

SUBJECT TO SENATE APPROVAL

MINUTES OF THE ONE HUNDRED AND SEVENTEENTH PLENARY SESSION  
OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

January 18, 1983

Professor Wasser (English, Staten Island), chairman, called the session to order at 7:15 p.m. in Room 207 at the Graduate School and University Center. Present were: Senators Amendolia, Bachman, Barber, Baxter, Beck, Bohigian, Borneman, Brogan, Buianouckas, Cinquemani, Danziger, Davidson, Finkelstein, Gerardi, B. Gerber, Goldzweig, Grossman, Heller, Henderson, Jaffe, Jiji, Keyser, M. Levine, S. Levine, Litke, McDaniel, Miller, Minter, Muehlig, Muller, Picken, Plissner, Riley, Rodriguez, Samalonis, Schulman, Schuyler, Sohmer, Speidel, Stroup, Timoni, Trefousse, Waldinger, Walkwitz, Wedeen, Wolfe, Yousef, and Zaneteas; Alternate Senator Ladimer, and Senator Elect Lytra. Liaison member Nachtsheim (New York State Conference, AAUP) attended. Dr. Jean Ellis, Executive Director of the Senate, also attended. The absences of Senators Baumrin, Burton, Cooper, Freedman, Gelernt, Hunte, Lea, Pennington, Petratos, Valinsky and Williams were excused; Alternate Senator Graham was also excused.

- I. Approval of the Tentative Agenda: The tentative agenda was approved with the addition of item 3 A: Special Commendation of Mr. Raymond Paretzky.
- II. Approval of the Minutes of the 116th Plenary Session (December 14, 1982): The minutes were approved as circulated.

III. Communications from the Chairman: Professor Wasser reminded the members that his report, as customary, comprised two parts - one written and one oral. He called special attention to item 1 in the written report - the establishment of a Presidential Search Committee for Medgar Evers College, named by the Chairman of the Board and including Trustees Bloom, chair, Rivera, vice-chair, Cavanagh, Polk, and Murphy, ex-officio, as well as faculty members elected by the Faculty Organization of Medgar Evers - Professors Clement, Seda-Rodriguez, and White, two student members designated by the student governments at the college, an alumnus and a community person. That committee has not yet begun its work but is now ready to act.

Professor Wasser next reported on the matter of the appointment of a Deputy Vice Chancellor for Management and Budget. He reminded the Senate that this issue had been discussed last spring by him when it first arose in the Board Committee on Faculty, Staff and Administration. The first proposal was to create a new title, "Deputy Vice Chancellor". The Committee rejected that proposal. Subsequently the creation of the new title "Deputy Vice Chancellor for Management and Budget" was proposed but the Committee once again hesitated to approve the addition of such a title. Subsequently, the membership of that Committee was persuaded to establish the title for one person - Mr. James Lawrence, Director of the Budget - in order to encourage him to remain with the Central Administration. Mr. Lawrence was appointed to the new title but, almost immediately, resigned to accept a post at City College. During the summer an advertisement of a vacancy in that position appeared in The New York Times. Professor Wasser immediately protested this action and was supported by other members of the Board. The administration, however, denied that the title had been established for an individual and proceeded with the search that had been advertised. In late November it was proposed that since a candidate had been found that person be appointed to the title but be given the title "Director of the Budget" for internal purposes. When Professor Wasser was asked to agree to this, he refused. The matter was not referred to the Board Committee. Without notice, however, the appointment was proposed in the Executive Session of the December meeting of the Board. Professor Wasser and other members of the Committee on Faculty, Staff and

Administration protested the bypassing of the Committee by this action. In addition, said Professor Wasser, he had stressed that his opposition to the appointment was not directed towards an individual and was separate from the merits of any candidate. It was based on the belief that addition of a new executive title was unwarranted given the proliferation of administrative appointments. Nevertheless the Board approved the appointment with one abstention.

Professor Wasser said he had discussed the matter of central administrative appointments with the Chancellor and had informed him of the faculty's concern in this area. Chairman Wasser also called the Senate's attention to item 6 in his written report, "Central Office Personnel Actions". He explained that a comparable item will be included in his written report henceforth since campus personnel actions were usually reported to faculty members by means of a Newsletter or similar communication but central administrative personnel actions were not so reported. He said that he had informed Chancellor Murphy of this item in his report and the Chancellor had stated that the many items appearing in this report were the result of the fact that when he took office he had frozen promotions in the central administration; therefore, this report reflected a backlog of promotions. He explained further that such actions were monitored by a Central Office Committee and that, in making them, he had kept in mind the fact that the average of promotions of eligible persons in the senior colleges was 18% per annum and the promotions made in the Central Office at this time averaged 13%, some 5% below the average in the senior colleges. In addition, in response to Professor Wasser's expression of concern that the Rem, instituted some years ago to compensate faculty members who accepted administrative appointments for the fact that instead of a contract binding them to 9 months work they were bound to an 11 month assignment, was now awarded to HEOs who were always appointed to 11 month contracts, the Chancellor said that he intended to review the matter of Rems as well as promotions.

In response to a question about the appointment in the Chancellor's Office of an individual to be paid the salary of a full professor Professor Wasser explained that the schedule for Higher Education Officers paralleled that for Full Professors. In response to a further question he corroborated that Higher Education Officers and others in that series were not required to have earned higher degrees as a qualification for appointment. Professor Plissner (Student Services, Kingsborough) noted that the issue under discussion here was related to a report in The New York Times of January 18 concerning Comptroller Goldin's audit of HEOs in the University.

Professor Wasser also reported on the progress of the various searches now underway for central administrative personnel. The search for a Deputy Chancellor, according to Senate Executive Committee member Riley who is a member of that Search Committee, is underway. It hopes to meet its target date which is set in late February but is still at the stage of collecting and sifting vitae. The Search for a Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Professor Wasser continued, is being organized. He, Professor Hunte (Mathematics, Borough Manhattan) and Professor Noehlin (Art History, Graduate School) serve on that Committee which has met twice. The New York Times of January 9 and this week's Chronicle of Higher Education carried advertisements of the position.

The status of the Senate resolution on University membership in ICPSR (the Interuniversity Consortium for Political and Social Research) was the next item in Professor Wasser's report. He said that the Chancellor, as the Senate knew, had agreed to implement that resolution so far as membership was concerned although he could not at this time provide the support services requested. Vice Chancellor Posman, Professor Wasser continued, had informed him that the funding for that project was now arranged and negotiations with ICPSR were being opened.

Chairman Wasser spoke next of the status of the Senate's Resolution on Faculty Participation in the College Budget Process. That resolution was transmitted to Chancellor Murphy whose initial response on December 15 was to state his support for such participation and his intent to make every effort to see that the faculty's recommendations were appropriately considered. The Chancellor had further stated, however, that he had a concern with the proposal that the college-wide governance body elect the non-administrative full-time faculty members of the team to develop the request since he was obligated to follow the process prescribed by the Bylaws, viz. that the President submit his budget recommendations to the college P&B for its recommendation prior to submitting it to the Chancellor. He therefore proposed that he write to the Presidents regarding the Bylaw provision on P&B action and ask that it be followed. The Senate leadership, the Executive Committee, responded to this proposal by letter and in discussion with Chancellor Murphy that the Senate proposal was not inconsistent with the Bylaw provision on P&B action but merely added to it. The Executive Committee has just received a second response from the Chancellor, said Professor Wasser, in which he states:

Since you feel there is no inconsistency between the mechanism embodied in the Senate resolution and the provisions of the University Bylaws, then we are in agreement on this issue. I will therefore move forward and implement that section of the Bylaws so that the appropriate faculty will have their rightful role in the University's budget process.

Professor Wasser indicated that he would not comment on the response at this time but that the Executive Committee planned to continue discussing this matter with the Chancellor.

Dr. Wasser said too that the Executive Committee had begun discussions with the Chancellor concerning the proposed resolution on Evaluation of Senior Campus Administrators which appeared on the Senate's agenda for the present meeting and had made the proposed resolution on Search Procedures available to him although no discussion has taken place. In view of the fact that some time has elapsed since the last meeting of the Senate Executive Committee with the faculty heads of local governance bodies, the decision was made to hold such a meeting early in the spring semester and the Senate Office is now in the process of setting a date for that meeting. The reasons for the decision, Professor Wasser continued, are several: there are actions which local governance bodies can take to move forward on the issues embodied in the resolutions passed and proposed to the Senate this year and also it seems important for them to know the issues which are under discussion in the Senate. Finally, the meeting will also make it possible for the Chairman of the Senate Governance Committee, on behalf of his Committee, to discuss the planning by that Committee for a Governance Conference to be held in the Fall 1983 with local leaders. The Chairman of the Governance Committee, Professor Wasser added, had been consulted by the Executive Committee when the decision to call this year's meeting with local heads was under discussion. Finally, said Professor Wasser, he wished to call the Senate's attention to the recent report issued by the Carnegie Corporation and authored by Ernest Boyer, The Control of the Campus, which cited the strengthening of faculty governance as a need in the present decade for the development of higher education institutions.

III A. Special Commendation of Mr. Raymond Paretzky: Professor Wasser called on Professor Picken (Romance Languages, Queens College) who has served as Mr. Paretzky's mentor. Professor Picken said:

I scarcely need tell this body, of all audiences, that a teacher's greatest joys are the achievements of his students, so you can imagine

with what feelings I come before you tonight, as a member of the Queens College Faculty, to introduce our first guest, the first student from Queens College and, indeed, the first student from City University ever to have been elected to a Rhodes Scholarship, Mr. Raymond Paretzky.

If I were to list all of Raymond's accomplishments, I would only embarrass him, and we would have time to do very little else this evening. Suffice it to say that he is an English major and a French minor with a better than 4.0 average. He won a Belle Zeller scholarship in his sophomore year and was elected to Phi Beta Kappa in his junior year. Last month before winning his Rhodes Scholarship he was admitted to Harvard Law School, an option he may take up when he returns from Oxford. He has had a distinguished career in student government at Queens and currently serves as Vice-President of the Student Association and Chairman of the Day Student Senate. He has been editor of a campus newspaper and associate editor of the Queens College Law Journal. He is a tennis player and a skier. In addition to all this, he has found time to serve regularly as a tutor in our Writing Skills Workshop since his freshman year. He has accomplished all of these things despite a devastating personal tragedy which occurred shortly before he entered college and despite having to earn money to meet his college expenses.

As many of you know, the 32 American Rhodes Scholars are selected on a regional basis and are chosen on a good deal more than their academic record. Raymond was judged by the selection committee for the Middle Atlantic States District to be among the four students from a field which originally comprised over 400 outstanding young men and women from New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, the District of Columbia and West Virginia, to have best fulfilled Cecil Rhodes' criteria of academic excellence, devotion to duty, capacity for leadership and proven physical vigor.

Mr. Chairman, it would clearly be inappropriate for us to spend much time congratulating ourselves on having finally produced a Rhodes Scholar - inappropriate for us - and unfair to a student of whom we are exceedingly proud. Rhodes Scholars, no matter what school they come from, are chosen for the qualities of character and intellect they have demonstrated during their undergraduate years and their promise of future achievement. Demonstrating the qualities Cecil Rhodes had in mind when he spoke of finding "the best men for the world's fight" is, I would say, a rather more difficult thing to do at a commuter college like Queens than at Harvard or Princeton or the Service Academies. Raymond's success in the Rhodes competition is a personal triumph.

But if we cannot take credit for Raymond's achievement, we can take heart from it. For a long time I have felt that City University students, as a group, suffer from a negative self-image, a lack of self-esteem. How many times has each of us overheard a student say, "I only go to Queens," or "I only go to City"? Many students come to us with their eyes firmly fixed on getting qualified as quickly as possible for a low-grade, entry level job, and they never look to the right or to the left or up. This low level of expectation is reinforced, I regret to say, by attitudes we constantly hear expressed in the highest echelons of our University. As we wish Raymond Godspeed and every success in his

studies at Oxford, let us hope that his triumph will serve to broaden the horizons and raise the sights of all of our students.

Mr. Chairman, before asking Raymond to address us, I should like to introduce the following motion on behalf of the Executive Committee:

Be it resolved: That the University Faculty Senate specially commends Mr. Raymond Paretzky, a senior English major at Queens College, on the occasion of his selection as a Rhodes Scholar.

The motion was duly made and seconded. Professor Wasser asked Mr. Paretzky to come to the podium and read the following Explanation of the Resolution:

The University Faculty Senate on behalf of the faculty of The City University congratulates Mr. Paretzky on his success in the Rhodes competition. The faculty is proud of his achievement which represents the Rhodes Scholarship Trust's recognition of Mr. Paretzky's academic promise and personal strengths. The faculty applauds Mr. Paretzky's intellectual gifts and his contribution as a student leader to the life of his college and his University. The faculty is proud too that The City University could offer Mr. Paretzky the academic climate and personal support to nurture his abundant talents. His success exemplifies the faculty's goal to transmit its own commitment to learning and to the intellectual stimulation and personal development of the men and women who enroll in The City University to seek higher education. The faculty wishes Mr. Paretzky continued success as he pursues his studies in English Literature in the University of Oxford.

Given this eighteenth day of January nineteen hundred and eighty-three in the City and State of New York and sealed with the seal of the University Faculty Senate.

Professor Wasser then presented a certificate embodying the resolution and explanation to Mr. Paretzky who also received a resounding round of applause from the Senate.

Mr. Paretzky said that he assumed that the applause indicated passage of the resolution. He thanked the Senate and said his remarks would be brief. He wished to emphasize two points, he continued. First, in reference to the Belle Zeller Scholarship he wished to stress the importance of such programs and the need to expand that program and institute others like it. The scholarship, he continued, provided him and other students who won them not only with money but with an awareness that their achievement was being recognized. This, he said, was heartening for it permitted them to know that their effort did not go unnoticed. In addition, the process by which the scholarships were awarded was important to him. The interview for the scholarship was difficult - he was one individual facing a number of people putting questions to him and having the responsibility of making decisions on the awards. The process was similar to that he faced in the Rhodes competition; therefore, his experience in the Zeller competition had stood him in good stead in his quest of a Rhodes Scholarship award.

A second point which he wished to emphasize, said Mr. Paretzky, was the importance of student government activities for CUNY undergraduates. In particular, the encouragement of responsible student participation in governance such as exists at Queens College he deemed very important. By allowing students direct participation in decision-making through the Academic Senate which at Queens includes a membership of which one-third are students, the college makes it possible for them to have the

experience of introducing resolutions, discussing them, seeing them pass through the body and this is important. Through work on such bodies as the Curriculum Committee on which he served at Queens, Mr. Paretzky continued, seeing how the college works encourages the student to feel part of the college and not just an observer confronted by the faculty. He would advocate extension of such practices throughout the University, he said.

Finally, Mr. Paretzky concluded, he was proud to have won this award from the University and from his college for it showed that they have vitality. He agreed with Professor Picken that the negative image CUNY students have of themselves needs to be fought, that students need to realize that this is a growing, vital institution where they receive a quality education and have the opportunity to participate in student government, both of which prepare them for future successes.

IV. Guest Speaker: Dean Charles Halpern, CUNY Law School at Queens College: Professor Wasser then introduced Dean Halpern. A graduate of Harvard College and Yale Law School, Dean Halpern came to City University having previously taught at Georgetown University Law Center and Stanford Law School. The major focus of Dean Halpern's career before his appointment as Dean of the CUNY Law School, Professor Wasser continued, was in the area of public interest law. Upon graduation from law school he clerked for Judge George T. Washington of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. In 1969 he was co-founder and director of the Center for Law and Social Policy, the prototype public interest law firm. Three years later he founded the Mental Law Project and in 1975 he became the Executive Director of the Council for Public Interest Law. His career as an attorney, an educator and an administrator as well as his special field of interest combined to make him the successful candidate in the national search for the first Dean of CUNY's Law School. It is with special pleasure, concluded Dr. Wasser, that he presented Dean Halpern to the Senate to report on the progress being made in preparation for the first class of students who will enroll in September 1983.

Dean Halpern thanked Professor Wasser and said that a year or two at Oxford sounded attractive to him right now as he contemplated the fall when students would begin to arrive. He had been told that this was the Golden Age of his Deanship - the period before the faculty or student body appeared. Further there was a story making the rounds which went like this: a man wakes up at 7:30 a.m. to the sound of his mother knocking at his door. "It's time to go to law school," says the mother. "I don't want to go to law school," says the man, "the students hate me and I hate them; the faculty hates me, and I hate the faculty". The mother says, "You have to go to law school - you're 45 years old and you're a Dean".

Dean Halpern then noted that he had been invited to give a progress report on the Law School and to respond to comments and questions and said that he would now proceed to his report. First he wished to provide some history of the school. The idea originated some ten years ago when Joe Murphy was president of Queens College. At that time Dr. Murphy and some political leaders from the Borough of Queens promoted the idea. Several other CUNY colleges agreed that establishing such an institution was desirable. Enabling resolutions were passed by the Board and by the Regents. Then came the fiscal crisis of the mid-seventies and the project was put on ice. After Saul Cohen became president of Queens it was pursued vigorously once again. The plan was reformulated and represented to the Regents who amended their previous resolution and the school was created. Just over a year ago the Search Committee for the Dean of the Law School offered Dean Halpern the position and he accepted the offer. He thought that it represented an extraordinary opportunity at that time and he still thought so. He knew that the task would be difficult and he still thought so. He had very much underestimated the dimensions of the latter, however, since he did not

understand all of the problems he would face and no one really explained how difficult the task ahead would be. On the other hand, he continued, the group which has been assembled to develop the plans for the school has made extraordinary strides and it was his belief that they were on the verge of a very important innovation which would have many benefits for CUNY and for New York City.

The Law School, explained Dean Halpern, was set up not to be ordinary but to devise a new curriculum oriented towards public interest law. The plans have been written up from time to time both in the journals and in the press. The Law School brochure explains this in more detail, said the Dean, and he had brought copies of that brochure with him for anyone who might wish to have one. The curriculum of the Law School differs from that of conventional institutions in a number of ways. The clearest elements of difference are 1) it is more theoretical and intellectual than conventional curricula and 2) similarly it is more practical. Most law school curricula are middle of the road. At CUNY, however, the intent is to study legal doctrine, the rules of evidence, etc. in an intellectual perspective by consideration of their historical roots, the sociological setting which led to their formulation, the economic context within which they emerged. It is also the intent to be more practical. Other schools teach legal skills but not lawyering and do not deal with such areas as ethics and the like nor do they teach students how to draft or negotiate a contract. At CUNY the plan is to put more time and energy into those skills and to teach students about the ethical dilemmas they will face in the practice of law and the public responsibility they will undertake. The plan is an ambitious one and would be intimidating if two exceptional legal educators were not already aboard and applications from a large number of others had not been received.

The School has already established itself as the most interesting and significant development in legal education in many years. At professional meetings he has attended, CUNY Law School has been the number one subject of discussion, Dean Halpern said. In general the plans have been greeted enthusiastically and there is much interest in the school's success. Much of this is due to the fact that Professor Howard Lesnick has accepted appointment to the school and he has been responsible for most of the curricular development. Professor Lesnick clerked for Justice Harlan, taught for many years at the University of Pennsylvania Law School and served as a visiting professor at New York University Law School a post he left when he was persuaded to join the CUNY staff. Much of the time over the last six months has not been devoted to curriculum or curriculum design. When asked about what he has done in that time, Dean Halpern said, his response is that most of it has been devoted to the janitorial side. Now, however, the school is installed in a former junior high school. They are getting furniture and there is a room which is recognizably a law library with many feet of bookshelves now almost filled by the 20,000 to 25,000 volumes of law books which they are now sorting and cataloguing.

The school is also working its way clear on its relationship to the other constituent elements in City University, at least to the extent of acquiring some idea of the ambiguities and doubts which exist with regard to that relationship. The very name of the school reflects this. Dean Halpern said he had met many people in the colleges and he was confident there were many opportunities for collaborative ventures between the Law School and the other elements in the University. The precise relationships, however, would have to be deferred for a year or two. At present groups such as the Senate can be of greatest assistance by making sure that capable students know about the program and apply for admission. In visiting other colleges within the University Dean Halpern was startled to learn that there are lots of people who don't know about it. In mid-March the School plans to host a program for CUNY faculty and administrators to introduce them to the Law School. The tuition has been set at \$3100 which is expensive for CUNY but cheap for New York City since other

schools in the area have tuition pegged at a level which is prohibitive now. Dean Halpern said it was difficult to realize that he had only eight months until the students arrived. When he accepted the deanship the time at his disposal seemed almost forever. Now, however, it seems very short indeed. There are six more faculty members to be hired and that process is taking place now with the more than 1,000 applications whittled down to about 100. Dean Halpern concluded that he thought the School would have a capable staff and an able student body and he looked forward to September.

Dean Halpern then responded to the following questions and comments from the floor. 1) Professor Henderson (Special Programs, City)-" I congratulate you on your plans and found what you had to say of great interest. I noted especially your comments with respect to cooperative ventures and the development of relationships with other CUNY units. I wonder, therefore, what encouragement you might give the City College Urban Legal Studies program?"/ We have established good communications there. The program is headed by an extremely competent person with whom I have had many discussions so that we have a headstart there. Over the next few years I would expect that a large number of students who have completed that program will apply to the Law School. 2) Professor Muehlig (Business, Medgar Evers) - What can you tell us about the stipulations you have established with respect to admissions?"/ There are no specific stipulations. We intend to follow an administrative process which looks at the fullest information. We will use the LSAT but we will not use a cutoff point - the system of scoring that test has been revised, you know, so that the old 200-800 scale is no longer applicable and even if it had been we would not have used a cutoff'. We will look at each student and if the LSAT score is low we will see what other factors indicate his or her capacity for success in the work offered at the School, what capacity he or she has for the public service aspect of our curriculum etc. Admissions will be an individualized process. 3) Professor Muller (Economics, Graduate School) - "Have you made any provision for older applicants or for part-time study and what is the future prognosis in terms of special programs, for example, Women and the Law?"/In response to your first question we will welcome older students. It has been my experience that they have a great deal to contribute and that they are well suited to the study of law. We will not have part-time students at this stage, although most students are de facto part-time now. As financial aid funds have dropped off and as the boredom of the second and third years sets in we anticipate that many of the second and third year students will be working part-time and we hope to be able to integrate that work experience into the learning experience. With respect to the second question on the development of programs of general interest to other institutions, we would like to do that. We have thought in terms of combined graduate degree programs at the doctoral level and we think our interdisciplinary approach lends itself well to such thinking. There are possibilities for joint master's programs as well. We will be talking about those matters next year. The ideas that we have are not yet thought through but we hope that we will be a resource for others in the University. There are many courses being given now and we would think the fact that there are now professional legal educators here would be an asset. Also, we have thought of a workshop on business law, for example, with law school faculty and others possibly doing some team teaching but we haven't begun to explore the richness of the entire system yet. 4) Professor Litke (Business, Kingsborough) - "Are you planning to work out a program comparable to the cooperative one at Northeastern Law School when you speak of integrating students' work experience with their learning experience?"/ No, that is not the way we have been thinking. Professor Litke further asked - "Would you see recommending certain courses for pre-law majors - for example, English like Harvard or others?"/ The Northeastern plan shapes the whole program and for that reason we rejected it. With respect to a pre-law curriculum I think that undergraduates should follow their intellectual interests and open as many windows as they can. They should be able to think, read and write critically in order to pursue the law curriculum but although most pre-law students think they should study economics



or political science, I think the opportunities for liberal education are too limited to enroach on with pre-law training. 5) Professor Speidel (Earth and Environmental Science, Queens) - "A knowledge of the law is becoming increasingly important for faculty in the sciences and engineering who are being called upon to give evidence in a variety of cases. Have you thought of training in what goes into being an expert witness?"/ That is a very interesting idea. I think it is part of a larger set of how do people who are not part of the Law School interact with it. I think there is an argument for encouraging undergraduates to have a course on the legal system since legal institutions play an important part in the lives of others. I would like to see far broader training in law. 6) Professor Ladimer (Community Medicine, Mt. Sinai) - "Another law school in this area has to be specialized as you are planning for yours. I have several questions. 1) Are you able to accept afternoon and evening students? 2) Do you contemplate the possibility of accommodating non-degree students? and 3) is it possible that you will have faculty members who are not lawyers teaching law students or that there may be research programs undertaken jointly by law faculty and non-law faculty?"/ There are strong arguments for part-time students but we would like to defer that question for a few years. With respect to having non-degree students we think that is a superb idea which we would like to develop but not now. It may sound like dodging but it isn't. I think it is important that we have non-lawyer faculty early on. The faculty we have have interdisciplinary skills and at the same time we want to draw on other schools. We already have ties with Queens College but we will not be restricted to those faculty only. 7) Professor Schulman (Fire Science, John Jay) - "What did you say is the name of the person responsible for curricular design?"/ Howard Lesnick. Professor Schulman further asked - "I was wondering about the class size - you said 150 students will be admitted, will they be taught en masse or divided into smaller groups?"/ There will be about 150 and what that group will look like we don't know yet. We intend to use a variety of pedagogical methods. There will be some lecture courses for the entire 150 but we will be doing a lot of small group work as well as simulations and such. 8) Professor Baxter (Academic Skills, Hunter) - "Will 150 students be the limit each year so that if 100 students go on from the first to the second year only 100 new students will be admitted?"/ No, we will admit 150 each year and grow to about 450 students. At some point we will also have to give thought to the matter of transfer students, attrition and the like. 9) Professor Henderson (Special Programs, City) - "I have been looking at your five year budget and listening to your description and plans in the area of curriculum and it sounds to me as though life experience were going to be important and also I do not see how the 2 adjuncts indicated in your budget will be able to handle the work you project. How are you going to reconcile these factors?"/ Adjunct teachers are used differently in law school from other systems. Most are in full-time practice and teach for love or a minimal stipend. We believe that within our budget the help needed is possible. We will also place students out to work under supervision. Professor Henderson further asked - "Even if you don't have an idea of who the students are who will be entering the Law School you must know that the tuition level you have set will bring a flood of applications. Have you established some guidelines re: male and female students, ethnicity and the like so that you will guarantee places for all groups?"/ We know that we are committed to having a diverse representative student body. Beyond that we will take a look at the pool of applicants and then make our decision. We are drawn to the principle of diversity as necessary for a better educational experience and we have the same thinking in relation to the faculty we are assembling. I suspect that law schools in general are moving up from the situation where women were explicitly discriminated against since they now constitute about 40% to 50% of law students but that is not yet true of faculty in general. We intend to have diversity in our faculty and to lead the way there since others have so poor a record.

Professor Wasser said he wished to alert Dean Halpern to other issues which will have to be considered in the future. First there is the issue of governance and the

relationship between the Law School and the Senate. There are two possible models for such a relationship, said Dr. Wasser - for example, there is the Mt. Sinai School of Medicine pattern or there is the City College pattern. The former elect their own delegation; the latter is comprehended within the City College delegation. That issue will have to be resolved. The second issue is that there has been some discussion in the Senate Executive Committee about the Ad Hoc Oversight Committee for the Law School which is made up of lawyer members of the Board and the question of faculty representation on that committee has arisen since it is making decisions on curriculum, admission standards and the like which are matters which fall within the faculty's area of responsibility.

Professor Wasser then thanked Dean Halpern who responded by thanking the Senate for their interest and attention. Dean Halpern distributed copies of the Law School Brochure to interested members and said that additional copies might be obtained by calling his office 520-0990.

- V. Proposed Resolution on Faculty Participation in Evaluation of Campus Administrators: The resolution was introduced and its adoption moved and seconded. In the discussion which followed some concern was expressed that the proposal was not more explicit and did not establish more precise procedures and spell out the evaluation process in greater detail. The argument was also offered that within a system like that of the City University an umbrella document was more appropriate than one which might usurp the authority of individual campus faculties and governance bodies. A motion to postpone discussion of the resolution until the 118th Plenary Session to permit members who wished to propose changes in language or procedures to forward them to the Executive Committee for their consideration was made, seconded and passed.
- VI. Proposed Resolution on Search Procedures for Senior Administrative Officers at the University Level: The resolution's adoption was moved and seconded. The resolution was then adopted unanimously.

A motion to adjourn brought the session to a close at 9:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jean Ellis