

draft  
subject to senate approval

MINUTES OF THE ONE HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-THIRD PLENARY SESSION OF  
THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE OF  
THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

May 15, 1990

Chair Wedeen called the session to order at 7:15 p.m. in room 1700A of the Graduate School and University Center. Present were Senators Aaronson, Adewumi, Allaire, Barbanel, Barley, Baumrin, Baxter, Beaton, Bishop, Bleyman, Bohigian, Brenner, Bronars, Brugnola, Buianouckas, Bushler, Canate, Caudle, Cooper, Cyril, Danziger, Davidson, Davis E., Davis R., Debate, Donleavy, Donoghue, Eisenberg, Frisz, Galub, Gerber, Ginsberg, Gordon, Gram, Greenbaum, Grossman, Gura, Henderson, Hill, Hough, Jaffe, Kaplan, Kaufman, Knoop, Koshi, Kott, Krashinsky, Lidov, Lundeen, Magid, Manassah, Mandel, Markoe, Matthews, McCarthy, McCullers, Muehlig, O'Malley, Otte, Picken, Plissner, Riedler-Berger, Riley, Rodriguez, Schulman, Schuyler, Selvadurai, Shaffer, Sherrill, Simor, Singleton, Sohmer, Speidel, Stern, Stroup, Svitak, Tenebaum, Trefousse, Thompson, Umolu, Walters, Washburn, Washington, Wedeen, Weiss, Westrem, Yousef, Zades, Zinberg, and Alternate Senators Alsop, Blanks, Brady, Friedman, Immergut, Lowy, Hernandez-Miyares, Nass, and Reid. Professors Berkowitz M., Berkowitz W., and Broido, were excused. Heads of Faculty Governance Bodies Frisz (Queens), Galub (Bronx), Ginsberg (BMCC), Gura (Brooklyn), Sohmer (City), and Zades (CSI) attended. Senate Acting Executive Director Hoffacker and Administrative Assistant Pasela also attended.

I. Adoption of the Proposed Tentative Agenda: Chair Wedeen asked for a motion to adopt the Proposed Tentative Agenda. The motion was made, seconded and approved.

II. Acceptance of the Minutes of the 182st Plenary Session (April 24, 1990): A correction was received in the office on page 3, paragraph 2, line 11. The additional cut should read \$200 million instead of \$2 million. A motion to accept the minutes was made, seconded and approved.

III. Introduction of Newly-elected Senators and Alternates: see attached.

IV. Communications from the Chair: This evening the majority of my report is available in writing. There is one meeting report that I could not have in writing because it took place last night. It was the Board of Trustees' Public Hearing in preparation for the Monthly Meeting. The item that was brought up was the divestiture of all University holdings in tobacco companies. There were many people who came to give testimony as to why the City University should divest itself of holdings that have anything to do with the tobacco industry. It was quite a touching and pertinent session.

The next issue that I would like to bring you up to date on is the "F" grade. We forwarded our censure resolution to the AAUP. They find it significant. They are sure that they will respond in a letter to the Board. They asked for the resolutions from all the colleges for their files. They are discussing referring the issue to the appropriate committee for consideration of an AAUP censure.

Concerning the Lehman Search which came up last time, let me go over some of the material I have uncovered. For the Executive Committee, I spoke with the staff person for the Search Committee, the Chair of the Search Committee, and an elected faculty member on the Committee. It was an 11 member committee, 6 of whom were women. There were: four trustees, three were female; three elected faculty, one woman; one president who was male; two students, one was female; and there was an alumna representative. The Committee did abide by all guidelines for presidential searches and affirmative action established by the Board of Trustees. I received in writing some information from Dean Barsam (Executive Search and Evaluation). Let me read you one paragraph of his letter,

I can assure you that the Lehman College Presidential Search Committee has carefully followed the Board of Trustees' Guidelines for Presidential Searches.... The Committee's search plan, which is required by the University Affirmative Action Guidelines, and was approved by the University Affirmative Action Officer, included extensive outreach in developing a pool of qualified candidates.

I spoke with the female faculty member of the Committee. From all the information I was able to get, there was no objection to the process on the part of the faculty members on the Committee who were duly elected by the total college faculty. As to the total pool, the numbers are confidential. You cannot, especially when a committee is still in operation, break down the numbers in categories. However, when the committee proceedings are completed, there is an affirmative action document filed and made public. So, at this point, the Executive Committee sees nothing that is inappropriate in the way the search has proceeded to date. I will open this for discussion later.

Last time there was a resolution before you by Professor Sohmer concerning the City College resolution on reporting of pejorative comments. At this time it is being tabled. It may be looked at again in the fall, but it was the wish of Professor Sohmer and the Executive Committee that it be tabled at this time.

This will be my last meeting with you as Chair, although I certainly will be here. As you heard, I was just re-elected as a Senator from Brooklyn, so I intend to be with you. However, I would like to take just a few moments to comment on my reactions and thoughts as your Chair for the past four years and also as an ex-officio Trustee because of my position in this organization. I know I have had the thought, as some of you have along the way, what power do we really have? You've all heard that on the campuses. What do we really control? We control nothing, but we influence a great deal. We really hold a vital position in this University. We are the voice of the faculty. It is a very significant and important voice. It really becomes our responsibility to ensure the free academy, and I think we have done this pretty successfully. We certainly have done it as well as we knew how through the past years. It is important for us really to watch. What is most important? That we really become the guardians of the free process so that there can be the kind of exchange and academy that most of us hold so terribly important.

I was thinking to myself last night, what are the categories where the Senate is important? I came up with three areas. One, was in governance. Remember when the question came up about eliminating a major in a particular department? At that time, it was felt that that was the best way to educate teachers. We fought it hard and long because we felt that what is a major, or what is not a major, remains with the faculty, not with the lay board. The result was that, although the Board expressed their feelings and

gave their goal, they left it up to the faculty to submit their individual ways of handling and defining the situation. The Ed major didn't go. Also, when the issue came up, as it did in some colleges, of some presidents finding it important, for whatever reasons, to combine, or dissolve, or make new departments it was decided that this was not the way it should go without someone else looking at it. It shouldn't be an administrative decision. This now will come back to the appropriate Board committees. A president can no longer do it on his or her campus without anybody having any say or doing anything about it. The latest issue we are working on, and it is still in the working stage, is the "F" grade. Did we win that one? No we didn't win, but by the same token the original document said that the "F" grade should be expunged from the transcript. It no longer will be expunged. They understand that we are here. We're here trying to do what everybody else in this University is trying to do -- what is best for our students with the knowledge and background that we come from and come with.

Second, we disseminate information in this body. You go back to your colleges with a lot of information you have gotten here. You've gotten it from the committees that you have worked on. You have studied areas, you have brought back reports. You've gotten it in writing and when there was a particularly significant issue we have ripped it apart on the floor. We are part of it. The information is always here. We have a policy of having the Chancellor come and present a report and the opportunity to question and have him give answers. There aren't too many Chancellors around this country who meet face to face in this kind of open discourse so that they can be questioned, criticized or whatever else it happens to be. We sometimes initiate in areas that we feel need further investigation such as our SETM discussion, reports and panel.

But if I had to be in the position answering what, of all things we do, I consider most important, I think probably the most important thing is the subtle interventions. Sometimes many of us don't even know about them, the quiet negotiations. It is the ombudsman role that we very often have to exercise. In the last couple years, and I am only giving examples, I can think of a case when, at one institution, the president, meaning well for his college because that is what his college really needed, came out with a statement defining what faculty would need to get tenure in his institution. He wanted a project in remediation or at some kind of assistance to students to take the place of standard research. Well, it serves a purpose for that college, but it blocked those faculty who did want to go the writing and research route. Since this was a contractual issue, we did call on the PSC and asked them to join us because we all have to work together. What happened was that both standards are now in existence in that school; you can go the usual standard academic route or you can go the college project route. This was one example. Another that we have been working on, it is not yet closed, has been a particular department in a particular institution where faculty were told what the passing grade would be that term for majors in a discipline. Some of us were down there. We talked. We negotiated with deans, with presidents -- it's working. We hope that it will continue to work. We've had many of these come up. Even in presidential searches. A few years ago, there weren't necessarily faculty representatives, and certainly not in the numbers there are today. There is now faculty on every search committee whether it is for a president, a chancellor or any other position, we are there.

In conclusion, I really want to thank you for giving me the opportunity to lead you for these past four years. I know that I have gained a lot from

it. I hope I have grown. My satisfaction has been there and also there have been some sleepless nights as part of the total package. One thing I will say, I have given it the best I have. I hope that it has served you well and hope that perhaps the Senate is in some way as good or a little better than when I started. I want to thank you for it.

The Senate warmly applauded its outgoing Chair. Professor Trefousse (History, Brooklyn) -- "On behalf of the University Faculty Senate, I should like to offer a motion of thanks to Professor Shirley Wedeen for a job faithfully and effectively performed as Chair for the past four years." The Senate unanimously endorsed this resolution.

V. Budget Update: Chair Wedeen announced that there was no budget update since there was no new information available. In addition, the Chancellor was unavailable and the other situations in the University were changing so fast that there was no point in having anyone other than the Chancellor address the Senate.

VI. Elections: Chair Wedeen reviewed election procedures and asked Professors Gerber (English, Brooklyn) and Kaufman (Mathematics, CSI) to serve as tellers. Professor Frisz (Student Development, Queens) requested that, in cases where there was more than one nominee for a position, nominees be allowed to make a short statement. The Senate agreed to this procedure.

A. Chair: Professor Riley (Chemistry, Bronx) nominated Professor Robert A. Picken (Romance Languages, Queens). Professor Trefousse (History, Brooklyn) nominated Professor Donald Davidson (Computer Information Services, LaGuardia). Both candidates made short statements. Professor Picken was elected and Professor Davidson immediately moved acclamation, a motion endorsed by the full Senate.

Professor Picken then addressed the Senate. He thanked Senators for their support and pledged to work as hard as possible to represent faculty. He thanked Chair Wedeen and noted her accomplishments during a difficult tenure as Chair. He also paid tribute to Professor Riley who has chosen not to stand for Senate office saying that, "no one has worked harder or more effectively" for the faculty.

B. Vice Chair: Professor Zades (Student Services, CSI) nominated Professor Sandi Cooper (History, CSI). There being no further nominations, the Secretary was directed to cast a single ballot.

C. Treasurer: Professor Trefousse nominated Professor Fred Greenbaum (History, Queensborough). Professor Riley nominated Professor Bernard Baumrin (Philosophy, Graduate School). Both nominees made short statements. Professor Baumrin was elected.

D. Secretary: Professor Danziger (English, Hunter) nominated Professor Bernard Sohmer (Mathematics, City). There being no further nominations, the Secretary was directed to cast a single ballot.

E. Members-at-Large: The following nominations were made: Professor Yousef (Mechanical Technology, CSI) nominated Professor Fred Greenbaum; Professor Thompson (Special Services in Education, Lehman) nominated Professor Mary Rita Donlevy (Special Services in Education, Lehman); Professor Bishop (Secretarial Science, BMCC) nominated Professor Marvin Jaffe (Science, BMCC); Professor Depas (English, KCC) nominated Professor Susan O'Malley (English, Kingsborough); Professor Muchlig (Business Administration, Medgar Evers) nominated Professor Mary Umolu (Humanities, Medgar Evers); and Professor Matthews (Mathematics, Hunter) nominated Professor John Donoghue

(Social Science, NYCTC). The candidates each made a short statement. Elected were Professors Davidson, O'Malley, Greenbaum, Umolu, and Jaffe.

The Senate applauded its new leadership.

VII. Reports of University Faculty Senate Standing Committees: [The following Committee reports are available and can be requested from the Senate office: Academic Freedom, Academic Policy, Affirmative Action, Governance, Legal Affairs, Remediation, Research, and Student Affairs (N.B. the Academic Freedom and Legal Affairs Committees took no action during 1989-90).]

Professor Manassah spoke for the Graduate Affairs Committee. He reported on the frustrations his committee had encountered in attempting to obtain information on the Graduate and Research Initiative. He then read the following committee report.

The Graduate Affairs Committee met several times during the academic year to consider ways of obtaining information about the "Graduate and Research Initiative." The Committee shares the frustration of its chair, as reported in the chairman's comments dated April 24, 1990, and as incorporated in the minutes of the Senate plenary session of that date, and strongly urges the adoption of the two proposed resolutions submitted for consideration at the May 15 plenary session.

Respectfully submitted,  
 Professor Linda Barley (Health & P.E., York)  
 Professor William Berkowitz (Chemistry, Graduate School)  
 Professor Marlies Danziger (English, Hunter)  
 Professor Donald Davidson (Computer Information  
 Services, LaGuardia), Liaison  
 Professor Helen Koepfer (Biology, Graduate School)  
 Professor Suzanna Simor (Library, Queens)  
 Professor Jamal Manassah (Electrical Engineering,  
 City), Chair

Professor Manassah then offered the proposed "Resolution on Obtaining University Financial Information" (copy attached). The resolution was seconded. Professor Eisenberg (Math & Computer Science, Kingsborough) asked if the information had been requested under the Freedom of Information Act. Professor Manassah replied that such a request might be the outcome of the adoption of the resolution. The resolution was passed without dissent. Professor Manassah then offered the proposed "Resolution on the Allocation of Reserve Funds" (copy attached). In response to Professor Speidel (Earth & Environmental Science, Queens) an editorial change was accepted which would reallocate reserve funds proportionally to the sources from which they were taken. The resolution passed without dissent.

Professor Donoghue then spoke for the Academic Affairs Committee. He noted that the Committee had devoted its meetings to articulation. It held a productive meeting with Vice Chancellor Reid-Wallace and her staff. An allocation of one million dollars was included in the University budget to support articulation activities, but it has been eliminated. To date, articulation programs have relied on grant funds. Professor Donoghue met in May with Dean Hamby and recommended a University-wide conference on articulation for the fall. Vice Chancellor Reid-Wallace has said that her office would address the issue of community college students who are retested in senior colleges and possibly propose University-wide policy. Professor Bronars (Elementary Education, Queens) asked if testing decisions are made by the faculty and if a University-wide policy would

represent the same type of situation as the "F" grade mandate. Professor Donoghue responded that such policies were the responsibility of the faculty and that this issue was one about which community college faculty felt strongly. Professor Speidel noted the articulation impact of the "F" grade mandate, highlighting the negative impact of the new policy on students and the ramifications of Board interference in academic policy.

Professor Zinberg (Speech, Queensborough) reported for the Remediation Committee. She asked Senators to "hold the date" of Friday, November 16th, for a Remediation Committee Conference "Helping Students to Succeed Against the Odds" to be held at Bronx Community College. The Committee is in the process of identifying a keynote speaker and has invited Mr. Jamie Escalante. Invitational letters will be sent to all Senators and Professor Zinberg hoped the Senate would support this Committee project.

VIII. Reports of Faculty Members of Board of Trustees' Committees: The reports were available in writing.

IX. New Business: Chair Wedeen read the following proposed resolution for the Executive Committee:

Resolution of The University Faculty Senate  
of the City University of New York in Support of  
Representation for the President of the SUNY Faculty Senate  
on the SUNY Board of Trustees

May 15, 1990

- Whereas: the Faculty Senate of the State University of New York has no representation on the SUNY Board of Trustees, and
- Whereas: the SUNY Student Senate has representation on the Board of Trustees, and
- Whereas: both the Faculty and Student Senates are represented on the City University Board of Trustees, therefore be it
- Resolved: that the University Faculty Senate of the City University of New York supports the pending legislation which would amend the State Education Law to place the President of the SUNY Faculty Senate on the Board of Trustees.

Professor Bleyman (Natural Science, Baruch) noted that, on the CUNY Board of Trustees, the representative of the Student Senate has a vote, but the representative of the Faculty Senate does not. She hoped that the SUNY Faculty Senate President would be a voting member of the Trustees. Professor Markoe (Academic Advisement Center, Brooklyn) asked the Senate to support the resolution and not to confuse the issue by debating voting status. Professor Frisz moved to amend the resolution to add that the SUNY Faculty Senate President would be a voting member of the Trustees. The amendment was seconded. Mr. Hoffacker noted that the resolution was in response to a request from the President of the SUNY Faculty Senate and reflected her concerns. Professor Sohmer spoke against the amendment and added that, should the SUNY President get a vote, the UFS would be positioned to request a change in status for the CUNY Faculty Trustee. The amendment failed. The resolution then passed.

Professor Picken reported on an "highly unusual" personnel action in the University Report for the May Board of Trustees' meeting. He stated that he had been approached on his campus in his role as faculty member on the Board of Trustees' Faculty, Staff and

Administration Committee regarding "possible favoritism." The action would confer 13.3b status (the equivalent of tenure for HEO's) on Jay Hershenson and Dave Fields, both of whom are presently in the Executive Compensation Plan and consequently exempt personnel. He offered the following proposed resolution:

Resolution of the University Faculty Senate of  
The City University of New York Regarding  
May 21, 1990, Central Office University Report Item "Action Effecting a Legal  
Order, Arbitrator's Award or Settlement Agreement (Instructional Staff)"

May 15, 1990

Resolved: that the University Faculty Senate calls on the Board of Trustees to defer action of the appointment of Jay Hershenson and Dave Fields as Higher Education Officers pursuant to section 13.3b of the PSC/CUNY agreement and refer the matter to the Faculty, Staff and Administration Committee for review.

The resolution was seconded. Professor Thompson thanked Professor Picken for monitoring those items and bringing the information to the floor of the Senate. The resolution passed.

Professor Thompson then addressed the report on the Lehman Search. She thanked the Executive Committee for following up on the issue and stated that she was not surprised by the "bland, noncommittal answers" that had been generated. She stated that a February through March nomination period could not permit the widest possible solicitation. She found it "statistically unlikely" that the search would have generated a short list covering three protected classes, but no women. Professor Thompson concluded that the issue of equity for women candidates was still a difficult one and that more work should be done to analyze the search process.

Professor Umolu reported on the celebrations at Medgar Evers commemorating its 20th anniversary and the inauguration of President Edison O. Jackson. She invited Senators to the events scheduled for Wednesday, Thursday and Friday and to be a part of the recognition of 20 years of struggle.

Professor Bohigian (Mathematics, John Jay) brought the Senate up-to-date on the events at John Jay. North Hall is occupied, but other buildings are open. He stated, "the process is a good one and the students are acting responsibly." Meetings have been going on regularly and students have been invited to faculty meetings. Plans are in place for concluding the semester. The students have raised "very legitimate issues." The primary issue is the role of administrators who were present, but did not intervene, when the police took action against students. The students want those administrators suspended from their administrative positions immediately, while the college and University wish to take action only after an investigation is completed. Professor Bohigian did not want to go into other details due to the sensitive ongoing negotiations.

Professor Matthews raised the issue of divestment of tobacco stocks and encouraged the Trustees to approve the action. She stated that the University should not profit from the manufacture and sale of tobacco products.

There being no further new business, Chair Wedeen wished Senators a good summer and asked for a motion to adjourn.

The meeting adjourned at 9:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Bruce Hoffacker  
Acting Executive Director