

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

HELD

SEPTEMBER 27, 1971

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

The Chairman called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

There were present:

Frederick Burkhardt, Chairman  
David I. Ashe  
Herbert Berman  
Maria Josefa Canino  
Alexander A. Delle Cese  
Fileno DeNovellis  
Jean-Louis d'Heilly  
Norman E. Henkin  
Minneola P. Ingersoll  
Robert Ross Johnson

James Oscar Lee  
John A. Morsell  
Jack I. Poses  
Luis Quero Chiesa  
Barbara A. Thacher  
Francisco Trilla  
Eve Weiss  
Arleigh B. Williamson  
Isaiah E. Robinson

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

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

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

The absence of Mr. Hayes, Mr. Reid and Mr. Wessell was excused.

**NO. A. INTRODUCTIONS:** The Chairman introduced Dr. Francisco Trilla, newly appointed member of the Board, and Acting President Peter J. Caffrey of New York City Community College and Acting President Candido A. de Leon of Hostos Community College.

**NO. B. PRESIDENTIAL SEARCH COMMITTEES:** The Chairman reported that he had appointed the following Presidential Search Committees:

**UNIVERSITY GRADUATE DIVISION**

Jack I. Poses, Chairman  
Maria Josefa Canino  
Edward S. Reid  
Barbara A. Thacher  
Nils Y. Wessell

**NEW YORK CITY COMMUNITY COLLEGE**

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

Upon motions duly made, seconded and carried, the following resolutions were adopted or action was taken as noted: (Cal. Nos. 1 through 6)

**NO. 1. REAPPOINTMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS OF BOARD MEMBERS:** (a) The Chairman reported that the Mayor has reappointed Mr. Frederick O'R. Hayes to a full nine-year term expiring June 30, 1980 and has reappointed Mr. Fileno De Novellis to fill the unexpired term of Mr. Francis Keppel. His term expires June 30, 1973.

(b) The Chairman reported that the Mayor has appointed the following new members of the Board of Higher Education:

Mr. Edward S. Reid (For a nine-year term expiring June 30, 1980.)

Dr. Francisco Trilla (To fill the unexpired term of Mr. Louis Nunez. His term expires June 30, 1977.)

**NO. 2. CITIZENS' COMMISSION ON THE FUTURE OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK:** Ambassador Robert F. Wagner, Chairman of the Citizens' Commission on the Future of The City University of New York, presented the following progress report of the Commission entitled "Section 1. Funding."

**REMARKS BY ROBERT F. WAGNER TO THE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION**

September 27, 1971

Just in case some of you can't place me, despite the introduction, I am the father of The Robert F. Wagner, who is heading the Commission to Repeal the Hot Dog Tax.

I am glad to take note, that quite a few members of this Board are young enough to be able barely to remember the time when I was mayor of this city. Sometimes I don't remember so well myself. I was older then—or I felt older.

Anyway, I do remember that the two major municipal problems which occupied my time, attention and concern during my last months in office were the transit negotiations and the crisis in the Board of Higher Education. I could only help settle the second of these two problem situations, and we patched things up pretty well at the time.

Some months later at the request of Chancellor Bowker and Professor Edelstein I agreed to use whatever good offices I had with the then Speaker Travia in behalf of what became the City University Construction Act of 1966. Tony agreed to take it over and it became the Travia Law; it is one of the main legal foundation stones on which the City University stands or rather operates today.

That's the law that established the 50-50 funding formula as well as the Construction Fund.

That activity expanded my commitment to the City University which was already great because of my father who was an alumnus of City College.

Also, there were on the Board of Higher Education a number of good friends and acquaintances whom I had appointed and who continued to engage my interest in the University. There are only three left . . . three out of twenty-one . . . in less than six years. That's time for you.

Anyway, when Al Bowker and Julius Edelstein and then Porter Chandler approached me to help organize and to become chairman of a Citizens' Commission to Study the Future of the City University, I agreed—with the understanding and assurance that this undertaking would take no more than six months at the outside. Well, that's what they thought, and that's what I thought.

I agreed to take this job, because I have a real concern, interest, and commitment to the future of the City University. I felt that the kind of study that was being proposed might perform a substantial service for the City University, the City and the State . . . for the young people thereof.

There were designated to serve on that Commission a representative group of outstanding citizens concerned with the University, but basically unrelated to its governing structure—not part of the University establishment, in other words.

One of the members of our Commission has since been appointed to the Board of Higher Education. He is an old friend and I am pleased to congratulate and to greet him at what I understand is his first meeting of the Board, and I mean of course my old friend Dr. Francisco Trilla.

I am here tonight to report to you very informally on the status of the report of the Citizens' Commission, having recently submitted, rather informally, a draft of the first section of the report—the section on the funding and financing of the University. I believe that each of you received a copy. I think you also received a brief explanation of why we sent you a draft and not a copy of the report in final form. We owe you a somewhat more detailed explanation on that.

As soon as the draft of the report on the funding section was completed, it circulated among members of the Commission for their comments and approval of the language. As I said, the basic thrust and content of the recommendations had already been approved. The finalized version of the report was scheduled to be sent to members of the Board of Higher Education, the Mayor, the Governor, the Board of Regents and to the legislative leadership of the State and City governments.

We had intended to release the report on a particular Tuesday, approximately ten days after the report, in draft form, was submitted to the members of the Commission for their final clearance. Unfortunately, as sometimes happens, even to the City University, the New York Times changed our timetable by prematurely breaking the story. On the Friday before the Tuesday, the Times, having secured, by fair means or foul, a copy of that draft, printed a story about the report, but only on page fifty, based on that draft.

That draft, with a few amendments, was subsequently sent to the members of the Board so they would have a copy at least by the Monday preceding the Tuesday in which this part of the report was to have been released.

Under those circumstances, there was no time to reproduce a final copy. It had to go as a draft . . . which you received.

There haven't been many substantial changes in the final version as you will see when you receive your final copy in a week or so.

I hope you will find the time to read the introduction or foreword to the funding report. It explains the difficulties we confronted because of the Beame boom which fell on our staff consultants. It also explains why we decided to delay the submission of our recommendations until now.

There could be some confusion as to the formal status of the report, and particularly its status with respect to the Board. The explanation is as follows:

When the Board established the Citizens' Commission in November of 1969, almost two years ago, it was stipulated that although the Commission was a creation of the Board, it was not to be thought of as a creature of the Board. So, it was agreed that the Commission would submit its report or reports, not only to the Board, but also to the other bodies with whose implicit consent and authorization the Commission was established . . . namely, the Regents, the State Legislature, the Mayor's Office, the Governor's Office, and the City Council. Consequently, the Commission voted to transmit its report (in four successive sections) simultaneously to the Board of Higher Education, the Mayor, the Governor, and the State Legislature, and of course, the Board of Regents. The Commission hopes that the bodies referred to will see merit in our recommendations and move to implement them. **That's the name of the game.**

Our recommendations cover a wide range of actions which we propose be taken by the State Legislature, by the Governor, by the Mayor, by the City Council, by the Board of Regents, and by the Board of Higher Education. Some of the more important recommendations, including those in the funding report, will require comprehensive consideration and assessment by all the governmental bodies concerned. Clearly the Board of Higher Education must serve as the mainspring for action on our recommendations. The Board may not subscribe to each and every one of our recommendations and/or may agree wholly with some of our recommendations. That will be up to the Board.

Our recommendations represent the consensus of the members of the Commission, following prolonged studies, consultation, deliberation, and verbalization of these recommendations. We hope that you will review them all carefully, as you receive them, and give them the benefit of your best and most thoughtful deliberation.

We are aware that unless you support our recommendations in whole, or in part, that will be the end of them. We of the Commission are well aware that in the final analysis, the Board of Higher Education can support, advocate, and implement or oppose and dispose of the recommendations in the Round File or on the Back Shelf.

In the presentation, I am not talking directly about our specific recommendations. I assume that you have read them and I understand that the report will be referred to one of your committees for further consideration.

When this Commission was organized, I had the strong feeling that some members of the Board, as well as some officials in Albany and New York City, felt that our Commission would inevitably recommend the imposition of tuition. Others believed that we would recommend the maintenance of the status quo. As you know, our recommendations follow neither of these two predictions. We found an alternative. We hope you will support it.

In any event, I hope you will agree that our recommendations in this report, as in our subsequent reports, are worthy of your most intense deliberation.

I will be glad to answer any questions about the substance, but I will assume that you are going to study them and don't need my commentary on them at this point. Should your committee want to talk to me and other members of the Commission about them, we are at your disposal.

I emphasize that the report which has been made public and submitted is only the first section, as is explained in the report itself. It is the first of four, covering broadly the subject assigned to us, namely the Future of the City University.

The other three reports will be on: (1) Scope and Mission, (2) The Governmental Status of the University, including its relationship to State and City, and public accountability and governance, and (3) Relationship of the City University to the other colleges and universities in the area, and to the public school system of New York City.

All of our conclusions and recommendations have been arrived at. They were arrived at last Spring and Summer. The task which is still under way is the writing of the reports surrounding and backing up the recommendations.

That's the job that was to have been performed in major part by Peat Marwick, but which is now being done with such help as we can buy, borrow or steal from the University and outside the University, including my own son.

To some extent, each of the four separate reports stands by itself, but in a larger sense they are interdependent. Nevertheless, at some sacrifice of unity, the Commission decided to release the reports in four sections, making each one as self-sustaining as possible. Each one will require different sets of implementing action. The report before you on Funding covers the most controversial area and requires the most coordinate implementation by the City, the State and the Board of Higher Education.

It may indeed interest you to know that the recent undertaking of the Board of Regents to establish a regional Task Force to study the possibilities of inter-institutional cooperation in the New York area is the direct result of a recommendation of the Citizens' Commission which was first informally communicated to the Board of Regents and then, at the request of the leadership of the Regents, was formally conveyed and promptly acted upon. So the Citizens' Commission at least scored one run, in terms of a recommendation which has already been acted upon.

During the first few months, the steering committee of the Commission met with staff and drew up a work plan to provide information and services for Commission members. Staff provided us with 28 background papers which helped us in the course of our study. The Commission met either in Committees, or, as a committee of the whole 30 times. Included in these meetings were interviews with 48 persons or groups. A list of whom we met

with appears as Appendix 6 in the report. As you can see, the list includes city and state political leaders, community groups, students, faculty, the Board of Regents and others who are concerned with higher education in New York City, State and nationally. We tried very hard to get input from all those concerned with the future of CUNY. To insure further public input before we made our final decisions, we held public hearings.

In the work of the Commission, we had the close cooperation of the University and its staff. We could not have proceeded without it. We had the constant counsel of Chancellor Bowker, and the invaluable input of Chancellor Hyman and Vice-Chancellor Hollander and his replacement Vice-Chancellor Frank Schultz. We leaned heavily on, and continue to lean in the preparation of the report, on the major assistance of Vice-Chancellor Edelstein, and the Office of Urban Affairs and particularly Mr. Duncan Pardue and Dr. Stanley Lefkowitz.

In the beginning this Board gave us a written charge, posing a series of comprehensive, controversial and extremely difficult questions. I guess that if they hadn't been, we wouldn't have been asked to answer them. These were questions around which controversy has raged between and among the various elements concerned with the University for many years.

As we say in our funding report, we found that we couldn't produce answers that would please everybody. We have produced what is in our judgment a practical and realistic package of recommendations. I think this package can be supported. I think it can be effected and implemented.

Our recommendations flow from substantial study, deliberation, and discussion which included consultation with most of the major decision makers in this field. My judgment is that these constitute a set of practical recommendations. Of course you will draw your own conclusions.

The Chairman expressed the appreciation to Ambassador Wagner and the members of the Commission for the work performed.

**NO. 3. COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT: RESOLVED,** That the following items approved by the Committee on Campus Planning and Development be adopted:

**(a) MASTER PLAN REPORT - QUEENS COLLEGE:**

**RESOLVED,** That the Board of Higher Education indicate its general acceptance of the Master Plan Report and Recommendations for the Development of Physical Facilities for the Queens College Campus as prepared by Morris Ketchum, Jr. & Associates, Architects and Planners, in accordance with the terms of a contract for the development of said plan; and be it further

**RESOLVED,** That Table 12-2 of the 1968 Master Plan of the Board of Higher Education be modified to delete the tentatively listed facilities under Item 6, Queens College, and in place thereof include the facilities indicated in the aforesaid Queens College Master Plan Report.

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

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

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

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

"Table 12-2 includes a revision of the listing of the specific projects as they appeared in previous issues of the City University Master Plan. The table has been revised only in those cases where planning or construction has advanced to a point where such revision is significant. Certain specific projects that have been advanced in planning have been added.

"The University and the colleges are in the process of developing campus master plans. Therefore, it is not possible at this time to establish the total list of individual facilities needed for any one of the campuses. However, Table 12-1 does include many facilities that were identified as essential prior to the start of the local master planning processes. This table will be altered as the campus master plan for each institution develops."

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

The Queens College Master Plan is based on an expected increase in enrollment from the planning base 1969 enrollment of 13,980 full time equivalent day students to an anticipated 1975 enrollment of 18,170 FTED students. The projected enrollment increase is nearly equally divided among undergraduate and graduate programs, reflecting a significant increase in the size of the graduate program. Undergraduate enrollment will shift from a majority of lower classmen to a majority of upper division students.

Approximately 3,270,000 gross square feet has been established as the floor area required to meet the anticipated College needs. Of the 1,607,000 gross square feet occupied or under construction, 241,000 gross square feet of obsolete temporary facilities are to be demolished and 865,000 gross square feet are to be renovated at a cost of \$9.2 million. An additional 1,900,000 gross square feet of new construction is proposed which together with related site and utility work will cost \$131.6 million (January 1971 construction cost estimate).

The Master Plan in summary has fully developed the functions and locations of major educational, social and service facilities, and has established the requirements of motor, pedestrian and service traffic, along with the architectural and landscape design factors and supporting utilities, in order to enhance the environmental character of the total campus.

This plan is proposed to be implemented in an orderly succession of three construction phases which will satisfy the most urgent needs of the College's educational program in a sound, economical manner and cause a minimum of disruption or inconvenience to College operations.

The campus social functions, chiefly located in the existing Dining Hall and Student Union, and central services are retained without basic change; Science facilities are remodeled and substantially enlarged; Academic I becomes a facility for teacher education; Social Sciences, moved from Academic I, are housed in new space adjacent to Art, Music and Communication Arts and Sciences in the enlarged Golden Center; Physical Education received additional indoor facilities adjacent to its existing outdoor areas; central library facilities are augmented by a new Library/English/Philosophy structure located adjacent to and interconnected with both Student Union and the re-housed and expanded administrative services; the central mall is redeveloped for outdoor assembly; and other existing and new outdoor spaces are re-landscaped.

Throughout the campus, existing sloping topography and subsurface conditions have been utilized as a design factor to create multi-level buildings set on terraced slopes with upper stories above ground and lower stories either partly above or underground, according to functional demands. As a result, the visible upper height of these structures is usually three to four stories, thereby maintaining the semi-residential character of the total campus.

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

**(b) NEW SCIENCE AND VISUAL ARTS CENTER BUILDING - KINGSBOROUGH COMMUNITY COLLEGE:**

RESOLVED, That the Board approve preliminary plans, outline specifications and preliminary estimate of cost of \$7,100,000 (as of June 1971) for a new Science and Visual Arts Center Building, as part of proposed Phase I Construction, at Kingsborough Community College, as prepared by Lundquist and Stonehill, architects; and be it further



RESOLVED, That the Department of Real Estate be requested to execute a license agreement for the aforementioned space.

EXPLANATION: The above mentioned space will provide the college with two classrooms, faculty office space for eighteen positions and ancillary facilities.

The Department of Real Estate has negotiated a license agreement for use of the above space for a term of three years from September 1, 1971 with an option for one additional year, twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week, at a cost of \$8,600 (\$2.69/sq.ft.) per annum. Landlord will provide the use of the classrooms and offices, with all the furniture contained therein; provide electricity, heat and hot water; make all inside and outside repairs. Tenant shall be responsible for cleaning services and provide security guards on the premises during the hours of occupancy.

**NO. 4. REPORTS OF THE ACTING CHANCELLOR:** (a) Acting Chancellor Seymour C. Hyman presented the following report:

There are a few major items that need to be presented to the Board. The first of these is the report on the results of deliberations of the Affirmative Action Committee. This report is being distributed to you. It has a great deal of interesting information in it, not the least of which is that our faculty is composed of about 30% women. This wasn't known to us until we made this survey. It shows the City University in the forefront of achieving equal employment opportunity. In the title of Full Professor, the City University has 14.4% women, Berkeley has 2.3%, and the University of Pittsburg has 5.6%. The Affirmative Action Report has been distributed to all the Presidents. Each President will undertake to establish such a program on his campus. The results will be carefully watched and reported to the Board and all concerned agencies, such as HEW. There will be an opportunity for the Board to decide what it wants to be its affirmative action policy. The report has been sent to HEW because it contains the required statistical survey requested by HEW.

From our enrollment figures it looks at present as though we will have a freshman class of 38,000. This is what we are budgeted for. This is what we predicted though there was a period of time during the spring when we thought it might be 41,000. The staff has been correct for the past two years. Last year they predicted 35,000 and were right, this year 38,000, and they were also right.

The attrition statistics have been discussed in the press. We don't have final figures on these yet, but what we do have at this point shows that the senior colleges were reduced by about 16% in freshman attrition this year as compared to 16% the year before and 15% the year before that. In the community colleges the figures were 35% this year as against 35% last year and 32% the year before that. The Open Admissions freshman class which represented a much wider spectrum than the class of the year before has experienced the same attrition rate as the previous class.

I want to make some comments about the space situation which is the thing that worries some of us the most. A year ago we had the intention of acquiring one million square feet additional rental space. We only acquired 800,000 square feet. In the fall of 1969 we had 110 square feet per student. In the fall of 1970 we had 93 square feet per student. In the fall of 1971 we have 86 square feet per student. This is a serious situation. The 86 figure represents 94 square feet in the senior colleges and 75 square feet in the community colleges. Some remedies will be suggested in the Wagner Commission Report. Something must happen in the next five years in terms of capital improvement and signs of progress must happen this winter.

I'd like to report that the Advisory Commission mentioned by Ambassador Wagner has just been established by the Regents and includes as representatives of the City University Chancellor Kibbee, and Presidents Marshak, Lief, Colston and Schmeller, and myself. In addition to our members, a very distinguished group has been appointed: McGill of Columbia, Hester of N.Y.U., Walsh of Fordham, Everett of the New School, Saltzman of Pratt, and Boyer of the State University.

Just one more comment. It does appear as though the sabbatical leaves that this Board said it would have granted had it been able to, are indeed dead. Litigation on this will be heard in November but that cannot have meaning for us for this year.

(b) **RESOLVED**, That the Chancellor's Report (including Addendum Items) for the month of September 1971 approved as amended, as follows:

Hunter College—Item A-1.3.2.: Reappointment of Douglas Maynard as Vice-President and Provost with compensation at \$6,000 per annum—Withdrawn.

Queensborough Community College—Item AA-1.1.2.: Promotion of Anthony Behr from Associate Professor to Professor with waiver of the Bylaws—Withdrawn.

Staten Island Community College—Item A-1.11.3: Designation of Vice-President and Deputy Vice-President—Arthur Kaufman with compensation at \$6,000 per annum—Amend compensation to read \$5,000/annum

New York City Community College—Item E.16.1.: Agreement between New York City Community College and the Board of Higher Education—Withdrawn.

Part G—Addendum: Item G.1.8. Establishment of an Advisory Board for the College Adapter Program: Add following sentence: "It is suggested that students from the College Adapter Program be included as part of the Advisory Board."

Part H—Errata: Items listed in Errata to be withdrawn or changed, as indicated.

**NO. 5. GENERAL DISCUSSION—POLICY PROPOSALS FOR FUTURE BOARD CONSIDERATION:** No further action.

**NO. 6. AGREEMENT WITH BOARD OF EDUCATION:** **RESOLVED**, That the Board of Higher Education enter into an agreement with the Board of Education under the terms of which the Office of Teacher Education will administer a program for paraprofessionals in education during the academic year 1971-72. Funding for the program will be provided by the Board of Education in an amount not to exceed \$1,365,000. The form of the agreement is to be approved by the General Counsel and, when approved, executed by the Secretary.

**EXPLANATION:** Under the terms of the agreement, 40,000 instructional contact hours will be made available to approximately 2,000 undergraduate students in the fall semester and 5,200 undergraduate students in the spring semester for a maximum of seven instructional contact hours of three to six college level credits per student per semester.

At this point the Board went into Executive Session.

**NO. 7. CREATION OF A UNIVERSITY CENTER:** It was agreed that the Committee on the University Center, as newly constituted continue its study of Chancellor Bowker's "Memorandum on the Creation of a University Center, Absorbing the Graduate Center." It was further agreed that all members of the Board be invited to meetings of the Committee on the Academic Program.

Upon motion duly made, seconded and carried, the meeting adjourned at 9:20 p.m.

N, MICHAEL CARFORA  
Secretary of the Board