

SUBJECT TO SENATE APPROVAL

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

September 27, 1983

Professor Wasser (English, Staten Island), chairman, called the session to order at 7:00 p.m. in Room 1700 at the Graduate School and University Center. Present were Senators Amendolia, Ballabon, Barber, Baumrin, Baxter, Beck, Beheshti, Bohigian, Borneman, Brogan, Bryant, Bulanouckas, Burks, Cinquemani, Cooper, D'Amico, Danziger, Davidson, DeLa Campa, Donleavy, Early, Ercolano, Fedullo, Forman, Friedman, Galub, Gerardi, B. Gerber, Greenbaum, Grossman, Harris, Hecht, Heller, Henderson, Hunte, Jiji, Julia, Kadushin, Kirsch, Kolliner, Lea, Lekachman, Litke, Loy, Lytra, Moyné, Parkhurst, Picken, Plissner, Prince, Quinn, Reuder, Rodriguez, Rosen, Schneider, Schreiber, Seguire, Sohmer, Speidel, Spivak, Stroup, Trefousse, Wakatama, Waldinger, Waldman, Walkwitz, Walter, Wedeen, Weightman, Wolfe, Yousef and Zaneteas; Alternate Senators Bearison, Costantakos, Forstall, Lerner, McDaniel, McGillicuddy, Peterson and Wepman. Senators Alsop, Beilin, Cahn, Cantwell, R. Gerber, Riley and Valinsky were excused. Chancellor Joseph S. Murphy and Dr. Jean Ellis, Executive Director, also attended.

- I. Approval of the Tentative Agenda: The tentative agenda was approved as proposed.
- II. Approval of the Minutes of the 121st Plenary Session: The minutes were approved as circulated.
- III. Communications from the Chairman: Professor Wasser noted that the three faculty members who are serving in the Office of Academic Affairs this year as faculty fellows were present at the session - Professor Gerardi (Health and Physical Education, Kingsborough) as a Senator and Professors Barsam (Performing and Creative Arts, Staten Island) and Bonnett (Sociology, Hunter) as the invited guests of the Executive Committee.

Professor Wasser then announced that the Senate's accustomed meeting place had been changed from Room 207 to Room 1700 this year because of the renovation of the former which had resulted in the loss of the Lounge formerly used for the pre-session social hour. Unless the meeting room were changed, it would therefore have been necessary to meet in one place for the pre-session and another for the session. Professor Wasser also reminded the Senate that materials, in addition to those mailed to the membership, were available on the side table and included his written report, the reports of faculty members of Board committees and the proposed slate of Senate Standing Committees, 1983-84.

Professor Wasser also announced that the chairperson of the University Student Senate, Melvin Lowe, had been honored last week as the recipient of a National Black Leadership Roundtable Youth Award.

The Public Meeting of the Board of Trustees on September 26 was the next item in the Chairman's report. That session, he said, was an extraordinary one because shortly after the Chairman of the Board had called the meeting to order and introduced the new president of the Mt. Sinai School of Medicine, Dr. James Glenn, the meeting was disrupted by a small group of demonstrators from Medgar Evers College who recited in strident tones their complaints and concerns about difficulties with respect to facilities, to the acting president and other elements in the college environment. As a result, the Chairman entertained a motion to recess the meeting and it was reconvened in another part of the building at 80th Street. At that point the Board considered the resolutions before it. Professor Wasser had raised questions about

some of those items, namely the supplements to be paid Distinguished Professors and holders of Named Chairs as listed on the University and Chancellor Report for that meeting, the proposal to purchase on a university-wide basis Point of Sales Cash Register Type Computer Terminals and the proposed Executive Salary Supplements. With respect to the first Professor Wasser had asked for an explanation of the variations in supplements to be paid these persons as listed on the report but had not received a satisfactory explanation. The second was a resolution about which the Executive Committee had raised questions last week - questions which Dr. Wasser had brought to the Public Hearing on the agenda on September 20. Subsequent to that time Vice Chancellor for University Systems Fuchs had met with Professor Wasser in an effort to respond to the Committee's questions but the issue remained somewhat clouded in particular with respect to the extent of consultation on this item which had taken place - had, for example, it been reviewed with the University Computer Policy Committee or the Council of Presidents or some other formal group comprising representatives from all campuses or was it a response to separate requests on the part of a few? Therefore, Professor Wasser had reiterated the Executive Committee's concerns and made them a part of the record of the meeting. The final issue was one which has troubled members of the Board in varying degrees since last spring. When it was brought to the Committee on Faculty, Staff and Administration on which Dr. Wasser sits last spring, the Committee had not approved it for forwarding to the full Board. It had appeared nevertheless on the agenda of the June meeting of the Board and at that time the discussion of the item had resulted in a tabling of the resolution. At the first meeting of the Faculty, Staff and Administration Committee this fall the item had been reviewed and this time it had been approved with Professor Wasser abstaining and the Chairman of the Board joining in the proceedings to exercise his right to vote as an ex-officio member of the Committee. The full Board had also approved the resolution last night with one abstention by Trustee Baard and with Professor Wasser's concerns being made part of the record of the proceedings.

Turning to other Board activities, Professor Wasser spoke to the fact that during the spring term, as he had reported to the Senate previously, members of the Board began to voice concerns about some of their procedures and about more clearly defining their role vis-a-vis the University and the staff. These concerns, he reminded the Senate, were fostered by the Board's attendance at the Association of Governing Board's meeting in Atlanta last April and their discussions and observations there about other boards' role and procedures. In June, therefore, the opportunity was provided for the Board to discuss these concerns at some length among themselves and with the Chancellor at Caumsett. Several hours of discussion alone with the Chancellor on June 12 examined such issues as the role of the Board in policy-making, the "management" of the Board by staff, the flow of information to the Board and the Board's Committee Structure and Procedure. Various alternatives in each of these areas were suggested for consideration. On June 13 the vice chancellors joined the gathering and each described the work of his or her department. Out of these discussions has come the appointment of a Task Force by the Chairman of the Board chaired by Trustee Cavanagh and comprising Drs. Bernstein, Kolodny and Polk in addition to Mr. Lowe, chairperson of the Student Senate, and Dr. Wasser. The chair and vice chair of the Board will sit with the Task Force ex officio and President Bassin, York, will be the presidential consultant. Mr. Harris, the special consultant to the Chancellor last year, will serve as a consultant to the Task Force also and Mr. Warmbrand, secretary to the Board, will serve in his usual capacity. The Task Force's recommendations will go to the full Board for review.

Professor Wasser told the Senate too that he had met with the Chairman of the Board during the summer, at his own request, to go over a number of matters and to voice his view that should the Board decide to move to one of the alternatives proposed, viz. to sit as a Committee of the Whole, the influence and role of the faculty would be diminished. He noted also that another consequence of the Board's sessions at Caumsett and subsequent reflection was the decision to provide opportunities for the members to become better

acquainted with various constituencies within the University. Thus, it has been decided to invite the entire Board to the Senate's annual dinner at which the Board Chairman will present greetings and to hold an extended luncheon and informal exchange session for the Board and the college presidents. A comparable activity, it is presumed, is being planned for the Board and the Student Senate.

Professor Wasser reported next on the report developed by Mr. Harris, the Chancellor's Special Consultant, during the academic year 1982-83, dealing with the Organization and Management of the Central Office of the City University. The report was released last spring, although portions of it had been implemented as it was developed. Mr. Harris concluded that the organization is structurally sound, in general, but that performance could be improved to accomplish the principal tasks. Those tasks he defines as (1) assisting the Board, (2) serving the colleges, and (3) representing the University. Mr. Harris' recommendations, Professor Wasser continued, included: creation of an integrated office of the Chancellor, composed of the Chancellor, the Deputy Chancellor and a new Office of Management Review; creation of a Vice Chancellor for University Relations; conversion of the position of Senior Vice Chancellor for Urban Affairs to Senior Vice Chancellor; merging of the planning function and the Office of Institutional Research into a new office of Policy Planning and Analysis and reduction of the number of executives reporting directly to the Chancellor. In the area of managerial changes Mr. Harris suggested: (1) tighter management of the Central Office; (2) restricting, wherever possible, the role of the Central Office in administration to developing administrative practices for use by the colleges and assisting the colleges in implementation; and (3) continuing management audits of each Central Office unit. These recommendations, Professor Wasser reiterated, are being put into effect and are in part responsible for some of the changes at 80th Street.

Dr. Wasser also told the Senate that Vice Chancellor for Faculty and Staff Relations Catalano has tendered his resignation effective in June 1984 and said that he expected a Search Committee to be named shortly.

Next Professor Wasser stated that there had been a revision of the 1983-84 operating budget during the summer with a cut of 350 lines by June 1984 mandated for the University. The Executive Committee, he continued, had met with Deputy Vice Chancellor for Budget and Finance Vivona for a briefing on this in August and had met with the Chancellor about it last week. Professor Wasser said that this was apparently part of a broader cut in state personnel mandated by the Governor and that he expected the Chancellor to address this subject in more detail in his report later on the agenda.

The Executive Committee, Dr. Wasser said, met also during the summer with the new Deputy Chancellor, Houston Elam, the new Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Marguerite Barnett, who was the guest of the Senate this evening, and the new Vice Chancellor for University Relations, Margaret Weiss Boepple. Dr. Elam would be the guest of the Senate at the October Plenary and Ms. Boepple at a time later in the year.

Two documents reviewed by the Executive Committee earlier this fall will most probably become subjects of debate for the Senate, Dr. Wasser said. They are Research Foundation President Goldstein's paper on University/Corporate Relationships which includes an Agenda for the City University and a revision of the current policy and procedures for Evaluation of Presidents which has been approved unanimously by the Council of Presidents. Since the latter would require a change in the existing policy guidelines of the Board for Evaluation of the Chancellor and the Presidents, Professor Wasser said that faculty views would be sought.

Finally, Professor Wasser reported on recent recognition of CUNY and its faculty

in National Endowment for the Humanities grants announced in the morning New York Times had gone to City University units: The Graduate School for a seminar on "Great Issues of African Political Philosophy and Literature", Hunter College for "Puerto Ricans in New York: Voices of the Migration"; and two to Lehman College - for a summer seminar on "Ibsen, Strindberg, Chekhov and Shaw as Contemporary Playwrights" and for curriculum revision to provide "a common intellectual experience for students." In addition three CUNY faculty members were the recipients of ACLS grants for studies they proposed - Professor Brown (History, Brooklyn), Professor Mermall (Spanish, Graduate Center), Professor Moore (Art History, Hunter).

IV. Chancellor's Report: Chancellor Murphy said he regretted that Professor Wasser had not stated the titles of the studies for which faculty received their ACLS grants. Professor Brown's is "Legitimation by descent - the Capetians and Saint-Denis" which, he added parenthetically, he took to be a legitimation of the procedures of the Council of Presidents; Professor Mermall's study on "Ortega y Gasset and French Culture" he awaited eagerly and Professor Moore's on "The West Frieze of the Siphnian Treasury at Delphi" he intended to read immediately upon publication since he found himself in need of oracles.

The Chancellor then reported on the University's enrollment. He said there were 45,345 students an increase of 6.7% over last year. Of these transfers constitute the largest group. He said that the number of students entering from parochial schools and from the neighboring counties, especially Nassau and Westchester, was noteworthy with the two largest institutions in terms of numbers of transferees Nassau Community College and New York University. The University has been encountering an interesting phenomenon, he said, with applicants from New York University who could not have gotten in to CUNY's senior colleges under present admission standards because they had high school averages below 80 but who were admitted to NYU, presumably because there was a warm body and a check, who transferred to the senior colleges once they had demonstrated by their college course work that they were admissible.

The Chancellor said too that the community colleges were pretty well financed this year due to the City's surplus and generosity towards the University as well as to the Governor and the legislature's allocation of \$1.7 million additional this summer. The senior colleges, however, are not doing so well, he continued. At the beginning of the summer the 10,900 lines given the University were allocated because it was felt they should be while they were in hand. No sooner was this done than word was received from the State that the University must reduce the number of lines by June 1984 to 10,547 or the 350 noted by Dr. Wasser. The University intends to try to recover those lines but does not know whether that effort will be successful; however, it has been projected that the number can be reached through attrition. The total dollars saved by the State as a result of this cut is very small and the cut is due to political necessity not an economic one. The program of early retirement made available to personnel in state agencies, but not CUNY, last spring had resulted not in the 3000 vacancies which were anticipated but in some 8,400 vacancies - a commentary and symbol of the dedication and loyalty of state employees. For example, Albany was left without sufficient stationary electricians, whoever they are and thus some lines had to be put back. The Chancellor said the summer cut was clearly a political statement by the Governor who was determined to reduce the State's work force as he had asserted he would. The University has suggested that the State give us the money not lines and that that would further reduce the work force but the success of that proposal is an unknown. The lifting of the hiring freeze imposed on the University, said the Chancellor, did make possible filling some 700 positions this fall.

With respect to the Capital Budget Chancellor Murphy said that there were bond sales for the New York City Technical College and Queens College projects but that there was some concern about the sales for projects at Medgar Evers, LaGuardia, Hostos reflection was the decision...

and Baruch. Baruch, however, is now to be yoked to the State University College of Optometry in a building which will be used by both. The University has had some problem in getting the Dormitory Authority to float its bonds in a timely fashion and as a result has not had the advantage of fluctuating interest rates which had been low. It now appeared that the bonds would probably be sold in December when interest rates would probably be the highest for the year.

There have also been changes in the Pell Grants, the Chancellor continued, changes in the standards for eligibility and in the awards for room and board which will result in increases of from \$37 to \$250 for CUNY students.

Chancellor Murphy said too that he has had a number of discussions with Anthony Alvarado, the Chancellor of Schools and that he found him to be talented, energetic, and imaginative. The Schools Chancellor, he said, recognized that the demographic projections imply a smaller CUNY. Therefore, they had agreed to confront the dropout issue since the rate of dropouts is 45% which is horrendous and unacceptable. The drop out rate which is a loaded term is not exclusive to CUNY or the City schools but elsewhere it is spoken of as retention which has a different connotation. Dealing with the dropout rate, the Chancellor continued, is not something which can generate all that much political, commercial or social pressure because to deal with it would mean that the schools would not continue to provide the work force for the fastest growing industry in the city - the fast-food industry. With more education people would demand higher wages than the \$3.45 per hour they receive as minimum wage. The Schools Chancellor and the University's Chancellor, however, have discussed a variety of collaborative enterprises which might be undertaken and which might be funded.

Governor Cuomo has named an Advisory Committee on Education, the Chancellor reported, which includes several distinguished educators and some not so distinguished and he counted himself among the latter group of members. Their charge is to fashion a program for the Governor so that he can take a regional and national position on Education. There is no indication, however, that the program will be translated into dollars.

Turning to internal matters, the Chancellor said that he had made a number of appointments, most of which had satisfied the Senate Chairman's demands concerning Procedures. He had made some errors, he acknowledged, but he thought the University could be pleased with the results nonetheless. He indicated also that there would be other changes some in process now and others to occur during the year.

Chancellor Murphy said too that he thought most of the issues brought to him by the Senate last year had been resolved whether to or not to the satisfaction of the body. He acknowledged that he had not been a dutiful member of the organization but that he had committed himself this year to once a month meetings with the body. He said too that the Executive Committee of the Senate put in more hours than any other group of which he knew; they had met for some nine hours the previous week so far as he could judge, although that number might not have been required absent Professor Baumrin and four might have sufficed. He said that, as the Senate knew, the quality of the City University's faculty astonished him, that he had finally had a bookcase installed in his office - there was none before - and many faculty had, through their contributions to the Book Project which he and the Senate had sponsored jointly, filled the shelves with their work. Thus, he had the opportunity to read faculty publications and was learning about many subjects from Buster Keaton to swimming, all of which confirmed his belief in the amazing breadth of interests of the faculty.

Chancellor Murphy then responded to the following questions and comments from the floor. 1) Professor Greenbaum (History, Queensborough) - "I was happy to see that we have taken a step backward on the CUNY BA and returned to the original governance of that program and that the illegal usurpation by the Graduate School had been undone.

When do you expect that the CUNY BA Committee will report to the appropriate body, that is to the Senate?"/ Ask Vice Chancellor Barnett that question. It is she who knows more about it than I. You recall when I spoke to you last year I was all excited about the program and thought this is a great idea. Then, I read your report which Henry sent me and I found that there were all kinds of problems. So I decided not to deal with it but to let my Vice Chancellor work it out. 2) Professor Speidel (Earth and Environmental Science, Queens) - "What do you see as your major accomplishments since you became Chancellor and what do you anticipate as the problems for this year?"/ You are a better judge than I of the accomplishments. So far as the coming year is concerned I think we will be involved with the school system in a big way and try to help with the dropout rate. You know, the business of learning moves in a continuum from K through college and beyond but the system is discontinuous and knowledge is just not organized to fit the structure. The biggest problem is the bureaucracy and the whole problem I cited in my remarks before about dropout versus retention rates. We don't really know how bad that rate is but we do know we are failing lots of people. Half of the students do not graduate and there are two million people in this town who are not high school graduates. We have to have some role or hand in discovering who they are. We are the ones who will profit from this and be enriched. I don't mean to be chauvinist or dramatic or regional but I am. I think we are lucky at the diversity in this town and in our university and people expect us to be that way. The law - the 1979 legislation states that upward mobility is the only thing that justifies investment by the State in a separate institution from the State University system. My second goal is to see to it that the Graduate Center gets adequate support. When one thinks that in the brief time comparatively speaking we have existed and that we are an urban university, we are 14th in the country in programs among the top ten, that is a source of pride. 3) Professor Harris ( Speech and Hearing Sciences, Graduate School) - "What do you think we should be doing? What is your vision of the University five years hence?"/ I think we are going through a period of relative stability, that is one with no dramatic growth or decline, with no infusion of dollars or major cuts in funding. It is a period when we can target on our principal interests and what hurts most. What ideological interests there are in the national attitude the perception of values coming from Washington will affect. My sense is that the constitution of the University will remain as it is now. There will be an increasingly larger percentage of minority people coming through the ranks and making it - which is not very different from what has gone on here since the establishment of the Free Academy in 1847. Our colleges, you know, are extraordinarily reflective of their neighborhoods and the values and politics of the people in their neighborhoods are reflected in them. They are not like some college on a hill in the midst of a town with different values and perceptions. That's true of most - though not perhaps Borough Manhattan or Hunter. The college is looked at as a vehicle for acculturation and it is increasingly looked at as a producer of the middle class. I guess also that if we are going to be innovative we have to be at our point of greatest strength and, after all, we are located in the greatest city in the world. 4) Professor Grossman (Elementary Education, City) - " In your discussions with Chancellor Alvarado you said you addressed more involvement of our teacher education programs with the Board of Education. Now, as you know, our teacher education departments make their own arrangements with local community boards. What do you think will happen to those arrangements?"/ I am not eager to be in the way of the 140 programs said to be in existence now. Someone made a list of them and as one reads it they range from the sublime to the ridiculous. It is no good to try to deal with them from the central administration. The best way is for them to be implemented at the colleges. What we do want to do is (1) undertake an evaluation of what is working and what isn't, (2) see whether we can universalize what is working. This place has a parochialism which is remarkable and that is silly. <sup>is</sup> If something seems to work, for example, if the Middle School at LaGuardia is as successful as they say it is, we should do it everywhere. This is precisely the kind of thing the Carnegie Corporation had in mind in its recent recommendations; (3) remove the

bureaucratic barriers on both sides - ours and the Board of Education's. 5) Professor Baumrin (Philosophy, Lehman) - "You mentioned that Henry Wasser might be interested in the evaluation of presidents. Could you summarize the new program approved by the Council of Presidents and the arguments for it?" / I understand the Executive Committee is going to have a session with me on that on October 4 and I will discuss it then. So far as the present system is concerned I have seen only one evaluation - of your president and that said he was a wonderful guy. 6) Professor Donleavy (Special Services to Education, Lehman) - "How far have the negotiations gone in settlement of the women's case (i.e. the Melani case)?" / There was a meeting today. I want to see the thing settled, as you know and I think we have made some progress. I think we are very close on a dollar amount and I think we have to get City agreement on that, then we have to figure out how to allocate it. The University is interested in seeing the right of justice prevail. Professor Donleavy further asked - "Why aren't the CUNY figures in the AAUP listing of salaries and compensation? They were last year." / I don't know. 7) Professor Cooper (History, Staten Island) - "I have been trying to figure out how to make a question out of what really is a speech without too much success but I'll try anyway. Having spent four of the last five years on the Executive Committee and many more as a Senator and having been trained as an historian, I am shocked at what I read in the Clarion's most issue on pages 8 and 3 about the University's revised Retrenchment Guidelines being accepted. What I read there sounds as though they were the product solely of discussion between yourself and the PSC. I am very troubled by this since as a Senator and an Executive Committee member I spent many hours reviewing draft documents drawn up by the Senate as revisions of the Retrenchment Guidelines and I have evidence to support this. Could the Executive Committee find some way to correct the historical record? I am personally offended by the hours of work I put in and my colleagues put in and I know it won't do any good to write to the Clarion because they won't publish my letter and I believe something should be done." Professor Wasser noted that the Clarion was the PSC's publication and that they could publish the account as they perceived it. Chancellor Murphy noted that the University paper, i.e. the Senate Newsletter had already set forth the Senate's role in revising the Guidelines and Professor Wasser confirmed the Chancellor's statement that he had referred to the Senate in his own remarks about the revision. Professor Baumrin rose to a point of order and stated that the Clarion article included a direct quote from the Chancellor which acknowledged only the role of the PSC in the revision. Professor Baumrin further stated that as the Chancellor had been told last year his predecessor had called on the Senate immediately after the AAUP censure was imposed to appoint a committee to draft new guidelines to approach the AAUP. The new Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs who came to the University at that time had the lifting of censure as a major agenda item and worked with the Senate committee on re-drafting the Guidelines. The Senate's Committee members received no compensation for the many hours they put in - nor did they seek it - but at least there could be some recognition of their efforts and initiative. The document did go through some forty drafts before it became an in-house document and when it was said publicly that the revision was solely the product of the administration and the AAUP, this was disturbing. If third parties believe they had a signal role in that process that should not obscure the fact that they were third parties and to eliminate the second parties is inexcusable. The University should remedy this affront. Professor Yousef (Mechanical Engineering, Staten Island) stated that he would personally assure Professor Cooper that any letter which she sent to the Clarion would be published. 8) Professor Sohmer (Mathematics, City) - "It is almost October and the new budget cycle is in progress. Even though the Chancellor and Vice Chancellor for Budget and Finance suggest that the cycle begins in June, in fact it begins now. Given that fact would you feel compelled to write to the presidents and suggest that they involve faculty in that process?" / I did last year I think and I will now.

V. Reports of Faculty Members of Board of Trustees' Committees: The reports were circulated in written form and copies are appended to these minutes.

VI. Approval of Proposed Slate of Standing Committees, 1983-84: Professor Wasser presented the slate and explained that it was developed on the basis of responses received from Senate members. All members had received committee preference forms in June and those who had not responded by August received a second request. He suggested that nominations might be made from the floor but that it was also possible to add members to committees even after the formal approval of the slate. Therefore, it might be more efficient and more useful in terms of maintaining balance on committees and manageable size for meeting purposes if those Senators who were not assigned, indicated their preference to the Chair and permitted the Executive Committee to make additional assignments. Professor Wasser also noted some additions and other changes in the proposed slate. A motion to approve the slate as presented incorporating those additions and changes was made, seconded, and passed without dissent. (A copy of the adopted slate is appended to these minutes).

VII. Guest Speaker: Vice Chancellor Marguerite Barnett, Office of Academic Affairs, "CUNY in the 1980's: The Quest for Excellence and Equity in a Time of Scarcity": Professor Wasser next introduced Vice Chancellor Barnett. He stated that she received her A.B. from Antioch where she majored in Political Science and the master's and Ph. D. from the University of Chicago in Political Science. Dr. Barnett, he said, was the author of many books and articles. Among these was The Politics of Cultural Nationalism in South India which was awarded the American Political Science Association Ethnic and Pluralism Award in 1981 for the best scholarly work in political science within the previous five years exploring the phenomenon of Ethnic and Cultural Pluralism. She was also co-editor of several publications including Public Policy for the Black Community: Strategies and Perspectives, Educating the Disadvantaged, and Comparing Race, Gender and National Origin Desegregation. Vice Chancellor Barnett, he continued, came to CUNY from Teachers College, Columbia University where she was professor of Politics and Education and Director of the Institute for Urban and Minority Education. She previously was professor and chairman of the Political Science department at Howard University and taught also at Princeton University. Dr. Barnett is a member of the Board of Directors of the ACLU and of the Overseas Development Council and a Trustee of the NAACP.

Vice Chancellor Barnett acknowledged Professor Wasser's introduction and noted that it was a long way from South India to the City University but that one thing united them and that was scarcity which she viewed as a public policy and political issue. She said that fiscal stringencies and the new political realities of the 1980's have challenged the assumptions and goals of urban education developed in the 1960's and that those challenges were keenly felt at the City University. Dr. Barnett said she wished to explore three issues in her remarks this evening: 1) the national context which influences higher education policies, 2) the specific meaning of that context for the City University, and 3) the leadership initiatives of the Office of Academic Affairs in view of the city, state, and national environment of scarcity and erosion of resources. On the first Dr. Barnett said that education has emerged as a potent political issue in the 80's. This perception, she continued, was fed by the same forces as generated interest in education in the 60's - fear of the United States' loss of its competitive edge economically and militarily to other nations. Today, she said, critics of the schools point out problems emerging from a loss of leadership in markets and in worker productivity as evidence of the schools' failure. Also, the tensions in East-West relations heighten concern about the educational preparation of military personnel who may be called upon to operate and maintain sophisticated armaments. There is a striking difference between educational reform in the 60's and now, however, she asserted and that is the result of the Brown versus Board of Education decision which set the stage for the pursuit of policies whose aim was the achievement of equal educational opportunity. This led to intervention in the early childhood education system and efforts towards busing and desegregation as well as improvements in on-site education for low income minority children. Then, educational excellence and equity were not viewed as antithetical.



It was thought that educational excellence could be fostered by raising the performance of all students. Today, however, the theme of excellence is viewed as incompatible with equity. Many argue that experiments to achieve a greater measure of equality through intervention in early childhood education were failures but that flies in the face of research findings. Evidence from the 1982 National Assessment of Educational Progress report supports findings that the gains where Title I was applied are real. The rise in SAT scores for minority students also attests to this. Nonetheless, said Dr. Barnett, educational policy is being made today in a society undergoing massive technological and structural transformation. This is especially true in the economic system. In the 60's the struggle for minority advancement coincided with American economic interests - the economy was booming, there was a labor shortage and business thought that blacks, other minorities and women represented a new and untapped source of workers. Thus, big business sought the expansion of a skilled labor force through education and affirmative action. Shortly thereafter when a few gains had been registered the domestic economy began to change. There was strong competition in the world market from other capitalist countries, the dollar declined and there was increasing independence of nations in the Third World. The United States slipped into a protracted economic crisis and there was direct competition for jobs. In this period of persistent downturn and truncated expectations the hardest hit group were Blacks and other minorities. The economic changes were mirrored in public policy and a new revolution in that area. What is this public policy revolution? Although seemingly disparate and unrelated there is an underlying unity of perspective which links the education policies of the current national administration, I think. The elements are: tuition tax credit, budget reductions, tax exemptions for schools which discriminate, opposition to busing for racial balance, transformation of the Department of Education into a foundation, opposition to affirmative action, emphasis on educational excellence and freedom for the educational consumer, and the new federalism. Dr. Barnett identified three themes which she saw converging in these issues - 1) the notion of contraction of the public sphere and of the definition of what constitutes legitimate public interest; 2) social triage; 3) individualism and the privatization of public interest. The first, she continued, is demonstrated in the formulation of the new federalism. It removes debate on pressing issues from the national arena and places it on the states where it becomes fragmented. Further, it lowers expectations of what the federal government can do. It moves lobbying for public institutions and inhibits their ability to mobilize. Social triage, she continued, divides students into three groups: 1) those for whom movement into the middle and upper class is possible, 2) those for whom such movement is assured, and 3) those for whom it is impossible. Some people think that dollars spent on the group in the third category are wasted and that help should be given those in the second. The popular interpretation of the report of the National Commission on Excellence says that it means that government should be select and concentrate on programs for the intellectually gifted and this results in the focus on the tuition tax credit. To the extent that help is to be given the poor it is to help those with the most upward mobility. Nathan Glazer has written, "Do those who wish to escape have the duty to stay behind with the worst? And does society have an obligation to force them to? I think the answer to both questions is No. To me, freedom is a higher value than those advanced by the forced association of the aspiring and achieving with those who create an environment in which they can neither aspire nor achieve." The priority being assigned individualism, she said, means the ending of an era in which there is equity in education and that equity is equated with justice with choice. That equation is a simple restatement of the confusion of personal freedom with individual choice in the market place which is so typical of conservative writing. Civil rights issues are the ones which have evoked the most consistent statements in this area. There is presidential opposition to busing, for example, and to affirmative action, and support for tax exemptions for schools which discriminate. All of these are justified or rationalized through the juxtaposition of individual to group rights. Group rights are denied as legitimate and there is denial of public responsibility to redress group discrimination, deprivation or exploitation. Efforts to redress these

are instead attacked as inimical to the rights of the individual. Vice Chancellor Barnett identified another characteristic American dynamic as a force shaping current educational policy as a progressive loss of a substantive, consensual core of American values and symbolic referents. There has always been, she continued, a proximate consensus in America on common national direction and overarching national purpose. This consensus provides the most general frame of reference and purpose for the educational system. For example, during the early 19th century the myth of the melting pot encapsulated a real cultural emphasis on ethnic assimilation that was reflected in school curricula. What this means, in other words, is that the educational system is not autonomous but is shaped by the economic, political, social and cultural context. The present period is one in which there is a lack of either a unifying or compelling national purpose or a homogeneous, contained cultural core and this leaves educators and educational systems open to the vicissitudes of reform faddism. Thus, education becomes increasingly like popular culture. One year hemlines are up and hula hoops are "in". The next, hemlines fall and punk rock is the accepted social style. One year the educational focus is on open classrooms, another year it is back to basics. One year physical education and exercise are in; the next math and science. Because of this individualism and social triage are made more acceptable. This is the environment within which the City University must fulfill its mission today.

Vice Chancellor Barnett then spoke to the mission of the City University and said she viewed the University as charged with a dual mission - to serve as a principal instrument for upward mobility and access to the middle class for traditionally disadvantaged populations and to teach its students to think critically about the world and the forces shaping it which is the essence of liberal arts education. She noted the challenge to that dual mission and the fact that historically since the founding of the Free Academy CUNY had been involved in the social life of the city. The University, she suggested, exerts control over the economic destiny of the population it serves and also, more subtly exerts influence by training the bureaucratic workforce for the city's institutions - teachers, police, social workers et al. In the present context there is a danger, the Vice Chancellor said, that the University can become, unwittingly, an instrument for social triage by assisting in replicating the new class structure which conforms to the needs of industry and which produces large numbers of students trained for entry level positions in skilled and semi-skilled jobs with limited mobility. This is the result of several factors - there are not enough well-paying jobs so employers can demand an associate's degree rather than a high school diploma as the new, necessary credential essential for job qualification; there is misguided public pressure to turn the University into an institution which produces a workforce narrowly trained to the specifications of industry. The reverse of this can also be observed when students demand certain practical courses and reject irrelevant courses in the humanities and social sciences. The Vice Chancellor said that she was not deprecating the importance or necessity of providing students with the kind of practical skills which were necessary for them to begin well-paying careers. Rather, she said, she deplored the uncoupling of the practical from theory, the substitution of the practical for critical thinking since the latter is the hallmark of higher education. By critical thinking, she continued, she meant two things - the imparting of a spirit of criticism to students such that no theory or concept was sacrosanct or beyond the critical apparatus defining a discipline and that the same critical posture opened up to students the possibility of thinking critically about the socio-historical forces impinging on them and shaping their lives. The point was well made according to Vice Chancellor Barnett is Paolo Freiere's Pedagogy of the Oppressed. Problem-solving, she said, helped students to see the present as history and to provide the intellectual means for them to envision transformation of themselves and their society in ways which are progressive and liberating. The University's mission is being challenged, Vice Chancellor Barnett opined, but the Office of Academic Affairs rejected the easy route of letting struggles

among the disadvantaged for shrinking resources determine how it met its obligations. Instead, she said, the Office realized that it must devise ways to accomplish the University's mission with ever shrinking resources and to communicate its importance to the public.

Vice Chancellor Barnett then spoke to the ways in which the Office might supply leadership initiatives in the University. She said that it must work to increase outside support for innovative ideas consistent with the mission of the University, it must learn to draw on the resources within the system more effectively, and it must continue to target its program efforts to serve the most disadvantaged students. During the coming year Vice Chancellor Barnett said the Office of Academic Affairs would pursue certain specific initiatives: 1) academic program review and evaluation which will incorporate a general review by the Office of the program approval process with the aim of rationalizing, strengthening and evaluating the procedures for creating and gaining approval by the Board and the State for new programs; 2) research institutes and centers - here the Vice Chancellor said that there are some 51 such institutes and centers and that the policies governing them have been debated widely within the University in recent years but that there were no University guidelines for such units. She identified three goals as important in this area: 1) encouragement of faculty research and service at the University; 2) increase of flexibility for faculty and administrators in structuring responses to society's need for university research in a particular area; and 3) maximization of ways and means by which the University could enrich the mix of private and public funds for research purposes. The third area identified by the Vice Chancellor as of special interest and concern was the review of the University's effort in the basic skills area. She said that the office had collected a great deal of data from both the national and university academic communities with respect to remedial reading, writing, mathematics and ESL programs. Now the systematic assessment of those data and the various strategies they demonstrated was necessary to identify the most successful programs. The effort to collaborate with the Board of Education to address basic skills issues was another area named by the Vice Chancellor as part of the Office's agenda. A fourth initiative, she said, would be the development of additional discipline-based committees across campus boundaries. The distinguished, talented faculty are among the University's greatest strengths, she said, but the size and fragmentation of the University often inhibited interaction among the faculties in the same discipline. All of these initiatives, she said, were part of the Office's commitment to increase the level of excellence with which CUNY could perform its mission as a university despite unchanged or diminished resources.

In conclusion Dr. Barnett asserted that for educators these were the best of times and the worst of times. The best because after years of neglect education was once again in the headlines; the worst because this concern for the state of public education came at a time of unparalleled economic and fiscal challenges and the ascendance of an inimical ideological environment. Education faced formidable obstacles, she said, before there was a significant commitment of resources to public education. She said too that the role of the faculty in fulfilling the University's mission was crucial and central, that academic decision-making had been an important faculty prerogative since the founding of the academy, that the Office of Academic Affairs shared a deep commitment to that prerogative and as faculty colleagues would attempt to monitor, develop implement and evaluate academic policy with a view of, commitment to and accountability for the whole. The entire thrust of the office, she said, was to be creative in the use of shrinking resources in a period of decremental planning and scarcity. In the quest for equity and excellence, she said, she looked forward to the faculty's continued collegial input and support as the office and they worked together to pursue the University's mission.

Vice Chancellor Barnett then responded to the following questions and comments from the floor. 1) Professor Speidel - "I apologize if the tone of this question

from the floor. 1) Professor Speidel (Earth and Environmental Science, Queens) - "I apologize if the tone of this question appears adversative but I was concerned before your speech and I am concerned after listening to it. Leaving aside the arguable points in your remarks I am concerned about the fact that you are a political scientist, the Chancellor is also a political scientist, the Deputy Chancellor is a management person, the Vice Chancellor for Fiscal Affairs, a fiscal person. It doesn't appear that there is anyone in the top echelon of the University's administration who has hands on knowledge of technical programs or science programs and we have a situation where the facilities for technical and science programs are outmoded. How do you plan to bring yourself up to snuff so the scientists can feel comfortable?"/ First some of the audience fell asleep and then left, so to have gone into the sciences would have made my speech too long. I've been here only 27 days and don't think I can be expected to have everything under my belt yet. I can say that the SPISE program at the community colleges has been a model for a collaborative proposal being developed in the Office of Academic Affairs. That proposal has been discussed with Provost Lustig and with President Proshansky. My lack of mention of the science was not an indication of lack of concern. A program leading to the PhD in Computer Science is at the top of the agenda for program approval in the Office and I reject the notion that as a political scientist I am not concerned with the sciences. On the issue of the disadvantaged and not advantaged as a parent I remember times when my daughter was bad and when she was good. What it reflects are the problems of society and the obligation of the legislature to provide us with money. If I dwelled on those subjects, that is the reason; it doesn't mean that I am not concerned with all students. Professor Speidel further stated - "But you can't say that a political scientist has hands on knowledge of the sciences."/ As Director of the Institute at Teachers College I had experience with technical programs. We served the school districts in this city and others, throughout the country as a matter of fact providing technical assistance under Title I and Title IX. Professor Speidel further stated - "I think there is a misunderstanding about what I meant by 'technical' programs. I referred to programs in the technologies, for example, electrical engineering. Can you say you have hands on knowledge of electrical engineering?"/ I don't have that knowledge. My predecessor, of course, was a physicist and perhaps you would prefer to have him still but I think we can demand that whoever heads my office have an open mind about all programs. Professor Speidel concluded, "I must say that I think you have made a terrible beginning." 2) Professor Lea (English, Lehman) - "Welcome to the Senate. First of all, most of us will not disagree with your philosophy vis-a-vis the liberal arts. What concerns me is that there are many things you want to do which are worthwhile but there are too many, I think and I urge you to filter out those you wish to undertake immediately and hold the rest. 3) Professor Baumrin (Philosophy, Lehman) - "Since I share most of the things you know nothing about I wish you could say a little more about the institutes and centers. It is true that we lack uniform guidelines and I wonder whether you would not agree that it would probably be a good idea to have a faculty committee to draw up some guidelines. Also, could you expand on what you said about cross-campus discipline-based committees. Would the purpose be simply communication or more than that?"/ Professor Donleavy interjected that the onetime cross-campus committee in teacher education had provided an excellent forum for communication and that there was a university-wide group in guidance and counseling too./ I think those disciplines which have such committees know that new efforts have come out of those committees. I think we can build on existing models. For example Cinema Studies which Professor Barsam, one of our fellows, is active in and knows about. With respect to not doing too much we want to begin in mathematics. We have had some feedback that the interest is there and the Chancellor is very interested in bringing public school teachers into the university to discuss curriculum development from the school through the Ph.D. There are many things we can build on in terms of existing activities, for example the Basic Skills office which has accumulated data which need to be reviewed and integrated with data from outside and data from outside that need to be assessed. 4) Professor Wedeen (Education, Brooklyn) - "I think that after listening to you we are all ready

I call you 'Marguerite'. You've seen us at both ends but I wanted to say that I think you can count on our support and on our critical comment and I just wanted to thank you for standing up to us."/ I'm used to a feisty style.

VIII. Proposed Policy on Restricted Publication: In the absence of Professor Gerber who was taken ill, Professor Baumrin reported for the Ad Hoc Committee appointed on the mandate of the Senate last spring and charged with the task of revising the policy proposed at that time on the basis of discussion in the Senate. That ad hoc committee, he said, included three members of the Senate Research Committee and three members of the Senate Executive Committee: Professors Gerber (History, Lehman), Muller (Economics, Graduate School) and Speidel (Earth and Environmental Science, Queens) were the Research Committee members and Professors Baumrin, Sohmer (Mathematics, City) and Valinsky (Statistics, Baruch) represented the Executive Committee. The result was the proposed policy on the agenda this evening.

Professor Sohmer suggested the addition of a requirement that the Executive Committee report to the Senate in two years' time on the implementation of the policy and that suggestion was incorporated in the motion to approve the document which was duly made and seconded. The motion was passed unanimously.

IX. Proposed Resolution of the Foreign Students Affairs Committee, 1982-83: Professor B. Gerber (Comparative Literature, Brooklyn), chair of the Committee, re-introduced the resolution since discussion of it had been interrupted by a quorum call at the 121st Plenary Session. She then moved adoption of the resolution as amended from the floor at the 121st Plenary Session. Her motion was seconded and the resolution was adopted without dissent.

A motion to adjourn brought the meeting to a close at 9:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jean Ellis, Executive Director