Minutes of Proceedings, December 20, 1971

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE BOARD OF HIGHER
EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

HELD

DECEMBER 20, 1971

AT THE UNIVERSITY GRADUATE DIVISION
33 WEST 42 STREET—BOROUGH OF MANHATTAN

The Chairman called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m.

There were present:

Luis Quero-Chiesa, Chairman
David I. Ashe
Herbert Berman
Frederick Burkhardt
Maria Josefa Canino
Alexander A. Delle Cese
Fileno DeNovellis,
Jean-Louis d’Heilly
Frederick O’R Hayes
Norman E. Henkin
Minneola P. Ingersoll

Robert Ross Johnson
James Oscar Lee
John A. Morsell
Edward S. Reid
Barbara A. Thacher
Francisco Trilla
Eve Weiss
Nils Y. Wessell
Arleigh B. Williamson
Isaiah E. Robinson, ex officio

N. Michael Carfora, Secretary of the Board
Arthur H. Kahn, General Counsel

Chancellor Robert J. Kibbee
President Milton G. Bassin
President John W. Kneller
President Leonard Lief
President Robert E. Marshak
President Joseph S. Murphy
President Mina Rees
President Donald H. Riddle
President Herbert Schueler
President Richard D. Trent
President Jacqueline G. Wexler
President Clyde J. Wingfield
President William M. Birenbaum
Acting President Peter J. Caffrey

President James A. Colston
President Candido A. deLeon
President Edgar D. Draper
President Leon M. Goldstein
President Kurt R. Schmeller
President Joseph Shenker
Professor Ralph W. Sleeper
Mr. Richard Lewis
Deputy Chancellor Seymour C. Hyman
Vice-Chancellor Julius C. C. Edelstein
Vice-Chancellor Timothy S. Healy
Vice-Chancellor Bernard Mintz
Vice-Chancellor David Newton
Vice-Chancellor Frank J. Schultz

The absence of Mr. Poses was excused.
At this point the Board went into Executive Session.

**NO. A. BRONX COMMUNITY COLLEGE CAMPUS CONSTRUCTION:** Deputy Chancellor Hyman presented a report on the Bronx Community College Campus construction situation.

Motion made, seconded and lost to halt all work on the proposed campus site, start a lawsuit and explore alternative sites.

With respect to the Bronx Community College Campus construction, the Chancellor was instructed to continue along the lines that he has been following, i.e., programming and designing facilities for construction at the air rights site with a new architectural team and proceeding with legal action against the former architect and engineer.

**NO. B. NEW YORK CITY PRESIDENTIAL SEARCH COMMITTEE:** (a) Upon motion duly made, seconded and carried, the following report of the New York City Presidential Search Committee was received and accepted:

REPORT OF THE NEW YORK CITY COMMUNITY COLLEGE PRESIDENTIAL SEARCH COMMITTEE

DECEMBER 20, 1971

Hon. Norman E. Henkin, Chairman
Hon. James Oscar Lee
Hon. Francisco Trilla
Hon. Eve Weiss
Hon. Arleigh B. Williamson

Professor Harry Dunbar
PROFESSOR Rafael Esparra
Professor Mildred D. Tolkoff
Mr. Gilberto Garcia (student representative)
Mr. Peter Laluz (student representative)
Mr. George R. Cole (alumni representative)

The New York City Community College Presidential Search Committee was appointed on September 27, 1971 by the Chairman of the Board of Higher Education, Mr. Frederick Burkhardt, to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of Dr. Milton G. Bassin on September 1, 1971.

Three representatives of the New York City Community College faculty, two representatives of the student body, and one alumni representative were named by their respective groups to serve in an advisory capacity to the Board's Committee.

The Search Committee met with the outside representatives as a committee of the whole six times from September 27, 1971 to December 20, 1971.

The Committee considered in detail the credentials of more than fifty possible candidates and interviewed six candidates for the position.

While mindful of the need to appoint a permanent president of New York City College y Colelge as soon as possible, the Committee was motivated by the conviction that the individual selected possess high academic credentials, dedication to urban education, and proven ability as a leader capable of securing the confidence of the faculty. The Committee is of the unanimous opinion that Herbert M. Sussman, currently President of the Allegheny Campus of the Community College of Allegheny County, completely satisfies the foregoing requirements.
Mr. Sussman was interviewed by the Committee on December 2, 1971. Mr. Sussman’s academic credentials and experience in higher education are most impressive.

The Committee is of the unanimous opinion that Herbert Sussman would be an excellent president of New York City Community College and, therefore, recommends to the Board the following:

(1) RESOLVED, That the Board of Higher Education, acting as the Board of Trustees of New York City Community College, approve the appointment of Herbert M. Sussman as University Professor of Education, and President of New York City Community College, subject to concurrence of the Trustees of the State University of New York, effective February 1, 1972, at a salary rate of $37,275 ($31,275 plus $6,000), subject to financial ability.

(2) RESOLVED, That the bylaws of the Board be waived to effectuate the appointment of Mr. Sussman as University Professor of Education, as Mr. Sussman does not possess the Ph.D. degree.

Upon motions duly made, seconded and carried, the following resolutions were adopted:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Higher Education, acting as the Board of Trustees of New York City Community College, approve the appointment of Herbert M. Sussman as University Professor of Education, and President of New York City Community College, subject to concurrence of the Trustees of the State University of New York, effective February 1, 1972, at a salary rate of $37,275 ($31,275 plus $6,000), subject to financial ability; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the bylaws of the Board be waived to effectuate the appointment of Mr. Sussman as University Professor of Education, as Mr. Sussman does not possess the Ph.D. degree.

NOTE: Approved by the Trustees of the State University of New York on January 25, 1972.

Upon motions duly made, seconded and carried, the following resolutions were adopted or action was taken as noted: (Cal. Nos. 1 through 11)

NO. 1. ELECTION OF VICE-CHAIRMAN: The Honorable Barbara A. Thacher was elected Second Vice-Chairman to fill the unexpired term of the Honorable Luis Quero-Chiesa, which ends May, 1972.

At this point the Board went into Regular Session.

NO. 2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: RESOLVED, That the minutes of the Board of Higher Education for the following meetings be approved as circulated:

- Special Meeting - January 18, 1971
- Regular Meeting - January 25, 1971
- Executive Committee Meeting - February 9, 1971
- Regular Meeting - February 22, 1971
- Regular Meeting - March 22, 1971

NO. 3. COMMITTEE ON LAW: (a) PROPOSED BYLAW AMENDMENTS RELATING TO REMOVAL OF CERTAIN PERSONNEL, laid over.
(b) Mr. Ashe, on behalf of the Committee on Law reported that the State Division on Human Rights dismissed the complaint of Professors Mallaly and Powers of Queens College. Professors Mallaly and Powers claimed that they were denied promotion on the grounds that they were Catholics.

NO. 4. REORGANIZATION OF THE GRADUATE DIVISION AS THE GRADUATE SCHOOL AND UNIVERSITY CENTER: (a) Resolution of the Committee on the Academic Program approved as follows:

WHEREAS, The Board of Higher Education has studied the role of graduate education at the City University and has determined that the University should make full and innovative use of the educational resources of the Graduate Division in developing graduate and undergraduate education; therefore be it

RESOLVED, That a strong, concerted and public effort be made by the Board of Higher Education and the Central Office to emphasize the importance of graduate study for the University, the relationship between graduate studies and the total educational effort of the University and our commitment to continue and to strengthen graduate education at the University; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Chancellor of the City University be authorized to reorganize the Graduate Division as the Graduate School and University Center; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Graduate School and University Center be structured as follows:

The Graduate School and University Center shall be headed by a President who shall have responsible to him the following:

a. Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies
b. Dean for Urban Policy and Programs
c. Dean for University and Special Programs

There shall be a policy advisory committee of Presidents appointed by the Chancellor for the Graduate School and University Center;

and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Dean for University and Special Programs shall initially have responsibility for the Program for Study Abroad and the CUNY B.A. Included under the responsibilities of the Dean for Urban Policy and Programs shall be the Urban Analysis Center; and be it further

RESOLVED, That with the establishment of the Graduate School and University Center, an ad hoc committee jointly appointed by the Chancellor and the President of the Graduate School and University Center shall be convened (1) to develop guidelines to retain doctoral studies as the major function, (2) to specify the criteria under which new programs will be developed and adopted, and (3) to determine the nature and structure of the academic councils that will govern the several programs; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the physical facility on 42nd Street shall be designated as The Graduate School and University Center; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Master Plan of the Board of Higher Education be so amended.
EXPLANATION: Early this year, Chancellor Bowker developed a proposal to enhance the role of the University's Graduate Center by broadening its scope, structure, and functions.

The educational purpose of the proposal was to draw together and encourage greater cooperation and interchange of ideas among the faculties of CUNY's colleges, involves a larger number of faculty from the individual colleges in university-wide programs, and, at the same time, provide a dynamic setting for university-wide activities, including the doctoral programs, research activities, educational pilot programs, urban internship programs, urban service and research activities, and other educational programs.

The administrative aim of the proposal was to free the Chancellor's office from the direct responsibility of administering programs which are essentially educational and which divert a disproportionate amount of attention from the major tasks of the Central Administration.

During the past two months, extensive hearings have been held by the Committee on the Academic Program (expanded for this purpose to include members of the Board's Executive Committee) to determine the views of interested parties. Among those who testified were the President of the Graduate Division and her staff, representatives from the Faculty Senate and the Legislative Conference, and members of the central administrative staff.

In the course of the hearings the following points emerged:

1. The Graduate Division has a vital role to play within the University, and the University must respond by developing a variety of ways to make full use of the educational resources of the Division in order to enhance both graduate and undergraduate education.

2. A much better liaison than presently exists should be established between the Graduate Division and the colleges of the University, and more direct links between graduate and undergraduate education should be developed.

3. In view of the special relationship between the City University and the City of New York, it would be appropriate for the University to develop a larger number of study and research programs in the area of urban affairs. It is in this area that the faculty of the City University can make a contribution to the City of New York which is unique and which would benefit the faculty and students as well.

At the conclusion of the hearings, the Committee received a position paper from Chancellor Kibbee (please see below) and voted unanimously to endorse it. The recommendations of the Chancellor's paper are embodied in the above resolution.

The broadening of the scope and structure of the Center to include the University-wide programs proposed here will have the result of immediately involving and serving many more faculty and students throughout the University. The Graduate School and University Center will emerge as an increasingly important facility for CUNY's colleges individually and for the entire University. The broadening of the base and functions of the Center will strengthen this entity as a whole and consequently, its component parts, including the doctoral programs, and relate it more directly to the contemporary urban scene.

(b) Comment and original recommendations of the Chancellor:

The proposed reorganization of the Graduate Division and the Graduate Center was laid over from last month so that the faculty and students of the Graduate Division might have an opportunity to speak to the issues.

During this time I have met on several occasions with representatives of the faculty and students separately and with an AD HOC Committee of the Graduate Council. The latter group also appeared before the Committee on the Academic Program.

As a result of these meetings I agreed to a number of changes in the wording of my recommendations which I felt did not impinge upon the substance of what was proposed but which did seem to ease the concerns of the faculty and the students.

These changes are reflected in the resolutions before you. My original proposal has been included in the agenda because it attempts to set forth the reasoning on which my recommendations are based. The recommendations at the conclusion of my paper have been rephrased in a manner that is reflected in the resolutions.

NOTE: Original recommendations of the Chancellor follow:
In the late Spring of 1971, Chancellor Bowker prepared a memorandum outlining proposed changes in the organization of programs operated by the Central Administration and the Graduate Division of the City University. He was moved to suggest these changes by two fundamental considerations: what he and others perceived to be the budgetary vulnerability of the Graduate Division in the present fiscal and psychological climate and by his conviction that except under very special circumstances the Central Administration should not be involved in operating primarily academic programs.

The Chancellor’s experience during the 1971 budget cycle both in the City and in Albany convinced him that there was resurgent opposition to the University’s doctoral programs—an opposition brought to new sharpness by the severe fiscal crisis at both State and City levels of government. The reasons behind the opposition are numerous and complex: a rising spirit of anti-intellectualism in influential quarters; the growing belief that there is or soon will be a glut in the doctoral market; the high-cost of graduate education; the visibility and relative grandeur of the Graduate Center which to the uninitiated is the same as the Graduate Division; the lack of any substantial constituency to speak for doctoral programs; the fiscal plight of private universities and a belief (privately supported by many of those in private universities) that CUNY is draining off badly needed revenue from them; and a belief that we are unnecessarily duplicating programs that already exist in the City and which could absorb additional students less expensively. Where in more expansive times these might be considered the private opinions of individuals, today as the financial situation worsens they become the rationale for action. As such they cannot be dismissed lightly.

The educational reasons behind the suggested reorganization were clearly stated in the Chancellor’s memorandum and are generally understood. The Central Administration was not designed to carry on operational academic programs; it is not properly staffed to do so; it is not the appropriate atmosphere for such programs; when situated in the Central Office, these programs lack the contact with and control of the faculty that is essential to their proper development.

The Board referred the proposal to its Committee on the Academic Program for this purpose by members of the Senate. Since the Chancellor’s memorandum was released several formal responses have been received which deserve consideration.

In a memorandum to the Committee on the Academic Program dated September 22, President Rees made several important points. First she concurred in the educational reasoning in the Bowker memorandum and felt that those programs which were clearly educational could be subsumed within the Graduate Division. At the same time she felt that programs that were essentially administrative (e.g., SEEK Central) should remain with the Central Administration.

On October 13 a special committee of the University Faculty Senate, chaired by Professor Peter Caws, proposed to a plenary session of the Senate a statement regarding the future of the Graduate Division. The statement essentially adopts a position closer to that presented by President Rees supporting the possibility of the Graduate Division, accepting responsibility for certain all-university educational programs but asserts that this can and should be done without a change in the name and general structure of the Graduate Division. The Committee’s report was acted upon by the Senate at a special plenary session on October 25.

The Senate recommended a strong stand by the Board of Higher Education linking doctoral work to other University programs; that only all-university academic programs compatible with the Graduate Division’s mission should be transferred to it and specifically excluding undergraduate and masters programs operated by the colleges; and suggesting ways in which the Graduate Division might be reduced but was firm in her conviction that the Bowker plan would not really reduce significantly the vulnerability of the Division to those who questioned the wisdom or cost of the programs while at the same time it would obscure the identity of the graduate programs and seemed to reduce their significance within the University.

In a memorandum to the Council of Presidents dated October 4, President Marshak made an alternate suggestion that only all-university undergraduate programs might properly be administered at one of the colleges under a director appointed by the President but with a CUNY-wide policy council appointed by the Chancellor. He agreed with President Rees that essentially administrative functions should remain with the Central Office.

A Committee of the Council of Presidents also has taken up the Bowker memorandum and the substance of its feeling was conveyed to the CAP by President Rees.

The Committee agreed that a continuation of doctoral level education at the City University is essential for the maintenance and enhancement of the quality of academic work throughout the University. The Committee concluded that this position argues for the diversification of the work of the Graduate Division only in ways that are related to graduate study and research or, at least, are not dysfunctional to the basic concerns of the Division.
Others have testified before the Committee on the Academic Program but for the most part they have supported one or another of the positions described above. Vice-Chancellor Edelstein, who worked most closely with Chancellor Bowker in guiding the University budget through local and State legislative bodies and budget offices, confirmed the Chancellor's perceptions of what was happening and the political vulnerability of the doctoral programs in an era when the scalp is being replaced by the ax.

There are a series of questions which one could pose based on the information and the judgments that are available to us:

1. How real is the political threat to the Graduate Division and how serious might be its consequences?

2. If it is real and serious, does the suggestion that the Graduate Division be "hidden" in some larger entity ameliorate that threat and by how much?

3. Are there other administrative moves that might also ease the danger?

4. What is the effect upon the Graduate Division and the strength of doctoral programs of whatever measures which might be adopted?

5. Should all university educational programs be moved from the Central Office into a more academic atmosphere? If so, how should this be done?

6. If other programs are moved to the Graduate Center how should they be administered? Within some new structure? Under the present Graduate Division? Separately?

There are undoubtedly other questions. However, if we can answer these we will be well along toward a solution which can be adjusted in detail, as problems develop and are perceived.

I would like to give my answers to these questions and then make a series of recommendations.

First, we must accept the contention that the political threat to the Graduate Division is both real and serious. Those closest to the budget process have so stated. Chancellor Bowker for the past eight years devoted much of his considerable talent and effort to build the graduate programs at this University. His commitment to the essential importance of graduate study in the University and to its sound development was certainly as great as that of anyone in the University. It must be accepted as a given fact that his proposal was an effort to save the Graduate Division and not to destroy it.

The possible consequence of the political, or, more accurately, the budgetary, threat to the Graduate Division is more difficult to assign with any precision. At the outside, we must assume that forced to choose between graduate and undergraduate programs or between graduate study and the implementation of "open admissions," the graduate operation would be sacrificed by those whose political survival depends upon the support of well-defined constituencies. More realistically, the danger might take the form of freezing or reducing expenditures for the Graduate Division, a process that would either stifle growth or constrict the scope of graduate programs, or both. The severity of such action would most likely be a reflection of the level of the financial crisis faced by the City and the State.

Actually it is difficult, if not impossible, to really hide the graduate program from a determined attack from those who really wish to curtail it. The Bowker proposal is a means of making it extremely difficult to get at the Graduate Division in its entirety and might serve to divert attention from the relatively high costs of doctoral programs. If our only concern were to effectively mix graduate costs into those of other ongoing programs, locating the programs on the individual campuses would seem to be a superior strategy or, alternately to place the funding of the program in individual budgets to be drawn on by the graduate program. Such solutions, however, could easily destroy the central unifying concept on which the development of graduate study was established.

We should not dismiss too lightly the danger of destroying or diluting the identity of the Graduate Division. There is a very real sense in which the graduate program is what makes CUNY a university rather than a consortium of colleges. The Division is an important symbol of our own commitment to the importance of graduate study and to our view of ourselves as a total university. This commitment is important if we are to attract and retain first-rate scholars to the University. The University's success in building up a number of strong doctoral programs in a remarkably short period of time may be attributed in part at least to the visibility of the program both as an attraction to those from without and a rallying point for the many fine scholars who were already present on the various campuses.

In my mind, there is no doubt that the primarily academic programs which are currently being operated from the Central Office should be moved to an atmosphere where faculty involvement is more direct and where other academic programs can serve both as a support and a stimulus. For the present, I believe most of them should not be located on individual campuses. It is difficult for an all-university program to maintain the support and interest of faculty from many campuses when it is placed on one campus even if only for administrative purposes. The tendency is for others to think of such programs as the particular responsibility of the mother campus despite efforts to involve everyone.

The only non-campus oriented facility that combines both an academic atmosphere and an independent, all-university image, is the Center on 42nd Street. It is my feeling that so long as we wish to consider academic or academically related programs as all-university programs, they should be located there. At the same time, I believe it would be a mistake to place them under the wing of the Graduate Division as such. This could only serve to dilute the efforts of those whose principal concern is, and should be, graduate education and research. It would also place these programs which have an importance of their own under the sponsorship of those who have a different mission and a different set of interests.
RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on my view of the situation as presented in the preceding paragraphs, I wish to make the following recommendations:

(1) A strong, concerted and public effort be made by the Board of Higher Education and the Central Office to emphasize the importance of graduate study for the University, the relationship between graduate studies and the total educational effort of the University and our commitment to continue and to strengthen graduate education at the University.

(2) The physical facility on 42nd Street should be designated as The Graduate School and University Center.

(3) The Graduate Division should be reorganized as The Graduate School and University Center.

(4) The Graduate School and University Center should be headed by a President who shall have responsible to him the following:

   (a) Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies
   (b) Dean for Urban Policy and Programs
   (c) Dean for University and Special Programs

(5) There should be a policy advisory committee of Presidents appointed by the Chancellor for The Graduate School and University

(6) Initially the University Center should include the Program for Study Abroad and the CUNY B.A. As other programs develop or the future thrust of existing programs becomes clearer, they should be added to the Center if they meet the criteria of academic-relatedness. Included under the responsibilities of the Dean for Urban Policy and Programs would be the Urban Analysis Center.

(7) For the present, the Research Foundation and SEEK Central will be retained within the Central administrative structure.

CONCLUSION

This proposal has emphasized solutions to the educational problems raised by the Bowker memorandum rather than the political-budgetary problem. These are, I believe, some elements of the proposal that will blunt to some extent the budgetary attack on what is now the Graduate Division. The immediate and longer-range additions to the new organizational structure will tend to relate it more directly with the contemporary urban scene, with government itself and with a larger constituency. The Graduate Faculties themselves might expand these relationships by developing inter-disciplinary doctoral programs that speak directly to the needs of the community and of government.

At the same time, the proposal attempts to retain the importance and centrality of the doctoral programs within the new structure. The Division has been raised to the status of a School and the Dean of Graduate Studies designated as Provost. The Board of Higher Education can further confirm the University's commitment to the graduate program by selecting as president of the new operation a person of a stature to assure the graduate faculty that the Board and the Central Office are firmly committed to excellence in the graduate programs of the University.

THE GRADUATE SCHOOL AND UNIVERSITY CENTER

![Diagram of the Graduate School and University Center]

1 Policy Advisory Committee (Presidents)
NO. 5. COMMITTEE ON THE ACADEMIC PROGRAM: Motion made, seconded and lost to lay over the recommendations of the Committee on the Academic Program.

RESOLVED, That the following items approved by the Committee on the Academic Program be adopted:

(a) MASTER IN URBAN PLANNING—THE CITY COLLEGE:

RESOLVED, That The City College be authorized to award the Master in Urban Planning degree; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Career Option in Urban Design, leading to the Master in Urban Planning degree, to be given by The City College, be approved in principle, effective February 1972, subject to the approval of the New York State Board of Regents; and be it further

RESOLVED, That two years after approval in principle, the Committee on the Academic Program will initiate a preliminary review of the program in consultation with the President of The City College; and be it further

RESOLVED, That five years after the initiation of the program, the Committee on the Academic Program will act on final approval; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Master Plan be so amended.

EXPLANATION: There is a strong need for architects who can operate effectively amid the constraints and complexities of urban problems. To help train graduate architects to understand the problems of our cities, this program combines professional on-the-job training with classroom instruction. In morning classes, students will study the component parts of contemporary cities; learn how to gather and use data in the formulation of urban planning problems; examine the concepts and methods used by the social sciences to analyze urban social, political, and economic structures; and study the legal framework within which the urban designer must operate.

In the afternoons, students will work in the City Planning Department or the Housing and Development Administration under close professional supervision on a clearly defined urban design project.

New York City has been in the forefront of the movement to make urban design a part of the governmental process. In establishing links with city agencies, this program takes advantage of the special expertise available in the City in urban design and is the only program in the State to offer practical experience in real urban design problems.

(b) BACHELOR OF SCIENCE (LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE) — THE CITY COLLEGE:

RESOLVED, That the program in Urban Landscape Architecture, leading to the B.S. degree (Landscape Architecture), to be given by The City College, be approved, effective immediately, subject to the approval of the New York State Board of Regents; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Master Plan be so amended.

EXPLANATION: This program will provide a career opportunity for students now in the School of Architecture and Environmental Studies who have a special interest, motivation, and ability in the design of private and public urban open space systems.

The curriculum is designed to meet an ever-increasing need for landscape architects from urban areas who are educated and trained to deal with some of the problems created by the urban environment. In this program - the only one of its kind in New York City - the City itself will be used as a workshop to teach students how to design the physical settings for community and neighborhood groups who use the open space system of the City. Students will be given a knowledge of the special technological systems and materials that are necessary in the construction and maintenance of urban open space systems and by means of first hand experience will gain insights into the operations of government and the decision-making process involved in the creation of public open spaces.

The program will serve the City by creating a group of architects trained to understand some of its special problems. It is expected that the curriculum will become a model for urban landscape architectural education programs.
(c) M.A. IN RUSSIAN AREA STUDIES FOR TEACHERS OF SECONDARY SCHOOL SOCIAL STUDIES—HUNTER COLLEGE:

RESOLVED, That the Russian Area Studies for Teachers of Secondary School Social Studies leading to the Master of Arts (M.A.) degree, to be given by Hunter College, be approved in principle, effective February, 1972, subject to the approval of the New York State Board of Regents; and be it further

RESOLVED, That two years after approval in principle, the Committee on the Academic Program will initiate a preliminary review of the program in consultation with the President of Hunter College; and be it further

RESOLVED, That five years after the initiation of the program, the Committee on the Academic Program will act on final approval; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Master Plan be so amended.

EXPLANATION: This program recognizes the growing need for social studies teachers with a specialized knowledge of non-western areas, particularly the Soviet Union and its sphere of influence. It is designed to serve present or prospective secondary school social studies teachers who wish to further their graduate education and facilitate their professional advancement.

Graduates of this program will qualify for inclusion in the list of those recommended by Hunter College, under its approved Teacher Education Program, to the New York State Education Department for permanent certification as teachers of secondary school social studies, and will meet the requirements of the New York City Board of Education for a permanent license in secondary school social studies.

No similar curriculum is being offered within the New York City metropolitan area, and this program will help to fill a local need for social studies teachers with a knowledge of Russian and Soviet Affairs.

(d) PERFORMANCE-BASED UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM—BROOKLYN COLLEGE:

RESOLVED, That the Performance-Based Undergraduate Program for the Education of Teachers, leading to the B.A. in Education, to be given by Brooklyn College, be approved, effective September, 1972, subject to the approval of the New York State Board of Regents; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Master Plan be so amended.

EXPLANATION: The primary objective of this highly innovative program is to improve the education of children and youth in an urban setting by providing entirely new methods of training their teachers. The program calls for a new partnership among college educators, school personnel, and community agencies. An essential element is the establishment of complexes known as 'School-Community Teaching-Learning Centers.' Each Center would contain physical facilities for instruction and research, would be related to nearby elementary, junior and senior high schools, and would take on the unique quality appropriate for meeting the needs and developing the strengths of the community which it serves.

The program, which is designed to encourage a problem-solving, self-exploratory approach on the part of the Center personnel and students instead of the mere practice of skills, calls for curricula that will integrate course content with field experience, from the first course through the entire sequence. It seeks to improve teacher education by basing the mode and content of instruction on recent research on teaching-learning behavior and by providing increasingly complex field experiences which are directed toward helping prospective teachers to understand the aspirations and potentialities of the children and youth in the schools in which they plan to teach. Contact with Afro-American and Puerto Rican children and youth who constitute a majority of the public school population of New York City will be emphasized.

(e) B.A. – M.A. IN MUSIC—QUEENS COLLEGE:

RESOLVED, That the program leading to the 4 1/2 year B.A.—M.A. in Music, to be given at Queens College, be approved in principle, effective February, 1972, subject to the approval of the New York State Board of Regents; and be it further
RESOLVED, That two years after approval in principle, the Committee on the Academic Program will initiate a preliminary review of the program in consultation with the President of Queens College; and be it further

RESOLVED, That five years after the initiation of the program, the Committee on the Academic Program will act on final approval; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Master Plan be so amended.

EXPLANATION: This program identifies the gifted music student at an early stage of his college career and encourages him to move into graduate work as rapidly as possible. It enables high caliber students to undertake advanced work during the third year of study and to start the graduate level curriculum by the beginning of the fourth year.

This program will serve to attract outstanding students to Queens, since it will provide them with a unique opportunity to compress their studies. It will also feed into the Ph.D. program in Musicology those Queens students who might otherwise be attracted to other universities. It is anticipated that the Department of Music at Queens and the University as a whole will benefit by the presence of the very gifted student who, under other circumstances, might turn elsewhere.

(f) WOMEN STUDIES PROGRAM—RICHMOND COLLEGE:

RESOLVED, That the Women Studies Program, leading to the B.A. Degree, to be given by Richmond College, be approved, effective February, 1972, subject to the approval of the New York State Board of Regents; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Master Plan be so amended.

EXPLANATION: Courses in Women Studies are being offered at virtually all of the colleges and universities in the New York metropolitan area. However, this program is the first in the area to coordinate the course offerings within the various disciplines into a coherent program.

Demand for the program has come from an increasing number of students at Richmond and the CUNY Graduate Center, and from women in the community who have expressed a desire to return to complete their undergraduate education if they could participate in such a program which would be particularly relevant to their interests. It will provide students with an opportunity to study materials and data pertaining to women which have been previously overlooked, and will prepare them for graduate work in Women Studies and for a variety of new positions which are now being developed for persons with a background in Women Studies.

(g) CONCENTRATION IN PUERTO RICAN STUDIES—LEHMAN COLLEGE:

RESOLVED, That the concentration in Puerto Rican Studies leading to the B.A. Degree, to be given by Lehman College, be approved, effective February, 1972, subject to the approval of the New York State Board of Regents; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Master Plan be so amended.

EXPLANATION: The purpose of this curriculum is to prepare students for graduate study in Puerto Rican affairs, and to provide prospective teachers with a knowledge of the cultural heritage of children whose language, customs, ideas and ideals are rooted in the historical, socio-economic, political and educational background of Puerto Rico. The program will serve to meet the increasing educational needs of students who are aware of the importance of academic training in order to deal intelligently with the social and cultural problems of the Puerto Rican minority group and it will help to relate the College to the Puerto Rican community in New York City. The interdepartmental character of the courses will also increase cooperation between the Department of Puerto Rican Studies and other departments of the college such as history, political science, economics, education, sociology, anthropology, and Spanish.

(h) COMMUNITY COLLEGE STUDENT OPTIONS—CUNY BA PROGRAM:

RESOLVED, That as of February, 1972, a community college student in the CUNY BA Program will have the following options:
1. He may elect, in fulfilling the CUNY BA requirements, to achieve an Associate Degree as awarded by a community college in the City University. Upon receiving the Associate Degree, he shall be automatically matriculated into a senior college of his choice for the purpose of completing the CUNY BA Degree.

2. He may elect to proceed directly to the CUNY BA Degree without achieving an Associate Degree. Such student, upon the certification of his Faculty Committee that he has earned 60 credits in good standing, shall automatically be matriculated into a senior college of his choice for the purpose of completing the CUNY BA Degree.

EXPLANATION: The above resolution is presented to overcome the difficulty the CUNY BA Degree Program encountered with community college students when they reach the maximum number of tuition-free credits at the community college. This resolution is unanimously recommended by the University CUNY BA Committee.

NOTE: Mr. Hayes asked to be recorded as voting "NO" because of the lack of information with respect to the fiscal responsibility of the programs.

NO. 6. COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT: RESOLVED, That the following items approved by the Committee on Campus Planning and Development be adopted:

(a) CONSTRUCTION OF NEW PHYSICAL EDUCATION BUILDING – KINGSBOROUGH COMMUNITY COLLEGE:

RESOLVED, That the Board approve preliminary plans, outline specifications and preliminary estimate of cost of $5,602,043 (as of December 1971) for construction of a new Physical Education Building, as part of the proposed Phase I Construction, at Kingsborough Community College, as prepared by James Stewart Polshek & Associates, Architects; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Bureau of the Budget be and is hereby requested to approve said documents and estimate, and a cost limitation of $6,935,908 (including $514,278 for escalation to projected bid date of September 1972, $305,816 for contingencies during construction and $513,771 for bid contingency) chargeable to Capital Project HN-190; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the State University be and is hereby requested as appropriate to establish or adjust the applicable Capital Budget Project to implement the action approved by this resolution.

EXPLANATION: The building delineated in the preliminary plans is basically a reinforced concrete and structural steel frame on pile foundations with a brick and glass facade. Interior finishes and mechanical systems conform to our standards. The building contains gymnasium, pool, locker rooms, offices and special activities spaces all in strict conformity with the program of requirements. In accordance with Board resolution of May 3, 1971, Calendar No. 2(j), as approved by the Bureau of the Budget, Phase I and II, as originally outlined in the Master Plan, have been combined in Phase I. The plans meet the approval of the College and the Office of Campus Planning and Development in all aspects of design and function.

The plans have received preliminary examination of the Building Department and conform to legal requirements for exits and stairs, subject of course to final examination of completed contract documents. The design has also received preliminary approval of the Art Commission of the City of New York which rules on aesthetic considerations.

The original Master Plan Budget as of June 1969 based on a gross area of 95,565 sq. ft. $3,876,500

Approved changes of 2,958 G.S.F. at $45.66 per sq. ft. 135,062

Sub-total $4,011,562

Reduction for pro-rated heating and cooling equipment required in Central Power Plant 45,990
Minutes of Proceedings, December 20, 1971

Revised June 1969 Budget ................................................................. $3,966,572

Escalation Cost Factor from June 1969 to December 1971
is 33.17% x $3,966,572 ................................................................. 1,314,780

Total .................................................. $5,280,352

ITEMS NOT FORESEEABLE PRIOR TO COMPLETION OF MASTER PLAN

(a) Special fills as required to raise building elevation
(Corps of Engineers new requirements for flood control) ....................... $131,016

(b) Transformer Vaults required for overall site (electrical distribution
requirements not available prior to completion of Master Plan) ................... 27,295

(c) Demolition of Existing Power Plant (Building has been
shifted to site of Existing Power Plant to provide better plan and
connections to remainder of campus) ................................................ 211,865

Total Master Plan Adjusted Budget as of December 1971 ......................... $5,650,418

The Architect's estimate of $5,602,043 is lower than this above amount by $48,735 and is therefore considered to be within our
allowable total project cost limits.

The gross area of the building as proposed is 98,884 square feet. The cost of building construction only, per square foot,
excluding land fill, as of December 1971, is therefore $5,259,172 divided by 98,884 or $53.19 per square foot, which is
considered reasonable for this type of building.

It should be noted that the estimated cost of $5,602,043 is to be considered a "value" estimate. The estimators define this as
being one reflecting "normal" market conditions. A "normal" market would reflect known labor wage rates; known material
costs; available work forces of all trades; sufficient supply of building materials; normal or predictable labor productivity;
sufficient and responsive available bidders; unrestrictive financial capabilities; sufficient subcontractors and material suppliers.

As stated in the body of the resolution, the estimators advise that given present-day bidding and market conditions, bids might be
expected to range up to 8% higher than their present "value" estimate to reflect present abnormal market conditions. Accordingly, an amount of $513,771 has been requested for bidding contingency should market conditions at time of bidding
reflect abnormal pricing similar to present day conditions.

At the time of completion of final plans and a final detailed estimate, an assessment of the bidding market will be made. This
analysis will determine the degree of abnormality of the market at that time. An abnormal market would reflect premium labor
costs for overtime, travel or guaranteed wages; premium prices for materials or a shortage of materials; shortage of skilled labor;
insufficient prime or subcontractors, reflecting poor responsive competitive bids; high borrowing costs for construction activities;
high risk factors due to long term construction durations; decrease in labor productivity.

The estimators are maintaining a monthly guideline on market abnormality factors and will keep CUNY advised during the
development of final plans as to general trends or anticipated impact.

Both the estimators and the construction manager, as well as the University and College technical staffs, believe that the building
as designed is reasonable and economical considering the program functions to be served.

On this basis it is recommended that the plans be accepted and that approval of the Budget Director be requested in order that
final plans may be developed for this vitally needed facility.

(b) DENTAL HYGIENE CLINIC – NEW YORK CITY COMMUNITY COLLEGE:

RESOLVED, That the Board approve final plans, specifications and an estimate of cost of $595,650 (including
escalation and contingencies) for a Dental Hygiene Clinic, Pearl Street Building of New York City Community
College as prepared by the staff of the College with the assistance of Steinharter-Schwarz Associates, Consulting
Engineers for Mechanical Work. The cost of construction is to be charged to Capital Project HN-206; and be it
further

RESOLVED, That the State University be, and is hereby requested as appropriate, to establish or adjust the
applicable Capital Budget Project to implement the action approved by this resolution.

EXPLANATION: On September 28, 1970, Calendar No. C11, the Board approved the preliminary plans, specifications and
estimate of cost for the New Dental Hygiene Clinic. The Bureau of the Budget in a Certificate CP 5820 dated January 27, 1971,
approved the preliminary plans, specifications and a cost limitation of $595,650 for this alteration. The present documents and
estimates have been reviewed by the staff of the University Dean of Campus Planning and have been found satisfactory.
NO. 7. CHANCELLOR'S REPORT: (a) Oral Report:

The first thing I would like to do is to note a regulation which was included in the Chancellor's Report of May 26, 1969, which requires that I report annually to the Board no later than the December meeting the progress of the University in achieving racial integration. There will be a complete report in greater detail sent out to each Board member, but I would like to make a few points. I have here a five-year progress report on the numbers and percentages of various racial groups in the population of the City University. In 1967, there were 120,000 undergraduates in The City University of New York, of whom 99,000 were white, 12,000 were black, 3,000 to 4,000 were Puerto Rican, and 5,000 others. In 1971, of a population of 180,000 students, 123,000 were white, 33,000 were black, and 10,250 were Puerto Rican. Expressed in percentages, the percentage of the white population of the University has decreased from 81.7% in 1967 to 68.7% in 1971. The percentage of the black population has increased from 10.2% in 1967 to 18.8% in 1971, and the Puerto Rican population has increased from 2.9% in 1967 to 5.7% in 1971. The percentage of "others" has decreased from 4.1% to 3.6%. There has been a gradual increase in the percentage of black and Puerto Rican undergraduate students and a gradual decrease in the percentage of whites. One other statistic. In 1967 the freshman class, full-time and part-time matriculated students, was 6.5% black; this year it was 21.0% black. The percentage of Puerto Rican freshmen rose from 4.0% to 8.6%, and "others"—which includes whites—went from 89.5% to 70.4%. I would like that much of my report placed on the record as part of my oral report, and a complete report will be sent to each Board member so that you will have a complete analysis in greater detail.

The second thing I would like to bring to the attention of the Board is the matter of our budget. The Board approved a budget of $496 million dollars. The Mayor is required by State law to certify our budget to the State. He has certified a budget of 455 million dollars. This came about as a result of negotiations with the Mayor's Office.

I would like to bring a few matters of fact to your attention to bring you up-to-date. Mr. Ashe has referred to the Powell Case. With respect to the Powell Case, the Case was argued in the Appellate Division on December 7. There has been no decision, and I don't know whether one will be coming down. The Sabbatical Leave Case, which many of you may recall which I filed last year, was before the Appellate Division, and on December 10, that Court unanimously affirmed the decision of Judge Dollinger. Finally, we have filed an amicus brief with the Supreme Court in the Roth Case. We requested the Corporation Counsel to file such a brief, which he did—arguing that neither the University nor the City should have to give reasons for the non-reappointment of probationary personnel.

There were two major matters that I wanted to talk to you about. The most important one is the private university plan which most of you have seen spread on the pages of The New York Times last Wednesday. The report came as a surprise to me as well as to you even though I knew several days beforehand that it was going to be done. A copy of the statement of the college presidents involved was given to me late Monday evening, and I had a visit from Mr. Kirkpatrick, of the C.I.C.U., on Tuesday morning to ask if I had any reaction, which I gave him. The plan was presented at a press conference on Tuesday afternoon. I released a reply at a press conference of my own on Wednesday and spoke to the student press the following day. The proposal has several parts to it, the creation of an emergency fund at the State level to take care of short-range problems, and a long-range solution to the higher educational financing problem in the form of a tuition plan with a gimmick. The gimmick of the plan was to pay for it by taxing students attending public institutions. The proposal covers questions which we are discussing in the Regional Advisory Council. An advisory committee to the State Education Commission is presently taking up the same question and laid over to its next meeting discussion of a series of plans prepared by Dr. Hollander. A small task force was formed, of which Frank Schultz of our staff is a member, to develop more detailed information as a basis for considering the several alternative proposals. Unfortunately, the private university plan was submitted before either the Advisory Council or the Advisory Committee could meet.

I think the Board should have a little more information on what has gotten to be a cause celebre in the City, namely, the proposal from the Council of Presidents for a single session day throughout the University. This is believed in some quarters to be a plan to eliminate the Schools of General Studies and all of the programs carried on by the Schools of General Studies, programs for students who work in the daytime and must attend school at night and those attending adult education courses. This is not the intent of the documents and cannot be inferred from any reading of the documents that came out of the Council of Presidents. It would be impossible for this much misinformation to be gotten out unintentionally, and since most of the flak from this has come from certain areas of the City, I think it is an effort to kill the plan before it is discussed. The plan has been passed by the Council of Presidents in principle and has been referred to the Faculty Senate, the Student Senate, and the two labor organizations as well. It will be brought before the appropriate committees of the Board for discussion. There is a lot of misinformation flying around. My personal advice would be to ignore it because it is not based on any documents I know of.

Upon motion duly made, seconded and carried, the Board approved the following statement of the Chancellor with respect to the proposal made by the Commission on Independent Colleges and Universities:

The problem of finding adequate funds to finance the mounting cost of higher education is severe for public as well as private colleges and universities. A solution will be found only through the cooperative effort of both sectors. That is why The City University of New York, in word and deed, has vigorously supported planning and cooperative inter-institutional efforts aimed at optimum utilization of every dollar in public funds. That is why the Council for Independent Colleges and Universities, the organization representing the private institutions of higher education in New York State, chose to make its proposal for financing higher education without prior consultation with the public universities or the Metropolitan Regional Council appointed by the Board of Regents.
The proposal appears to be an application of the Lockheed subsidy doctrine to the problem of financing higher education. We are presented with the proposition that private institutions, governed by private boards of trustees, should have their deficits erased by massive injections of public funds. This may be an attractive prospect in times of ready availability of government fiscal resources. At a time when such funds are inadequate even to meet the vital needs of public universities assigned public higher education missions, this kind of proposal warrants the closest scrutiny in terms of fiscal priorities.

The proposal is presented as a tuition equalization measure to be achieved by the State merely increasing the size of its scholar incentive payments. Such an increase, however, would represent a large net addition to the cost of higher education in New York State.

To cover this additional cost the proposal calls for a new higher education user tax to be imposed upon students at public institutions for the purpose of covering deficits of private colleges and universities. This would mean an enormous increase in tuition charges to parents of students enrolled in the State University of New York and the same high tuition scale The City University of New York, thereby terminating its 124-year tradition of free tuition.

The proposal represents a radical departure from our State's higher education policy over the past decade, a policy which opened college study to tens of thousands of low and moderate income young people and adults who would otherwise have been denied that opportunity. To implement this State policy the public universities have undergone significant expansion, but the private institutions have not been ignored. On the contrary, few states, if any, can match New York's contribution of public dollars to the support of private institutions of higher education. In addition to direct subsidy in the form of Bundy aid, the State has vastly expanded and increased indirect aid to private colleges and universities through scholarships and tuition grants to students enrolled in them.

Aid to private institutions by the State has not been opposed and, in some programs, has been strongly supported by the publicly appointed trustees and administrators of the City University. We continue to recognize the important role filled by private institutions in adding to the diversity of our State's overall system of higher education. We also recognize and are concerned with the fiscal plight now confronting them.

But economic circumstance, like so many other conditions of men and institutions, is a relative measure. A rich man forced to spend his capital rather than living off the earnings of his investments is relatively worse off than he was when interest income paid his bills. Still, compared on a scale that considers life style and living standards, he is immeasurably better off than the worker who has no savings to dip into when he suffers a reduction in wages.

A private university that incurs deficits and is forced to expend some of its endowment is in a critical condition relative to the time when the interest on its endowment covered its budgetary needs. A public university, however, is prohibited by law from incurring a deficit. It is compelled to fulfill its educational responsibilities within the rigid fiscal constraints imposed by government. If the budget it is allocated is inadequate, the public university will do its job by cutting enrollment, increasing faculty workload, congesting facilities or a range of other options distasteful in varying degrees to students, faculty or the community it must serve. Institutional life styles are inevitably reflections of budgetary leeway and the capacity to incur debt.

There seem to be more questions raised than answered by the proposal of the private colleges and universities. In return for such a massive public subsidy:

Would the private institutions accept the same audit and control conditions that are mandatory for public colleges and universities?

Would they accept the annual budget procedures and fiscal constraints under which the public universities operate?

Would they, in proportion to the percentage input of government to their budgets, be willing to accept publicly appointed members on their boards of trustees?

If economic barriers are going down, should not discriminatory admissions be eliminated?

Most important, are they ready to accept a fair proportion of the PUBLIC POLICY mission of higher education?

The last question is of particular concern to The City University of New York. Given CUNY's open admissions mandate and a substantial diversion of its funds to other institutions of higher education in New York City, City University would be doomed to academic disaster if the other institutions refused to accept their fair proportion of educationally as well as economically disadvantaged high school graduates. If the private institutions, even with substantial State subsidy, followed their current admissions policies, CUNY would rapidly become a higher educational ghetto, enrolling only those high school graduates whom the private institutions chose not to admit. Abandonment of free tuition would eliminate CUNY as one of the few remaining magnets holding middle income families in the City of New York. Thousands of hard-working, moderate income families live in the five boroughs of New York City who are unable to afford tuition payments for their children's college education. Free tuition at CUNY is for them the major reason for maintaining their residence here.

In summary, it appears that the proposal advanced by the private colleges and universities offers no prospect of enhancing the quality of higher education in New York State and great probability, if implemented, of reducing higher educational opportunities for those who need them.

We look forward to the outcome of work being done on the subject of higher educational financing by the Hurd Task Force, the Wagner Commission, the State Education Commissioner and the various legislative committees (in Washington as well as in Albany). It is our earnest hope that the alternatives they advance will move the private and public colleges and universities toward a more efficient and productive use of the resources available to them.
(b) RESOLVED, That the Chancellor's Report (including Addendum Items) for the month of December 1971 be approved as amended, as follows:

(1) Items listed in PART H—ERRATA, to be withdrawn or changed, as indicated:

(2) QUEENS COLLEGE—PART C: At the request of Dean Axelrad, the following new computer science courses are withdrawn: Computer Science 701 through 712, 780 and 799.

(3) BRONX COMMUNITY COLLEGE—Item A-1.12.9. Withdraw reappointment of Bruce Sauber, Adj. Asst. Prof. in the Speech Department.

(4) RICHMOND COLLEGE—PART AA: Table appointment of Leonard Quart as Assistant Professor until the next meeting of the Board.

(c) Resolution adopted, as follows:

RESOLVED, That Article XI, Section 11.1d. of the bylaws of the Board be suspended with respect to reappointments, promotions and tenure recommendations listed in the December 1971 Chancellor's Report.

(d) Resolution adopted, as follows:

RESOLVED, That February 1, 1972 be held as the date beyond which no recommendations for reappointment, tenure or promotion should be granted without evidence given to the Board of systematic student evaluation, except in such cases where the Chancellor presents a cogent reason for further delay.

Mr. d'Heilly asked to be recorded as voting "NO" as he felt the colleges had sufficient time to implement the bylaw requirement.

NO. 8. GENERAL DISCUSSION - POLICY PROPOSALS FOR FUTURE BOARD CONSIDERATION: No further action.

NO. 9. BUDGET REQUEST 1972-73: WHEREAS, The Board of Higher Education, at its meeting of November 22, 1971, adopted a Budget Request for 1972-73 totaling $496.4 million; and

WHEREAS, The budget request as adopted contained a request for the City University Construction Fund of $18.7 million of which $9.4 million of Tax Levy needs was in the budget request; and

WHEREAS, The City University Construction Fund, at its meeting held on November 15, 1971, adjusted the earlier estimate of need for 1972-73 upward from $18.7 million to $20.9 million; therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Budget Request for 1972-73 be adjusted to $497.4 million so as to include the increased need for the City University Construction Fund.

EXPLANATION: The City University Construction Fund, in its preliminary estimate of need in August, 1971, requested a sum of $18.7 million for the year 1972-73 to meet various bond debt service needs, to retire notes used for interim financing and meet administrative expenses. At its meeting of November 15, 1971, the Construction Fund revised its preliminary estimate of $15.8 million for debt service on City University bonds to $17.4 million and increased the need for administrative expenses of the Dormitory Authority of the State of New York from the preliminary estimate of $1.0 million to $1.3 million. These increased needs for 1972-73 necessitated that the preliminary estimate of $18.7 million be increased to $20.9 million and required that the sum in the expense budget request be increased from $9.4 million to $10.5 million as the City's share.
RESOLVED, That the Board of Higher Education indicate its general acceptance of the Master Plan Report and Recommendations for the Development of Physical Facilities for the Richmond College Campus as prepared by Edward Durell Stone & Associates, Architects and Planners, in accordance with the terms of a contract for the development of said plan; and be it further

RESOLVED, That Table 12-2 of the 1968 Master Plan of the Board of Higher Education be modified to delete the tentatively listed facilities under Item 7, Richmond College, and in place thereof include the facilities indicated in the aforesaid Richmond College Master Plan Report.

EXPLANATION: The 1968 Master Plan of the Board of Higher Education included in Chapter 12, Planning for Physical Facilities, the following statement under Item 1, Basic Assumptions and Procedures:

"Nevertheless, the City University has embarked in implementation of a policy of master planning for each of its institutions. Utilizing the advice of a professional advisory committee, and following intensive interviews, the University has selected twelve architect/planner teams after an extensive search. Each of these teams has been assigned to develop a total architectural concept for a single campus. Their assignments range from institutions still in the site selection stage to the oldest establishments needing study of partial replacement as well as expansion of facilities. These architect/planner teams have direct and continuing contact with the president and faculty of the institution they are studying.

"The resulting campus master plan will be based on the academic program as developed within each institution. The office of the Vice-Chancellor (now Dean) for Campus Planning and Development will introduce such guidance as may be needed to maintain congruence with the University's total enrollment, academic and financial commitments. The central authority has the further responsibility of developing space guidelines and basis of comparison so that space planning will be consistent within the University for similar uses. This complex study also involves justification of these space guidelines as compared to parameters utilized by other public and private institutions. The study of these basic planning assumptions is being carried on in cooperation with the New York State Education Department. A paramount consideration throughout is the active policy of the Board of Higher Education to encourage institutional autonomy and avoid stereotyping of programs."

Also in Chapter 12, under Item 3, Specific Building Plans, the following is indicated:

"Table 12-2 includes a revision of the listing of the specific projects as they appeared in previous issues of the City University Master Plan. The table has been revised only in those cases where planning or construction has advanced to a point where such revision is significant. Certain specific projects that have been advanced in planning have been added. The University and the colleges are in the process of developing campus master plans. Therefore, it is not possible at this time to establish the total list of individual facilities needed for any one of the campuses. However, Table 12-1 does include many facilities that were identified as essential prior to the start of the local master planning processes. This table will be altered as the campus master plan for each institution develops."

A specific campus development plan for Richmond College has now been completed by the indicated architect/planner firm under the direction of the University and in concert with the College.

The Richmond College Master Plan is based on a projected 1975 enrollment of 6,400 FTED students. The projected enrollment anticipates 5,000 full-time undergraduates day students, 300 full-time day graduate masters students, 3,100 part time masters students (equating to 750 full time equivalent day graduate masters students) and 350 Ph.D day students.

Approximately 1,915,000 gross square feet have been established as the floor area required to meet the anticipated College needs. The estimated construction cost for buildings and related site and utility work is $78.7 million based on a November, 1970 construction cost estimate.

The Master Plan has fully developed the functions, areas, and locations of the educational, social and service facilities, and has established the requirements of motor, pedestrian and service traffic, along with the architectural and landscape design factors and supporting utilities.

The plan focuses on the inter-relationships of the various elements of the academic complex, the inter-disciplinary approach to education, and the concept of "mix" as spelled out by the Educational Consultants. The campus plan insures a built-in "sense of place" through which students may (1) more readily identify with the college as "theirs" and (2) tend to care more about what goes on at the College.
The main academic complex as planned by the architect/planners contains the following facilities:

- The Division of Humanities
- The Division of Social Sciences
- The Educational Resources Center
- The Central Administration Center
- The Building & Grounds Service Area
- The Division of Pure and Applied Sciences
- The Division of Professional Studies
- The Student-Faculty Center
- Lecture Halls

The general-use facilities such as the Educational Resources Center, lecture halls and Student-Faculty Center are centrally located within the Academic Complex, with the divisional areas grouped around the perimeter. Public oriented facilities, i.e. the auditorium and the Administration Center are adjacent to the main arrival court.

The various building units are planned as modular components, interconnected for flexibility of use and ease of circulation. The maintenance and service elements located at the lower level are grouped together for maximum efficiency and ease of administration, providing a system of service to all facilities of the complex, out of sight and without the usual requirement of several outdoor service yards and the roadways servicing them. All major horizontal mechanical runs are collected at the lower level, therefore being continuous and easy to reach for maintenance and expansion. This departure from the traditional campus results in economy of cost and efficiency of operation.

The recommended plan provides an appropriate initial step prior to the detailed planning of new individual physical facilities for the Richmond College campus and the Board's acceptance, in principle, of this overall plan is recommended in order that specific steps toward its implementation may proceed.

(b) RENTAL OF SPACE—LEHMAN COLLEGE:

RESOLVED, That the Board approve a contract for the rental of a 6,174 square foot temporary data processing center building to be located on the Lehman College campus for a total of five years at an annual rental of $74,364, chargeable to the appropriate tax levy.

EXPLANATION: The proposed temporary building will provide facilities for the entire Lehman College computer center and will also include a research room, one seminar room, six offices, one faculty study room, and a nominal amount of space for storage and maintenance.

Contract documents for the rental of the temporary structure were advertised by the College and four bids were received on November 29, 1971. The bid was on an annual rental basis for five years with the College having a no cost purchase option after the fifth year.

NO. 11. MODIFICATION OF FRESHMAN ADMISSIONS' ALLOCATION SYSTEM: Laid over to a special meeting of the Board.

Dr. Lee pointed out that the proposed modification of the Freshman Admissions' Allocation System is to increase the number of students admitted to the University and allocated to the colleges on the basis of ECONOMIC CRITERIA and not on the basis of race, color or creed.

Upon motion duly made, seconded and carried, the meeting adjourned at 11:05 p.m.

N. MICHAEL CARFORA
Secretary of the Board