policy is to take the balance of an academic year. We are seeking to strengthen the role of the affirmative action officers on the campuses by requiring that the affirmative action officer approve recruitment plans at the initiation of a search as well as at the conclusion of a search so that we can try to assure that the applicable and relevant groups, professional organizations, etc. are in fact contacted for candidates at the outset. The development of more systematic recruitment procedures and the establishment of more thorough procedures for evaluating the success of affirmative action plans on each campus are also to be part of that agenda. I think one of the things to emphasize is that a significant element of affirmative action, which is the dynamic component of any equal opportunity program, is the same thing that should be happening in faculty recruitment in any event. We should be spreading the net as widely as possible and trying to develop as many qualified applicants as we can for any available position. I think a lot of the answers come from hard work and not from any rhetorical flourishes about the program. Each search is unique and the search process is the only way in which we will increase diversity within the faculty. It is very easy to turn around and hire an adjunct with whom the department is familiar because the adjunct has been in the department forever or any number of other ways in which departments in the past tended to hire. These are all systems that have not worked to increase diversity or representation.

We have started several programs in the last year or two. One of which is a program that assists faculty who are currently members of the permanent instructional staff, either lecturers with certificates or tenured assistant professors who do not have the doctorate, to achieve the doctoral degree. The University is funding release time for those people and a mentoring system to encourage those people to finish their dissertations has been established. We have 40 people now involved in that program with 8 mentors and a significant number of that group are minority candidates. I hope over a number of years this will lead to a significant number of participants earning doctorates and therefore being able to advance their academic careers. That group is heavily populated with females and members of minority groups.

We are looking at, through the University Affirmative Action Committee, other impediments to recruitment and advancement of female and minority

faculty within the University and looking at efforts we can make to overcome these. In addition, we are going to make a more concerted effort in the next few years to increase the representation of minority faculty and female faculty within the group of distinguished professors. Again, this is something that requires hard work and, frankly, the initiative of the various personnel and budget committees and appointment committees within the departments. We do not, in spite of what anybody might think, make faculty appointments at 80th Street. Faculty appointments come from the faculty. We monitor, we cajole, we do a whole variety of things to try to assure that policies and procedures are followed and that affirmative action programs produce significant change and significant results. But again, the initiative comes from the departments and the faculty members. The University as a whole has been one of the most successful in the country in recruiting minority faculty to its campuses and our new hire statistics in the last several years reflect recruitment that is almost one half female and close to one-third minority. This is for the system as a whole. It varies considerably within and among the colleges and within departments and sections of the colleges. We are looking at a variety of initiatives that will strengthen and enhance the program. If I can leave you with any single thought tonight, it is the long-term issue of bringing more of our own undergraduate students into pursuing academic careers, or else we will have an empty hall here in another ten years.

Professor Stroup (Philosophy, John Jay) -- "Betty Sue Taylor, who is the Chair of the Faculty Senate Affirmative Action Committee, has asked me to convey her regrets for not being here tonight. She is home with the flu, but she is here in spirit because she dictated a question for Vice Chancellor Bloom and I would like to read it to him. The question is not a new one and is as follows: At the risk of being redundant, we see no reason why the printing of CUNY's faculty salary scale has been discontinued in the AAUP publication Academe. This information was submitted until about 1983 and subsequently has been withheld. The Affirmative Action Committee of the Senate has repeatedly requested that the information be submitted again. It seems to the Committee that our salary scale is public record and therefore would reveal no secrets by being printed in the Academe tables. In what way do you defend CUNY's failure to submit this information?"/ The same way I have defended it for the last several years. However, these are issues that I would rather not discuss in this large a forum. I would be happy to discuss it either with the Executive Committee or with the Senate's Affirmative Action Committee. They are issues unrelated to the issue of affirmative action but are issues related to matters effecting collective bargaining. Professor Kaplan (Biology, Queens) -- "Ira, I am very pleased that the affirmative action program is going ahead full pace. One of the comments that you made toward the end was that unless we find some way of advancing our undergraduate students into academic careers, we will fall apart. One of the shortcomings that we have in our University is that there is very little funding for graduate students, particularly tuition waivers, fellowships, and the like. I am sure that you are aware of the fact that the union is very strongly in favor of increased tuition waivers and increased assistantships and certainly will present that when negotiations come along. I would like to have you clarify what the view of the University is on this issue."/ The University is committed to increasing financial support for doctoral students. I think the Five Year Plan document, as well as our 1990-91 budget request, reflects those priorities. This is something we have been working on and will continue to work on because it is crucial, I think, for the reason that you've stated. I am not talking, even though we are here at the Graduate Center, solely of encouraging our students to come to our own Graduate Center. What I am really

talking about is the broader issue of encouraging our undergraduates to pursue doctoral study in a variety of institutions. The point is a very important one, that we are very much behind. Professor Greenbaum (History, Queensborough) -- "As a member of a department in a community college whose members largely received their Ph.D.'s after they came to the college, I am very much interested in the mentoring program. You mentioned there are only 40 people in the program currently. Is there any thought to expanding that program?"/ Yes. The program has doubled from last semester to this semester and we are working on the process of training mentors and expanding the program. Professor Chabora (Biology, Graduate School) -- "If I can address one point on affirmative action, I see somewhat of an inconsistency between the talk that we have been hearing here and the beginning of the search for a President of the Graduate School. If I understood correctly, you were talking about making sure that we have a considerable outreach in affirmative action. Yet what we hear coming from the Board and 80th Street is that this search for the President of the Graduate School is going to be crunched into a very short period of time; perhaps looking to bring candidates here before the end of the semester. How is this consistent with a pattern of expanded affirmative action?"/ Having been involved in a number of searches, the reality is that the speed of the search will depend on how the committee functions. The search committee will set up its own timetable and its own process for reviewing candidates. There is no preordained timeframe or result. Professor Matthews (Mathematics, Hunter) -- "You mentioned some numbers about the increasing numbers of minorities and women on the faculty but there is the old story about the average -- if one foot is in a bucket of ice and the other in hot water. In the sciences and mathematics, I doubt that those averages have gone up quite as much as in some other fields. Has the Board and the Chancellor's office considered programs that might specifically reach down into the high schools, because it is at that level, if not before, where many people get turned off about math and science."/ I agree with you. There are a number of collaborative programs with the high-schools and a number of colleges have received federal grants of several varieties designed specifically to bring more undergraduate students into science areas and to support those students while they are in science areas. I think you are quite correct in that the availability of minorities in the sciences has been less than it has been in other disciplines and I think this is a problem that we are trying to address. A number of the colleges have been quite successful in achieving grant support for that purpose. Professor Yousef (Mechanical Technology, Staten Island) -- "Vice Chancellor Bloom, one comment or thought that has come to mind about affirmative action officers which I understand, in the scheme that you described, are very very significant and a central part of the success of your program. As appointees, they are very much beholden to their college president so they reflect the attitude of the college president -- I am not necessarily suggesting anything about my own college president -- but when I see that an affirmative action officer may have six or seven other responsibilities I wonder how much time is really devoted to affirmative action. The other issue is, have you considered an independent group that reports to you directly, not to each college president, for the sake of uniformity?"/ As to the second point, I might consider it but the presidents won't. Going back to your first point, we have taken a number of steps to try to assure that the affirmative action officers have sufficient time and sufficient support staff so that they can function effectively in that capacity. One can argue for a full-time affirmative action officer as the sole method of proceeding. On the other hand, a number of the affirmative action officers have key roles in other aspects of the institution which assist them in their functioning as affirmative action officers because they are quite aware of a number of things that are happening around the college

which assist their affirmative action responsibilities. I think there is not a clear-cut answer to what the best structure is, but we are trying to assure that in cases where the affirmative action officer has other responsibilities he or she has sufficient time and/or sufficient support staff to enable him or her to function effectively. Professor Yousef continued -- "The other part of my question deals with the issue you raised earlier, namely that we do not take advantage of the visiting professorships. What we really have been taking undo advantage of, in my opinion, are substitute lines to the point that I can't follow whether the appointment leads to a minority appointment or continued substitutions. I am particularly concerned about it because of the tremendous expense of it all over CUNY. I have done some study about it through the Chancellor's reports. My fear is that this has really been used, not so much to help with affirmative action, as probably the intention was, but to give more power to the deans in every unit to say to the department, no I am not going to give you a full line I am just going to give you a substitute line. So that is kind of a power play rather than really helping affirmative action."/ I think there are two points I would make. One, this argument has a familiar ring from across the street in the PSC offices. Second, there are limitations and we are trying to be stricter in enforcing limitations and conditions around substitute appointments. Professor McCall (Compensatory Education, Baruch) -- "I am asking these questions on behalf of a colleague and we are after some of your statistics. How many women filed under section 13 of the Melani decree? How many cases have been resolved? How have they been resolved and what is the status of those not yet resolved?"/I have to give you the same answer I gave the last time I was here. I cannot answer those questions for you. Those questions need to be addressed to plaintiff's council. Professor Bohigian (Mathematics, John Jay) -- "I appreciate the dilemma you find yourself in with affirmative action because you correctly stated that it is the departments that make appointments and not the central office. However, in view of the fact that some departments, none represented here of course, have had a tradition of not doing as much as they could for affirmative action, why couldn't the University centrally, when lines become available, make it quite clear to the college presidents that a number of lines off the top will become available to those colleges that are willing to find appropriate qualified candidates in the area? This would be done on a first come first serve basis, so it becomes an incentive at each campus to do what is correct and what's right."/ I think we have encouraged the colleges with a variety of approaches to try to deal with departments that have been less than enthusiastic about affirmative action. We have tried to do this through strengthening the affirmative action officers, through strengthening the affirmative action process, and through bringing to the attention of presidents on a regular basis areas in which minorities and women are underutilized in given departments and areas. We are doing this on a regular and systematic basis but, based on what I heard about the "F" grade before, I don't think you would really want me to insert myself into the process of faculty recruitment at the Math department at John Jay. Professor Weiss (Health, Queensborough) -- "I was wondering, does the University administration feel that the college affirmative action officer should become directly involved in departmental hiring decisions?"/ The answer to that question, which is a fairly loaded question, is that the function of the affirmative action officer is to insure that a fair and open process of recruitment and selection takes place. It is not to substitute his or her academic judgement for that of the department, assuming the department is appropriately exercising its academic judgement. Professor Eisenberg (Math. & Computer Science, Kingsborough) -- "In May of 1989 there was an article by Jack Newfield in the New York Daily News, and I quote from it. 'There have been claims of patronage and mismanagement at City University, but this sin

seems to be concentrated at Kingsborough Community College. That place does seem to have a master's program in clubhouse cronyism and nepotism...Before any of City University's special services such as child care are cut, lets cut Kingsborough's doctoral program in nepotism and patronage.' In September I wrote, on behalf of the Kingsborough Chapter, to Chancellor Murphy that we be informed of all actions taken in response to these allegations. Your response, Vice Chancellor Bloom, was that these issues were covered by Article 5 of the PSC contract that states that requests for information must come from the Central Office of the PSC. I responded in a letter that this provision applies to statistical and financial information and again requested that we be informed of all actions taken by the Board. You responded that evidence of significant wrong doing will be thoroughly investigated and such action as is called for will be taken. I wrote again, recommending that your careful review begin with the names presented in the Newfield article. To date I have not received a response to those requests."/ One of the groundrules of my presentation here is that I would not address any specific case, and I stand on that groundrule. Secondly, your last letter arrived yesterday. Professor Eisenberg -- "I also wrote to you concerning interference by President Goldstein in PSC elections, both overt and covert. You responded that your office could not get involved in such a request made by individual faculty." Professor Wedeen questioned the relevance Professor Eisenberg's comments. Professor Eisenberg noted that his comments were in response to appointments in which the correct use of affirmative action procedures had been questioned. Professor Jaffe (Science, BMCC) -- "You talked about the longer view in terms of affirmative action and you mentioned getting into the high schools. Has anybody considered going a little further, particularly in the math and sciences. A number of years ago the New York Academy of Sciences set up programs to get into what could be called targeted elementary schools in minority areas. This could serve two purposes. One in terms of showing the flag of the teaching profession which, in general, is not held in high regard. Has anybody at Central given thought to getting the troops out into the elementary schools?"/ A number of colleges have programs through both departments of education and through some of the math and science departments that are doing exactly that. We have developed a number of collaborative programs with the Board of Education, some of which deal with those issues, and we are encouraging the colleges wherever possible. This is the type of project, in the end, that needs to be done through the faculty at the individual campuses. We can only encourage it and set up structures and relationships that will make it easier to accomplish. Professor Jaffe continued -- "Okay, second question. Since there will be negotiations and one of the ways that people in this country, students, youngsters, as well as everybody else, perceive professions is in terms of dollar signs, I would suggest that one of the easiest ways to increase minority recruitment, as well as other recruitment in the City University, is to simply double our salaries."/If you find a way of taking the million dollar contracts that are going to mediocre baseball players and shifting it to higher education, I would appreciate it. Professor Stroup -- "With my own question. In view of the recent Supreme Court decision, I wonder how you would trade off the secrecy of the personnel process against the need for openness to insure that discrimination does not exist?"/ I think the case is a very interesting case from a variety of points of view. Taken along the line of affirmative action cases that had preceded it, the court was saying, in one sense, that one had to produce evidence of discrimination in order for certain actions to follow. In this case the court was looking at the nature of the evidence that could and would be produced and essentially saying that situations in which these evaluations may well constitute evidence of discrimination, that these evaluations have to be to some degree -- and the degree is not totally clear -

- made available to the EOC and to plaintiffs so that the nature can be assessed. I think, in the long run, it will have less effect on the quality of evaluations than I think some of the immediate reaction, at least that I have been reading in various periodicals, seems to suggest. Most people who have written evaluations, particularly who have written evaluations involving the City University at least, have been aware that there is a possibility that these eventually may come to surface in some legal proceeding. I would hope that faculty would be willing to continue to write evaluations with clarity and with candor, even though the likelihood that these evaluations might at some future point become available to the person about whom they are written has increased somewhat. But, I would hope in the long run, it will not have the type of effect that some commentators have suggested. There is a balance here between what has to go on in a proceeding in which discrimination is charged, which is try to weight the evidence or the information one has, and the desire to encourage people making these evaluations to be as open and candid as possible. It is, as everyone knows, easy to charge discrimination but very difficult to prove. I think this is a question of balancing these interests, which is a very difficult thing. In some ways the decision has a number of positive elements. I think it supports a number of concepts that we all support. I don't think anybody here would be in favor of evaluations that were biased or otherwise distorted. It may make some people slightly more cautious than they have been. But, I think these are issues that have to be balanced against one another. Professor Stroup added -- "Let me be more specific. Do you anticipate, and can you foresee, any concrete proposals coming from either your office or the Chancellor's office?"/ I think you know the decision just came down and we are still assessing it. I think its immediate impact will probably be limited. Where it will go in the longer run, I don't know. We are still studying it and we are still considering what it represents, but I think people writing evaluations should be writing ones that they can stand behind. Professor Donleavy -- (Special Services in Education, Lehman) "In terms of evaluating how well City University is achieving affirmative action, I wonder how you use the feedback you get from the Middle States Association which has affirmative action as one of its items? It is my understanding that several of the units have gotten quite negative reports on their affirmative action achievements."/We have reviewed each of the Middle States reports and they have been discussed with the presidents and senior executives of those colleges involved. Professor Donleavy added -- "And then what steps are taken or what monitoring is done by your office?"/We monitor quite closely and we monitor more closely situations in which there appears to be a problem. I will say something that is not going to startle anybody; the evenness with which affirmative action goals are pursued around the University is not consistent. There are colleges that have been much more aggressive and much more successful than others. These are considerations we are quite aware of. Professor Donleavy further noted -- "It might be interesting to have something in the budget to reward colleges which do achieve affirmative action with either extra lines or what have you. It might be a very interesting way to do that."/We have looked at approaches like that from time to time. Professor Muehlig (Business Administration, Medgar Evers) -- "Vice Chancellor Bloom, you mentioned released time, so I feel I can ask a question on that. Are there any specific guidelines regarding the utilization of released time, particularly now in terms of budgetary concerns, or is that within the purview of the local administration?"/There is a set of guidelines that were adopted by the Council of Presidents in 1985 which outline in a broad sense appropriate uses of released time. The granting of released time is at the discretion of the individual colleges. During periods of budget difficulty, the tendency is to reduce released time and this has been true for the almost 25 years that I have been involved with the

University. But the way it is administered varies from college to college. The needs of the colleges vary, the structures of the colleges vary, the programs are organized differently -- we have not sought to impose any uniformity of approach among the colleges. Professor Manassah (Engineering, City) -- "I think what you have said about encouraging fellowships for graduate study is admirable. I congratulate you on that. But, are you aware, for example, of how much of the money that was earmarked for fellowships and for graduate study in general this year has been moved from the active budget into the University reserve and how much of that money was moved also from that item into OTPS for many colleges?" /I do not know the answer to your question off hand. Professor Manassah -- "I can tell you it is substantially over 30 percent." Professor Speidel (Earth & Environmental Sciences, Queens) -- "Vice Chancellor, I would like to say something complimentary and encouraging about a program. I was told on two separate occasions by individuals on my campus that by far and away the most rewarding experience that they had had in their professional careers, which were extensive, was their service as mentors for colleagues working to complete their Ph.D.'s. There was tremendous enthusiasm among all the participants for the program." /Well thank you very much. Professor Berkowitz (Chemistry, Graduate School) -- "Going on the assumption that throwing money at a problem will solve it, three suggestions. I am in the sciences and obviously we have a lack of students and a lack of possible future students. One, we could throw money in the direction of tutors, retired high school or college teachers for minorities, women or anybody else for that matter. Two, you could pay for the travel of minority and women candidates for job openings on individual campuses rather than leaving the individual campus to do that. Third, you could increase the number of Grad Fellow A's and B's for minorities and women in the sciences above and beyond those that are mandated by the graduate initiative." /Thank you. Professor Sohmer (Mathematics, City) -- "One of things that goes unmentioned is what happens in P & B's and all of us who sit on a P & B are bound by the Max-Kahn decision and every now and then something unconscionable occurs in the P & B and we are faced with a very serious problem by transgressing Max-Kahn or merely hoping that the damage can be contained. Is there any consideration of a rule which makes Max-Kahn labile to whistle blowing?" /Well it already is. There is provision for a submission of a minority report to the next highest body and that has been used from time to time. Professor Sohmer -- "Many people are not aware of this avenue." /I think that it is something that they should be made aware of. I have seen a number of occasions when minority reports have been used to good effect. Chair Wedeen then thanked Vice Chancellor Bloom for his presentation.

IX. New Business: SUNY Faculty Senate Chair Karen Markoe: Professor Markoe noted the extent to which the Plenary discussion of affirmative action paralleled the concerns of faculty in SUNY. She reported that last year SUNY central allocated 30 lines specifically to hire members of underrepresented groups. The effort was very successful and the lines will be reallocated on a three-year cycle. The SUNY budget appears to be approximately \$43 million ahead of last year. Professor Markoe reported that she just returned from a Middle States meeting at which educational outcomes and assessment were the topics; these measures are likely to become an increasingly important component of accreditation procedures. Two SUNY concerns that are not on the CUNY agenda are animal welfare and nuclear waste disposal sites. All governance heads will receive an invitation to meet with the National Network of Faculty Senates, in San Francisco. She requested that Senators support potential legislation which would amend the State Education Law to permit the Chair of the SUNY Faculty Senate to sit on the Board of Trustees as is the

practice in CUNY. It was noted that the CUNY faculty Trustee does not have a vote on the Board while the student Trustee has voting privileges.

IX. New Business, cont.: Professor Brady (Library, Queens) pointed out that the Five Year Plan Executive Summary appeared to offer little support for graduate education and research, especially in light of Vice Chancellor Bloom's stated interest in increasing the pool of minority candidates with advanced degrees. She also noted that the Plan did not adequately reflect the impact of inflation and the increased costs associated with technological improvements, especially in libraries.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Bruce Hoffacker  
Acting Executive Director