

SUBJECT TO SENATE APPROVAL

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

February 19, 1985

Vice Chairman Wedeen (Education, Brooklyn) called the session to order at 6:40 p.m. in Room 1700 at the Graduate School. Present were Senators Amendolia, Baumrin, Baxter, Beheshti, Binder, Bohigian, Borneman, Brogan, Buianouckas, Canate, Cantwell, Cooper, D'Amico, Danziger, Davidson, De La Campa, Donleavy, Early, Essoka, Fedullo, B. Gerber, Greenbaum, Grossman, Harris, Henderson Isaacs, Jaffe, Jiji, Kadushin, Kirsch, Lea, Muzio, Nelson, Parkhurst, Plissner, Rosen, Rovira, Schneider, Sohmer, Timoni, Trefousse, Waldinger, Walkwitz, Walter, Wimmershoff-Caplan, Wolfe, Yousef, Zades, Zaneteas, and Zarin; Alternate Senators Kleinman, Ladimer, and Stern and Alternate Senator-Elect Terrell. The absences of Senators Ballabon, Barber, Ercolano, Gelernt, Gluck, Lytra, Muehlig, Picken, Reuder, Riley, Romm, Rose, Valinsky and Waldman were excused. Liaison Member (PSC) Zeller also attended. Chancellor Joseph S. Murphy and Dr. Ellis, Executive Director, also attended.

I. Approval of the Proposed Tentative Agenda: The proposed tentative agenda was approved as circulated.

II. Approval of the Minutes of the 135th Plenary Session (January 22, 1985): The minutes were approved with the following corrections: Page 1, ll. 6-8: "Senators Amendolia...Zaneteas were excused." and p. 7, l. 25 " the formula for capacitor charging...". (corrections underlined)

III. Memorial Resolution for Professor J. Robert Loy (Modern Languages, Brooklyn): Professor Wedeen explained that Professor Loy who was well-known to his fellow Senators as well as to his colleagues at Brooklyn College and the Graduate School had died suddenly on February 3. The following memorial resolution was therefore proposed:

BE IT RESOLVED THAT: The University Faculty Senate of The City University of New York expresses its profound sorrow at the untimely death, on February 3, 1985, of its colleague J. Robert Loy. Professor of French at Brooklyn College and a member of the University doctoral faculty, Bob Loy joined the faculty in 1959 and served on the Brooklyn College Senate Delegation since 1974. He headed the Senate's Library Committee and its Committee on Foreign Languages. He was dean of his college delegation and, throughout his tenure in the University and his college, served the cause of faculty governance. A student of 18th-century French literature, Bob Loy was truly enlightened, the heir of his special research interest: Diderot and the other philosophes. The University, Brooklyn College, and the Senate mourn his absence.

The resolution was moved and seconded and adopted unanimously. Professor Trefousse (History, Brooklyn) moved a minute of silence in Professor Loy's memory. The motion was seconded and the Senate rose for a minute of silence.

The chair then passed to Chairman Wasser (English, Staten Island), who explained that his somewhat delayed arrival was due to his attendance at the Chancellor's reception in honor of President Cohen (Queens College) whose leaving the University is now imminent.

IV. Communications from the Chairman: Professor Wasser reported first on various

activities of the Board of Trustees. He spoke first of the Trustees' annual trip to Albany to discuss the University's budget for 1985-86 with the Legislature. He explained that the Executive Budget can be modified by the Governor during a 30 day period following its submission and that part of the effort was therefore to achieve such changes on behalf of CUNY. In addition, he reminded the Senate, it was customary for the University to look to the Legislature to restore funds, included in the University's Budget Request but not proposed by the Governor in his Executive Budget. The trip this year - it is an annual one - took place on February 11 and 12. Some nine of the Trustees accompanied by Chancellor Murphy and several members of his staff comprised the CUNY group. Among the Trustees, in addition to Professor Wasser, were Chairman Murphy, Vice Chairman Everett, Mrs. Bloom, Mr. Cenci, Mr. Lowe. Members of the Chancellor's staff included Vice Chancellors Corbie and Barnett, Acting Vice Chancellors Hershenson and Vivona, Acting Dean Brown, Mr. Howard Galen and Mr. Richard Rothbard of the Office of Budget and Finance. The trip, in comparison to last year's, was more successful. More of the Legislative leaders attended the events scheduled for the evening of February 11 - a cocktail reception and dinner. Assemblyman Fink, majority leader and speaker in the Assembly, was present at both; Senator Anderson, majority leader of the Senate, attended the reception; Senator Ohrenstein, minority leader in the Senate, was also at the two events as well as several other leaders in both houses and key members of the New York City delegation. Another innovation at this year's events was the presence of the CUNY Albany interns. The format of the February 12 meetings by members of the Board with legislators was also different. Several group meetings with key legislators had been arranged by Acting Director of Legislative Affairs Mays. These meetings, in which the Trustees participated as a group together with members of the Chancellor's staff, were hosted by key legislators whose staff arranged for other legislators to be present as well. Among these meetings were sessions hosted by Assemblymen Fink, Siegel (chairman of the Assembly Higher Education Committee), Straniere (Staten Island), Rappela, minority ranking member of the Higher Education Committee, Senators Gold (Queens) and Ohrenstein. In addition, Chancellor Murphy and some of his staff met with people in the Governor's Office. The results of these efforts, Chairman Wasser continued, will not be known until the Budget is adopted but it was the impression of those participating that the general attitude was receptive.

Professor Wasser reported also on the Board's Public Meeting of January 28. He spoke especially of two issues that he addressed in the meeting. The first related to a proposed resolution of the Board's Faculty, Staff and Administration Committee concerning Senior Executive Salaries, i.e. the salaries of the Chancellor, the Deputy Chancellor, the Vice Chancellors and the Presidents. The resolution proposed an increase in those salaries so that they would be set at a level equivalent to those of comparable positions at the State University Central Office and the SUNY University Centers. When he received the agenda for the meeting, Professor Wasser said, he had asked for a breakdown of the salaries in terms of dollars because the resolution did not include that information. He was informed by letter from Vice Chancellor Bloom that the schedule would be forthcoming as soon as the exact figures were known. He had repeated that question at the meeting and noted that it seemed to him that the salaries should be a matter of public record. The Vice Chancellor explained their absence on the grounds that the resolution was intended to speak to a principle. Board Chairman Murphy and other appointed members of the Board supported Professor Wasser, however, and the Chairman insisted that the salary schedule, which has already been approved by the State Budget Office, be included in the minutes of the meeting. Chairman Wasser's second intervention, he continued, was related to the proposed resolution to amend the Bylaws in order to establish the title of Medical Liaison Officer. He had asked why this action was proposed since it was his understanding that the title was for an appointment that was limited to a two-year, one-time, appointment. The resolution, on the other hand, did not include a time limit and therefore created a permanent position. The reply to that question was that the amendment and establishment of the title were required in order to place the appointee on the University payroll since he did not hold a teaching position and the salary he would receive exceeded that paid to persons

the Higher Education Officer series. The salary, he added, was set at a level comparable to that paid in the Medical Professorship line since the position was attended, and was, in fact, held, by a physician. Professor Wasser said that he had reminded his fellow Trustees that, in the not so distant past, a comparable situation had arisen. At that time a request had been made by the then University administration that a title be created by Board resolution to amend the Bylaws in order to assign that title to an individual to prevent his leaving the Central Office. The stipulation had been made verbally to the Faculty, Staff and Administration Committee that the sole purpose of the amendment was such. In practice, however, circumstances proved otherwise. The individual left the University immediately after being named to the new title - that of Deputy Chancellor for Budget and Finance - to become a Vice President at City College. The title was then offered to and accepted by another appointee, brought in from outside the University, and was probably going to be assigned to another person now. Once again, however, Professor Wasser's point drew the support of his colleagues on the Board, including the Chairman, and it was ruled that the minutes of the January 28, 1985 meeting should include the stipulation with respect to the time limit, one-time nature of the assignment of the title.

Professor Wasser's communications were interrupted at this point by several questions and comments from the floor. He was asked to describe the duties of the position and after his explanation several Senators questioned the need to create what appeared to be a "super-HEO" to handle an administrative task that might be performed by any very well-qualified HEO. The wisdom of using the institution's resources in this way when virtually every department in every college was hunting for means to add lines was questioned. It was suggested that the University once again seemed to be dealing with its financial problems in a manner that constituted the obverse to that which occurred outside its confines - the state of the railroads, it was noted, was accompanied by a reduction in the corporate bureaucracy; at CUNY, however, a decline in funding led to an increase in the bureaucracy. The qualifications of the appointee were also noted on the basis of the information available in his curriculum vita and questions were raised about the justification for the appointment. The Senate was informed that the Executive Committee had discussed most of these points with the Chancellor when the appointment was made from among candidates recommended to him by an internal Search Committee that screened applicants who responded to the advertisement of the position. He had explained the appointment on the basis of the individual possessing the qualities required to handle the specific tasks involved and had noted, in particular, the need for the appointee to be a physician in order to deal with medical people in the clinical facilities attached to the medical education proposal. It was also pointed out that the medical school had received seed money, separate from the University's other financing, in the Governor's budget for 1984-85 and that separate funding was included also in the Executive Budget, 1985-86. The status of the progress towards establishment of the medical school was discussed also and after Chairman Wasser had noted the adoption by the Board of a resolution to move towards establishment of such a school, the granting of authority to the University to award the M.D. degree by the Board of Regents, and the signing by the Governor of the medical school bill it was suggested that the Medical Liaison Officer be asked to attend a Plenary Session in order to provide a first hand report on developments.

Dr. Wasser then turned to another issue - articulation. He noted that his written report for the session indicate that the Senate's hearings on this major issue of 1984-85 would be held on Friday, February 22 from 9:30 a.m. to 3 p.m. He said that the location of the hearings had been changed since the Third Floor Studio was under construction. The location was now in the Graduate School Auditorium and persons who had requested places on the speakers' list were so being told as well as having a notice of the change posted at the Graduate School. In addition, Professor Wasser said, the Presidents have set the dates for their hearings which will be held at 80th Street on three different dates. The first, he added, was scheduled February 19 but, for a reason not known to him, was cancelled. Dr. Wasser said too that he had invited President Lief, chairman of the COPS Academic Affairs Committee to have both the Senate and the COPS hearings

conducted under joint sponsorship. President Lief has replied, in a note received this afternoon, that he thinks it too late to have joint sponsorship but that a meeting with us after all the testimony is in should be useful. I shall inform him that I agree. Dr. Wasser reported also that the Senate Articulation Committee has been developing its resolution on this issue in cooperation with the Executive Committee and would be reviewing that proposal in the light of the testimony at the Senate hearings. A final resolution, he said, would be on the agenda of the next Plenary Session, March 12, 1985 and at that time a full discussion of the issue that he believes one of the major academic matters before the University this year would be possible.

The next item, Dr. Wasser reported, was the matter of appointments to the University Committee on Research Awards, the policy-making body for the CUNY/PSC Awards Program. That matter was the subject of a meeting on February 14 attended by Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Barnett who chairs the University Committee and those members of her staff who staff the Committee - Deans Barsam and White; Professor Gerber (History, Lehman), chairman of the Senate Research Committee, Professors Greetham (English, Queensborough) and Mueller (Economics, Graduate School), members of the Senate Committee, Dr. Wasser and Dr. Ellis, who staffs the Senate Committee. Chancellor Murphy was also invited but, at the last minute, was unable to attend. As a result of his absence no final resolution of the problem that arose last summer with respect to this matter was reached since the Vice Chancellor was acting, as she stated, "as the Chancellor's ears" and not to speak for him since he was responsible for making policy. Nonetheless, there was a full discussion of the procedures employed in making appointments and the Committee's and the Senate's concerns about what they perceived as violation of the agreed upon guidelines. The actions taken this year as well as the principles asserted in the Chancellor's Letter to Chairman Wasser last summer were reviewed too. The Vice Chancellor said that she would report the discussion to the Chancellor and that he would discuss the matter and a possible solution with the Senate Executive Committee at its meeting on February 26. Following the meeting the Senate representatives discussed ways of achieving what all perceived as the common purpose of the Chancellor and his staff and the University faculty with respect to the UCRA. Professor Wasser had then written to the Vice Chancellor and told her of the Senate proposals for a solution and invited her comment. The proposals were as follows: 1) In future, the Senate Research Committee would forward three lists to the Vice Chancellor - Highly Recommended Candidates, Recommended Candidates and Nominees Not Recommended; 2) In compiling these lists, the Senate Committee would base its recommendations solely on judgements based on academic considerations; 3) Efforts to widen the pool of potential appointees would be made by both the Senate Committee and the Vice Chancellor. As stated at the meeting, the Senate would be happy to solicit nominations from each member of the University faculty, if financial support to defray the additional printing costs were available. In addition, the Senate would extend its solicitation of nominations through telephone calls to department chairs in the areas where vacancies existed. The Vice Chancellor and her staff would decide what measures they wished to use to expand their list; 4) The appointments would be made only from the Highly Recommended and Recommended Lists. Subsequently, Vice Chancellor Barnett indicated her intent to support these proposals and to recommend them to the Chancellor for his endorsement as the basis for a solution and with the recommendation that they be reviewed after two years of implementation. Thus, Professor Wasser stated, those who participated in the meeting are hopeful that a satisfactory agreement will be achieved at the February 26 meeting so that the nominating process may be set in motion. Finally, Chairman Wasser noted that the Doctoral Policy Committee had been of help in the discussions on this matter since that Committee which is chaired by Professor Gittell (Political Science, Brooklyn) had written to the Vice Chancellor, and through her to the Chancellor, to express concern about the process as implemented last summer.

Professor Wasser concluded his report with two announcements. He said that he was sorry to inform the Senate that Senator Joseph Ercolano (Mathematics, Baruch) was in the hospital and would be there for a period of time. He would be pleased, said Dr. Wasser, to receive cards or calls from friends in the Senate. His address is Mount Sinai Hospital,

urgery 4 - Room 3494, 100th Street and Fifth Avenue, New York, New York 10029. His phone number is 212-650-3494.

Finally, Professor Wasser stated that, as indicated in his written report, there had been a major crisis with respect to the distribution of the Senate Newsletter to the campuses. The Newsletter was delivered to the campus mailrooms only on February 19 and would be circulated to the faculty on February 20. He hoped that liaison members of Senate delegations would monitor the college mailrooms' participation so that the internal circulation of the publication were not any longer delayed. As he said in his written report, Dr. Wasser continued, the repeated problems in printing and circulating the Newsletter are a great disservice to the editor Professor Gordon Lea whose efforts to produce a timely and lively as well as informative and meaningful Newsletter were so poorly rewarded. The problem, as with so many other Senate activities, is of course, the skimpy budget within which the body must operate. Professor Wasser then said that he would like to ask for a motion to have the minutes of the session reflect the Senate's appreciation of Professor Lea's fine editorship of the Newsletter and his perseverance despite the obstacles he had to overcome. The motion was made and several times seconded and adopted unanimously.

Professor Grossman (Education, City) then asked about the Task Force on Teacher Education, specifically the membership of the Task Force and its charge. Chairman Wasser replied that it had been appointed by Vice Chancellor Barnett, that he did not have a list of the members, that he was one and that he could report on the basis of the one meeting he had attended to date that it was chaired by Dean Irene Impellizieri (Brooklyn College), that Dean Scott (Hunter) was a member, that the staff person was Dean McGarraghy. Professor Grossman opined that she thought there ought to be faculty involved in teacher education on the Task Force also and Dr. Wasser said he did not yet have the full membership list but would obtain it. Professor Wedeen then spoke of a proposal for an Academy for Pedagogy that had been circulated and said she intended to ask the Chancellor about it.

V. Chancellor's Report: Chancellor Murphy having arrived his report became the next agenda item. He said that he would be going to Albany in the early morning hours in order to testify at a hearing of the joint Finance/Ways and Means and Higher Education Committees of the State Legislature. He would address two different methods of remedying deficiencies in the Executive Budget 1985-86 with respect to the University's funding. -those that might be remedied by changes on the part of the Governor during the 30 day period subsequent to submission of the Budget and those that would require action by the Legislature. In point of fact, he would address all of the deficiencies on both fronts. The items to be included were as follows: 1) the community college base aid for which the University would request a \$200 per student increase as well as some programmatic increases; 2) a return of the 127 positions removed because the University's enrollment was down some 3000 FTEs in the fall from projections and would argue that the falloff was not that great due to a strong spring semester enrollment; 3) the funding for child care which was being reduced as a result of the State's making good on a promise given last year to phase out such support after three years; 4) the 10% cut in temporary services levied on all State agencies; 5) various miscellaneous items that were put in by the Legislature last year and removed in the new Executive Budget proposal; and 6) funds for restoring and increasing the amounts for summer freshmen programs since there was interest on the CUNY Board and now in the State Assembly and, hopefully, the State Senate too in this area. The Chancellor was optimistic, he said, on the Budget Outlook. The State's financial picture was such that the \$7 to \$9 million restoration that CUNY sought ought to be forthcoming. It was clear that the economy of the State had generated surpluses so that all things seem possible this year even a tax cut and reduction of the State deficit - although these would probably not occur until the agencies' requests were satisfied. There is a growing opinion, he continued, that a tax cut should follow

enhancement of State services since there is a perception that the State is not doing all that it could in the area of services. I would welcome some economists doing a study on whether a tax cut really generates economic activity.

The Chancellor said that the Albany trip by the Board and the Chancellor and other staff had been successful, he thought, that he had the opportunity to meet with members of the Black and Puerto Rican Caucus as well as with the Governor's Office and that he would not comment further since he was certain that Professor Wasser had discussed the trip in his report to the Senate. The Chancellor said too that his emphasis in his testimony on February 20 would be somewhat different from the direction taken in the past. He would stress the quality of the University's programs and the value of the faculty to the Legislature. He would be reading a list of faculty honors as well as speaking again to the high ratings assigned by national rankings of doctoral programs to the various CUNY PhD programs.

The Chancellor noted also that the University had been assigned five leading professorships in the Executive Budget. He said that there had been some opposition to this but that CUNY had been given them because the State University has ten. The number is, of course, inadequate but they will have to be distributed equitably. There is no mechanism at hand as yet to do this.

Chancellor Murphy said that he was going to propose that the Faculty Senate create a Committee to analyse the Reagan Budget especially the Higher Education sections, for example, the Pell Grants. He was, he continued, becoming paranoid about what was being done with respect to the cuts in that program. He thought that all the hullabaloo about the middle-class guaranteed loan program was intended to detract from the \$635 million cut in Pell grants. If one followed the discussions, he said, one noted that the administration's responses to comment on the cuts in higher education focused always on the loan program. He could, he continued, devise a scenario that to increase the competition between the middle class and the poor the intent was to get the former railing and ranting so that, in the end, the cuts would be restored and the funding would then be taken from the poor. Mr. Bennett who spoke of the Florida vacation week, the Cadillac etc. as products of the guaranteed loan was a former assistant professor of philosophy at Boston University - possibly the only philosopher who agreed with that institution's president's approach. He could empathize with the status of an assistant professor, having held that rank himself but he perceived in the administration's scenario a danger to CUNY. If the cut in Pell grants is carried out and recurs in the next three years the program could be left with no more than \$635 million in funding. He was therefore addressing the issue of the Pell grants on every possible occasion. He had testified in Washington already and would be going there again shortly.

The Chancellor said that this ended his report and that he would be happy now to respond to questions and comments from the Senate. There was one other item he wished to report, however. Mayor Koch has appointed his former Budget Director Alair Townsend as Deputy Mayor for Development.

1.) Professor Stern (Physics, New York City Tech) - "What is the situation with respect to the capital budget?" / The capital budget situation is somewhat embarrassing at the moment because we have received a good deal on that side. The funding for the Staten Island campus is there, there is no solution to John Jay yet and the \$22 to \$24 million for Medgar Evers is not sufficient. The solution for Baruch is not the most ideal but it is a vast improvement over present circumstances. That side looks very good remembering that continuing commitment by the State and City is required for the capital budget. That, of course, ties the hands of future legislators through bonding, the darling of corporate interests and business men because the bonds will be paid out

n if everyone is homeless. The State has lots of money. I hope they spend it wisely. With respect to the Staten Island site Willowbrook may have been a snakepit but, in fact, it is perfectly suited to a college campus in terms of layout. 2) Professor Wedeen (Education, Brooklyn) - "In relation to the Academy of Pedagogy, can you tell us about who originated it, its curriculum, faculty involvement in the planning etc.?" / I have received the Executive Committee's response and I passed it on to Marguerite Barnett in whose shop the Academy originated and I am waiting for her response because I don't have personal knowledge of it. I do know that it is a pet project of a group down there. 3) Professor Cooper (History, Staten Island) - "In relation to money - is there anyway that the Melani money will be raised. I know that there is money in the State Budget but that is far short of the amount awarded. Is there anyway that the difference can or will be raised? I remember a few years ago when the issue of paying the Rapp-Coudert people arose, there was considerable difficulty in obtaining the money to pay them." / The Melani settlement is under a court order. Professor Cooper further stated "But there is a considerable difference, as I understand it between the award and the State Budget amount - some \$5 million gap." / There is a court order and the money has to be there unless the City and State go into bankruptcy. The gap is related to an unresolved issue. Since the conditions on which the award was made occurred when CUNY was wholly funded by the City the State has raised the issue of responsibility for paying the award so that there is a need to calculate who should contribute how much towards the court-awarded settlement. With respect to the Rapp-Coudert victims that was not a matter of a court order. 4) Professor Lea (English, Lehman) - " I have a comment and a question. With respect to your explanation concerning Mr. Bennett I was not sure whether you attributed his attitude to the fact that he was an assistant professor, a philosopher, or at B.U. My question concerns child care. Vice Chancellor Bloom said, when he spoke to the Senate recently, that he was preparing screening guidelines for people working in child care at CUNY and I wondered whether those had been completed since he has not sent them to us as he indicated he would." / As a former Assistant Professor at Brandeis I well understand the contemptuous attitude taken towards such so I don't have to get revenge. I don't know whether the guidelines have been completed but I will find out. 5) Professor Sohmer (Mathematics, City) - If there is a diminution of Pell funds will the University reduce tuition?" / What do you think? There will be those who argue that we are not affected because the poor will drop out and we will gain students from the middle class who will no longer be able to attend the privates without the guaranteed loans. What worries me is the lack of attention to what is happening to the Pell grants. The administration's response is only to issues related to the \$32,000 income level on guaranteed loans. Isn't it more important to give to the truly needy is a question that is asked and the administration response is "yes" but, in fact, they are taking away from the poor. There are a lots of opponents of the administration's cuts in higher education spending but they are interested in different things. For example, the privates are not really interested in the Pell grants. We are trying to be fair and argue for both but the problem is that they are very smart and I can't figure out how one deals with people who are both smart and meretricious. 6) Professor Bohigian (Mathematics, John Jay) - " That answer is a good introduction to my question. It seems to me that the University does not have any formal procedures for making the best use of its faculty. There are some 200 people working in the Central Office but you come to the Senate and ask for help. But among those 200 people there is no one to do what you want. Why haven't you established a research arm of faculty rather than appoint so many HEOs etc. You have all those people but none is doing the kind of research you need, why not move in the direction of being more responsive to the needs of the University?" / When faculty come to the Central Office or move into the administrative ranks of the colleges there is a curious metaphorical emphasis that occurs - they are no longer considered to be faculty after one or two years. If you are suggesting that there is something we can't do internally then 1) we have to decide whether all the things that need to be done are being done as well as they could be. If one analyses 80th Street or the college administrations you can find better ways of doing things but faculty have to make substantial sacrifices to do

what needs doing. The total at 80th Street is less than in the past and the people added there have legitimate credentials. Much of what needs to be done there is marginal and can be done by non-academics. For example, we have a lot of law work - the amount of work in that area is enormous. We need a fringe benefit specialist like a financial aid officer on the campuses who is a specialist in that area but they don't have to be academics. There is no question but that the bureaucracy has increased; it has increased throughout the country and I think it is unfortunate to spend too much on that area. When I had some lines the only unit in the University where cuts were made by me and there was a decrease was 80th Street and the Graduate School was the only unit that increased because that's where I gave the lines. 7) Professor Yousef (Mechanical Technology, Staten Island) - "I keep reading in the Advance - with respect to the Staten Island site a debate on Willowbrook versus South Beach - has the decision been finally made in Albany?" / I think it has and I hope the Governor will announce it soon. I don't know for certain but I think it is a virtual certitude.

8) Professor Trefousse (History, Brooklyn) - "We have an Academy, you know, that could do the kind of research you've been discussing. I would urge the Chancellor to use it."

9) Professor Binder (History, Staten Island) - "The University - especially the Graduate Center - has a center for Scandinavian Studies and for many other area studies and the colleges do too but not one for Urban Studies or Urban Education. Why not establish a permanent center for these?" / I had a meeting on this recently but, for example, in Urban Studies I had people involved in various programs there and there is a great diversity among them. The University has the capacity to prepare drafts on all kinds of things and I had a room filled with people interested in lots of things but they - and Urban Studies - lack a common conceptual scheme and the economists want to study urban economics, for example, and so forth. It's like structuralism. Professor Bohigian interjected - "There has to be a Gestalt, it has to take all disciplines." / That sounds fine until you get them in one room. Professor Binder further asked - "Why not define the issues that need to be studied and start there?" / That sounds fine but who is going to do this. How do you select the issues and how solid is the conceptual universe of urban studies? What do you select as urban issues - racism? poverty? and who will do it? It isn't that I don't think you're right. There are lots of people clamoring for what you're saying but who to ask is the question. I'm not giving up though.

10) Professor Baumrin (Philosophy, Graduate School) - "Could you give us an update on the status of the medical school?" / The medical education program has cleared the Board, the Regents and there are indications that partial accreditation may be possible this spring. The amount of dollars being sought now is a question. I think there is sufficient support to get them. Also agreements have to be worked out and there are people working on them. There are many governance agreements - between Sophie Davis and Long Island Jewish, between CUNY and Long Island Jewish, between CUNY and the subsidiary hospitals, between Long Island Jewish and the other hospitals designated in the legislation. All of these are now in draft form and there is a lot of back and forth on them. There is a need to reconcile the internal structural setup with the human considerations.

11) Professor Wasser (English, Staten Island) - "With respect to articulation - As you know our hearings are to be held on Friday and the presidents set three dates for theirs but today's, for some reason, appears to have been cancelled. We offered joint sponsorship of those hearings - all of them - but have had no reply yet. We think ours will be important and ours are going to be the basis for a resolution that will take into account the testimony given at them and provided in writing. We know that the Presidents' hearings are being held but don't have much other information on them. What is the purpose of those hearings?" / I can't answer that question.

12) Professor Muzio (Biological Sciences, Kingsborough) - "With respect to the medical school - what is being done in relation to outside employment by physicians who hold faculty rank? There was a good deal written when the problems arose at Downstate, for example, within the last few years. During the formative discussions I hope there will be equitable arrangements with respect to multiple positions so that the issue is settled during the early days." / The expenditure of State dollars is governed by State regulations and those physicians



who are on the State payroll will have to comply. The Downstate problem arose because physicians on full-time lines were also employed outside and had incomes from private practice in the \$200,000-\$300,000 range. The limitations are not on income but on time. I would say that this is something that needs to be watched.

VI. Proposed Resolution on Guidelines for Appointment of Leading Professors: The proposed resolution was moved and seconded. After brief discussion the question was called and the resolution was adopted with one negative vote.

There being no new business the meeting was adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jean Ellis