

SUBJECT TO SENATE APPROVAL

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

November 13, 1984

Professor Wasser (English, Staten Island), chairman, called the session to order at 7:05 p.m. in Room 1700 at the Graduate School. Present were: Senators Alsop, Amendolia, Barbanel, Baumrin, Baxter, Beck, Beheshti, Bermann, Binder, Bohigian, Borneman, Brogan, Buianouckas, Cantwell, Cooper, Danziger, Davidson, Donoghue, Early, Ercolano, Essoka, Friedman, Galub, Gelernt, Greenbaum, Grossman, Hecht, Jiji, Kirsch, Lea, Loy, Lytra, McDougall, Moyne, Muehlig, Muzio, Nelson, Otelsberg, Parkhurst, Picken, Plissner, Reuder, Rosen, Sackstedter, Seguine, Sohmer, Speidel, Sprague, Thaxton, Timoni, Trefousse, Van Sickle, Waldinger, Walkwitz, Wedeen, Weightman, Wimmershoff-Caplan, Yousef, Zades, Zaneteas, and Zarin; Alternate Senators Karan, Kleinman, Ladimer, Lynch, Mbugua, McDaniel, O'Riordan, Shepard, Sheridan, Stern, Thompson, Youkeles, and Zuckermann. Senators Ballabon, Barber, Blaustone, Dispenzieri, Donleavy, B. Gerber, Gluck, Julia, Litke, Riley, Romm, Rose, Schneider, Valinsky, Walter and Wolfe were excused. Liaison Member (PSC) Professor Emeritus Zeller also attended. Chancellor Joseph S. Murphy and Dr. 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 132nd Plenary Session (October 23, 1984): The minutes were approved with the following correction: on pages 1 and 9 Professor Yousef's department should be "Mechanical Technology". Professor Ballabon's absence was excused.

III. Communications from the Chairman: Professor Wasser announced that the 134th Plenary Session on December 11 would be the annual dinner meeting of the Senate. Professor Barry S. Brook, Executive Officer of the Ph.D. Program in Music, will be the guest speaker. His topic will be "Music in the Life of Man: A World History". Invitations and reservation forms were mailed to Senate members and their guests on November 9. Chairman Wasser announced also that there had been a snafu in the Central Office mailroom so that unconscionable delays took place in the delivery of the UFS Newsletter to the campuses. The Newsletter, he said, involved considerable work and provided much information to members of the faculty and others throughout the University and the community. The contents had a time-dated value, however, and delays such as occurred in delivery of the November issue were unfair to both the editor and his staff and the recipients. The Newsletter should now be on all campuses and liaison members were asked to report to the Senate Office if this were not the case on their campus. The same snafu, Dr. Wasser continued, had affected other mail from the Senate Office - especially to the campuses - so that many Senate Committee members did not receive meeting notices and other materials in a timely fashion - a fact that the Office had learned only last Friday. The snafu has now been unravelled and it is hoped that it will not recur.

Chairman Wasser reported next on several events that took place on October 31. Three major University receptions, he said, were scheduled in the late afternoon that day. He attended two - a reception hosted by the President of the Graduate School for the new head of the Board of Visitors, Dr. Vartan Gregorian of the New York Public Library, and new members of the doctoral faculty and a reception hosted by the President of Hunter College to celebrate the unveiling of the sculpture "Tau." The latter occasion provided the opportunity for some discussion with President Shalala concerning her much publicized critique of the New York City school system. Professor Cooper (History, Staten Island), member-at-large of the UFS Executive Committee, represented the Senate at the third event - a reception hosted by the President of John Jay College to honor Basil Paterson on the award of the first honorary certificate in Dispute Resolution and Conflict Mediation

by John Jay. Chairman James P. Murphy, Board of Trustees, presented the Certificate and Mr. Paterson spoke briefly but eloquently on the assassination of Indira Gandhi on October 30 and the relationship of that event to the Certificate he had received.

Courtesy of The New York Times of November 9, Dr. Wasser said, all present were aware of the difficulties that continue at Medgar Evers College. He was certain, he noted, that Chancellor Murphy would report further on this matter later in the agenda but wished the Senate to know that, as a member of the Board of Trustees, he was being briefed regularly on developments at that college. The University, he said, was pursuing its own investigation on three levels: 1) with respect to the assault charge filed by the Director of Financial Aid, 2) with respect to the allegations made by her concerning improprieties in the award of financial assistance to students at the college, and 3) with respect to internal difficulties at the college. A recent report from Vice Chancellor for Faculty and Staff Relations to Chancellor Murphy indicated that progress was being made in all three inquiries with the New York Police Department also probing the assault charge, the University's Department of Internal Audit conducting an audit of all financial aid awards to Medgar Evers students in addition to the sample audit reported in The Times and cooperating with Federal investigators in their audit of the awards, and with respect to the third with a dialogue having been initiated between President Chunn and his faculty as well as between him and the Senate and the Union.

Chairman Wasser reported too that the Senate had been approached for assistance by a group of faculty who currently occupy apartments in Washington Square Village as tenants under leases on which the City University is the primary tenant. New York University, the owner of the buildings, has refused to renew the leases and has notified the tenants that they must move. The University has officially taken a passive role in the matter, although, when asked by NYU to institute eviction proceedings against the tenants, it refused to do so and is providing informal legal advice to the tenants. Several members of the Board have been contacted by the tenants and are concerned about the situation. The Senate is trying also to secure additional assistance for the affected faculty members.

With respect to the issue of faculty members' service on Committees that has its origin in the problem introduced by the Brooklyn College Faculty Council Professor Wasser reported that the Senate leadership had taken several steps that he would outline in greater detail in connection with item 8 on the session's agenda.

Finally, the Chairman stated that the timing of the evening's session was such that he was not submitting a written report. The information usually incorporated in that report had been reported already or was not available at this time. Hence, he had decided to confine his report to an oral one.

IV. Chancellor's Report: Professor Wasser welcomed the Chancellor back from his trip to China and took the opportunity to present the first copy of the second edition of the Directory of the Faculty of The City University of New York (April 1983) that had just been received from the binders today. Professor Wasser expressed again the thanks of the Senate and the University for the financial support provided by the Chancellor towards publication of the book. Chancellor Murphy expressed pleasure at receiving the book and asked whether it was a complimentary copy. Professor Wasser explained that the Senate members, Board of Trustees, members of the senior University administration, heads of all college departments and college libraries received complimentary copies of the book. Additional copies and copies for personal use by members of the faculty were available so long as supplies lasted but at a charge of \$3 per book since the expense involved in publication, even with the assistance of the Chancellor, represented a substantial investment from the very tight Senate budget. Persons wishing to purchase copies, he said, could do so by forwarding a check or money order for the appropriate amount drawn to the order of Dr. Jean Ellis/University Faculty Senate to the Senate Office at 80th Street.

Chancellor Murphy then gave his report. He said that, of course, there were many people in the University who have gone to China and that their insights might be more penetrating than his but that nonetheless he wished to share some of his with the Senate. He had visited seven of the 800 universities in China while on his trip. There were, he explained, certain "key universities" there - those administered under the National Ministry of Education - and it was these he had seen. Other universities were administered, as in the United States, by the state governments, and, in contrast to the US situation, some administered by various government agencies. The latter were usually directed towards a specific, rather narrowly defined purpose as, for example, the University administered by the Ministry of Textile Production. One idiosyncratic practice that especially interested Chancellor Murphy, he said, was that each university had its own factory and some had as many as six or eight, in which they generated profits which they used for their own purposes - to supplement their funding. It was reminiscent, he said, of the days when NYU was into macaroni. In China, Chancellor Murphy continued, one could be born, live and die on a university campus and never leave. He had asked what happened if there were no profit and the reply was that all do produce a profit. When he persisted, he was told that they had to produce one and therefore did. When he asked that a hypothetical situation in which no profit was generated be addressed, he was told that the situation could be handled by reducing the wages so that there would still be a profit. In Shanghai he had asked and been permitted to visit a labor union as a special favor. He had asked whether labor unions there functioned in the same way as here and was informed that they can't since the union does not represent the worker against an exploiter of labor. Therefore, the union does not negotiate on behalf of the worker, nor represent its interests vis-a-vis management. Its function is directed particularly in the area of enrichment of cultural life. Thus, the unions run schools, universities and such. Chancellor Murphy said that he was impressed by the fact that everyone in China goes to school. There are about 130 million university students - a number that is comparable to ours. Furthermore, everyone in China works; there are no unemployed or idle people. The Chinese have mandated the one-child family so that a generation is maturing in which there will be no aunts or uncles. The way this is managed is that the government makes an allowance to the parents of one child but if they have a second child they must repay the allowance. The Chancellor said he could only imagine or have fantasies about a culture in which everyone was the product of a one child family. It was his understanding, however, that the rules were to be eased somewhat and a man and woman who were themselves only children could have a second child. That, of course, would not happen for sometime - twenty years or so when the present babies being born reached maturity. Now it is the generation of the 50's that is maturing and they were the products of Mao's emphasis on increasing the population through large families.

Chancellor Murphy commented also that he was most forcefully struck with the Chinese treatment of the elderly. Older people in China have a great deal of dignity. All whom he met or observed had something to do that was considered "socially useful". A sign of a civilization; the Chancellor continued, is found in the way it treats its older people. Another impression was derived from the fact that everyone in the universities had suffered during the days of the Cultural Revolution but when he asked whether people there had suffered, he was told that none had - not faculty members at least. Administrators could be found who had. Those who had been willing to speak of their experience made apparent that they had often been subjected to systematic humiliation so that this suggested that the reports we had read or heard were not exaggerated. For example, there was in the University of Fudan a woman physicist of considerable renown - she had, in fact, been the recipient of a CUNY honorary degree some years back in 1981 - and she had been reduced to cleaning toilets or some such task. Nonetheless, she and others like her had surprised him by speaking of their experiences without acrimony. One who could speak English and did not have to communicate through an interpreter as most of those the Chancellor met did said privately that he had got a lot done in the countryside and had enjoyed a sense of freedom from the usual routine of academic life - he had even written a book. There was, Chancellor Murphy continued, substantial interest in CUNY. Several

CUNY colleges have relationships with Chinese universities already - City with Fujian and Hunter is now talking with some. The Chinese are anxious to foster these relationships and to create more so that there may be exchanges of faculty, students et al. There are a certain number of "drummers", in the nineteenth century sense of the term, i.e. "salesmen" whom I met whose "commodity" is the universities. Japanese and English are the languages that are most taught in China and there is talk of Japanese exchanges also. All over there are signs that read "Forward with unity towards Socialism with a Chinese Character." The idea that China as a socialist society has to adapt to Western models is not popular and there is in China more autonomy in activity than in the traditional Western socialist state. Older countries' bureaucratic socialism hasn't worked and the Chinese seem to embrace a more mixed society, though this is not really the case. There is no private property, for example, but there is private wealth. They have much to learn and they are anxious and willing to talk about the social sciences now.

Closer to home, Chancellor Murphy said, he believed he had previously briefed the Senate on the status of the University's Budget Request. Since then, he continued, the Board had approved the Request and he and others on his staff had made a presentation in Albany to the heads of the Legislature and to the State Division of the Budget. He had met, since his return from China, with Mr. Dullea, the Governor's operations person and with Mr. Dullea's aide, Mr. Foley about the University's budget and progress. The University is participating on the Governor's Commission this year and will write part of the State of the State message so that some of the University's needs should be included. The State's fiscal situation appears to be holding steady, i.e. there will be a surplus of revenue and probably a tax cut. There will be a special session of the Legislature at the end of November or early December to deal with that and with appointments to the CUNY Board.

On another subject the Chancellor said that he had no additional information on the Early Retirement Option, although questions about that might be directed to Vice Chancellor for Faculty and Staff Relations Bloom who was the Senate's guest speaker this evening. The University doesn't know yet how many staff members will choose to exercise the option.

On the Capital Budget the Chancellor said there was some progress on Staten Island's campus and the University thinks this may be a good year for that project since there are not too many outstanding projects now. Staten Island, John Jay and Baruch remain but LaGuardia's problem has been resolved and work is going on with Medgar Evers.

Chancellor Murphy announced that there is a new member of the Board - a Mayoral appointee, William Howard, whose name is now before the State Senate's Committee. John Jay, he announced also, has been ranked first for its PH. D. program in Criminal Justice, an achievement in which the College and the University may take pride since that rank is 1 out of 71 other programs in the nation. La Guardia, he continued, has received one of three or four Federal grants in substantial amounts in the area of articulation and transfer.

Chancellor Murphy then responded to the following questions and comments from the floor. 1) Professor Mushlig (Business, Medgar Evers) - "I am speaking officially for the Faculty Organization of Medgar Evers College with two requests: 1) that you provide it with a copy of Ira Bloom's Report and 2) that the leadership have the opportunity to meet with you before the end of the month."/ Both are reasonable requests but I have a question about the time and place of the request. Could we discuss this in a less public forum? 2) Professor Sohmer (Mathematics, City) - "Has your experience in China convinced you to persuade the State to eliminate the mandatory retirement age for University personnel?"/ I would guess that prior to the time you reach age 70 the mandatory retirement age will have disappeared so, you see, you have a long time to look forward to. 3) Professor Speidel (Geology, Queens) - "Some years ago, Chancellor, as President of Queens,

you favored the decentralization of the colleges. Do you still hold that view?" / Ronald Reagan was once a Democrat. I share the feeling everybody has that polarities are not desirable and that any safeguards versus extremes - of centralization or decentralization - are good. That is the direction in which we need to move. 4) Professor Otelsberg (Business, York) - "Is there an official program of exchange between CUNY and Chinese universities going to be established?" There is one now but we have agreed that a University system doesn't make sense and that it should be in the hands of the individual colleges with assistance from the University. City has a program with Fudan in Physics that is on-going and approved and established. In a different respect La Guardia has an arrangement with Shanghai University - Shanghai is more like us or what we were in the past ; there are five colleges put together under a single "Board". I was asked to help facilitate the arrangement and they are going to move ahead on it. There are also some professors at Brooklyn College with ties to other institutions in China. I think the University should encourage and support such arrangements and help with establishing them. 5) Professor Binder (History, Staten Island) - "With respect to the Staten Island campus - has there been any decision about the location?" / There has not and won't be until the consultant now under contract reports. That is a delaying tactic but probably the last. We were given money in this year's budget to study the location and that's what's been done. There are four potential sites - the present Sunnyside one, South Beach, St. George and Willowbrook. The consultant's recommendation is forthcoming. The question is now being studied but we are moving towards a substantial decision. 6) Professor Ladimer (Community Medicine, Mt. Sinai) - "Since according to the Regents medical degree certification means a medical school, could you tell us the form it will take, etc." / The Regents have approved the granting of the M. T. degree by the University; they have granted that authority to the Board. The mechanism will be the Sophie Davis Program plus two years of clinical experience in Queens hospitals under the faculty of Long Island Jewish Hospital and three others. We haven't created a school. We have taken what we had for the last ten years and entered into a contractual agreement with the hospitals. In the next five years the students in the 70 slots at Sophie Davis will get through. After a lot of questions and problems I think we have overcome them and it is a big achievement for the University - one that everyone should take pride in. People have been concerned about the possible drain a medical school would create on the Operating Budget. The Board too was very concerned about this but it adopted a resolution stating clearly that the approval was related to separate funding for the medical school. Some people have said the proposal springs from a desire to get more dollars for the medical program at Sophie Davis. It does not affect the University's long-standing agreement with Mount Sinai, its faculty lines nor its students. I think it is a good thing and everyone should be pleased. It is time the University moved ahead into medicine, in fact, it should look to other fields such as veterinary medicine and dentistry - in fact, perhaps veterinary dentistry. 7) Professor Thompson (Specialized Services in Education, Lehman) - "Do the Chinese have anything comparable to tenure or do faculty get moved around where they are needed and in areas where they are needed?" / They have tenure, that is, institutions can recommend people for tenure but the decision is made at the provincial level. The institution's candidates are recommended to an association that reviews and forwards them to the provincial Board of Scholars that makes the recommendation. For the National universities the decision is made in Beijing. I had an argument with a Distinguished Professor of Mathematics who had been at Stony Brook a couple of years ago. I suggested that in the United States if there were a distinguished mathematician it wouldn't matter if that person were a bad husband, father, or citizen - none of that would matter to achieve tenure - for that the issues were narrowly defined. The Chinese professor said, "Yes, there were other variables there. If, as I had suggested, there were two candidates and one leads an exemplary political life, they would take that into account." What happened then is even more interesting. Four or five others present began a dispute among themselves - in Chinese which, of course, I could not understand since I was confined to discussion with those who spoke English or to using an interpreter. My translator later said, "I can't tell you the arguments they made but what is remarkable is that they took place."

People are still reluctant to test their opportunities for debate there but they are surprisingly frank. I expected them to be more reticent but they weren't. Professor Thompson further asked - "Do you think that tenure will vanish as mandatory retirement at 70 will?"/ No. The worst thing about tenure is that too many people get it. No, really too many were fired who were untenured so now there are too many tenured people left. Tenure, I think, is so institutionalized now, it has survived so many mindless attacks, I don't see the security issue being changed. In fact, there are fewer attacks on the institution of tenure now than in recent years. 8) Professor Baumrin (Philosophy, Graduate School) - "You said there were 70 slots at Sophie Davis over five years?/Per year. Really we're talking about seven years when there will be almost 500 MDs - 497 to be exact - coming out of the program although that doesn't take into account the erosion in numbers that will inevitably occur. Professor Baumrin further asked - "Is there a University Curriculum Committee supervising curriculum development for the medical program? / Ira Bloom can tell you that there are a number of committees - there is a University Committee and a Trustees Committee. Professor Baumrin said, "You are aware, no doubt, that there is a great deal of ferment in the medical profession about the appropriate education for doctors with a considerable criticism of the traditional medical school curriculum. I can think of a number of mechanisms that might be employed- is the planning being done by a University Committee, Sophie Davis? I hope it is not just the Board."/No. We have a Medical Liaison Officer now, Dr. Robinson, who comes from Harlem Hospital and who is in the process of working out the contractual arrangements and the curriculum. We are aware of the Steven Muller report plus we have other committees working on it. If you are worried about the Board doing it unilaterally, you shouldn't. Just what is it?" Professor Baumrin said, "In the development of University programs it is not clear to me that development is looked at as a University development involving faculty from many institutions with an interest and knowledge in the program. This program could draw on the resources of the University as a whole, of many persons and, in fact medical education philosophy differs from that of Sophie Davis in many respects. If there is no forum then it is just Sophie Davis developing into a medical college - I'm probably being more candid than I should be but I have asked many questions about Sophie Davis and since there is no affiliation nor University supervision, I don't see a University curriculum development committee to rule for the whole and not one branch./ A University curriculum development committee is being confused with other things. Creating the curriculum falls within the province of those who know medical education and should be limited to those competent in that area. Are you confusing it with other considerations? Those are the public and social policy implications, or the political dynamic of the program. What devious purpose are your questions designed to serve? Professor Baumrin replied that since he was one of the people qualified to direct one aspect of the program and had never received a phone call with respect to his participation it seemed to him unlikely that the program's planners were going to draw on the University."/ People who are participating are publicly known and if there are a number of individuals that is larger than those who can be involved some are not going to get a phone call. I can't imagine what a course in Ethics in medical education would be like. 9) Professor Sohmer - "At least historically medical education came at the end of a continuum. Now the only people involved are doctors. Can you recommend leaving it solely to doctors?"/ I don't know if that is the case. I think some aspects are for doctors only, some are not. I think it is right that doctors need a broader base in their education and if we don't have that, we will. The Board and the Chancellor's Office will look at what is planned- and once a curriculum is developed the City College faculty can look at it. You know, do you not, Professor Sohmer said, that since its inception the Sophie Davis School has been a self-contained unit, reporting only to itself and the City College faculty has not participated in seeing its curriculum."/ I was not aware of that - I will have to look into it. 10) Professor Van Sickle (Classics, Graduate School) - To pursue Stefan Baumrin's inquiry and lift it above the persona to the level of ad hominem - with the Law School there was a call to articulate a CUNY view of legal education. Is there a CUNY philosophy in the medical planning?"/ The outline of what will serve the public good is, in the case of the medical program, in the law itself - geriatrics and family

are are the areas prescribed; secondly, to make it possible for the hospitals to provide a higher level of medical care than has been available in Queens County; and thirdly, to launch an effort to increase the number of minority physicians in the City and State committed to practice in the underserved areas. Those conditions were set by the Regents grant of the right to award the degree. One issue I need to look at is the degree to which non-medical people are looking at the curriculum. I had assumed that if City has had the Biomedical program for ten years, the faculty had looked at it. If the City faculty has been excluded, then something is wrong. Professor Van Sickle further asked - "In the case of the Law School was the same thing true?"/ No. The Law School has been looked at by the American Bar Association and it has a particular thrust. The original concept of the Law School has not changed since the project was begun ten years ago but what has emerged is different in thrust. 11) Professor Zuckermann (Student Services, Staten Island) - "I have a Chinese question. Are the curricular offerings at Chinese universities tied with the economic needs of the region, for example, if there is a glut of engineers, do they shift people from that area?"/ My understanding is that, for example, if there are too many physicists for there to be an opportunity for them to be used, so they are trying to move to engineering because they do need engineers. They have an excess of physicists but everything else they underproduce. They began to award the Ph.D. only two or three years ago, you know, and one has to be very highly qualified to be admitted to a university. They find our engineering and management programs very impressive and were much interested in Baruch's management training. With respect to medical education, their medical schools produce doctors in five years out of high school. There is no effort at humanistic education. I visited one and had a revealing conversation with the president who said, "You understand that we don't produce the same quality of doctor as some in the United States do, but we concentrate on the areas that are underserved, for example, in the Western part. The emphasis is on family medicine." I asked how they worked and was told that the top 100 graduates are placed in major city hospitals, the middle range of graduates in the provincial hospitals and the bottom 200 or so in remote rural areas. That's not very different from the United States. The things they look at are life expectancy and that, the Chancellor said in an aside, is high now - life expectancy is 78 for women and 71 or 72 for men, but infant mortality which is less studied since it is less than ours - about two per thousand births is not of interest. The low rate is due to the limitation to one child families; they would like to routinely perform amniocentesis on pregnant women so that they could abort in the first trimester any fetus with any defect. I don't know the details but there are not enough physicians trained to do that and I can't imagine what it would be like or what it would take to achieve that goal. 12) Professor Greenbaum (History, Queensborough) - "With reference to our medical school - the plan now is to have the technical programs at hospitals in Queens, I would think the curriculum would somehow be given here at some point."/ I find myself being definite but I don't know. We have had two or three levels who studied the program before the Regents granted the degree authority, now there two or three others - there is a Board Committee, an Implementation Committee, a Liaison Officer, a nucleus of activity at Sophie Davis, interest at Sinai. There are lots of players but it is not put together. Sinai is involved and has been all along - Dr. Glenn served on the previous committee and is on the new one and there has been as wide a variety of suggestions as possible. If other constituencies have a reasonable claim to be heard, we would like to hear from them. 13) Professor Alsop (Biology, Queens) - "To save any more activity we have got a number of post-graduate programs in my area and there is a program at the Graduate School and yet they differ from those at a lot of other universities. We charge a large tuition whereas others give a tuition remission to graduate students who are well along in their research. Could you find out from the State whether they will let us do what SUNY does, give some relief to our students in the form of teaching assistantships, tuition remission etc. For example, in Biological Programs my students are involved in doctoral projects that involve considerable expense to complete and the burden is very onerous. Thus, students are choosing against CUNY and going to private institutions on that basis."/ One of your colleagues is now an Executive Officer and he is at 80th Street

this year as a Faculty Fellow. He is working, as part of his assignment, on the condition of laboratories in the University and available funding sources to see what can be done to provide University support.

V. Reports of Faculty Members of Board of Trustees' Committees and of the Faculty Representative to the CUNY Construction Fund: Professor Wasser reminded the Senate that these reports were distributed in written form at the opening of the session and noted that questions about the contents were welcomed. (Copy attached to these minutes).

VI. Guest Speaker: Vice Chancellor for Faculty and Staff Relations Bloom: Chairman Wasser welcomed the Vice Chancellor as the newest appointee to that rank on the Chancellor's staff. He noted that Mr. Bloom was a graduate of City College and held the J.D. degree from Harvard Law School. Prior to his appointment as Vice Chancellor, Dr. Wasser said, Mr. Bloom served for six months as the acting person in that post, having previously spent 13 years in the Office of the President at Lehman College. At Lehman he held a number of posts. He was Special Assistant to the President and acted as Presidential Designee for Instructional Staff Labor Relations; he was Executive Assistant to the President and in that capacity acted as chief of staff to assist the President in all facets of his administration. In 1978 he was appointed Associate Dean of the College and in 1982 became Dean of the College. Mr. Bloom was Executive Assistant to the Dean of Students at City College before moving to Lehman College and also taught as a Summer Lecturer in the Baruch School of City College's Political Science Department and in the Political Science Department at City. His additional professional activities include service on several City University Task Forces, as a member of the Board of Directors of various Bronx community groups representing the President of Lehman College and in his own right and as chair and participant in various University and college committees.

Vice Chancellor Bloom said that he was not sure whether as an only child and an administrator, he should have accepted this invitation, but that he appreciated the opportunity to speak to the Senate, especially since after 17 years of service in the University he knew many of the Senators present as good friends and partners in his work.

As Dr. Wasser noted, he said, he had served for ten months as Acting and so-termed "permanent" Vice Chancellor for Faculty and Staff Relations. The move from the campus to the Central Administration was interesting. On campus the issues with which he dealt were more personal while at the Central Office the issues were more abstract, more grandiose in the aggregation of large numbers and dollars. Faculty and Staff Relations does deal with individuals in its work in the area of personnel and in grievance proceedings and that, he said, helps to maintain a perspective. Beyond that the Office which he heads deals in issues such as negotiation of the contracts for employees of the University, early retirement, the Melani case, the personnel system, all of which affect the instructional staff of the University - both faculty and non-teaching staff. In addition, the Office is responsible for issues that affect the non-instructional staff of the University.

During the months he had been "permanent" Vice Chancellor, that is since September, Vice Chancellor Bloom continued, the early retirement option has been a major concern. By December 1 faculty and other members of the staff must make an irrevocable decision on retirement by the end of January 1986. This applies only to the State-funded units and there is little indication that it will be extended by the City to those units that are in the City's hands for financing. Last year when the option was not available to CUNY personnel, other State employees who were able to exercise it did so in far greater numbers than had been anticipated - some 30% took advantage of the option while the anticipated number was 10%. The indications now at CUNY are that there is greater interest in favor of early retirement among members of the support staff - Gittelsons, skilled trades people and the like. The decision, of course, is a very personal one and is based on factors such as age, health, family situation, other opportunities for employment etc. The

niversity has about 3400 employees who are eligible, about 1600 of them are teaching faculty. As of this date there have been 150 applications but the expectation is that there will be a dramatic increase in the next two weeks - since most people seem to be waiting to the last possible moment to make the final decision. The impact among the colleges will probably vary with factors such as the age of staff members and others affecting the numbers. In several the program will provide the opportunity to recruit to strengthen understaffed programs and to enhance the affirmative action efforts of the University as well. The non-instructional staff is, of course, less visible and less glamorous but serves an important role in the University. In that respect the University is in the process of establishing its own civil service as a means to achieve greater flexibility in the non-instructional area. In addition, a variety of issues are under negotiation with the unions that represent the non-instructional staff.

Turning to the current contract negotiations for the instructional staff, Vice Chancellor Bloom said that, as the Senators knew, the citywide Coalition Bargaining was at the point where the City had indicated a wish to move to an impasse panel. There have been various reactions to this, but on the whole the unions have opposed it. It is hard to predict, the Vice Chancellor said, what course the bargaining will take since this is the first time an entire contract will have had to be negotiated by an impasse panel. So far as negotiations between the University and the Professional Staff Congress are concerned, he continued, these have moved forward independent of the City bargaining process and have dealt well with the "non-monetary" aspects of the contract.

Again Vice Chancellor Bloom thanked Professor Wasser and the Executive Committee for the invitation to be present and address the Senate and indicated that he would be happy to respond to questions from the membership.

1) Professor Lea (English, Lehman) - "Welcome to the Senate, Ira. My question may not be in your bailiwick but you know, I am sure that the City is fingerprinting child care workers now in response to the recent problems in that area and I wonder whether the University intends to initiate such procedures for the people who work in our centers?" / Yes. My office and the Office of Student Affairs and Special Programs are setting up procedures to do this. 2) Professor Speidel (Geology, Queens) - "One of the things you must be aware of are the rather extensive notes and minutes of the Senate and in one of the reports distributed this evening there is a report that a person was approved for appointment as a Distinguished Professor whose name was put forward "as a special arrangement with the Chancellor." How many Distinguished Professors recommended by the colleges are being warehoused because they lack such a special arrangement?" / The appointments to that rank are a joint responsibility of my office and the Office of Academic Affairs. Academic Affairs does the original screening and there are a number of proposals pending. I think the term "warehousing" is inelegant. Professor Speidel interjected - "Inelegant or inaccurate?" / Both. The issue with Professor Lifton's appointment was that the opportunity to have him come to the University depended on an immediate action, therefore, the proposal was brought to the Committee. It was done after consultation with the PSC since the number of such appointments is in the agreement. Both the union and the University are hopeful that as a result of the current negotiations the number will increase. 3) Professor Bohigian (Mathematics, John Jay) - "Thank you for your characterization of the negotiations that are out of your purview right now. You are doubtless aware but the Senate may not be of the full story, No negotiations have taken place but the City has gone to impasse proceedings. Not a single word has been exchanged but each side has stated its position - the City has offered a 2% increase and the coalition has proposed a 9% increase with 8% givebacks. Nonetheless, the City has gone to impasse. Thank you again, Vice Chancellor, for stating the situation." / You know, of course, that I am "management" and therefore I sit with the City at the bargaining table. I have to say that your report is not entirely accurate. There were a number of sessions during the summer and into the early Fall. There were several face-to-face discussions at which the unions were able to state their position. The City made an offer and the

unions presented their demands. The complaint is that there has been nothing since. But there were several sessions that were extended discussions so your report is inaccurate. 4) Professor Wasser said that he too had a question - "I think each member of the Executive Committee who is a member of a Board Committee notices the number of Vice Chancellors and members of their staff who are present at those meetings but sometimes it is unclear who the resource person for the committee is since sometimes the responsibility is not where one would have expected. Is there a set of guidelines on this or something else?"/ Both of the above. There is a delineation, usually one Vice Chancellor is principally responsible but the Committee may deal with issues involving both. Therefore, both are present. For example, Academic Affairs and Faculty and Staff Relations are both at meetings of the Committee on Faculty, Staff and Administration although the Vice Chancellor for Faculty and Staff is the chief resource person. 5) Professor Cooper (History, Staten Island) - "As long as you represent management in the negotiations I hope that you are aware - in fact, many hope that you are, that the medical coverage of the last contract was the worst aspect of that agreement. It is a living disaster. That was my comment. My question is this. At what point is the Melani settlement going to move from theory to reality, that is when does the money arrive? In addition, for the record could you once again announce that the money will not come out of the University's funds."/ For the record we do not anticipate that the money will come out of the University's funding. I am aware of the problems with medical coverage and that is a subject of the negotiations. In addition, my office is looking at ways to improve it. 6) Professor Alsop - "Are you also looking at the inequality between retirees on TIAA and TRS?"?Yes.

VII. Proposed Resolution on Allocation of Early Retirement Lines: Professor Sohmer, on behalf of the Executive Committee, presented the resolution and moved its adoption. His motion was seconded. Professor Sohmer then responded to questions and comments from the floor. Professor Alsop suggested a change of wording in the fourth provision to clarify the intent. Professor Trefousse asked why there was no provision at the University level and Professor Sohmer noted that there was in the first provision. Professor Wedeen said that she thought the percentage in the third provision was too low. Professor Greenbaum asked whether the department was not to have guidelines too. Professor Bohigian agreed with Professor Wedeen and suggested that "and" be substituted for "or" in provision 3. Professor Speidel said he agreed with the thrust of the resolution but had some editorial suggestions: to substitute "because" for "since" in the first sentence, that "and" be substituted for "or" in provision 3. Professor Van Sickle asked whether the language of this resolution was consonant with that ordinarily employed in Senate resolutions and was informed that it was. Professor Weightman (Sociology, Lehman) offered an amendment to provision 5 to include the phrase "and with the concurrence of the participants". The amendment was seconded and discussion on the amendment ensued. Professor Cooper said that this proposal was more radical than there had been in the past, that nothing like it existed when the holocaust of 1976 occurred and that, in her view, this, given the history of the University, was far superior to any previous provisions even without amendment. Its adoption would mark a dramatic departure from past procedures. Professor Gelernt (English, Brooklyn) said that he seconded Professor Weightman's amendment as extremely important. The question was called on the amendment. The amendment was defeated with no affirmative votes, because the maker had left during the discussion. The question was then called on the principal motion. Several points of information were raised to clarify which editorial changes were to be incorporated in the document. Professor Trefousse (History, Brooklyn) asked for a quorum call. There being no quorum present, the meeting was adjourned at 9:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jean Ellis