

**MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING OF THE  
BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK**

**HELD**

**JULY 1, 1970**

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

The Chairman called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

There were present the following members of the Executive Committee and other members of the Board and the Administrative Council who were invited to attend:

Francis Keppel, Chairman  
David I. Ashe  
Herbert Berman

James Oscar Lee  
Jack I. Poses  
Luis Quero Chiesa

Maria Josefa Canino  
Porter R. Chandler  
Jean-Louis d'Heilly

Minneola P. Ingersoll  
Robert Ross Johnson  
Louis Nunez

N. Michael Carfora, Secretary of the Board

Chancellor Albert H. Bowker  
Acting President Joseph J. Copeland  
President John W. Kneller  
President Joseph P. McMurray  
President Donald H. Riddle  
President Richard D. Trent  
President Robert C. Weaver  
President Jacqueline G. Wexler  
President Milton G. Bassin  
President William M. Birenbaum  
Acting President Edgar G. Draper

President Nasry Michelen  
President Theodore Powell  
President Kurt R. Schmeller  
President Joseph Shenker  
Dr. Robert S. Hirschfield  
Mr. Richard Lewis

Deputy Chancellor Seymour C. Hyman  
Vice-Chancellor Timothy S. Healy  
Vice-Chancellor T. Edward Hollander  
Dean Benjamin Rosner

The absence of Mr. Burkhardt was excused.

Upon motion duly made, seconded and carried, the following resolutions were adopted or action was taken as noted:

**NO. 1. OPEN ADMISSIONS:** The Chancellor presented the following report:

There are several things to report about in connection with Open Admissions:

There's the academic program, some space problems, and a few other things, but the most critical thing is the size of the freshman class and what to do about it, and I would like to talk about that and tell you how it looks to me and what the alternatives are.

Our own estimate of the freshman class is 34,445 students, and we are budgeted for about 30,000 students. The presidents have somewhat higher estimates than this which are based on the number of students who have accepted admission to each college. Experience is varied from college to college, but from 7 to 12% of the people who indicate an intention to come in the spring do not show up in the fall. The estimates may be off, but this is how it looks to us.

#### SENIOR COLLEGES

Regular students	10,785
Remedial students	6,740
Total	17,525

#### COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Regular students	4,900
Remedial students	8,470
Total	13,370

A regular student in the senior colleges is one whose high school grade average is over 80%, and a remedial student is one whose high school grade average is under 80%. In the fall of 1969 we admitted 8,800 regular freshmen. There is an 80% average now instead of an 82% one, but I don't think that explains the increase of almost 2,000 students.

A regular student in the community colleges is one with a high school grade average of 75% or better, and a remedial student is one with a high school grade average of less than 75%.

If you add to these totals 2,500 SEEK students and 1,050 in College Discovery, we come to a total of 34,445 students.

Now let me tell you where we are in terms of the budget allocations that have been made to the colleges at this point. On June 15 we distributed enough money to handle the following numbers of students:

#### BUDGET ALLOCATIONS

Senior Colleges	
Regular students	9,080
Remedial students	5,210
Community Colleges	
Regular students	3,950
Remedial students	6,460
SEEK	2,500
College Discovery	1,050
Total	28,250

SEEK and College Discovery admissions are controlled to make the number of admissions equal to available places.

We did not distribute the whole sum we had available. We were keeping a reserve. We have some additional money.

We are budgeted for about \$1,350 per student. In addition to that, extra funds were given for remedial students. These are divided into Class A and Class B students depending upon how much remediation they need. Class A students have averages between 75% and 80%, and Class B students have averages below 75%. There is about \$400 or \$500 more per student for remedial students.

That represents a statement of where we are. Now the problem is what we should do about it. We have requested the Budget Office, and the Budget Office has placed before the Mayor an additional request for about \$10,000,000; about \$8,000,000 for distribution according to these formulas, and a couple of thousands for remediation and other things. We have not heard from the Mayor, and it is possible within the next week or two that the Mayor will move to give us some increased allocation. We are pessimistic about it. If we get it, we will keep it. The Governor has promised to match it. He is, however, a little bit reluctant about the community colleges, but in the senior colleges he is matching. We are asking money from the Mayor and from the City, and so far we have been asking this through conferences and administrative channels. The Mayor is aware of this meeting today. On the other hand, we haven't really rattled the drum as much as we could in private.

I guess we have two alternatives. The first is that the Mayor perhaps will decide to give us all the money we need. That seems to me not likely to happen, but it is possible. We could fight for money and get it if the Mayor doesn't give it to us, or we could cut back and fight at a later date, or we could live within the budget.

If we decide to fight, there are two things that bother me. One is the fact that we are operating in an area in which we don't have much experience. Last year only two or three of the colleges achieved their estimated enrollment. If we end up with 31,000 students in the fall, we are going to look mighty foolish. The fact that makes me a little nervous about fighting is that most of the colleges, not all, had substantial unexpended balances at the end of the year. Some of this is desirable, and some is natural. Our budget comes late. Many positions are not filled. The Budget Office steals money from us one way or the other. But we are underspent by \$10,000,000 this year. This comes largely from the fact that when the University creates positions, they are meant to be filled on July 1. Any position that we create from now on will not be filled on July 1. This has been true for a number of years. It happens when we ask for money at this time of year. That is neither here nor there.

On the other hand, we might be in real, real trouble in the fall. I guess what I think we ought to do if we decide to make a major effort for more money is to go ahead as close to normal as we can although we are spending more money than we have and try to find more money later.

Let me tell you what the alternatives will be if we live within our budget. We could put the students on a 12-hour program instead of a 15-hour program. If we did that, we would be spending within our budget. This would amount to about a 20% reduction in the budget, which is about our overage. The other possibility is to put a certain segment of the class on a reduced schedule. There would be a problem in deciding what segment of the freshman class should be on a reduced schedule. If we put the remedial students on a part-time schedule, it can be said that the Open Admissions students need more time and more help. On the other hand, if we go along and put the regular students on a part-time basis and put the Open Admission students on a full-time schedule, we would be going back on our promise that the students who would have entered by the regular admissions procedures would not be harmed in any way.

The other alternative is to enter the fall spending at an accelerated rate and when things come to a head, indicate that we don't have enough money to see us through the year. And if we are serious in fighting for more money, I think we are much better off to fight in the fall with the students already in the University. If we fight now, we may drive the students out. There are plenty of private institutions who would take some students at this time. I think we are better off fighting in the fall.

**NO. 2. THE CITY UNIVERSITY RESEARCH FOUNDATION:** RESOLVED, That a Memorandum of Understanding between the City Budget Office, The City University Research Foundation and the City University be approved and that a contract between the Board of Higher Education and the Research Foundation which implements the Memorandum of Understanding also be approved.

**EXPLANATION:** On October 27, 1969, the Board of Higher Education resolved that the City University Foundation be assigned responsibility effective July 1, 1970, for administering all grants and contracts awarded to any unit in the University. This arrangement has been endorsed by City budget officials who have agreed to a partial retention of overhead and released time recoveries by the University as a means of encouraging and facilitating research. The memorandum of understanding and the contract formalize the understanding arrived at with City officials regarding the funding and administration of research activity.

**NO. 3. FULL TIME TRAINING PROGRAM TO PREPARE DIRECTORS OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH--THE CITY COLLEGE:** RESOLVED, That the Board of Higher Education approve a contract dated June 1, 1970, between The People of the State of New York acting through Ewald B. Nyquist, Commissioner of Education of the State of New York, and the Board of Higher Education on behalf of The City College of The City University of New York, to conduct a full time training program designed to prepare directors of educational research for a maximum of two (2) participants, in consideration of the sum of \$14,200 paid by the State of New York to the Board of Higher Education, and that the Secretary of the Board be authorized to execute said contract on behalf of the Board of Higher Education and The City College.

**EXPLANATION:** Commencing June 1, 1970, and continuing through May 31, 1971, The City College will conduct a full time training program designed to prepare directors of educational research for a maximum of two (2) participants. In providing said training program The City College shall provide the following: those graduate courses approved by the Commissioner of Education; field experience which may be on or off campus; supervision of off-campus internship; submission of reports required; and the selection of participants, subject to the approval of the Commissioner of Education.

**NO. 4. TEMPORARY BUILDING--BROOKLYN COLLEGE:** RESOLVED, That the action taken by the Board of Higher Education at its meeting on February 24, 1970 (item G.1.8. of the Addendum to the Chancellor's Report--Rental of Temporary Structures--Brooklyn College) be amended to increase the estimated rental cost from \$6.50 per square foot per year to \$8.76 per square foot per year, and reduce the total square feet to be rented from approximately 31,000 square feet to 21,000 square feet.

**EXPLANATION:** Subsequent to the February 24, 1970 authorization, contract documents were prepared by the College for four temporary buildings. Although the original request indicated a need for 31,000 square feet development of plans indicated that only 21,000 square feet of one-story structures could be reasonably fitted to the site. It also became apparent as the plans were developed that four separate structures (not one or two) would be required and more extensive site utility work than originally anticipated would be required.

On April 24, 1970, a single bid was received for construction and rental of said temporary buildings. The five year total of rent was to be \$1,049,000 (\$9.92/square foot/year) with a purchase option at termination of \$130,000. Removal would have been at no expense to the owner.

This bid was rejected. The plans were reviewed by the College and the Office of Campus Planning and Development and certain work was deleted from the contract documents without reducing the net useable area.

On June 25, 1970, bids were received from four bidders. The five year total of rent of the low bidder is \$924,000 (\$8.76/square foot/year) with a purchase option at termination of \$1.00. Removal at termination would be at an expense of \$40,000 to the owner.

It is felt that the low bid is reasonable and award is therefore recommended.

At this point the Committee went into executive session.

Upon motion duly made, seconded and carried, the meeting adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

N. Michael Carfora  
Secretary of the Board