

SUBJECT TO SENATE APPROVAL

MINUTES OF THE ONE HUNDRED AND THIRTY-FIRST PLENARY SESSION OF THE  
UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

September 25, 1984

Professor Henry Wasser, chairman, called the session to order at 7:05 P.M. in Room 1700 at the Graduate School and University Center. Present were: Senators Barbanel, Baumrin, Baxter, Beck, Binder, Bohigian, Brogan, Buianouckas, Canate, Cinquemani, Cooper, Danziger, Davidson, Donleavy, Early, Ercolano, Friedman, Galub, Gelernt, Gerardi, B. Gerber, Gluck, Greenbaum, Grossman, Hecht, Herszenhorn, Isaacs, Jaffe, Jiji, Kadushin, Lea, S. Levine, Loy, Lytra, Meister, Moyne, Nelson, Otelsberg, Parkhurst, Picken, Plissner, Prince, Quinn, Reuder, Rosen, Rovira, Schneider, Schreiber, Seguire, Sohmer, Speidel, Sprague, Thaxton, Trefousse, Van Sickle, Wagner, Waldman, Weiss, Walkwitz, Walter, Wedeen, Weightman, Wolfe, Yousef, Zades, Zaneteas and Zarin; Alternate Senators Kleinman, Ladimer, Mbugua, McDaniel, Muzio, Naas, Shepard, Stern, Thompson, Hunte, Youkeles and Zuckermann. Senators Cantwell, Donovan, Henderson, Kirsch, Litke, Riley, Timoni and Valinsky were excused. Also attending was Liaison Member PSC Professor Zeller. Chancellor Joseph S. Murphy and Dr. Ellis, Executive Director USF, also attended.

- I. Approval of the Tentative Agenda: The tentative agenda was approved as circulated.
- II. Approval of the Minutes of the 130th Plenary Session (May 15, 1984): The minutes were approved as circulated.
- III. Communications from the Chairman: Professor Wasser welcomed the Senate to the first Plenary Session of the new academic year and noted that the leadership had resumed full activities and had already met two to three times on Senate business. He stated also that his communications this evening would add to his summer letter circulated in August and to the written report distributed at the session.

Chairman Wasser reported first on the Public Meeting of the Board of Trustees on September 24. The meeting focused on an appreciation of the services of Albert V. Maniscalco to City University prior to and during his tenure on the Board. The Trustees designated him Trustee Emeritus - an honor conferred only once before by the Board and then on another Staten Islander, Arleigh Williamson. In addition, Trustee Emeritus Maniscalco was awarded the Chancellor's Medal, and the current Borough President of Staten Island, Anthony Gaeta, as well as Mayor Beame who had appointed Trustee Maniscalco to his initial term as a CUNY Trustee, his former colleagues on the Board and President Volpe of the College of Staten Island paid tribute to him. The Board's other business included the approval of several resolutions authorizing construction and rehabilitation projects at various colleges and the passage of a resolution to divest the University of investments in financial institutions or companies doing business with the Union of South Africa. A memorial resolution for former president of Brooklyn College Harold C. Syrett and a resolution commemorating the Bicentennial Anniversary of the Board of Regents were also adopted. The appointment of Acting Vice Chancellor for Faculty and Staff Relations Ira Bloom as Vice Chancellor for Faculty and Staff Relations was approved as was the designation of Chancellor Murphy's Executive Assistant Jay Hershenson as Acting Vice Chancellor for University Relations. With respect to the latter position Chancellor Murphy told the Board that it is his intention to establish a Search Committee to conduct a nationwide search to seek a permanent appointee. Finally, the Chancellor recommended and the Board approved the designation of Dr. Joyce Brown as Acting University Dean for Urban Affairs to serve during the search for a permanent appointee to that post.

Dr. Wasser spoke also about the CUNY Medical School and added to the information

he had given the Senate in his summer letter and in his written report for the meeting. He said that on September 21 the Board of Regents had granted the City University the right to award the degree of Doctor of Medicine.

The next subject to which Chairman Wasser addressed remarks was the 1985-86 Budget Request which, he said, was in the process of being developed and on which the Board of Trustees had been briefed in the course of an all-day retreat on September 19. At that time Vice Chancellor for Budget and Finance Posman had reviewed the draft of the request - a process he would be following with the Senate Executive Committee on October 2. The operating budget request at present is for a total of \$943.3 million - a 14.7% increase over the 1984-85 total with the increase for the senior colleges, \$87.4 million (14.2% plus) and \$32.5 million (15.9% plus) for the community colleges. There is also a \$1.2 million increase for the medical school. The budget features the usual request for lines based on enrollment projections but, in addition, seeks funds on a university-wide basis for two special purposes: QUEST - an acronym for Quality in Education through Staff Targeting - and the Program for Excellence and Access. These programs consolidate position requests for the colleges and are intended to direct staff to the areas of highest priority; they also seek funds for programs related to the Board of Education, for part-time tuition assistance and for child care among others. The community college request is directed towards reducing the student/faculty ratio from the current 20.4 to 1 to 18.5 to 1. There is also a request for changes in the formula used to compute State aid to the community colleges which would make the state's share in that funding 34.2% instead of the current 32.7%.

Continuing on the subject of the budget request, Dr. Wasser said that the capital budget request, in its present stage, totals \$237.2 million for projects financed by Dormitory Authority funds, i.e. construction projects with \$163.1 million for senior college projects and \$74.1 million for community college projects. It includes also a total of \$107.7 million in State and City funding for rehabilitation projects with \$89.2 million earmarked for the senior colleges and \$18.5 million for the community colleges.

Chairman Wasser reported also that Chancellor Murphy has initiated a process to provide representation of the University at special events in other institutions. Accordingly, he has asked the Senate chairman to name faculty members to represent the University at two events that are taking place on October 1. Professor Sandra Clarkson (Mathematics, Hunter), a graduate of the University of Georgia and a former member of the Senate Remediation Committee, is CUNY's official delegate to the Bicentennial Convocation of the University of Georgia and the National Conference on the Future of University Research sponsored by the American Council on Education and the Association of Land Grant Colleges and Universities with support from the Exxon Foundation and the University of Georgia Research Foundation in connection with the Bicentennial celebration. Distinguished Professor of History Richard C. Wade (Graduate School) who holds the bachelor's degree from the University of Rochester and was a member of the History department there for a decade before joining the CUNY faculty will be the University's official delegate at the inauguration of George Dennis O'Brien as eighth president of that University.

Next Professor Wasser turned to the subject of the University Committee on Research Awards. After his written report was printed, he explained, a change took place in the membership of that Committee. Professor Lee (Psychology, Brooklyn) had resigned and Professor Donald Levine (Psychology, Brooklyn), a candidate recommended by the Senate Research Committee, had been appointed in his stead. An additional vacancy for this year has been created by the absence of the Engineering representative on the Committee on sabbatical leave. The Senate Research Committee has therefore solicited nominations from departments throughout the University with potential candidates to fill the one-

year vacancy in that area. As he indicated in his summer letter, Professor Wasser continued, discussion about the procedures for making appointments to that committee is underway and he said that he hoped to have a fuller report on the matter for the next Senate meeting.

Another matter of priority concern, the Chairman asserted, arose at the end of the summer when the Executive Committee learned that the reappointment of a Distinguished Professor at a community college was in jeopardy due to the method of funding such professorships. The non-reappointment of that individual was averted through the combined effort of the Senate and the union but both the PSC and the Senate wish to take further steps to prevent a similar situation from arising in future.

Finally, Dr. Wasser said, the Brooklyn College Faculty Council had requested the Senate to include a matter of grave concern to them and the faculty of the University in general in its high priority agenda for the year. The matter relates to the rights of faculty serving on committees to legal representation and indemnification. The Executive Committee has asked the Legal Affairs Committee to study the pertinent materials and documents transmitted by the Brooklyn Faculty Council and to advise the Senate. Professor Wedeen (Education, Brooklyn), vice chairman of the Senate and a member of the Brooklyn College Faculty Council Steering Committee, elaborated on the issue at the request of the Senate. The issue she said turned on a communication from the University's Vice Chancellor for Legal Affairs in response to an inquiry from the Brooklyn Steering Committee that stated that faculty members serving on a committee not provided for in the University's By-laws or in the college governance plan were not entitled to legal representation or indemnification if they were sued in the performance of duly assigned duties. Members of the Senate raised a number of questions but it was agreed to permit the Legal Affairs Committee to examine the issue applying their special expertise and report to the Senate prior to further discussion by the body.

IV. Chancellor's Report: Chancellor Murphy greeted the Senate and said that he had, in recent days, been addressing himself to what appears to be the only really significant question of the times, "When does life begin?" He had written a piece on the subject for the Op-Ed page on the beginning of life but could not predict whether or not it would be published. In a more serious vein, he said that he thought it unfortunate that this question loomed as the principal political issue of the day rather than some of the pressing and urgent problems that ought to be being addressed. He stated that he had some mundane things that the University was doing in connection with the coming elections to report. October 4 has been set aside as Voter Registration Day, an activity that was not part of a partisan political effort although possibly 75% to 80% of those the University persuaded to register would vote democratic if they voted. The University was urging everyone to cooperate in this effort - the colleges had assigned coordinators on each campus to this effort and the students were working very hard at this activity. Some 20,000 new registered voters had been enrolled already and it was possible that the number might be doubled on October 4. One did not know whether or not they would vote but the University wished to make voting possible for as many as possible.

Chancellor Murphy then enumerated a number of initiatives that he hoped would be undertaken in the coming year, pausing to comment briefly on the Budget Request before turning to those initiatives. With respect to the Request he said that the budget was in two parts - the first based on the "model" required by the State Budget Office. That "model", he continued, was really not a model but an arithmetic average of class size or student/faculty ratio in about one-half dozen colleges upstate that was then applied to CUNY. The University had endeavored for several years to persuade the Budget Office of the problems in that model but the people there were adamant in

defense of it and noted the Chancellor in an aside, it was so irrational that it became justifiable. The University has therefore given up the effort to have that "model" modified. Instead, the budget request was constructed in two parts - the first in response to the model requirement and the second comprising some innovations. Among the latter, he continued, the University hoped there would be a sufficient number of interest to the Governor's Office and the legislature and Budget Office to be passed. There had already been indications that the third year of the Law School would be funded and that there was sufficient interest in that area for passage. The University had assurances also that the medical school would be a separate line in the budget now that it had been approved by the Board and the Regents had granted the University the right to grant medical degrees. The announcement of that decision by the Regents, Chancellor Murphy said, he would have thought to have been a significant achievement for the University given its relatively recent foundation and university-wide graduate programs. It was met, however, by silence, although the only objection came explicitly from the Deans of Medical Schools in the State of New York on the grounds that it would add to the number of doctors. The School does not do that, however. It really replaces the 71 Sophie Davis trained students who take degrees from other medical schools with 71 CUNY MDs. The acquiescence of the State to separate funding for the undertaking, the Chancellor asserted, was important since it would allay the fear of a drain on other University resources, at least for the time being.

Turning to the previously mentioned initiatives the Chancellor said that the first was that the University has to address other opportunities for professional education. For example, he said, there are two dental schools in the City which are consumers of public dollars although they are private institutions and it should be a question of public policy whether this should continue especially since dentistry was becoming a lower middle class occupation but training for the profession was sufficient and costly to make it affordable only to middle class or higher income persons. Therefore, there were empty places in the existing dental schools because of the tuition costs.

A second issue confronting the University is that of retention of students. That issue has inherent importance but it is also one being pressed by some members of the Board and therefore must be addressed. The University's record here, he continued, was not strong although the data suggest that over a protracted period of time CUNY students do better than the national average in earning degrees. The situation for the University in this area the Chancellor characterized as "no win". If retention rates are high, the University might be said to have lowered standards and if they were low, that its standards were too high especially because the number of students would be down and that would have a damaging effect on an institution that operated with an enrollment-driven budget. The issue needed to be addressed, he said, especially because some of the students did come to CUNY marginally prepared and that meant a high dropout rate. Again in an aside the Chancellor remarked that he had stopped telling those who commented on the high dropout rate that, of course, among those dropouts, the University might count persons such as Mayor Koch, Henry Kissinger and Senator Moynihan all of whom had been dropouts from City College, since no one seemed to find it funny.

The issue of articulation constitutes a third initiative. Although two Chancellors ago he had chaired a Chancellor's Task Force on Articulation, stated Chancellor Murphy, the issue remained important and there were many people who were fed up with it since it had not been resolved. In dealing with the transfer of credit from the community colleges to the senior colleges, he continued, there were problems not only at CUNY but in other large university systems and City University had done better than some - the University of California, for example - and worse than others - the University of Florida, for example, where he believed they had decided that after a certain date all community college credits would be accepted at the four year institutions. Although the University continued to search for a solution, at present various people were at

work preparing an articulation guide so that students will at least be aware of what is possible. Of course, if students go to the privates, the situation is different.

Collaboration with the school system is another initiative on the University's agenda. There are some 140 programs now and we are trying to do something centrally, for example, we have asked for moneys for special purposes and, of the many dollars we have requested, we have indicated that some of the money is targeted for this. We are also trying to formalize some of the new proposals coming forward and see if we can pedal them to interested non-governmental agencies.

The Chancellor reported also that on the matter of Early Retirement under the legislation enacted by the State in June the University has had a hard time putting together a plan. It will not be possible to know before December 1 what size group it is dealing with so at present there is not a clear notion of what the impact may be. Estimates suggest that one-third to one-half the faculty at some colleges are eligible; in fact, from what we can tell there are lots of eligible people but we hope that faculty and administrative staff will not elect to exercise the option but our guess is that there may be quite a few administrative personnel who will on the basis of the survey made. It may come down to the question of alienated personnel versus non-alienated but we think the bulk will be among administrative people like bursars who do the mundane, everyday paper work in the University and they will be hard to replace.

The matter of affirmative action, Chancellor Murphy continued, is closely related to the early retirement option because if there are going to be replacements, they will be made in accordance with the existing affirmative action guidelines.

The Chancellor reported too that the Melani case had now been set aside and the guidelines for distributing the money were being developed. The final decree was signed by the judge and became effective September 10.

The Chancellor then spoke about construction and facilities and reported that there were four major construction projects not yet fully defined: the Staten Island consolidated campus; the Baruch campus and Medgar Evers. La Guardia's project was advanced when the City University Construction Fund passed it today so that there seems to be a solution there. The Chancellor noted that he would like to say the same about Baruch. With respect to Medgar Evers Chancellor Murphy said that there were still open questions there that had to be settled since if it were to continue as a community college, its construction would be a City responsibility but if it becomes a four year institution, then the State would assume responsibility.

With respect to enrollment the Chancellor said he did not have a clear idea of the situation at this stage. Flash enrollments indicated that enrollment is holding steady with part-time enrollments up and full-time down. The general tendency to elect part-time status may reflect the economic status of the University's students and the problems they encounter working full-time and attending college. There is also another element in the picture - the Equated Student - and that figure has remained the same. Enrollment is an area about which the University must be concerned especially in terms of holding steady because of the need to meet the targets that have been set since they are related to revenue and if the University fails to collect the established sums expected from tuition, then it must find some way to make it up.

The Chancellor said there was also an item in the budget on libraries and another item that was inspired by the knowledge that SUNY has Leading Professors to whom they pay higher salaries - a device that enables them to employ Nobel Prize winners et al. - and therefore he included a comparable request for CUNY.

There were some other random items on his list, the Chancellor said, but he thought that he would stop now and respond to questions if there were any.

1) Professor Lea (English, Lehman) - " I attended the CUNY Construction Fund meeting this afternoon and the subject of limits on our bond issues came up. The Construction Fund is contemplating new ways of funding since those limits are close to being exceeded and I wondered do you know anything about this and will our projects be in jeopardy if we don't move forward quickly?"/ I don't know much about it except that it is related to cash flow. I understand that the monies are collected separately and used to pay off the bonds. We have had several large issues recently and there is something in the State about evaluating the matter of per capita lending. Whether these are Dormitory Authority limits or self-imposed limits by the CUNY Construction Fund I don't know. There is also a difference between the decision to sell bonds and to use the funds. I know that the Lombard-Wall difficulties were related to this issue but I can tell you that right now we are not going to be spending the funds. 2) Professor Ercolano (Mathematics, Baruch) - "Could you tell us about the problem with Baruch's campus?"/ President Segall has come up with construction and building ideas that are now being explored. 3) Professor Speidel (Earth and Environmental Science, Queens) - "It is good to see you here, will it happen again?"/ I welcome the opportunity to meet with my gracious former colleague. Professor Speidel further asked - "What do you see as the major problems facing the University and how do you propose to deal with them?"/ If there are lots of problems, then I won't appear here so often. But I will compare my record with that of the chair. Individual problems I will deal with ad hoc. If the revenue collection remains high and there should be no dramatic budget changes. The major problem, I think, is Early Retirement and the possibility that exercise of that option will remove distinguished faculty from our ranks. If that happens we will have difficulty replacing them, especially due to the loss of a whole generation of young people to the profession. There has been a continual erosion of the faculty. The University reached its apex after World War II with the infusion especially of German refugee professors. I don't think my own generation has been as creative or vital as the previous one and I'm not sure why - perhaps it is due to the fact that they lack the gymnasium experience or the refugee experience but if one looks at the names they show some loss and that loss is greater now. It's not universal but that judgement worries me as does the fact that more and more academic activity is being conducted outside the universities. For us since we rank among the 10 to 15 top in the country there is a problem of breaking loose the resources to use for this purpose. Then too there is the problem of the new wave of immigrants who are seeking an education and we have to decide how to respond to that. 4) Professor Bohigian (Mathematics, John Jay) - "I notice you didn't mention the John Jay building among the facilities and projects you discussed. You know that the original site has fallen through and I assume the omission was an oversight."/ I mentioned only building projects and John Jay's thrust is other than that - it is to acquire an existing facility. 5) Professor Thaxton (Health Sciences, Medgar Evers) - "You mentioned a tie-in at Medgar Evers between the construction and the senior college status, could you say more about it?"/ There is a proposal for a return of the college to four-year status that I have seen - though 75% of the programs are already four-year. That proposal was submitted at the end of the summer and we have forwarded a response to the college and raised some questions. We are now awaiting the college's response and clarification with respect to the questions. When that is received and the proposal is accepted by me, it will go to the appropriate Board Committee and if that committee approves and the Board approves then it will require agreement from the State. In point of fact the status is not that important; it really comes down to a question of who pays the bills. Probably since the City is reluctant to pay the bills for an institution that may become four-year they are holding back. The proposal meanwhile is being subjected to a bureaucratic review - and by that I mean review by those who do that kind of thing and I do not use the term pejoratively - and

then we will see. In other words, as the saying goes, "The ball is in their court."

6) Professor Thompson (Specialized Services in Education, Lehman) - "With respect to your comment on the effects of early retirement on recruitment, I think your office should address revitalization from the point of view of attracting faculty with divergent not convergent thinking. I have two questions. First, about articulation - You pointed to QUEST and second, what developments do you see in an urban university, what limits or restraints are there with respect to new programs? How does one discover the redundancies and the like?" /That is hard to answer in a general way. If a program is thought through that is responsive to the needs of students and has appeal probably there would be a positive response but there is no easy, obvious or universal answer. It depends on the program. With respect to your remark about convergent thinking and boredom, it is an interesting observation but the solution is not simple. I am sorry you are bored. Professor Thompson interjected, "I'm not; I'm never bored." / I thought you meant sitting here. 7) Professor Baumrin (Philosophy, Graduate School) - "You said there were other matters you had written down that were initiatives being undertaken by the University. Would you care to expand on them for us?" / If you really want to hear about energy management, inventory programs, financial disclosure forms and such. Professor Baumrin further asked - "What about the medical school, what is its status now?" / The Board of Regents has approved the plan. Professor Baumrin further asked - "Do you mean it is just there?" / I expect that within two years we will be granting degrees to students who have completed the five year program at Sophie Davis. 8) Professor Gerardi (Health and Physical Education, Kingsborough) - "With respect to construction at the campuses, is there a mechanism to monitor facilities for the disabled?" / Legally we are required to do so and I would be surprised if there were not. I know that Hunter was built in conformity with the legal requirements and I am certain that the majority of our facilities meet the minimal requirements only but there are facilities there. 9) Professor Otelsberg (Business, York) - "You mentioned several campuses where construction projects are being undertaken and I assume that you know that York's Phase 1 project has been completed, but what about phase 2?" / Some money was appropriated for phase 2 but not all. The project's justification included a statement re: its service to the community so the State provided half the money needed and said the community should provide the other half, thus revealing the lack of understanding about the ability of the South Jamaica community to do so. Professor Otelsberg further asked - "Is phase 2 included in the 1985-86 Budget Request?" / Yes. 10) Professor Zeller (Political Science, Brooklyn emeritus; PSC liaison member) - "This is a practical matter but in connection with recruitment is any attention being given to faculty housing that they can afford? / We have started doing something and have undertaken a very preliminary exploration of this. The results are not clear but something may come of it and we will then select a good idea and go with it. Brooklyn and Queens have done some investigating of this and, of course, President Shalala is very interested. We have been talking with NYU about the possibility of something on the Bellevue South site which is adjacent to the Nursing School but once we have something then we will try to get some support. There is a Phipps program and the Ford Foundation is another source with whom we have had some discussion but now we are exploring possibilities. Manhattan is very difficult; there is less problem in Brooklyn and Queens where some affordable housing is available. 11) Professor Trefousse (History, Brooklyn) - "Would a return to free tuition help recruitment and would such a move be financially and politically feasible? And is there evidence of a sentiment to do this?" / It would help with recruitment but it is probably not possible and yes there is a lot of sentiment for it. Whether that is due to nostalgia or what, I don't know but there are Board members who speak to it frequently and it is on our agenda because it is politically smart although not really possible. The idea of "free" sticks - it doesn't mean "giving" something and there is a preference for "giving" something. 12) Professor Jaffe (Science, Borough Manhattan) - "Could you expand on energy management?" / The University has developed an energy data management system for budgeting and tracking the consumption and costs of energy sources. There is some budget flexibility in this area so that if you save on energy, you can use the monies otherwise. 13) Professor Van Sickle (Classics, Graduate School) - "With respect to the problem of recruitment, housing would help but

another thing would be to take different colleges and face the issue of teaching load. There was an effort here. We graphed a number of actions for the Board to show the history of enrollment growth and decline and we had one on teaching load that we didn't use. Teaching load has gone all over the lot. There were some good years in the 70's but it crept up in the period of my absence from the University. The recent arbitration settlement brought it down slightly and some colleges are using artful and creative ways to deal with it; others are not. We don't have a faculty policy on it and it is the subject of debate. Some presidents don't want such a policy because they are making adjustments now for those whom they deem best able to use the time. It ought to be examined since the State has a tendency to deal mechanistically with it. We tend to be very careful about what we do. We have tried and I have been part of that effort. We do have adjustments for Distinguished Professors but we could do more. 14) Professor Cooper (History, Staten Island) - "I have a minor question to satisfy my curiosity. Before I came to the Senate, Ira Bloom was Acting Vice Chancellor for Faculty and Staff Relations and now he has the regular appointment. Was there a search committee for that post?"/ Yes and they recommended three candidates. One decided not to do it; one was good but not experienced and Ira was doing a creditable job so he was appointed since he was among those recommended. Professor Cooper further stated - "I asked because I am serving on a Search Committee now and I don't want to spend all that time only to discover that you have a person standing in the wings to appoint. Do you?"/ Ask me in private. 15) Professor Baxter (Academic Skills, Hunter) - "Has any consideration been given to tuition waivers for faculty children?"/ Essentially that is a negotiations item although the PSC has not forwarded it to us. Several Senators interrupted and stated that the item was indeed negotiated for the last contract, was in the contract as a non-cost item but was turned down by the Financial Control Board because a Vice Chancellor told them it was a cost item./ I am for anything that gives faculty more if there is a way to get it through, then I think it is terrific. On this though if it didn't get stopped by the Control Board then someone would ask for the dollars instead because they didn't want their child here or they didn't have children or some other reason so I don't see how it can be a non-cost item. There would also be the question of establishing eligibility for the benefit - would there be a number of years of service required or what? I don't think it's a bad benefit but there are questions that have to be resolved. Professor Davidson (Data Processing, LaGuardia) - "Couldn't it be done not as part of the contract but as policy, for example on a space available basis?"/ For all? If it is possible, yes. 16) Professor Zuckermann (Student Services, Staten Island) - "On retirement, are there any plans to launch a major attack on that problem?"/ President Lief spent two years on producing a report that appeared, I believe, in March of last year. I have looked at the recommendations in that report and there is a lot of activity though not all hold a coordinated view on what to do. 17) Professor Picken (Romance Languages, Queens) - "What is the present status of the Melani suit?"/ It has been settled and the final decree has been signed and it became effective September 10. We are now in the implementation stage and it is, in effect, a closed issue from a legal point of view.

V. Reports of Faculty Members of Board of Trustees' Committees: These reports were circulated in written form and copies are attached to these minutes. Professor Grossman (Elementary Education, City) asked about Professor Wedeen's statement in her report on the Academic Policy, Program and Research Committee meeting what was being done about Teacher Education. Professor Wedeen said that Vice Chancellor Barnett had appointed a Task Force chaired by Dean Impallizeri of Brooklyn College. Professor Grossman asked whether the Vice Chancellor was aware of the work done by a previous Task Force and suggested that she be apprised of it, if she were not. Professor Wedeen agreed.

VI. Approval of Slate of Standing Committees, 1984-85: Professor Wasser introduced the item. He noted that the Senate Charter (Article VI, Section 1) provides that the Chairman with the approval of the Executive Committee shall nominate members of standing committees and standing committee chairmen. The slate placed before the Senate, he said,



was developed by the Executive Committee using the committee preference forms returned to the Senate Office. Those Senators who did not return forms, he continued, might find that they had not been assigned to a committee or that they had been assigned to a committee other than the one they might have preferred. Since the Committee slate was developed to include among the members representatives of various delegations as well as persons with some special interest or knowledge of the charge to the committee and with an eye to size of the committee, it was difficult to make changes at this stage. Nevertheless, Professor Wasser said, the Charter provided for nominations from the floor and such nominations would be entertained shortly. The entire slate would then be submitted for Senate approval.

Professor Wasser then told the Senate of two changes in the printed slate distributed at the meeting. He announced also the names of the four chairs of UCRA sub-committees who had been elected by that Committee and who, under the terms of the agreement worked out some years ago when the Senate Research Committee became the screening body for nominations to that committee, were ordinarily included among the members of that committee. At present, those appointments would not be before the Senate for approval.

The chairman made one other preliminary remark to explain that the proposed committee slate included a Fiscal Affairs Committee in place of the Budget, Facilities, and Governmental Relations Committees originally proposed. The Executive Committee had decided, he said, that these three might be subsumed into one and a new charge given. That charge would be "to study the impact on academic policy and decision-making of legislative and Budget Office funding and fiscal policies and to report its findings as well as any recommendations deemed appropriate to the Senate." He announced also a revised charge for the Undergraduate Affairs Committee: "To review the report and recommendations of the Task Force on Student Retention and Academic Performance and to formulate, with the Senate Executive Committee, a response and recommendations for Senate consideration."

Professor Wasser then opened the floor to nominations. Five members of the Senate were nominated for committees of their choice, one Senator asked for a change in committee assignment and one typographical error was corrected. The slate was then moved, as revised and was approved without dissent. (Copy attached to these minutes.)

VI. Report of the Academic Freedom Committee, 1983-84: Professor Greenbaum— Professor Greenbaum (History, Queensborough), chairman of the Committee, presented the report which had been distributed to the membership prior to the meeting. (Copy attached to these minutes.) Professor Speidel moved acceptance of the report and that motion being seconded, the floor was opened to discussion.

The extended discussion that followed raised a number of questions: the rationale for the majority report's finding that the faculty member's academic freedom had not been violated; whether, as the chairman indicated, that finding's basis on the fact that, although the procedures were faulty in the committee's view, they had been followed, constituted a sufficient basis for the finding, the definition of academic freedom used by the committee. The point was made also that there were general issues raised by the report that were not insignificant and that they warranted discussion despite the fact that such discussion was not in order on the the motion being debated. In reply to a point of information it was stated that the motion to accept included both the majority and minority reports. The motion to move the previous question having been made and seconded passed when put to a vote. The motion to accept the report was passed. Professor Sohmer (Mathematics, City) moved that the questions raised by the report that were not pertinent to the motion to accept as well as the entire question of grade changes be addressed by an ad hoc committee appointed by the chairman. The motion was seconded and adopted unanimously. The view was expressed that this was the kind of

issue that should be before the Senate for debate.

VIII. New Business: Professor Waldman (Foreign Languages, York) raised the question of the nomenclature used to identify persons chairing committees. After some expression of differing points of view on this matter Professor Wasser stated that the item would be on the agenda for the next meeting since any decision at this stage of the meeting would not be appropriate given the lack of notice to the body and the relatively small number of members still present most having departed at the conclusion of the announced agenda.

A motion to adjourn having been made, seconded and passed, Professor Wasser adjourned the meeting at 9:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jean Ellis  
Executive Director