

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

November 18, 1986

Chair Wadeen (Education, Brooklyn) called the session to order at 6:30 p.m. sharp in Room 1700 at the Graduate School and University Center. Present were: Senators Alston, Amendolia, Ballabon, Bank, Barbanel, Baumrin, Baxter, Beheshti, Berkowitz, Binder, Bleyman, Bohigian, Boylan, Brower, Buianouckas, Canate, B. Cohen, Cooper, Cravzow, Davidson, Donleavy, Donoghue, Eisenberg, Galub, Gerber, Gluck, Greenbaum, Grossfield, Grossman, Henderson, Huang, Jaffe, King, Kirkland, Lea, Lytra, MacLennan, Matthews, McCall, Moyné, Muehlig, Muller, Otte, Parkhurst, Picken, Riley, Rodriguez, Rosen, Rovita, Schlesinger, Segal, Seguire, Sheridan, Sohmer, Speidel, Stern, Taylor, Thaxton, Timoni, Walter, Wasser, Wadeen, Weiss, White, Yousef, Zades, Zanateas, and Zarin; Alternate Senators Blanks, De Moose, B. Ginsberg, Hernandez, Ladimer, Linder, Rowan, and Sessions; Professors Boylan (Queens), Sohmer (City) and Thaxton (Medgar Evers), heads of campus faculty governance bodies. Senators Constantinides, Danziger, Depas, Gura, Hernandez-Miyares, Jiji, La Rubbio, Litke, McCullers, Plissner, Trefousse, and Wimmershoff-Caplan were excused. Chancellor Joseph S. Murphy and Dr. Ellis, Executive Director, also attended. President Edmond L. Volpe (Staten Island) was the guest speaker.

I. Approval of the Tentative Agenda: The chair made the following corrections before asking that the agenda be moved: 1) Item VII to be deleted; 2) Item X to become Item IX; 3) Item IX to become Item V at the request of the Chancellor. The chair then asked that the agenda be moved. The agenda was moved, seconded, and approved.

II. Approval of the Minutes of the 150th Plenary Session (October 21, 1986): The minutes were approved with the following additions and corrections: Senator Henderson's absence was excused. The minutes were then approved as distributed.

III. Communications from the Chair: The Chair said that she did not have communications to add to her written report for this session. She asked, however, that the members read Item 2 of the written report on Articulation with special attention.

IV. Reports of Faculty Members of Board of Trustees' Committees: The chair noted that these were available in writing with the materials being distributed at the session and that the faculty members of committees were available to respond to questions.

V. Chancellor's Report: Chancellor Murphy thanked the chair for placing his report at the beginning of the session and explained to the Senate that his request was based on his need to return to his residence as soon as possible in order to participate in an informal discussion with members of the Board who would be dining together there.

The Chancellor said that the University's sense is that there is a fertile environment in the State Budget Office this year for making a special effort on the University's Budget Request. The University is therefore making substantive requests in the asking budget and elsewhere 1) for equipment, since there are definite needs especially in the sciences; 2) for graduate fellowships and flexibility on graduate students and 3) for additional lines for the colleges. The Chancellor further reported that he would be having a discussion with the Board that evening to alert the members on the prospects for success not simply in terms of the document they already have but alert them to the administration's thoughts with respect to additional documents and to some signals already received from the Governor's office

that some dollars are available. We have been informed, although not by letter, and in a way that might give credence to those who believe that most things occur by conspiracy or in a meretricious way - a way that I will explain to you one day when both of us have more time - that we have acquired \$2 million in the name of Robert F. Wagner - not Senior or Junior but the one who served as Senator sometime in the 30's and for whom we do not seem to have a designation now - for an Urban Institute. We should get another \$ $\frac{1}{2}$ to 1 million so that the University should be able to do something on behalf of the City.

Chancellor Murphy reported also that in the past few weeks there have been a number of speeches around the country concerning worker education and there has been an interest shown in what the University is doing in that area. Also, tomorrow night, he continued, there will be a reception for faculty honors. It is a small effort but a genuine one on the part of the University to recognize those who have made a contribution during the past year through their receipt of honors and fellowships.

I will now be happy to respond to questions and comments.

1) Professor Lea (English, Lehman) - "Did you see in The New York Times recently the article critical of the failure of the Human Resources Agency to mount a Social Work Program in Child Abuse?" / CUNY has the largest Social Work School in the country, I believe, and supplies the largest number of social workers in the City. Thank you for calling my attention to this; we will look into it. 2) Professor Sohmer (Mathematics, City) - "The relationship between the Graduate School and the campus is uneasy, perhaps strained, especially because there is a malaise that makes the relationship delicate - perhaps inequitable. Would you comment on this?" / You started "strained", then progressed to "inequitable" - the meaning seems uncertain to me especially in relationship to my usual discussions with you. Professor Sohmer further said - "The campuses feel that the distribution of the budget for graduate study should be more equitable and should be made to various places to correlate with the effort put forward." / It could be related to lots of things. You seem to be tiptoeing with a civility I am not used to. You must have some idea of being screwed that we should discuss. 3) Professor Boylan (Biology, Queens)- "The Queens College Academic Senate adopted a resolution to change the way it selects delegates to Search Committees and sent it to Vice Chancellor Bloom in April 1985 and then in May 1985 to Vice Chancellor Rigney. Since that time the Queens Senate has been unable to get a telephone call returned by the Department of Legal Affairs. The Queens Senate passed another resolution in the spring 1986 but that it is clearly too soon to expect any kind of response to. I have kept copies of the letters we have sent and I have begun to keep notes of the calls we have made that have not been returned. Can you do anything about this?" / May I have the copies? / I have them here. 4) Professor Wasser - "With respect to Graduate Education what are the University's intentions? SUNY seems to be emphasizing aspects of interdisciplinary programs. Do we plan to go that way or to use any money to strengthen existing programs?" / On the average, yes. There are a number of disciplines within our Ph.D. offerings in the academic disciplines that have been developed. Now, there is a somewhat different situation with an interest in developing programs that are different and for which there is a market. I don't on principle object but I am kind of old fashioned. There are such programs; so we have to look at them but my personal inclination is to keep putting dollars into liberal arts programs. We have also been talking about a smaller Graduate School although ours is larger than the University Centers in certain respects. For a relatively modest investment we can bring it up to a higher level. Some of the programs have got more and more distinctive; some surprisingly are not up there. History is high but Economics is surprisingly low. There is a question as to what to do with large and distinguished things such as Physics that does not achieve the ap-

appropriate level. Perhaps, in that area, some of the evaluators didn't understand our set-up because we certainly have a distinguished faculty and although we may never be an MIT, certainly our programs should rate with the University of Massachusetts, if not, somewhat better. The question is where to put the dollars, where they will pay off. A lot depends on the equipment dollars and other possible things. 5) Professor Yousef - "I want to ask you to comment on something much simpler - I wondered whether you had anything to say about the event you attended at The College of Staten Island recently. I refer to the honoring of Yuri Orlov."/ President Volpe is to be admired and complimented for that event but his salary is not to be raised [the last was said jokingly to the President who had arrived for his address to the Senate]. It was the evening of the 7th Game of the World Series but that seemed to have no effect on the number of persons who were there - there was, in fact, an amazing turnout and the response of those present was a measure of the significance of the event. How he accomplished it was marvelous and it was a privilege to take part.

Chair Wedeen thanked the Chancellor.

V. Guest Speaker: President Edmond L. Volpe (College of Staten Island): The Chair welcomed President Volpe and presented him to the Senate. She said that he had been a member of the CUNY faculty since 1954, having come to the City College in 1954 and having joined the English faculty there. He was a member of that faculty for some 20 years, served as chairman of the Department from 1964-1974 and also was a member of the Senate from 1970 to 1974 and of the Executive Committee. He became acting President of Richmond College in 1974 and was named President the following year. In 1976, he presided over the merger of Richmond with Staten Island Community College to form the College of Staten Island - the federated institution that emerged from the initial merger. His principal goal now is the establishment of the consolidated campus at Willowbrook for which funding seems to be forthcoming. President Volpe is a Faulkner scholar and I know that his book on Faulkner has been continuously reprinted and has become a standard work. He will be leading a delegation of College Presidents to Italy in the summer of 1987 and led another such group to India last summer. It is a pleasure to welcome him back.

President Volpe thanked the chair and said he was very pleased to be at the Senate. He was returning after twelve years absence and, frankly, was somewhat surprised to be there and that he had been asked to come. In his day the Senate was too busy listening to each other to listen to any anyone else. The body had come a long way since those paleolithic days - in its trustee role and others. His relationship with the Senate, however, had been somewhat closer than one might think. He had arrived at Richmond College to find his Senate friend Max Weiner there too and, of course, Henry Wasser had preceded him as Dean. Professors Cooper and Yousef too - the former from Richmond and the latter, Staten Island Community College were familiar figures and he was compelled to pay attention to their presentations. His former role had a certain impact on his perceptiveness as an administrator. As a Senator he had been aware of the degree of chicanery and other comparable qualities that characterized administrators; now he was aware only of the openness of administrators - although he must admit, he had not abandoned his former paranoia entirely - it was a sense he now shared with other administrators but was directed vis-a-vis the University administration. In any event he hoped that he might qualify for the Chair's statements tonight.

President Volpe said that he would love to take this opportunity and talk to the membership at great length about the College of Staten Island, but would not. He would like instead to share with it his concern about a number of forces at work within

American higher education that posed a threat to the very character and mission of colleges and Universities. Before doing so, however, he would make one comment and say that it appeared to be popular these days to apply the word "comprehensive" to describe the CUNY colleges. He might claim to be the most comprehensive of Presidents because when he went to Richmond, he had to learn about various kinds of institutional structures and, it seemed to him, that the major savings that had been achieved was to obtain a "two-fer" since he was one president with two colleges. When he began his salary was \$42,000. He had to learn the educational philosophy of a community college; he now had the memory of an experimental upper college, and he was learning the philosophy of a four-year college in the making. Tonight, however, he wished to address the broader topic he had outlined. He firmly believed that the quality and character of the American University was intimately linked to the tradition and practice of shared governance, particularly in personnel procedures. It is impossible, for me, to imagine removing faculty from the processes of appointments and reappointments as well as promotions and maintaining any semblance of quality as an academic institution. There are some problems that pose a threat to that tradition and practice. Nothing that I say, I want to make clear, should be interpreted as anti-union. I was actively involved in the transition from the Legislative Conference into the PSC, and a strong supporter of the union movement throughout my university career. Further, I consider the PSC leadership to be very sensitive on academic issues and faculty prerogatives.

I am concerned, President Volpe said, about the anomalies that are being created by imposing concepts designed for industry, where there is a clear distinction between management and worker, on an institution in which it is the worker rather than management that exercises the primary responsibility for what are elsewhere managerial responsibilities, such as hiring and evaluating. The Yeshiva Decision recognizes the complexity of that issue and although it does not apply to public institutions its holding that the Yeshiva faculty was too involved in governance to warrant unionization poses a very serious issue. The difficulty we must face in the academic sector is the premise in collective bargaining that management holds all the goodies and the union must wrest for the worker better and better benefits, contract after contract, so that the result is contract determination of procedures that makes it seem that implementation is solely management's when that is not so. The responsibility rests with the chairman - people who are not paid for that and who may or may not be suited to that function. I am not against elected chairmen but there are problems. I have seen the will of the faculty thwarted by people who won that election because of lack of implementation of practices. I have studied hundreds of files that contain unsatisfactory evaluations and thus thwart the will of the faculty. I don't want to attack the principle but we can't destroy the concept of shared governance. The fear that I have is that we will slide into a personnel process analogous to the Board of Education.

Another area of shared responsibility is promotion. The recent Boyer report highlights the question that is the center of the promotion process. According to the report the stress on publication is not satisfactory to faculty who have to publish not because they believe in it but have to. Our Bylaws are the source of the problem. Full professors must have published extensively and must have a reputation on the national and international level that is the requirement. If it were literally applied it would be very limiting to faculty's real interests. The application of a single standard to diverse faculty is one anomaly in this area. The second anomaly is that the standards for the community college and the senior college are the same. The problem is not attributable here alone but also to the fact that we have disciplines as varied as we have and even within the same discipline the percentage devoted to research differs. The emphasis on publication reflects national standards according to the Boyer report. Boyer believes it is time to deal with it and my experience makes me agree with him. But we have to go at it slowly - imposing standards that differ from those at the heart of the process has an effect on workload and its relation-

ship to that of other workers. The big question has been introduced by Boyer and we have to deal with it.

If we are going to preserve American universities, President Volpe continued, we have to think about the problem of altering their character by the removal of a research component. It is now the crux of our workload and there is a need to relate it to a research commitment and production - the choice should exist on that basis. We need to put our own house in order before others do. If our traditions are not preserved we will evolve into a teaching university and be a different institution.

Chair Wedeen thanked President Volpe, stating, "You asked why you were invited back now you know. Please stay, if you will and respond to questions."

1) Professor Yousef - "You mentioned me a couple of times. You also mentioned your 12 year absence and I have to wonder whether you are again absent or want the PSC as your forum, but I think your reference to governance and the lack of a solution suggests you do not recognize the difference between a military command and a governmental structure. There is an exchange of information in the latter. I don't know what you are trying to call for. The industrial model has been avoided by the PSC leadership who have been careful about preserving the academic nature of the university. Do you have the solution to the questions you've raised?"/ No. I do believe the PSC is sensitive but there is a possibility we may move into the system I have discussed. 2) Professor Bohigian - "My comments are not very nice. It is clearly a very long time since you have been in a classroom and you also are not clear in your understanding of the Bylaws. If publishing is not emphasized enough it is the President who is the chief academic officer and he can make an independent decision under the Bylaws. You have made a number of erroneous statements; the regulations that are written in are there to deal with. The faculty has trouble with the HEO lines and the basis for appointments there. You can address those problems; the faculty can't. There is an issue of signing the documents. You suggest an increase in workload as possible. Twenty-eight years ago when I came to CUNY - relatively late my salary was \$3500. Unionization improved the salary structure and it has made a difference. If you relate it to the Executive Compensation Plan, it is not at all out-of-line!"/ I made the point at the outset that neither I nor what I said was anti-PSC. It has accomplished unionization intelligently, sensitively, with protection but there are anomalies. 3) Professor Lea - "I am saddened by the bias in your perceptions about CUNY. The University is seen to be a third rate place and the faculty a third rate bunch. It may be true but I do not believe that anyone takes the view that someone who does the job of merely writing is deemed worthy of promotion. The By-Laws set forth standards. I agree with you. 4) Professor Schlesinger (Nursing, Hunter) - "There is a valid point to be made concerning good teachers and standards apply them too. Doing research is not the only way to function in the University's setting and programs and there is an anomaly making it a requirement for everyone. The relationship to workload is not valid though!"/ President Volpe did not respond. 5) Professor Speidel (Geology, Queens) - "I heartily agree with what you have said and you may be the first speaker we have had in some time with whom I have agreed - really throughout the body of his remarks. The questions you raise need to be discussed. The fact that I agree with you, of course, means that you may be in trouble. Would you care to comment now on the new Staten Island campus' location?"/ Out in Siberia. For some time the college has been housed on two campuses. Richmond had a modern campus of three office buildings near the ferry which are now the St. George campus; the other site has 40 acres on which a student body far too large to be ac-

commodated had to be housed. It is moving to 216 acres at Willowbrook, a facility previously used for the mentally retarded. There is ample room for a consolidated campus there and it seems that funding to prepare it to house the college will be forthcoming. 6) Professor Gluck (Education, Brooklyn) - "With reference to the site of the new campus - remember that Brooklyn College stands on a former carnival ground and it hasn't been affected. What you said and believe about the PSC is not correct. The procedures that you describe are not solely the union's. They have been hammered out through negotiation of contracts between the bargaining agent and the University. The regulations that you cite are not substantive but technical. With respect to adherence you the president have the authority. The contract is subject to interpretation; it is not a union-presented document but is hammered out. You should sit down with the PSC and discuss the issue there."/ I will be happy to.

7) Professor Greenbaum (History, Queensborough) - "The story of shared governance has become a myth in recent years. More worrisome is the worry of administrators who move from institution to institution instead of back and forth between administration and teaching and thus are becoming a permanent class."/ I don't consider myself part of a permanent class. 8) Professor Thaxton (Health Sciences, Medgar Evers) - "Does your discussion relate to Staten Island and anomalies in governance there?"/ It is a kind of discussion, not something taking place. Grievances are often based on personal judgment but I don't know what to substitute. There is the issue of the use of student evaluations that many faculty don't like but again I don't know what to substitute. 9) Professor Donleavy (Special Services to Education, Lehman) - "Perhaps you could help us by introducing a reexamination of the Bylaws and personnel practices with respect to women. Women find their interests different - their approach different and many of us would like those questions looked at."/ Something can be done if we are not playing with an impression. 10) Professor Jaffe (Science, Borough Manhattan) - "I differ with you about student evaluations. I think they are very important but, if you agree, shouldn't senior administrators have faculty input as an important factor in their evaluation?"/ I think faculty do have input. 11) Professor Muller (Economics, Graduate School) - "I rise to a point of personal privilege. There are different perceptions about women and the scientific method. Only one was established by my colleague. Many, many women are practitioners of the scientific method with all its controlled trials, ethnography, etc." 12) Professor Cooper (History, Staten Island) - "One's perception of problems changes depending on the place from which one looks at them. In thinking about the future what troubles me most is the professional class of administrators and the number of part-time faculty. The combination of these seems more of a danger in the future if they converge than any one factor. I wonder if faculty are going to be around by the year 2000. The speech you gave is different from the one I had written."/ I could write many speeches but I am not aware of this professional class of administrators to which you refer - at least not at CUNY. 13) Professor Ballabon (Economics, Baruch) - "When you discuss conditions of work, promotion criteria and the like that is one thing. If you had children choosing a career today and the choice was between CUNY, law school, medical, and preparation for joining a Wall Street firm, what advice would you give them?"/ That's easy - teaching. I have one child in Public Health, one in a Ph.D. program and one law school. I don't think the profession is deteriorating but there are difficulties. 14) Professor Binder (History, Staten Island) - With reference to your remarks tonight. I agree with some, not with others. There is the issue of quality. As a chair at City College I remember the quality and the Chancellor's report was more ours than . I get the impression now that CUNY's quality is reserved to the Graduate Center and rarely shared with the colleges or associated with them. They are mentioned in connection with remediation but not by another quality. The full time lines that come now are given to the Graduate Center. That is not what used to be. Then they came to the campuses."/ [No response] 15) Professor Bohigian - "I will take one more stab. The point concerning minor violations is that there is a need to demonstrate the reason for that whereas the major violation is forgiven, It has been true for ten years. If hiring were well done initially, everyone would

be retained. If in the University one were to eliminate one constituency - faculty, administration, staff and students - which would you eliminate?"/ I refuse to answer. I disagree completely with your point about hiring. It is very difficult to know how successful you will be at the beginning. You need to have the experience of working with the person and of having the person work in the CUNY setting. 16) Professor Yousef - "I thank my friends for trying to salvage something this evening. I try to steer clear of the Union issue here but tonight I need to. Ours was the first faculty union in the United States and has been in existence some 16 years. So instead of anomalies it shows the growth of the University under unionization - perhaps due to the contracts."/ I respect what you say and I am not against the PSC. I don't think they have done wrong things. I am only pointing out problems that exist.

VII. Proposed Resolution on the Chancellor's Attendance at University Faculty Senate

Plenary Sessions and at its Executive Committee Meetings:The Chair said the item was suspended at the previous meeting. Professor Lea, introducer of the resolution, spoke and asked that the the motion be withdrawn in the hopes that the Chancellor, who had again walked into the session at the right moment had learned that his appearance is important and required. The mover and the seconder agreed to withdraw the motion since Professor Lea, after an anecdotal recital referring to the Chancellor's handling of the situation, had asked them to do so. The Secretary was asked that the Minutes reflect the motion was withdrawn and that the Chancellor had met the Plenary this evening and the Executive Committee on October 28.

-VIII. Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Structures and Procedure: The chair explained that a revised and therefore incorrect report had been mailed to the membership and that copies of the correct report were available this evening. She suggested that anyone who did not yet have one obtain one now. This was done. She then introduced Professor Baumrin, chairman of the Committee.

Professor Baumrin read the charge to the Committee, as recorded on the minutes of the One Hundred and Forty-Ninth Plenary Session (September 23, 1986). He then asked that the report be considered seriatim and the body agreed. Professor Baumrin emphasized that the Committee had no desire to press the report through the Senate but had requested that the Senate be given the opportunity to consider the report submitted as well as the thinking reflected in the report circulated prior to the meeting.

Professor Baumrin then presented the first part of the Report which dealt with the Senate's minutes. It was agreed with little discussion to retain the current format of the minutes and to preserve the present timetable of distribution. There was considerable debate, however, on the proposal that members be permitted to modify their comments as recorded prior to the distribution of the document. A number of views were expressed and a number of ways of achieving the goal - to permit a speaker who realized he or she had misstated fact to clarify the record or to be certain that the minutes which are not a stenographic transcript not misstate what a speaker has said. After considerable debate it was agreed that within the timeframe indicated and under the conditions noted, a member might clarify his/her statements with the agreement of the Executive Director. If the Executive Director could not accept the clarification there could be consultation with the members of the Executive Committee to make a decision on the issue and unless they agreed, the statement would remain as recorded until the following Plenary Session when the body considered the resolution on approval of the minutes of the previous session.

8.

Sections 2,3, and 4 were tabled, section 2 until the January meeting; sections 3 and 4 to time indefinite.

A motion to adjourn then brought the session to a close.

Respectfully submitted,

Jean Ellis, Executive Director