

*Faculty Council*

BRONX COMMUNITY COLLEGE  
of The City University of New York

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING - 10/3/63

All members present. Guest: Professor Meyer Rosh

1. Meeting called to order at 12:15 P. M.
2. It was explained that the minutes of September 13, 1963 had been sent to all members of the Faculty in advance of their acceptance by the Council in order to distribute them at the same time as those of the Faculty Conference of May 22, 1963.

Action on Minutes

Minutes of the meeting of September 13, 1963 were accepted with the following corrections:

Item A - p. 4

The first sentence should read: "Membership rosters of committees were accepted as presented; additional memberships will be considered at a later date."

Omit second sentence.

Omit final sentence in second paragraph.

Item G - p. 5

Change "discussion" to "reference was made."

Communications and Announcements

A - From the President:

1. There was a successful conference in the morning with the State Education Department Coordinating Council for Nursing. When the session closed, there were extremely congratulatory statements from several of the committee members in attendance.

2. On October 1, 1963 the Engineers' Council for Professional Development informed Dr. Meister that we had been accredited in Electrical and Mechanical Engineering Technology, in both Day and Evening Sessions, until 1967. Congratulations to Professor Stillerman and his staff on this most successful outcome.

B - From Dean Tauber:

The tentative agenda for the Faculty Conference was prepared by the Agenda Committee. The original date had to be changed because the President could not be present. The new date is Thursday, October 17, 1963. Classes held on Wednesday, October 16 will follow a Thursday schedule.

C - From Dean Minkin:

A tentative Calendar of College Occasions for the 1963-64 year was distributed. Copies will also be sent to all Faculty members.

Unfinished Business

A. Election of two Directors to B. C. C. Inc.

It is specified in the Articles of Incorporation that the Faculty be represented. It was decided that the two nominees polling the greatest number of votes would be the Directors - the other two would be alternates.

Members: Miss Marion Stringham, Mr. Thomas Finnegan  
Alternates: Professors Herman Stein, Marvin Hirshfeld

B. Workload

The President reminded the Council that the report of the Committee to Study Workload was that of an Ad Hoc presidentially-appointed Committee, addressed to the President. The report closes with recommendations, all of which have been considered, but no changes made.

While the final decisions must, of course, be made by the President, Dr. Meister emphasized that he would be guided by the sentiments and recommendations of the Faculty Council after a full discussion.

Each of the Ad Hoc Committee's recommendations was then read aloud and discussed separately:

1. Number of Days Required on Campus Per Week:

It is recommended that within the Master Program and bearing in mind the best interests of the student at all times, the Administration endeavor to give a four-day work-week when feasible to every Faculty member who <sup>2.</sup> deserves it. In every instance it should be understood that a Faculty member is on call for proper college business which may arise, e. g. Faculty meetings, committee meetings or other Faculty events in which the particular Faculty member should be a participant.

The President accepts this recommendation. (It was later noted that in reality this has been college policy since February, 1963.)

2. Classroom Contact Hours:

The committee recommends that each department have discretion to schedule teaching programs within a range of 12 to 16 contact hours per week. In scheduling classroom contact hours departmental chairmen should avoid a consistent pattern of scheduling a Faculty member for multiple preparations and new course preparations in order to maintain maximum teaching effectiveness. Any reduction of contact hours below the present normal fifteen-hour load should be made with the greatest discretion, bearing in mind departmental budgetary allocations, effective organization, and good teaching practices.

This is essentially a budgetary problem. Also, since the City University is at present discussing the whole problem of lengthening the Day Session times, day, week and year, as described in the Levy Report, large lecture classes, T. V., etc., all of these factors are interlocked. While we cannot arrive at a decision at this time, Dr. Meister welcomed discussion.

A special plea was made for some adjustment in teaching load for those teaching GE 1 and 2 (English Composition) in view of the fact that the conference hours scheduled for each student in these classes are in reality part of the requirements for the course. At least two such individual conferences must be scheduled for each student each semester, plus 8 themes in GE 1, and 5 in GE 2.

It was pointed out that another factor to consider is the number of different course and laboratory sections an instructor teaches. Dr. Meister agreed that this was a valid problem and should be considered.

In discussing teaching load, it was explained that 15-16 credit hours per semester or 30-32 per year is the norm for this college. Dr. Meister observed that the Board of Higher Education has never enunciated a University policy. It has been left to each individual college to adopt its own practice. Ever since the inception of B. C. C., we have operated on the policy that "an hour is an hour" in every subject. Consequently, there are no equated hours for labs, health ed., etc. At this point, Dr. Meister showed the formula he has used since the beginning to present B. C. C.'s personnel needs to the Budget Director. In this, contact hours = 25; class size = 21, work load = 15 hours. On this basis, we would need about 150 Faculty to teach next year's projected 1500 Day Session students.

The Ad Hoc Committee report indicated that the decrease in contact hours in other colleges was achieved by increasing class size.

A suggestion was made that the matter of increasing number of contact hours in a course be brought to the Curriculum Committee. It was pointed out that in the past this Committee had been reluctant to discuss teaching load because it was considered to be an administrative function. Dr. Meister indicated that after a department had examined its own educational problem, and considered all the alternatives, it might appeal to the Curriculum Committee for action on increasing the credit hours or contact hours in a course. It was emphasized, however, that there is an interaction in all such matters. The budget is a college-wide one, not a departmental one. Action that may be favorable to one department can work a hardship on another. The discussion brought into focus the complexity of the problem. The question was tabled at this point with the understanding that present policy continues until we can find a satisfactory alternative.

### 3. Office Hours:

Conflicts between the programs of instructors and students and the demands by students on the instructor's time require some flexibility in scheduling office and conference hours. With this in mind we recommend that each instructor schedule a minimum of two office hours per week. Obviously faculty members are always available for consultation with their students by appointment.

Dr. Meister pointed out that the understanding between the college and each Faculty member was 15-16 hours of teaching and 4-5 office hours. However, he was willing to try a system of 2 definitely scheduled office hours, and 2 additional hours of "availability" by appointment. ( Dr. Meister will announce effective date of this at the Faculty Meeting on October 17, 1963.)

The additional recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee: Class Size, Equivalencies of Lecture, Recitation and Laboratory Hours, Compensating Classroom Time for Extra-Curricular and Co-Curricular Activities remain for further deliberation. Present policy will continue.

C. Agenda for Faculty Conference, October 17, 1963

Agenda as presented by the Agenda Committee was approved unanimously.

Reports of Committees

Faculty Welfare - Professor May, Chairman

Professor May reported that his Committee had been requested by Dr. Meister to devise machinery to be used to gather suggestions and reactions to the Community College Bylaws and the "Levy Report." The Committee submitted the following suggestions to Dr. Meister:

1. That the departmental representatives of the Faculty Council be charged with the responsibility of garnering the views, both pro and con, of the Faculty members within their departments.
2. That the Faculty Council representative then submit the highlights of each person's viewpoint, in writing, to the Committee on Faculty Welfare through its chairman.
3. That, after scanning these outlines, the Committee recommend to the Agenda Committee that it invite selected members of the Faculty to give a prepared talk. The Committee on Faculty Welfare will attempt to choose a slate of speakers who will offer representative points of view.
4. That nothing in this procedure shall prevent any member of the Faculty from securing the floor so as to present his viewpoints to the assembled Faculty on the two matters under consideration when it meets on October 17.

The recommendations of the Faculty Welfare Committee were accepted unanimously.

Legislative Conference - Professor Reynolds

Dr. Reynolds reported that he had asked for and secured a postponement of a discussion of the Community College Bylaws until the B. C. C. Faculty had had an opportunity to react to them. Staten Island C. C. has made a point-by-point study comparing the Bylaws of the four-year colleges with the Community Colleges. At

the next meeting, the Legislative Conference will act upon the Bylaws.

At this point, a member of the Faculty questioned the Legislative Conference's action as revealed in the minutes of the meeting of June 6, 1963 in which the following resolution had been sent to Dr. Meister:

In view of the fact that the "Report of Special Committee appointed by the BHE to investigate charges as to Bronx Community College" has been completed and made public, The Legislative Conference expresses the hope that mutual confidence will be restored between the administration and faculty of the Bronx Community College and that the inherent principles of academic freedom will be preserved.

It was pointed out that at the first Faculty meeting in 1962, the Faculty gave Dr. Meister a unanimous vote of confidence. Since the resolution of the Legislative Conference of June 6, 1963 is considered to be a slur on our President, on our Faculty and on our College, a motion was made that a letter be sent to the Legislative Conference from the Faculty of BCC informing them that we consider this resolution to be out of order; that academic freedom has never been in question, nor has mutual confidence.

Mr. Casais, the other representative, responded in defense of the Conference, explaining that this group has a long history of being very much interested in faculty welfare. He did not think this resolution passed by the Legislative Conference was a slur. He stated that the Tuttle Committee was formed as a result of a "conflict." The Legislative Conference merely said we should start with a clean slate.

The representatives were asked what role they had played in this; did they support the resolution?

Dr. Reynolds responded that the original recommendation concerning this resolution was not made by either of our representatives. As he recalled it, Dr. Meister received a letter from the Conference prior to receipt of the minutes so that he might be notified in advance that the resolution was coming. Dr. Reynolds said he supported the resolution because he had been "shaken up" by the Tuttle Committee.

The representatives were then asked whether they were serving the Faculty in this instance.

Mr. Casais explained that their situation at the Legislative Conference was not an easy one. There has always been a feeling of suspicion of the four-year colleges toward the two-year institutions. Our representatives find themselves always on the defensive. The Conference is interested in us nevertheless, "especially since the UFT is on the warpath." Both representatives asserted that they believed the Legislative Conference action was "helpful to the College."

Dr. Meister inquired whether those who had voted for this resolution, had read the original Tuttle Report. Mr. Casais responded that he thought they had not; they had read the press account. Dr. Meister pointed out that their resolution had started, "In view of the fact that the 'Report of Special Committee appointed by the BHE

to investigate charges as to Bronx Community College' has been completed and made public, . . . ." which should have meant that they had at least read the original report before they passed judgment yet they had depended on press releases. He stated that he did not learn before, during or after the discussion at the Legislative Conference that the letter and resolution were coming. Our representatives had never informed him of it themselves. Furthermore, he went on, Dr. Reynolds had never presented his report of the proceedings to the Faculty Council even when given time for a report at both the September and October meetings. He had indicated in response to Dr. Meister's question that the report he had given was a full one.

The motion to send a letter to the Conference from the Faculty was tabled for action at the next meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 2:10 P. M.

Respectfully submitted,

Vera F. Minkin  
Secretary

mr