

MINUTES OF THE ONE HUNDRED AND NINETY-SIXTH PLENARY SESSION OF
THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

December 10, 1991

Chair Picken called the session to order at 7:05 p.m. in room 1700A of The Graduate School and University Center. Present were Senators: Allaire, Alsop, Anderson, Barbanel, Baum, Baumrin, Baxter, Bleyman, Buianouckas, Bushler, Cañate, Caudle, Cooper, Danziger, Davidson, Davis E., Davis R., Donnangelo, Donoghue, Edwards, Feinerman, Fitzgerald, Galub, Gerber, Greenbaum, Grossman, Gura, Jacobson, Jaffe, Kaplowitz, Koshi, Lidov, MacLennan, Magid, Matthews, McCall, Meier, Moore, O'Reilly, Otte, Picken, Plissner, Reid, Reynolds (ex-officio), Rodriguez, Selvadurai, Shaffer, Sherrill, Sohmer, Spiedel, Svitak, Tenenbaum, Trefousse, Vasillov, Yousef, Zades, and Alternate Senators: Brady, Hounion, Italia, Lowy, Schwartz, Taylor, Trembinska, and Whealey. Professor Brenner, Brugnola, Frisz, Krashinsky, Simor, Wedeen, Westrem, and Zarin were excused. Heads of Faculty Governance Bodies: Chabora (Graduate School), Gura (Brooklyn), Kaplowitz (John Jay), Vanfelix (BMCC), and Weiss (QCC) attended. Professor Henry Wasser, President of the CUNY Academy attended. Acting University Dean Spatt accompanied the Chancellor. Senate Executive Director Hoffacker and Administrative Assistant Pasela also attended.

I. Adoption of the Agenda: The agenda was moved and seconded. Professor Speidel (Geology, Queens) made a motion to modify the agenda to include a memorial for Professor Edward Schreiber (Geology, Queens) as item IIa. Professor Sohmer (Mathematics, City) requested that the proposed resolution on actions of the Board of Trustees be removed as a listed item of New Business.

The agenda, as modified, was adopted.

II. Acceptance of the Minutes of the 194th Plenary Session (October 29, 1991): Professor Jaffe (Science, BMCC) offered the following prepared expansion of his comments reported on p.25: "Marvin Jaffe, speaking for the motion. I'd like to address something that was mentioned in the discussion of the motion. I will ask the parliamentarian to let me know if I get out of order. I find it very distressing that any member of the Senate, brought something, or would like to have a topic discussed at a plenary, and de facto is prevented or obstructed from, in any manner, from bringing that before this group. I believe that was mentioned by one or two members of the Executive Committee and I find that abhorrent. Now to the motion, I have seen the video tape in its entirety. I know that it has been broadcast on several networks. I am surprised that people who are concerned with original sources have not, since July, taken the opportunity to address this type of matter. Also, I would like to point out one of the previous speakers, one of the first gentlemen to speak, mentioned inequality of treatment between Professor Jeffries and Professor Levin, in terms of what appeared to be equally offensive speech,

or equally offensive pronouncements. I wish to point out that action was taken by City College, it is my understanding that Professor Levin was removed from teaching his freshman classes, at one point, for a semester or one year and that other actions were taken against Professor Levin. To my knowledge, no such action was taken against Professor Jeffries by the City College Administration. So there appears to have been inequality of treatment by the administration of City College, and I assume backed up by 80th Street. In terms of offensive speech, and in terms of academic freedom, I think we, of course, have to be a bit careful, about our own academic freedoms, our own right to free speech which is why I find abhorrent, preventing anybody from bringing a resolution before the plenary. I know the minutes are not verbatim, but I request strongly that my following statements be taken in the minutes verbatim, so they not be misconstrued or not editorialized. I request the Chair take them verbatim, if that's O.K. I believe that if anybody used the following language of let's get Hitler to kill the kikes; let's lynch the niggers; let's get rid of the spics; down with the chinks; and some other adjectives that I can't think about ethnic groups that are in this room including myself, I think we would, some of us, myself included -- or some disparaging remark I can't think of about women as a minority -- I think all of us would get a chill down our spine. Because we all come from backgrounds, everyone in this room with probably maybe only one exception, come from some sort of minority backgrounds. We either come from the Caribbean, we either come from the Middle East, Arab, Israeli countries. We all come from groups that have been attacked and we all to some degree are minorities; whether socio-economic or racial or religious."

"Just as the words that I requested be taken in context, so that they not be misconstrued, would be found offensive by, I assume, everybody in this room -- and if I preached that in my chemistry class, I think that I should have a problem. I think that if I went out and represented my college, Borough of Manhattan Community College of the City University of New York, which I have on occasions, and made pronouncements, where I then reflect BMCC -- or I then reflect, as I was a member of the Executive Committee of the University Faculty Senate, on some occasions, and if I made these remarks, then these remarks reflect not only on me, but on the University Faculty Senate and the University. And I think that is the point we have to be careful of. Everybody agrees that there is free speech, aside from academic freedom. You have a right to free speech but not to falsely cry fire in a crowded theater. I think it was John Locke who said I have a right to swing my fist but not when it ends in your jaw. So I think we have to put these things in balance and therefore I urge that you vote for the resolution."

The Minutes, as amended, were accepted.

IIa. Memorial Resolution for Professor Edward Schreiber: Professor Speidel presented a memorial statement for Professor Schreiber.

Edward Schreiber, Professor of Geology at Queens College and at the Graduate School, was killed in an automobile accident on November 11, 1991. Ed was a sometime member of this body and of the UFS Committee on Research. More recently, he served a three-year term on both the University Committee on

Research and on the Faculty Advisory Council to the Research Foundation. He was a member of the Select Committee on Bylaw Revision for the PSC-CUNY Research Award Program.

Ed was the author or co-author of over 50 articles and one book, "Elastic Constants and Their Measurements" in geophysics. That his reputation was truly international was underscored by the e-mail, fax and phone messages of shock and sorrow that came into the department from around the world. His activities touched many of you. As a member of a small, select group, he was responsible for the "lunar touchstone" exhibit at the Air and Space Museum as well as the lunar exhibit at the Museum of Natural History in Washington.

Whatever he did, Ed Schreiber did with thoughtfulness and style. He was a valued colleague and will be missed.

Chair Picken asked the members of the Senate to observe a moment of silence.

III. Reports:

a. Chair: As customary, I am submitting in written form a description of the occasions since the October plenary on which I and other officers have represented the Senate.

Members of the Senate who were able to attend our annual dinner meeting on November 19 know that it was a memorable event, perhaps the best Senate dinner meeting in memory. Not only was the food delicious and we were honored by the presence of a number of distinguished guests -- including the President of the SUNY University Faculty Senate, Professor James R. Chen of the State College at Geneseo -- but we were treated to an eloquent discussion of the Asian American presence in City University by Mr. John Kuo Wei Tchen, Director of the Asian/American Center at Queens and recipient of the 1991 Charles S. Frankel Prize of the National Endowment for the Humanities. While those who were not able to attend may have missed a terrific meal and congenial company, they need not miss Mr. Tchen's speech which we shall reproduce and distribute to Senate members. Contained in it are a number of policy recommendations which Senate committees may well wish to consider.

You will note from the written reports on the November meetings of the Board Committees on Academic Policy, Program and Research and on Faculty, Staff and Administration that the submission to the Board of an extensive revision of the governance plan and a reorganization of the faculty at Medgar Evers by President Edison O. Jackson has raised numerous concerns among the faculty of that institution. The faculty, through its governance organization chaired by Professor Leon Johnson, and through the PSC Chapter chaired by Professor Joyce Siler, has moved effectively to make their views known to the Board of Trustees. In addition, they have recently presented President Jackson with a petition signed by a majority of full-time members of the faculty, asking for a reconsideration of his proposals.

As of now, no action by the full University Faculty Senate has been called for. The officers will continue to monitor the situation and continue to work with the Medgar Evers Faculty Organization and PSC Chapter in hopes of bringing about a resolution which is satisfactory to the faculty of the college. We shall keep you informed.

I now turn to the November 23 meeting of the Board of Trustees. Those in attendance were in something of a state of shock since word of the Governor's proposal to cut the senior college operating budget by \$13.2M between now and April 1 had been received just hours before the meeting. Although the matter was only reported by the Chancellor and not extensively discussed, it was obviously on everyone's mind. The Student Trustee was once again absent, although a number of matters which should have been of concern to the University Student Senate were considered.

The major item of interest was the presentation of an Interim Report on the College Preparatory Initiative (CPI) by the Chancellor, a report prepared by her Advisory Committee on School System Collaboration. The report deals mainly with policy issues surrounding the CPI and does not substantively alter the academic recommendations of the Senate Advisory Committee and the Joint CUNY Faculty/Public School Conferences. Vice Chancellor Joyce F. Brown, chair of the Chancellor's Committee, described in detail the work of her group, its recommendations and how they were arrived at. I should like at this point to pay special tribute to the Senate's representatives on that Committee, Professor Joseph G. Riley (Chemistry, Bronx) and Professor Ann Raimes (English, Hunter). They have spent many long hours trying to solve a host of very difficult problems, and they have represented us, and the variety of viewpoints the Senate holds, extremely well. After Dr. Brown finished her presentation, I described briefly the work of the University Faculty Senate's Advisory Committee last spring.

The Chancellor laid stress on the fact that this is an interim report, subject to revision and change before a final recommendation on the CPI is made to the Board at its March or April meeting. She announced that there would be consultations about CPI with faculty and other interested parties on every campus before a final recommendation is made so, that there may be the broadest possible expression of opinion. I will return to the subject of these consultations in just a minute.

In the portion of the Board meeting devoted to action items, the Trustees approved, in addition to routine financial matters, the establishment of an A.S. degree program in computer science, an A.A.S. program in microcomputer business systems and a B.S. degree in human services, all at NYCTC.

In the Executive Session which followed the regular Board meeting, Mr. Richard F. Rothbard, a colleague well known to this body, was appointed Vice Chancellor for Budget, Finance and Computing following an extensive national search. Mr. Rothbard had been serving in an acting capacity for the past year and a half. The Senate's representative on the search committee was Professor Sohmer.

To return to the subject of the campus consultations on the CPI: these are being organized by the Office of Urban Affairs, under the supervision of Dean Ronald Berkman, and coordinated on each campus by the Provost in collaboration with the local campus governance organization. You will recall that at the October Plenary, the Chancellor asked us for our help in scheduling these events, and I and the Senate staff have endeavored to respond. It is anticipated that these consultations will take a wide variety of forms, dependant on the nature of the campus and the desires of the campus community. Those of you representing Lehman know that a meeting was already held on your campus last week -- it was the first of the series - - and it took the form of a general faculty meeting at which Dean Berkman made a presentation of progress on the Initiative and solicited the views of those in attendance. At future consultations, it is expected that representatives of the high schools and CUNY faculty who have worked on the Initiative will also be present to describe their roles in the evolution of the proposal.

I think it is in everyone's interest, whatever format these campus meetings take and whether only faculty are involved or students and administrators also participate, that the discussions be as substantive and as substantial as possible. The Chancellor is interested in hearing the recommendations of each of the campuses on the CPI before she makes a final recommendation to the Board, and a consultation of this nature on an academic policy matter is unprecedented in the history of the University.

I shall be writing soon, on behalf of the Executive Committee, to each of the local governance leaders to offer our assistance in the process and to suggest ways in which the faculty's voice can be effectively heard. I am particularly concerned that there should be a follow up to the meetings with Dean Berkman and that the faculty's recommendations should be reported to the Office of Urban Affairs and ultimately to the Chancellor. All of this will have to be organized and implemented in an expeditious fashion, since effectively there will only be the month of February and the beginning of March in which to work. I am also concerned that I should receive copies of the reports which local faculty governance organizations may make. It is my intention that the questions, comments and recommendations of colleagues throughout the University should inform the report I will offer to the Trustees when the CPI comes to the Board for action.

I will remind Senators that the Forum on the CPI, which is being prepared by the Student Affairs Committee and which was originally scheduled for this meeting, will be held in conjunction with the February Plenary.

The Chancellor agreed at the October Plenary to provide every member of UFS with a copy of the 1992-93 Budget Request. The printing of this document in its final form has not as yet been completed. We will mail it to you as soon as it is available.

You have all undoubtedly received a letter from Ms. Miriam Soffer, lecturer in the department of classical and oriental languages at Queens, containing allegations against the college's administration and her department chair. In accordance with our normal procedures, this matter has been referred to the Academic Freedom Committee for disposition.

As previously announced, the Senate will hold a University-wide conference on the subject of graduate education throughout the University on Friday, March 6. The conference, entitled "Graduate Studies: Problems and Opportunities," is being coordinated by the Graduate Affairs Committee, chaired by Professor Danziger (English, Hunter). Plans are well advanced and preliminary invitations will be sent before the holidays. As with recent Senate conferences, each department chair in the University will be asked to designate a representative to attend. In addition, all members of the University Faculty Senate are encouraged to participate, and we ask only that you register in a timely fashion. President Frances Degen Horowitz of the Graduate School and University Center has agreed to be the keynote speaker. The conference will be free of charge for registered participants.

b. Chancellor: It is good to see you on this warm, spring-like evening. We have some really very very wonderful news. Monday morning I got up, got The New York Times, and there was the list of the Rhodes Scholars and I noticed one at Brooklyn. So that was wonderful. We have been in contact with Lisette Nieves and everyone is very proud of her. Today I got a call and Brooklyn has a Marshall Scholar, a young woman named Toba Friedman. So I can hardly wait for tomorrow to find out what is happening next to our students and it is really a wonderful achievement for both of these very very fine young women, both of whom hope to study at Oxford. They have done us proud.

I want to talk just a little bit about our budget status and then I'll be glad to respond to any questions and to talk about any other issues that the University may have in front of it. The state budget is really kind of mired down. The assembly is due back in tomorrow and we hope we will know more after they have been there for a while. The things you see in the newspaper about Speaker Miller and Senate Majority Leader Marino and Governor Cuomo trying to come together on a multi-year agreement are all true. What is interesting about all of this -- we are now almost to the middle of the December, and early in November when I was making trips to Albany, various Department of Budget (DOB) staff people were saying that they were sure there would have to be an agreement soon because, as the year wore on, it would become almost impossible to do any cuts in a budget that ends April 1st. Basically now this budget only has four more months to run, so to try to eke savings out of a budget when you're already eight months through the year is not a very fruitful enterprise. The DOB people have all turned out to be incorrect. This is now a month later, there has been no agreement on either a multi-year budget or the cuts for this year, so the thing still remains in a kind of stasis. Everything, of course, hinges on two events: will Governor Cuomo run, and will Speaker Miller be able to continue as Speaker of the Assembly? I will let the Plenary decide what they wish the outcome of both of those events to be. I do have to say that Speaker Miller is a devoted friend of the University and I am very eager that he continue in his role. I think our fate whether the governor chooses to run or stays as governor will be similar. So I think that issue, although of interest to us, is probably not going to play a pivotal role in our budget. We have had one small breakthrough that will interest you, and I don't have all the numbers in my head, but we were able to get agreement from DOB to do some of the very important renovations and other projects on our campuses that had been held up. So Deputy Chancellor Mucciolo and Senior Vice

Chancellor Farley are moving ahead with some of the renovation and major maintenance projects that had been held up for a while.

At the city level things have been far more complicated. The city is dealing with the threatened takeover by the Control Board and also with its earnest desire to get access to MAC money. They recommended a mid-year cut for the community colleges of \$5.6M. We were, to put it mildly, just absolutely outraged and distraught. The community college budget, over a two-year period, has been cut from \$122M, the city's contribution, to \$76M; the city's contribution has been cut that much. So to recommend a mid-year cut of an additional \$5.6M translated for us into cutting teaching and cutting sections, which would have impaired the process for the next 10,000 admissions. To compound it, applications to the community colleges are running 20% ahead of last year. We believe that that has happened because we have had to cut so many sections already in the community colleges and because the senior colleges have had to control enrollments so much; we have developed a large backlog of admissions to the community colleges. Students who could not get in last fall or perhaps not even last winter are trying very hard to come to us now. As you know, we indicated to the city very accurately what the results of this cut would be. It received quite a bit of newspaper coverage. And at this point we are in intense negotiations with the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) over that \$5.6M. It is beginning to look quite promising -- that we will not have to surrender up all of that money. I can't say yet if we will have to surrender up a part of it, but they are being much more supportive.

Also on the city level; I went by myself back to City Hall on Saturday. The city had given all city agencies and CUNY targets for cuts for the years ahead in order to appeal for MAC money and in order to stave off the Control Board. The cuts were to be divided into two categories. First of all, those that we could make without needing legislative permission and without needing union permission. Then the second category would be cuts that we could make if we had legislative acquiescence or if we had union permission. Virtually every city agency, us included, had not complied with the recommendation to begin with. You saw much of this in the newspapers. So everyone was summoned back in and asked to do it all over again. We met that deadline on Monday night. We have indicated, though, very very clearly to Budget Director Michael and to various people, the mayor and others, that any further cuts for the community colleges will engender diminished enrollments. There is no other alternative for us and we are making the point clearly and as concisely as we can. In addition, we are ratcheting the issue up further by pointing out that as the city moves ahead through a very staunch attrition process -- the plan in the city is that from here on out for every five people that retire, quit, or go away from the workforce, they will only replace one, a permanent attrition rate of 80% for people that move out of the workforce over the next two to three years -- we would be the major route for retraining people to move them back into the workforce and we are creating a plan on that issue as well. That is the budget up to date. As you can see much of it is ongoing and very current.

I should indicate that since I last met with you, the Board of Trustees at its November meeting endorsed very warmly and fulsomely, with appreciation to the Faculty Senate, the initial

steps that have been taken on the CPI. We are now in a process of consulting on each of the campuses with good help from Dr. Picken and the Faculty Senate. I'm pleased that that is going so well and will continue to talk with you about that.

Professor Sherrill (Political Science, Hunter) -- "This is a non-budgetary question. As you probably know we are required to sign an oath of allegiance. We solemnly swear or affirm that we will support the Constitution of the United States and so on."/Professor Picken -- "...and the Constitution of the State of New York. That's correct."/ Does anybody know what is in the Constitution of the State of New York?/Professor Picken -- "It is many volumes." Professor Sherrill -- "It is one of the longest state constitutions around. One part of my question has to do with the appropriateness of such a requirement. We are also required to fill out a multiple position reporting form in which, among other things, we are required to disclose our voluntary activities. The Constitution says that no law shall be passed restricting freedom of speech, press, assembly, right to petition, and what has become accepted in American Constitutional law, for at least the 20th century, as the protection of the right of association in voluntary causes. I do not see how it is possible for us to keep our word on the loyalty oath that we are required to sign and simultaneously fulfill the Board's mandate on the multiple position report. Further, I would suggest that every member of the staff who requires that we fill out this multiple position form as it now stands is violating their oath to support and defend the Constitution. I was wondering whether your office has any plans on reconciling these contradictory demands or perhaps doing away with them both, which I would strongly recommend."/ I think I probably signed that same oath. I can remember signing it and being surprised because a lot of states threw out the loyalty oath requirement for faculty. In any event, on the multiple position issue, we have had several conversations on that with Vice Chancellor Bloom and Professor Polishook. That has been an issue that has interested them. Apparently, if I understand it correctly and perhaps Professor Picken can help me, the multiple position form or one similar to it is one that several campuses have been cheerfully signing over the years. I think Queens is such a campus. Is that right? Professor Picken -- "Yes. The entry about voluntary organizations however is new this year."/But there are certain campuses that have had a form. Then what happened was that the state passed all these various ethics laws a year or two ago. That really created a situation where everybody in CUNY has to fill out a multiple position form, so the job in faculty and staff relations was to try to take existing multiple position forms on several campuses, reconcile them with the demands of the state ethics law, and create a form that everybody would fill out that would deal with all of these issues. There has been such a committee. A committee has been formed to look at this issue and to try to make the form as simple and easy as possible. Apparently, from the state ethics law situation, the voluntary commitments are of interest. Now if you run a girl scout troop, that is not of interest. If, however, a voluntary commitment has a material impact on your employment as a faculty member, that is of interest -- if you were pastor of the largest church in Manhattan and you call that voluntary, that would have an impact on your role as a faculty member. That is the way Vice Chancellor Bloom has explained it to me. Professor Sherrill -- "The government certainly has no right to inquire about religious beliefs or practices."/That is not what I am saying at all. I'm saying if you, on a voluntary basis, took on something that was basically a full-time job, the state has, in the ethics law, a material interest. Professor Sherrill -- "I don't

understand how voluntary activity can be a full-time job."/An awful lot of people have done it that are faculty. I have two more things to say. I remember years ago when I was a University of Illinois faculty member, the State of Illinois had some of the stiffest requirements -- I suppose trying to deal with the crookedness in Chicago government which was enormous, and never addressed by any of this. But we used to all compete on the voluntary thing. We would laugh and giggle about all the things we would put in. We would put in if we were teaching a Sunday school class, if we had a girl scout troop, if we had taken in somebody's stray cat. We would all compete to put in the biggest list of voluntary stuff on our forms and add extra paper. The final thing I would say is if this issue continues to be of concern, although I would submit that it is really more in the purview of the union, I would be delighted to ask Vice Chancellor Bloom to come down and discuss it fully with you because he knows all the ins and outs. Professor Sherrill -- "Those of us who answered that question by saying, effectively, that you have no right to ask us that question have been notified that we are placing ourselves in jeopardy for disciplinary procedures."/I think under the ethics law that is actually true. So why don't you ask Vice Chancellor Bloom to explain that. Professor Picken -- "The Executive Committee will pursue the matter with Vice Chancellor Bloom and we will invite him as we have in the past to address the Senate on the matter at a convenient time."

Professor Lundeen (Nursing, City) -- "This is a question about articulation. In October, in response to our Committee on Undergraduate Curriculum, you mentioned that you might develop a task force. What is the status of this?"/Dean Spatt -- "The charge is almost finished at this moment. For procedural reasons the charge is being written before the group is actually being identified. We are deciding what they are going to do and then we are going to create the group. We have a working team at 80th Street doing the charge and I would say maybe within the next month or so we will go ahead. For Academic Affairs it is Dr. Susan Cole and for Institutional Research it is Dean James Murtha."/We have started the staff process by asking them to draft up a page or two of the articulation concerns. Then we will be talking with Dr. Picken and bring this more fully fleshed out in front of the Senate and start to move ahead on it. We have not forgotten. Professor Lundeen -- "We spend a lot of time talking about students who are having difficulty and attracting students -- admissions problems -- but this is an issue that relates to retention and rewarding and supporting the students who are successful."/Absolutely. In fact, with the new presidents, I try to spend a lot of time with them on it. I had working lunch today with President Davis from York. She is very very concerned about it; already it has come in front of her that a lot of students coming into York are having trouble with acceptance of their prior course records. She is very sensitive to it. She is very eager that we move on it. I am very mindful of it. Thank you.

Professor Baumrin (Philosophy, Graduate School) -- "Two comments and a question. Comment one; it seems to me that on the conflict of interest forms that were just discussed, they have changed multiple position to something else because of the statute. I didn't notice, I could be wrong about this, any either consultation with faculty of the relevant sort or wide consultation in the drawing up of the form, but just a rush to accommodate whatever. I was annoyed by it. I think it's insulting on the part of the those who elicit it and of course by the legislature in getting into our personal affairs. But now it has become just a horrible thing. What I'm

concerned about is that faculty, relevant faculty, ought to be involved or else we are going to have University-wide distaste for it which is going to be blamed on the central office not on the legislature." /I think it has already been blamed on the central office. Professor Baumrin -- "And I think the blame in part belongs to somebody who would say as an explanatory example, well suppose you were the pastor of the largest blah blah -- that is the typical dean's horror story." /Apparently that is a true example. Professor Baumrin -- "It may be a true example, but it is not realistic for us who do lots of different things." /No I mean it is a true example amongst our faculty. Professor Baumrin -- "I understand that. But there are other things we do besides being pastors." /Professor Baumrin, it is my understanding, but once again I think the Executive Committee needs to talk with Vice Chancellor Bloom, that this was considered in the purview of the union. There were union representatives on the committee that drew up this form and now that there have been objections to the form the committee is taking another look at it. I can understand people's concern, especially since it is new and people don't know what it is aimed at. And frankly, in today's climate, with some of the things that are happening nationwide, I'd think I'd be even more sensitive to it than I used to be. So I appreciate the concern, but I have to say until you can get to Vice Chancellor Bloom, the current status of it I think has advanced more than you and I are aware of. Professor Baumrin -- "My second comment is that two years ago Lehman had a Marshall Fellow who went on to study at Cambridge. The University made very little of it and so did The New York Times. I hope in the case of these wonderful youngsters from Brooklyn that a lot will be made at Brooklyn and a lot made of them and their achievements and that the Marshall not be shuffled under the Rhodes just because that is the way our newspapers handle these things." /I agree with you. The minute we got the call, Vice President Gold from Brooklyn called me this afternoon to tell me about the Marshall, I lit out on foot looking for Jay Hershenson to get to The New York Times which was planning to run a story on the Rhodes Scholar. We were getting the Marshall Scholar into that story, or least I believe we had, when something happened in the Supreme Court today. There was a big decision on the Son of Sam case. In any event, The New York Times got space taken up. They called us though because they knew we were concerned. Our story will not run tomorrow, but it will run. Professor Baumrin -- "My question is when you said legislative action -- having to do with budget diminution -- are you talking about something like amending the tenure regulations? That was a very opaque comment as far as I'm concerned." /I hadn't even had a thought about tenure. Professor Baumrin -- "You didn't say anything about it. What I'm asking you is when you need legislative response in order to accommodate budget reductions, what legislative response are you talking about?" /For example, there is a rule that the city contribution to the community colleges has to be at least 27 percent of the total budget. If the city drops its funding anymore they will be below 27 percent and we are trying to hammer home that they must meet their agreement. Their view, of course, is that maybe they can get legislative relief and not meet that. That is the kind of mandate, I was referring to.

Professor Grossman (Elementary Education, City) asked if the 80% attrition figure that the Chancellor mentioned applied to CUNY. The Chancellor responded that the University was not subject to this policy and again highlighted the fact that the University can serve as a retraining vehicle for those who are displaced from city jobs. Professor Baum (English, York) indicated her frustration at having written five times to the Office of Urban Affairs regarding

the CPI. The Chancellor asked for specific information, apologized for the lack of response, and promised to follow-up with the Office of Urban Affairs. **Professor Jaffe** commented, regarding the multiple position form, that guidelines on the number of hours permitted and the types of activities that are not significant would be helpful.

The Chancellor wished Senators good final weeks, wonderful holidays, and offered her appreciation for the faculty's patience and help in the ongoing budget crisis.

III. a. Chair (cont.): As the Chancellor has said, the University's budgetary situation is grave. However, I think you should know that the UFS has not reached the predicament our colleagues in the State University are in. The SUNY Senate is faced with new travel restrictions and, consequently, the annual joint meeting of the CUNY and SUNY Senates' Executive Committees which was scheduled for the end of this week has had to be postponed. Fortunately all we need are subway tokens which we pay for ourselves. Imagine CUNY facing a budget crisis without us!

That concludes my report. I should be happy to answer questions on either the written or oral parts of it.

Professor Davidson (Computer & Information Services, LaGuardia) noted that, with Big Brother falling all over the world, the University should not be adopting new practices which require faculty to provide information on their personal lives. **Professor Meier** (Library, Hunter) noted that Mr. Cantor (PSC) had instructed faculty at her campus not to respond to the question on voluntary activities.

c. Report on the Multicultural Conference: **Professor Marlies K. Danziger**: Our conference on multiculturalism, sponsored jointly by the Senate and the CUNY Academy for the Humanities and Sciences, can be considered a great success. We had expected a maximum of 200 participants, accepted 250, had to turn away at least two dozen more of our colleagues for lack of space, and eventually had about 170 participants at the John Jay College building on 59th Street.

The theme that the conference stressed from the beginning was the one suggested by its title; "One University for Many Cultures." And the challenge we set for ourselves was to find some common ground: to acknowledge that we as a University must serve students of many cultures but that at the same time we must work at being one University.

The format we adopted -- some presentations in plenary session, some workshops -- worked well. In the morning three speakers set the stage for the later discussions. Professor David Lavin, professor of sociology at the Graduate School and long associated with the CUNY Office of Institutional Research and Analysis, showed how the student population at CUNY has changed over the past 20 years from a fairly homogeneous white middle-class student body to far greater diversity in our entering freshmen. Professor Nancy Dean, until last year the chair

of the Hunter Faculty Delegate Assembly and professor of English, now Emerita, described some specific steps that Hunter has taken to strengthen faculty awareness of multiculturalism -- steps such as an all-day conference in January and funding for further faculty development from the college's president. Then Dr. David Traboulay, professor of history at CSI, described his own fascinating multicultural background before explaining how he and his colleagues rethought the world history curriculum at their college (not without difficulty, but eventually with success). At lunchtime, Mr. Edgar Beckham, Program Officer of the Education and Culture Division of the Ford Foundation and formerly Dean at Wesleyan University, offered parts of a position paper that encouraged "traffic between cultural borders" and favored increased minority faculties to offer a non-threatening environment for students.

We then broke into small workshops. Reflecting the interests of the participants, four of these focused on faculty development, two on student services, and eight on changing the curriculum. Discussions within these workshop were lively and, so far as we can gather, amicable. The answers the "recorders" of the workshops brought back to the afternoon plenary showed considerable agreement, especially in the repeated calls for more faculty seminars, increasing the diversity of the faculty by using adjuncts and visiting professors, and more mentoring of students. Suggestions concerning the curriculum ranged from encouraging students to enroll in courses that integrate knowledge of several cultures, to making all courses reflect multicultural concerns, to sending students to experience the different cultures of New York City. Some fears of not doing justice to traditional cultures and possible distortions in the presentation of other cultures were also noted. Perhaps the most practical advice to come from a workshop was that those faculty members interested in developing a multicultural curriculum should not spend their energies arguing with those colleagues who did not wish to be convinced but should rather band together with like-minded colleagues and go ahead with their planning.

Professor Henry Wasser, President of the CUNY Academy, introduced the keynote speaker, and Professor Picken led the afternoon's plenary session. And special thanks should go to Mr. Bruce Hoffacker and his staff in the Senate office for their splendid organizing of a large and complex conference.

The proceeds of the entire conference will be published in the spring.

V. Invited Guest: Professor Henry Wasser, President, CUNY Academy for the Humanities and Sciences: It has been more than five and half years, I believe, since I presided over this body. I suppose I do recognize perhaps about half, but I am afraid that there has been a turnover in that time. So my purpose tonight in a sense is to acquaint you a bit with the Academy because the history of the Academy is certainly closely intertwined with that of the University Faculty Senate.

I have just run across this book for the first time [CUNY English Forum, Volume 1, AMS Press Inc., 1985] -- I should have seen it before, it is the first publication of the Academy -- and it turns out to be relevant. Allen Mandelbaum's introduction speaks of the fact that, "Universities are often born of cities; but in few universities has the matrix of the city

engendered as deep a bond between metropolis and academy as in the City University of New York. However recent the formal titling of CUNY -- 1961 -- it draws its patrimony, history, and future from parts that have enlightened generations of citizens. When New York is blessed, CUNY is blessed; When New York is vexed, CUNY is vexed. Yet in the city's most beleaguered decade, the 1970's, it's university undertook an extraordinary social commitment centered in the departments of English.

Then it was the whole of the university that helped mobilize the parts. That endeavor, with its drama and travail, together with the city's time of lamentable final troubles, drew much attention. Some, however, were perceptive enough to see other nascent forms of university collegiality." He goes to indicate that the intellectual resources from the entire university were drawn together, and that the Academy is the formate of this particular first conference, which was an English forum, and that "...the CUNY Academy for Humanities and Sciences offered still further evidence of university-wide collaboration. It is, thus, most seemly for the proceedings of the first university-wide forum to be the first in the series of the Academy's publications."

What I would wish to tell you is that the Academy basically was founded in a time of travail, the fiscal troubles of 1975-76. It was founded for a reason. Given the lowered morale from layoffs, firings, shut-down of the University and the like, a group of senior professors got together who wanted in a sense to sustain, and to the degree possible, to uplift the morale of junior faculty and of the entire faculty by establishing University-wide forums, conferences, seminars, and the like. It accomplished that purpose. I think it was recognized as such, particularly by the late Chancellor Kibbee -- those of us who have been around a long time know of the important role he took in helping in the establishment of the Academy.

Now there are basically, it seems to me so far as faculty is concerned, three University-wide institutions or structures. One, of course, is the PSC which deals, and I am over simplifying, with working conditions of the faculty. Two is the University Faculty Senate, again I am over simplifying, but let's say it is an advise and consent body participating in academic policy formation with respect to this University. The third University structure is the Academy which deals in a sense with the University-wide concerns in intellectual matters; scholarship, research, and the like. That does not mean that such activities do not go on at the colleges; of course they do and they go on in rich fashion. But, on a University-wide basis, the Academy provides that opportunity for faculty to get together for intellectual reasons, for reasons of knowledge, for intercourse with respect to what we are as a profession; whereas the other agencies of the faculty are brought together for other stated purposes.

So aside from asking all of you to join, I would mention one or two other matters with respect to the relationship to the Senate. I think it is fair to say that without the help of the Senate, the Academy would not have been established. It was established by a group of senior professors but it needed the help of the head of the UFS at that time; it needed the intervention of the UFS with respect to the Board as the guidelines were developed that indicate what the Academy is about. Secondly, it is intertwined in another way which some of you may not know

and that is that the head of the UFS or its representative sits by reason of office on the Board of Directors. Of course, there are many members of the Academy who are members of the Senate and elected to that Board of Directors. The membership intertwines. Of course, we have on several occasions had remarkably successful collaborations. You have just heard of one, the conference last Friday on multicultural curricula and the like conference a year ago on articulation. So these collaborative activities, which I am sure will continue, are of benefit both to the Academy and to the Senate.

What I want to end up with is a program summary of the Academy for spring 1992. Just to give you some examples, there is the program on the United Nations with Max Finger, on Wagner in Israel -- and here we have the grandson of the composer coming. We have scholarship on women, we have the philosophy of science, a conference on Walt Whitman, and we have also Thomas Sobol, the State Commissioner of Education speaking, as well as Jack Geiger, professor of medicine to speak on the New York City health crisis. Also on the program are an East European Conference, one on the French Revolution, and our usual semester social where we have various speakers. Thank you.

V. Old Business: Proposed Charter Amendments: Professor Zarin: Chair Picken discussed the procedures for amending the UFS Charter noting that, if moved by the Plenary, the proposed amendments would go to campus faculty governance organizations for action. The Charter requires that colleges representing one-half of the University instructional staff as represented by the Senate give their approval for the proposals to become effective. Professor Zarin (English, Lehman) was scheduled to present the proposals, but was excused due to illness. Professor Cooper (History, CSI), liaison to the Ad hoc Committee on Elections, substituted for Professor Zarin.

Professor Cooper highlighted the ways in which the Ad hoc Committee attempted to respond to concerns regarding perceived unfairness of existing election procedures. Alterations are proposed in the procedures for nominations and elections and in the extension of the term of office of the secretary and treasurer to two years. The major change is the creation of a Nominations and Elections Committee, although floor nominations would still be permitted. This Committee would also arrange for the circulation of biographical information on all candidates.

Six Charter changes were proposed and Chair Picken ruled that each would be acted upon individually. The first proposed amendment was offered:

Change 1. (page numbers refer to the Charter)

Current:

ARTICLE VI - STANDING AND OTHER COMMITTEES (pp. 16-17)

Section 1. -- Section 4.

Proposed:

Section 5. Nominations and Elections Committee.

There shall be a Nominations and Elections Committee to supervise and conduct the nomination and election procedures of the Senate. This committee shall prepare slates of nominees for Senate officers and Executive Committee members-at-large to be presented at the meeting preceding the annual organizational meeting (usually, therefore, the April meeting of the Senate). This committee shall also prepare and circulate election materials, such as brief biographies of the candidates.

In supervising the conduct of elections at the annual organizational meeting of the Senate, or at special elections, the Nominations and Elections Committee shall tally the results of each ballot, and the Chair of the Committee shall announce the results of the tally, specifying the number of votes for each candidate for each office.

This committee, consisting of 6 members, shall be elected at the January plenary meeting from among Senate members who are not members of the Executive Committee, with no less than 1/3 of the committee members from senior colleges (including the medical school, the law school, and the graduate center) and no less than 1/3 of the committee members from community colleges. The Chair of the committee shall be elected by the committee from among its members.

Professors Baumrin and Jaffe both opposed the revision arguing that the existing system was working. Both agreed that circulating biographical information would be helpful. Professor Sherrill asked if the intent of the revision was that these would be competitive elections. Professor Cooper responded that that was the intent. Professor Sherrill stated his view that the Nominations and Elections Committee should not conduct the election. He further asked if a member of the Nominating Committee could be a candidate for office. He then moved to amend paragraph 3, line 3, to read: "...members who are not candidates for election to office..." The amendment was seconded and passed. Professor Bleyman (Natural Science, Baruch) then recommended that election of the Nominating Committee be included in the May process rather than as a separate January process as indicated in paragraph 3, line 2. This was formalized as an amendment, seconded, and passed. Professor Sherrill then moved to delete paragraph 2. The motion was seconded.

A quorum call was requested. No quorum was present and Chair Picken declared the meeting adjourned at 8:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Bruce Hoffacker
Executive Director