

MINUTES OF THE TWO HUNDRED AND THIRD PLENARY SESSION OF
THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

October 20, 1992

Chair Picken called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m. in Room 1700 A of the Graduate School and University Center. Present were Professors Allaire, Anderson, Baumrin, Baxter, Beheshti, Berkowitz W., Bleyman, Bodnar, Bohigian, Borgese, Brugnola, Buianouckas, Cañate, Caudle, Clerk, Cooper, Danziger, Davis E., Davis R., Donoghue, Fitzgerald, Frank, Frisz, Galub, Gerber, Ginsberg, Greenbaum, Grossman, Hounion, Hurtado, Kaplowitz, Karan, Kaufman, Koshi, Krashinsky, Lidov, Lundeen, Mandel, Martinez, Matthews, McCall, Meier, Meyers, Neville, Norton, O'Malley, Otte, Picken, Reid, Reitano, Riedler-Berger, Rosario, Sherrill, Simor, Sohmer, Speidel, Tenenbaum, Terrell, Tillyer, Trumbach, Umolu, Whealey, Wonsek, Yousef, Zades, Zarin and Alternate Senators Brady, Diz, Johnson, Kulkarni, Lagos, Lowy, McKinney, Mettler, Richter, and Roff. Professors Bell, Gura, Jacobson, Reynolds (ex-officio), Rose, Selvadurai, Squitieri, Trefousse, Weinberg, and Youkeles were excused. Faculty Governance Leaders Kaplowitz (John Jay), Sherrill (Hunter), Whealey (BMCC), and Zades (CSI) attended. President Bowen (LaGuardia), Dean Shechter (CO), and Professors Levine (CSI) and Taylor (NYCTC) were guests of the Senate. Executive Director Hoffacker and Administrative Assistant Pasela also attended.

I. Adoption of the Agenda: Professor Picken noted that a revised tentative agenda had been distributed. Chancellor Reynolds was unable to attend due to a family health emergency. A proposed resolution on the University of the District of Columbia had been added. The revised Agenda was adopted.

II. Reports:

a. Chair: As customary, my report this evening is in two parts: a written section entitled "Communications from the Chair," and an oral report. My oral report will deal mainly with the meeting of the Board of Trustees on September 30 and the meeting of the Board's Long Range Planning Committee which immediately preceded it.

The Long Range Planning Committee, which consists of the Chair, the Vice Chair, the chairs of the standing committees and the faculty and student trustees, was called together rather hastily to consider the Master Plan which the University is required to submit to the Board of Regents every four years. I had previously complained to the central administration that handling the adoption of the 1992 Plan in this way precluded its discussion at a public hearing of the Board. I was told that public discussion was not necessary since the Plan was only a formality, that it really contained nothing new, that it was simply an updating of the 1988 Plan, and that it did not go beyond the 1990 Five-year Plan. The press release issued after the Board meeting says, however, that "The City University of New York's newly adopted 1992 Master Plan sets forth a sweeping array of academic programs, student services, capital construction, and expanding collaboration with the New York City school system as priorities for responding to the increased demand for higher education." The truth is perhaps somewhere between these two statements. In any case, I tend to take these documents seriously because they are official statements of University policy and can always be invoked as such when justifying some future action.

What struck me most in reviewing the document was the anticipation of continuous enrollment increases with a projection of 246,000 students registered in degree courses by the year 2001. But nowhere in the 56-page document was there a plan for any increase in the full-time faculty. Since the

University already relies too heavily on adjuncts, as we have discussed on many occasions, I introduced the following amendment to the Master Plan:

No discussion of the University's academic program or mission can ignore the devastating reductions in the teaching faculty that have taken place over the past five years. Through early retirement, resignation, and inability to recruit new faculty, the teaching staff of the University has been diminished by approximately 14% since 1986. Given the equally dramatic increases in student enrollment during the same period, the University has been forced to rely to too great an extent on adjuncts. If the University is to advance and adapt its educational mission, it must reverse these trends and rebuild the full-time faculty.

The 1988 Plan proposed a phased conversion of adjunct staff to full-time faculty. This need was recognized in a modest way by the State Division of Budget in the 1990-91 Executive Budget. But because of the loss of full-time positions through attrition and layoffs, the situation now calls for decisive action. Therefore, the Chancellor establishes as a University-wide goal having 70% of all undergraduate sections taught by full-time members of the faculty or CUNY graduate fellows by the Fall of 1996. (Some programs may be excluded from this calculation based on their particular mission.)

I am pleased to say that the Chancellor agreed to this amendment and that it was accepted by the Committee and incorporated into the document subsequently adopted by the Trustees. I would not want to overemphasize its importance, but, at least, the University now has as a stated goal a substantial increase in the number of full-time faculty members, is committed to treating this as a priority, and is obliged to seek funding for it. It is particularly gratifying to note that this newly adopted initiative is referred to as a University priority in the Chancellor's 1993-94 Budget Request which will be considered at the October Board meeting.

I turn now to the September regular monthly public meeting of the BoT. The Chancellor, as is usual, spoke first, giving her oral report. In it she evoked some of the achievements of the summer and early fall: the Early Retirement Initiative, the prospect of \$15M from the state for the applied sciences, the possibility of a lifting of the bond cap, the effective voter registration drive, and the like. She called on Senior Vice Chancellor Farley to make a presentation on the new Allied Health Center at Hostos, which he did along with the architects.

At the conclusion of the Chancellor's oral report, I asked for the floor and made a statement on the impact of the budget reductions. You will recall that at the September plenary we received descriptions from all the campuses on the devastating effects this year's budget is having on every campus. On the basis of these statements, I was able to sketch out for the Board the magnitude of the difficulties confronting faculty and students as the new academic year began. I am sorry to say that it fell to me alone to do this, and that no member of the central administration presented a picture to the Trustees of what the conditions which prevail on our campuses actually are.

Trustee Edith B. Everett, the Vice Chairperson of the Board, who was presiding, graciously expressed her thanks for my statement and spoke of "the importance of reiterating the problems to make the public and the Legislature aware that, although it appears that the University is adjusting to and accepting these budgetary cuts, in reality it is not. It is important that the Legislature and the powers-that-be are constantly reminded that with such deficiencies, the University cannot do the job that it would like to do, and cannot do the right things for the students."

I would like once again to thank those Senators who made reports to the plenary last month on conditions at their colleges. It was their diligence and hard work that permitted me to inform the Trustees of what actually is going on in the University.

In connection with the University report, I made a statement, a copy of which is included in the documents for tonight, concerning a not insignificant number of pay raises for executive personnel. These I feel were ill-timed and ill-considered -- nothing short of an outrage.

The only other matter to come before the public meeting of the Board, apart from routine items, was the approval of the revised Hostos Governance Plan. This plan had received extensive consideration at the College and was twice discussed by the Board's Committee on Faculty, Staff, and Administration (FSA), as has been reported to the Senate. The Plan, as approved by the Board, contained three rather technical amendments proposed by the President but not formally approved by the College Senate. But as they had not been the subject of formal objections by the faculty, they were accepted by FSA.

When the University Report was being considered by the Board, one Trustee asked for an Executive Session to discuss a personnel matter appearing in the Report, although this Trustee did not object to the Board's approving the Report. An Executive Session was accordingly held. While I am not, of course, at liberty to report the discussion that was held at that session, I do anticipate a policy statement coming in the near future from FSA concerning searches for personnel in the Executive Compensation Plan.

Following a practice in effect for a number of years in the State University of New York Faculty Senate, the Executive Committee has decided to recognize extraordinary service to the UFS or to faculty governance at the campus level within City University by the designation of Distinguished University Faculty Senator Emeritus. It is, of course, intended that recipients of this award should be retired or have filed for retirement. The award will be made by the Executive Committee but nominations may be submitted by Senators or governance heads at any time. It is hoped that an initial award or awards can be made in connection with our Annual Dinner next month.

You will have picked up your invitation to our Dinner Meeting this evening. We will have the opportunity to meet in a relaxed and informal setting our new Vice Chancellors, Dr. Richard M. Freeland, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, and Dr. Joyce F. Brown, Vice Chancellor for Student and Urban Affairs.

As previously announced, the Senate will be sponsoring, in conjunction with the Council of Campus Faculty Governance Leaders, an all-day, University-wide conference on "Strengthening Campus Governance," to be held on Friday, December 4, at John Jay. The Conference, which will be chaired by Professor Kaplowitz (English, John Jay), who in addition to being a member of this body is Chair of the John Jay Faculty Senate, will center on the primary areas of faculty responsibility as well as on appropriate structures. There will be plenary sessions, workshops, and a keynote address by Professor Kenneth Andersen of the University of Illinois at Champaign, who is former National First Vice President of the AAUP and who has written extensively on faculty governance. Also participating will be Professor Joseph Flynn (Humanities, SUNY Alfred), former President of the SUNY Faculty Senate and Director of the National Network of Faculty Senates, and Dean Ann Burton (Arts and Sciences, NYU), former Chair of this body. We have requested each college governance organization to designate eight delegates. In addition all members of the UFS are cordially invited to participate, and you may register by contacting the Senate office at your earliest convenience. The Conference, which includes lunch, is free of charge to all who register in advance.

By now all of you should have received your copy of the fall Newsletter in your college mailbox. If you have not, please let us know. I am sure you will agree with me when I say that this issue is not only larger than in the past, but particularly informative and attractive. This only came about as the result of a great deal of hard work, and I know all of you will join me in thanking Professor O'Malley, Mr. Hoffacker, and Ms. Pasela for their efforts.

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

Professor Borgese (Biological Science, Lehman) -- "Rumors have been circulating on my campus that the CUNY Press is no longer in existence. I would like to know whether that is indeed the case. If it is, what has happened to the funds that normally support it? What are they being used for now?" /I have not heard that as a rumor or anything official. So far as I know, the CUNY University Press is still in existence.

Professor Baumrin (Philosophy, Graduate School/Lehman) -- "This is by way of an official rumor. I ran into a fellow faculty member at my college who reported that the Press is kaput." /I will endeavor to find out, Professor Borgese, and give you a call.

b. Special Fiscal Affairs: Professor Sohmer (Mathematics, City) reported on the special meeting of the Fiscal Affairs Committee called to review the Chancellor's 1993-94 Budget Request for both the operating budget and the capital budget. The meeting began at 3:30 on a Friday afternoon, with the document available only a short time before. As per usual practice, the registration period for the Public Hearing closed at 4:00 that same afternoon. As a consequence of the unavailability of the draft document, no one registered to speak and the Budget Request moved ahead without public discussion.

Professor Sohmer highlighted the fact that the Budget Request process establishes University priorities which could be implemented even if earmarked funding was not provided by the city or the state. He cited the example of the University security initiative which was not specifically funded in 1992-93, but the approximately \$5M cost was covered by the University nonetheless. It is for this reason, providing the moral basis for supporting initiatives independent of earmarked support, that the certification of University priorities through the Budget Request process is especially important.

The initiatives detailed in this year's request are as follows: workforce development -- an item inserted after expressions of interest on the part of the governor -- \$9.5M at the senior colleges and \$2.8M for the community colleges; graduate research initiative, \$5.6M; SETM, \$2M at the senior colleges and \$1M at the community colleges; adjunct conversion to full-time faculty lines, \$2M at the senior colleges and \$1M at the community colleges; student success/freshman year, \$8.2M for the senior colleges and \$6.4M for the community colleges; new building operations, \$9.4M for the senior colleges and \$8.2M for the community colleges; campus security, \$3.8M for the senior colleges and \$1.4M for the community colleges; and mandatory cost increases, \$22.2M for the senior colleges and \$15M for the community colleges. Professor Sohmer noted that some members of the Committee who are particularly well connected politically suggested that new initiatives were not likely to be funded by the state. Specifically they noted that the Governor's call letter suggested new initiatives only when the costs would be offset by reductions elsewhere in the proposal.

Senators asked Professor Sohmer about the student success initiative. He responded that it included all of the freshman year initiatives designed to improve retention, but added that he was unaware of any evaluation of the programs. Senators added that evaluations had been conducted and the program had proven successful in contributing to student retention and advancement. Both the operating and capital budgets were approved for submission to the full Board.

c. Reports of Faculty Members of Board of Trustees' Committees: Written.

III. Proposed resolution regarding the termination of the Faculty Senate of the University of the District of Columbia: Professor Greenbaum (History, Queensborough) presented the proposed resolution (text appended) on behalf of the Executive Committee. He noted that the termination of the Faculty

Senate of the University of the District of Columbia was invalid and that many institutions had overlap between the leadership of various faculty organizations. After an editorial improvement, the resolution was adopted unanimously.

IV. Panel on the Chancellor's Task Force on Science, Engineering, Technology, and Mathematics: Professor Lundeen (Nursing, City): We have three very distinguished guests with us to talk about the report of the Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Science, Engineering, Technology, and Mathematics (SETM). As you may remember, there was a previous Task Force on SETM that Vice Chancellor Carolynn Reid-Wallace appointed in May of 1988 and that report was released in September of 1989. It was discussed at the Senate shortly after that. In November of 1990, the current Chancellor appointed this advisory committee. Their charge was to review the previous Task Force and other reports that addressed the status of SETM in both the state and in the nation. Their report was submitted in March of 1992 and at this point it has not yet been released. However, the Chancellor has responded to the Committee's report and you have received that in the mail.

The three guests that we have tonight are: Acting Assistant Dean Yaakov Shechter (OAA), who is assigned to science education at the central office and who served as staff for this report; President Raymond C. Bowen (LaGuardia) who was a committee member; and Professor Alfred Levine (Applied Science, CSI) who was also a Committee member. Dean Shechter will speak first on the charge to the Committee and how that charge developed and then the other members will speak.

Dean Shechter: Good evening. I am really happy to be here because it gives the three of us an opportunity to talk about this report that we worked on for a period of almost a year. Three years ago, almost to the month, the Vice Chancellor's Task Force report was released and, if you recall, it created a lot of noise and publicity. The contrast is that our report, that was released in March, has not gotten any airing up to this point. In fact, you do not have the report in your hands. I think it would be a good idea if you had it because then you can appreciate the response to the report.

I came to 80th Street in September 1989 and that was just when the Task Force report came out. I discovered as I went through my faculty fellow year that this Task Force report was one of many. As a matter of fact, there were three previous reports -- one in 1980, one in 1985, one in 1986, and then, of course, the 1989 Task Force report. The bottom line is that we at CUNY are very good at task force reports. We are not good at implementing anything. The history of the 1989 report is as follows -- and I was privy to what happened after the report. The report came out, there was a lot of publicity, the Vice Chancellor invited the members of the Task Force to 80th Street, and they got recognition. Following that, the report was given first to a person who is not with us anymore, Dean Giammona, and then it was given to the Board's Long Range Planning Committee. I was at the meeting and my feeling was that that Committee did not really know what to do with that report. So they told Dean Giammona and myself to start collecting data. I collected data for about a year on space for SETM, equipment -- of course, as you know, in science equipment becomes obsolete very fast, but the word was that that we were going to get a new Chancellor who was a scientist and things would look up. Indeed the Chancellor came in and right away she appointed the Chancellor's Advisory Committee on SETM whose members are: Former City College President Harleston, Chair; President Bowen (LaGuardia); President Goldstein (Baruch); President Meredith (NYCTC); Professor Emeritus Albert Bowker; Professor Elizabeth Boylan (who is now Acting Provost at Queens); and Professor Levine. We were supposed to have a University Student Senate representative, but one was never appointed. This committee, in contrast to the Vice Chancellor's Task Force, was, to put it relatively, a high-powered committee, with presidents. It was also, at the same time, a committee that had a sense continuity. We had Elizabeth Boylan and Alfred Levine who were part of the other Task Force. I found that to be very helpful. I did not join that Committee until seven months after it began. Dean Giammona was the staff member before me. When I joined the Committee, it was already working on actual reports.

Now the charge. The charge as spelled in the Chancellor's letter was to review the recommendations of the SETM Task Force, to review national reports on SETM, to develop a manageable set of goals which the University can pursue over the next several years, and also to develop strategies for implementation of those goals. In addition, it was to take into account the following objectives: To increase outside support for research from federal and private funds, to encourage cooperation within and among the various campuses and to develop University-wide projects, and to advance further the University's policy of pluralism and diversity. The Chancellor specifically asked for short-term and long-term objectives and proposals that do not require too much money, and those that require more. This was very important to us and we paid close attention to these charges.

In December 1990, the Committee met for the first time. It broke into four subcommittees, and I think this is important because they reflect the type of interests we had. One was a subcommittee on outreach and articulation chaired by President Meredith; second, on undergraduate education, chaired by President Bowen; third, on graduate education, chaired by Professor Boylan; and a fourth one on facilities and research, chaired by President Goldstein. There were 11 meetings of the full committee and numerous meetings of the subcommittees. As you just heard, the final report to the Chancellor went out on the 23rd of March. From that date on, I was not involved in anything that had to do with the Committee or with the follow-up. I simply was not privy to anything, so I don't know what happened. I know that the Chancellor took the report and gave it to people in OAA to look at and that is what I think we see here in terms of the response.

Now, what about the report which you do not have in your hands? I wish you did have it in your hands and I presume, in the future, the University will distribute this report because I think it is a good piece of work. The recommendations are really the substance of the whole report. I think it is also important to again keep in mind the reaction to the 1989 Task Force report. There was a lot of reaction there. I recall sitting in a Senate meeting and the feeling was that it was skewed more toward research and short on science education and short on the community colleges and so on. My feeling is that our report this time is very balanced and not only balanced, but really addresses the problems of science education.

Here are the numbers of recommendations: 1. Undergraduate curriculum: there were two short-term and two long-term recommendations -- the short-term recommendations are important because these recommendations could be implemented very very cheaply; 2. Student access and student nurturing, a total of eight recommendations; 3. Graduate education, six recommendations. 4. Faculty recruitment and development, six recommendations; 5. Faculty diversity, two recommendations; 6. Impact on primary and secondary education, three recommendations; 7. Intra-CUNY linkages, seven recommendations; 8. Extra-CUNY linkages, three recommendations; 9. Funding initiatives, five recommendations. All in all, we came up with 48 recommendations. In addition, the report included appendices which took a lot of time to prepare. These are full of data. One of the questions that we had is how do you define SETM? What falls within SETM? Secondly, what does CUNY have in SETM in terms of students majoring in SETM, students who graduate with degrees in SETM including associate, bachelors, masters, and doctoral degrees? Thirdly, an inventory of all educational programs that fall within SETM on all levels and special programs within CUNY that are intended to encourage participation in SETM of women and minorities. All these are found in the appendices. It gives us a grasp and understanding of what we are talking about when we say SETM. Otherwise, it is very nebulous. That is another reason why I think the University community should have the report in their hands, to see what we have. If we are talking about a goal to increase the number of women and minorities by the year 2000 -- to double it -- what do we start with? So the numbers are there. Again, I would express my feeling, and again I was staff and I was not voting, but I think the expectation of the Committee when we finished our work was that there would be a dialogue with the University community, with the administration, talking about these proposals, discussing them. In other words, we wanted some feedback and I would say that there is a certain amount of disappointment that this did not occur. Again, I welcome this forum because it is the first opportunity that we have had to talk about the report. Thank you.

Professor Lundeen: President Bowen has been president of LaGuardia since 1989. He is a scientist by background in zoology and biochemistry. Although, he has declined to speak on biochemistry tonight, he is very willing to speak about SETM in the community colleges.

President Bowen: Thank you very much. Let me first say that it was really an enjoyable Committee. After being in administration for about 20 years, it was good to get where the action is and to work with these two notable faculty members and Liz Boylan. We really had a ball. I should say for the past 28 years I have spent my career in 4 universities and 3 community colleges, so I am somewhat of a gadfly. But what has concerned me is that usually, when we talk about math and science, we do not include community colleges. That is why I was very very interested in serving on this Committee. But what I enjoyed about the Committee, which I think is going to really pay off for us in the future if, in fact, several of these recommendations come to fruition, is that we thought as a University. When I first came to City University, I thought it should be called a federation rather than a university and I was pleased that this Committee thought about education as being all one system rather than a conglomerate of separate entities.

We submitted our report in March of this year and we received the Chancellor's response on the 25th of October. So, unfortunately, the Committee has not discussed this either with the Chancellor nor with any people at 80th Street, and you do not have the report. It is kind of difficult for me to respond to anything -- I can say anything, and you can't challenge me because you haven't read it. But, one of the recommendations that I thought was a very good one -- there were a few -- was to have the science, math, and engineering departments of the various borough colleges meet at least two times a year. As you know, one of the problems we at community colleges have is articulation, but we thought if all of the scientists and all of the mathematicians, engineers, physicists, etc. would get together and discuss curriculum -- as you know, in most community colleges there are about two or three senior colleges where most of our students go. For example, most of our students from LaGuardia go to Queens, some go to York, although they do go University-wide. But we thought it would be very good if the scientists from LaGuardia met with those in Queens to discuss curriculum. We thought that that would not only enhance articulation, but also get faculty to know each other. I thought that that was a very worthwhile thing to do, but reading the response, it doesn't seem to have a high priority. Another thing that we thought was very good was joint appointments. I think back to the 1960's when Linus Pauling, while he was at Berkeley, was also teaching at Merit College in Oakland. So why not have joint appointments? There are a lot of distinguished professors who I know nationwide that just want to teach undergraduates. This person may elect to teach primarily at a community college and at the same time keep his hand in research at one of the four-year schools or the Graduate School. So I think a joint appointment would benefit not only community colleges but the University as a whole. Another thing that I was very interested in, and I am familiar with it a little bit, is the Gateway Program that they had at City College. One of the problems with the Gateway Program is that, although you go into the high schools, it is very very difficult to look at students from the tenth to the twelfth grade who have never been exposed to science, mathematics, engineering, etc. and suddenly, through some mystical experience, make scientists out of them. So you have to reach further down. You have to start working with the junior high schools and elementary schools, which is what we are beginning to do at LaGuardia. If the grant comes through, we will be working with potential scientists and bringing people from the fourth through the seventh grade to the college to begin a laboratory science experience. So, again, my primary input with the Committee was on the community colleges and various outreach programs. Now in terms of the actual undergraduate education, I am going to yield to Al Levine.

Professor Levine: Thank you. Let me emphasize by holding up the documents. What you are holding in your hands is this response. The response contains some, but not all, of the recommendations. This is the report. I will hold it this way so you can see its thickness. The report contains four and one-half pages titled "index of recommendations." The index of recommendations has phrases, they are not even sentences, together with a page number in the report to which the specific recommendation corresponds. All you have is a document that contains some of these non-sentences together with, typically, a

paragraph of response. The paragraph of response is not what the Committee wrote and in some cases is the exact opposite of what the Committee had in mind. Now in most cases, if there had been a meeting between the Chancellor's staff, the Chancellor, and the members of the Committee, we would have had a dialogue. We could have discussed what we had in mind. We could have listened to what other people had in mind. I am convinced that on every single recommendation we would have reached agreement. I am hopeful that that will occur. I am hopeful that after it occurs we will be able to send you a revised copy of this response containing the recommendations we actually made. I might add that I was on the older SETM committee which, as Yaakov correctly states, was the fourth such committee. This is the fifth such committee. When the meetings of this committee began, I asked President Harleston -- who I might say parenthetically did a wonderful job on this report and really worked hard despite his problems and he really gave a lot of energy and dedication to this report and did an excellent job -- why this committee, this fifth committee, was going to be different than the other four committees. He explained it to me. He said that the other four committees were primarily faculty, with maybe an occasional dean, but basically faculty. This Committee was college presidents, so it had real clout, and therefore this Committee was going to have a real impact. I do believe this Committee really had clout and had less of an impact than any of the previous four reports. I think that is a disgrace. I might say that the college presidents who were on this committee all worked very hard, were very impressive, and did an excellent job. The Committee had no impact.

Now, with that as background, I would like to read through certain sections of the actual report rather than the non-report. I was asked to concentrate on undergraduate teaching of science:

It is important to recognize that teaching has multiple dimensions. We single out as especially important "instruction" and "modelling." Instruction is the more concrete of the two and represents the surface content of the classroom and laboratory transaction. Instruction is the communication of information, techniques and skills. It requires laboratories with functioning equipment, laboratory technicians to support them, necessary supplies and advanced students who support the instructional process. Teaching schedules must not be unduly onerous nor can classes or laboratories be unduly crowded. Instruction happens in the research laboratory as surely as it happens in the classroom and instructional laboratory.

In all its venues, instruction truly thrives only when accompanied by modelling. A faculty member models the processes of a scientist as a thinker, as a learner and as a practitioner. She models the ways of attacking and solving scientific problems. She models the satisfactions of scientific investigation and discovery. She models the pleasure she takes in the way of science. We subscribe to and wish to see strengthened a "domino theory" of modelling as well, in which the beginning undergraduate takes as her most immediate model the (more accessible and more credible) advanced undergraduate who can, in turn, model herself on the graduate student who mirrors the post-doc who follows the principal investigator and instructor. In among their models, and especially their faculty models, members of their own ethnic groups, and in parallel fashion, we feel that women students should also be able to see their own potential in *their* models.

The attitude of this Committee was that if we really wanted to stress teaching, we had to emphasize the role of the faculty member. If the faculty member is effective, he or she will communicate love of the subject and they will inspire students. Without this nothing matters. This was the thrust of this document. You notice it got lost in the response. Continuing [from the report]:

The short-sighted pursuit of immediate economy argues for packing large numbers of students into crowded classrooms taught by low-paid graduate students and adjuncts. Some students, of course, succeed, but large numbers (in some elementary science and mathematics courses as many as 60%) either fail or earn a D. Apart from the human cost

in broken dreams and crushed egos (which we must not ignore), there is a long-term dollars and cents implication because many of these students will take the same course again and incur additional expenses the next semester or the next year. Budgeting for right now hides the true cost and permits us to believe that we're saving money.

In fact, we know how to do better. Small-group, problem-based introductory science and math courses of the type pioneered by Uri Treisman and his followers have been proven successful all over the country and throughout CUNY. They cost money for sure, but only in the short run. In the long run they save money and they save students.

I don't think anyone in this room would argue with that. Reading on, "We can save money and save students by effective coordination of courses among the community college and senior colleges." Ray has already addressed that. We then started to make specific recommendations. I want to read specific recommendations:

All undergraduate units of CUNY should provide minimal essential course offerings in science (biology, chemistry, earth sciences and physics), mathematics and computer science. At the same time, CUNY should ensure the capability of offering full majors in biology, chemistry, computer science, mathematics and physics at all comprehensive senior colleges (Brooklyn, City, College of Staten Island, Hunter, Lehman, Queens and York).

Now I might add that it was President Harleston who insisted on this. He insisted on this as a statement about what is meant by a senior college. In this time of budget cuts, it is important to keep in mind that the integrity of the senior colleges must be preserved and that this requires offering majors in certain disciplines -- full majors.

Now, of course, you can't offer full majors in everything. There are going to be certain majors that will offered at only one campus and so we recommended further that a student enrolled at a particular campus be allowed to complete the requirements for a major not offered at that campus. My favorite example of this would be a student interested in forensic science. There is an excellent major in forensic science at John Jay, but perhaps the student doesn't want to transfer there. Maybe the student wants to stay at, say, CSI or Brooklyn, take all of their basic mathematics, physics, chemistry, liberal arts, humanities, and social science courses, but meet the requirements for the major at John Jay. Why shouldn't this be permitted? Right now it is not. Our recommendation is that it should be permitted.

This is something that Ray already addressed, but I want to emphasize it. We recommended: Delegates of the faculty of all colleges should meet at least twice each year on a disciplinary basis to review syllabi, examinations and student papers, as well as entrance and exit criteria in order to establish competency-based outcomes for common curricula. These meetings should be jointly chaired by one community college and one senior college representative with the explicit intent of improving articulation. Subcommittees can be created which would have the effect of encouraging regional articulation pacts.

Later in the document, "we hope that some of the recommendations that we have made for improving the communications encourage this sense within CUNY." Now, I would like to read the response to that recommendation. "*Encourage the sense of a CUNY-wide faculty in each SETM discipline by establishing cross-campus councils to meet at least twice a year.*" The Chancellor responds:

The proposal presents interesting possibilities, but I am concerned that it may not be the most effective way to pursue the goal of University-wide collaboration. To some extent, of course, we are already pursuing this kind of collaboration through specific programs and disciplinary areas, such as the Urban Marine and Freshwater Initiative and the ATM

1

proposals. This alternative model, with broader application, may well help us reach our science goals more quickly and efficiently.

Well I am sorry, I don't know what the Urban Marine and Freshwater Initiative issue is, despite my having been involved in environmental science for 20 years. This is definitely not a model for encouraging a sense of CUNY-wide faculty. Our goal was to have all faculty in physics -- and I dare say in history because this statement has nothing to do with the SETM disciplines -- meet as faculty interested in a discipline; faculty with similar problems, faculty who can exchange information on both research and pedagogy, faculty who can talk to their colleagues, faculty who have more in common with their colleagues in the same discipline at another college than they do in many cases with faculty on their campuses. This is a proposal about which I'm sure that if we spoke to the Chancellor, she would agree. I am absolutely certain that if we had the opportunity to explain what we had in mind, it would get a positive response.

Professor Frisz (Student Personnel, Queens): In listening to your comments, my reaction is, if you feel so strongly about the responses that you just gave and the kinds of work you did and the effort you put into it as a Committee, what kind of action are you planning to take to make sure that the report gets thoroughly aired and not just a written response?

President Bowen: Unfortunately, this was an Advisory Committee and we gave our advice. Unless the Chancellor or her staff requests that we meet again, the Committee right now is in limbo. As I mentioned early, we submitted the final report back in March and we just received a written response within the last couple of weeks. Hopefully, there will be a follow through. I was talking to Professor Levine outside and he said we have a new academic Vice Chancellor now so we will probably have a new committee on SETM. Seriously, I hope we can meet to, as he said, express the recommendations because they are very good recommendations. This Committee, and I have served on hundreds of committees, was truly a University Committee and after the first meeting or so we lost our faculty rank or administrative rank and really dealt with what we thought was the problem and responded accordingly.

Professor Kulkarni (Mathematics, Queens): The Chancellor's Advisory Committee on SETM has recommended that all new Graduate School appointments be joint with a college campus. This is an excellent idea. It should be extended also to the faculty members presently having such appointments. Whatever is involved in putting substance in this idea, it should mean that no matter which pot a doctoral faculty member's salary is coming from, there should be a formal connection with a college where a faculty member will have teaching privileges. Actually, similar recommendations were also made by the review panel of the Middle States Association in its accreditation review of the Graduate School in 1987. Last March, under the auspices of the UFS, there was a conference on graduate education. Several faculty members at that meeting also came up with similar ideas.

Some of the faculty members presently holding Graduate School appointments have expressed interest in teaching at a college. But at present, it is simply a fact that there are so many bureaucratic hurdles arising from the "allocation system" that it becomes a great hassle for a faculty member of one CUNY unit to teach at another unit. Add to this various ego-problems unavoidable in dealing with two executive committees and two administrations. So the Graduate School appointees have complained that they feel unwelcome at the colleges. The complaints from the other direction are even more bitter. Built-in disincentives for participation in the doctoral programs directly hurts research, student-faculty relationships, and also external funding for student support. It seems that joint lines for doctoral faculty will resolve most of these knotty issues.

I should mention that in the student publications at the Graduate School, a fear is often expressed that the colleges, not realizing the importance of research, may not release their faculty for doctoral instruction. In fact, a call for more Graduate School appointments is mainly based on this argument. Joint lines should not only relieve these student fears, but in fact these joint lines would also offer the students

a much wider choice of faculty mentors, as well as contacts with colleges which many students badly need in order to get adjunct positions.

Before closing, I would like to express an opinion that at the Graduate School we should not try to recruit an outstanding scholar by promising him or her lifetime, post master's-level doctoral teaching. I don't mean to offend anybody's sensitivities on this issue, but from personal experience I have come to believe that in a research career, just to keep one's sanity, teaching is necessary, and in teaching, a balance between undergraduate and graduate teaching is necessary. There are ups and downs in a research career as in other walks of life. So burdening someone with a lifetime of post master's-level doctoral teaching is not fair to the individual, to the students, or to other colleagues. This may well be a reason why, in all well-reputed universities I am familiar with, they expect even their Nobel Laureates and members of the National Academy to share responsibility for undergraduate education. The result can be as thrilling as the famous Feynman lectures for undergraduates in physics, or Pauling's college chemistry which revolutionized science teaching in the 1960's at all levels, and literally all over the world. So I fully support this idea and if there are any further explanations of what is meant by the joint lines I would appreciate hearing it.

Professor Levine: I would like to comment that the Committee has received some written material that we took very seriously and it was reflected in this recommendation. I would like to read specifically what we said about this, since again, none of you have the report:

The direct exposure of students to the richness and strength of our faculty can be a powerful inspiration. For that reason, we believe that all faculty including Distinguished Professors should regularly teach undergraduate courses.

We then quote from an editorial in Science:

The title of professor should be given only to those who profess, and it is perhaps time for universities to reserve it for those willing to be an earnest part of the community of scholars....Distinguished professors should be lured, rewarded and retained by offers of good salaries, laboratory space, recognition, and administrative support, but not by the bonus of "no teaching."

That is a quote from Science.

Professor Greenbaum: You mentioned the question of someone taking their program at one school and particular courses at another. We already have a vehicle that permits that, the CUNY BA.

Professor Levine: What we have in mind is the student will get their degree from their own campus and get it listed as a major from the other campus. Therefore the degree would be a regular degree and not the CUNY BA.

Professor Berkowitz (Chemistry, Graduate School): Parenthetically before I ask my question, there is no professor of chemistry at any campus of the City University who does not teach undergraduate courses. I would like to ask about the kinds of information you collected. Did you go to other universities and, for instance, ask about graduate student stipends or tuition remission?/ Yes. / It is in the report? I am glad you did. Some months ago I wrote a letter to the Chancellor and the response was "not true." What I said was that of the schools that I contacted in the NYC area, not one of them charged tuition for graduate students in chemistry. The reply from the Chancellor's office was, "many schools charge tuition for graduate students." It was in other disciplines, not chemistry.

Professor Levine: Table 1 of the report contains a list of 14 schools of which CUNY is the bottom one, showing the level of support. In every case the university provides full remission of tuition so this amount is support and then tuition is not charged. CUNY is 14th out of 14.

Professor Bohigian (Mathematics, John Jay): Before President Bowen leaves, I think he hit it right on the head with respect to his comment that CUNY is a federation and not a university. I think that is the core problem you faced without realizing it. It wasn't that this was a science report. Had this been a humanities report, had this been an English report with these recommendations -- you were questioning the very tenet that this has never been a university in the real sense. We don't have tenure across the board. That is why we don't meet in terms of different faculties. This is a core issue and what you did, obviously, was hit a very very sore nerve. I think that has to be kept in mind. I do have a question. I hope I just misheard. When you were ticking off senior colleges did you leave off John Jay? Did you forget or did you do it intentionally? Your words were irritating because you said the comprehensive senior colleges. That needs explanation. When you include things like that in the report and leave off some senior colleges, you are not going to get support, you are not going to get unity. I want an explanation as to why that was left off.

Professor Levine: I believe that President Harleston checked with the presidents of each of the senior colleges to ask if they considered their school a comprehensive senior college and explained the distinction. We made a distinction between senior and comprehensive senior colleges. [Various Senators responded that comprehensive or special mission is a function of a college's mission statement.]

Professor Bohigian: You see, if you are going to take that premise -- you used your favorite example in talking about forensic science and how you would send students just to John Jay, apparently they would have to go to John Jay to take the forensic science -- or would they do it by correspondence -- what you are doing then essentially is you are saying that we are going to peel away at the apple and we will just allow you to have this core mission of forensic science, public administration, criminal justice, but you can take all your subject matter at another college. No way. No way. If that is a major tenet of your report, we are going to fight it because essentially that is going to eventually diminish and wilt a college like John Jay, it is going to wilt a college like Baruch. You cannot do it that way. You complain on the one hand that you did not have the chance to sit down with the Chancellor and if you had a chance you would be able to convince her. I've got news for you, the chances are you wouldn't and you wouldn't convince the CUNY staff. I think you are deluding yourself, but also you have an obligation to sit down with those other institutions without wiping them out with a sweep of a brush.

Professor Levine: There was no intention to wipe them out and, indeed, I think that intention was the opposite. Right now if a student at CSI says, "I am interested in forensic science," the faculty at CSI will never say to them, "go and take anything at John Jay." The faculty of CSI will say to them, "oh, why don't you study chemistry here? After all, we don't have very many chemistry majors." We are not going to let someone "escape." Now what we are trying to do is achieve a sense where the faculty will not behave that way; where we look upon CUNY not as a federation but as a University. We will take advantage of the strength in all of our institutions. The reason that I used forensic science at John Jay is precisely because it is an excellent program. It is not the intention of this report to diminish John Jay. We did not make up these institutional categories. They are not a consequence of this report. That is what we had to deal with.

Professor Bohigian: I still think the approach is not the approach that should be used in this matter. What you really have to do is to get the faculty to talk about what action you would take. The faculty should be running this University. Instead, you are permitting the Chancellor's office and her staff to run the University. The faculty should be up in arms on issues such as this. We should be up in arms that we are talking about a report that has not been released. We should have some sort of militant action that should be taken. Just arguing among ourselves is not going to help. We have permitted ourselves to be buffaloes over the years and each group has been divided and separated. Each college has been fighting

against each other to a certain extent. We are going to face this no matter what. If this is the fourth report or fifth report folks, we are not implementing, we are not focusing properly. We should be demanding this. The message should go out to every math department, every physics department, every chemistry department and put this on the agenda of their meeting. Demand from the Chancellor that this report be released, not stand for this outrage, some sort of united action. You should also probably go to the PSC and ask for their help in this matter as well because this goes beyond the boundaries of an academic issue, it goes to the very heart of who is running this University -- whether we is going to continue to allow the Chancellor and the staff to run it or whether the faculty are going to take over issues of direct concern to them.

Professor Levine: I would like point out that the recommendation for CUNY-wide disciplinary meetings is an attempt to get the faculty together on a basis that can get some action going. It is not an attempt to set up a structure which will allow what you just recommended.

Professor Speidel (Geology, Queens): I think that President Bowen put it quite succinctly in that what we are looking at is an effort that you people put together advisory to the Chancellor, which explains why it has not received the light of day. I don't mean that in any pejorative sense. It is a real shame because, quite frankly, it is the best written document that I have read coming out of any particular group in the University, certainly including anything from the UFS, and by far and away anything else coming out of the central office. I think that you have articulated many of the problems and I think, quite frankly, that the best service that the Chancellor could offer to the University is to release the report without a response, not get into the particular choice of language or anything else, because some of the things that have been presented under her name are really quite loaded. For example, and I use the thing that Professor Levine talked about earlier about distinguished professors, that they should be recruited with laboratory space recognition, administrative support, but not by the bonus of no teaching. I turn to page seven of the Chancellor's response and on the bottom I see the wording, "the central weight control for doctoral faculty would be arranged to ease the instructional burden of research active faculty." That is a very, very nonfelicitous choice of language and I think that one of things that you can do is to report back to the Chancellor some of the reactions -- as neutrally as possible from her point of view --and ask that she just authorize the release and publication of the report. This is the advice that I have.

Professor Levine: I would like to respond by reading the actual words in the report that that statement was an answer to:

At present our workload formula involves only the number of class hours taught. We call for a renegotiated formula that will equalize workload. We cannot expect new faculty members to spend hours building new laboratory facilities without counting that effort as part of their workload. But we cannot improve without better laboratories -- both for research and for freshman. Furthermore, these efforts should be recognized in tenure and promotion deliberations. Our goal should be to recognize and reward quality work in all of its forms.

The response reads:

Along with the problem of recruiting doctoral faculty, I am asking the Committee on Academic Affairs of the Council of Presidents to see if some appropriate handling of the central weight control for doctoral faculty would be arranged to ease the instructional burden of research active faculty.

That isn't what we were addressing.

Dean Shechter: In response to Professor Speidel's comment, I would recommend that the UFS ask the Chancellor for a release of the report because the Chancellor released the response and it just makes good

sense to look at the report too. I don't know how technically difficult it is to disseminate, but I think the Senate should have the report and disseminate it. That is my recommendation. No one else can do it. One more note, the one thing that I forgot to mention is the person who did all of the writing is Dean Michael Engber from City College. He took all of the reports and forged them into a legible, readable, good document and I think he deserves a lot a credit.

Professor Danziger (English, Hunter): It was interesting to hear your call for University-wide meetings in the disciplines because, in fact, this is something that the UFS has been very interested in, and at the time when the articulation agreements were being discussed, that is precisely what the UFS called for. Such meetings were begun and then got lost in the shuffle. I think instead of just calling it for it as if this were something new, we should be saying that this is something that the faculty is very much interested in, would certainly back, should be revived, and you should refer to our document. In fact, we should recirculate that document to make the point that you are not alone in calling for this.

Dean Shechter: What your pointing out is something very important. We not only have a proliferation of task forces, but also we do not have communication between task forces. We worked here, and I know that there is a task force on articulation, and there is a task force on teacher education, and each one works like that. So I think there must be a mechanism where task forces can talk to each other. A lot of times we are reinventing wheels. I think this is very important.

Professor Caudle (Psychology, Sociology, and Anthropology, CSI): Essentially that was the point that I wanted to make. I am speaking as a Senator, but also as a member of the Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Articulation. So I would like to make an official request that this report be made available to that Committee as a resource because it seems to be quite a rich lode that we can mine as we prepare our own recommendations.

Dean Shechter: You should make the request of the Chancellor.

Professor Lowy (Physics, Queensborough): You may not be aware of it, but I was an alternate member of that Committee and I was not invited, as matter a fact I was specifically prohibited, from attending. I was offered the chance to look at the report provided I would not say anything to anybody and could look it at only in the office at 80th Street. That is just for the record. I think this just emphasizes what previous speakers have said. I would like to add also that I haven't seen the report. I haven't read it. So it is very hard to comment on something that I haven't seen. Aside from that, I think that the emphasis seems to be one sided, towards faculty rather than towards students. Our problem is that we don't have students to go in there. Part of the attraction for students, which I don't know if you have emphasized at all, is the fact that there are jobs available. My experience of going to high schools has been that as soon as you speak of the fact that there is a job available, students become very interested.

Professor Cooper (History, CSI): I was going to quickly point out some history. In fact, Chancellor Kibbee had authorized a convocation of meetings in two disciplines and that got lost in a budget crisis. We were supposed to have all-CUNY, all-day institutes in history and one other discipline. On the matter of research, does that secret collection of fact sheets address the issue of outside business-based funding for research and are you aware of the fact that the Trustees voted last month on the Center for Advanced Technology and the Applied Science Coordinating Institute? Both of which came to the committee which I sit on after they went to the Trustees, in something of a reverse procedure, because of putative deadlines that had to be met. Both of which contain very serious implications about the funding of research in CUNY which may have technologically profitable applications. I know this is not pure research, this is applied, but the basic issue is still an issue. I am not expecting an answer now, but I would like it opened up because it is quite serious and I don't know whether or not, since I haven't read that thing either, it is considered.

Dean Shechter: This report does not address the specific issue of funding from outside sources. It encourages initiatives that will seek outside sources, private and federal. As to the issue of the CAT and the Applied Science Institute, I was at the committee when you addressed it and I think that it should be pursued further on. We did not get the money yet, but once we get the money, of course, what happens when we have patents and things like that remains to be resolved.

Professor Cooper: I just want to say, faculty may not realize it, but the administration seems to be saying, unless I am imagining, that in the future in America, science research in general will be funded, not by public, but by private sources -- larger and larger percentages of it -- if those private sources have something that can be gotten out of it. Obviously this skews whole project, whatever the project.

Professor Levine: Professor Cooper, the report did address this. It is a very difficult issue I can say that we didn't have convenient answers. I will read what we wrote:

Acknowledging that public funding is diminishing, we believe that appeals to business and industry must assume a larger role in funding of research and instruction. There is a caveat here. The faculty member whose research fortuitously lies in areas congenial to a business or industrial entity will have little difficulty persuading it to put some money on the line. Likewise, the faculty member who is willing to tailor research interests to those of this partner will find ready support. The challenge is to encourage industry to support activities which are not in their immediately perceived self-interest.

I know that doesn't answer the question.

Professor Picken: On behalf of the Senate, I would like to thank Professor Lundeen, President Bowen, Professor Levine, and Dean Shechter. I want to assure the Senate and the members of the panel that the Executive Committee will pursue with the Chancellor when it next meets with her, which is in the beginning of November, the question of the release of this report. The one thing I cannot undertake is to say that the Senate will reproduce the report. We just couldn't afford to, but hopefully we will get the report released.

There being no new business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Bruce Hoffacker
Executive Director