

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

October 1, 1985

Professor Wasser, chairman, called the session to order at 6:40 p.m. in the Auditorium at the Graduate School and University Center. Present were: Senators Alston, Baker, Baumrin, Binder, Bohigian, Boylan, Bresnick, Brofsky, Brogan, Canate, Cinquemani, B. Cohen, Constantinides, Cooper, Danziger, De La Campa, Depas, Donleavy, Donovan, Ercolano, Fedullo, Feingold, Friedman, Galub, Gerber, Gluck, Gram, Greenbaum, Grossman, Gura, Guydon, Hayon, Hecht, Henderson, Hernandez-Miyares, Jiji, Johnson, Kachuck, Kadushin, Lea, Loetterle, Lytra, Matthews, Milentijevic, Moyne, Muller, Otelsberg, Parkhurst, Picken, Plissner, Quinn, Rodriguez, Rose, Rosen, Russell, Schiavone, Simor, Sohmer, Speidel, Stern, Stroup, Sullivan, Thaxton, Timoni, Trefousse, Waldinger, Walter, Wedeen, Weightman, Wolfe, Yousef, Zades and Zarin; Alternate Senators, Ginsberg, Glass, Kuhner, Ladas, McDaniel, Richter, Sessions, Shaffer, Sternlight, Terrell and Weiszmann. Excused were Senators Beck, Cravats, Davidson, Friedman, Kirsch, Litke, Muehlig, Riley, and Washington. Dr. Belle Zeller, liaison member, PSC, also attended. Chancellor Joseph S. Murphy and Dr. Ellis, Executive Director also attended. Vice Chancellor for Budget and Finance Vivona and Dr. Irwin Polishook, PSC, were the guests of the Senate.\*

I. Approval of the Proposed Tentative Agenda: The tentative agenda was approved by motion duly made, seconded and passed.

II. Approval of the Minutes of the 139th Plenary Session (May 21, 1985): The minutes were approved with the following correction: Professor Baumrin was present.

III. Communications from the Chairman: Professor Wasser welcomed the Senate and its guests. He apologized for the unannounced location of the meeting and explained that the Senate Office had never been informed of the change from Room 1700 to the Auditorium. The Executive Director had learned of the relocation of the meeting by accident the morning of the meeting. All other meetings, with the exception of the Annual Dinner Meeting scheduled for December 11, 1985, will be held in Room 1700, she has been assured.

Professor Wasser announced the following: 1) There are new staff members in the Executive Director's Office at 80th Street - Mrs. Jean Thomas and Dr. Margaret Corey. The former has been with the Senate since June; the latter joined the staff last week. Your indulgence until they are fully acclimated is requested. 2) The letters calling for election of college delegations to the Senate for 1986-87, i.e. to fill vacancies due to the expiration of Senators' terms on May 14, 1986 have been sent to the colleges. It is hoped that the elections will take place in good order and that they will have been completed by February 1 and the pertinent information concerning the newly elected and re-elected members transmitted to the Senate Office, preferably in writing. 3) The next meeting will be on October 22, 1985 when President Proshansky of the Graduate School and University Center will be the guest speaker.

The Board of Trustees Borough Hearing in Queens, Dr. Wasser continued, will be held on Thursday, October 31, 1985 in the Queens Borough Hall, Room 213, from 5 to 8 P.M. Attendance at the hearing is invited, especially by those at the CUNY colleges and schools in Queens. Those wishing to speak at the hearing should notify the Office of the Secretary of the Board, Martin J. Warmbrand - 794-5450 - no later than Friday, October 25. The Board's Borough Hearing in Staten Island is scheduled for Thursday, November 14, 1985 at 130 Stuyvesant Place from 5 to 8 P.M. Further details have not yet been announced but will be forthcoming soon.

\* Professor Davidson was present not excused.

Professor Wasser next spoke to major issues that the Executive Committee had identified as the foci of Senate attention during 1985-86. The primary issue on the agenda for this year, he continued, is the search issue. While presidential searches are not free from problems, he said, they are conducted within the framework of written guidelines adopted by the Board. Searches for senior administrative positions at 80th Street, however, are uneven and at times chaotic. There have now been a series of appointments there for which no searches have been conducted and these have been appointments of top-level people on the Chancellor's staff and not of lower echelon positions in the administrative structure where the situation has been very much the same for some time. With the exception of the Deputy Chancellor and the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and carry-over positions from the previous administration, such as the Vice Chancellor for Legal Affairs, the fundamental appointments in the Central Office have been made by the Chancellor without a search committee's recommendations. The action at the Board meeting in June when two more Vice Chancellors were named to positions at least one of which the Board had been assured would be filled on a permanent basis only after a proper search had been conducted provoked reaction among some Trustees other than myself and the result was a divided vote on that appointment. An ad hoc committee of the Board plans to review the procedures for appointments to senior administrative posts and Chairman of the Board Murphy has acceded to my request to be accorded an opportunity to present the Senate's and the faculty's view on the issue. The Executive Committee has already and will continue to discuss this issue at some length and hopes to consult with the entire Senate membership at the next meeting on October 22. That discussion will take up the issue, as the Senate did in 1983 when it adopted guidelines for searches for senior administrative positions in the Central Office, and will be directed towards identifying those positions not discussed in the 1983 resolution for which searches ought to be conducted, the membership of such committees, the procedures that should be followed on selection of members, especially the faculty members, of those committees. There is special concern too with the fact that even when we have been asked to serve on those search committees that have been established - both for senior members of the staff and for those at a lower level - the conduct of the search for Central Office positions has often been less than satisfactory. The present practice in the appointment of senior people seems to be the naming of a person to serve as "acting" and after some time has passed to recommend appointment to the permanent title on the basis of past performance. I might add, in that connection, that the Queens College presidential search was one that avoided most of the pitfalls that we have noted in so many other searches at all levels in the University. The credit for that, I believe, belongs to the chair of the committee, Trustee Blanche Bernstein, and to the fact that there exist Board established guidelines written down to serve as a framework for the committee's activities. The cooperation among the faculty members of the Committee - the three members from the Queens faculty and myself was also a factor so that taken as a whole that search was the most effective of those in recent years. There were imperfections but it was superior to any other in the recent past.

A second issue that the Senate needs to consider at length is that of presidential power under the University's Bylaws vis-a-vis the duties and responsibilities of the faculty. The issue is not new but the Executive Committee's attention has been directed to it by a number of questions raised about practices or occurrences at various colleges in the past few years. The most recent matter brought to the Executive Committee is what we call "the LaGuardia issue." It was brought to the Committee by the Department of Accounting and Management at the college and concerns the right of a department to elect its own chairperson and the presidential power to certify the election or refuse to do so and to name his own choice to that position. At LaGuardia the department's choice of a chair was refused by the president who then imposed a person of his own choice. We are currently engaged in discussions with the members of the department, through their representative and with the president about the refusal to certify a

person chosen by a 9 to 6 vote. The president has indicated that he might eventually agree to accept another elected chair but negotiations are going on between the president and the department. It should be noted, as an aside, that the department's objection is not directed to the person chosen by the president and who is a colleague but to the fact that the person was not the department's choice and the president's refusal to accept the department's elected chairman and his failure to accord the members the opportunity to select a person acceptable to the president thus became a matter of principle. The Executive Committee has entered the matter because of the fact that the principle of presidential power and its scope vis-a-vis faculty responsibility and power and its scope is one that has been raised in a number of cases over the past few years and that has assumed the dimension of a general concern of the University's faculty that it is appropriate business for the Senate. Thus, the Executive Committee foresees it as an important agenda item for this year.

A somewhat related issue is another that must be addressed because it is larger than the specific examples that called the Committee's attention to it - the delay in follow-through on policies developed by this body and its committees. For fully two years the Senate's carefully drawn policy on Restricted Publication and the related policy on University/Corporate Relations that followed have awaited attention from the administration and Board. We are told that at least the first is tied up because an opinion from the Vice Chancellor for Legal Affairs whose opinion was sought has not yet responded - either to a seven to eight month old request from the chair of the Board Committee on Academic Policy, Program, and Research to whom the policies were sent with a request that they be placed on the Committee's agenda nor to a request made in my presence via telephone by the Chancellor some seven weeks ago. This situation is far too common to be ignored by the faculty-at-large and by the Senate if the Bylaw responsibilities assigned to us are to be more than empty words.

My written report this evening outlines a number of other developments during the summer months including the most important events in which the Executive Committee and I have participated. I want to say a few words about one of those - the Conference of the International Association of Universities which I attended as the faculty trustee representing the Board and the faculty of the City University. Chairman of the Board Murphy and the Chancellor were pleased to have me do this and thus I participated as the official University and Board delegate. There were some 400 heads and representatives of universities throughout the world in attendance. It was impossible to interact with the eight Russians present who though they made speeches about peace and cooperation, kept to themselves. It was otherwise with the East Europeans, the delegates from Poland, Yugoslavia, Rumania. There were - and perhaps this is a commentary on the state of their economy - representatives of 20 Japanese universities,; there were also 35 American colleges and universities that participated. There was some disappointment on the last day of the conference because in the election for a head of the association for the next five years there was a struggle between the head in Benin and in Geneva. Only four Americans remained to participate in that election and I was besieged with questions about why the others had left. I have a number of documents that anyone who wishes may see. There were all sorts of interesting people there, I might add - the Head of the University of Havana who has been talking to Pittsburgh about exchange programs, the former president of the University of Pennsylvania Martin Meyerson who was a major speaker, and the heads of the University of Sofia. The Conference proved to be a very interesting continuation of the meetings that I attended last year with the European heads of universities. As the representative of the CUNY Trustees I have written up the conference for them and would be happy to make that report available to anyone interested. It will be available through the Senate Office.

Professor Wasser then responded to questions. Professor Lea (English, Lehman) spoke on the issue of searches and said that the Chancellor had made clear in discussion with the Executive Committee, the Senate, and other forums that he needs more flexibility

4

in his choice of staff so that those at the higher level may be reflective of the University's constituencies. All of that is a reasonable goal but proper procedure is another. There is the issue of the kinds of lower level positions for which there ought to be searches and how to conform to affirmative action principles and follow affirmative action guidelines. Professor Cooper (History, Staten Island) spoke to her experience on the Search Committee for a Director of Inter-governmental Relations of which she was a member representing the Senate and the faculty. She had attended a meeting of that committee only three weeks ago at which she had spoken to some of these issues, since the meeting had been preceded by some lengthy discussions with the Vice Chancellor for University Relations. The Committee had been established last year and had interviewed a number of candidates at that time. It had made recommendations of candidates to the Chancellor but all of them had, in the end, turned it down. Parenthetically, she added, the job is a difficult one requiring the person to commute between New York and Albany and to do so for what is little money. When it became known that none of them had accepted and when the acting appointee resigned to accept a position with the Commission for Independent Colleges and Universities, that formerly held by Henry Paley, the decision was evidently made not to make another temporary appointment. She therefore received a phone call from the Vice Chancellor in August stating that it was imperative that someone be found quickly since the need for such a person would be immediate given the approach of the new academic and legislative year. Additional candidates had been identified, he said, and the Committee would be meeting to interview them. Professor Cooper had stated her view that a formal reopening of the search was required and had argued at some length with the Vice Chancellor who seemed to take her view seriously. Subsequently she received a message, however, that a meeting of the Committee to interview the identified candidates had been arranged. After raising the issue with the Chancellor in an Executive Committee meeting and expressing her view that the procedure being followed was in clear violation of affirmative action principles and guidelines - a view supported by the other members of the Executive Committee - with the advice of the Chancellor she presented her position to the Committee. The other members of the Committee did not share her views, however, and had no misgivings about the procedures being followed. They therefore voted to interview the two candidates at that time. The result was the recommendation to the Chancellor that one of the two be appointed. Professor Cooper said that she had abstained from the vote on the candidates since she had problems with being a puppet asked to support appointment of some politician's wife to the post. She had written a number of nasty letters about the procedures and believed it was of primary importance to find a way to persuade the central administration to behave in a vaguely proper way in these matters.

IV. Reports of Faculty Members of Board of Trustees' Committees: Professor Wasser noted that these were circulated in written form and asked for questions, if any. There were none. (The reports are attached to these minutes.)

V. Approval of Proposed Slate of Senate Standing Committees, 1985-86: The proposed slate was approved with some additions. (A Copy of the Approved Slate is attached.)

VI. Report of Vice Chancellor for Budget and Finance Vivona: Vice Chancellor Vivona greeted the Senate and noted that each year the Budget Office extends itself to various groups in the University to go over various issues with them. He said that he would speak first to the Chancellor's Budget Request for 1986-87 which must be submitted to the Governor in the next few weeks after it had been approved by the Board of Trustees. The Request, he said, would focus on three areas - the University's objectives, the needs of the senior campuses and the needs of the community college campuses. These areas, he continued, were consistent with the approach taken by the University in recent years. Thus, University objectives would be the largest area of concern and included here would be a number of things: excellence and access, retention, research and development, collaborative programs with the Board of Education, financial aid,

child care, and college-related programs. With respect to the community college campuses the approach will be through proposed changes in the state aid formula, through increased city contribution. Finally, there will be all efforts made to carry out the Board mandate to take all necessary action to obtain senior college status for Medgar Evers College.

There will also be an effort to address problems in recruitment and retention, to strengthen programs, library resources, instructional equipment resources. The process followed was the following: after discussions with the presidents to make pre-allocations with respect to the number of jobs, non-salary costs and the like. The colleges then constructed their requests and addressed their needs within a university framework. A reasonable process was followed with respect to the community colleges as well although it was of necessity somewhat different because it is formula-driven. Through overarching goals for both senior and community college budgets there is an attempt to combine them.

The most important issue in the next twelve months is that of enrollment. The projection for 1986-87 is for a slight decline overall. The decline this year appears to be due to a number of uncompleted construction projects, e.g. at New York Technical College and we expect that those colleges will eventually recover. There is also the issue of demographics to take into account. With respect to the retention issue - it is a practical matter of retaining students. The projection for the senior colleges is for a decline from 89,000 FTEs to 88000 FTEs. Retention is, of course, related to enrollment but a loss of students or FTEs leads to a deficit since the budget is based, in part, on revenue from tuition collections. On the community college side we anticipate a 45800 increase over two years. In funding, as I noted, on the senior college side there are two sources: state aid and tuition. The University's entire request is for state funding because the University can never, given its goals, ask for an increase in tuition - nor would it. For the community colleges the sources are state aid and city funding including tuition levels established by the city. The entire budget process is viewed also in terms of the costs of early retirement, flexibility and articulation.

The issue of flexibility on which some State legislation was adopted this year is a second one that I have been asked to address this evening. Basically, there are four elements to which the legislation speaks: 1) transfer of funds between colleges, concentration of programs in the Central Office and distribution of them, considerable power for the Board to distribute cuts in funding and to deal with carry-forward money. The primary thing that the legislation does is to cut paper work - which was a principal goal of SUNY, who had, after all, initially sought the legislation because of the stronger control over their budget exercised by the State. In the area of financial aid we have made representations with respect to TAP and to federal programs with some special emphasis on aid to part-time students and the paper work was outside our central concerns, though it was more sought by SUNY.

Vice Chancellor Vivona then responded to questions and comments from the floor. 1) Professor Baumrin (Philosophy, Graduate School) - "Does the flexibility legislation speak to inter-institutional transfers?"/ They are permitted but only to the extent of 5% for major purposes. 2) Professor Plissner (Student Services, Kingsborough) - "Could you elaborate on your reference to articulation?"/ The policy adopted by the Board last spring requires the expenditure of some sizable amounts of money to implement. 3) Professor Sohmer (Mathematics, City College) - "Is what happens that the Presidents present requests based on the college's determination of its needs and then through the decisions of the Central Office those needs are revised within the Chancellor's framework?"/ We try to present the level of needs over three years in the pre-allocation. The college then comes back with the disposition of that pre-allocation and projection. Those requests are not always in conflict with the University goals. 4) Professor Speidel

(Geology, Queens) - "Vice Chancellor Vivona, how do you see your role vis-a-vis the Chancellor and the Deputy Chancellor as a staff person who is a number-cruncher or as a staff person making his own judgments? If you see that role as other than that of a number-cruncher, what do you see as the faculty role in putting together or allocating the budget? / I see the role as having a sense of the college needs and of having work come out of a Vice Chancellor who gives time to leadership and not numbers exclusively.

5) Professor Guydon (SEEK, John Jay) - "With respect to early retirement will there be additional offers?"/ Not in the senior colleges but efforts are being made to secure that option for the community colleges. Of the 740 eligible in the senior colleges, about 8% retired and we are now going through them and we are implementing a program in filling and realigning the positions between colleges over a two year period. With respect to the community colleges the Council of Presidents passed a resolution to pursue the option with the City but the City is against it. However, CUNY wants to treat all staff equally.

VII. Chancellor's Report: In defense of Vice Chancellor Vivona I would say that he has the same autonomy that Professor Speidel had as Dean of Science at Queens.

I have just returned from a trip to Cuba, as you know. The University had received a note from the University of Havana to discuss a possible relationship between the two universities. I went with Trustee Joe Rivera and Professor Frank Bonilla, Director of the Puerto Rican Institute. Frank Bonilla had, of course, visited Cuba at other times. We went by way of Mexico City two days after the earthquake and the devastation is enormous. It seems to me that we ought to deem appropriate some relief effort and try to raise some money for them. The University there was not involved and I understand that earthquakes are unusual in that they can leave one building intact while razing the neighboring one. I don't know very much about that. I can say, though, that the faces of people there whom I saw still carried a stunned expression. The situation is the worse because the country was stricken already economically, and there must be a need for at least \$12 million - not in some distant future but immediately. The country appeared devastated in a few places. I hope that I may ask the Senate to help in the effort to provide relief.

We were invited to Cuba by the University and by the Polytechnic Institute also which is interested in arranging exchanges with us. We will not be the first to have such exchanges with the University of Havana - the Johns Hopkins School of International Affairs has had such exchanges for sometime and Pittsburg and Havana recently agreed on a program for exchange of students but we may be the first to have such a relationship with the Polytechnic Institute. The institutions we visited are operating at a high level of intellectual activity; they are tied in with a network of others in the socialist world and they are now interested in ties with the capitalist world as they call it in their terminology. We didn't have any technical people with us. Professor Bonilla and I are both social scientists but there will be an attempt to develop relationships through the Puerto Rican Center which, as you know, is concerned with more than Puerto Rico - it has been doing considerable work in Caribbean Studies. I would like us to look into various academic areas and into special education as well. Cuba has a whole network for children with disabilities and I'd like to look at such things as the way teachers are trained and so forth. They are interested in funding in New York.

We also had the opportunity to see the City generally. I haven't had the opportunity to spend time in a socialist country before this. They are insistent on characterizing themselves as socialists and were equally insistent on labeling me "capitalist". When I tried to avoid that label, they said, "We don't mind being called 'socialist', but you mind being called 'capitalist'. Why?" Cuba is a very extraordinarily complex place. They are much concerned with the issues of embargo, in their relationship to other countries and in normal institutional relations. With res-

pect to the embargo they gave examples such as the blockade - it seems they export nickel to, for example, Italy where it is used in manufacturing various products. If the product has more than 5% nickel of Cuban origin, it can't be imported into the United States. There are problems with other members of the OAS. Instead of being able to import oil from Venezuela which is in close proximity, they have to get it at a distance from the USSR. There is a freshness of memory with respect to the Bay of Pigs even though over 20 years have passed and a desire to regenerate the memory. Granada is also on their minds and the death of the 20 construction workers. They are formulating plans for the year 2030 in the city and are talking about such things as a subway system. Their economy is 85% linked to other socialist societies in the world and they look richer than, for example, the Dominican Republic. They receive generous aid from the Soviet Union. Castro spoke of indexing import goods. They entered into 20 year agreements on sugar when it was 30¢ a pound and those agreements are still in effect but they need to do something more on import and export. If one sets prices, as they do, it is easier to plan but not in a country like ours where prices are responsive to the market. I jotted down my observations and if I have the opportunity to jot them down with the accuracy and fidelity of the Faculty Senate, I will do so.

Vice Chancellor Vivona has spoken to you on the budget and you know that he is available to you, if you wish more information at any time. The Budget Request is going to the State in the next few weeks. Relationships with the Board of Education look fruitful and the budget will reflect that. We are going for \$10 million as opposed to the lesser amount we were given this year, I think it was \$9 million. The retention issue is directed towards retaining enrollment for a five to ten year period and the request will include funds to help make that possible. Economic Development is an umbrella concept. I don't really understand it and I haven't wanted the University to assume too great responsibility in this area but it is a kind of game we have to play. Under enrollment we are aiming at a gradual increase. We need to look more at older people who are looking for graduate and professional opportunities and I have asked the faculty to look at this area. We also need to look into ways we can use teacher education to address teachers and pedagogy. We are working on an equipment count and support for the hard sciences generally. We are asking for funds for the acquisition of what is called "state of the art equipment" - I don't really understand what "state of the art" means - and other equipment. It is partly our fault that we lack what we should have been acquiring due to the fact that we traded off funds for equipment in the past in order to meet other needs.

I have been watching Channel A for the last six months waiting for something to happen and at last something has. I don't quite understand what they're doing but I hope you will invite Dean Hirshfield here to make a presentation. I thought planning programs was simple but it isn't, they tell me. There is a need for editing, for example, for technical matters with respect to production and so forth. Perhaps if you invite Dean Hirshfield someone, say Professor Sohmer will tell him what's wrong and he will have an interesting evening.

I have also been writing many letters soliciting support for lobbying the Congress on the impact of the proposed Federal tax program eliminating the deductibility of State and local income taxes on New York State. If tax deductibility is eliminated, it will be a serious issue for us. The Governor is speaking to this nationally and is getting more support than expected and other states are looking on the effects of the measure on them. There will be an impact on property even if the sales income is not applicable.

It is hard to speak about the Council of Presidents and the community college early retirement since that matter is of concern there but the City is resisting it and is, in fact opposed.

We also have a new Board member - Dr. Maria Canino. She was formerly a member of the Board of Higher Education and we are looking forward to working with her.

Also, the Borough Manhattan presidential search has begun and we are looking forward to finding a good person there. We had very good press on the appointment of President Kenny at Queens and she is coming in this week to take up the job. There is also a reception planned for her.

The status of the Medical Education is as follows: during the year there are two phases that we will address - 1) the Governor's office we are negotiating with on the necessary difference in funding; and 2) we will also be talking about the capital account and the effect from the State point of view since the senior colleges are fully funded by the State and the community colleges are funded in part by the State and in part by the City.

On the Law School accreditation - it has received it so that the first group to graduate will receive degrees from an accredited school. The Law School is attracting a good deal of attention since its program is non-traditional and came at a time when other schools were looking for ways to revise their programs. In brief, it is an extraordinary experiment and is being used as a model. It came at the right time when other schools were fed up with their program of study.

We are also working with a coalition based on the Biaggi bill for Part-time Pell grants.

There has also been a national group this year that I headed. We have been personally surprised that the Budget for those grants went through with an increase although human services didn't have a good year.

Professor Wasser informed the Chancellor that the Senate had turned over four tapes to Dean Hirshfield - of programs for Channel A prepared by the Senate two years ago and televised then and since, describing the Senate and its activities and the University.

Professor Wasser also told the Chancellor that he had talked with Trustee Canino and was looking forward also to working with her and he has been invited to attend the reception for her sponsored by the Puerto Rican Council on Higher Education.

The Chancellor then responded to questions and comments from the floor.

1) Professor Lea (English, Lehman) - You spoke of economic development and the difficulty in projecting job opportunities. There was a report done in 1980 on projections of job opportunities in the 80's that might be of some help. I will send it to you. Thank you. I have looked at the data and among the ten largest categories there is no high tech. The largest growth is in services. I also came across an interesting thing. Some countries don't calculate GNP on services although ours does and that segment is 70% now. 2) Professor Speidel - "Two years ago after the Senate's Spring Meeting where we adopted a policy on Restrictions on Research Publication, the product of our Research Committee's work over a period of some two years, we sent that policy to you for a response and implementation. We have not had that response yet and the policy lies dormant. We have learned that people are looking at it but that is all, can you tell us what the situation is?" / It must be in Legal Affairs - that's where that kind of delay happens. Professor Wasser added, "It originally went to the Board Committee on Academic Policy, Program and Research. (N.B. Professor Speidel is in Geology at Queens.) 3) Professor Danziger (English, Hunter) - "Vice Chancellor Vivona spoke of new positions to implement the articulation policy. Could you tell us what kind of positions?" / I can't. Ask Vice Chancellor Barnett but I understand they are positions related to your recommendations. 4) Professor Baumrin (Philosophy, Graduate

School) - "On the articulation policy maybe I am ignorant but is there going to be an attempt to equalize courses in the liberal arts so that there is some equivalent?" Professor Wasser responded and said that there were supposed to be committees to do this.

VII. Guest Speaker: Dr. Irwin Polishook, President Professional Staff Congress: Chairman Wasser said that Dr. Polishook needed no introduction. He was certainly well known to the membership, was a former member of the Senate, and was a member of the History Department of Lehman College, although he was on leave from the college during the period of his union office. Dr. Polishook said that he appreciated the opportunity to be here. He was indeed a former member; in fact, he was among the founding members of the Senate and took part in far stormier times than now. As a colleague, he appreciated the invitation to be here and also the work carried out by the body. There had been regular contacts between the Senate and himself over the years that went beyond the overlapping membership of the two groups. He had met with the Executive Committee from time to time and had regular contacts with the Faculty chairman now - more so than with either of the Chairman's immediate predecessors. They had talked informally about problems and rarely was there a disagreement on policies. The University may have two faces and the Chancellor thinks that division between the two groups is helpful since the administration can use the division to impose their view. He could not remember an issue of faculty interest, however, on which the two bodies differed. He would not allow the Chancellor to think so. The Chancellor and Vice Chancellors were low key and had a different view.

The subject he would address this evening to use up the time, Dr. Polishook continued, would be the Contract and Its Meaning. It was a serious topic and because it was a long time since negotiations began and were completed but the contract was not signed until August 1985. It took all that time to go down and sign for submission of the completed agreement to the Financial Control Board. Now it is up to the University to do its part. The contract was ratified this summer by individual ballot mailed to people's homes and including the text of the agreement, a summary of the agreement, and a descriptive letter from him to the recipients. That was a lot of work and the cost was sizable and the procedure was arduous and the timeframe long. It differed from the process in other unions where the membership was required to vote at a meeting called for the purpose.

The first question on people's minds was maybe not the least.- when would they be paid? It requires a long answer. For the community colleges payment will come this month; it will be on line with the increases for the October checks, and there will probably be a separate check for the prior year. That's what is expected for the community colleges. In spite of what people think that is a difficult process and requires considerable effort and the way it is paid is not out of line with the way others are handled.

On the senior college side there is a very difficult problem. To put it in the most severe terms - it requires a significant State appropriation as an add-on to the University's budget. In addition, the State has taken the position that until the Legislature acts and the Governor signs the bill, the negotiations are not completed. We had the bad luck to conclude the contract after the Legislature had adjourned so that it is not until the next meeting of the Legislature in January that the appropriation can be considered. I don't anticipate a problem but it will be six to eight weeks subsequent to that that the payment comes and I am now projecting March for that. I have been told by members of the union that this wouldn't happen to any other group. But it has. It is possible, but not probable but the special session that may be called for November may be able to add our issue to the agenda but that is usually a closed agenda. But otherwise we will have to wait. An answer should have come on the agreement in March but since we control ourselves it was not easy. That is not

said out of any self pity or fear but to respond to issues that are raised, etc. A public, however, is hostile - the University is thought of as peripheral. In 1976 how many had faith in the University's survival? But we did survive and did better than expected but are even better now.

The next question is what we got. Was it worth getting? We didn't get everything we expected - that was true not just of us. Certainly we got what we wanted. Our first offer was for a 9% increase which we wanted but didn't get. Was that realistic? It depends on circumstances and the willingness of the City and State. We were looking for an increase in pay to exceed the cost of living and enable us to catch up and were prepared to engage in give and take about what more there might be but there is a third outside party that has to agree. We did get one (an increase) that exceeds the cost of living.

We were also interested in an increase in the welfare fund, the City health plan and items such as research etc. and there was general concern about post-retirement health plans. There were also professional concerns and, of course, the cost of living. Also, there are special needs that affect the University. The value of what we got lies in the fact that our needs were met especially with respect to pension.

Another question is what would we do without an agreement by negotiation? Either the matter would be settled through the process of dispute resolution by the State under the Taylor Law which would be imposed for one year or we would go to arbitration. Why not the latter? Because we thought such a measure would provide less. We are among the highest paid public employees and we were concerned with presenting a credible case. The question is asked why did only the UFT go to arbitration? Because they made the determination that any other route would bring more than negoti. on and they did as well as anticipated. What happened about the UFT? The UFT got all this money, why didn't we, I am asked. There is no trumpeting by the UFT about what they got - in fact, they have minimized it and said it was not a good settlement. They got something but there were many givebacks.

We went through a struggle for the instructional staff - we remember government gives little regard to things we think important but even a good argument doesn't count with government. The City has dollars but one thing it doesn't want to do is to spend those dollars on public sector employees and certainly not professors. There was also an issue about health benefits about TIAA retirees which was settled favorably and we did not have givebacks. The uniformed forces got more but that is a different issue. We did do well, especially if all the aspects of our agreement are taken into account.

Dr. Polishook then indicated that he would be happy to respond to questions.

- 1) Professor Hecht (Mathematics, Hunter) - "I feel in a state of limbo. I am on Travia leave and my social security will be calculated and paid in relation to salary. You tell us that the salary will not be adjusted until after my benefits are calculated. So what will that do to them?" / That will all be straightened out retroactively.
- 2) Professor Milentijevic (History, City) - "The Legislature will be in session in November, what will the University do to put this on the agenda for that session? / The University is not good at this. We have been in touch with the Governor's Office. Now the University needs to deliver. We have done our part. It is up to them now.
- 3) Professor Gerber (Comparative Literature, Brooklyn) - "Was the University responsible for the delay or the fact that the Legislature was dismissed. That is of interest to know." / The fact that there was not a contract was not due to them.

There were no further questions nor items of business. On a motion duly made and seconded the meeting was therefore adjourned at 9:45 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,  
Jean Ellis, Executive Director