

SUBJECT TO SENATE APPROVAL

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

October 22, 1985

Professor Wasser, chairman, called the session to order at 6:30 p.m. in Room 1700 at the Graduate School and University Center. Present were: Senators Baker, Barbanel, Baumrin, Beheshti, Berkowitz, Binder, Bohigian, Boylan, Brofsky, Buianouckas, Canate, Cantwell, B. Cohen, Constantinides, Cooper, Gravats, Danziger, Davidson, De La Campa, Depas, Donleavy, Eisenberg, Ercolano, Fedullo, Feingold, Flashner, Galub, Gerber, Ginsberg, Gram, Greenbaum, Grossman, Gura, Guydon, Hecht, Henderson, Hernandez-Miyares, Hinds, Jaffe, Jiji, Kirsch, Lea, Litke, Loetterle, Lytra, Matthews, Milentijevic, Movasseghi, Muehlig, Muller, Otelsberg, Picken, Plissner, Quinn, Riley, Rosen, Russell, Seguine, Shaffer, Simon, Simor, Sohmer, Speidel, Stern, Stroup, Sullivan, Timoni, Trefousse, Waldinger, Walter, Wedeen, Weiss, and Yousef; Alternate Senators Ginsberg, Glass, Kleinman, Ladas, Meister, Nowinski, O'Riordan, Sternlight, and Terrell. Senators Alston, Brogan, Gelernt, Gluck and Hayon were excused. The Executive Director, Dr. Ellis, also attended.

I. Approval of the Tentative Agenda: The proposed tentative agenda was approved with the changes: item 7 "Guest Speaker" became item 3 at the request of the guest because of a conflicting engagement and item 5 "Chancellor's Report" was deleted because the Chancellor was unable to attend due to a delay in his return from Albany where he was engaged in discussion of the University's 1986-87 Budget Request.

II. Approval of the Minutes of the 140th Session (October 1, 1985): The following correction was proposed and discussed: Professor Timoni indicated that on p. 3, l. 1 the vote of 9 to 6 was not accurate and that it should read [a] person chosen by a "10 to 6" vote. Professor Wasser said that the statement as recorded in the minutes was accurate but that the correction was also true and the difference would be explained in his communications this evening. The correction was therefore not included in the approval.

III. Guest Speaker: President Harold M. Proshansky, President, Graduate School and University Center: Professor Wasser introduced Dr. Proshansky, stating that, at the speaker's request he would say only that, in a sense Dr. Proshansky needed no introduction since the membership knew him well as their host and source of support and welcomed him.

Dr. Proshansky acknowledged the introduction and said that he did not cease to be surprised when he met faculty in the University who did not know there was a Graduate School or where it was located. The Senate, he felt confident, knew him as its "caterer" [Dr. Proshansky graciously contributes the services of a bartender during the Senate's pre-session social hour each month - a support that is greatly appreciated in view of the body's lack of dues and limited budget.] if not as president of a Graduate School that is located on 42nd Street.

Turning to more serious remarks, President Proshansky said he wished to speak briefly about the School and its history, present state, and future, that he might be interrupted for questions or comment, and that after his presentation, he would respond to additional questions and welcomed comments. Since, in his view, no address was entirely meaningful without exchange between the speaker and the audience. In terms of history President Proshansky said that the Graduate School was celebrating its 25th Anniversary this year, that it had been a long, hard struggle with some good and some bad

times but the School had made it. It began in 1961 with four doctoral programs - in Chemistry, Economics, English, and Psychology; now there are 30 programs in a wide range of disciplines - especially in the liberal arts and sciences and in some additional fields as well. That the School will ever offer its 40th program, he thought doubtful, although some additions to the present ones were contemplated. All of the School's programs, he continued, were initiated by faculty who had proposed and mounted several new ones in recent years - Environmental and Earth Science was begun four years ago; Computer Science had been offered for two, and, at present, a letter of intent had been presented to the Board Committee on Academic Policy, Program and Research for endorsement before transmittal to the State Education Department proposing a doctorate in Musical Arts that was not identical with the Ph.D. but analogous to the recently established Doctor of Arts degree.

In its early years the Graduate School, said Dr. Proshansky, changed to a University Center too. There was a long story to that action at the time. The Graduate School was headed by a Dean [Dr. Proshansky held that post.] and the idea behind the establishment of the School was that it take over the academic programs that were housed at 80th Street and to this was then added the idea that it take on also other academic activities under 80th Street's management such as the CUNY BA program. There was a political reason also, Dr. Proshansky added, that he would tell the Senate someday. The Graduate School was from the beginning a consortium - that was Chancellor Bowker's idea. He created a confederation and the reason was pretty good because if any president thought of doing it on his or her campus there would be a problem in terms of resources - in particular, of financing such an activity and might well lead to the duplication of such effort on many campuses. In that way any doctoral offerings would be doomed because there was no way to support them and would be none. The idea was unusual and remains so. Only one other Graduate School conforms to that model - that at Pomona which is part of the Claremont Complex. Even that school, however, is much smaller than CUNY's and the problems are greater here.

The problems of the Graduate School when it began and now are to some extent the same and they are ones that President Proshansky has pointed to again and again. He has reiterated that there can be no such thing as a Graduate School independent of the rest of the University. 90% of the 1100 faculty members at the School come from the rest of the University with only a small number of central appointments. The 164 people on Central appointments include administrators and if their number is subtracted from the total the number is even smaller. In some cases there are programs staffed by only central appointees but the general rule is that the students begin and end their studies here but the faculty, at least the larger proportion, comes from the campuses. This is true of the liberal arts programs but the sciences are different because of the laboratory requirements. At the time we began we developed the "chosen agent" concept and it was a great idea, i.e. to identify the college with strength in a given science and have the doctoral work handled there. Thus, that is the case with Biology, Chemistry, and Physics and Psychology to some extent as well as Earth and Environmental Science. The concept looked good on paper but it was difficult to mount. There is some overlap and the support is not there but although our science programs are not all at the top of the ratings compared to other programs in the sciences they did very well as indicated by the assessments and national surveys that have been conducted. There are also three programs that have a single home and they serve also as illustrations of the "chosen agent" concept. Criminal Justice is handled by John Jay, Business by Baruch, Engineering at City, Social Work at Hunter and Biomedical Science by Mt. Sinai.

Dr. Proshansky spoke next of the fact that it was important to keep in mind that the Ph.D. programs were not departments in the structural sense of that term. Although some people wish they were, it is good that they are not. Outside of the 150 central appointments the rest could fall to the ground if the programs were housed in the usual departmental structure and the faculty decided they didn't want to do doctoral work. Run-

ning the programs is a complex procedure requiring, above all, an administrative hand. Thus, the person in charge has to have skill, diligence, and interest and the ability to put people together since the members of the doctoral faculty are in large numbers all full professors who have, so to speak, arrived. It is such a need that the programs have rather than a chairman in the sense of a department. That is why the head of the program is not an elected chairman but an Executive Officer appointed by the President after extensive consultation with the faculty in the program, the students, et al. and receiving their advice and suggestions. The selection is not a unilateral process. Even if there is not an election in the usual sense of the word, the process is one I consider democratic. So that putting together the faculty of the program is one problem we have in the Graduate School. Faculty who teach doctoral courses have a problem too. There was, for example, a member of the doctoral faculty who said that he would have to withdraw because it was impossible to teach both places since the time allotted to travel between campuses was too great to enable him to use his time effectively. The division of labor constitutes a very real problem and it is due of course to our unique structure.

The main problem now - and it is one I raise constantly and, therefore, I think most of you know my position - and it is one for the entire University as well as the Graduate School is how many, in fact almost all faculty have teaching loads that defy the notion of a faculty who can be effective teachers and researchers. 90% of the doctoral faculty teach two courses and that was the original solution devised to make possible the concept of a consortium. That lasted until about 1973. The situation at City and Queens was better but even there the other responsibilities of faculty make the situation horrendous. How do I know? I was dean of the Graduate School but before that I taught and after coming from NYU to Brooklyn College I was horrified when I was asked to teach five courses, four of which involved the same preparation and were scheduled virtually back-to-back so that just keeping track of where I was in each of the four was in itself a problem.

Another major problem is that the funding is not adequate, hasn't been and won't be. The State does not understand why greater funds are needed - in fact, the needs of the educational institution in terms of funding are not understood and won't be. I have tried to offset this by developing a Board of Visitors and by devising programs to engage the interest of foundations and others. I look for money anywhere - extra money for students, for faculty travel, to keep the programs' quality at a reasonable level. Last year I raised \$3 to 4 million and that is a lot without a substantial body of alumni to whom one can appeal. There are no more than 2,000 to 5000 alumni and their first quest is and must be to find a job. Another way that I have devised to help in this area is to establish research centers because I believe that various programs can cooperate more in that structure and will do so voluntarily than otherwise. If one asks regular departments to do this, it won't work but the neutral territory of the research center means faculty are more willing to come. From 1 or two we have expanded to 12 and Henry Wasser can tell you about the beginnings of the Center for European Studies which he directs. The Center is jointly funded by a grant with Columbia and that is something that might work with anyone. I was asked why recently I had given a medal to someone who can't read and my response was that the person could make an "X" on a check and I was prepared to award a medal to anyone who might give us support and hopefully \$10 million. In fact, I would name the school for such a person.

When I took over the Graduate School, President Proshansky continued, the University was centered on four colleges - City, Hunter, Brooklyn and Queens - that were the oldest - the group known as "FOSC" [four oldest senior colleges] and at that time there was a President Marshak (for whom I am frequently mistaken now by those unaware of the existence of a City University Graduate School) and there was no NYU Graduate Center at midtown.

The decision to locate our Graduate School on its present site was, however, deliberate and made at the beginning and from the beginning the faculty was recruited from a pool comprised of faculty at the colleges so that we have an outstanding resource in terms of recruitment and are able to have a faculty of great strength. We also have a library downstairs that is housed in 60,000 square feet of space - so large that one could build a court and have a basketball team in unused space. The library was not meant to be a research library primarily since it would be impossible for us ever to outdo 42nd Street and we have been fortunate - and this was a factor in the decision on location - to have that library readily accessible to our faculty and students. Very soon 42nd Street's resources will be even more useful to us since we will have a computer terminal in our own facility connected to it and our faculty and students will be able to use the resource without crossing the street. In addition, the present chairman of our Board of Visitors is Vartan Gregorian, president of the Public Library at 42nd Street and an academic, and that helped fortify the bonds between the two institutions. There are 32 people on that Board, all of whom are well known names and their interest and support is invaluable.

One cannot ignore the problems that we have, however, and I would like to outline them now. First, there is the fact that we have only one building. It is wonderful that it is located on 42nd Street but there are difficulties in terms of space. Thus, there is need for rental of additional space since one can't desecrate the building we do have nor can we starve faculty and students of appropriate conditions, in terms of facilities, to accomplish their purpose. Renting space is difficult in this area, however, and expensive. Furthermore, I deem it a sin to rent when there is space available that the University could occupy - space within easy access of our present location. I have my eye on Voorhees which will be vacant when New York City Tech takes on its new facilities. Our other problem in terms of space is that every group wants to meet here. Our auditorium which is the largest meeting place seats only 250 persons and any larger group must hunt out a place elsewhere. In contrast, for example, the recently established NYU Center has an auditorium with a capacity of 600.

A third problem is the teaching load which is a burden for faculty and difficult to resolve. One way, and I have suggested this, is for faculty to buy out time from the home college.

There is another problem - simple but irresolvable, I fear. We have 30 programs and there are 178,000 students in the University with less than 3,000 doctoral students. The size of our student body has to be controlled in order to keep our programs strong. Thus, we have more faculty than classes. There is not much that can be done though. At first, we thought we could use a rotation system for faculty but that scheme didn't work because the evaluators from the State Education department who came in our early life, were constructively critical and pointed out the need for a core faculty. Thus, in making appointments we are forced to make choices from among the great number of qualified and interested faculty available.

President Proshansky ended his presentation at this point and reiterated his desire to receive questions and comment from the floor that he might respond to them and deal with issues he had not yet addressed and which were of concern to the Senate. 1) Professor Lea (English, Lehman) - "It is good to see you again, President Marshak. I have the privilege of being a Ph. D. graduate of CUNY, and a member of the first class to receive degrees. I am grateful for the contacts and to the faculty with whom I worked as I pursued my degree. I would like to pay public thanks to Professor Danziger who was one of the faculty whose courses I took and who helped me so much. I remember the bad also, however, for example, the lack of concern with placement. I was called in by John Hollander and told not to expect placement by the University. Does this situation still exist?/ The time of degree means that you were not in the first class. [There ensued an

exchange between Drs. Proshansky and Lea on the subject of whether or not Professor Lea was indeed in the first class to receive degrees which was settled when the fact that completion of Professor Lea's degree had required a number of years due to the fact that he had to earn a living at the same time; therefore, there were others who were able to receive degrees at an earlier date than he.] That was not generally true and is not true now. There is a placement office with full time staff - a Director and an assistant who constantly talk with students. This is very important for them and for contacts. The problem is that what a particular discussion or faculty member does can't be monitored. For example, someone who is a friend of the doctoral programs almost destroyed us. Tim Healy said that we relied too much on our own and that the university that doesn't go beyond its own commits a sin. He said we should cast wide our net in recruiting. Numbers of faculty took this as an axiom and thought they had the string to do so. As I think I made clear in my presentation, however, such an approach would have doomed us. In 1985, the story came that in the selection of people to fill lines or adjunct positions it was best not to use CUNY Ph. D.s. The placement issue did not arise at the beginning when there were jobs but when the slump in academe came faculty avoided placement and said it's your problem. We have placed people though and did even in that period. I don't think Ph.D.s should be renaissance people, though, unable to do other scholastic things than teach. They should go look and talk to people in other fields where their degrees prepare them and which might be equally satisfying. This year, we have a new assistant provost whose special function is students a former Faculty Fellow, Elizabeth Tenenbaum. 2) Professor Cooper (History, Staten Island) - "What are the historical or other justifications for the Graduate School to be the only unit without elected chairpeople?" / Elected chairs would destroy us; we don't need democracy in your sense and we do elect in a way. The President solicits advice, names, etc. from both faculty, students, and others in a position to know the possibilities in terms of people and then recommends an appointment to the Board. We need only an Executive Officer who is skillful in the ways I've indicated - someone not involved in any cabal, who can keep an eye on getting people from many campuses to work together, etc. In other ways - all other ways - things are elected. It is not undemocratic nor am I. Students write, faculty write, I select because I need someone to run the program and that is the role of the Executive Officer. 3) Professor Guydon (SEEK, John Jay) - "How does one get an appointment to the doctoral faculty?" / The hiring is done by the President in accordance with the rules and Bylaws established by the faculty not the President. One writes to the Executive Officer and sends a vita and the judgment is going to be made by the faculty in the program. It is not different from the process in a department where specialization is not needed. It is a matter of determining what is true of "X" that is not of others. We have also striven to select others than full professors to fill appointments. 4) Professor Ercolano (Mathematics, Baruch) - "Computer Science is a fairly new program and I have mentioned it to students who said that there was no description of it in the Bulletin. How does this happen and how can they find out about it?" / The reason is that without an O.K. from the SED on registration of the program and that can not occur until the proposal is passed by the Board one can't print anything about a program. Approval is often given in time to include such a new program in the Bulletin but, in this case, it was not on the Board agenda in time to have completed all these preliminary requirements; therefore, it is not included. Interested students can call the Executive Officer or the Provost's Office. 5) Professor Kirsch (Nursing, Hunter) - "Is there a feeling about the establishment of new doctoral programs?" / There is no coy answer or polite one. This is an unusual university that I don't understand half the time nor its policy on students. Open admissions was not a disaster due to the students but to the administration. We would like more students but the funding to support them is not there. The next program close to my heart and the School is in Classics. There was such a program - a joint program with NYU that is now wholly ours although some courses will still come from NYU. That program will cost money but is one we need to keep up. Without additional funding we would detract from the quality of the programs we have. Thus, for ten years we have held off on adding a new specialization in Psychology because it would constitute a strain on our resources. We already

the area. The notion came from the campuses - from Queens and Hunter that we would pay for such a program. From the State we will not get additional funds although they say we have, according to their formula, 45 too few lines and they are giving us some now. The question really is that we will never say no but will do a program if the funding is available. 6) Professor Depas (English, Kingsborough) - "I had a Mellon Fellowship two years ago and the program was very interesting for me and other community college people who had that opportunity. Is it still going?"/ Yes, originally the grant came from Mellon and ours was one of the first grants they made and it was very successful. I was non-plussed when dealing with a foundation head [the reference is to the head of the Mellon Foundation prior to the first award] who having heard my proposal and eaten my lunch said, "I'm sorry to disappoint you but we have discontinued assistance in that area." John Sawyer said we are interested with respect to senior colleges and, of course, our grants are competitive. My response was to supply a list of five names and suggest that he call some of those names. Subsequently, he called me back and said, "I didn't know anything about you, apply." We got that grant and three renewals with the understanding that the program would become a permanent part of our operation and that we would provide support. Kingsborough and Queensborough and other of our community colleges have contributed funds towards it. 7) Professor Donleavy (Special Services to Education, Lehman) - "In 1983, at Lehman I chaired a committee that did a survey of the status of women in the various units of the University. That survey's results indicated that at the Graduate School the ratio was 170 women to 1074 men. Using our categories we found that the ratio varies according to discipline - in Art women predominate, in another there were only 4 to 6. In all others men outnumber women by far. That is a situation that is representative of academic life but there is a discrepancy between the Graduate School and the colleges. You might be interested in soliciting funds to support increasing the numbers of women on your faculty."/ We have a Center for the Study of Women and Sex Roles that is supported by such a grant. The trouble is that the women who qualify need to be found account of the historical development of academe there is a problem in some fields. The idea of adding to the numbers is uppermost in our minds and for the past five and eight years I have served on the Boards of two organizations devoted to the recruitment of women. Catalyst is one for the past five years and the other for a time that began long before. We have the same problem from those who come from the Affirmative Action people in Washington. They are not interested in data but insist that we need to do better. Furthermore, the Chancellor keeps his eye on that ball here. As it is we hire women as often as we can. 8) Professor Picken (Romance Languages, Queens) - "I was one of the Directors of Study Abroad and I must say that I don't think the Graduate School's takeover of that program was a success. When Queens College turned it over it was a success. There was a monetary reserve; it was one of the top programs in the country and the Graduate School closed it down in 1976 during the CUNY fiscal crisis."/ Wait, I am highly in accord with some of what you say. But the program while at Queens was shored up by 80th Street; it didn't make money at Queens. There were hidden costs and it came to \$283,000 to service 182 students in programs of poor quality. We closed it but only because we were told to cut our budget and it was only those things that one could that were closed. We eliminated Study Abroad, Library and Information Services and two others. The information that was circulated about the program at Queens was not true. Professor Picken further said "I would like to go over the figures with you but it did run on a reserve but when it went to you the dollars went. The point is that it is an example of what people perceive and the feeling that the role of the upper college is inferior to that of the Graduate School."/ The role is secondary. The mandate was to develop the best graduate school that we could and that the funding matched. On a personal basis I would love to double, triple, quadruple the size. Not for Senate approval but if we are multicampus we should be. I don't care about funding. Therefore the center has to support itself. The members are not doctrinaire but they have to fight. We are improving the administration and, for example, have combined the Provost and the Dean's roles in one office. We used to pay administrators a salary supplement but no more. Find us the dollars and we will make them equal. 9) Professor Wedeen (Education, Brooklyn) - "We have all

lived with times when students were short and we had to take a cut made from above. Was the decision on what to cut at the Graduate School made with consultation with faculty et al.?"/No. There was discussion with the Policy Council but it was futile. There was the problem of tenured faculty and now there is even a problem with HEOs who have three and five and then after ten years quasi-permanent contracts. We had to decide who to cut and the problem was where to do it since we had to do it somewhere. Every cabinet meeting is attended by either faculty or students - at the second and fourth meetings by faculty and the first and third by students. They report and there is discussion. With respect to participation in budget, there we are so structured and controlled that neither we nor they have much to do with it.

President Proshansky completed his presentation by stating that he would like to add one note. He said that he would like the Senate to understand that despite his pitch and defense of people he was not unmindful the fact that life was better there - that a two-tiered system was always a problem. In certain ways there was more flexibility there and faculty spent more time there. The idea of mercy is all right if you can find the dollars, if not, life is simple, Equipment dollars were distributed for science and where we asked for \$2,000,000 because that's what's needed, the sum was reduced to \$238,000. But the key is that I am not President of the Graduate School of the University and I can't function without for a moment forgetting that the senior and community colleges don't not exist.

Professor Wasser thanked President Proshansky on behalf of the Senate and the President was applauded loudly and enthusiastically.

IV. Communications from the Chairman: Professor Wasser then turned to the matter of his communications. He made several announcements: 1) Philip Pearlstein, Distinguished Professor of Art, Brooklyn College will be the guest speaker at the Senate's Annual Dinner scheduled for December 10. Further details relating to the dinner would be sent to members in the near future. 2) The November issue of the UFS Newsletter was in the Print Shop and will reach the campuses before the end of the week. The campus mailrooms had been alerted to its arrival and Chairman Wasser asked that the liaison members of delegations follow up to be certain that distribution took place promptly and appropriately to faculty in the departments. 3) The Senate Office requested that delegations that had selected liaison members other than the member who served last year report the name of the new liaison to the Executive Director. 4) The Executive Director asked that committee chairs try to avoid the time just prior to the Plenary Session - convenient though it might be - for committee meetings since the hours from 4 p.m. on were heavily scheduled for Graduate School classes and it was virtually impossible to secure meeting rooms for committees. Sometimes, that shortage was so acute that there were no rooms available or, as occurred this evening, two committees were scheduled, however reluctantly, in one room.

The Chairman then reported that members of the Senate had been serving, at the Chancellor's request, as his and the University's official representative at inaugurations of chief executive officers of various universities and colleges. To date, the reports the Executive Committee received were enthusiastic. Professor Sohmer had represented the University at the inauguration of the new president of Connecticut State University/ New Britain on October 2 and at the inauguration of the president of Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute on October 11. Professor Picken was the delegate to the inauguration of the new president of the University of Connecticut/Storrs on October 12 which was celebrated not only by the usual reception and luncheon but also by a football game that, unfortunately, resulted in a loss by the home team to that of the University of Delaware. On October 13 Professor Riley was the Chancellor's delegate to the inauguration of the president of Tougaloo College, Tougaloo, Mississippi and on October 16, Professor

Davidson was in Toledo at the inauguration of the president of the University of Toledo. Professor Danziger had reported that the new president of Hartford College for Women whose inauguration she had attended on October 6 was a woman who held promise for the future of the college and whom one might expect to be at the beginning of a lengthy career in university administration. Tomorrow, Chairman Wasser concluded, Professor Wedeen would be going to Norman, Oklahoma where, on October 24, she would be the University's delegate to the inauguration of the president of the University of Oklahoma. Professor Wasser requested that any Senator or member of the faculty who was willing and able to perform this service for the University and/or who knew of a particular inauguration that he or she might appropriately attend was asked to alert the Senate Office to that interest, since Chancellor Murphy had told the Executive Committee of his wish to ask this service throughout the year.

Professor Wasser turned next to an update on the status of the La Guardia issue. He reminded the Senate that at the October 1 session he had outlined the issue and said that since that time reports from faculty in the department of Accounting and Management at La Guardia had indicated that negotiations with President Shenker concerning the chairmanship of that department had been at a standstill. In terms of the developments that have occurred since the last report, Professor Wasser said, he could report that a letter received by him from the president detailed the history of the matter and reported his earlier negotiations with the department and meetings with its faculty. The vote of the department which had been incorrectly transmitted to Professor Wasser in a previous discussion with the President as 9 to 6 had been corrected to 11 to 6 in the letter but the fact that none of the negative votes was recorded in favor of the person appointed by the President was not indicated. Parenthetically, Professor Wasser explained that the apparent inaccuracy in the Senate minutes to which Professor Timoni had referred in the discussion of approval of the minutes of the October 1 session of the Senate this evening was due to the erroneous information in Professor Wasser's possession at the time and not to incorrect recording of his report. Continuing his main narrative, the Chairman said that the La Guardia department had informed the Senate leadership that unless there were some movement on the issue at the college prior to the November 19 Plenary Session, it would ask the Senate to endorse a resolution of censure of President Shenker.

On October 15, Professor Wasser continued, he had met with Faculty Fellows and the American Council on Education Fellow who are working this year in the Office of Academic Affairs to tell them about the Senate and its role in the University as well as to offer them the Senate's hospitality in the Office at 80th Street and at a Plenary Session. The Executive Director had joined the group briefly to add her invitation to visit and make use of the Office.

Professor Wasser reported too on a conference he had attended on the weekend of October 18th through 20th in Washington. It was a conference of Europeanists related to his own research interests and that of the Center for European Studies at the Graduate School which he served as Director and the administration of universities abroad had been the focus at the session which he chaired. The Conference addressed, among other subjects, the difficulties currently facing the universities abroad and it was made clear that troubles existed in most places but especially in the English institutions because of sharp cuts by Prime Minister Thatcher in their budgets; thus the faculty were fleeing. There are a number of articles published recently that point to the fact that this difficulty is not unique to the English universities. The most recent issue of Change he said, included several pertinent pieces: "Faculty at Risk" by Bowen and Shuster, one by Professor Cittel (Political Science, Brooklyn) on the community-based college and, finally, one by Burton Clark, "The Professoriate in America" that featured the problems of faculty.



Next, Chairman Wasser spoke of the issue of search procedures and said that there was a resolution later on the agenda from the Executive Committee that spoke to this issue. In general, he might say that with respect to central appointments - with which the Senate's concern appropriately lay - they continued to follow no pattern and remained without a statement of policy guidelines. For example, the position advertised in The New York Times on Sunday, October 20, soliciting applications for an Assistant Director of Articulation had no faculty member on its search committee, so far as the Senate knew, and, parenthetically, according to staff in the Office of Academic Affairs is one of the two steps being taken to implement the Board's resolution on Articulation, the other step being the working out of a timetable for implementation of the policy. The Senate would recall, he continued, that the Senate adopted a resolution on search procedures for senior administrative positions in January 1983 that had gone all the way and was now, in the Senate's view, the law of the land. None the less, it was evident with respect to important searches such as those for Deans, or Directors whose responsibilities were universitywide the faculty was not always represented on the Committee or the faculty member was named without consultation with the Senate. During the summer 1985 the Chairman and Executive Committee had lodged protests with the Office of Academic Affairs concerning the procedures being followed there and had, ultimately, carried those protests to the Chancellor. There the matter remained at present.

Professor Wasser announced also that the Executive Committee, in response to requests from several Senators, had decided to establish a Standing Committee on Library as in the past. The Committee will be chaired by Professor Binder (History, Staten Island). Other members, primarily from the teaching faculty are being asked to serve and the full membership will be presented to the Senate at the 142nd Plenary Session on November 19.

Professor Wasser reported on the Chancellor's Budget Request for 1986-87. The Vice Chancellor for Budget and Finance had reviewed the Request with the Committee on Fiscal Affairs of the Board at a meeting to which all Board members were invited. That request sought 41 additional lines for University Management [the Central Administration] and those included 10 in cooperative projects with the Board of Education, 8 in construction, and 4 in academic affairs. Dr. Wasser said that he believed that the Office of Academic Affairs was already a large one - certainly on the basis of a rough count he had made that indicated 34 positions, a larger number than under the previous vice chancellor he thought-although the sum total of positions might not exceed those available before.

Professor Wasser then responded to questions and comments on his report. 1) Professor Baumrin (Philosophy, Graduate School) - "Has the Board's Long-Range Planning Committee discussed the increased responsibility for Budget given the Board under this summer's Flexibility Legislation to shift monies between the central administration and the colleges and from one purpose to another?" That Committee never meets except on a particular issue. Professor Baumrin further asked whether then the faculty who sat on the Board Committee on Fiscal Affairs would tell the Senate whether the Vice Chancellor had explained the changes to the Committee. Professor Picken responded that he had said that the Board's Policy on Articulation required additional staff to implement. 2) Professor Sohmer (Mathematics, City) - "If I remember the 25 new lines for articulation probably exceed the number in our Speech Department." The Budget Review was rather quick. The Fiscal Affairs Committee did not pass the item since it lacked a quorum so that the full Board will deal with it. There are additional lines too for Communications - for televising on Channel A. For many weeks there was no real programming but now it has begun a full schedule. The tapes of the Senate's four programs that were done a year or two ago have been made available, for use, if they wish. The expanded communications operation,

incidentally, is being directed by an Acting Dean for Communications - a position held by Bob Hirschfield who was the first chairman of this body. There are some other increases but at the moment there are no new projects included; there are increases to things that have been there already. 3) Professor Lea (English, Lehman) - "The increase of lines at 80th Street suggests that as 80th Street acquires more lines it hires more and there are simply more and more people to administer the University while more and more other hiring needs are not met. 4) Professor Greenbaum (History, Queensborough) - "Year after year there is a decrease in the number of students and more and more administrators." 5) Professor Speidel (Geology, Queens) - "Several weeks ago there was a question about the previous administration that was made up of major administrators who were only ones with experience in the academic arena but now people feel that hiring out of industry to do the job is better and thus there are people being hired without knowing what they ought to be doing. Could the Executive Committee take up the issue of whether, if there are any lines cut, the central administration look at whether there might be people at the colleges who can serve - not fellows but for five-year appointments. I think that is the only way that a possible retrenchment could be handled and if we are going to see more administrators, the most we can hope is that they are people with academic background." / Certainly the Executive Committee can take up that issue. My experience has been that when one has administrators without academic background there is a use of people with background in accounting and management and technology and the corporate analogy of such a policy is horrendous especially when the candidates are taken with no more than 3 or 4 years background. 6) Professor Cooper (History, Staten Island) - " I think the hiring of still another administrator is the thing that would most fit making the articulation issue self-destruct. If articulation is to succeed and most of the procedure was developed by the faculty and needs its support or it will be sabotaged. It will take two years before people understand it and it is bizarre that it should be directed by someone from outside. It is faculty who should be administering." / In all likelihood the person hired will be non-faculty and given a salary etc. to do the job so that the situation is one that has to be watched. 7) Professor Binder (History, Staten Island) - "I should like to make an observation. This has been an interesting meeting. Granted I had a large glass of wine during the pre-meeting hour but I seem to have arrived in the Land of Oz. President Proshansky spoke of the young professors. I didn't know there were any being hired. There seem to be two worlds. There is an academic plan for five, we have 7, 80th Street has more administrators, we can't hire faculty; faculty needs funds for travel but has none, there are funds for administrators to go to China and elsewhere." 8) Professor Yousef (Mechanical Engineering, Staten Island) - 9) Professor Wedeen (Education, Brooklyn) - "I think the implementation should be administered by faculty. A way to do it might be to have two people on half lines hired from the faculty.

At this point Professor Grossman (Education, City) moved the following resolution with assistance from Professor Baumrin:

RESOLVED: With respect to staffing of the implementation of the University's articulation policy all appointments shall be made from among the University's faculty members, one half from senior colleges and one half from community colleges, all on temporary assignment to the Central Office.

The resolution was duly seconded and adopted unanimously.

Professor Bohigian (Mathematics, John Jay) then observed that he was concerned about hiring in areas other than implementation of the articulation policy and moved the following resolution:

RESOLVED: The Board of Trustees henceforth no longer appoint any new positions but have to rearrange staff taking from existing faculty especially from those suffering re-trenchment.

The resolution was not put to a vote since a resolution to move the agenda - to which Senator Bohigian objected but was overruled - was made and passed with one negative vote. Professor Bohigian then observed that he was concerned about the Senate's actions in light of the power it had.

V. Reports of Faculty Members of Board of Trustees' Committees: Copies of these reports are appended to these minutes.

VI. Proposed Resolution on Search Procedures: Professor Wasser then read a resolution on Search Procedures proposed by the Executive Committee acting on the mandate of the Plenary. He noted that the members had before them the newly proposed resolution and copies of the Resolution on this matter adopted January 18, 1983. The resolution was moved and seconded and discussion ensued. A motion to consider the sections seriatim was made, seconded, and passed and discussion then proceeded. Section One was adopted with one amendment that was adopted with one negative vote. The section as amended was adopted without dissent. Section Two was adopted as proposed as was section three. A motion to table the motion's remaining sections for consideration at the next Plenary Session interrupted the discussion of section four. The motion to table was adopted.

On a motion to adjourn the meeting adjourned at 9:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jean Ellis  
Executive Director