

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

May 20, 1986

Chairman Wasser called the session to order at 6:30 p.m. promptly in Room 1700 at the Graduate School and University Center. Present were: Senators Alsop, Bank, Barbanel, Baumrin, Baxter, Beck, Beheshti, Berkowitz, Binder, Blancher, Bloom, Bleyman, Bohigian, Boylan, Brofsky, Brower, Buianouckas, Canate; Clemente, Cohen, Constantinides, Cooper, Cravats, Cravzow, Dannenberg, Danziger, Davidson, Depas, Donleavy, Donoghue, Donovan, Eisenberg, Flashner, Galub, Gerber, Ginsberg, Gluck, Greenbaum, Grossfield, Grossman, Gura, Hayon, Henderson, Huang, Jaffe, Jiji, Johnson, Julia, King, Kirkland, Ladas, La Rubbio, Lea, Litke, Loetterle, Lytra, MacLennan, Matthews, McCarthy, McCullers, Meyers, Milentijevic, Moreau, Movasseghi, Moyne, Muehlig, Muller, Newman, Parkhurst, Picken, Plissner, Quinn, Riley, Rodriguez, Rosen, Rotwein, Russell, Schulman, Segal, Segune, Sheridan, Simor, Singleton, Sohmer, Speidel, Spivak, Stern, Stern, Stroup, Taylor, Thaxton, Timoni, Trefousse, Vines, Waldinger, Wedeen, Weiss, White, Wimmershoff-Caplan, Yousef, Zades, Zaneteas, and Zarin; Alternate Senators Amendolia, Baker, Blanks, Boris, Cohen, Geach, Genn, Ginsberg, Glass, Hernandez, Holland, Ladimer, Lander, Lerner, Linder, Rovira, Rowan, Schlesinger, Sessions, Sobieraj, Svitak, Weightman, and Youkeles. Senators Alston, Ercolano, Walter and Washington were excused. Chancellor Joseph S. Murphy and Dr. Ellis, Senate Executive Director, also attended. Mr. Dugan, General Counsel to the Research Foundation/CUNY attended by invitation as consultant on item 3, "Proposed Policy on Restricted Publication."

I. Approval of the Proposed Tentative Agenda: The proposed tentative agenda was moved, seconded and approved as distributed.

II. Approval of the Minutes of the 147th Plenary Session (April 22, 1986): The minutes were approved as circulated.

III. Proposed Resolution on Restricted Publication: Chairman Wasser introduced the item and noted that it had been laid over from the 147th Plenary Session, that the text had been edited and revised in accordance with the discussion at that session, and placed as the first order of business at this session as stipulated in the previous session. Professor Muller (Economics, Graduate School), chair of the Senate Research Committee, moved adoption of the resolution. Her motion was seconded. A motion to call the question on the motion was passed and the motion put to a vote. The resolution was adopted with two negative votes and two abstentions.

IV. Introduction of New Senators: Chairman Wasser introduced the new Senators and new Alternate Senators. Baruch - New Senator Lea Bleyman (Natural Science) and re-elected Senator Robert Rosen (German, Hebrew & Oriental Languages); New Alternate Senators Mary Jean Holland (Natural Science) and Kristin McDonough (Library); Borough Manhattan - new Senator Richard Brower (Science) and Alternate Senators Susan Amerling (Secretarial Science) and Manuel Hernandez (Accounting); Bronx Community - New Senator Michael Spivak (Special Educational Services) and re-elected Senator Arthur Galub (Social Science); new Alternate Senator Agnes Sobieraj (Biological Sciences) and re-elected Alternate Senator Michael Glass (Mathematics); Brooklyn - New Senators Donald MacLennan (Television and Radio), Barton Meyers (Psychology) and Paul Sheridan (Art); Returning Senator Peter Zaneteas (Classics); Re-elected Senators John Quinn (Speech) and Hans Trefousse (History); and

Alternate Senators Patricia Lander (Anthropology and Archaeology) and Mary Rowan (Modern Languages and Literature); City - New Senator Joseph La Rubbio (Chemistry) and re-elected Senators Latif Jiji (Engineering) and Drosoula Lytra (Romance Languages); Graduate School - New Senators Joseph Grossfield (Biology) and Walter Newman (Earth and Environmental Science) and returning Senator Stefan Baumrin (Philosophy), and Alternate Senators Bogdan Denitch (Sociology) and Isaias Lerner (Spanish); Hostos Community College - New Senator Carmen Clemente (English) and reelected Senator Humberto Canate (Mathematics); returning Alternate Senator Pasquale Amendolia (Student Services) and new Alternate Senator Michael Stimola (Student Services); Hunter - New Senators Frank Kirkland (Philosophy) and Russell White (Geology and Geography), Returning Senators Bernice Baxter (Academic Skills), Harold Ladas (Educational Foundations), and Earl Shaffer (Library) and New Alternate Senators Yaffa Schlesinger (Sociology) and Regina Linder (Health Sciences); John Jay - Reelected Senator Catherine Rovira (Foreign Languages); Kingsborough - New Alternate Senator Barbara Ginsberg (Health, Physical Education and Recreation) and Returning Alternate Senator Merrill Youkeles (Behavioral Sciences & Human Services); LaGuardia - New Senator Jan Wellmon King (English) and reelected Senator Donald Davidson (Data Processing); Returning Alternate Senator Gail Baker (Science); Lehman - New Senators - Stanley Bank (Adult & Business Education), and Richard DiKardo and Reelected Senator Mary Rita Donleavy (Special Services to Education), New Alternate Senators Barbara Geach (Nursing) and George Weightman (Sociology) and Reelected Alternate Senator Barbara Cohen (Nursing); New York City Technical - New Senator Betty Sue Taylor (Writing and Speech), Returning Senator Wayne McCullers (Social Science) and Reelected Senators John Donoghue (Social Science) and Judith Walter (Developmental Skills), New Alternate Senator Maxine Blanks (Nursing); Queens - New Senator Roy Cravzow (Romance Languages) and Reelected Senators David Alsop (Biology) and Robert Picken (Romance Languages); - Queensborough - New Senator Robert Singleton (English), Reelected Senators Judith Barbanel (Basic Skills) and David Blancher (History) and New Alternate Senators Maxine Genn (Library) and Sylvia Svitak (Mathematics); Staten Island - Reelected Senators Thomas McCarthy (Modern Languages) and Henry Wasser (English); York - New Senator Che-Tsao Huang (Educational Technology) and Returning Senator Harriet Vines (Student Development); New Alternate Senators Linda Barley (Health and Physical Education), Richard Boris (Political Science) and Edvige Coleman (Italian).

Elections, Dr. Wasser said, have not been held at Medgar Evers College, CUNY Law School or Mount Sinai School of Medicine and have not been completed at City College.

V. Communications from the Chairman: Chairman Wasser reminded the membership that his written report that supplemented these communications had been distributed at the meeting. (Copy attached to these minutes). He reported first that President Flora Mancuso-Edwards had submitted her resignation to accept the Presidency of Middlesex County College which is part of the New Jersey system. [There were gasps of surprise from the Senate.] Professor Wasser then reported further on the Board's Brooklyn Borough Hearing held May 14. Vice Chairperson of the Board, Edith Everett, presided, since Chairman of the Board Murphy could not attend. The other Trustees present, in addition to himself, were Sylvia Bloom, Maria Canino, and Florida Negron, chair of the University Student Senate. Also present were Chancellor Murphy and a number of Vice Chancellors and other members of the 80th Street staff and Presidents Chunn, Medgar Evers; Goldstein, Kingsborough; Hess, Brooklyn; and Schwerin, New York City Technical. Several State legislators who represent Brooklyn districts were also there, he continued, among them State Senators Halperin and Markowitz. City Councilman Horowitz was there too. Probably the most important testimony - at least from the Senate's viewpoint - was that of UFS Senator John Quinn, a member of the Brooklyn College delegation and chair of that college's Faculty Council. It concerned a matter about which, Dr. Wasser said, he would have more to detail shortly. Vice Chairman of the Senate Shirley Wedeen was at Professor Quinn's side as well. There was testimony too from students at York College concerning

the same matter they had raised at the Staten Island Borough Hearing - the denial of tenure to a faculty member by the college president. The students were protesting this as they had at the other hearing. A number of community people testified on various issues related to the colleges - among them the senior college funding and status of Medgar Evers College which they favored.

Chairman Wasser reported also on a number of issues that had been brought to the leadership by local faculty governance bodies and faculty members. He spoke first about the issue raised in Professor Quinn's testimony to the Board at the Borough Hearing. Professor Quinn had been in touch with the Executive Committee, he said, as chair of the Brooklyn Faculty Council. The issue had arisen when the Faculty Council noticed in the Chancellor's Report of April 28, 1986, an affiliation agreement that authorized Brooklyn College to admit to its community outreach program and to matriculated status in the School of General Studies individuals who lacked a high school diploma because the institution they had attended did not issue nor provide means to obtain a high school diploma. The examples cited were the yeshiva or seminary that had "a rigorous course of study." The Council's and, indeed, the Brooklyn College faculty's first knowledge of that agreement thus had come from a chance noticing of the Chancellor's Report item - despite the college faculty's Bylaw and governance plan right to have control over admissions. The Council had consequently raised the issue with President Hess as a procedural one - irrespective, for the present, of the substantive matter with respect to admission to matriculated status students who lacked either the high school diploma or its equivalent such as the GED. The Council had requested only that the President seek to have the agreement rescinded by the Board until the faculty had had the opportunity to exercise its right to approve or disapprove an agreement that related to admissions. Professor Wasser added that although students such as those mentioned in the Brooklyn item were admitted to other colleges within the system - Kingsborough and La Guardia, for example - the approval of the college faculty had been given prior to the item's having been forwarded to the Board. Therefore, the issue was one of due observance of the right of a faculty to exercise the authority delegated to it by the University Board's Bylaws and the college's governance plan. To date, the issue had not been resolved and when Professor Quinn had raised it at the Brooklyn Borough Hearing in a direct request to the Board that it rescind its action in approving the item, Chancellor Murphy had responded, at the request of the president, his response had not been either direct or clear - in fact, one might term it "ambivalent."

A second issue raised with the Committee had been transmitted by the Queensborough Community College delegation. It was a developing issue on that campus and concerns an affirmative action matter that had been raised by the chief librarian concerning actions taken by the Queensborough Academic Senate and faculty library committee with respect to the functioning of the college library. At issue was a complaint of discrimination on the grounds of infringement of the individual's rights on the basis of national origin - a complaint that had been filed with the Human Rights Commission. Again, Professor Wasser said, the issue was one of the rights of the faculty which the faculty chair of the Queensborough library committee had asserted were the basis for the actions taken by the Academic Senate vis-a-vis the staff member.

The Head of the Faculty Council of the College of Staten Island had asked the assistance of the Senate leadership in securing a response from the Vice Chancellor for Legal Affairs to a letter sent him by the Council in October requesting that his office review proposed changes in the college's governance plan to insure faculty indemnification and right to counsel in the performance of its duties. A follow-up letter to the Vice Chancellor had also failed to produce results. The issue was the same, Professor Wasser said, as that which had arisen at Brooklyn College last year and that still had not been resolved. Again there had occurred a lengthy period of delay and an inability by the faculty to obtain a response from the Chancellory.

A third issue had brought to the leadership by a member of the Kingsborough Community

College who was also a member of that college's UFS delegation. The Senator had alleged that the issue is one of violation of the Senator's academic freedom and had sought the Senate's support in the matter. The Executive Committee would review the request at its next meeting and had alerted the chairman of the Senate Academic Freedom Committee that it might be referred to it for investigation and a report to the Senate in the fall.

Chairman Wasser spoke next of the Borough of Manhattan Community College Presidential Search. That search was moving towards its final stage, he said. The five candidates who had been selected for campus interviews had visited the campus and had met with various campus groups - administrators, faculty and students et al. - and had prepared their reports for the search committee. The Committee had arrived at its recommendations and had submitted them to the Chancellor who would now try to arrive at his recommendation to the Board. The full Board would have the opportunity to interview the finalists on June 3 and the search should then move towards an end.

Next, the Chairman reported on the matter of summersalaries for researchers. The matter of compensation for time for researchers holding grants from external agencies, he said, was in active negotiation for resolution of a misunderstanding that had developed as a result possibly of the transition from one central administration to the other. The matter was part of the University's Multiple Positions Policy, he reminded the Senate, and when that policy was revised in December 1981 the original language developed and submitted by the Senate had found its way into the policy statement approved by the Board as 2½ months compensation with 3 months discretionary. Somehow the three months discretionary possibility had vanished from the possible allowance because of the language of the policy as adopted had not been sufficiently explicit. The situation had been further complicated by the fact that various Deputy Chancellors and Acting Deputy Chancellors had agreed to take action to correct the problem but had failed to succeed in doing so. The present Acting Deputy Chancellor, Mr. Mucciolo, has indicated that he would move on this matter as soon as he had a full understanding and full information on the issue. At his request the Senate Office and Dr. Wasser had spoken with the University people who had authored the document approved by the Board in 1981 - in particular, the President of Kingsborough Community College who was then serving as Acting Deputy Chancellor. Mr. Mucciolo would now be able to speak with President Goldstein and obtain the information he wanted from him so that the issue could be resolved in short order.

Finally, Chairman Wasser said that as he completed the six years of his term in the chairmanship of the University Faculty Senate he wished to make a few additional comments. He had tried to act with toughness and astuteness as the position demanded and although the role of chairman took great energy and time he had been grateful for the opportunity to fill the office. He thought it important to emphasize also how important he had concluded the Senate Minutes were in the form that they took. Although they might not be perfect transcriptions of the proceedings they achieved 99 per cent accuracy and their full importance lay in the fact that they provided information to the University. That fact was preeminent since they were regarded as the major source of information in the institution. The Presidents provided some information as did the reports by Senators to the faculty whom they represented but the detailed minutes of the Plenary were valuable for that detail. Thus, the minutes were an important arm of influence for the Senate. The UFS Newsletter was an equal source of influence. Ably edited by Professor Lea the Newsletter served too as a major source of information for the University community. As it was edited the paper's importance resulted from Professor Lea's journalistic sense of what was important and what was not and the Senate's influence was supported by the publication. It was his hope that both documents would continue to serve that role.

Professor Wasser then called on Professor Lea for a question. Professor Lea stated that he thought it only right that he express what he was certain was the view of the

entire Senate. Professor Wasser had served indefatigably in the faculty's behalf in the leadership of the Senate and in his role as a Faculty Trustee. He personally, Professor Lea continued, was troubled by Dr. Wasser's position as a non-voting member of the Board and he wondered whether the efforts of the Senate to campaign for a vote for the faculty member had been abandoned because he would hope that the campaign might be resumed. Do you believe that in your long service on the Board, Professor Lea asked, that vote would have made a significant difference? No, Professor Wasser responded, I was able to achieve a great deal without the vote. I was able to influence on behalf of my constituency. Through going to the multitude of meetings, conferences, etc. that the Board is called upon to attend, I was able to extend that influence on a personal basis. On the full Board matters are routinely approved; it is only different on rare occasions. I think too that I was able to work successfully especially on those search committees on which I served. I do not feel a sense of regret or loss because I did not have the vote. On policy matters I had the opportunity to make my case; I could make motions or second them. I enjoyed the full privileges of my fellow Trustees with the exception of the vote. In the full Board what is important is that there be 9 votes in favor and those instances when my having the vote would have affected that number seldom arose. It is not the vote itself that is important.

Professor Muller (Economics, Graduate School) then expressed the appreciation of the entire body to Dr. Wasser for all he had done for the Senate.

Professor Grossman (Education, City) said that she appreciated what Dr. Wasser had said about the faculty trustee's vote but that it seemed to her to be important symbolically, especially since the other ex-officio trustee had the power of the vote. She was glad to hear that the faculty trustee's influence had not been diminished but still thought that the vote should be a priority issue for the Senate to address next year. Professor Bohigian (Mathematics, John Jay) said that he had been rereading the minutes of the April 22 Plenary Session and that he had reviewed his question to the Chancellor about the number of HEO's et al. on his staff. The answer he had received was inane, i.e. that the vitas were on file. When we in departments at the colleges hire, he said, we assume that the person has at least four years plus training. When an assistant professor is hired the person has to have spent five more years before being considered for promotion. Thus, one was speaking in terms of 15 years if one added the ten years needed for consideration for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor plus the additional five for promotion to Full Professor. Professor Bohigian thought that this issue ought to be pursued so that the Senate might be certain that persons at the Associate level in the Central Office had had ten to 15 years experience in lieu of the degrees for which waivers had been granted them.

VI. Nomination and Election of the Chairman of the University Faculty Senate: Dr. Wasser reviewed the procedures and Charter provisions governing the conduct of elections for the body. He then appointed Professors Barbanel (Basic Skills, Queensborough) and Zades (Student Services, Staten Island) tellers.

Nominations were then declared open. Professors Shirley Wedeen (Education, Brooklyn) Bernard Sohmer (Mathematics, City) and Robert Picken (Romance Languages, Queens) were nominated. Professors Plissner (Student Counseling, Kingsborough), Russell (Chemistry, City) and Riley (Chemistry, Bronx) presented brief nominating speeches on behalf of Professors Wedeen, Sohmer and Picken respectively. Professor Wedeen was elected on the second ballot.

VII. Nomination and Election of the Vice Chairman of the University Faculty Senate: Professor Wasser then called for nominations for Vice Chairman. Professors Donald Davidson (Data Processing, La Guardia) and Sandi Cooper (History, Staten Island) were nominated. Professors Picken, Sohmer, and Riley declined. There being no further nominations, brief nominating speeches on behalf of the candidates were made. Professor Davidson was elected.

- VIII. Nomination and Election of the Treasurer of the University Faculty Senate: Dr. Wasser called for nominations. Professor Robert Picken (Romance Languages, Queens) was nominated. There were no other nominations and the Secretary was instructed to cast a single ballot for the election of Professor Picken.
- IX. Nomination and Election of Secretary of the University Faculty Senate: Dr. Wasser called for nominations. Professor Joseph "Gil" Riley (Chemistry, Bronx Community College) was nominated. There were no other nominations and the Secretary was instructed to cast a single ballot for the election of Professor Riley.
- X. Nomination and Election of Five Members-at-Large of the Executive Committee of the University Faculty Senate: Dr. Wasser opened nominations for members-at-large of the Senate Executive Committee. Professors Gordon Lea (English, Lehman), Murray Plissner (Student Counseling, Kingsborough), Fred Greenbaum (History, Queensborough), Bernard Sohmer (Mathematics, City), Sandi Cooper (History, Staten Island), Mary Rita Donleavy (Special Services to Education, Lehman), and Marvin Jaffe (Science, Borough Manhattan) were nominated. Professors Cooper, Greenbaum, Jaffe, Lea, and Sohmer were elected.
- XI. Proposed Resolution of the Academic Freedom Committee: Professor Greenbaum, chairman of the Committee presented the proposed resolution and moved its adoption. The motion was seconded. There was brief discussion and Professor Baumrin moved an editorial amendment that was accepted by the Committee. The two views presented in the discussion were that it might be better not to direct a protest versus a given group but rather to affirm the principles of academic freedom and that "Accuracy in Academia" was the most pernicious force to emerge since Senator Joseph McCarthy. When put to a vote the resolution was adopted with three abstentions. (Copy appended to these minutes.)
- XII. Committee Reports: The Senate received a number of annual reports of Committees presented by the chairmen of the reporting committees. Professor Donleavy presented the report of the Affirmative Action Committee. Professor Danziger presented the report of the Articulation Committee. Professor Seguire presented the report of the Curriculum Policy Committee. Professor Binder presented the report of the Library Committee. Professor Walter was unable to present the Remediation Committee report and with the assistance of the Liaison Member of the Committee, Professor Riley, the report was presented and received. (Copies of the reports are available from the Senate Office on written request.)
- XIII. Reports of Faculty Members of Board of Trustees' Committees: The reports were distributed in writing. (Copies are attached to these minutes.) Professor Grossman who had requested additional information about the personnel actions noted in the April Plenary Minutes asked whether that full explanation would be made available to all members. She was told that the first part of the explanation had been attached to the Minutes of the April meeting and that the second part would be attached to the Minutes of the May meeting.

XIV. Chancellor's Report: Chancellor Murphy said that his plan this evening was to present his paper on Affirmative Action to the Senate for its subsequent study and discussion. He then thanked the retiring Chairman of the Senate, Dr. Wasser, for his service and cooperation with the University Administration during the period he had worked with him. Dr. Wasser, in turn, thanked the Chancellor and noted the civility with which he had been treated and the cooperative manner in which he and the Senate had been treated. The Chancellor then extended his congratulations to the incoming leadership.

Chancellor Murphy's paper is attached to these minutes. After completing the presentation Chancellor Murphy responded to the following questions and comments from the floor. 1) Professor Henderson (Special Programs, City) - "Thank you for the paper. It was, in my opinion, very forthright and important. How is it going to be carried out?"/ There is a mechanism in place now that requires certification that affirmative action requirements have been met in the hiring of the recommended appointment. There is a question of the processes to be used in meeting those goals and there is no excuse not to make those goals clear. 2) Professor Movasseghi (Natural Science, Medgar Evers) - "How is the Affirmative Action Officer at the campus selected - what is the University's role in that selection? Does faculty have a role in that selection?"/ Others can explain better how the selection is made. It is a Presidential appointment, however. 3) Professor Bohigian (Mathematics, John Jay) - "I would like to compliment you on an excellent paper. Do you intend on the implementation to discuss it with the Council of Presidents? A main problem seems to be the Presidential appointment that does not meet the criteria of affirmative action goals. Their appointments frequently do not match those goals or meet the criteria."/ There is a thing known as University policy - there are presidents who pursue it with vigor; others seem not to do so. There is also the presidential evaluation policy that has now been resumed after several years hiatus and one of the factors to be considered is the way in which the president's leadership has included the college's pursuit and meeting of affirmative action goals. When there is a question of being evaluated it is not unnatural to keep in mind the meeting of the criteria to be applied in the evaluation. I too am going to be evaluated, as you know, and that has encouraged my attention to dealing with various constituencies in the University - such as the Faculty Senate. 4) Professor Cooper (History, Staten Island) - "What you have said is important. It is an area that concerns me greatly, as you know. Getting a handle on it - especially on recruitment and having an appropriate pool of candidates to meet our goals is a great problem since the pool depends on being able to recruit appropriately qualified personnel and the problem there, it seems to me, lies with recruitment of students by graduate schools. The graduate route seems to me to be important."/ There is a going back across the country - with the City University as an exception. Fewer minority students are entering graduate programs. I am hopeful that the professional programs will provide a number of dollars for such students to pursue graduate programs with fellowships. It is our burden, I think, to find the shape of the rest of the country. 5) Professor Stroup (Art, Music and Philosophy, John Jay) - "I have just finished a discussion of this as a philosophic issue in a course on Ethics and Law and I want to ask about the following issue. The Senate Affirmative Action did a survey of the University's Distinguished Professors as of Fall 1985 and that revealed that at the Graduate School there were 37 male and 1 female Distinguished Professor. Are such persons appointed as the result of a search? What procedures could be implemented to provide greater representation of women?"/ No one was aware of Distinguished Professors, I think, until we increased their number and stipend. We did have Texas in mind when we began this but it is now going down the drain. There has been some discussion on that issue and there is some embarrassment about the representation of women. We were in a bind because of the limited numbers up to this last year when we had a narrow opportunity to add. The situation is better now. The appointment process sometimes seems to me to be a matter of who is in the room when recommendations are being made. Professor Eisenberg (Mathematics, Kingsborough) - "The Affirmative Action Officer at my college is a woman who would never dream of challenging the President. Have you considered the possibility of having full-time professors hold that post?"/ My responsibility is not to impose such requirements on the presidents. The president should. I think, as I said, that the evaluation criteria and having the meeting of affirmative action goals a part is a novelty and that is going to affect the appointments. Professor Eisenberg further asked - "Do

you have an affirmative action officer at 80th Street?"/ The Vice Chancellor for Faculty and Staff Relations is visiting the campuses and is representing the University's policies there. 7) Professor Ginsberg (Data Processing, Borough Manhattan) - "In the process of a selecting a new president for my college, will affirmative action guidelines be a priority?"/ The pool of candidates whom you've seen should be evidence of affirmative action guidelines being in place. Professor Ginsberg further asked - "Do you have any news for us? A timetable?"/ I heard the names of the candidates this morning - everyone else seems to have known them before this. I am now reviewing that list and I would imagine that it will be sometime after June 3 that there may be news to give you. The members of the Board who did not serve on the Search Committee will have the opportunity on June 3 to interview the candidates; so the news will have to come after that. Professor Meyers (Psychology, Brooklyn) - "Thank you for the sentiments you have expressed. There is resistance to them on the campuses. It would seem to me that beyond the various sentiments that the implementation of affirmative action goals will affect a successful evaluation of the president, it is important that they be a high priority."/ I have previously responded that there is also the option of making it known that the allotment of lines and resources will be contingent on meeting those goals. 9) Professor Greenbaum (History, Queensborough) - "I would like to tell you of my experience when I was applying for an academic post many years ago now and that was to be called for an interview and enter a room where the committee doing the interviewing had already decided on their choice and that choice was made as a result of the old boys network. Once the pool is wider how will that problem be solved?"/ Did you ever receive a letter as one friend of mine did suggesting that he had not been appointed "since he might not be happy here"? Who is at the table does affect what the choice will be and how it will be made and therefore how representative a group that is important. I don't think one can start with a presumption of evil, but the question is stymying since one can't know the motives that move decision-makers. The process is difficult to put in place but not impossible. 10) Professor Grossman (Education, City) - "I should like to begin with a disclaimer that this question is not meant to be impertinent. Do you have an affirmative action officer with respect to your administrative staff - faculty, HEOs, et al. ?"/ There is one. I have the authority to make staff appointments without reference to anything save to my own guide and that includes a sensitivity to the matter. There are no faculty appointments though at 80th Street. 11) Professor Bohigian - "With respect to your comment on the control of presidential appointments - you might go a step further and concentrate on a smaller goal. If a suggested candidate does not meet the criteria don't accept the recommendation. What are the correct procedures with respect to faculty opinion on procedures - for example, a presidential recommendation of a candidate who received a negative vote at two P&Bs?"/ It is not easy and I can give only a bureaucratic response. 12) Professor Litke (Law, Kinsborough) - "You mentioned something about the Supreme Court decision the other day. Could you say something about that statement and its addendum?"/ It was the decision reported in today's press. I saw a memo on it but I did not have the opportunity to look at it carefully. I think I was talking about the Human Rights Commission not the Supreme Court. What the Supreme Court decision is is not clear since there are five opinions by nine men and it seems to me that they are probably going to wait for another decision before making the interpretation clear. 13) Professor Henderson - "Since the goals are clarified why couldn't numbers be set: no white males after "x"?/ Nothing is quite that clear. Professor Henderson further asked - "Just stop after "x"."/ There are two things - 1) if there is a confrontation then ultimately you are going to make everyone very angry. Then you haven't encouraged circumstances where you might succeed. Where one falls on deaf ears then there is another situation. The case has been made - to the presidents, to the departments. So let's look and see what's happened. We are against the current nationally. It is not the time to move in this area so the way to proceed is that we have to assume that we are educators in an educational institution and that we are educating ourselves. We have done better than others before but a situation of you can't do this or that is not best. WE have to assess the situation now and not have blood on the table afterwards.

9.

There was a motion to adjourn and the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Jean Ellis
Executive Director