

FOR SENATE APPROVAL

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

September 23, 1986

Professor Wedeen (Education, Brooklyn), chair of the Senate, called the meeting to order at 6:35 p.m. Present were: Senators Alsop, Alston, Amendolia, Amerling, Bank, Barbanel, Baumrin, Baxter, Berkowitz, Binder, Bleyman, Bohigian, Boylan, Brower, Buianouckas, Canate, B. Cohen, Constantinides, Cooper, Cravats, Cravzow, Davidson, Donleavy, Donoghue, Donovan, Eisenberg, Galub, Gerber, T. Ginsberg, Gluck, Grossman, Gura, Hayon, Henderson, Hernandez-Miyares, Huang, Jaffe, Jiji, Karan, King, Kirkland, La Rubbio, Lea, Lytra, MacLennan, Matthews, McCullers, McDonough, Meyers, Muehlig, Muller, Parkhurst, Picken, Quinn, Riley, Rose, Rosen, Rosen, Russell, Segal, Seguire, Shaffer, Sheridan, Sohmer, Speidel, Stern, Taylor, Thaxton, Timoni, Trefousse, Vines, Waldinger, Walter, Wasser, White, Wimmershoff-Caplan, Yousef, Zades, and Zaneteas; Alternate Senators Blanks, De Moose, Hernandez, Lander, Linder, Sessions, and Youkeles. Senators Danziger, Depas, Geach, Greenbaum, Litke, Milentijevic, and Plissner were excused. Senators Boylan, Ginsberg, Quinn, and Sohmer also represented, as heads or liaisons, local campus governance bodies. Chancellor Joseph S. Murphy and University Faculty Senate Executive Director Ellis also attended.

I. Approval of the Proposed Tentative Agenda: Chair Wedeen welcomed the membership to the first Plenary Session of the academic year, 1986-87 and noted the five minute delay in convening the meeting - a delay that seemed appropriate this evening but not in future. She asked too that the members now come to order and terminate their discussion with people they had not seen since last year and people they had not seen since 20 minutes ago. It was her intention in future, she said, to start on time, since she was an old school marm. She wished to say "hello" to everybody now and to say that she hoped the summer had been a period of enjoyment and time to relax and a period of good health and to do whatever people chose to do in summer. She wished the body a good and productive year.

The Chair then asked for a motion to approve the proposed agenda and, hearing a motion and a second as well as a call for the question, called for a vote. The vote was unanimous and the agenda adopted.

II. Approval of the Minutes of the 148th Plenary Session (May, 20, 1986): A motion to approve and a second to that motion were made. The question was called and the minutes with the following corrections passed to the Executive Director in advance of the session: p. 1, par. 1 "Alternate Senator De Moose" should be added between "Cohen" and "Geach". Senator Stern's name should be deleted between "Stern" and "Stroup". Senator White (Geography, Hunter) asked a question of the Chancellor that was omitted as was the response . (p. 8). Professor White's question at the 149th Session (*infra*, p. 8) addresses the same issue and the omitted question has not been inserted at his request.

III. Communications from the Chair: Chair Wedeen announced that she had appointed a new parliamentarian, Professor Baumrin (Philosophy, Graduate School) to that position. She announced too that the Secretary and Treasurer of the Senate would be seated among the membership and not at the head table at Plenary Sessions. The Parliamentarian, she noted, would not sit at the head table but in the rear of the membership - probably on the back table. She further informed the Senate that it was her plan to include in her written report to the Senate, circulated at each session

to the membership and attached to the Minutes in the university-wide distribution of them. Her oral report will be brief and will include only those items that, at times, demand immediate communication to the membership as, for example, when an important item comes up that is too late to get into print. For example, she continued, "I represented you at the SUNY this past weekend". The reason for a brief oral report was, she said, to permit ample time for action items and areas of special interest or significance to be gone over for discussion and debate so that whenever the Senate members were together there would be opportunity to take up such items.

Professor Wedeen then reported on the SUNY meeting she had attended. The SUNY Senate, she explained, meets once a year in Albany since, geographically, the SUNY colleges' location makes group assemblage less easily possible than the CUNY situation. She reported that she had given the SUNY members the CUNY Senate's best wishes and had reaffirmed the desire to work jointly on projects of mutual concern to CUNY and SUNY. In fact, this year in December the SUNY delegation of its Executive Committee will host the CUNY leadership in New York - a procedure that differs from the past. In previous years the CUNY Executive hosted the meeting in New York but SUNY now has a new facility on 43rd Street and has expressed the desire to reciprocate the earlier hospitality. In the meeting, one of the major items will be putting together a joint document on academic freedom and first amendment rights.

The chair reported further that, at the SUNY session, she had attended various seminars that were being held and that among these was a meeting of the Committee for Student Life that she found especially interesting. The session was somewhat different from CUNY's committee meetings in that they had polled all of the campuses and had asked them to respond to a questionnaire on what they did for first year freshmen with special educational needs and had asked them to present a one page summary of those activities that were a little unique and worked. The Committee planned a conference in early November, "The First Year College Experience" and was selecting from the proposals submitted those that should be on the agenda for that conference. The chair said the process looked alive, interesting and helpful and she planned to pass the information on this subject that she had collected to the appropriate CUNY committee. One can reinvent the wheel, she commented or try something different and that was the reason to look at the SUNY example just as their purpose was to accomplish the same thing in relation to their colleges.

The session was reminiscent of CUNY because Chancellor Wharton, at one session, had reported, as CUNY's Chancellor does, to the Senate. Chancellor Wharton had come in and spoken and had outlined his priorities for the year - Budget and Advancing the Image of SUNY.

Professor Wedeen reported also that there was one other piece of information she would like to share. Earlier this month at a Board dinner at the Chancellor's residence one of the topics discussed of interest to the Senate was the Summer Session Freshman Skills Program, 1986. The results of that program were highly successful. She knew too, she continued, that for next year the University was asking a large budget increase for freshmen who have failed one of the Skills tests. It seemed time for the Senate to look at the results of the program and to be in on the first steps in planning for the future session. She wished the Remediation Committee to take an active look at the findings on the program's past successes and become involved in assessing the program's results and in planning for summer 1987.

Chair Wedeen reminded the Senate that when it met in May she had discussed some of her priorities for the Senate in 1986-87 - a proposal with which apparently many Senators had agreed and why she was present in the chair this evening. She was pleased, she continued, to say that the Executive Committee had chosen to approve the establishment of two ad hoc committees: the Priorities Committee and the Structure and Procedures

Committee. The first, the Chair noted, she had proposed because she had thought that some Senators, especially newer ones, didn't feel at home and that there should be an opportunity for them to communicate their concerns to the leadership. Therefore, she had proposed these committees. The charge to the Priorities Committee, as approved by the Executive Committee, is to develop recommendations on those CUNY faculty issues that the Senate should address and present an interim report to the Executive Committee no later than December 1, 1986 and subsequently to the Senate in the Spring semester. The Structure and Procedures Committee is charged to review the structure and procedures of UFS Plenary Sessions and to make recommendations on them and to present its report to the Executive Committee no later than October 24 and subsequently to report to the Senate before the end of the Fall semester. Here again, Professor Wedeen added, we have been running a certain way and have found it comfortable. Perhaps the Committee will conclude that we should continue in the same way or perhaps differently - it's like hems going up and down. There is the question of whether we should convene at 6:30 or 7:00, for example, in order to park at 7:00 or depart for home earlier by meeting at 6:30. 6:45 won't help; so perhaps we will meet at one time one semester and at the other in the alternate semester. There is also the question of our minutes and whether they should continue to be reported as at present or whether they should include for report action items only. In terms of the Priorities Committee there is something else to add. What we are hoping to do here is really twofold: 1) to carry on the business of a Plenary and have on the agenda those items that come within our purview and that arise from day to day and 2) items that we should deal with. The Executive Committee is doing what it has always done, i.e. to set the agenda in terms of both, although with greater emphasis on the business that is immediately at hand. We thought that you should become more involved, however. Even though the lines are open at all times and lines to the group are open to members to feed to them some of the priority items to consider, having this committee may determine ways to strengthen the lines of communication. The committee will also feed to the Executive Committee some of the priorities that should be of interest for the year that can then be gone over by the Committee and have them come back to you. I hope that members who wish to suggest issues will get in touch with Dr. Ellis who will pass them to the Chair of the Committee or will get in touch with the Chair themselves. Professor Baxter (Academic Skills, Hunter) will chair the Priorities Committee and Professor Baumrin (Philosophy, Graduate School), the Structure and Procedures Committee. (A list of the full membership of the Committees is attached to these Minutes.)

One suggestion that I made in May, said Professor Wedeen, was that at some of our meetings we should devote a portion of time to plenary meetings and then meet in our committees. At our Plenary Session in October the Executive Committee has decided to try such a session. Therefore, we will meet as a group for the first hour - 6:30 to 7:30 and then break into groups. We are trying this because we know what a hassle it is making the time in busy schedules to come down town - especially since some of us are auslanders and coming to town is difficult. so if we can avoid two trips it is helpful. It is worth trying to see whether it will make it easier to have committee meetings when you are free and here. The plan for October is not to invite anyone outside the Senate so that we can get done at 7:30p.m., break into committees and meet. The group will be as it has been and will be active and get things done. Dr. Ellis will be in touch with each committee head next week so that they can have a room assignment and a notice sent to their committee members.

In that connection, you should know that we have had some new people join the office staff this summer. Mrs. Joanne Bronstein whom many of you will remember on the phone has returned as senior administrative assistant and Ms. Stasia Pasela has joined as secretary. Mrs. Florence Ercolano is with us too as research assistant on a part-time schedule.

Chair Wedeen noted also. It is my plan this Fall to visit each college campus since

there may be problems and issues that they have in common. As we know, campuses have problems that are unique and do arise but they also have problems that have developed on other campuses too and thus are university issues that the Senate can and should address. Visits to the campuses will provide the opportunity for me to learn what, if any, problems there may be. Would the liaison people, therefore, call Dr. Ellis so that a date can be arranged that can be mutually convenient for myself, Senate members at the institution, other campus faculty leaders and other appropriate members of the faculty they may wish to invite. While at the college, I plan also to speak with the President and any other key administrators you or the President think I should. You can speak with the president or Dr. Ellis will, if you prefer, and let the president know that I will be on campus and would like to chat with him or her and any other members of the administrative staff the president may wish. You may make the arrangements any way you deem best - by having the president and others join the faculty, by having that a separate discussion, or by some combination. The important thing is to let people know that I will be down there and the faculty will have the opportunity of sharing what turned up on campus with me so that if issues come up that can be handled quietly, subtly by the Executive Committee, it can do so and otherwise, as we are aware, we know the power of the mass media.

As the last item tonight, Professor Wedeen said, I would like to share with you I spoke with our dearest liaison member, Belle Zeller, last week and she started the conversation, "How're you doin'" and I told her, "Just fine". We chatted and she wants me to tell you she sends her very best to you for a good leadership year. I know she would like to hear from you - if you know her or if you don't. She is in St. Vincent's Hospital at Seventh Avenue and 11th Street and would love to receive notes or cards there. The room number is Room 632, Smith Building.

I have spent more time on my communications tonight than I planned or will do in future because I'll be certain then not to talk as much, Professor Wedeen concluded.

IV. Reports of Faculty Members of Board Committees: The reports were distributed in writing this evening but the members are here and would be happy to answer any questions, the Chair explained. (Copies of the Reports are attached to these minutes.)

V. Appointment of Ad Hoc Committees (For information). Chair Wedeen reminded the members that ad hoc committees were appointed by the chair and stated that she had consulted with the Executive Committee in making these appointments. The membership did not require approval by the membership. The list of members, she continued, had also been distributed with the other materials at this meeting. She referred, she noted, to the two committees - on Priorities and Structure and Procedures - to which she had spoken earlier.

VI. Nomination and Approval of UFS Committees, 1986-87: The Chair then introduced this item and prefaced it by explaining the Executive Committee's work in preparing the slate to be voted on and a brief statement. The slate, she said, was derived from the Preference Forms mailed to the membership this summer and the responses received. In preparing it, certain guidelines had been established: every effort had been made to assign members to first choice options but in some cases second and third choices were used. This resulted from the need to consider a number of variables, such as balancing senior and community colleges, distributing members across the disciplines, including persons, even some members of the faculty-at-large, whose expertise would be useful in the deliberations. In addition, Senators had been assigned to their choices before turning to the Alternate Senators. Additions to the Committee slates to be considered, nominations would be accepted. It was her hope, however, that the members would be willing to submit those nominations in writing and permit assignments to be made within the guidelines she had outlined. Even if the slate as presented were adopted, she reminded the membership, additions were always in order. Professor

Wedeen then called for a motion to approve the slate as submitted. The motion was duly made and seconded. Since there was no discussion, the question was called and the slate was approved unanimously. Professor Wedeen asked that additional requests be submitted to Dr. Ellis in writing for consideration at the next Executive Committee meeting on October 7.

VII. New Business: Professor Muller (Economics, Graduate School) announced that as Vice-President of the CUNY Academy for the Humanities and Sciences she wished to inform the membership of two proximate events on the Academy's schedule for the year. She had distributed announcements of them this evening and would note now that they were: 1) On October 2, Dr. Robert N. Butler, Brookdale Professor of the Department of Geriatrics and Adult Development of Mount Sinai Medical Center, a national leader in his field, would lecture on "The Longevity Revolution" and 2) On October 22, John Rewald Distinguished Professor Emeritus of Art History, CUNY Graduate School, would lecture on "Cezanne, the Steins, and Their Circle". Dr. Rewald, an honorary trustee of the Museum of Modern Art, had been a guest curator there and had prepared some of the catalogues for memorable exhibitions at the museum. All faculty were welcome free of charge but reservations were necessary (Academy Office 212-790-4493) since seating was limited. Therefore, places should be reserved in advance.

Professor Wedeen then entertained questions. Professor White (Geography, Hunter) asked why the monthly checks received by staff in September failed to include the contractual increment - especially since that increment had been included in a contract negotiated two years ago. Professor Wedeen suggested that he put his question to the Chancellor when he joined the Senate for his report - which would be the next agenda item. She further noted that the question was one to which she had no answer and that it dealt with an issue within the purview of the collective bargaining agent rather than that of the Senate.

Professor Grossman (Education, City) asked about the Commission on Teacher Education on which Professor Wasser (English, Staten Island), former UFS Chairman, served and which had been meeting for several years and requested a status report on its work. At the request of the chair, Professor Wasser responded that there had been no final report, although the membership had concluded its work. They had thought such a report would be completed last June but there had been none. Professor Gluck (Education, Brooklyn) added that she had served on the Commission too as the representative of the PSC and the College and the staff member, Ms. Bowles, who was supposed to prepare the report had suffered an injury so that it was still in the works. Furthermore, there had been an onslaught of other reports, such as the Carnegie Study and the Holmes Report that needed consideration. There was some feeling among the members of the Commission too that the Chancellor's heart was in its work and it might be appropriate to ask him about that since there was no doctoral program in the field at CUNY and that had impeded the recognition of the University's programs in the field and failed to earn it the appropriate status it ought to have, given the quality of the work in the field. There was also talk in the Commission of an Academy that would serve as a research center in the field but that too seemed not to be going forward. Something was not right about the administration's commitment to the work of the Task Force. Dean McGarraghy of the Office of Academic Affairs had been active in running the Commission but there had been the sense of lack of commitment elsewhere. It was then suggested that Professor Gluck might address a question on this subject to the Chancellor.

Professor Sohmer (Mathematics, City), member-at-large of the Senate Executive Committee said that he seemed to have seen or heard somewhere that there had been a meeting of the Board of Trustees Fiscal Affairs Committee this week for the purpose

of a review of the Chancellor's 1987-88 Budget Request and he wondered whether there had been such a session and whether the chair might tell the Senate something about that meeting and the Request. Professor Wedeen responded that she had attended that meeting on September 22 since all members of the Board had been invited to it and had heard the presentation and had the opportunity to discuss it. Vice Chancellor for Budget and Finance Vivona had gone through the Request for this year and there were two areas that had been included: the pre-freshman summer session and work on the master's level for teachers who hold liberal arts degrees, tuition-free, to be followed by an internship year. He went through the entire budget and listed the priority items: child care, library, facilities, software - all items that have been seen before. She would defer to the Chancellor to make further comment on the Request, since she thought he could discuss it more fully and planned to do so.

Professor Bohigian (Mathematics, John Jay) said he would like the Senate to look into the issue of the University's current Multiple Positions Policy Statement since he believed there were serious problems with its phraseology and stipulations - some of these very possibly illegal on close reading. Certainly, the policy differed significantly from that promulgated by other institutions and was out of step with theirs, e.g. the information generated by Harvard's 350th Anniversary Celebration had certainly suggested a vast gap between theirs and CUNY's. If one read the CUNY document carefully, he continued, it was illegal for faculty to spend time with their families. In addition, Professor Bohigian continued, he noted and persons had noted on the September Chancellor's Report the significant increase in REMs so that deans were at \$78,000 now and the enormous differential between the compensation they received and that received by faculty. Professor Wedeen said that these issues should be transmitted over to the Priorities Committee.

Professor Wedeen then asked whether there were any other priority items the members would like to throw out at this time. Professor Baumrin said that he was not so disturbed about the REMS as he was about his own salary. He had done some calculations recently comparing his 1970 salary and assuming that he had received no increase and no promotion since then with his 1986 salary. He had discovered that on that basis his current salary provided \$80 a week. Though he could manage on \$112, he jestingly said, his concern lay with faculty salaries not administrative ones. Professor Wedeen said that a meeting to be attended by Professor Davidson, vice chair of the Senate, and herself with President Polishook and Mr. Cantor of the PSC was planned and this concern could be passed along then. The general purpose of the meeting was to review some of the grey areas that lie between the two groups such as the issue of handicapped students since those grey areas encompass many issues of mutual concern.

VIII. Chancellor's Report: Professor Wedeen then greeted Chancellor Murphy and surrendered the podium to him for his report. Chancellor Murphy said that normally in the past he had tried to talk in general about the state of the University but at this time there was nothing momentous to report - only some housekeeping items. He would therefore confine his report to those and then respond to questions.

The Chancellor reported first that the initial analyses of enrollment had prompted unusual concern because of the data on TAP which usually provides a clue to enrollment. The decline in the number of students receiving TAP suggested that enrollment had declined. There were a number of theories on the decrease in TAP recipients, e.g. that the impact of the Reagan years was showing its effects here. That impact would tend to decrease the numbers of enrolled students. The analysis of the data, however, turned out not to have produced the initial effect suggested. Either the analysis was not accurate or something. In fact, it turns out that there has been some increase in enrollment. Those in the middle class who are clinging tenaciously to the symbols of that status have

found that they are not able to do what normally they would - send their children away to college. Those students don't qualify for TAP but they do if they go away. Another hypothesis is that there is a reduction in the number of full-time students, and increase in the number of part-time students and the latter do not qualify for TAP in the same way that full-time do. In any case, the four year colleges seem to be in decent shape, it now seems, while the community colleges show some decrease and this is the reverse from last year but the total should remain the same.

The economic climate in the State is generally good and it is buoyed by growth in the state as evidenced by such things as the number of "junk" bonds around and the like. Their own reading of the prospects is generally good and is undoubtedly buoyed by the prospect of the November election and another in two years.

I can also tell you that we have gotten money for construction that amounts to some \$1.3 million from the State in addition to the money for the John Jay project and the bill is thus \$1.5 million which is good - at least for the construction industry. So to those of you who may find yourselves in a few years in a windowless office it will be the result of architectural innovation - and we might give some thought to putting up a plaque to them.

We have also received support for graduate education although there is some decrease in enrollment there too. One of the major thrusts in the Budget is in this area.

I do not want to go into greater detail on the Request for 1987-88 because Professor Wedeen who was at the meeting the other day has probably filled you in already.

There have also been some personnel changes. Augusta Kappner has been appointed President of Manhattan Community College and is working 14 hours a day as she has all her life. I am pleased with the appointment because I think she is very good, artful in devising plans and headed for success. Dr. Adriana Garcia de Aldridge has been appointed Acting President at Hostos. She is, as some of you know, from City College's Puerto Rican Studies department where she has done extremely well. A Search Committee has been established to fill the position on a permanent basis and that will be chaired by Dr. Maria Josepha Canino.

A vacancy that you may not know of is the Deanship of the Law School which developed over the summer. Seymour Boyers who has been serving on the Advisory Board to the Law School has been named chairman of that Search Committee and the faculty representatives who will serve on that committee are being selected in accordance with the governance plan of the Law School.

Professor Wedeen was present at the first unveiling of looking at the Budget Request and she will report as required.

In terms of relations with the Board of Education. We are adding another Middle College. I am somewhat apprehensive about our continuing to do this and I would be anxious to hear your views on the issue. It is prudent to do so since our students do come from there but I am apprehensive because it may come out of our hide. I think we should send the bill to the Board of Education but I fear it would be paid like most City bills are.

On initiatives - in this area we are dealing with something of an intractable problem. We are asking support for the Freshman Summer Program and we have gotten some money there but we have done it successfully and we are in a position to do more if we are given the funds.

We are also seeking a modest increase in staffing, especially in an area that has been poorly staffed for a decade - counseling.

In terms of legislative initiatives we are still hopeful to achieve the senior status for Medgar Evers that we have pressed. In addition, we are seeking an increase in the community college formula. We have asked for money for teacher education and we are seeking funds for a CUNY Press that we have wanted for some time and have found a way to do it inexpensively but creatively.

Finally, on the federal side, we don't know what Congress is going to do with the Higher Education Bill in the end since they no longer have Gramm-Rudman to do it for them. I think they will put off the issue of reducing the budget until after the election, however. CUNY is in the Higher Education Bill and has been rather successful - something many other institutions have been unable to do. There is a provision for Pell Grants for part-time students which is there because of the support of Mario Biaggi and Bill Ford.

On the Federal side we have also made some progress with child care and in persuading the Congress that child care shouldn't be perceived at that level - nor at the State level - as financial aid. If a student is on welfare and uses the child care facilities that is not financial aid. Without it students can't get degrees so the idea they have is that such students should take a certificate not a degree. It is our job to see to it that people are not penalized in that way.

The whole thing is especially sensitive because, if I am correct, we are the second largest recipient of Pell Grants in the country.

I am also pleased to tell you of an exchange program that is being established with the University of Puerto Rico. We have worked first through Frank Bonilla, director of the Puerto Rican Studies Institute and we have agreed on joint research projects with them. The projects will be largely on immigration with some additional areas also.

You should know too that on November 20 the New York Chapter of the Anti-Defamation will bestow its Human Rights Award on Chairman James Murphy of the Board of Trustees. I hope the University Faculty Senate will sell a lot of tickets to this event (Cries of "Tell them the price" from knowledgeable members). I think the choice is astute because they have a good person and the result is bound to be positive. After all, said the Chancellor in an aside, with a Jewish donor and an Irish recipient, how could the product be anything but good.

Thank you. I will be happy to answer any questions, of course.

The Chancellor then responded to the following questions and comments from the floor. 1) Professor White (Geography, Hunter) - "A number of my colleagues and myself are concerned with the lack of timeliness concerning the pay increases in the checks being distributed at the colleges. Why with two years lead time the increase should not have been included in the last month's checks is not clear. Can you tell us why this is so?"/ No, but I will get the answer. I don't imagine you are the only one but that there are several./ It is four weeks late, Professor White emphasized./ I will get the answer. Professor Lea (English, Lehman) - "Welcome back. I notice in the vanguard in endorsing the Governor's program on drug abuse. I wonder how this relates to the situation that exists on our campuses where students are openly smoking grass. Is this an empty gesture or are the administrators going to do something on the campuses. If we really want to do something we should."/ The Governor's concern lies with crack and other innovations not grass. The issues are separate. We were requested by the Governor's Office to respond with emphasis on crack. There is literature

to distribute, and the Presidents will designate a person on the campus to be the distributor. In situations like this a minor issue with respect to the function of the university but it is a social problem. There is no benefit to us but it is useful. I was at the Press Conference where it was announced. If I don't appear enthusiastic about it is because I believe that drugs are an expression of other fundamental problems in our society. We live in a society where people are so downtrodden that they turn their anger against themselves. 3) Professor Alsop (Biology, Queens) - "This is a housekeeping question. It concerns graduate programs and those who teach in them. Many of those in such programs would like it brought up that those people are remunerated in lines that now go to the President and Provost to distribute as they please so we who generate them don't see the results. Shouldn't those lines come back to those who generated them?"/ That is a local issue but there are two things to be said - 1) when City College was founded in 1847 one condition was that we never engage in graduate work. The question of graduate involvement did not exist until 1962 when Mina Rees's and Albert Bowker had the idea and thought to hide it. The argument might have been to take 500 lines, put them at a Graduate School and ask people on those lines to teach at different places, at different times. Instead, they set up what we have now. The exception is the MA in mathematics - mathematics was Mina Rees' field - the idea was to distribute except in math which is at the Graduate School. There was another problem - to show a relatively inexpensive program. Therefore, graduate dollars are a pot; time is bought below the market rate; a line when it goes back means less in a department. Sometimes the last is a good idea. Sometimes it is rational not to. I thought this should be a local issue and up to the institution to find out why. Professor Alsop further stated - "The last point is wrong, although much of what you said is right. If the money does not go to the Graduate School, those involved are going to say, "We are getting ripped off," and they won't come back. It is not just one president but many. A policy should come from your level and come down."/ I'll see what I can come up with." 4) Professor Baumrin (Philosophy, Graduate School) - "I want to return to Professor Lea's question turned slightly. We prepare and have most of the teachers in the City of New York in our colleges but there is a serious problem in what we are doing - our laxness with respect to moral education. Respect for law is something you carry with you in teaching the younger generation. I think our laxness has affected their attitudes. I have worked at this university for 20 years and I have seen a deterioration of students' respect for law - it is generic on campus. We let students into class who are high; our bathrooms reek. It comes from a lack of morality in leadership. The press informs me that the Governor has said that administrators should launch moral education in the schools. Our teachers are unprepared for that and I don't think we can prepare them. It is not the teacher education programs but the environment in our colleges." Professor Grossman (Education, City) rose to a point of personal privilege - "Not in teacher education do students come in high. I have never had such a student in my classes not would I permit it. Our students have to perform in schools, they can't be high or they will have no job. The State must certify them and it won't certify them without a course in preparation for moral leadership. I take great exception to the indictment of teacher education with respect to moral laxity in that department."/ Perhaps I am used to Philosophy. I found Professor Baumrin's comments confused - being high is not illegal. Are the press and the other media the fountainheads? The Secretary of Education has talked of morality - his brand. We haven't and I don't think we should promulgate our truths. I shall reserve for another time a speech on morality but maybe not. 5) Professor Jaffe (Science, Borough Manhattan) - "With respect to the remark on being in loco parentis, what are we doing with respect to the mentally handicapped students on our campuses? Has the administration given thought to doing something specially in light of some recent events?" - I was shocked this summer, and shocked afterwards to discover that the individual who had been three times in mental institutions at the University of Georgia could buy a handgun. President Schwerin's op-ed piece

in The Times made the point very effectively, I think. There have been many suggestions made, including having armed guards on campus. Such a policy would lead only to homicide and suicide. We have requested money for security and we have experts in that area working on plans and we will continue to do this. With respect to students who have had problems - since privacy is a right it is a delicate area since we want to make clear a separation of the neurotic from those who commit violence. Professor Jaffe further said - "If an individual enters a Chemistry lab, violence could easily result. There is a need to alert the instructor and those who need to know, e.g. the Dean to the problem. There is, of course, a question of the right of the individual but there is, as always, also the issue of the individual versus society. Usually society has prevailed but the problem does exist." / I agree. Professor Jaffe further stated - "I have a suggestion - with the academic excellence in this university, perhaps some Task Force or group can be established that can address this problem." 6) Professor Wasser (English, Staten Island) - "With respect to Task Forces - Three of us in the University Faculty Senate have served on the Task Force on Teacher Education but have been concerned that there is no final report. We know that there has been a change in staff and illness but it is troublesome since SUNY three years ago came out with a report. Even though that report was not exciting there have been important other reports such as the Carnegie Report and we haven't produced any. We produce more teachers than any university in the country, I think and we are in the rear. I am concerned as are my colleagues whether the Task Force's work was intended to be just discussion during the past two years. What priority has been established on when we may await that report? / I am aware of lacking a document but I am not persuaded that it will be coming forth with recommendations that won't be timely and didn't become outmoded. In the meantime we have moved ahead. We produce 60% of the school teachers in the City but a lower percentage of them - 1100 of 3 or 4000. That production rate is going to increase since there is going to be a shortage of teachers. To meet the coming crisis we have made various proposals - to take back students with a degree and train them for teaching. I don't think SUNY or the SED were premature and I have seen a precis of our Task Force's report and there is nothing there that seemed to go beyond what I have already seen. The answer to improving teachers, I think, is to increase salaries and increase the pool - but in our system teachers' wages languish. There is another issue and that is the environment and nature of the school itself. As a result, people don't stay. People here deal only with the problem that people come to you with. In other professions they think about other matters. If we redistributed the wealth that would make teaching more attractive and that is more difficult and intractable. 7) Professor Davidson (Data Processing, La Guardia) - "I have a question that relates to the Skills Assessment Tests adopted recently. You said that the Budget Request includes more funds for the Freshman program that trains students to pass the tests. And at the end of the program some do but the Articulation Committee found last year through its research that students failed and never retook the tests and they were not required to do so. Instead the tests were used as placement instruments. They were not an exit criteria and they finish two years at a two-year college where they usually are retested if they are going to a four-year college. And although they are not at their original level, they still fail and have to do them again at the junior level. Can't we do something about making the tests exit criteria? / There has to be a vehicle and the issues are for the committee or the result of the effort of the University Faculty Senate. When they came and told me I had to sign waivers because students couldn't pass and there were in the group students with 3.5 grade point averages who couldn't get through the tests it seemed ridiculous. 8) Professor Vines (Student Development, York) - "With respect to the emotionally disturbed - did you say there was money for student development? / A number of colleges made that request and we have put it in. 9) Professor Binder (History, Staten Island) - "I have a comment about the Task Force on Education report - we have a Task Force examining a problem called Teacher Education but that discipline

doesn't have a Ph.D. program. There are policy issues that should be addressed but the problem seems to be that other issues were not considered and the problem addressed solely to respond to the Board of Education's request for more teachers."/ I agree. Our relationship with the Board of Education is uneasy at best. There are inequalities, jealousies, etc. The Board of Ed is preoccupied with other problems - with custodians, busses, etc. that we don't have. We have no power or authority over this. Professor Binder further stated - "But we do have authority over the studies in our colleges."/ The traditional places to look for money are 'nt where they should be. Maybe we shouldn't have teacher education. 10) Professor Speidel (Geology, Queens) - "At another session last year I asked about a statement from you concerning the state of the University as you see it - overall or college by college and I wondered whether you would care to make it now."/ Yes and No. Professor Speidel further asked - "In November?"/ You haven't changed. 11) Professor Gluck (Education, Brooklyn)- "I and my colleagues labored on the Task Force on Teacher Education. What also took time was that other commission and reports were coming at us. We were looking at other things, e.g. the liberal arts and it was hard. The Vice Chancellor spent only ten minutes with us in the three years and there was a sense that we were not supported by 80th Street. We did look at the many constituencies we had to consider - graduate programs, for example, paraprofessionals, etc. The Commission worked hard. I wanted you to know./if you think I was disrespectful about the work of the Task Force, no. My disrespect is for the institutions mentioned by Professor Binder (i.e. Ivy League institutions). Our programs are not in the Holmes report because we have no Ph.D. program although the quality of our students is o.k. in teacher education, it is not in the liberal arts. I apologize for the lack of cooperation from 80th Street and I have asked when I will see the report. 12) Professor Donleavy (Special Services to Education, Lehman) - "A number of years ago you wrote an article in Daedalus and you were negative with respect to many aspects of teacher education, e.g. the lack of a liberal arts degree for teachers. We have seen a decline that requires top leadership. Could you give us some idea of your perceptions now?"/I think that education is looked down on by the elite, women are in the majority in the field and I think it is affected by affirmative action policy. I believe that it is not accidental but by design."/ I can't recall all I said in that article. But if I were asked to speak I would mean what I said not by accident but by design. 13) Professor Wedeen (Education, Brooklyn) - "If it was by design, teacher education was accidental."

Chair Wedeen thanked Chancellor Murphy for his report.

There was no further business so the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Jean Ellis
Executive Director