

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

HELD

APRIL 24, 1972

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

The Chairman called the meeting to order at 5:40 p.m.

There were present:

Luis Quero-Chiesa, Chairman
David I. Ashe
Herbert Berman
Frederick Burkhardt
Maria Josefa Canino
Alexander A. Delle Cese
Jean-Louis d'Heilly
Norman E. Henkin

Minneola P. Ingersoll
James Oscar Lee
Jack I. Poses
Barbara A. Thatcher
Francisco Trilla
Eve Weiss
Nils Y. Wessell
Arleigh B. Williamson

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

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

President James A. Colston
President Candido de Leon
President Edgar D. Draper
President Leon M. Goldstein
President Herbert M. Sussman
Professor Ralph W. Sleeper
Mr. Alan Shark

Deputy-Chancellor Seymour C. Hyman
Vice-Chancellor Timothy S. Healy
Vice-Chancellor David Newton
Vice-Chancellor Frank J. Schultz

The absence of Mr. DeNovellis, Mr. Hayes, Dr. Johnson, Mr. Reid and Mr. Robinson was excused.

Upon motions duly made, seconded and carried, the following resolutions were adopted or action was taken as noted: (Calendar Nos. 1 through 12)

At this point the Board heard Professor Belle Zeller and Dr. Israel Kugler as representatives of the Professional Staff Congress re Calendar No. 7, Professional Obligations of the Faculty, and related matters.

NOTE: A copy of Professor Zeller's and Dr. Kugler's remarks is on file with these minutes in the office of the Secretary of the Board.

The Board returned to the formal agenda.

NO. 1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: RESOLVED, That the minutes of the Board of Higher Education for the following meetings be approved as circulated:

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETINGS: February 14, 1972 and February 23, 1972

REGULAR MEETING: February 28, 1972

NO. 2. COMMITTEE ON LAW: (a) At the request of the Chairman of the Committee on Law, the proposed amendments to bylaw Sections 6.2c and 15.10b are withdrawn.

(b) No report.

NO. 3. COMMITTEE ON STUDENT SERVICES: RESOLVED, That the following resolution approved by the Committee on Student Services be adopted:

APPLICATION FEE – SPECIAL PROGRAM APPLICANTS:

RESOLVED, That the University's practice of waiving the application fee for Special Program Applicants authorized by Board resolution on June 23, 1969, Calendar No. 17, as amended on June 22, 1970, Calendar No. 50, be discontinued, effective for the February 1973 semester.

EXPLANATION: In June 1964, the University contracted with the Research Foundation to have all applications for admission processed by University Applications Processing Center in return for payment to them of the application fee. On June 23, 1969, guidelines for the charge of the application fee were set up by the University which included a provision for waiver of the fee by the Director of Special Programs. Subsequently, through administrative action, the University granted a fee waiver for students applying to the SEEK and College Discovery Programs. In granting that fee waiver, the University made no provision for payment to the Research Foundation for processing these applications. The University exempted 101 applicants from payment of the fee under this clause in September 1969, 14,000 in 1970 and 18,500 in 1971; the estimated number of such applicants will be 18-20,000 for September 1972. The University does not have funds to meet this obligation. Therefore, to enable the University to meet its contractual obligation to the Research Foundation, all applicants to the SEEK and College Discovery Programs shall be required to pay the normal application fee.

NO. 4. COMMITTEE ON THE ACADEMIC PROGRAM: RESOLVED, That the following actions approved by the Committee on the Academic Program be adopted:

A. BACHELOR OF SCIENCE DEGREE IN MUSIC (PERFORMANCE) AND (COMPOSITION) – BROOKLYN COLLEGE:

RESOLVED, That the program leading to the B.S. in Music (Performance) and the B.S. in Music (Composition) to be given at Brooklyn College be approved in principle, effective September 1972, subject to financial ability and to the approval of the New York State Board of Regents.

EXPLANATION: These programs provide students with a degree which is more precisely defined in music than the present Bachelor of Arts. The Bachelor of Science degree in Music indicates a liberal arts concentration with an intensive sequence of courses in the major. The degree, which draws upon courses already existing at Brooklyn, prepares the student for graduate education in music and enables him to qualify for a variety of teaching positions where intensive undergraduate training is required. It provides for more intellectual enrichment and is particularly suited to the needs of the gifted student who might otherwise be forced to attend a conservatory.

B. AMERICAN STUDIES PROGRAM—BROOKLYN COLLEGE:

RESOLVED, That the American Studies Program leading to the B.A. Degree to be given at Brooklyn College be approved in principle, effective September 1972, subject to financial ability and to the approval of the New York State Board of Regents.

EXPLANATION: This program permits the student to examine the development of his national culture from several perspectives. Each student, working with a counselor, will design a program which will enable him to explore the relationships between diverse aspects of American culture and to select and define an area of special interest for concentrated study. To enable students to pursue a wide range of specialized interest, the courses for the major will be drawn from the Departments of Afro-American Studies, Anthropology, Art, Economics, Education, English, History, Music, Political Science, Sociology and Urban Studies. The program emphasizes field work, and at least two courses must be in a School other than that of the student's departmental major.

NO. 5. COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT: The following items are placed on the calendar subject to the approval of the Committee on Campus Planning and Development which meets on April 17, 1972:

A. SELECTION OF ARCHITECTS AND ENGINEERS—THE CITY COLLEGE:

RESOLVED, That the Board approve the renovation and equipping of Baskerville Hall and Wingate Gymnasium and the construction of an Athletic Field, all on the campus of The City College of New York, at an estimated cost of \$3,686,375, to include design fees, construction, furnishings and miscellaneous costs; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Board approve the selection of Hardy Holzman Pfeiffer Associates, Architects, and S. W. Brown & Associates, Consultant Engineers, a Joint Venture, for the design of the aforesaid work; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the City University Construction Fund be requested to authorize the Dormitory Authority of the State of New York to take appropriate steps to effect the design, construction and furnishing of the indicated facilities; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the following items are hereby approved and shall be made a part of the Note Project (City University Note Issue) by appropriate inclusion in a future Supplemental Note Agreement supplementing the Note Agreement by and among the Dormitory Authority of the State of New York, the City University Construction Fund and the Board of Higher Education of the City of New York, dated as of June 12, 1967. The Chairman of the Board of Higher Education of the City of New York is hereby authorized and directed to execute a Supplemental Note Agreement including such items and to cause the seal of such Board to be affixed thereto. The Secretary of such Board is hereby authorized and directed to affix his signature thereto in attestation of such seal; and be it further

RESOLVED, That notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, prior to the execution of any such Supplemental Note Agreement, changes, insertions and omissions may be made to the description of such items

as hereinafter set forth as may be approved by the Chairman of the Board of Higher Education of the City of New York, and the execution by said Chairman of any such Supplemental Note Agreement containing such items with such changes, insertions and omissions shall be conclusive evidence of such approval; and be it further

RESOLVED, That such items are as follows:

Note Facility:

DESCRIPTION

LOCATION

BASKERVILLE HALL: Renovation to provide facilities for general academic use and for Department of Student Personnel Services

On City College campus,
West Side of Convent Avenue
South of West 140th Street

WINGATE GYMNASIUM: Renovation of Physical Education Facilities

OUTDOOR ATHLETIC FIELD

On City College campus,
South of Finley Student Center

ESTIMATED COST: \$3,686,375

ESTIMATED OCCUPANCY DATE: January 1975

ARCHITECT: Hardy Holzman Pfeiffer Associates, Architects, and S.W. Brown & Associates, Consultant Engineers, a Joint Venture

and be it further

RESOLVED, That the item hereinabove set forth is included in the Master Plan of the City University, as approved by the Board of Regents and incorporated into the Regents Plan or general revision thereof for expansion and development of higher education in the State and as thereafter approved by the Governor, and that with respect to such item the appropriate reference thereto is as follows:

Included as an amendment to the 1968 Master Plan of The City University of New York as approved by the Board of Regents in April 1970 and by the Governor on November 10, 1970.

and be it further

RESOLVED, That the City University Construction Fund and the Dormitory Authority are hereby requested to approve such item as hereinabove set forth and to take appropriate action to authorize the inclusion thereof in a future Supplemental Note Agreement; and be it further

RESOLVED, That this resolution shall take effect immediately.

EXPLANATION: Because occupancy of the Natural Science and Physical Education Building is expected by September 1972, the renovation of Baskerville Hall and Wingate Gymnasium will be able to proceed after that date. The obsolete laboratories and related facilities in Baskerville Hall can then be replaced by facilities both for undifferentiated academic use and for the Department of Student Personnel Services. The obsolescent spaces in Wingate Gymnasium can then also be altered, repaired and refinished to become a more useful component of the College's Physical Education facilities.

Because the demolition of Lewisohn Stadium may start within a year or so (the exact timing will be determined by the procurement method selected for the North Academic Center), it will be necessary to provide an out-of-doors athletic facility on campus.

A tentative budget for the project, based upon figures included in the Master Plan and adjusted to current values and market conditions is as follows:

	COST AS OF FEBRUARY 1972	
Baskerville Hall Renovation	\$1,654,800	
Baskerville Hall Furniture & Equipment	\$ 206,850	\$1,861,650
Wingate Gymnasium Renovation	\$ 963,000	
Wingate Gymnasium Furniture & Equipment	\$ 120,375	\$1,083,375
Athletic Field		\$ 316,350
Total Renovation, Furniture & Equipment		\$3,261,375
Architect's & Engineer's Fee & Miscellaneous		\$ 425,000
TOTAL COST OF PROJECT		\$3,686,375

B. PROJECT NO. CC-170 – THE CITY COLLEGE:

RESOLVED, That the Board approve the preliminary plans, outline specifications and preliminary estimate of cost for fire hydrants, fire access facilities, South Campus, and roof repairs, Wingate and Townsend Harris Halls, The City College, as prepared by Economides and Goldberg, Consulting Engineers. The preliminary estimate of cost of construction is \$306,500 based on present day costs, including contingencies; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Director of the Budget be requested to approve said documents with a total cost limitation of \$312,700, which includes 2% escalation to an estimated bid date of June 1, 1972, chargeable to Capital Project HN-203.

EXPLANATION: On January 25, 1971, the Board approved a contract with Economides and Goldberg for consultant services for the above mentioned projects. This contract was subsequently approved by the Bureau of the Budget. It called for the planning of a twelve-inch water main and five new fire hydrants on the South Campus between Convent Avenue and St. Nicholas Terrace as well as a new entrance gate and access road on St. Nicholas Terrace, north of the present gate, to meet violation orders imposed by the Fire Department.

The roofing work is for the rehabilitation due to deteriorated existing conditions. The proposed work is not in conflict with the Master Plan.

The preliminary estimate as of March 1972:

1. Fire Protection Facilities	\$109,500
2. Roof Repairs	\$197,000
TOTAL	\$306,500

The documents and estimates have been reviewed and approved by the College and the Office of Campus Planning and Development concurs with their approval.

C. ALTERATION PROJECTS – BRONX COMMUNITY COLLEGE:

RESOLVED, That the Board approve the preliminary plans, outline specifications and preliminary estimate of cost for a group of ten alteration projects at the 120 East 184th Street Building of Bronx Community College as prepared by Roy Euker, Architect. The preliminary estimate of cost of construction is \$394,860 as of February 1972 without contingencies; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Director of the Budget be requested to approve said documents with a total cost limitation of \$433,674 including an escalation of 4.6% to a bid date of August 1, 1972 and 5% for contingencies chargeable to Capital Project HN-206; and be it further

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

EXPLANATION: On May 3, 1971, the Board approved a contract with Roy Euker, Architect for consultant services for the above mentioned projects. This contract was subsequently approved by the Bureau of the Budget.

The estimates of the individual projects are as follows:

	Estimate 2/17/72
1. New Administrative Area	\$ 60,480
2. New Business Office, etc.	\$ 25,908
3. New Registrar's and Dean of Student's Office	\$ 49,176
4. Registrar's Computer Lab., etc.	\$ 9,576
5. New Tutorial Room (ET MT)	\$ 17,280
6. Additional Auditorium Lighting	\$ 5,880
7. New Shower Heads - Labs.	\$ 8,400
8. Incinerator Renovation	\$ 10,800
9. Auditorium Air Conditioning	\$155,280
10. Air Conditioning--Student Lounge--Lunch Room	\$ 52,080
TOTAL	\$394,860

The documents and estimates have been reviewed and approved by the College and the Office of Campus Planning and Development concurs with their approval.

Mrs. Weiss asked to be recorded as voting "No" on Item C.

NO. 6. CONTRACTS AND OTHER FINANCIAL MATTERS: RESOLVED, That the following resolution presented by the President of Baruch College and recommended by the Chancellor be adopted:

RENTAL OF DATA PROCESSING EQUIPMENT--BARUCH COLLEGE:

RESOLVED, That The Bernard M. Baruch College be authorized to advertise for and receive and open bids and award contracts to the lowest responsible bidder for rental of data processing equipment as required by the College, for the period from July 1, 1972 through June 30, 1973, at an estimated amount of \$158,000, chargeable to Code 042-5200-413-01-73, and/or such other funds as may be available, subject to financial ability; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Mayor be requested to approve and authorize the expenditure of the estimated amount of \$158,000, for the proposed rentals.

EXPLANATION: This equipment replaces equipment at a comparable rental.

NO. 7. PROFESSIONAL OBLIGATIONS OF THE FACULTY: RESOLVED, That Calendar Nos. 3 and C3 of the minutes of the Board meeting held October 26, 1970, be amended to read as follows:

RESOLVED, That the following statement with respect to the professional obligations of the faculty be approved:

PROFESSIONAL OBLIGATIONS OF THE FACULTY

1. PREAMBLE: Each full-time faculty member should view his appointment to a college or university faculty position within the City University as his major professional commitment. This commitment obliges the faculty member in two ways: he is at once a member of the national and international world of learning and a

member of the City University community. Though his first responsibility to the City University is that of teaching, he should recognize the obligation to be regularly accessible for conferences with his students, to participate in appropriate extracurricular undertakings, and to serve on various college and university committees and as a member of college and university councils and other assemblies. He should constantly make all efforts to improve his professional standing through study and thought, and also through activities such as research, publication, attendance at professional conferences, and the giving of papers and lectures. Such professional involvements enhance his abilities as a teacher and as a member of the City University community; they should be undertaken with a view toward supporting the value of his activities on campus and equipping him to participate in significant educational innovation as well as toward furthering his professional stature.

2. MULTIPLE POSITIONS:

a. **GENERAL POLICY AND PROCEDURES.** Because appointment to a college or university faculty position is a full-time assignment, the faculty member should accept no employment or consultative work outside the City University unless this employment also improves his professional standing. Professional standing is the most important consideration, but it is also expected that no faculty member will engage in any occupation or employment, whether for extra compensation or not, which will impair his services, to the institution or interfere with his ability to meet his commitments, to his college and the university. Each faculty member has a responsibility to observe professional standards of behavior in becoming involved in supplementary activities. Where supplemental activity is felt to be desirable[;] (that is, [where] when the activity is closely related to professional interest, and especially when it strengthens professional competence and enriches professional performance), such activity is encouraged [provided it does not involve more than an average of one day a week.] **provided the individual faculty member receives approval for such endeavors from the departmental P & B after full disclosure of his total academic and professional commitments. Having received such approval, [T] the extent of the benefit, and the amount of time to be expended upon such work [,] should be decided by the faculty member in consultation with his departmental chairman, subject to the review of the college president. The President's approval will be given only for activity that involves not more than an average of one day a week, or its equivalent.**

b. **EXTRA TEACHING WITHIN THE CITY UNIVERSITY.** (1) Where the best interests of the college or university make it desirable or necessary to draw upon full-time personnel in one unit or branch for service in another, requests for such service should originate with the academic or administrative officer of the requesting unit and have the approval of the academic or administrative officer of the other unit. It is the policy of the university and its colleges to achieve exchanges of services, wherever possible, by budgetary interchange or by the balancing of interchanged services, with no additional academic load or extra remuneration for the individuals concerned. [Where this is not possible, the desired assignment may be arranged as an overload with extra compensation. A maximum of one course or no more than 3 hours per semester, whichever is larger, will be permissible.] Variations from this norm will be allowed only with the special permission of the Chancellor, or the appropriate president[.]. **Special permission will only be granted up to a maximum of one course, or three hours, whichever is larger.** (2) Where the best interests of one of the units of the City University make it desirable or necessary to draw upon the services of full-time personnel of that unit as an overload, with extra compensation, a maximum of one course or no more than 3 hours per semester, whichever is larger, will be permissible. (3) During the academic year, full-time faculty appointed to participate in the doctoral program are expected not to engage in additional teaching. As a matter of general policy, faculty whose programs have been reduced to allow for their participation in the doctoral program are expected to adhere to this rule. Exceptions may be made only for the most powerful reasons bearing on the professional interests of college and university. The intent of preceding and succeeding paragraphs must apply to these exceptional cases.

3. **THE SUMMER:** It is recognized that periods of refreshment and rest are essential to effective work, and all full-time personnel are encouraged to take adequate vacations. Teaching in a summer session or in a special institute (such as NSF and the like) or working on a research grant or contract—shall not in any case exceed two-ninths of an academic year's full-time commitment as measured both in time and in remuneration.

4. **MULTIPLE EXTRA INVOLVEMENT:** Where more than one type of involvement beyond the primary commitment is entered into (e.g., extra teaching plus consultation), the total extra involvement shall be controlled by the intent of the preceding paragraphs, jointly considered.

5. **ANNUAL REPORT:** At the regular June meeting, the Chancellor and the presidents shall report to the Board on the steps taken to implement these regulations and the extent of compliance with the limitations set. These reports shall contain details about all excesses over any of the guidelines herein stated, including the names of all persons involved and the specific reasons for the excesses.

NOTES: (a) Matter in bold type is new; matter in brackets to be deleted.

(b) Above amendments approved by the Council of Presidents at its meeting held April 10, 1972.

NOTE: Mr. Delle Cese asked to be recorded as voting "NO."

NO. 8. CHANCELLOR'S REPORT: (a) Oral Report.

First, a couple of quick items. As you know, or you may not know, the Mount Sinai Medical School and Medical Center is searching for a new president. They have established a Search Committee under Gus Levy, the Chairman of the Board, and I am a member of that Search Committee. Most of the time has been spent on the question of how to organize Mount Sinai or reorganize it to find if they need two people, a president and dean. Dr. James was both. That problem has not been resolved. There are nine faculty members on that Committee and nine trustees, and the faculty is very leery of the presidency being separated from the deanship because it involves a new area. Also on the Committee are one student and one resident. That problem is still to be resolved, at which time they will presumably go out and begin a search. The next meeting is about the fifteenth of May. They felt they have a cooling off period right now at the beginning and they intend to see if they could come up with a new start.

I have had two interesting visits. We had a meeting which was arranged through Mrs. Weiss with the President of the University of Haifa and then we had a meeting with the Director of the University of Puerto Rico. I think this is important because there are some very strong feelings and very strong movements toward the possibility of developing some pretty good reciprocal relationships with certain universities abroad, and I think this is important in those areas in which there is a connection with a large group of our constituents. We have discussed some possibilities of exchanging our faculties and students. I think in the months ahead this kind of exploration may become a little more formal. There are principles involved that I may be bringing to the Board for consideration of matters of policy. There are some interesting possibilities both for the City University and the other institutions.

We have begun in the Central Office a review of the Central Office operations which we will be carrying on in the next six to eight weeks to see if we can take another look at ourselves as an administration and what we are doing and what we should be doing and what we ought not to be doing. I can't give you a report on this. We had one session, and it was a fruitful one, about how the Central Office can be better and more realistically organized to perform its functions.

There are two other things which I did want to talk to you about. There really isn't much to report about the budget. We left Albany with twenty or twenty-one million dollars depending on who is counting. The budget operations in the City have not really gotten going yet. I think they are trying to work out themselves the business of state aid before they actually get going. There was a piece in the paper about furloughs for City employees which, of course, is one of the moves of gamesmanship between Albany and the City which will eventually be resolved. It seems that nobody yet is really interested in talking about specific budgets. That is a report that I'm sure I'll have more about next time. There really isn't that much time left. I'm sure that in the next few weeks they will solve or resolve the question of the amount of money the City thinks it has. Right at the moment it is in limbo.

The other thing that I want to talk to you about is much more important. That is the reason for my being in Albany today and the reason I had to miss the first part of the meeting. There are a number of issues still before the Legislature or about to come before the Legislature that affect the University but are not budgetary items in the usual sense of the word. They are matters that are equally as important as the budget. The first is the efforts of the University to move the construction of the community colleges out of the City's capital budget and into the City University Construction Fund. The reason is fairly simple. The City's capital budget has severe limitations on the amount of money that it has, and we must come to the City in competition with a large number of worthy organizations and causes, such as schools, parks, playgrounds, etc., to divide up what is a diminishing melon, and the net result is that the amount of money that comes out for the community colleges is down to a dribble. This year it could be summed up to some 6 1/2 million dollars for Queensborough Community College. We do get more money out of the capital budget, but most of that is for equipment. But the amount of money that we get for construction is small and might get smaller as the need increases and the amount of money decreases. It certainly is not the amount of money that moves construction at a reasonable pace. Our efforts to move it into the Construction Fund are to get more money through bonds and therefore make available a way that we can get approval on individual items to make faster progress in terms of building up the community colleges. This year for a number of reasons a number of people outside the City all of a sudden became interested in this possibility, not of putting the money into our Construction Fund but of using bonds to finance community college construction throughout the State. This has resulted in a bill from the Governor's Office which has support from the Speaker of the Assembly and other upstate and suburban legislators. The joker in the Governor's bill is that the process by which these bonds are paid off is tied in with fees. This process we find unacceptable, and we have been working with people in Albany, the Budget Bureau, the New York delegation and the leadership of the Assembly to find some sort of a way to get out of this. The City has come up with a device whereby the City University Construction Fund becomes the local sponsor of the community colleges, and if this goes through, all of the conditions that apply to the City University Construction Fund apply to their dealings with the community colleges. Now the Construction Fund, as you know, is not restricted in its ability to issue bonds to the amount that comes through fees. It really is a fairly simple way of dealing with this problem. The other possibility is to set up separate conditions for the community colleges in the City. A third possibility is to have the bill apply to the community colleges outside of the City and have a separate bill for us. That is one of the things we have been working on today. There is a limit written into the bill that we suggest in that the amount that could be procured for this purpose would be set at \$400,000,000. This is more money that we could use for the community colleges in the next four or five years.

The next matter that was under discussion in Albany today is a sort of a simple but a complex one, and that is the New York University Bronx Campus. As you know, back in the beginning of the session, the Governor came out with a proposal that essentially said that the State University would buy the Bronx Campus of New York University and that the campus would be used for the purpose of developing a major engineering complex—sort of an M.I.T. complex—for the State of New York. This would create a large dynamo of an institution in the City with State assistance and would help to solve the severe financial problems of N.Y.U. It is a large amount of money. It would help to solve the fact that the Bronx Campus and its activities are a major drain on the resources

of N.Y.U. It would protect the people in N.Y.U.'s engineering program, and the liberal arts people would be combined with Washington Square. It had some drawbacks. Nobody really knew, including the State University, what they would do with this campus. It turned out that there was little enthusiasm for the project every place you turned. In my earlier talks with the leadership of the two houses of the Legislature, the response was very weak. Even in the very reaches of the Governor's own family there was a certain amount of apathy. The State University itself was doing what it was supposed to do but really had no stomach for the whole thing. And, of course, we were not in there cheering everyone on. We suggested that the N.Y.U. campus, if it were available, would be a good site for Bronx Community College. As people started talking about this and as the lack of enthusiasm became obvious to people in Albany, this idea began to get a little currency. The last week things began flying around like shrapnel, and last Saturday Dr. Hyman and I had a 45-minute call with someone from the State University and that was followed by a phone call by the Chancellor of the State University which resulted in my meeting with them today. They are now proposing that 80% of the campus be turned over to City University for Bronx Community College. The rest of the campus might be used for graduate technical engineering-related programs. The problem we had was that nobody knew what this program should be or could be, and if it was done, there was no reason the State University had to be the progenitors of this kind of operation. We started off from the premise that if these buildings were usable for such engineering programs, they could be carried on or developed by interested institutions in the City. There is a problem here, and I think it is a personal one. The Governor has a personal stake in this, and to do it that way seems to wash the whole thing down the scuppers in terms of what currency there was for the Governor in the political sense. It started out as his idea. It might end up as just a local transaction in which City University gets a needed facility for an ongoing program. Not a very exciting idea. That is the problem as it stands now. I had a long conversation with State Director of Operations Hurd to discuss these facilities. I can't say that Mr. Hurd has seen the light on all of this and that it will come out exactly as we suggested, but he did listen and take notes, and I think that particularly on the Bronx campus thing that we have a good chance of moving that even further away from where it stands now and closer to the position that we should like to take. On the community college matter, I think if Mr. Hurd and people there can get over the idea of the relationship between buildings and tuition, that that too can go, although I think there that they are not as directly involved as a lot of people outside of the Governor's Office.

The third thing we discussed was a plan that was developed in the Regional Advisory Council for the possible transfer of students with money. This has gotten to the point where there is a proposed piece of legislation for determining how this would be. We are putting that forward as not really the City University's bill. It was one of the things that we thought of which might serve as evidence of the kinds of things that could be done in The City University of New York and would bring some benefits to City University in terms of its space problems, but it is not a bill that we live or die on. The number of students is small enough so that distributed among our campuses no institution would know that it had been relieved of a number of students, but this is something that can be done. This is a good thing and it is an evidence of our willingness to work out cooperative relationships with other institutions and for that reason we have supported it although we are not taking the lead in pushing it through the Legislature. Mr. Hurd did not know it had gone that far. He asked for a copy of it, which he got. He did not commit himself one way or the other.

There is one other thing that we discussed, the priority system that we worked out in cooperation with Campus Planning and Development, which was a way of trying to break the logjam in the Governor's determination of master planning projects and we got a very promising response from Mr. Hurd. He had not had a chance to analyze it but thought it was a great step forward. He made a great concession. He said he would send me a copy of the Governor's message before it is typed for my comments. I not only talked with Mr. Hurd but Chancellor Boyer and Mr. Nyquist.

I'd be glad to answer any questions.

(b) RESOLVED, That the Chancellor's Report (including Addendum Items) for the month of April 1972 be approved as amended, as follows:

Items listed in PART H—ERRATA, to be withdrawn or changed as indicated.

NO. 9. GENERAL DISCUSSION — POLICY PROPOSALS FOR FUTURE BOARD CONSIDERATION:

(a) The Chairman reported the receipt of a letter from the CUNY Women's Coalition requesting to be heard.

It was agreed that the Chairman would write to the Coalition and inform them that:

(1) The Chancellor's Advisory Committee on the Status of Women at CUNY is holding open hearings on Thursday, April 27, 1972.

(2) The Board is awaiting the Committee's report.

(3) Once the Advisory Committee's report has been made public and is presented to the Board, the Coalition may then make application to the Board to be heard.

(b) Mr. Ashe and Vice-Chancellor Newton reported on collective bargaining matters.

NO. 10. COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT: RESOLVED, That the following actions approved by the Committee on Campus Planning and Development be adopted:

A. PERMANENT SITE—BARUCH COLLEGE

RESOLVED, That the action of the Board of Higher Education, October 23, 1967, Calendar No. 1, to accept the Report of the Special Committee on the Future of Baruch School, dated September 27, 1967, be amended to delete from the report recommendation No. 5—"That the College be situated in downtown Brooklyn"; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Board approves the amendment of the 1968 CUNY Master Plan to provide an appropriate project to permit the acquisition of a permanent campus facility for Baruch College in Manhattan; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Board of Regents be requested to take appropriate action to include the amendment of the CUNY Master Plan into the Regent's Statewide Plan for Higher Education.

EXPLANATION: Baruch College, founded in 1919 as the School of Business and Public Administration of the City College, has from its inception been located at 17 Lexington Avenue (23rd Street) in Manhattan. For the past 53 years as a segment of the City College or of the Colleges of the City of New York or The City University of New York, Baruch has been assigned the major responsibility for college level business education in the City system; a mission it has executed with outstanding success; a mission which continues since it was spun off from City College and established as a senior college (liberal arts and sciences and business and public administration) by the Board of Higher Education on July 1, 1968.

The issue of site location and expanded facilities for Baruch has been under discussion for many years. The first Cottrell Report (1) in 1950 called for the allocation of \$2,750,000 for expanded facilities for Baruch. The second Cottrell Report (2), authorized in 1960 by the Director of the Budget of the City of New York and the Board of Higher Education, was directed at a comprehensive study and evaluation of the physical needs of Baruch. This latter report published in 1962 recommended strongly a lower Manhattan location for Baruch on the grounds that such a central location in the City could serve best the needs of the system as a whole and the City's business community.

Historically one must examine the early master plans of the City University to determine why a Baruch location outside Manhattan was considered. The University's first Master Plan covering the quadrennium 1964-68 stated that there was need for a new senior college in Queens or in Brooklyn with a view towards opening such a "new college" early in the second quadrennium 1968-72. This need was re-emphasized in the 1965 "Amendments to the 1964 Master Plan." Originally it was thought that this "new college" should be located such that it could serve both Queens and Brooklyn (so much so that the Chancellor's staff referred to this college as "Queensbrook"). This plan was altered with the establishment of York College in October, 1966 with a subsequent commitment to a Queens location. The commitment of York College to Queens left Brooklyn without a second senior college. To meet this pressure for higher education in the borough the 1968 Master Plan proposed a Brooklyn location for the then newly established Baruch College.

In the interim the Board of Higher Education planned, as noted in the 1969 Revision of the Master Plan, a new four year experimental college for the Bedford Stuyvesant area on the perimeter of downtown Brooklyn. This college, established as Medgar Evers College in 1969, originally planned as a community college emerged as a four year professional college offering among other specializations both associate and baccalaureate degrees in business administration.

It is this development of a new four year College in downtown Brooklyn now operating principally at 317 Clermont Avenue and scheduled to have its major interim campus base in September 1972, at 1150 Carroll Street (site of former Brooklyn Prep High School) and the major expansion of Brooklyn College into downtown Brooklyn with the rental of 170,000 square feet at 210 Livingston Street and by the leasing of the entire Brooklyn campus of St. John's University, which has more than adequately met the pressures for expanded senior college facilities in downtown Brooklyn.

Whither Baruch now? Building a campus at or near the traditional 23rd Street and Lexington Avenue site is possible but difficult, costly and time consuming. For the Fall 1972 semester the space crunch is such that the acceptance of 1400 entering freshmen depends on the now on-going leasing negotiations for 155,000 square feet in two different locations within the 23rd Street area. The space and facilities problem is acute not only in terms of instructional space but also for faculty office space and space for essential student services and activities.

The president of the College is now convinced that the only viable solution to the Baruch College space and facilities problem is the acquisition of a major building in downtown or lower Manhattan. Such an acquisition would make possible the growth and the development of Baruch College as a major senior institution in CUNY.

This does not constitute a new solution for Baruch. The "Ashe Report" (3) of the City College Committee of the Board of Higher Education (March 9, 1967) in its consideration of the feasibility of separating Baruch from City College called attention to the need to locate the college close to the business center of New York City. In considering the question of retaining Baruch as a component of City College, the report said the following:

If it were feasible to do so, perhaps the most satisfactory answer to the question of location would be to transpose the entire City College complex from St. Nicholas Heights and from Gramercy Park to a single downtown location in the middle of the business community and on the main arteries of public transportation. Given sixty acres in lower Manhattan and \$150,000,000 for construction such a move might be considered, with an alternative use for both of the present plants to be provided within the City University's Master Plan. Realism does not support this course of action. (p. 5).

Although the "Ashe" Report did not recommend the separation of Baruch from City College it definitely recommended the location of Baruch "in the lower part of Manhattan Island." (p. 12)

Somewhat later, in September 1967, "The Special Committee on the Future of the Baruch School" (The Keppel Report) (4) recommended the "spin-off" of Baruch from City College and stated the following:

There is a need both in the City and in the nation for a pioneering institution concerned with the administrative sciences in their broadest sense, offering the highest quality education for the business professions and administration, committed to a research program that will bring knowledge in all of the disciplines to bear on the problems of business and administration, expanding opportunities for members of minority groups, and specializing in business education within the broadest possible framework. (p. 4)

While it is true that the "Keppel Report" stated that this need could be met by the location of Baruch in downtown Brooklyn it did so at a time when we could not foretell the senior college status of the Medgar Evers College (then contemplated as a community college) or the large scale expansion of Brooklyn College in the downtown Brooklyn area.

Once again one must turn to the "Ashe Report" for specific recommendations for the Baruch College location. The report stated the following:

Location—geographical location within the City of New York as related both to the Day and Evening Session students, undergraduate liberal arts studies for business students, both undergraduate and graduate professional studies, and all of these as related to teaching staff both full-time and adjunct, the relationship of the professional business school to the business community, and the commuting accessibility of the School to all five boroughs. (p. 3)

There are, however, countervailing and overriding considerations which make it necessary to locate the professional work of the school of business close to the business community, where many of the Day Session and most of the Evening Session students work, and where many of the superior adjunct and part-time faculty are available. (p. 4)

As the only College in the City University with a nationally recognized School of Business it would seem appropriate that the College be located in the financial heart of the City.

Thus, the resolutions noted above are submitted for your approval.

FOOTNOTES:

1. Donald P. Cottrell, Adrian Rondileau, and Leo S. Schumer, REPORT OF THE MASTER PLAN STUDY OF PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE CITY OF NEW YORK, 1950
2. Donald P. Cottrell, and J. L. Heskett, EDUCATION FOR BUSINESS IN THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK, March, 1962
3. The City College Committee, REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE BARUCH SCHOOL OF BUSINESS AND PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION, March 9, 1967
4. The Committee on the Future of the Baruch School, REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE BERNARD M. BARUCH SCHOOL OF BUSINESS AND PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION, September 27, 1967

B. RENTAL OF SPACE—QUEENS COLLEGE:

RESOLVED, that the Board approve the rental of 5,705* square feet of space at 155-09 Jewel Avenue for use by Queens College; and be it further

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

EXPLANATION: For the past nineteen years Queens College has been operating an Early Childhood Center at the Pomonok Housing Project in Queens under a rent free agreement with the New York City Housing Authority. Effective December 1, 1971, the Housing Authority began charging standard economic rent for the rental of community space.

The Department of Real Estate has negotiated a lease for the subject premises for a period from December 1, 1971 to July 14, 1972, at a rental of \$10,839.50 per annum (1.90/Sq. Ft.). The landlord will furnish electricity, heat, hot and cold water. The tenant is to provide porter service at his own cost and expense.

C. ALTERATION PROJECTS—STATEN ISLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Higher Education approve revised estimate of cost for a group of alteration projects at Staten Island Community College consisting of (1) alteration and addition to existing maintenance building; (2) alteration to mail and reproduction room; (3) air cooling of various areas—all buildings; alteration to custodial area; plans for which were prepared by the private consultants, Goldfarb & Hecht, at an estimated cost of \$296,000 (as of September 1970), chargeable to Capital Project HN-206 for which bids were received in the amount of \$394,312; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Director of the Budget be and is hereby requested to approve said revised estimate of cost for the above mentioned group of projects for Staten Island Community College with a cost limitation of \$415,000 (the sum of bids received and 5% added for contingencies during construction), chargeable to Capital Budget Project HN-206 (referred to as SC-169); and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Trustees of the State University be requested to establish an appropriate capital budget provision for this project.

EXPLANATION: The projects included in these documents are for the purpose of establishing the following:

1. Space at maintenance building for maintenance of window blinds, paint storage, work area for landscaping, etc.
2. New space for mail and reproduction room presently occupied as storage area.
3. Air cooling various rooms occupied extensively throughout the summer. This project (SC-169) will be further extended to include related improvements to accommodate future air conditioning design under the Study Contract.

* Originally shown as 5,075 through clerical error.

4. Providing for our male custodial staff with lockers, and dressing and eating areas.

Plans, specifications and estimate of cost were prepared by private consultants, Goldfarb & Hecht, Consulting Engineers. These plans were reviewed by college administrators and the Office of Campus Planning and Development and basically met their approval and were considered complete and ready for bidding.

The Board approved the final plans and cost estimates at its meeting of October 26, 1970, Calendar No. C5, and the Bureau of the Budget issued CP 5830 dated January 26, 1971 with a cost limitation of \$325,600 which included 5% escalation and 5% contingencies above the original estimate of \$296,000 (as of September 1970).

The College was not satisfied with the Department of Buildings approval obtained by the consultants. This required revisions to the plans and delayed receipt of bids to December 15, 1971. A good range of bidders submitted bids in accordance with the following tabulation:

		Low Bids	High Bids	Engr. Estimate
General Construction	5 bids	\$101,101	\$164,745	\$ 62,000
Plumbing	4 bids	25,645	33,000	7,000
HVAC	9 bids	184,700	338,777	194,000
Electrical	9 bids	27,867	79,418	33,000
		\$339,313		\$296,000

The bids totalled \$339,313 and were in excess of the estimates as noted above. In addition, the low bidder for HVAC was released from his bid due to an honest error. The cost of this work was then considered to be the second bidder's cost which is \$232,500. It was decided at this time to rebid the General Construction and Plumbing while holding the HVAC and Electrical. The work was rebid on March 9, 1972 with the following tabulated results:

		Low Bid	High Bid
General Construction	9 bids	\$ 92,700	\$167,745
Plumbing	8 bids	20,000	31,858
HVAC*		232,500	338,777
Electrical**		49,112	79,418
		\$394,312	

*Previous bid held by contractor

**Previous bid not held by contractor--3rd low bidder figure used

This resulted in an overall cost of \$394,312 as of March 9, 1972.

The original estimate as of September 1970 of \$296,000 may be escalated in accordance with MBM index by 16% to \$350,000. The bids as twice received do not indicate that we can come within this limitation. We are therefore requesting approval of cost based on actual bids received. The bids for the General Contractor, Plumbing, and HVAC will be held but we expect to rebid the Electrical portion of the work. This rebidding is required on the advice of the General Counsel of the Board. We feel that with the new cost limitation of the sum of the bids previously received plus contingency we should be able to award this work within the requested cost limitation.

NO. 11. COMMITTEE ON COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AND STAFF RELATIONS: RESOLVED,

That the following statement approved by the Committee on Collective Bargaining and Staff Relations be adopted:

Notwithstanding the indicated annual salary, hourly and/or semester hour rates shown in the Chancellor's Report to be effective on September 1, 1972 and/or January 1, 1973 for both initial appointments and as incremented, in cases of reappointment to instructional staff titles, BHE approval is authorized only to the extent of the appropriate salary and/or rate legally and contractually payable as of August 31, 1972.

In addition, for employees not required to be reported in the Chancellor's Report, the salary rates payable are those in effect August 31, 1972.

These provisions shall be deemed to be applicable to all 1972-73 appointments and reappointments contained in the Chancellor's Reports and previously approved by the BHE.

NO. 12. STUDENT SENATE: The Chairman read a memorandum from Mr. Shark, President of the University Student Senate, asking that the Board consider the matter of University-wide action to protest the escalation of the war in Vietnam.

Motion made, seconded and carried that this is an administrative matter and the individual presidents and the Chancellor may issue public statements to protest the escalation of the war in Vietnam if they so desire.

At this point the Board went into Executive Session.

NO. 13. HONORARY DEGREES--THE CITY COLLEGE: (a) **RESOLVED**, That the degree of Doctor of Laws or Doctor of Humanities, honoris causa, be conferred upon the following, at the Commencement Exercises of The City College to be held on May 30, 1972:

Laws: Herman Badillo
Humanities: Leonard B. Davis

Laws: Stanley H. Fuld
Humanities: Buell G. Gallagher
Humanities: Edgar Johnson

Humanities: Ernest Nagel
Laws: A. Philip Randolph

(b) **RESOLVED**, That the degree of Doctor of Laws, honoris causa, be conferred upon the following, at the dedication ceremony of the new Science Building at The City College:

Kenneth J. Arrow
Julius Axelrod

Jacob Feld
Philip Handler
Milton Halpern

Frank Press
Julian Schwinger

NOTE: In accordance with established guidelines (BHE, 3/23/70, Cal. No. 7) the Council of Presidents approved the above resolutions and the Chancellor concurs with the Council's action.

Miss Canino and Mr. d'Heilly asked to be recorded as voting "NO" as to the principle of awarding honorary degrees. Dr. Lee abstained.

Upon motion duly made, seconded and carried, the meeting adjourned at 11:00 p.m.

N. MICHAEL CARFORA
Secretary of the Board