

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

**HELD**

**FEBRUARY 26, 1973**

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

The Chairman called the meeting to order at 5:35 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  
Norman E. Henkin  
Minneola P. Ingersoll  
Robert Ross Johnson

James Oscar Lee  
John A. Morsell  
Jack I. Poses  
Edward S. Reid  
Barbara A. Thacher  
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 William M. Birenbaum  
President Edgar D. Draper  
President Leon M. Goldstein  
President John W. Kneller  
President Robert E. Marshak  
President Joseph S. Murphy  
Acting President Harold M. Proshansky  
President Donald H. Riddle

President Kurt R. Schmeller  
President Herbert Schueler  
President Joseph Shenker  
President Richard D. Trent  
President Jacqueline G. Wexler  
Deputy Chancellor Seymour C. Hyman  
Vice-Chancellor Timothy S. Healy  
Vice-Chancellor J. Joseph Meng  
Vice-Chancellor David Newton  
Vice-Chancellor Frank J. Schultz

The absence of Mr. Berman and Mr. Hayes was excused.

Upon motions duly made, seconded and carried, the following resolutions were adopted or action was taken as noted: (Cal. Nos. A through 8)

**NO. A. NEW BOARD MEMBER:** The Chairman introduced Mr. Joseph J. Holzka, newly appointed member of the Board.

(NOTE: Mr. Holzka replaces Professor Arleigh B. Williamson for a nine-year term expiring June 30, 1981.)

**NO. B. REPORT OF THE CHAIRMAN:** The Chairman reported that:

(a) Mr. Holzka and Mr. Ashe (who has been reappointed for a nine-year term) will be sworn in by the Mayor on Tuesday, February 27, 1973.

(b) Professor Arleigh B. Williamson will receive the Mayor's Distinguished Service Scroll at Ceremonies to be held on Tuesday, February 27, 1973, at City Hall.

**NO. 1. CHANCELLOR'S REPORT:** RESOLVED, That the Chancellor's Report for the month of February, 1973 (including Addendum Items) be approved as amended, as follows:

(a) Items listed in PART H—ERRATA, to be withdrawn or changed, as indicated.

(b) General Note 3. SABBATICAL LEAVES in the Errata is amended to read as follows:

Approval is subject to financial ability and the applicable provisions, which have been extended, of the expired Agreements between the Board of Higher Education and the former Legislative Conference and the United Federation of College Teachers. Further, the Board's approval is subject to change under the terms and conditions of any Agreement to be negotiated with the Professional Staff Congress/CUNY.

(c) The following Lehman College items withdrawn from the Chancellor's Report are reinstated and approved:

Appointment with Tenure:

Dept. and Title	Name	Eff. Date	Salary
Economics Professor	Robert Lekachman	9/1/73	\$31,275/A

Designation as Distinguished Professor:

Dept.	Name	Period	Annual Supplement
Economics	Robert Lekachman (11)	9/1/73—8/31/74	\$5,000

(11) In addition to regular academic salary.

(d) The appointment of Dr. Frank Bonilla to read in the "Office of the Chancellor" instead of the "Central Office."

**NO. 2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** RESOLVED, That the minutes of the Board of Higher Education for the following meetings be approved as circulated:

Executive Committee Meeting - December 14, 1972

Regular Board Meeting - December 18, 1972

**NO. 3. COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS GOVERNANCE:** RESOLVED, That the following actions approved by the Committee on Campus Governance be adopted:

**A. CHARTER OF GOVERNANCE - KINGSBOROUGH COMMUNITY COLLEGE:**

RESOLVED, That the Charter of Governance of Kingsborough Community College be approved.

EXPLANATION: The Board's Statement of Policy on the Organization and Governance of The City University of New York provides that "The Board's Committee on Campus Governance shall have the responsibility for reviewing plans . . . submitted to insure compliance with this statement . . ."

The Board's Committee on Campus Governance, after review of the Kingsborough Plan, determined that it conforms to the prerequisites mentioned above and recommends that it be approved by the Board of Higher Education.

(NOTE: A complete copy of the Charter is on file with these minutes in the Office of the Secretary of the Board.)

**B. EXTENSION OF WAIVER OF THE BYLAWS - RICHMOND COLLEGE:**

RESOLVED, That the application of the bylaws of the Board of Higher Education to Richmond College be waived until January 1974.

EXPLANATION: Richmond College has been operating under a general waiver of the bylaws for five years. The waiver was extended to February 1, 1973 (BHE minutes June 19, 1972, Cal. No. 9E) until a formal governance plan was adopted by the College. Richmond College had developed an internal governance plan in conformity with the Board's Statement of Policy on the Organization and Governance of The City University of New York, but the plan failed to carry the campus referendum.

Richmond College requests a further extension of the bylaw waiver to permit the College to develop a revised internal governance plan in accordance with the Board's guidelines.

Mr. Ashe asked to be recorded as voting "NO."

**NO. 3A. FRESHMAN ALLOCATION:** The following Joint Report of the Committees on Expanded Educational Opportunity and Student Services was received and the resolutions contained therein were adopted:

After a review of the Freshman Allocation System used for the first two years of the Open Admissions Program, the Board of Higher Education, in January 1972 (Jan. 17, 1972, Cal. No. 1) approved a modification of the original Allocation System.

The modification authorized 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 to allocate students to the SEEK and College Discovery Programs. The number of students to be admitted in this way was to be determined by the size of the college's entering freshman class together with the institution's ability to provide the necessary remedial progress and student support services.

The modification was intended to improve the academic, economic and ethnic distribution of students among colleges of the University.

In March, 1972 (March 27, 1972, Cal. No. 10) the Board instructed the Chancellor to establish a Task Force to study the Allocation System and to develop recommendations for use in the allocation of students for the Fall, 1973 freshman class.

The Joint Expanded Educational Opportunity/Student Services Committee of the Board held public hearings in June in an attempt to elicit the widest range of views concerning the Allocation System prior to the initiation of work by the Task Force.

The Chancellor's Task Force submitted a report in November 1972 which was considered by the Joint Committee in December, 1972. The Task Force Report has received consideration by the University Student Senate and the University Faculty Senate as well as the Council of Presidents. In addition, the Joint Committee held public hearings on the Task Force report on January 30, 1973. Based on the Task Force report and recommendations, input from various groups and individuals from within and without the University and the recommendations of the Chancellor, the Joint Committee recommends the following for approval by the Board of Higher Education:

(1) RESOLVED, That Guideline (f) of the Statement of Policy on Open Admissions, adopted by the Board in July, 1969 (July 9, 1969, Cal. No. 1) be amended to read as follows:

**It shall assure that students who would have been admitted to specific community and senior colleges under admissions criteria we have used in the past shall still be so admitted[.]and, that students who have high school averages of 80% or higher or who rank in the top half of their high school graduating class shall be admitted to one of the senior colleges if they so choose or if they choose, they shall be admitted to the community college program of their choice.**

EXPLANATION: The Board's original intent in guaranteeing admission to senior college for students with a high school average of 80% or those in the top half of their graduating class (Nov. 12, 1969, Cal. No. 1) was to maintain the attractiveness of the City University for the high achieving student. The intent of the above amendment is to continue that guarantee and assurance but to expand the guarantee and opportunity to entering freshmen by offering a promise of the particular community college and program chosen by the student. It is also intended to remove the negative connotation with respect to the community college that was conveyed to some by the original language in the November 12, 1969 policy statement.

(2) RESOLVED, That the Statement of Policy of the Board (July 9, 1969, Cal. No. 1) setting forth the guidelines to be used as the basis for the implementation of the Open Admissions Program be amended by adding a seventh guideline which shall read as follows:

**(g) All City University Community College Associate in Arts and Associate in Science degree recipients shall be accepted as matriculated students at a senior college of City University, and that these students be given priority for transfer over non-University students seeking transfer and that upon such transfer they be granted a minimum of 64 credits toward a baccalaureate degree and be required to complete only the difference in credits between 64 and the total credits required in the baccalaureate program in which the student enrolls.**

EXPLANATION: The above statement is a reiteration of existing Board policy (November 27, 1972, Cal. No. 7c, d) providing for the automatic admission of community college transfer students to the senior colleges. This transfer arrangement is clearly an integral part of the operation of the University's Open Admissions System and is now being recognized by the Board as a basic policy component of the Program.

(3) RESOLVED, That the Allocation System as modified and approved by the Board of Higher Education (January, 1972, Cal. No. 1) be maintained through the Fall of 1973, except that the students selected for special admission be chosen from among those students whose high school averages are below 70%; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the number of students to be admitted under this special criteria be limited to no more than 5% of the total University entering freshman class in the Fall, 1973.

EXPLANATION: The modification of the Allocation System approved by the Board in January, 1972 authorized 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 to allocate students to the SEEK and College Discovery Programs. The purpose of the modification was to attempt to effect a better academic, ethnic and economic distribution of students among the various colleges of the University. The Task Force on the Freshman Allocation System, in reviewing the result of the modification, found that the intent of the modification was to some extent effective. An examination of the distribution of students for the Fall, 1972 freshman class clearly indicates that a great disparity still exists among the colleges with respect to the enrollment of the very severely underprepared students, i.e., students with high school averages below 70%. Approximately 21% of the entering freshman class (excluding SEEK and College Discovery) had high school averages below 70%. 17% of those students were enrolled in senior colleges while 83% were enrolled in the community colleges. Three of the nine senior colleges accounted for 75% of those students with high school averages below 70% who were enrolled in the senior colleges.

The special allocation of students with high school averages below 70% (limited to 5% of the total projected Fall, 1973 Freshman class) would affect approximately 1700 students. The remaining number of students with high school averages below 70% would be allocated to the colleges through the regular procedure.

The allocation of students under this procedure will have two advantages. (a) it would result in a redistribution of the most severely underprepared students not only from the community colleges to the senior colleges but more importantly among the senior colleges. If the whole group were to be allocated to the senior colleges, which is anticipated, the number of students with high school averages below 70% enrolled in the senior college freshman class would more than double and at the same time the number of such students in the community college freshman class would be reduced by approximately 30%. (b) the students would form an identifiable group for which additional funding would be supplied to the college. At the present time a number of the senior colleges enroll only a handful of students with averages below 70% making it difficult to programmatically meet the special needs of these students. A sizeable identifiable group would make possible the creation of a special program to address the particular needs of these students.

In the selection of student to be allocated to the senior college under this procedure student choice would be honored to the fullest extent possible.

(4) RESOLVED, That the Chancellor be directed to immediately undertake detailed and extensive study of the following long range proposals which were developed by the Task Force on the Freshman Allocation System:

(a) It was proposed that greater articulation of program and cooperation on remedial responsibilities be developed between the University and the high schools of the City. For example, the University might develop a wider and more general early admissions program for high school juniors or some of the colleges might be paired with one or more high schools to work on college preparation (i.e. remediation) for underprepared juniors or seniors.

(b) It was proposed that massive physical expansion in the form of new construction and the purchase or rental of new buildings might help to alleviate the problem of unsatisfactory distributions at some colleges by providing additional seats for an increased number of Level A and B students and ethnic minorities.

(c) It was proposed that the senior colleges develop an additional prestige model--perhaps an A.A. degree offering--which would accommodate the abilities and perhaps the aspirations of lower ability students allocated to the senior colleges. This proposal would provide students with a valid and honorable means of exiting and then reentering college. It would also call for a careful analysis of the future of the community colleges.

(d) It was proposed that the colleges of the University be grouped together in clusters which link high-draw institutions with low-draw institutions. Under such a proposal students would apply to a cluster of colleges and allocation to one of the colleges in the chosen cluster would constitute appreciation of student choice. Such an arrangement might enable the University to exert better control over ethnic and ability distributions at the various colleges.

(e) It was proposed that the community colleges develop special programs and introduce existing programs like Advanced Placement which are specifically designed to attract the higher ability student to the community colleges.

(f) It was proposed that the University develop entirely new methods of faculty recruitment designed to attract the number of faculty needed to deal with the actual ability level of the Open Admissions student population.

and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Chancellor be directed to report to the Board no later than September, 1973 the results of the study of these proposals; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the University Student Senate and the University Faculty Senate be asked to submit for consideration by the Chancellor additional proposals as they may deem appropriate.

**NO. 4. COMMITTEE ON BUDGET AND FINANCE:** RESOLVED, That the following actions approved by the Committee on Budget and Finance be adopted:

**A. PURCHASE OF COMPUTER EQUIPMENT - CENTRAL SERVICES:**

RESOLVED, That The City University of New York purchase a 370/168 computer, manufactured by the International Business Machines Corporation, with a down payment in the approximate amount of \$475,000 chargeable to Capital Budget project HN-191; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Board of Higher Education enter into a state and local government time payment plan financing contract with the International Business Machines Corporation extending over a period of 5 1/2 years to purchase this equipment, the form of contract to be approved by General Counsel; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Director of the Budget approve this expenditure from Capital Budget HN-191; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the City University take delivery of an IBM 370/165 computer until the 370/168 can be made available at which time the 370/165 will be returned to the vendor. The charges for use of the 370/165 are to comprise part of the contract with the vendor and to be funded from Capital Budget HN-191.

EXPLANATION: The City University of New York has prepared an analysis of the current state of computing within the University and has developed a plan for meeting the general purpose computer requirements of all of the colleges in the most economical manner. The first step in this plan requires the establishment of a Central Computer Facility which will provide instructional, administrative and research computing support to colleges which lack facilities and supplemental computer support to colleges with inadequate local computing resources. A Central Computer Facility will enable cooperative computer systems development which will avoid costly duplication of effort and provide for state of the art support of computer-related activities at all of the colleges. The state and local government payment plan enables the University to finance the full amount of purchase, approximately \$6.5 million, with approximately equal annual installments over 5 1/2 years, and an interest charge of 4 1/2% on the unpaid balance. The agreement includes the provision that if funding is not provided by the local authority, the contract is cancelled and the equipment will be returned to IBM.

**B. DATA PROCESSING EQUIPMENT - THE CITY COLLEGE:**

RESOLVED, That the Board of Higher Education approve the expenditure for, and authorize The City College to renew their existing agreement with the International Business Machines Corporation, pursuant to agreement No. OMPA 4987 between the City of New York and IBM, for the rental of data processing equipment for the period July 1, 1973 - June 30, 1974; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Board of Higher Education approve the expenditure for such other data processing equipment as may be required for efficient and uninterrupted operation of the Computation Center of The City

College for the period July 1, 1973 - June 30, 1974. Said equipment not covered by the City agreement referred to above, shall be subject to public advertisement and bidding procedures as outlined in Board of Higher Education Purchasing Regulations, to be reported to the Board in accordance with existing procedure; and be it further

**RESOLVED**, That the data processing equipment referred to in this resolution shall be in accordance with the Computer Center authorized inventory and that total expenditures for all equipment shall not exceed the estimate of \$212,995 for the period indicated, chargeable to Code 042-4300-413-01-74 - Rental of Data Processing Equipment, 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 \$212,995, for the proposed rentals.

**EXPLANATION:** The related equipment presently installed in the Computation Center, The City College, is compatible and necessary for efficient and effective operation of the academic and business programs of the College. Therefore, in the interest of continuance and undisturbed service and for efficiency, economy and standardization, approval of this resolution is requested.

The expenditure for 1972-73 was \$217,000. The resolution has the approval of the Vice-Chancellor for Budget & Planning.

#### **C. CLEANING AND MAINTENANCE SERVICE - BARUCH COLLEGE:**

**RESOLVED**, That the Board of Higher Education approve a contract for cleaning and maintenance service for Baruch College, Freshman Center, 560 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y., for the period September 1, 1972 to June 30, 1973 with Custodial Guidance Systems as the lowest responsible bidder in the estimated amount of \$160,000, without public advertising, for reasons of efficiency, economy and standardization, chargeable to Code 042-5200-400-01-73; and be it further

**RESOLVED**, That a portion of said contract amount, to wit, the sum of \$16,013.52 be charged for emergency purposes for the month of September, 1972.

**EXPLANATION:** On November 27, 1972, Calendar No. 6B, the Board approved a resolution for the purchase of emergency cleaning and maintenance service at Baruch College. the Comptroller's Office will approve payment for the month of September, 1972 only on an emergency basis. For reasons of standardization, efficiency and economy of service, the completion of the contract must be approved without public advertisement by the Board.

**NO. 5. COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT:** **RESOLVED**, That the following items approved by the Committee on Campus Planning and Development on February 20, 1973, be adopted:

#### **A. RENOVATION OF SHUSTER HALL--LEHMAN COLLEGE:**

**RESOLVED**, That the Board approve final plans, specifications, final estimates of cost of construction in amount of \$1,703,000 (based on a \$1,620,000 final cost estimate dated December 1972 plus an estimated \$83,000 for estimated escalation to a projected bid date of August, 1973) for the renovation of Shuster Hall, Lehman College, Bronx, as prepared by Georgio Cavaglieri, Architect, in accordance with his contract with the Dormitory Authority of the State of New York, dated November 19, 1970; and be it further

**RESOLVED**, That the City University Construction Fund be requested to approve said final plans, etc., and to authorize the Dormitory Authority of the State of New York to invite bids and to award contracts for the construction, furnishing and required supervision of construction of said facility; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Board approve, and the City University Construction Fund be requested to concur in the amendment of the Note Facility C.12.05 established for this project to provide for an increase in the Note Facility from \$150,000 (planning and miscellaneous costs only) to a total estimated project cost of \$2,200,000.

EXPLANATION: On May 22, 1972, Calendar No. 4(b), the Board of Higher Education adopted a resolution approving preliminary plans, outline specifications and preliminary estimate of construction cost (April 1972) of \$1,581,000. The Architects presented a final estimate of \$1,620,000 (as of December, 1972) which when escalated by a factor of 1.051\* would produce a cost of \$1,703,000 for bid date of August, 1973. Dividing this cost by the gross building areas of 96,072 square feet indicates an average renovation cost of \$17.72 per square foot. The present final estimate of \$1,703,000 for bid date, August 1973, may be compared with the preliminary estimate of \$1,581,000 (as of April 1972) which if multiplied by an escalation factor of 1.110\* to equate it to an August 1973 date would produce a comparable estimate of \$1,755,000.

It is estimated that in addition to the construction cost an additional amount of \$497,000 will be required for fees, equipment, etc. indicating a total estimated project cost of \$2,200,000.

The plans have been reviewed and meet the approval of the College and the Office of Campus Planning and Development.

The plans have been examined by the Building Department and conform to legal and safety requirements.

On this basis it is recommended that the final plans, etc., be accepted and authorization to invite bids and to award contracts for the construction and furnishing of this facility be granted.

\*MBM Cost Index of January, 1973.

#### B. WINDOW REPLACEMENT AND STONE WORK REHABILITATION - HUNTER COLLEGE:

RESOLVED, That the Board approve revised final contract documents including plans, specifications and an estimate of cost for window replacement stonework and steam-cleaning of the Hunter College Park Avenue Building, as prepared by Rose, Beaton and Rose, Architects and Engineers. The estimated cost of construction as of December 31, 1972 is \$3,847,850, chargeable to Capital Project HN-181; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Director of the Budget be and is hereby requested to approve said contract documents including plans, specifications and estimate, and further to approve a cost limitation of \$4,121,000.00 for the remainder and conclusion of this project. (Based on estimate of \$3,847,850.00 plus 2.3% for escalation to the bid date at the end of May 1973 and 4.6% for contingencies.)

EXPLANATION: On February 24, 1969 the Board approved final contract documents for Window Replacement and Stonework Rehabilitation of the entire Park Avenue Building as prepared by the architects with an estimated cost of \$2,832,000. The Director of the Budget approved the documents and authorized the expenditure of funds to cover a small portion of the work with a cost limitation of \$350,700. This first stage was subsequently carried out and it was discovered in the course of construction that certain conditions which were believed to exist on the basis of old plans turned out not to be fact. A supplementary agreement was awarded to the architect to modify the documents accordingly and it is this modified set and new estimate for completion of the project which the Board and the Director of the Budget is now asked to approve. The design has been checked by the college staff and the City University Campus Planning and Development Staff concurs in the approval.

#### C. ROOF REHABILITATIONS OF TOWNSEND HARRIS AND WINGATE HALLS - THE CITY COLLEGE:

RESOLVED, That the Board approve final plans, specification and estimate of cost for roof rehabilitations of Townsend Harris and Wingate Halls on The City College Campus as prepared by Economides and Goldberg, Consulting Engineers. The final estimate of cost of construction is \$197,000 including escalation and contingencies; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Director of the Budget be requested to approve said documents with a cost limitation of \$197,000 chargeable to Capital Project HN-203.

EXPLANATION: The aforesaid documents were prepared as part of a service contract awarded to the Consulting Engineers in accord with a budget certificate CP6096 approved March 26, 1971. Although the preliminary documents for the entire scope of the job were approved by the Board on April 24, 1972, the project never received a cost limitation from the Director of the Budget. Meanwhile budget restrictions caused the University Dean of Campus Planning to cut down on the program for the 1972-1973 fiscal period. This program now includes the roofing rehabilitations mentioned above and the final documents have been completed ready for bidding. The work has been reviewed by the College and the Office of Campus Planning and Development concurs with their approval.



**D. SUPPLEMENTAL NOTE AGREEMENT - LEHMAN COLLEGE:**

RESOLVED, That the Board authorize the execution of a Supplemental Note Agreement to the Note Agreement dated June 12, 1967, between the Dormitory Authority of the State of New York, the City University Construction Fund and the Board of Higher Education, to provide for the indicated increases in the estimated costs for the indicated Note Facilities:

NOTE FACILITY & DESCRIPTION	FROM	TO
C.12.04 Lehman College Gymnasium	300,000	650,000
C.12.06 Lehman College, Central Building Complex	1,000,000	1,800,000

and be it further

RESOLVED, That the City University Construction Fund and the Dormitory Authority be notified of the aforesaid action.

EXPLANATION: Heretofore, Note Facilities were established in the amounts indicated to permit the initiation of planning for the above projects. The present proposal submitted by the Dormitory Authority is to adjust the nominal amounts established to provide more reasonable budgets for the planning phase of the indicated projects. Included is provision for architectural fees, construction management, scheduling and specialized consultant services during design surveys, borings, soils analysis, contingencies, etc.

The proposals have been checked by the Project Management Staff of the University Dean of Campus Planning and found to be reasonable.

**E. PRESIDENT'S RESIDENCE - JOHN JAY COLLEGE: Item withdrawn.**

**NO. 6. COMMITTEE ON THE ACADEMIC PROGRAM:** RESOLVED, That the following actions approved by the Committee on the Academic Program be adopted:

**A. BA/MA IN MATHEMATICS - HUNTER COLLEGE:**

RESOLVED, That the Four-Year Program in Mathematics leading to the BA/MA in Mathematics to be given at Hunter College be approved in principle, effective February 1, 1973 subject to financial ability and to the approval of the New York State Board of Regents; and be it further

RESOLVED, That two years after approval in principle, the Committee on the Academic Program will initiate a preliminary review in consultation with the President of the College/Division; and be it further

RESOLVED, That five years after initiation of the program, the Committee on the Academic Program will initiate a substantive review in consultation with the President of the College/Division; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Master Plan be so amended.

EXPLANATION: This accelerated program is intended to provide the well organized, highly motivated student with an opportunity to complete a BA/MA as quickly as possible, and to attract to the College exceptional students who recognize their desire to pursue advanced study in mathematics at an early stage. The program will encourage students to broaden their background in mathematics with an allied minor in computer science, economics, philosophy, physics, or statistics, and will offer independent work in the senior year under the supervision of the graduate faculty. No additional expense is entailed in offering this combined degree program.

**B. CITY UNIVERSITY AWARD FOR EXCELLENCE IN TEACHING:**

RESOLVED, That the proposal to establish a City University Award for Excellence in Teaching be approved in principle, effective February 26, 1973, subject to financial ability and to the approval of the New York State Board of Regents; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the award shall consist of a prize of \$2,500 and a certificate of award, to be given in the second term of each school year to one faculty member from each of the units of the University, according to procedures that will be prepared and distributed by the Chancellor; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Master Plan be so amended.

EXPLANATION: The CUNY Award for Excellence in Teaching gives recognition to the fact that the primary task of the City University is undergraduate instruction, and seeks to reward faculty members who are excellent teachers. The award recognizes the significance of outstanding teaching not only in imparting information of value and skills in handling the tools of learning, but in communicating the energy of thought, inspiring creative effort, awakening a love of learning and instilling awareness of the importance of scholarly integrity.

**NO. 7. UNIVERSITY REPORT:** The Chancellor presented the following report:

The first thing I would like to tell you about is the situation of the N.Y.U. campus. As you know, the Deputy Chancellor met with representatives of the State Budget Office and of N.Y.U. several weeks ago, at which time three numbers were dropped on the table for the sale of the N.Y.U. campus to the City University. The first was the N.Y.U. number, which suggested a value of \$83,000,000. The second number was the number that seemed plausible to the Budget Office, \$62,000,000, and the third was our number, \$50,000,000. After some discussion by the parties concerned, the N.Y.U. people were asked to come back with a response to the Budget Office. They have done so, and the Deputy Director of the Budget, Dr. Miller, has asked for another meeting. That meeting is tomorrow, and we will be represented again by the Deputy Chancellor, Mr. Spiridon, and Mr. Farley of the Construction Fund. We are not sure what bright light will be at the end of the tunnel. Hopefully, we may come back tomorrow with some number that we can take to the Construction Fund. The Deputy Chancellor has made it clear and has an agreement from Dr. Miller that whatever agreements are reached, it will be clearly understood that the Construction Fund will be able to spend some \$35,000,000 to renovate the campus, and so the total cost of the property plus the repairs are things that we have to keep in mind.

The second matter I wanted to mention to you regards talks we have been having with the Columbia College of Pharmacy. This was an affiliated institution of Columbia University, but the affiliation is being discontinued. Columbia University, under its continuing austerity program, is going to divest itself of any concern for the Columbia College of Pharmacy. Since the number of colleges of pharmacy is dwindling in the city and those that exist are in the far reaches of Queens, there was some discussion of the Columbia College of Pharmacy possibly being incorporated into the City University. Lehman College has expressed interest, and it might be incorporated in some way with Lehman College. There are a lot of things to discuss before I would like to make a recommendation, and I may never make a recommendation on this, but I thought it would be well for the Board to know that preliminary discussions are going on. For example, we do not know what the financial condition of the college is nor what its liabilities are. We will make an audit of all their assets and liabilities before we go any further. We have gone so far as to have it discussed at the Regents' Regional Council to be sure that we are not stepping on anyone else's toes. The response of the Council at this time was that no objections seemed to be raised, but that is where the discussions are. They probably will continue. Once we get a firmer fix on the finances and the kind of program it might be if it were incorporated into Lehman College, I may come back with a recommendation. We would probably move it to the Lehman College campus and divest ourselves of the present building which is not in good condition. Lehman College feels that it might be worked into its present master plan. The College has an enrollment of 400, and so it's not a large program.

I've told you from time to time about the Fleming Report, which is the Regents' "outside look" at doctoral programs. That Report has been submitted to the Regents and has been made public. I have asked for sufficient copies for all the Board members and will send each of you a copy when it comes. The proposals were exactly those that we expected. They recommend that funds be limited to existing programs of excellence or the promise of excellence, and the phased removal of financial support from programs that are weak. The timetable is that the Regents will not move until May at the earliest. In the meantime they will be having a series of discussions around the State to get input from the institutions that are affected. I presume that these comments will be taken into account by the Regents before they take formal action.

A few comments about the Legislature. I have appeared before three committees in the last two weeks in Albany. The first was the Joint Legislative Committee in which I was asked to give my views on the community colleges task force. I told them exactly what I have told you, that that report did not take into account the special circumstances of the community colleges of the City of New York and I would not favor the proposal as long as the community colleges of the City of New York were included in the SUNY system. I told them that we had legislation to separate the community colleges of New York City from the State University system. The latest report is that the Legislature has heard from the county supervisors who are against the recommendations. Secondly, we learn the report was not really instigated by the Governor nor is he vitally interested in it. It was undertaken at the behest of the State University. We have been discussing our proposal for the separation of our community colleges from the State University with the legislative leadership in Albany but I don't yet know if our legislation will fly.

The second group I appeared before was the combined Budget and Ways and Means Committee of the Senate and the Assembly, in which I discussed the CUNY budget as certified by the Mayor and what the Governor's Executive Budget would mean to that certification. Copies of my talk were sent to the Board members. That particular meeting was a "listen" type of meeting. The Committee hears about forty people a day. I was the fifth. There has been no real action on the budget in Albany as yet. It is important to see what headway we will make, which will depend in large part on the recommendations that may come out of the Keppel Commission.

That brings me to my next subject. The Keppel Commission expects to release its report this week. They thought it would be Wednesday, but that was a couple of weeks ago. We only know in bits and pieces and then only by rumor what is going to be in the Keppel Commission Report. Most of you read the New York Times on Sunday about the recommendation for tuition in the City University. As soon as the report is out and we can actually see what they recommend, we will know how to approach the tuition issue. We are hopeful that they are going to make some positive statements about the needs of our construction program. What influence that will have I'm not sure. Beyond that, I can't say what will be in that report, but we'll soon find out. We shall try to get you copies as soon as possible and I am sure you will read about it in the papers.

There is another undertaking I want to mention briefly. We are investigating the possibility of joining in a suit against the Federal Government on the question of educational payments for veterans. The Higher Education Amendment provides for payments to institutions where the enrollment of veterans has increased 10% in the past year. There was money appropriated for that program. The President did not include it in his new budget, but neither did he impound it. He wants the Congress to repeal it. We have talked to the Corporation Council about the suit, and we will see if we can convince the Mayor that the Corporation Counsel should be involved in this, and we will see if we can pry some money out of the Federal Government through the courts.

One thing I did promise for this meeting and I will send you by mail is a report on nursing. As you will recall, several months ago the difficulty of placing graduates of the community colleges in senior college nursing programs was discussed here. We explained that to partially solve that problem we intended to open up new

upper division programs in the senior colleges to make seats for them. At the present time, of several thousand students in the nursing programs in the senior colleges, about 408 are transfer students. Since those senior colleges which are involved in nursing run their own four-year programs, the pressure increases as more and more of the community college graduates in nursing want to go on to four-year programs.

We have instituted efforts to get two programs going, one at Richmond College and one at John Jay College. The one at John Jay College, I believe, is further along. We are now convinced that we will be able to open up this program in September 1973, and it will take in approximately 100 students at the junior level. They have gotten some assurance from the State Department of Education that it will look favorably on the development of this program and register it. We are also pushing ahead at Richmond College. There have been a number of discussions with Professor Levine at Staten Island Community College and she has indicated that she will cooperate in a program that articulates with the community college program. John Jay would in effect take over a program that has existed at Roosevelt Hospital and would use Roosevelt Hospital for its clinical needs. Richmond is starting from scratch.

The target date is September 1973. The two programs will provide about 200 additional places for graduates of the community colleges and will relieve some of the pressures. I have been provided with a complete summary of the nursing picture at the University to date which I will get out to you after this meeting.

That really leaves nothing but collective bargaining and we don't have much to report on that subject. The situation is pretty much the same in that we are still in factfinding. The next dates are March 7, 8, and 9. Then it will be up to the factfinders. The factfinding panel will meet on March 22 to begin developing their report but it may not be forthcoming until May. We did suggest that the University might protest the length of this process to PERB and asked that the P.S.C. join with us in this protest. The P.S.C. has declined.

At the same time, as you know, we have been involved in some discussions about continuing direct negotiations. That started with some phone calls and then a preliminary exploratory meeting between Vice-Chancellor Newton, Dr. Zeller, Dr. Kugler and Mr. Cantor. In that discussion two suggestions were made by the P.S.C.: that the negotiations continue without lawyers and that the discussions concentrate on matters that were not yet before the factfinders. Since that time a few things have happened. I sent a letter to the P.S.C. suggesting that we meet on Friday, the 16th, to begin negotiations. They answered that they would like to negotiate without lawyers stating that they thought an informal meeting might be more productive. The P.S.C. suggested a later date, and we agreed to meet this morning at ten o'clock. Only one person appeared from their team, Mr. Cantor, who said that the others were not coming. They continually wanted to negotiate without lawyers.

I think I should tell you. We have reached an agreement on how to handle arbitration in the absence of a new contract, and so we will be going ahead with arbitration cases in the interim period.

The other thing was that there was an unfair labor practice charge brought against the Board regarding the resolution passed last spring on increments, saying that increments were not being paid after the first of September. That case was heard by PERB, the same hearing officer who heard the Triborough Case, in which he directed the Authority to continue to pay increments. That was not his decision in our case. The decision reproached the Board on the timing of its resolution, saying that the resolution could be interpreted as a harassment of the Union. It was a strange case. The Union never argued the case on the same basis that the Triborough Case was argued. The presiding officer even suggested that they might explore it and they refused. I must admit now that having failed in this case, they have entered another unfair labor practice charge on the non-payment of increments.

I will try to get to you the copies of the correspondence between the Union and myself over the last four days.

**NO. 8. GENERAL DISCUSSION:** Dr. Lee made mention of the Regents' Report on Post-Secondary Education and suggested that the Board apprise itself of what is happening in this field.

Wessell reported that as soon as background material on the subject has been assembled he will call a meeting of the Board's Special Committee on Teacher Education.

**Upon motion duly made, seconded and carried, the meeting adjourned at 6:40 p.m.**

**N. MICHAEL CARFORA**  
Secretary of the Board