Minutes of Proceedings, May 27, 1997

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

HELD

MAY 27, 1997

AT THE BOARD HEADQUARTERS BUILDING
535 EAST 80TH STREET - BOROUGH OF MANHATTAN

The Chairperson called the meeting to order at 4:32 P.M.

There were present:

Anne A. Paolucci, Chairwoman
Herman Badillo, Vice Chairperson

Satish K. Babbar
Jerome S. Berg
John J. Calandra
Michael C. Crimmins
Ronald J. Marino
Susan Moore Mounier

James P. Murphy
Robert Price
George Rios
Nilda Soto Ruiz
Richard B. Stone

Sandi E. Cooper, ex officio
Secretary Genevieve Mullin

Robert E. Diaz, General Counsel and Vice Chancellor for Legal Affairs
Hourig Messerlian, Executive Assistant

Chancellor W. Ann Reynolds
Deputy Chancellor Laurence F. Mucciolo
President Raymond C. Bowen
President David A. Caputo
Acting President Emilie Cozzi
President Ricardo R. Fernandez
President Matthew Goldstein
President Leon M. Goldstein
President Frances Degen Horowitz
President Edison O. Jackson
President Charles C. Kidd, Sr.
President Vernon Lattin
President Gerald W. Lynch

President Yolanda T. Moses
President Antonio Perez
President Isaura S. Santiago
President Kurt R. Schmeller
President Carolyn G. Williams
Dean Stanford R. Roman, Jr.
Dean Kristin Booth Glen
Vice Chancellor Jay Hershenson
Vice Chancellor Emma E. Macari
Vice Chancellor Brenda Richardson Malone
Acting Vice Chancellor Anne L. Martin
Vice Chancellor Elsa Nunez
Vice Chancellor Richard F. Rothbard

The absence of Ifeachor Potts was excused.
CHAIRWOMAN PAOLUCCI stated that our guest, Regent Louise P. Matteoni is a lifelong resident of Queens. She attended public elementary schools in Queens, Hunter College High School; and in 1950 was graduate Cum Laude from Hunter College with a Bachelor of Arts Degree in Spanish and Elementary and Secondary Education. At Hunter, Regent Matteoni was elected Phi Beta Kappa. Later she earned a Master of Arts Degree in Spanish and Secondary Education at Hunter College, and a Ph.D. at New York University in Educational Psychology with a specialization in Remedial Reading. From 1950 to 1966, Regent Matteoni was a teacher in the New York City schools in Queens, first at Public School 166; and later at Public School 7 where she served as Acting Assistant Principal during the 1966-1967 school year. In 1966, Regent Matteoni joined the faculty of New York University as an instructor, served as a Lecturer at Brooklyn College from February through June of 1968, and then successively an Assistant and an Associate Professor. She was appointed Professor at Brooklyn College in 1975 where she was Program Head of Reading and Learning Disabilities and taught undergraduate and graduate courses until her retirement in 1995. She's the author, co-author, or contributing author of several basic reading series and many articles in reading education and allied fields. She has spoken extensively on educational issues throughout the country. Regent Matteoni has served on many professional committees. Dr. Matteoni is presently Vice Chancellor of the Board of Regents. She is an ex-officio member of all standing committees and co-chair of all work groups. It is my great pleasure to introduce Vice Chancellor Matteoni.

A. STATEMENT OF REGENT VICE CHANCELLOR LOUISE P. MATTEONI: Thank you Dr. Paolucci. Just about all my teaching experience has been in New York City. I was also at Brooklyn College of The City University. I have an affinity for what is happening here. I also have a sense of responsibility for what happens at CUNY and while I want to be protective of CUNY, I also want to, in some ways, reflect on what CUNY should be looking at.

I was invited here to speak about the implications of what happened at Adelphi University. I was one of the three-member panel, the judges, at Adelphi. I'm not going to go into the merits of it but actually what made us come to the decision we did come to, and then its implications for any other college or university.

We made the decision in February and one of the first things we looked at was what does it mean for us? Let me say right now that I don't think any other college or university is going to match the conditions we found at Adelphi. I think that was an aberration, and I don't think it should be extended to any other colleges or universities. I want to reflect on some of the more legalistic type actions, or actually on sources, and then go into some of the other aspects of it.

The first thing that we looked at was a document called, "Board Liability: A Guide for Non-profit Directors." Actually this document was cited in our brief when we did come up with our decision. In this document there were three principles that we looked at: the duty of care, the duty of loyalty, and the duty of obedience.

Where we faulted Adelphi was in the duty of care. It says under the duty of care that directors must spend enough time on the organization's affairs to be reasonably acquainted with matters demanding their attention. Attention may involve inquiry into particular matters when information, or it's lack, raises some issues of concern that doesn't seem to be properly addressed.

That's very important for directors who are not full-time at an institution and I want to tell you how that affected us on the Board of Regents. Two months ago Regents College, which is an external-degree granting institution that's run by a board of overseers and is under the Board of Regents, came to us and asked for an increase in fees for examinations students have to take. Now, perhaps in the past we would have granted that increase without discussion, but with our experience with Adelphi one of the questions that came up was why the increase in fees? We were told they were going to now have a contract with an organization that is going to do the testing by computer. They have 500 sites around the country where students can walk in, take the test, and get the results immediately. One of the questions this triggered was well, with computer assisted testing isn't that cheaper than having it done the other way? We were told it isn't. We asked what are the implications? What is it costing actually? What does the contract say specifically? What are the options in the contract? What are the exit criteria? How long is the contract? The response was that we have in the contract that the vendor gets a certain amount and we get another amount. These were questions we never raised before but, because of Adelphi University, we started to raise those questions and we did not get the answers at that meeting. Then the implication was suppose
we don't pass on this request this month and we delay it to next month? They said oh you can't do that because we have to put out the information, and then the next thing was that the contract has been signed. Well, who had the authority to sign the contract? The President of the University of the State of New York, the Commissioner, had the authority to sign the contract, assuming that we were going to pass the increase in fees. Well, the Board was not willing to pass the increase in fees without more information. We wanted to know exactly what was in the contract; how do you get out of the contract if, in fact, the vendor is not fulfilling his obligations; what are the implications for the students; and how much more is it going to cost the students? We said we would delay it then and they should come back next month with more information.

Next month we met again with the director and other individuals. Again, the answers were not sufficient. We were not sufficiently comfortable with what was happening. We wanted to see the audited reports. The next morning we had audited reports so that we could, with confidence, vote for the increase in fees. We were also told by the people in the department responsible that that would never happen again. Why? Because in the past Boards of Directors or Boards of Regents were willing to accept what was coming without questioning it, but now we were looking at duty of care.

The second is the duty of loyalty. The duty of loyalty really implies that there will be no conflict of interest. As you know very well, at Adelphi University we found there were three instances of conflict of interest. Adelphi also was supposed to have signed statements about conflict of interest from the members of the Board of Trustees. It took them well over two years to get those signed statements. I know about conflict of interest but not whether there was one or not. So we felt that wasn't appropriate and adequate.

The last of the three duties was the duty of obedience. The duty of obedience was that the Board of Trustees would carry out the purpose or the mission of the institution. With Adelphi one of the problems was that there was no stated specification of the mission of Adelphi University. As a matter of fact, it was changing at that time. The president, and he said with the Board of Trustees, was changing the mission of Adelphi from serving one type of population to another population. Nowhere was it stated that this was going to be the mission, or the goal, or the objective. There were just statements made, but there was no discussion anywhere that we could see with the Board of Trustees where they met as a body and discussed the merits of something of this sort. That's going to get to one of the other aspects a little bit later on.

The other in this duty of obedience is also that funds should be spent on the stated purposes for which they are appropriated. Here again, going back, there was no examination of the budget; where the money was going in the budget, if it was being expended for the purposes for which it was identified, not in the audit reports but by which it was identified by the Board of Trustees. As a matter of fact when you look at the audit reports they indicate the money was spent for the purpose which is indicated on some sort of document; but that doesn't mean that expenditure matches the mission, or the goals, or the objectives. That was the important part, to get them to match. So we found that funds were being spent, and I guess the principle one there was, of course, the president did not meet the goals or the objectives of the university.

For Adelphi we did not audit the audits. We accepted the audits of the two firms Coopers and Lybrand, and Deloitte and Touche. We have an internal audit as well as an external audit for the Board of Regents so that we have both of them going on at the same time. We have auditors who will go over the audits to identify problems that come up, or to raise questions. The procedures vary from institution to institution. It depends upon the resources that are available and the talents that you have available to you at that time.

Another thing that we looked at were the Articles of Governance which stated that responsibility is shared among the trustees, the administration, and the faculty; and as such, the faculty must and has the right of representation in what is discussed and in decisions that are made. We found that in Adelphi there were two master plans; an internal master plan that the Board of Trustees saw and another external master plan that the faculty and the students saw, and they were not the same. The internal master plan indicated that there were three schools that did not serve the
purposes of Adelphi as they were seen by the President and the Board of Trustees, and that they were almost expendable. That information never appeared in the material that went out in the external master plan to the rest of the faculty so that Adelphi abrogated that role that was in the Articles of Governance. We also found that the Articles of Governance weren't used.

Another item, and perhaps the one that got the most publicity, was the evaluation of the president. I'm equating the president as the chief executive office much as we do the Chancellor here. For the evaluation of the president, there was no protocol. There was no formal evaluation. It was a letter written reflecting on what the president told the chair of the committee rather than what the committee discovered on its own. There was no statement of goals or objectives against which the president was going to be measured. There was no formal evaluation. There was no use of outside information. Everything was done within house, and it was always what the president told the chair of the committee on compensation. When the Board of Trustees, the individual members, were asked: "What did you use outside of Adelphi? Did you use any comparable data from other colleges and universities?" they did not. "Did you use anything that showed that Adelphi was successful in what it was doing?" they did not. As a matter of fact, they discounted some reports that were out in the press, and these were not done with malice of forethought, that said that Adelphi at one time had been rated very favorably and then had just kept going down lower and lower. So we felt that for these reasons, without going to into the specific details, the Board of Trustees was not acting in the best interest of Adelphi University.

One of the problems, or one of the things that we see is that there is a relationship between a Chancellor or a CEO and the Board of Trustees. The Board of Trustees is an independent policy-making body, but the Board of Trustees relies upon information that it gets by and large from the administrative staff, from the Chancellor, and other individuals. If the Board of Trustees for some reason feels it is not getting adequate information and it starts losing confidence in the Chancellor, then the Board of Trustees begins to work at odds with the Chancellor. On the other hand, if the Chancellor feels that the Board of Trustees is micro-managing, is going into affairs that does not concern the Board of Trustees, that goes beyond any charge of getting more information, then there is this creative tension that comes up. So that one of the problems that we face is how do you maintain the two roles as distinct roles but cooperative roles.

You know that's very hard because we have the same problem with the Board of Regents and that is when you're so involved with something, you sometimes overstep the bounds. One of the things that we know is that we have to really point our remarks to the Commissioner and not go beyond the Commission to other members of the department in the same way the Commissioner speaks to us rather than speaking to anyone in general and then coming back to us. I think that's one of the problems that we really face, and that is that line between management and policy making. It's always a gray area. It's always a spot there somewhere where we trespass.

It depends also on our feeling of confidence in the Commissioner and his feeling of confidence in us so that if we do go over, he knows it's not meant to abrogate his position. It's meant because we're so involved and we see ourselves as partners. One of the things that we do is we have had a committee on quality that has been meeting for over a year. The Commissioner sits on that committee as well as the members of the Board of Regents. We discuss these issues, and then we use examples as we come up so that we don't wait for them to accumulate or to fester but we meet them head on in that way. We have this open dialogue just about almost every month.

I'll just give you an example from our experience now. We are now in the midst of looking at graduation requirements throughout the State. Our Commissioner made a statement about a month ago, which was in the New York Times, that the State was going to translate the Regents examinations at the high school level in five different languages. It was the first we ever heard of it. The Board of Regents was aghast because you don't want to do these things publicly. If there is a disagreement, you do it privately. Members of the Board of Trustees felt that this was inappropriate, yet it was out there. Now we have to go back and revisit it. It's going to become a public issue, and it's one that did not have to go out in public that way. He did it, I'm going to say, in good faith. He said he was thinking out loud. Well a CEO cannot think out loud on issues that affect policy. The CEO thinks out loud when reflecting the policy but does not form policy. The CEO is not the policy maker, but he or she is the person who carries it out. So we see these tensions that come up. I'm not saying that they're done in bad faith; but they're done with, perhaps, an individual who is so immersed in what he is doing at that particular time that he's not thinking. He
said that he was thinking out loud. Well this is where a CEO has to be very careful that in that thinking out loud that person doesn't step into a policy-making role which then puts the Board, in this instance the Board of Regents, almost in an adversarial position.

Another one, and this is one that I have to be frank with you, this is one I'm looking at now at CUNY, and that is do the campuses know what the policy is for City University as far student admission is for each campus. I'm not going to into open admissions or it's advisability from 1970. Is there a different policy from one campus to another? What are the standards from one college to the other? I'll tell you why I'm reflecting on this. We have a task force on teaching that is now spending a great deal of time in looking at teaching across the State so that the teaching across the State and the preparation of teachers will match the higher standards that we're expecting. One of the things that we got in this task force on teaching was the report of the percentage of students passing the first provisional certification test for entering into teaching. That test is a test of liberal arts and science. Students may take it any time, and usually they take it by about the junior or the senior year, or they may take it beyond that. We did an analysis from the report, and we have, for the 113 institutions in New York State, the percentage of students passing the liberal arts and science test.

For City University, the percentage of students ranges from 39 percent to 83 percent. We were very much concerned about that. We have been meeting with deans of education, and we will be meeting on June 12th with presidents of colleges. One of the deans said sure we don't look good, this is a four-year institution and we accept anyone who comes into our institution. He named another institution that has a higher passing rate because they don't everyone, therefore, they're going to look good, and their statistics will always look good.

Is there a policy for teacher certification, teacher accreditation? Is there a policy for the acceptance of students? We're only looking at those in teacher education. Is there a policy that says well maybe we as a Board of Trustees should go back and look at those institutions to find out why after four, five, or six years only 39% of students pass the liberal arts and science test. Is it that they're not prepared for the students who come into them or that they accept students who should not be in those programs? What is the policy? That's something that we're going to be asking you because in our recommendations that are coming out now it says, "The Commissioner will hold all teacher education institutions accountable for the performance on the State Certification Exams of the students whom they recommend for certification. Programs whose recommended students show poor performance, that is less than 55% passing in 1998, 65% in 1999, 75% in the year 2000, and 85% in the year 2001, will be required to make significant improvements within three years or be phased out."

If those requirements were in place, and this is still a recommendation in proposal, for 1998 two institutions in CUNY have less than 55% of the students passing the liberal arts and science test. In 1999 with less than 65%, it will go up to four. In the year 2000 when less than 75% will trigger this, it will be five. In the year 2001 when the score will be 85%, all ten institutions with teacher prep programs will not meet the standard.

As a Board of Trustees you should have this information since it has been out since January. You have that information now and what is it that you are going to do? What should be your policy? I'm only taking the one area where we have more information at this point. This is your responsibility. This is something that you have to face; and not when it comes to the last minute when it's already in place, but anticipating that it's going to come in place. What is it that you can do and should do? What are your teacher preparation programs going to look like? What are you going to do as far as standards are concerned in the colleges and universities?

The other report that we got back, and again we're going to look at teacher preparation programs in particular, is that the majority of the faculty in teacher prep programs are adjunct faculty where the college and university has not really been selecting these individuals with the same standards that it selected full-time faculty. The full-time faculty do not reflect what is happening in the schools because there is no requirement for them to do so. The full-time faculty who are there, or those who enter into teacher prep programs, are held to one standard for the programs but another standard for tenure and promotion and they not match what the rest of the faculty is required to do. So we look at those areas now in particular because this is something that is going to be facing City University very, very soon; and it's going to be dramatic.
The information is public because we meet and we have been meeting at least twice a month. Now there were Deans of Education from City University at the last meeting about a week or two ago. They were there, and they had the information. I believe a paper has been sent to the college presidents. If not, it will be sent shortly because we are meeting again on Thursday, June 12th to go over the paper to find out if it's going to stay the way it is or if we want to make some changes. The full Board of Regents has not seen the paper yet. It's the subcommittee that has seen it acting for the Board. The Board will probably act on it at the July meeting and then send it out publicly. There will be public forums starting the middle of September through October, and then everyone will be invited to these.

One of the lacks that I see is that City University doesn't have anyone monitoring what the Board of Regents is doing or what the Committee on Higher Education is doing. The actions the Committee on Higher Education takes affects all the colleges and universities. We have representatives from across the State at our meetings. All our meetings are public meetings. We do everything out in public and our next meeting is going to be June 11th and 12th in Albany.

Our meeting on teacher certification is going to be on Thursday from 9:30 A.M., to 4:00 P.M., at One Park Avenue on the sixth floor. Anyone and everyone is invited. We especially would like to have someone from City University sitting there at that time. We will be discussing the advisability of using outside accrediting bodies for the Teacher Certification Programs. One that has been mentioned is NCATE, another one is Middle States. We need to get the input from the colleges and the universities whether we should use one or whether we should use a multiple.

One of the things also that we're looking at is the capacity of colleges and universities to do strategic planning. I know that you have several new members on the Board of Trustees. When were you involved as a group in strategic planning? When was the last time as a group, or when will be the next time as a group, that you will look at the mission statement for City University? Where does that mission statement come from? Should it be updated? Is it adequate? When was it last enunciated? Is it something that should be revisited at this time? Where do you have your goals and objectives for the two-year and the four-year colleges? Where from those goals and objectives have you identified the priorities or the time line for the coming years? Where, from the priorities, do you derive your resources; that is the financial resources, the budget to support the goals and objectives, the personnel resources, and that is the distribution amongst administration, instructional faculty and support staff? Where do you look at the balance of full-time and adjuncts? Where do you look at the condition of facilities to support your goals and objectives?

Then where in this entire scheme do you have the evaluation procedures, the assessment procedures, to see that, in fact, those goals and objectives are being met, and you have hard data to support that so that you can go on and do your next round of strategic planning to find out where you're at? What types of evaluation and assessment procedures do you have in place first for fiscal integrity? You have a tremendous fiduciary responsibility as far as the monies that are being spent in City University are concerned. What assessment procedures do you have to indicate that those monies are going where they're intended to go? First, where are they all coming from? They come from different sources.

I think this also hit us when we were discussing teacher certification. We had deans from various institutions at City University and one was talking about having a grant that they got that reflected something of this sort, and they have another grant. But there was no systemic approach that we really could identify coming from City University.

I'm not trying to beat up on City University. I come here as a friend and I'm only saying how can we now put this into shape in some way? We'll say the same thing to SUNY. We'll say the same thing to the independents. Where do you have protocols for the performance of administrators, to assess administrators, to evaluate their performance to determine whether they continue, whether they get increases, whether they get rewards, or whether they get sanctions?

Where do you have protocols to determine and to monitor academic progress? We can do it for the teacher education program. How about all the other students? How do you know that they are, in fact, successful? They may graduate; they may get a diploma, but are they successful? Is there a way, and I know resources are always
I have several issues I just want to raise. One is, and this has been in the newspapers, what procedure do you have to evaluate the effectiveness of the remediation programs which you are saying are so expensive, at the colleges and universities whether at the two-year or the four-year? Do you have a way of evaluating those programs? Which of the programs that are in place now are better than others and, therefore, should be replicated? Where is the discussion that focuses upon this because it's a very expensive issue? Where do you have a comparability of standards across the campuses so that one won't say we're the gem, or whatever it is, of City University, and the others are shown to be lacking? They are shown to be lacking because they don't have the resources the other one has, they don't attract the students and the standards are different. Is there a comparability in the course offerings from one institution to another? Is there a comparability in types of grades that are given from one institution to the other?

What is the relationship of the City University to New York City? How do you see its role in New York City? Is it there to help to support? In the past it was perhaps the bastion for New York City. Has that role changed? If it has changed, how has it changed, why has it changed, and should it continue to change?

Another one you should be concerned with is State oversight. One of the things the Commissioner had suggested when he was thinking out loud, was of having report cards for colleges and universities. What is that going to look at? Then you're going to start comparing one college to the other. I haven't heard about that for some time, but he's talking more and more about holding colleges and universities accountable. Everyone else is held accountable. What is it you should be held accountable for? How should you be held accountable for it? What structure should you have for conducting business? Are there meetings in which you are presented with something, discuss it without having sufficient time, -- and I know how much material you must be getting -- to really understand it and be able to get independent information if you want, so that you have to act on some things and then find out later that had you had more time and had you had the opportunity of going to others outside of City University, you would have had more information on which to base your decisions.

Fiduciary responsibility starts and stops with the Board of Trustees and that is that they are ultimately responsible. Now one of the things that we found was that in looking at their fiduciary responsibility they did not look at it from the point of view of the students at Adelphi University, but they looked at it more from the point of view of the administrator of Adelphi and they reflected more upon that than anything else. As a matter of fact, the tuition was going up, the number of students was going down, the reserve fund was not sufficient to maintain that area. The president had identified certain programs which he thought were going to be the stellar programs at Adelphi. The money was going into those programs, but it was being taken from other students. So we felt that the Board of Trustees did not reflect and represent all the students but were really guided to reflect and represent just a small portion of the population there.

Do you have a system and method for identifying where the money is coming from whether it's City, State, or Federal money, grant money or research money, and when the money comes where does it go? Can you track the money so you know exactly where it goes and then how it's expended from that point on. How much is going for the purpose for which it was intended? How much is going for administration? How much is going for whatever other purposes. These are you responsibilities. This is what you're here for. You cannot say well we had the information and it looked good. You have to have the hard data to know that it is good. I don't want to go on because we could go on at length in something of this sort. I think that in some ways we should be entering into these discussions—perhaps in another venue.

The last time the Board of Regents met with the Board of Trustees was on April 14, 1994. At that time, we discussed the funding for higher education, New York City, and several issues, and we have the minutes of that discussion. Our Commissioner at that time, Tom Sobol, was at that meeting as was Chancellor Reynolds. We haven't met in three years. Now it's time that the Board of Regents and the Board of Trustees for City University sit.
down and discuss what are the principle concerns that are coming up; how do we meet these head on and together, and then what do we do to help each other as partners in this. Again, we're not here as adversaries. We're here as partners. We help to identify the problems, and then we want to work with you to try to find the solutions to those problems, and we want to continue the dialogue. There is nothing that says that you cannot initiate an invitation to the Board of Regents, or at least the New York City Regents, to meet with you as long as we can come up with an agenda that we can agree upon and then discuss it from the point of view of sharing information and perhaps to find directions. I'll stop at that point.

CHANCELLOR REYNOLDS stated that we have been very active and working very hard on the Teacher Education and the Teacher Exam issue. One of our own Education Deans, Dean Hotzler has been at all of the meetings you were talking about. Maybe that person just wasn't recognizable as being the CUNY person. As the data become clarified this is an item that will be coming into the Board's Committee on Academic Policy, Program, and Research. We're very interested and are indeed bringing it to the Board.

CHAIRWOMAN PAOLUCCI thanked Regent Vice Chancellor Matteoni and stated that we do have some new committees in place who will be researching and reporting back to the Board on the various programs in remediation, also establishing new avenues of communication with the high schools in the area to facilitate the process into the community colleges.

Upon motions duly made, seconded and carried, the Public Meeting was recessed at 5:11 p.m. to go into executive session.

SECRETARY GENEVIEVE MULLIN
The Chairperson called the Executive Session to order at 5:11 P.M.

There were present:

Anne A. Paolucci, Chairwoman
Herman Badillo, Vice Chairperson

Satish K. Babbar
Jerome S. Berg
John J. Calandra
Michael C. Crimmins
Ronald J. Marino

Sandi Cooper, ex officio

Susan Moore Mouner
James P. Murphy
Robert Price
George Rios
Nilda Soto Ruiz
Richard B. Stone

Secretary Genevieve Mullin
Robert E. Diaz, General Counsel and Vice Chancellor for Legal Affairs
Hourig Messerlian, Executive Assistant

Chancellor W. Ann Reynolds
Deputy Chancellor Laurence F. Mucciolo

E1. APPOINTMENT OF LAW FIRM: The Board, by unanimous consensus, approved the appointment of Michael D. Hess and Mark Edward Brossman, representing the law firm of Chadbourne & Parke LLP, as Special Counsel to the Board.

Upon motions duly made, seconded and carried, the Executive Session was adjourned at 5:40 P.M.
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

HELD

MAY 27, 1997

AT THE BOARD HEADQUARTERS BUILDING
535 EAST 80TH STREET - BOROUGH OF MANHATTAN

The Public Meeting was reconvened At 5:42 P.M.

There were present:

Anne A. Paolucci, Chairwoman
Herman Badillo, Vice Chairperson

Satish K. Babbar
Jerome S. Berg
John J. Calandra
Michael C. Crimmins
Ronald J. Marino
Susan Moore Mounier

Sandi E. Cooper, ex officio

Secretary Genevieve Mullin
Robert E. Diaz, General Counsel and Vice Chancellor for Legal Affairs
Hourig Messerlian, Executive Assistant

Chancellor W. Ann Reynolds
Deputy Chancellor Laurence F. Mucciolo
President Raymond C. Bowen
President David A. Caputo
Acting President Emilie Cozzi
President Ricardo R. Fernandez
President Matthew Goldstein
President Leon M. Goldstein
President Frances Degen Horowitz
President Edison O. Jackson
President Charles C. Kidd, Sr.
President Vernon Lattin
President Gerald W. Lynch

President Yolanda T. Moses
President Antonio Perez
President Isaura S. Santiago
President Kurt R. Schmeller
President Carolyn G. Williams
Dean Stanford R. Roman, Jr.
Dean Kristin Booth Glen
Vice Chancellor Jay Hershenson
Vice Chancellor Emma E. Macari
Vice Chancellor Brenda Richardson Malone
Acting Vice Chancellor Anne L. Martin
Vice Chancellor Elsa Nunez
Vice Chancellor Richard F. Rothbard
B. TRUSTEE HONORS: Chairwoman Paolucci announced that Trustee John Calandra was honored by the Archdiocesan Italian Apostolate at its sixth annual reception on April 17th for his dedication to the Italian-American community. Congratulations John.

C. QUEENS BOROUGH HEARING: Chairwoman Paolucci announced that the Queens Borough Hearing will be held on Wednesday, May 28, 1997, at Queens Borough Hall in Kew Gardens. On behalf of the Board I would like to invite you to come there. We look forward to the interaction this hearing will provide with the college communities and constituents and to seeing many of you there if possible.

D. COLLEGE HONORS: Chairwoman Paolucci noted that in honor of The City College's 150th anniversary, the U.S. Postal Service issued a postal card in its historic preservation series on May 7th in Charter Day ceremonies held in Aaron Davis Hall on campus. I received a copy of it and it's a very attractive card.

E. FACULTY HONORS: Chairwoman Paolucci announced the following: 1) Dr. Sanders Korenman of the School of Public Affairs at Baruch College was selected to join the Council of Economic Advisors to assist in shaping the economic policies of our country.
   2) Professor June O'Neill of the Economics and Finance Department at Baruch College is currently the Director of the Congressional Budget Office.

F. GRANTS: Chairwoman Paolucci presented for inclusion in the record the following report of Grants $100,000 or above received by the University since the last Board meeting:

THE CITY COLLEGE

a. $1,247,000 DASNY to Gebert, G., Architecture, for "University-Wide Computer Aided Design Database-Phase III."

b. $1,082,176 NIH to Fishman, M., Chemistry, for "MBRS Minority Biomedical Research Support."

c. $1,000,000 NSF to Weiss, D., Science, for "Renovation of Research and Research Training Labs."

d. $487,327 NSF to Fosnot, C., Education-Admin, for "Summermath in the City."

e. $219,035 US DEPT. OF TRANS to Paaswell, R., Transportation, for "Technology Transfer Year-9."

f. $188,530 AFSOR to Alfano, R., ISUL, for "Materials for High Temperature Spectral Hole Burning Optical Storage."

g. $160,000 NASA to Parker, N., Transportation, for "Research in Global Climate Variability."

h. $119,431 NSF to Khanbilvardi, R., Civ Engineering, for "Transport of Sediments Radionuclides and Agrochemicals in Agricultural Watersheds Experimental."

i. $112,343 NSF to Mauri, R., Mech Engineering, for "Coalescence & Phase Separation During Spinodal Decomposition of Solvent Mixtures far from the critical point."

HUNTER COLLEGE

a. $405,305 BROWN UNIV./US DEPT. OF ED to Fernandez, D., and Graves, S., Programs in Education, for "The Northeast & Islands Regional Educational Laboratory."

b. $396,037 US DEPT. OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT to Freudenberg, N., and Birch, E., Health & Office of the Provost, for "Community Outreach Partnership Centers Program."

c. $266,000 FAN FOX AND LESLIE R. SAMUELS FOUNDATION to Dobrof, R., and Moody, H., Brookdale Center on Aging, for "The Last Years of life: A Program for Ethics and Caregiving."
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US DEPT. OF ED to Vazquez, J., Curriculum & Teaching, for "New York Multifunctional Resource Center."

PHS/NIH/NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF NEUROLOGICAL DISORDERS & STROKE to Filbin, M., Biological Sciences, for "Adhesion of Myelin Po-Protein."

PHS/NIH/NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF GENERAL MEDICAL SCIENCES to Franck, R., Chemistry, for "The Cycloaddition Way to Glycosyl Transfer."

ANDREW W. MELLON FOUNDATION to Caputo, D., and Kirkland, F., Office of the President, for "Mellon Minority Undergraduate Fellowship Program."

PHS/NIH/NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF NEUROLOGICAL DISORDERS to Lipke, P., Biological Sciences, for "Molecular Genetics of Yeast Sexual Agglutinins."

PHS/NIH/NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF MENTAL HEALTH to Harding, C., Psychology, for "Development of Neurotransmitter Systems and Behavior."

DOD/ARMY RESEARCH OFFICE to Greenbaum, S., Physics & Astronomy, for "EPR Instrumentation for Studies of Materials in Battery and Fuel Cell Development."

NYS DEPT OF SOCIAL SERVICES to Leashore B., School of Social Work, for "MSW Program, for ACS Caseworkers."

UNIVERSITY OF VERMONT/PHS/NIH to Filbin, M., Biological Sciences, for "Molecular Genetics of Yeast Sexual Agglutinins."

PHS/NIH/NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF GENERAL MEDICAL SCIENCES to Flessner, E. Sciences & Mathematics, for "Minority Biomedical Research Support Program."

GENERAL ELECTRONIC FOUNDATION to Buckley, R., and Ashkinazi, S., School of Social Work, for "Manhattan Center for Sciences & Mathematics: G.E. Scholars Program."

LEHMAN COLLEGE

NYC BD OF ED to Wolfe, M., and McGee, E., for "NYC Writing Project - High School Program."

NYC BD OF ED to Wolfe, M., and McGee, for "High School Math Project."

DEPT. OF DEFENSE/AIR FORCE to Chudnovsky, E., for "Tunneling of Magnetization."

THE COLLEGE OF STATEN ISLAND

NYCDE to Sonnenblick, C., for "EDWAA Retraining Program."

NIH to Ciaccio, L., and Sanders, J., for "Discovery Center Research Internship."

USED to Affron, M., Coffee, J., Fazzolari, C., and Jackson, C., for "Strengthening Institutions Program."

NIH to Naider, F., for "Peptide-cell Interactions in Saccharomyces Cerevisiae."

NYSED to Ciaccio, L., Fazzolari, C., and Sanders, J., for "Liberty Partnerships."

RF/SUNY to Zeldin, M., for "The NYS Small Business Development Center."

NYSED to Sonnenblick, C., for "Edge Skills Training."

AFSOR to Gorokhovsky, A., for "Research on Spectral Hole Burning."

NIH/NCI to Xu, Lisa, for "Thermo-Regulation in the Prostate During Hyperthermia."
YORK COLLEGE

a. $390,000 NYSED to Thomas, R., and Williams, M., Natural Sciences, for "Adult Literacy (NYCALI)."

b. $196,946 NASA to Schlein, J., Adult & Continuing Education, for "Mathematics, Science, and Technology Awards Program."

NEW YORK CITY TECHNICAL COLLEGE

a. $199,352 NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION to Squitieri, L., for "Reform in Education."

b. $180,000 NYS DEPT. OF ED to Burrell, B., for "State Systemic Initiative."

BRONX COMMUNITY COLLEGE

a. $1,280,158 NYC/HRA to Kellawon, for "Begin Language Program."

b. $1,045,992 NYSDE to Savage, for "VATEA."

c. $556,596 FORD FOUNDATION/UP to Donovan, for "Urban Partnership Program."

d. $431,130 NYC/DOE to Essoka, for "Tap Center #6."

e. $378,065 NIH to Davis, for "MBRSP-Support for Enhancement."

f. $368,156 USDE to Misick, for "Student Support Services."

g. $332,882 USDE to Danvers, for "Upward Bound (BXCC)."

h. $322,384 NYCDOE to Self, for "Project H I R E - JTPA Title II."

i. $286,278 NYCDYS to Choi, for "Mosaic - Beacon Center."

j. $266,870 NIGMS/NIH to Davis, for "MBRSP."

k. $248,938 NYS OASAS to Norwood, for "Health Force: Aids."

l. $244,634 USDE to Grant, for "Natl. Workplace Literacy (Workshop in the Workplace)."

m. $240,000 NYC/DYS to Choi, for "Mosaic CWA/Preventative Services Program."

n. $236,564 NYCDOE to Self, for "Mature Workers - JTPA Title II."

o. $223,473 NYCDOE to Choi, for "Mosaic Youth Training - JTPA Title II"

p. $213,500 FORD FDN to Donovan, for "Institute for Effective Partnership."

q. $199,698 NYSDE to Leineang, for "VATEA - Tech Prep."

r. $185,086 NYC/DFTA to Rivera, for "Older Adult Luncheon Club."

s. $139,758 NIGMS/NIH to Davis, for "MBRSP."

t. $134,724 NYSDE to Kellawon, for "Adult Education Program."

u. $132,000 NYSDE to Polowczyk, for "Liberty Partnership Program."

v. $131,000 HUD to Mendez, for "Differomorphisms Hispanic Serving Institutions Work Study Program."

w. $129,862 NIGMS/NIH to Davis, for "MBRSP."

x. $129,000 COPE/CUNY to Washington, for "Family College Program."

y. $101,197 NYSDE to Napper, for "Edge (Welfare To work Job Developer)."
QUEENS COLLEGE

a. $125,000 NIH/NAT INSTITUTE OF GEN MED SCIENCES to Shirvani, H., for "Pipeline Program for Careers in Biomedical Research."

JOHN JAY COLLEGE

a. $1,042.411 US DEPT. OF JUSTICE to Jacobs, N., and Glover, R. for "Training of Federal, State, Local and Tribal Agencies Personnel on issues of Juvenile Justice"

b. $129,129 NATIONAL INSTITUTE ON DRUG ABUSE to Spunt, B., for "A Research Project to Study the Effects of Drug Abuse on Violent Crimes Committed by Females."

At this point Trustee Price left the meeting.

G. ORAL REPORT OF THE CHANCELLOR: Chancellor Reynolds reported the following:

1. There are no major developments at this time in the State budget. As you know, the headlines right now are all about rent control. The Assembly and the Senate did return to Albany this afternoon. We are, though, unremittingly continuing to work with key legislators to try to have the best possible outcome to pursue the necessary restorations, most particularly in tuition assistance, base budget, and mandated increases. Also Trustee Cooper and I have been very together on the need for full-time faculty and the other items that are important to us. Regent Matteoni referred to teacher education issues which we've been working very hard on, computer purchases, and some others.

2. We've been working with the colleges on a proposed implementation of the retirement incentive legislation adopted by the legislature and approved by Governor Pataki. Such planning will be reviewed by the Board's Committee on Faculty, Staff, and Administration.

3. Mr. David Brand was confirmed by the State Senate last week as a member of the City University Construction Fund representing Mayor Giuliani.

4. On the City level, the City budget maintained stable funding at a level approximately that of last year's. It's down about $200,000 for the community colleges. Along with many colleagues, I testified this morning at length before the City Council Education and Finance Committees. Copies of my testimony have been distributed to you along with a one-page information sheet on the various objectives we are pursuing at the community college level.

5. The annual breakfast for the City Council will be held tomorrow, May 28th, at 8:15 a.m., in Harry's Restaurant in the Woolworth Building at 233 Broadway. We are pleased that many Trustees plan to join us then as do so many presidents.

6. On the Federal level, the resolution adopted by the Senate and House in Washington includes an increase in PELL grants from $2,700 to $3,000--something we have been vigorously advocating because of our very real student needs. The America Reads Project which allows college work study students to tutor youngsters out in the schools is also being constructed in a manner so that the required match funds from colleges will be waived. This program does have the disadvantage for us that work study students are very valuable workers on our own campuses; and when they're released to America Reads, the campuses lose their help. On the other hand, they're out there doing very, very good work.

7. $35 billion dollars over five years has been targeted for HOPE Scholarships with many of the details still to be worked out. We will send a detailed analysis to all of the Trustees as this proceeds ahead. I would remind you though, that Congress has now gone on vacation for two weeks as well.
8. At the Board of Education level, Chancellor Crew invited us to provide data on the College Preparatory Initiative, a copy of which I did also send to all Trustees. That presentation went very well last Wednesday at the Board of Education. The results are awfully good, and we are seeing real downturns in the amount of, most particularly, math remediation we're doing on our campuses. We really have come together with Chancellor Crew and the Board of Education on future initiatives to focus on having high school students take the solid academic courses they need to come well prepared to the City University of New York. That concludes my report Madam Chairwoman.

At this point Trustee Price rejoined the meeting.

At this point Trustee Potts joined the meeting.

Upon motions duly made, seconded and carried, the following resolutions were adopted: (Calendar Nos. 1 through 9)

Calendar items were considered in the following order.

**ADDED ITEM**

**NO. 9. PROFICIENCY IN THE CUNY WRITING ASSESSMENT TEST:**

RESOLVED. That the Board of Trustees require that no student shall be eligible to graduate from a community college in the CUNY system unless he or she has passed the CUNY Writing Assessment Test.

**EXPLANATION:** The CUNY Writing Assessment Test is a University-wide requirement that must be adhered to by all colleges within the City University system. Proficiency in writing in English is critical to maintaining standards. Basic proficiency requirements for graduation cannot be waived by any college.

**VICE CHAIRMAN BADILLO** stated that this resolution should be even more clearly understood by everyone in view of what the Vice Chancellor of the Board of Regents just finished saying a few minutes ago, that we have to have standards that apply throughout the University. Certainly proficiency in English seems to be a basic standard that The City University should have, and that should not require an extensive discussion. Just to be absolutely clear on what is meant by my resolution, regardless of what other standard there may be, this resolution is intended to say that every student throughout the University, including at Hostos, shall be required to pass the CUNY Writing Assessment Test because there was some change apparently where the test was only going to be worth 30% and there was going to be something else worth 70%. The intention here is whatever else may take place, they have to pass the CUNY Writing Assessment Test in order to graduate this year and in the future. I thought it was a present requirement, but I'm trying to make it sure that it is a requirement because many of us did not know that there was a special test at Hostos, and I don't know whether there may be a special test somewhere else. I think many of you know that I started Hostos when I was Borough President of The Bronx. I had put it at 149th Street next to Lincoln Hospital because it was supposed to specialize in health careers. It was a bilingual college because in Congress I was the author of the Bilingual Education Act. Just to be clear, I never would have gotten a bilingual bill through Congress or this College approved unless there was an understanding of two things: 1) bilingual means two languages, English and Spanish in this case, not monolingual; and 2) it is transitory in nature meaning a student might need to take English as a second language when they come in, but by the time they graduate, they're supposed to be fluent in English. Those were the conditions under which the College was set up when I was Borough President of The Bronx and later when I was a Congressman from that district. I had thought that this was what was going on now; but to clarify, I want to make sure that it is understood that the Writing Assessment Test has to be passed this year and in the future. The article that appeared in the newspaper seemed to indicate the policy will take effect in September. What we want to insure through this resolution is that the policy takes effect now.

**VICE CHANCELLOR NUNEZ** stated that presently we have the CUNY Assessment Test, the WAT used for placement. It's also the certification instrument for the University. There are two Board policies on record: the 1976 policy that says all senior colleges will require this instrument for certification, and a second policy in 1984 which
states that no community college student can transfer to a senior college in the City University of New York without having passed the WAT.

PRESIDENT SANTIAGO stated that since there has been a lot of misinformation about Hostos, I would like to make it very clear that at Hostos Community College we always have and always will hold English proficiency as a requirement for graduation. The instant case where there was a compromise of a test and there was an agreement that the test would be part of a final score was an emergency situation. However, the information that has gotten out there about what our standards are for English and what our commitment as an institution is to teach English is of real concern to me as President of the College. This University gave me, as a charge as President, the leadership of a faculty that has worked very hard over a 30-year period to create an institution that is strong in producing strong academic programs. Regrettably in the press because of that crisis situation, it was stated that Hostos Community College graduates students without English language proficiency. For our 1996 class of students, program by program, the percentage of courses that they've taken in Spanish shows that it's only 18.6% of the curriculum. A breakdown of two of our course schedules. Both course schedules reflect that 22% of our courses, of 716 and 789 that are offered, only 18% are offered in Spanish. The mission of the College is to provide bilingual, transitional instruction. Consistent with our language policy each level progressively of ESL students take from 25% to 100% of their courses in English. This analysis of our last registration clearly shows that the English policy, which is the progression slowly from taking 25% of students courses in English to full English courses, is tied to each level of ESL. Clearly our mission was to provide access to higher education, and we're doing that consistent with the model of instruction that I, as President, was brought to the College to administer. I am particularly concerned about all the misinformation that's gotten into the press. Today I share with you that, much like Dr. Matteoni presented to all of us, Hostos has been involved in strategic planning. Not only our ESL courses, but every course and every program is in the process of engaging in the identification of outcome measures. We promise you that it will not be only the CUNY WAT but many, many other standards of excellence. Those standards are reflected in the excellence and the success of many of our programs across the curriculum in Allied Health, in business, in technology. Hostos is a special environment; and our faculty and students work with one another with respect, commitment, and an extraordinary level of commitment to learning. Our entire College community has been engaged for the entire year in discussing not standards because we all agree that there has to be standards but what you expect faculty and what you expect administration to bring together to ensure student outcome. We don't want one standard. We have many tests, many assessments that students will have to meet. We will put into place various measures of cognitive achievement, of linguistic achievement, and of skills necessary for the work place. There is no question we will meet the University English proficiency for the graduation at community college, and I am adding that we will meet others. The recommendation of Hostos College faculty is that multiple measure be required of every student. I bring to your attention that as President I have a report on CUNY assessment standards that clearly stated that the CUNY assessment test could not be used as both an entry and an exit measure. For many of our students for which this test is used as a placement test, I would then be in violation of University policy. That is why we moved to develop multiple measures. I just want to make things clear that the College has done nothing but attempt to be in full compliance with what University directives have been in the office of Academic Affairs. On March 20, 1996, I received a memo from former Vice Chancellor Richard Freeland and the report of the CUNY Assessment Task Force. that Office of Academic Affairs the CUNY Assessment Report which directed us to develop multiple measures. In that report with regard to progress, and in this case we're not talking about certification we're talking about progress from ESL course into college-level English, and the report states with regard to progress assessment, "Faculty teaching remedial and ESL courses at the colleges should have primary responsibility for progress assessment guided and supported in this by the college and by the University Oversight Committees." I do want the Board to understand both myself and my faculty are functioning on the research in the field and the literature. You pay us for our best academic judgment, and that is what it is. If it is the policy of the University that all community colleges implement the test, our College will not be in violation. If this Board decides that we use the CUNY WAT, and that's what we will use.

At this point Trustee Stone left the meeting.

CHANCELLOR REYNOLDS stated that there are two issues. First of all, there's the 200 students who didn't pass the Hostos WAT or the CUNY WAT. We're doing intensive things to try to get them into position to re-take the test and hopefully pass it over the summer without penalty to them. Secondly, the resolution that you have is, indeed,
clear and that was the one that has been policy at Hostos and at our other campuses and we were attempting to reestablish. These students, the 200 under question were not up facing graduation. They are beginning in the English process, and they need to get the basic English so they can move ahead. The issues the Board are currently addressing have been in front of this Board for some time. In 1990, there was something called the Otheguy Report, and the senior Trustees. Chair Murphy and Trustee Mouner, will remember it I'm sure, was concerned about the incoming skills exam at CUNY. We have briefed Trustee Ruiz on this and I think Trustee Berg also understands this. The exam we are talking about is basically 12th grade reading skills. The situation had evolved to the extent that a test that essentially should be at the level of an admissions test to CUNY had evolved into kind of an exit test. A very large commission was set up during the earlier '90's. It has been in front of this Board a couple of times to look at the skills test, and where they should be given, and whether there should be an exit test. That was the so-called rising junior exam that was in front of this Board a year ago because we were trying to sort out the basic admissions test that assesses a student's math level of competency, and his/her writing competency – we're talking here about the writing competency exam – and make sure that students are prepared for college level work. So this had, indeed, been a process in phase so to speak over recent years with the Board. The rest of the community colleges are giving, and they do it in different ways. For example, passing the WAT is a prerequisite for English 102, the required second-level credit composition course at Queensborough and so forth. So the other community colleges are requiring passage of this test.

CHAIRWOMAN PAOLUCCI stated that she knew nothing about anything as of last Friday. Many of us knew very little about what was going on. I think the kind of information we've received here now. really, we should have had some time ago in Committee. Given the circumstances and the events of the last week and half or so, I have decided to set up a special committee with four people from the Board to survey and review the situation at Hostos, the curriculum generally, and other things. This will help, and we will be in touch with people at the College to clear the air on this and to clarify things and to come back into committee with some kind of suggestions for how to proceed and how to make things even better at Hostos. To that end I have asked Trustees Ruiz, Price, Rios, and Vice Chairman Badillo as Chair to work as a committee toward that end. President Santiago, my heart goes out to the students. I'm really disturbed by the fact that this has had to come to this point to be addressed. I think the matter of Hostos should have been looked at three years ago. We should have been examining it, and should have been making all kinds of adjustments to help the students in the proper way so that when it came to the time to take the CUNY WAT Test, there wouldn't have been this difficulty. I think in the future also if there are major changes of that kind, I do think that the Board should be made aware and given the information ahead of time. We're trying to resolve a very difficult thing here which is that the rest of the community college students are taking that test and Hostos is not. We cannot go against something is on the books. I will certainly see to it that the Committee works expeditiously and fast. We're putting in a lot of time, and I have to thank everyone for doing that because these are hard things to do as you all understand, and we would like to help absolutely. It is a crucial question. It could be even interpreted as preferential in some ways for some students, and we want to avoid that. Also for the sake of the future and the sake of consistency and the integrity of the Board we have to stand by what we just said.

NO. 1. UNIVERSITY REPORT: RESOLVED. That the University Report for May 27, 1997 (Including Addendum Items) be approved, as amended as follows, with the exception of Addendum Item D.1. Baruch College Campus High School which was amended to reflect that “the teachers who will be teaching in this high school come under the aegis of the UFT.”

(a) AA Section: Revise the following.

AA.1 APPOINTMENT WITH WAIVER OF THE BYLAWS - COMMITTEE APPROVAL NOT REQUIRED (APPROVAL BY OFSR) (SW INDICATES WAIVER OF SEARCH) - THE CENTRAL OFFICE: The entries for Kisha Fuentes and Le Shor Bellinger are withdrawn.

(b) Items listed in PART E - ERRATA, to be withdrawn or changed as indicated.

EXPLANATION: The University Report consists of the highlights of the personnel actions and other resolutions of a non-policy nature which require approval by the Board of Trustees.
NO. 2. CHANCELLOR’S REPORT: RESOLVED. That the Chancellor's Report for May 27, 1997 (Including Addendum Items) be approved, as amended, as follows:

(a) ERRATA: Add the following:

QUEENS COLLEGE
P 8-2 LEAVE OF ABSENCE WITHOUT PAY (INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF): The entry for Beverly Frazier is withdrawn.

(b) Items listed in PART E - ERRATA, to be withdrawn or changed as indicated.

EXPLANATION: The Chancellor's Report consists of standard resolutions and actions of a non-policy nature which require approval by the Board of Trustees.

NO. 3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: RESOLVED. That the minutes of the regular Board meeting, and executive session of April 30, 1997 be approved:

NO. 4. BOARD MEETING DATES FOR 1997-98 ACADEMIC YEAR: RESOLVED. That the following schedule of meeting dates be approved for the academic year 1997-98:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday, September 29, 1997</td>
<td>Monday, February 23, 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, October 27, 1997</td>
<td>Monday, March 23, 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, November 24, 1997</td>
<td>Monday, April 27, 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, December 22, 1997</td>
<td>Tuesday, May 26, 1998</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NO. 5. COMMITTEE ON FISCAL AFFAIRS, FACILITIES AND CONTRACT REVIEW: RESOLVED. That the following items be approved:

TRUSTEE MARINO stated that we instituted a rule on the Fiscal Affairs Committee of asking both the twenty-two units in the University and the Central Office to calendar an item the first time for informational purposes so that we could discuss it, lay it over, and then vote on it at the next committee meeting. Vice Chancellor Rothbard asked me on May 8th to consider passing eight other items I would consider to be ministerial, not of a policy nature. I don't want to hold these back from this meeting because it might impact on the operation of the University over the next academic year. So I would like to be the first abuser of my rule by asking that the Board consider eight other items all dealing with purchases, or leasing of equipment, or minor rehabilitation matters. So without any objection from the Committee members or from other Board members, from the calendar of the May meeting of the Committee I would like to add items 5-D, E, F, G, I, J, and K. However, let me do say that while I'm willing to do it this time, and I know on the June meeting there will be some items that we'll only have a chance to look at once, I'm again willing to do that. I really want to stress to the twenty presidents and two deans and to the Central Office, the seriousness of my willingness to do this this time but not in the next academic year.

CHAIRWOMAN PAOLUCCI added that all committees have made that request.

A. COLLEGE OF STATEN ISLAND - PURCHASE OF DUPLICATING COPIERS:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Trustees of The City University of New York authorize the College of Staten Island to purchase twenty-five (25) Model EP 3050 copiers from Minolta Corporation of New York under existing City of New York Contract Number 9687821, pursuant to law and University regulations. Such purchase shall not exceed a total estimated cost of $138,500, chargeable to FAS Code 229601302, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1997.

EXPLANATION: Twenty-five (25) new office copiers will replace thirty-two (32) obsolete copiers. In arriving at the recommendation to purchase the Minolta Model EP 3050 copiers, the cost of various photocopying models on the State of New York, City of New York, and Federal GSA contracts were reviewed. In addition, various manufacturers
were contacted to obtain sufficient information on various copiers to ensure that the College’s copying needs would be met. The City of New York contract provides the lowest price (purchase and maintenance cost) for this mid-size machine.

B. UNIVERSITY CONTRACTING OFFICE - AIR MANAGEMENT SYSTEM MAINTENANCE AND REPAIRS:

RESOLVED. That the Board of Trustees of The City University of New York authorize the Secretary of the Board to execute a contract or contracts on behalf of the University Contracting Office to purchase air management system maintenance and repairs. The contract or contracts shall be awarded to the lowest responsive and responsible bidder or bidders after public advertisement and sealed bidding by the University Contracting Office pursuant to law and University regulations. Such purchases shall not exceed a total estimated cost of $575,000 for the initial one-year term, chargeable to the appropriate colleges’ FAS codes, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1998. The contract or contracts shall include up to four one year options for the University to renew in its best interest. The contract or contracts shall be subject to approval as to form by the University Office of General Counsel.

EXPLANATION: During the past five years, the University has consolidated college air management system maintenance and repairs contracts and replaced them with University-wide contracts, which are awarded by Borough to several bidders or in entirety to one bidder, in the University’s best interest. The consolidation effort has achieved volume discount savings to the University. The maintenance and repairs of the University’s automatic temperature control systems are essential to ensure that the equipment operates and performs at peak efficiency. For fiscal year 1990-1991, the colleges spent $1,100,000 for management system maintenance and repairs. Utilizing the consolidated method, savings of over $500,000 per year have been achieved; in addition, administrative costs have been reduced.

TRUSTEE BABBAR stated that at the Committee meeting we had decided that in addition to the University Contracting Office the office of the Vice Chancellor for Facilities will also review and concur with the contract for its technical aspect. This statement should be incorporated in the explanation of the resolution.

ADDED ITEM

C. AMENDMENT TO OPTION AGREEMENT RELATING TO GROUND LEASE WITH THE FEDERAL GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION FOR YORK COLLEGE SITE:

RESOLVED. That the Board of Trustees of The City University of New York authorizes the Secretary of the Board to execute and deliver the First Amendment, dated as of May 26, 1997 (the “First Amendment”), to Option Agreement, dated as of June 23, 1995 (“Option Agreement”), between the Dormitory Authority of the State of New York and The United States of America acting by and through the General Services Administration (the “GSA”), relating to the Ground Lease Agreement (the “Ground Lease”) between the Dormitory Authority of the State of New York and the GSA, providing for the lease of Lot 80, Block 10099, Jamaica, New York, on the westerly portion of the York College campus (the “FDA Site”) on which a new laboratory for the Federal Food and Drug Administration (“FDA”) will be constructed.

EXPLANATION: On May 22, 1995, the Board of Trustees considered and approved the Option Agreement, which granted an option to the Federal government to enter into the Ground Lease for the FDA Site. At the time of the execution of the Option Agreement, a two-year option period, ending on June 23, 1997, was deemed adequate to enable the GSA to procure private developer services to construct a laboratory on the FDA Site. However, because of recent fluctuations in prevailing market rates, all bidders for the construction of the FDA lab have withdrawn. As a result, the GSA will reopen the bidding process. In this connection, the GSA has requested that the two-year option provided by the Option Agreement be extended for one year to June 23, 1998.
The Ground Lease, which is the subject of (and a schedule to) the Option Agreement, provides that if construction of the FDA laboratory is not begun by December 31, 1997, the Ground Lease automatically terminates. In light of the one-year extension of the option period, the GSA has asked for a commensurate one-year extension to December 31, 1998, of the date by which construction must be commenced under the Ground Lease.

The First Amendment grants the one-year extensions requested by the GSA.

D. LEHMAN COLLEGE - INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY:

RESOLVED. That the Board of Trustees of The City University of New York authorize Lehman College to purchase one hundred ninety four (194) Gateway Pentium microcomputers from Government Computer Sales under existing State of New York Contract Number FT00061, pursuant to law and University regulations. Such purchase shall not exceed a total estimated cost of $421,000, chargeable to FAS Code 221501309, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1997.

EXPLANATION: The College will replace older equipment and increase the number of networked microcomputers available to students in classrooms and public access areas of the Academic Computer Center, the Department of Sociology and Social Work, the Department of Health Services, and the Mathematics and Computer Center Department. In addition, these microcomputers will be used for admission and recruitment in the Department of Student Affairs. The new microcomputers will allow students and faculty to access the Internet and World Wide Web; students will also use these new systems to access services from other servers on campus and CUNY-Plus. This resolution has been reviewed and approved by the University Dean for Instructional Technology and Information Services.

E. LEHMAN COLLEGE - ENERGY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM:

RESOLVED. That the Board of Trustees of The City University of New York authorize Lehman College to purchase material and labor to install monitoring and control equipment to expand the existing Landis & Gyr System 600 Direct Digital Control Energy Management System from Landis & Staefa, Inc. under existing General Services Administration Contract Number GS07F-5665A, pursuant to law and University regulations. Such purchase shall not exceed a total estimated cost of $205,000, chargeable to FAS Code 217701479, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1997.

EXPLANATION: Currently, six campus buildings are controlled by the Landis & Gyr System 600 (DDC) Direct Digital Control Energy Management System. The connection of additional points and buildings to the system will be accomplished by using parts and equipment supplied by Landis & Staefa, Inc.. Connection of additional points to this system will result in energy savings due to increased accuracy, the ability to more accurately regulate HVAC units during unoccupied hours and the ability to reset required discharge air and water temperatures. Funding for the Energy Management Expansion is provided by the New York Power Authority.

F. YORK COLLEGE - INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY, PURCHASE OF COMPUTERS:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Trustees of The City University of New York authorize York College to purchase seventy four (74) computers from Dell Computer Corporation under existing State of New York Contract Number PT00109, pursuant to law and University regulations. Such purchase shall not exceed a total estimated cost of $197,800, chargeable to FAS Code 210701309, and FAS Code 218401309, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1997.

EXPLANATION: The College will upgrade computer laboratories for Business and Accounting majors with the purchase of thirty-six (36) pentium computers. These computers will provide students with increased access to the Internet through the College-wide computer network and maximize students’ exposure to information retrieval techniques. The College will also upgrade workstations to provide administrative support staff with desktop computing capabilities. Human Resources requires six (6) pentium computers to expand the automated time and leave system. The Office of the Vice President for Administrative Affairs and the Business Office will receive twenty-
four (24) computers to support professional and clerical personnel. The Office of Career Planning & Placement will maximize job search efforts, resume writing abilities and access to corporate literature with the purchase of eight (8) computers. This purchase is consistent with the College’s Information Technology Plan. This resolution has been reviewed and approved by the University Dean for Instructional Technology and Information Services.

G. MEDGAR EVERS COLLEGE INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY, PURCHASE OF COMPUTERS AND COMMUNICATION RELATED EQUIPMENT:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Trustees of The City University of New York authorize Medgar Evers College to purchase one-hundred and five (105) personal computers and communication related equipment from Dell Computers under existing State of New York Contract PT00109, pursuant to law and University regulations. Such purchase shall not exceed a total estimated cost of $280,000 chargeable to ME-CA101-97E and $49,000 chargeable to FAS Code 226601309 during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1997.

EXPLANATION: During the past three years, the College has been systematically and prudently working toward integrating its computing and information systems technology. This includes incorporating mainframe system access to the information system for registration and advisement; in addition, the College is facilitating faculty and staff access to electronic mail, Internet web access, and data transfer to desktop processors. The College has begun expanding the fiber backbone system in the Library to include access to all faculty offices and student laboratories.

The College will establish three (3) computer laboratories, containing Pentium class PC’s for use in the following areas:

1. A 30 workstation laboratory to serve as an open laboratory, and
2. A 30 workstation laboratory to serve as a mathematics laboratory, and
3. A 15 workstation laboratory to service as a nursing laboratory.

As part of this initiative, the College will upgrade thirty (30) faculty workstations in the School of Science, Health and Technology.

Students using these laboratories will gain experience with computers using information retrieval techniques and discipline specific software. Each laboratory will be connected to the College-wide area network for access to CUNY Plus and the Internet. The laboratory that is designated for mathematics will be available as open laboratory for student use when not scheduled for classes. The College will acquire 105 PC’s, 5 printers, upgrade 7 existing servers, and related networking equipment.

This purchase is consistent with the College’s Information Technology Plan. This resolution has been reviewed and approved by the University Dean for Instructional Technology and Information Services.

H. BRONX COMMUNITY COLLEGE - INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY, PURCHASE OF COMPUTERS AND RELATED EQUIPMENT:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Trustees of The City University of New York authorize Bronx Community College to purchase sixty-two (62) computers from Government Computer Sales, inc. under existing State of New York Contract Number PT00061, pursuant to law and University regulations; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Board of Trustees of The City University of New York authorize Bronx Community College to purchase five (5) Network File Servers from Dell Marketing L.P. under existing State of New York Contract Number PT00109 pursuant to law and University regulations; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the total of all such purchases shall not exceed a total estimated cost of $193,000, chargeable to FAS Code 2-827-01-300, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1997.
EXPLANATION: At the commencement of the 1996-97 fiscal year, the College received funding from the Academic Program Planning budget to establish or upgrade its computer laboratories in the following departments: Business, Physics and Technology, Nursing and Allied Health Science, and Academic Computing. The Physics and Technology laboratories will be purchasing twenty (20) Pentium P166 personal computers to provide state of the art education in their technical programs. In addition two (2) Pentium P200 personal computers will be ordered for the Automotive Technology program for database purposes and for the implementation of the EPA Natural Gas Program. The Department of Business will be purchasing twenty (20) Pentium P166 personal computers for faculty as well as for utilization in its Accounting, Paralegal, Secretarial Studies, and Marketing and Management programs. The Department of Nursing and Allied Health Science will purchase twenty (20) Pentium P166 personal computers for the creation of a multimedia lab. Five (5) Network File Servers (two for departments of Physics and Technology, and three for Academic Computing) will provide connectivity in a college-wide network environment. This resolution has been reviewed and approved by the University Dean for Instructional Technology and Information Services.

I. BROOKLYN COLLEGE - STUDENT E-MAIL PROJECT, PURCHASE OF COMPUTERS AND RELATED EQUIPMENT:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Trustees of The City University of New York authorize Brooklyn College to purchase network servers, software, and other computer related equipment from Ameridata Inc. under existing State of New York Contract Number PT00248 pursuant to law and University regulations. Such purchase shall not exceed a total estimated cost of $90,000, chargeable to FAS Code 221201309, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1997; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Board of Trustees of The City University of New York authorize Brooklyn College to purchase 30 PC workstations and other computer related equipment from Government Computer Sales Inc. under existing State of New York Contract Number PT00061, pursuant to law and University regulations. Such purchase shall not exceed a total estimated cost of $50,000, chargeable to FAS Code 221201309, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1997.

EXPLANATION: As part of Brooklyn College’s Electronic Campus initiative, network equipment and software will be purchased to facilitate the distribution to all students of permanent on-campus LAN based electronic mail IDs to allow electronic communication between students and the faculty and administration. The College will purchase equipment to host 16,000 to 20,000 electronic mail IDs with a nominal storage area for each student, the necessary network support structure, and the electronic mail/OS software license costs. The project is being funded via the Computer Access Fee allocation. This resolution has been reviewed and approved by the University Dean for Instructional Technology and Information Services.

J. BROOKLYN COLLEGE - INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY, PURCHASE OF COMPUTERS AND RELAYED EQUIPMENT:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Trustees of The City University of New York authorize Brooklyn College to purchase 220 computer systems from Ameridata Inc. under existing State of New York Contract Number PT00248 pursuant to law and University regulations. Such purchase shall not exceed a total estimated cost of $440,000 chargeable to FAS Codes 221201309, 288501309, and 287301309, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1997; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Board of Trustees of The City University of New York authorize Brooklyn College to purchase 140 computer systems from Government Computer Sales Inc. under existing State of New York Contract Number FTO0061 pursuant to law and University regulations. Such purchase shall not exceed a total estimated cost of $209,000 chargeable to FAS Codes 221201309, 288501309, and 287301309, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1997; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Board of Trustees of The City University of New York authorize Brooklyn College to purchase 46 printers and scanners from Computer Integration Corporation Systems under existing State of New York Contract
Number P007620 pursuant to law and University regulations. Such purchase shall not exceed a total estimated cost of $26,000 chargeable to FAS Codes 221201309, 288501309, and 287301309, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1997.

EXPLANATION: Brooklyn College will improve its ability to meet the needs of current students, to attract new students and to compete in an increasingly sophisticated and competitive teaching environment. The four projects, enumerated below, will enable the College to strengthen its computing infrastructure for student instruction and faculty research.

1. The College's two general purpose computer laboratory facilities, the Wolfe and Atrium laboratories and their associated instructional classrooms, will be upgraded to meet the demands of new media and web based instruction. The planned equipment acquisitions will continue the migration to Pentium based, Windows 95, large screen, CD-ROM based systems capable of supporting all planned instructional initiatives. The existing equipment will be distributed to faculty to improve basic computer access and literacy and be used to support instructional laboratories which require less intensive applications.

2. The College is equipping three new computer based instructional classrooms (English, Biology and Political Science) in order to expand the use of computer based instruction.

3. The Learning Center, serving thousands of students each year, will be able to deliver and review course materials from many disciplines, particularly the Core Curriculum. The existing computers need to be replaced with the more current models to support the instructional technology already being used as well as planned expansions. The planned expansion will allow the Learning Center to function as a general purpose high technology classroom accessible to other academic departments.

As part of Brooklyn College's Electronic Campus initiative, the College will expand access to its existing information system to faculty and department offices. This will improve the quality and efficiency of student advisement, recruiting, classroom support, faculty research, and college-wide communications. The College will install shared workstations and associated network infrastructure in each academic department to provide access to CUNY SIMS, purchasing and budgetary systems, E-mail, Internet, Library systems, College Intranet information, and client server classroom support systems. This resolution has been reviewed and approved by the University Dean for Instructional Technology and Information Services.

K. LEHMAN COLLEGE - PURCHASE OF DUPLICATING COPIERS:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Trustees of The City University of New York authorize Lehman College to purchase duplicating copiers from Minolta Copier Corporation under existing General Services Administration Contract Number GS-26F1003B, pursuant to law and University regulations. Such purchase shall not exceed a total estimated cost of $270,000, chargeable to FAS Code 218401302, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1997.

EXPLANATION: The College is seeking to replace fifty nine (59) office copiers. These copiers are experiencing considerable down time due to the age of the equipment. The increase in service calls has significantly increased maintenance costs. In addition, the copiers to be replaced represent a variety of makes and models which has had the effect of increasing costs of maintenance and supplies.

The cost/benefit of this acquisition was analyzed by computing the cost per copy and comparing it with the current cost per copy of approximately 2.50 cents. The current cost per copy rate does not factor in rate increases as the copiers get older, or the cost of replacing copiers that are beyond repair. The current proposal to purchase fifty nine (59) Minolta copiers provides for maintenance and supplies for years one through three at a rate of 1.0 cents per copy, and 1.25 cents per copy for years four through six. These rates will cover fifty nine (59) new copiers as well as eleven (11) Minolta copiers that the College currently owns. This resolution has been reviewed and approved by the University Dean for Instructional Technology and Information Services.
NO. 6. COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY, PROGRAM, AND RESEARCH: RESOLVED, That the following item be approved:

A. BARUCH COLLEGE - B.S. IN REAL ESTATE AND METROPOLITAN DEVELOPMENT:

RESOLVED, That the program in Real Estate and Metropolitan Development leading to the Bachelor of Science degree to be offered at Baruch College, be approved effective September 1997, subject to financial ability.

EXPLANATION: The purpose of the proposed program is to provide students with the knowledge and skills necessary to qualify for entry-level positions in firms that develop, manage, finance, appraise, and broker urban and suburban real estate markets, and in non-profit organizations and government agencies with real-estate activities. Graduates of the program will also be qualified to pursue graduate study in real estate or in other professional programs such as public administration, urban planning, and finance.

Employment opportunities in real estate professions in the New York metropolitan area are vast and growing. A survey conducted by the College in 1995 demonstrates that 80% of employers would be willing to hire graduates of the program for entry-level positions. In 1995, more than 300,000 persons were employed in the officially defined real estate industry, Federal, State, and City government agencies, and in peripheral fields of private sector employment. Thus, excellent employment prospects will be available to graduates of the program.

The proposed curriculum is interdisciplinary, combining courses offered by the Schools of Public Affairs, Business, and Liberal Arts and Sciences with capstone courses in Public Affairs that integrate prior course work in real estate and public affairs through an interactive computer simulation of the dynamics of metropolitan growth and development.

The Steven L. Newman Real Estate Institute will offer support to the proposed program in the form of fellowships for students and financial support for faculty who are engaged in research in real estate and related areas.

NO. 7. SALK SCHOLARSHIPS: RESOLVED. That the Board approve the award of the Jonas E. Salk Scholarships to the following graduates who have been recommended by the Chancellor:

WITH STIPEND

Matvey Brokhin
Kira Manusis
Cathenne U. Okonji
Natalya Koltunova
Rhondalyn C. McLean
Colette Monique Knight
Eve Sisser
David I. Sternberg

Hunter College
Brooklyn College
The City College
Hunter College
The City College
The City College
Queens College
Brooklyn College

HONORARY (in order selected)

Antonia Eyssallenne
Rohini Bhat
Mamie Caton
Jennifer Duchon
Elissa Rubin
Fahd Ali
Robert W. Maitta

Hunter College
Queens College
Hunter College
The City College
Brooklyn College
Brooklyn College
The City College
NO. 8. HONORARY DEGREES: RESOLVED. That the following honorary degree, approved by the appropriate faculty body and recommended by the Chancellor, be presented at commencement exercises as specified:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLLEGE</th>
<th>DEGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEHMAN COLLEGE</td>
<td>Dr. Glen Nygreen Doctor of Humane Letters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(To be awarded at the September, 1997 convocation)

ADDED ITEM

TRUSTEE CRIMMINS introduced a resolution proposing a $200 reduction in tuition at both the senior and community colleges.

TRUSTEE MURPHY recommended that the resolution be tabled and referred to the Committee on Fiscal Affairs, Facilities, and Contract Review for further analysis and discussion.

Upon motions duly made, seconded and carried, the Public Meeting was adjourned at 6:58 PM.

SECRETARY GENEVIEVE MULLIN

(This is a detailed summary of the Board of Trustees' meeting. The tapes of the meeting are available in the Office of the Secretary of the Board for a period of three years.)