

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

HELD

JANUARY 17, 1972

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

The Chairman called the meeting to order at 5:15 p.m.

There were present:

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

Robert Ross Johnson
James Oscar Lee
John A. Morsell
Jack I. Poses
Edward S. Reid
Francisco Trilla
Eve Weiss
Arleigh B. Williamson
Isaiah E. Robinson, ex officio

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

Chancellor Robert J. Kibbee
President Milton G. Bassin
President John W. Kneller
President Robert E. Marshak
President Mina Rees
President Donald H. Riddle
President Richard D. Trent
President Jacqueline G. Wexler
President Clyde J. Wingfield
Acting President Peter J. Caffrey
President James A. Colston

President Candido A. de Leon
President Edgar D. Draper
President Leon M. Goldstein
President Joseph Shenker
Professor Ralph W. Sleeper
Mr. Richard Lewis
Deputy Chancellor Seymour C. Hyman
Vice-Chancellor Julius C. C. Edelstein
Vice-Chancellor Bernard Mintz
Vice-Chancellor David Newton
Vice-Chancellor Frank J. Schultz

The absence of Mr. Berman, Mrs. Thacher and Mr. Wessell was excused.

At this point the Board heard the following with respect to the Open Admissions' Freshman Allocation System:

Mr. Marc Schulman, Chairman, Jewish High School Student Alliance
Professor Abraham Tauber, Metropolitan Council, American Jewish Congress

NO. 1. OPEN ADMISSIONS' FRESHMAN ALLOCATION SYSTEM:

(a) Mrs. Ingersoll, on behalf of the Committee on Expanded Educational Opportunity and the Committee on Student Services, presented the following resolution which was duly seconded and open to debate:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Higher Education reaffirm the guidelines for the implementation of the Open Admissions Program which were adopted in July 1969; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Board reaffirm its intent to permit each student to enroll in the college and curriculum of his choice but until such time as the University develops the capability of providing every student with his choice of college and curriculum, high school academic average and rank in class will continue to be used as the primary basis of assigning students to colleges and programs where demand exceeds available places; and be it further

RESOLVED, That effective with the September 1972 freshman class the Board authorize an increase in the number of students to be admitted and allocated to the colleges on the basis of the criteria used to admit and allocate students to the SEEK and College Discovery Programs.

EXPLANATION: In adopting the open admissions allocation system in 1969, the Board recognized that the SEEK and College Discovery Programs would assist in providing an academic distribution of students among the colleges sufficient to fully utilize the academic resources of the entire University. Because these special programs have not, for budgetary reasons, kept pace with the growth in freshman enrollments the above resolution would serve the purpose of bringing about the originally intended distribution. In applying this system student choice will be honored to the furthest possible extent. The number of students to be admitted to each college pursuant to the foregoing resolution should be determined on the basis of the size of the college's entering freshman class and the institution's ability to provide remedial and support services in addition to its normal academic programs.

(b) Motion to suppress debate was seconded and lost.

(c) Motion that the Board consider this an administrative matter and refer it to the Chancellor to take any action he deems necessary to implement it was seconded and lost.

(d) Motion to amend the resolution to include the following was seconded and lost:

and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Board reaffirm its policy that every student whose high school average is 80% or better or who ranks in the top 50% of his high school graduating class be guaranteed admission to a senior college of the University; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Board designate the Chancellor to implement the intention of this resolution.

(e) UPON MOTION DULY MADE, SECONDED AND CARRIED, THE FOLLOWING RESOLUTION WAS ADOPTED:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Higher Education reaffirm the guidelines for the implementation of the Open Admissions Program which were adopted in July 1969; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Board reaffirm its intent to permit each student to enroll in the college and curriculum of his choice but until such time as the University develops the capability of providing every student with his choice of college and curriculum, high school academic average and rank in class will continue to be used as the primary basis of assigning students to colleges and programs where demand exceeds available places and will continue to guarantee students whose high school average is 80% or better or who rank in the top 50% of their high school graduating class admission to a senior college of the University; and be it further

RESOLVED, That effective with the September 1972 freshman class the Board authorize an increase in the number of students to be admitted and allocated to the colleges on the basis of the criteria used to admit and allocate students to the SEEK and College Discovery Programs.

EXPLANATION: In adopting the open admissions allocation system in 1969, the Board recognized that the SEEK and College Discovery Programs would assist in providing an academic distribution of students among the colleges sufficient to fully utilize the academic resources of the entire University. Because these special programs have not, for budgetary reasons, kept pace with the growth in freshmen enrollments the above resolution would serve the purpose of bringing about the originally intended distribution. In applying this system student choice will be honored to the furthest possible extent. The number of students to be admitted to each college pursuant to the foregoing resolution should be determined on the basis of the size of the college's entering freshman class and the institution's ability to provide remedial and support services in addition to its normal academic programs.

NOTE: Mr. Ashe and Mr. Hayes asked to be recorded as voting "NO." Mrs. Weiss asked to be recorded as "NOT VOTING."

In voting "NO," Mr. Ashe asked that the following statement be spread upon the minutes:

I regret that I must vote "No" on this resolution. I wholeheartedly support the end which the resolution is intended to achieve—a true integration of minority students into all of our senior colleges. In the past I have opposed actions taken by our Board for the very reason that I believed they would lead to segregated conditions at some of our colleges. Nevertheless, I cannot support this resolution for the following reasons:

1. The basic document "explaining" this resolution (Attachment A, dated December 20, 1971) is so unclear that I read it several times and still did not know what it was trying to say. Other Board members have told me that they had the same experience. There is no reason why a report submitted to us by University staff as the basis for action by us cannot be written in language which we can understand. The lack of clarity in the report combined with the vagueness of the resolution itself can result in the implementation of the resolution in ways not intended by the members of the Board who have voted for it.

2. Granted that the goal sought here is most desirable and essential, it is inconceivable to me that there are not several different ways in which the desired end can be achieved. It may be that the other ways would have more drawbacks and inherent difficulties than this resolution, but we should have had them presented to us with the pros and cons of each. Instead, we have been presented with a single proposal on a take it or leave it basis.

In this connection it should be noted that the Board members have no research staff of their own that they can call upon to prepare alternative proposals. Nor were we given sufficient time to think of alternative proposals on our own, even without staff assistance.

3. With regard to the last point, I have been told that this proposal has been under consideration by staff and by two Board committees for almost a year. Yet, when it was presented to us we were told that the matter was so urgent that we could not be given more than three weeks to study the proposal, its implications, and possible alternatives.

4. When the Board adopted the Open Admissions Program on July 9, 1969, we made a clear and unequivocal commitment, as part of the program. We stated in paragraph (F) of the plan:

"It [the plan] shall assure that all students who would have been admitted to SPECIFIC community or senior colleges under the admissions criteria which we have used in the past shall still be so admitted."

By its action tonight, the Board has dishonored this commitment. Although we are told by staff that there is a basic and inherent inconsistency between this commitment and the other parts of the plan, we Board members have been offered no proof of such inconsistency. It may well be that another method could be found of achieving integration in our senior colleges and still honor our commitment. We have not been given the opportunity to explore such possibilities.

Assuming, however, that we could not honor this commitment and achieve the integration we desire, the manner in which this resolution has been presented and adopted has exhibited an insensitivity to the feelings and concerns of numerous friends of City University which could have and should have been avoided. At the time we adopted the Open Admission Program we received a remarkable degree of unstinting support from the constituent organizations of the Ad Hoc Committee for City University. One of the reasons for the unanimity of their support was this very commitment which we have just cast aside.

This is not the way one deals with tried and true friends. Time and again they have come to our aid when we needed them, and we will need them more than ever in the days ahead in view of the current budget crisis and the growing attacks on City University. Such friends should have been consulted before a formal proposal was submitted to the Board for action. They should have been advised fully and honestly of all relevant facts and they should have been asked for their thinking and any possible solutions they could offer for the problem.

In voting "No," Mr. Hayes made the following statement:

I think that something of a good case was made in this discussion for relieving the problems of City College. I think the Chancellor ought to be in a position to evaluate Open Admissions and to tell us more than came through in this discussion. The information ought to be available and articulated to us. Despite all of the discussion and all of the debate, I did not feel that this was adequately done as far as facts and figures were concerned. That is the reason for my negative vote.

In asking to be recorded as "Not Voting," Mrs. Weiss made the following statement:

In the first place, I must confess that I agree with Jack Poses in that I feel this involves no question of policy. I don't think that we changed the guidelines for the implementation of Open Admissions one whit. What we are doing is perhaps utilizing a different administrative procedure. However, once it was brought before this Board, it became important from a political point of view.

I'm confused by something Mrs. Ingersoll said. On the one hand, she said it was a minor adjustment. On the other hand, she said it was a question of saving the University. If it was minor, it took too much time of the Board. If it was a question of saving the University, I think an extensive study of what has happened should be made.

There are many more things that could be considered. I think it is unfortunate that we were called to a special meeting and given not much information about something which does not change the policy of the University.

Mrs. Ingersoll asked that the following statement in reply to Mrs. Weiss be spread upon the minutes:

I didn't say it was a matter of saving the University. I said it was a minor adjustment in the allocation system of the University. I said we should adopt this minor adjustment and move on to a consideration of something that does have to do with saving the University, namely, the matter of the budget crisis.

(f) Motion made, seconded and carried, that the Board continue to review the allocation system with broad respect to the community colleges and that the Chancellor share with the Board whatever information there is available on Open Admissions today.

Professor Sleeper noted that it is extremely important for the Faculty Senate and the Student Senate to be made a part of any continuing review of the allocation system.

At this point the Board went into Executive Session.

Upon motion duly made, seconded and carried, the following resolution was adopted in Executive Session:

NO. 2. APPOINTMENT AS PROFESSOR AND DESIGNATION AS VICE-PRESIDENT—BARUCH COLLEGE: RESOLVED, That Bernard Mintz be appointed as Professor with tenure in the Department of Management at The Bernard M. Baruch College effective March 1, 1972 at the salary rate of \$31,275 per annum, subject to financial ability; and be it further

RESOLVED, That Professor Mintz be designated Executive Vice President of The Bernard M. Baruch College for the period March 1, 1972 through June 30, 1972, with additional compensation at the rate of \$5,000 per annum, subject to financial ability.

NOTE: Professor Mintz transferred from the Central Office of the City University.

NO. 3. REPORT OF THE CHANCELLOR: Chancellor Kibbee, Vice-Chancellor Edelstein and Mr. Paley reported on the current budget situation and how it affects the City University.

Upon motion duly made, seconded and carried, the meeting adjourned at 10:30 p.m.

N. MICHAEL CARFORA
Secretary of the Board