

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

**HELD**

**APRIL 5, 1976**

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

The Chairman called the meeting to order at 6:40 P.M.

There were present:

**Alfred A. Giardino, Chairman  
Franklin H. Williams, Vice Chairman**

**Armand D'Angelo  
Sandra Lopez Bird  
Vincent R. FitzPatrick**

**Gurston D. Goldin  
Harold M. Jacobs  
James P. Murphy  
Vinia R. Quinones**

**Maynard S. Jones, ex officio**

**Etta G. Grass, Acting Secretary of the Board**

**Chancellor Robert J. Kibbee  
President Milton G. Bassin  
President William M. Birenbaum  
President Thomas C. Chalmers  
President Candido A. de Leon  
President Edgar D. Draper  
President John W. Kneller  
President Leonard Lief  
Acting President Gerald W. Lynch  
President Joseph S. Murphy  
President Harold M. Proshansky  
Acting President Morton Rosenstock  
President Kurt R. Schmeller**

**President Joseph Shenker  
President Herbert M. Sussman  
President Richard D. Trent  
President Edmond Volpe  
President Jacqueline G. Wexler  
Professor David Valinsky  
Deputy Chancellor Seymour C. Hyman  
Vice Chancellor Mary P. Bass  
Vice Chancellor Julius C.C. Edelstein  
Vice Chancellor Timothy S. Healy  
Vice Chancellor Anthony Knerr  
Vice Chancellor J. Joseph Meng  
Vice Chancellor Peter S. Spiridon**

The absence of Mrs. Hauser was excused.

The fiscal crisis facing the City University of New York is of a magnitude so great as to threaten its continued existence. Disproportionate and repeated budgetary cuts in the current fiscal year are shaking asunder the academic integrity and viability of a great University.

Until recently the educational and social mission of the University was recognized and funded by our City and State. With the City no longer presently able to fund at former levels, there has been a drastic reordering of social priorities. Even public perception of the University has temporarily changed with some people temporarily blinded and mistakenly seeing the University as an agency that takes away from, rather than one that provides for, the growth of our City and State.

For 129 years and until now the City's concern for public higher education was unwavering, through wars and economic depressions. The result was the growth of a great University as sufficient funds were provided to respond to educational demands. But today funds are limited. A reordering of priorities by the City and State require the University to contract. In order to carry out its trusteeship responsibility, the Board of Higher Education believes that some immediate alterations in the University's size and operations are required to preserve the integrity of this great institution. The present fiscal crisis permits no other course. In taking these painful steps we must stress that the long-term solution can be found only by resolving the core of the problem -- namely, the gross inequity in which we find the State funding the senior colleges of State University at a rate three times higher than the students at City University.

In past months numerous proposals have been presented for the restructuring and alteration of the University's educational services. Various University and Board committees have studied plans. These studies have led to a proposal for restructuring the City University by Chancellor Robert J. Kibbee, dated February 19, 1976. The Board of Higher Education has conducted extensive public hearings at which the views of many hundreds of the University's various constituencies were advanced. The Board has carefully considered the interests, concerns and views of the individuals and groups that testified or who have written. All of these expressions have influenced and shaped the Board's thinking. Necessary but painful decisions must be made. In reaching our conclusions we have sought to be attentive to many considerations including:

1. Movement toward new perspectives and direction of higher education including an older student body.
2. Appropriate distribution of the University's educational services throughout the five boroughs.
3. The necessity to balance the student population throughout units of the University.
4. The importance of preserving academic diversity and specialized educational missions within the new structure of the University.
5. The need to meet different social and educational needs of a highly diversified student body and City in new or different patterns of education.

**Dr. Goldin read the following statement into the record:**

I intend to vote on the restructuring proposals now before the Board with awareness of the fact that the restructuring plan is out-of-touch with fiscal reality. Fiscal exigencies compel the Board of Higher Education to initiate immediately a measurable process of institutional change involving administrative structures and academic programs.

I now urgently request Chancellor Kibbee to submit to the Board of Higher Education his specific recommendations for closing the acknowledged fiscal gap between the projected costs and anticipated funding levels in his restructuring plan.

This is necessary in order for the Board of Higher Education adequately to fulfill its responsibilities in approving a plan that is both fiscally sound and educationally viable.

It is essential that the Board of Higher Education receive from the University's chief academic and executive officer his recommendations for bringing the projected costs of the restructuring plan into balance with realistic anticipated funding levels. I regret that the Board has failed thus far to receive any such guidance for closing this acknowledged fiscal gap in the restructuring plan now before the Board.

**Mr. Jones presented a statement calling upon the Board to allow public debate upon the items on the calendar since, he said, they differed from those in the Chancellor's original restructuring plan which were discussed at the public hearing on March 8.**

**Mrs. Bird said that inasmuch as there appeared to be considerable disagreement among the members of the Board as to whether this plan would achieve the necessary savings, she moved to table Calendar Nos. 1 through 12 until the Board would have an opportunity to consider the alternate plan presented by the minority members of the Board. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Quinones. The motion was lost.**

**Mrs. Quinones stated that the present set of twelve resolutions do not viably restructure the University both from an academic and a fiscal point of view.**

**NO. 1. STATEN ISLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE AND RICHMOND COLLEGE:** The resolution was moved and seconded.

**Mrs. Quinones moved as a substitute resolution and read into the record the Minority Proposal for Restructuring the University:**

From the early 1800's to the present day, victims of persecution, prejudice, discrimination and poverty have come to New York City in numbers unequalled elsewhere. The City University and its colleges provided them with a ladder for upward mobility. No governmental agency has contributed more to the growth of the economy and cultural base of this City than its municipal colleges - now University system.

That University is literally on the brink of collapse. The City of New York is foundering in a fiscal morass of such magnitude as to cause its leadership to disclaim further responsibility for the University, the greatest social and cultural asset this City possesses.

The product of the City University, i.e., successful graduates, cannot be measured in dollars nor can their contributions to the quality of life in the city be quantified. For this reason, the University is easy prey for the budgetary axe. The axe is stayed only where the expenditure produces a clearly measurable return exceeding the outlay.

Numerous proposals designed to reduce the scope, mission and cost of the University have been advanced in the past weeks and months. In general the proposals have been met with such serious opposition as to immobilize the decision-making process within the University and the Board of Higher Education. It is our position that all the restructuring proposals thus far, have impacted primarily on those who can least afford the denial or reduction, of educational opportunity... mainly the city's minority and poor population.

In the midst of the current turmoil and confusion, there remain several factual certainties. First: The City University, since the inception of open admissions in the Fall of 1970, has provided exposure to higher education for countless thousands of students who would otherwise have had no chance to advance beyond the secondary school level. Second: Criticisms dealing with costs and academic standards of the University's open admissions program all avoid one simple fact, i.e., open admission students are succeeding at a rate equal to the national average. Third: Although it is true that high school average and test results are predictors of potential for success, they are extremely imprecise. The University - to survive in the current reality - must change its nature, its size, its scope, but if it is to be preserved in a new form, or rather if it is to be worthy of preservation, it must retain the essence of its uniqueness, i.e., its promise and opportunity for the population of this City.

Action must be taken and rational decisions made. The failure to act now will further erode the University's spirit and will shortly result in either the final demise of this institution, or much worse, the manipulation of its remains by political forces external to the City and the needs of its citizens.

We believe that the Chancellor's proposal of February 19, 1976, does not adequately restructure the University. It fails to address in any meaningful way achieving a university which will provide like standards and quality education across the board.

In advancing a broad outline for the restructuring of the University, we reaffirm our commitment to three basic principals in this order of priority:

**Quality Education**

**Open Admissions**

**Free Tuition**

We believe that the University should be a single academically and administratively consolidated educational institution, with various campuses of the one institution responding to the special needs of a changing urban population. Each of these campuses should reflect the educational mission, philosophy, and standards, established by a strong - central university administration.

We believe that this educational model can insure that University standards and quality are consistent throughout guaranteeing thereby that all CUNY degrees will reflect the same high level of competency; a fact which is not so presently. We demand and expect that equally appropriate rigorous standards will be imposed on students under the jurisdiction of the Board of Education as a prerequisite for the high school diploma.

We hold fast to the concept of Open Admissions. We believe that a New York City high school diploma or its equivalent should be the only admissions requirement to the University. However, confronted with fiscal stringencies, the Board of Higher Education is sacrificing the policy of open admissions.

We reaffirm our commitment to necessary remediation.

Proposals for limitation of enrollment to those applicants performing at a given level on skills tests in English and mathematics appear to be reasonable on the surface. A detailed examination of the implementation of such a policy indicates that:

1) The student population would become approximately 87% white - i.e. re-segregated.

2) The educational mission of the University will apply to a selected minority of the population of the City.

3) The various reports, plans, statements of the mission, etc. for restructuring the University fail to come to terms with the inadequacy of current instruments used to test and measure achievement of Black and other minority students because of the failure of past educational experiences to provide them with the analytical and linguistic skills needed for successful performance on group tests.

4) That studies such as the Lavin reports of August, 1974 and December 1975, and earlier ones such as the Plaut research of 1966 demonstrate that students from these groups do in fact achieve successful monitoring of college level work at a rate comparable to and, in some instances, superior to the national norms.

The imposition of limitations based on performance of writing skills, at a time when national norms in writing and predictive tests such as the SAT are declining, will be destructive for many potential successful aspirants for higher educational training. We reject any proposal that would place students for remediation purposes into the hands of those who failed to teach them in the first place. The damage that would ensue from segregated improvement centers in the areas of maturation, self-concept and forward movement appears to have escaped those proponents of such plans.

The present criteria for admission to the City University are the most equitable for preserving access to higher education.

We are committed to increasingly strengthened retention standards as students move up the education ladder so that a CUNY degree will in fact attest that the student has advanced to the level of competency which the degree represents. Our commitment is not only to open admissions but, as well, to "real" education.

We understand the fiscal restraints that face the University, and we know that we must make the kinds of fiscal sacrifices necessary to meet them. We believe that any reduction in fiscal expenditures must be shared by all, through changes in the structure of the University, by ensuing savings in administrative costs and other areas. We will not tolerate measures which, under the guise of reductions, sacrifice the quality, the availability, and the special programs of higher education for the City's minorities and the poor.

### CENTRALIZATION PLAN FOR CUNY

Based on the above principles, this plan represents a total redesign of the University. This proposal addresses itself to:

1. budgetary realities;
2. population diversity and educational needs;
3. geographic and economic realities of communities served by the University.

Accordingly, budgetary cuts are to be distributed equitably among the various components of the system. This plan maintains the essential principle of equity throughout the total system. It is therefore significantly unlike other proposals because it does not adopt the strategy of the status quo.

### THE ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE OF THE UNIVERSITY

The present unnecessary duplication of administrative cost in the University currently runs to approximately 40% of the University's operating budget. A reorganization of the nineteen independent colleges and central office's administration into a single administrative system can achieve a savings of over 90.0 million dollars within one year (FTY 1976-77).

This cost reduction can be achieved through centralizing operational areas and functional services. That is, by centralizing such operations as:

1. computer services and operations--terminals located at each campus rather than maintaining complete computer operations;
2. audio-visual production services;
3. facilities and planning services;
4. general purchasing of essential equipment and supplies;
5. printing and production of institutional publications and reports (printing of nineteen separate catalogs annually costs over 1/4 million dollars alone!);
6. library purchasing, acquisitions, and cataloging;
7. financial aid programs, accounting and budgeting systems, and registration systems.

The present computer capacity of the University is underutilized. To optimize utilization while increasing effectiveness in service delivery, the following are functional areas which can be computerized:

1. financial aid programs;
2. accounting and budgeting systems;
3. registration systems;
4. library cataloging -- limiting mis-utilization of reservation functions, and eliminating duplication of nineteen libraries.

By centralizing these various operations and computerizing functional areas within certain operations -- which are not necessarily exclusive or exhaustive -- the need for the present complement of administrative personnel throughout the system will be drastically reduced.

### THE ACADEMIC STRUCTURE OF THE UNIVERSITY

In order to maximize the effectiveness of educational programs in each of the boroughs, it is advantageous to provide for specialization in accordance with the individual programs that have been developed by various colleges. This would enhance the value of these campuses in the CUNY system and provide for the unique educational needs of many of our citizens.

The academic structure proposed allows broad access to these opportunities, strengthens academic viability, and facilitates the meaningful movement by citizens through the system. This model of a Comprehensive University --- in addition to offering baccalaureate and post-graduate programs, continues to provide ---

an array of one-year certificate options through which citizens may develop their professional and career talents, such as the programs on Staten Island;

an appropriate agenda of two-year degrees in technological, career fields, and specialized educational-business programs, such as the several Community Colleges;

an important offering of career-business programs, such as LaGuardia Community College and New York City Community College.

A Comprehensive University provides the citizenry with a series of educational stop-in and stop-out opportunities appropriate to the diversity and reality of their higher educational needs. For example, in the Borough of Manhattan, there are presently four senior colleges and one community college --- the community college, similar to other community colleges would provide Liberal Arts and Career Programs with each major program (e.g., Liberal Arts Program; Career Program) providing access to the senior campus which offers the continuation, that is, baccalaureate level, of that program --- e.g., CCNY: Liberal Arts and Engineering; Baruch: Business Administration; Hunter: Social (Welfare) Sciences, Education, etc. (These are examples and are by no means exhaustive in nature.)

The very important offerings as evident by the special campuses, such as LaGuardia, New York City Community, and Hostos will retain their present identity and uniqueness. Medgar Evers and Brooklyn will relate to Kingsborough Community similar to the above examples.

In reorganizing the University into a consolidated educational model, the specialization of academic offerings supports the uniqueness of each campus and responds to the specific needs of a changing urban population. This model strengthens the articulation among the campuses within the system.

Finally, this comprehensive model can insure that University Standards and quality are consistent throughout guaranteeing, thereby that all CUNY degrees will reflect the same high level of competency.

CITY UNIVERSITY BUDGET  
FOR  
ADMINISTRATIVE CENTRALIZATION

(Amount in thousands)

Senior Colleges	\$ 268,000
Community Colleges	111,000
University Management	10,115
City University Construction Fund	30,643
New York Public Library	978
*SEEK	29,719
*College Discovery	15,856
Other University Programs	<u>9,786</u>
Total	\$ 476,097

**Note:** The above figures represent an 18% reduction in the 1975-76 budget allocations, except those marked with an asterisk(\*).

SAMPLE COLLEGE BUDGETS PER FTE

FOR

## ADMINISTRATIVE CENTRALIZATION

SENIOR COLLEGE

Total Cost		\$	1,709	
Academic Cost	\$ 1,134			
Instructional Support	<u>222</u>		<u>1,356</u>	80%
Administrative Cost		\$	353	20%

COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Total Cost		\$	1,648	
Academic Cost	\$ 967			
Instructional Support	<u>316</u>		<u>1,283</u>	78%
Administrative Cost		\$	365	22%

The motion was seconded by Mr. Williams. The motion to substitute the resolution was lost.

The resolution was put to a vote. Mrs. Quinones asked that the roll be called. The following resolution was adopted:

RESOLVED, That effective September 1, 1976 Staten Island Community College and Richmond College be joined to form a single, federated Institution operating distinct junior division programs funded as a community college and senior division programs funded as a senior college under a single administration; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Chancellor be directed to initiate plans for consolidating the operations of this institution at the physical facilities now occupied by Staten Island Community College.

EXPLANATION: The foregoing resolution is designed to consolidate the operations of the two institutions on Staten Island into a single institution while at the same time preserving the distinct characteristics of the present institutions. It is anticipated that substantial savings will result from the consolidation of the physical facilities and administrative and support services.

Dr. Goldin, Mr. D'Angelo, Mr. Jacobs, Mr. FitzPatrick, Mr. Murphy and Mr. Giardino voted Yes. Mrs. Bird, Mrs. Quinones and Mr. Williams abstained.

**NO. 2. BRONX COMMUNITY COLLEGE AND HOSTOS COMMUNITY COLLEGE:** The resolution was moved and seconded as amended to read in the third RESOLVED, "the consolidated Hostos-Bronx Community College" and to delete in the EXPLANATION the words "to be called Eugenio Maria de Hostos Community College."

Mrs. Bird moved to table the resolution since the details on how the merger would work had not been spelled out. The motion was seconded by Mr. Williams. The motion to table was lost.

The following resolution as amended was adopted:

RESOLVED, That effective September 1, 1976 the Bronx Community College and the Eugenio Maria de Hostos Community College be merged into a single community college; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Allied Health Programs and Bilingual Program now operated by Hostos Community College be retained at Bronx Community College; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the consolidated Hostos-Bronx Community College be authorized to expand the Bilingual Program in response to student demands subject to such limitations as may be imposed from time to time by the Board of Higher Education; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Chancellor be directed to take such measures as may be required to achieve this consolidation.

EXPLANATION: The above resolution is designed to merge Bronx Community College and Hostos Community College into a single institution. The new institution will be located on the site now occupied by Bronx Community College. The merger is designed to reduce expenditures by eliminating what duplication of academic programs may exist and to consolidate administrative and support functions as well as physical facilities. At the same time it is the clear intent that the specialized allied health program and the bilingual program now operated by Hostos Community College be continued as an integral part of the new institution.

Dr. Goldin, Mr. D'Angelo, Mr. Jacobs, Mr. FitzPatrick, Mr. Murphy and Mr. Giardino voted Yes. Mrs. Bird, Mrs. Quinones, and Mr. Williams voted No.

**NO. 3. MEDGAR EVERS:** The resolution was moved and seconded.

Mr. Williams moved an amendment to the resolution which would allow Medgar Evers to continue as a senior college at the present time, subject to reconsideration on the basis of future enrollment patterns at senior colleges throughout the University which will provide a factual basis for determining future demands for senior college enrollment. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Quinones.

Mr. Jacobs spoke of his ties to Medgar Evers ever since its inception and explained the reasons for the way he intended to vote.

The amendment was voted down.

At this point the Board recessed for dinner. Upon its return, because of the temporary absence of Dr. Goldin, the Board decided to discuss Cal. No. 4 before voting on Cal. No. 3.

**NO. 4. JOHN JAY COLLEGE OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE:** Mr. D'Angelo moved an amendment to the resolution. The motion was seconded by Mr. Jacobs. The amendment was adopted as follows:

RESOLVED, That effective September 1, 1976 John Jay College of Criminal Justice will be reorganized and restructured so as to limit its academic focus to the fields of criminal justice and fire science; and be it further

RESOLVED, That programs in criminal justice and related fields now offered by John Jay College of Criminal Justice be continued and majors in liberal arts and sciences be eliminated; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Chancellor be directed to take such measures as may be required to achieve this reorganization.

Mrs. Bird, Mr. D'Angelo, Mr. FitzPatrick, Mr. Giardino, Mr. Jacobs and Mr. Murphy voted Yes. Mr. Williams voted No. Mrs. Quinones abstained.

At this point the Board returned to Cal. No. 3.

**NO. 3. MEDGAR EVERS:** The resolution was put to a vote. Mr. D'Angelo, Mr. FitzPatrick, Mr. Jacobs and Mr. Murphy voted Yes.

At this point Mrs. Quinones moved to table the resolution. Mrs. Bird seconded the motion. The motion was adopted. Mr. Williams and then Mrs. Quinones asked that the motion be reconsidered.

Mr. FitzPatrick moved that the meeting be adjourned. Mr. Jacobs seconded the motion. The motion was lost.

Mr. Murphy moved to table the resolution in view of the continued absence of Dr. Goldin. Mr. Jacobs seconded the motion. The motion was adopted, with Mr. D'Angelo, Mr. FitzPatrick, Mr. Jacobs, Mr. Murphy and Mr. Giardino voting Yes, and Mrs. Bird, Mrs. Quinones and Mr. Williams voting No.

**NO. 5. YORK COLLEGE:** The resolution was moved and seconded. Mrs. Quinones moved to table the resolution. The motion was seconded by Mr. Williams. The motion was lost.

The following resolution was adopted:

RESOLVED, That York College be continued as a senior college at the present time, subject to reconsideration on the basis of future enrollment patterns at senior colleges throughout the University which will provide a factual basis for determining future demands for senior college enrollment.

Mr. D'Angelo, Mr. FitzPatrick, Dr. Goldin, Mr. Jacobs, Mr. Murphy and Mr. Giardino voted Yes. Mrs. Bird, Mrs. Quinones and Mr. Williams abstained.

**NO. 6. ADMISSIONS:** The resolution was moved and seconded.

Mr. Williams moved to eliminate from the third RESOLVED the phrase "by the Board of Education in accordance with terms to be worked out by both Boards." The motion was seconded by Mrs. Quinones.

A further amendment was moved and seconded to add the following:

"and be it further

"RESOLVED, That the above resolution supersedes the resolution adopted by the Board on December 15, 1975, Cal. No. 6."

The amendments were adopted, with Mr. D'Angelo, Mr. FitzPatrick, Mr. Jacobs, Mr. Murphy, Mrs. Quinones and Mr. Williams voting Yes, Mr. Giardino and Dr. Goldin voting No, and Mrs. Bird abstaining.

The following resolution as amended was adopted:

RESOLVED, That effective with the entering freshman class in the Fall of 1976, the minimum requirements for admission to senior colleges of the University will be a high school admissions average of 80% or better, or a rank in class at the 66th or higher percentile or evidence of comparable achievement acceptable to the Chancellor on the basis of Scholastic Aptitude Tests; and be it further

RESOLVED, That for admission to one of the community colleges of the University, the minimum requirement shall be a college admissions average of 70% or better, or a rank in class at the 26th or higher percentile or by evidence of proficiency in basic skills acceptable to the Chancellor on the basis of a test administered by the University or by the presentation of an acceptable score on the GED examination; and be it further

RESOLVED, That applicants who do not meet the minimum requirements for admission to a senior college or community college shall be offered conditional admission to a transitional program to be operated under the supervision of the Board of Higher Education. Such students shall be offered instruction designed to improve their level of mathematical and language proficiency and shall be offered the opportunity to sit for a proficiency examination on a regularly scheduled basis; and be it further

RESOLVED, That applicants to the senior colleges who are admitted to SEEK and applicants to the community colleges who are admitted to College Discovery shall be admitted without reference to the criteria outlined above; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the above resolution supersedes the resolution adopted by the Board on December 15, 1975, Cal. No. 6.

Mr. D'Angelo, Mr. FitzPatrick, Mr. Jacobs, Mr. Murphy, Mrs. Quinones and Mr. Williams voted Yes. Mr. Giardino voted No. Mrs. Bird and Dr. Goldin abstained.

At this point Dr. Goldin moved that Cal. No. 3 be removed from the table. The motion was seconded by Mr. Jacobs. The motion was adopted, with Mrs. Bird, Mr. D'Angelo, Mr. FitzPatrick, Mr. Giardino, Dr. Goldin, Mr. Jacobs, Mr. Murphy and Mrs. Quinones voting Yes, and Mr. Williams voting No.

**NO. 3. MEDGAR EVERS:** Upon motions duly made, seconded and carried, the following resolution was adopted:

RESOLVED, That effective September 1, 1976 the name of Medgar Evers College be changed to Medgar Evers Community College; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the current authorization of Medgar Evers College to offer Baccalaureate Degree Programs be terminated effective June, 1978; and be it further

RESOLVED, That Medgar Evers Community College be authorized to offer a four year Baccalaureate Program in Nursing and that the number of students enrolling annually in the third year of the program be limited to 125.

EXPLANATION: The intent of the resolution is to convert Medgar Evers College from its current status as a senior college to a community college. Because of location of the institution and the special nature of the Nursing Program, specific authorization will be requested to present the offering of the Baccalaureate Degree in Nursing at Medgar Evers Community College. Upper division students now in attendance at Medgar Evers College will be offered the option of transferring to the senior college at another institution or complete the degree at Medgar Evers provided that completion is accomplished by June 1978.

Mr. D'Angelo, Mr. FitzPatrick, Dr. Goldin, Mr. Jacobs, Mr. Murphy and Mr. Giardino voted Yes. Mrs. Bird, Mrs. Quinones and Mr. Williams voted No.

At this point the Chairman called for another vote on Cal. No. 4 as amended since there seemed to be some question as to whether the previous vote was on the amendment which was adopted or on the main resolution as amended.

**NO. 4. JOHN JAY COLLEGE OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE:** Upon motions duly made, seconded and carried, the following resolution was adopted:

RESOLVED, That effective September 1, 1976 John Jay College of Criminal Justice will be reorganized and restructured so as to limit its academic focus to the fields of criminal justice and fire science; and be it further

RESOLVED, That programs in criminal justice and related fields now offered by John Jay College of Criminal Justice be continued and majors in liberal arts and sciences be eliminated; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Chancellor be directed to take such measures as may be required to achieve this reorganization.

Mrs. Bird, Mr. D'Angelo, Mr. FitzPatrick, Dr. Goldin, Mr. Jacobs, Mr. Murphy and Mr. Giardino voted Yes. Mr. Williams voted No. Mrs. Quinones abstained.

**NO. 7. STUDENT RETENTION PROGRESS:** Upon motions duly made, seconded and carried, the following resolution was adopted:

RESOLVED, That the grade of "incomplete" or its equivalent shall be awarded only when the course requirement has not been completed for good and sufficient reasons and where there is reasonable expectation that the student can in fact successfully complete the requirements of the course; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the grade of (W), withdrawal without penalty, be awarded only when it is clear that the student has good and sufficient reasons for withdrawing from the course and is doing so at a time when he or she is doing passing work in the course; and be it further

RESOLVED, That no-credit grades, (F), failing grades, withdrawal grades and their equivalents be incorporated in student's cumulative average for the purpose of determining academic standing and satisfactory progress towards a degree; and be it further

RESOLVED, That satisfactory progress toward a degree shall be defined as the satisfactory completion of:

1. At least one-half of the first four (4) courses or twelve (12) credits attempted.
2. At least two-thirds of the first eight (8) courses or twenty-four (24) credits attempted.
3. At least three-quarters of the first twelve (12) courses or thirty-six (36) credits attempted.
4. At least three-quarters of all courses attempted in any subsequent semester and cumulatively by the end of each subsequent semester;

and be it further

RESOLVED, That each student will be expected to maintain a grade point average of at least 1.50 for the first four (4) courses or twelve (12) credits attempted and at least a 1.75 grade point average for the first eight (8) courses or twenty-four (24) credits attempted. In each subsequent semester students will be expected to maintain at least a 2.00 grade point average; and be it further

RESOLVED, That students who fail to achieve these standards will be placed on probation for one semester and if unable to correct their deficiencies during that semester will be dropped from the University. The normal academic appeals procedure of each college will continue to consider individual cases and to make such exceptions to the implementation of these guidelines as unusual circumstances may warrant; and be it further

RESOLVED, That students who are dropped from the University for academic reasons may apply for readmission after one semester and be subject to normal faculty decisions; and be it further

RESOLVED, That students moving to the upper divisions of a four-year college either from the lower divisions of the college or from a community college within the University system or outside of it must provide evidence, in accordance with a standard to be determined by the Chancellor, that they have attained a level of proficiency in basic learning skills necessary to cope successfully with advanced work in the academic disciplines.

EXPLANATION: Foregoing resolutions are intended to maximize the instructional resources of the University. With the inception of the Open Admissions Program, the University and its faculty have liberalized the grading process so as to maximize opportunities for students. In the process, the grading system has been abused to the extent that very little incentive has been provided the student where he or she is doing less than average work. The intent of these resolutions is to have students' transcripts accurately reflect their performance and to maximize the available instructional resources.

**Mr. D'Angelo, Mr. FitzPatrick, Dr. Goldin, Mr. Jacobs, Mr. Murphy and Mr. Giardino voted Yes. Mrs. Bird, Mrs. Quinones and Mr. Williams abstained.**

**NO. 8. CONSOLIDATION OF PROGRAMS:** Dr. Goldin moved an amendment to the resolution, deleting from the first RESOLVED the phrase "in which duplication exist to an extent" so that it would read "those areas which are not justified by" etc., and deleting from the second RESOLVED the phrase "represent duplication within the University and." The motion to amend was seconded by Mr. FitzPatrick. The amendment was adopted, with Mr. D'Angelo, Mr. FitzPatrick, Dr. Goldin, Mr. Jacobs, Mr. Murphy and Mr. Giardino voting Yes, and Mrs. Bird, Mrs. Quinones and Mr. Williams abstaining.

The following resolution as amended was adopted:

RESOLVED, That the Chancellor be directed and authorized to review all program offerings within the University: doctoral, masters, baccalaureate, and associate degree levels, and to determine those areas which are not justified by student demand, enrollment, and quality, geographic distribution or other relevant academic or fiscal criteria; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Board direct the Chancellor to recommend to it the elimination of programs that are not demonstrably necessary as measured by the criteria outlined above.

EXPLANATION: The above resolution is intended to direct and authorize the Chancellor to accomplish a consolidation of program offerings within the University which will maintain the diversity of the City University's offerings but at the same time eliminate weak duplicate programs. It is the Board's intent and desire to provide the widest range of options to its students. At the same time the Board does not believe it is necessary to offer all of its programs at all of its units at all of its locations. The Board believes that student motivation will be sufficient to cause students to gravitate to the locations of program offerings.

Mr. D'Angelo, Mr. FitzPatrick, Dr. Goldin, Mr. Jacobs, Mr. Murphy and Mr. Giardino voted Yes. Mrs. Bird, Mrs. Quinones and Mr. Williams abstained.

**NO. 9. ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT SERVICES:** Upon motions duly made, seconded and carried, the following resolution was adopted:

RESOLVED, That the Board now limit the portion of the Personnel Budget devoted to administrative and instructional support services to the following guidelines: for institutions with 18,000 students (headcount) or more, that portion of the Personnel Budget utilized for administrative and instructional support shall not exceed 19%; for institutions with enrollment of 12,000 to 18,000, appropriate percentage shall be 21%; for institutions with students numbering from 6,000 to 12,000, the percentage shall be 23% and for institutions with less than 6,000 students, the percentage shall be 25%; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Board direct the Chancellor to develop guidelines, procedures and mechanisms for insuring that the several colleges of the University adhere to the above maxima and if he deems that exceptions are warranted, to make appropriate recommendations to the Board.

EXPLANATION: The Board believes that some limitation can even be placed on the amount college budgets expend for administrative and support services. After studying a review of the existing college operations, the Board believes that the above limitations are reasonable and will provide restraints within which institutional administrators can reasonably function.

Mr. D'Angelo, Mr. FitzPatrick, Dr. Goldin, Mr. Jacobs, Mr. Murphy and Mr. Giardino voted Yes. Mrs. Quinones voted No. Mrs. Bird and Mr. Williams abstained.

**NO. 10. ACADEMIC CALENDAR:** The resolution was moved and seconded. Mr. Murphy moved to amend the resolution to indicate that students, as well as faculty and the Presidents, are to be consulted. Mrs. Quinones seconded the motion. The amendment was adopted, with Mrs. Bird, Mr. D'Angelo, Mr. FitzPatrick, Mr. Jacobs, Mr. Murphy, Mrs. Quinones, Mr. Williams, and Mr. Giardino voting Yes, and Dr. Goldin voting No.

The following resolution as amended was adopted:

RESOLVED, That the Board direct the Chancellor to implement a modified calendar system utilizing the trimester basis, in those institutions of the University which he determines can handle adequately the administrative problems entailed by an immediate and rapid conversion to a new calendar system; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the precise form of the revised calendar should be determined by the Chancellor after consultation with the faculty, the Presidents and the students; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Board direct the Chancellor to implement the trimester calendar throughout the system by September 1, 1977 subject to such exceptions as the Chancellor determines to be academically justified.

EXPLANATION: The Board believes that there are substantial economies that might be gained from the implementation of the trimester calendar system in the City University. On the other hand, the Board recognizes that implementation of such a major calendar change in an institution of this size would produce very serious administrative problems and, therefore, believes that the implementation should be phased into the University on a cautious but relatively speedy basis.

Mr. D'Angelo, Mr. FitzPatrick, Mr. Jacobs, Mr. Murphy, Mr. Williams and Mr. Giardino voted Yes. Dr. Goldin voted No. Mrs. Bird and Mrs. Quinones abstained.

**NO. 11. CONSOLIDATION AND REVIEW:** Upon motions duly made, seconded and carried, the following resolution was adopted:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Higher Education direct the Chancellor and his staff to continue to examine the operations of the University at its various colleges, to identify any and all operations, procedures and policies which can be consolidated in order to perform more efficiently at all the colleges.

Mr. D'Angelo, Mr. FitzPatrick, Dr. Goldin, Mr. Jacobs, Mr. Murphy, Mr. Williams and Mr. Giardino voted Yes. Mrs. Bird and Mrs. Quinones abstained.

**NO. 12. IMPLEMENTATION:** The resolution was moved, seconded and failed to secure a majority, with Mr. D'Angelo, Mr. FitzPatrick, Mr. Giardino and Mr. Jacobs voting Yes and Mrs. Bird, Dr. Goldin, Mr. Murphy, Mrs. Quinones and Mr. Williams abstaining.

Dr. Goldin made the following statement:

I had indicated earlier today that I would participate in the vote on the proposals before this Board, fully aware of the fact, as I have stated frequently, that the plan that is before us, though it may be academically sound is fiscally unsound. I recognize that the fiscal crisis compels this Board to institute immediately a process of institutional change. However, I still await from the Chancellor a specific plan to close the gap between the projected costs and anticipated funding levels. Until I receive that plan from the Chancellor, I cannot vote on No. 12.

Mrs. Bird indicated for the record that insofar as she finds the whole plan unacceptable, she could not vote for any of the items in it.

Mr. Giardino read the following statement presenting his views on the funding problems of the University and his proposals for future funding from the State and the City:

What we have presently adopted relates to the academic restructuring and consolidation of the University. That provides the academic part of the answer for planning the future of City University.

However, rational planning also requires reasonably firm knowledge of the budget within which the University must work. Regrettably, the last year has seen unprecedented sudden and sharply fluctuating budget cuts imposed upon the University. The need is for the development of future funding plans by the City and State which would provide for an orderly increase of State funding to the level now given to the senior colleges and for a long-range objective toward a single funding formula to permit educational and financial efficiency and flexibility.

The dilemma faced by the Board is that we do not know the nature of the budget that may be available to us in the future. Negotiations are now taking place between the City and the State with respect to the share of higher education costs that each should provide. As The New York Times recently put it, the University has been asked to restructure under conditions "like rebuilding a house in total darkness, without any indication of the building materials available for the task."

Our joint obligation is to see to it that the historic imbalance between State and City funding of the University is righted. The State now funds the City University community colleges on exactly the same basis that it funds the State University community colleges. In the senior colleges, however, for every one dollar the State spends on a City University student, it spends three on a State University student. A City University four-year college received 44.4% of its budget from the State last year. That same year, a State University senior college received 87.3% of its budget from the State.

Every major study made in recent years, such as the Wagner Commission, the Governor's own "Task Force" on higher education and the Task Force of the State's Board of Regents have urged increased State funding of public higher education so that all citizens of the State receive their fair share of the educational tax dollar. We urge upon the Governor and the State Legislature to respond affirmatively to the voices of these good citizens.

Our Board recognizes the practical problems of accomplishing a shift in the funding relationship in a short period of time. However, the need is to set a fair and reasonable goal or relationship for the future funding of City University's four-year colleges. We believe that eventually it should approximate the following fiscal relationship or ranges:

75% - 80% direct State funding  
10% - 15% income from fees  
10% - 15% direct City funding

Some direct City funding is necessary for a variety of reasons. It clearly preserves the City University as an articulated entity, stretching from its nine community colleges through seven University colleges with their varied professional and liberal arts degree programs, up to its graduate school and allied medical school. It guarantees that the City have both voice and vote in determining the University's service to it and its people. Finally, it would keep alive the dream and reality of free public higher education, of opportunity and promise for talented citizens of all ages, colors and conditions, which for over a century and a quarter has distinguished this City.

#### PROPOSAL FOR FUTURE FUNDING

(1) During the transition period we urge that

1. The City commit itself to make available to the University for 1976-77 the amount presently set forth and approved in its current three-year fiscal plan, namely, \$211.7 million.

2. The State commit itself to provide a constant level of financial support approximately 5% less than the amount adopted by the State for the current school year, 1975-76, namely, \$280.7 million as opposed to \$293.3 million which was provided in the budget adopted by the Legislature.

Projected figures for 1976-77 indicate a reduction of almost \$124 million for that year from the last normal budget figure of \$679.2 million which was adopted by the State Legislature in March 1975. That reduction has been achieved through increased faculty productivity, higher student fees, other economies, and the restructuring plan above described. This is a gross reduction in spending of 18.2% from July 1, 1975 to July 1, 1976 -- a startlingly rapid decrease in a period of rising costs. This lower spending rate declines further during the following year -- inflationary trends notwithstanding. This would permit an orderly and gradual increase in the percentage of State funding and would move toward increased State responsibility for higher education.

The level of support proposed here for higher education in New York City would provide a condition of stability, albeit in austerity, that would permit the University to carry out its educational mission and maintain its academic quality.

It must be recognized that although tuition is frequently proposed as a solution, it is not in fact a solution to the University's fiscal problems. To the extent that the University might require additional funds, over and above the amounts indicated, it would be appropriate for the Board to consider means of generating income from within the University whether in the form of fees or tuition, or in other ways. However, absent firm commitments from the State and City as to their levels of support, additional income, however it is generated, has no meaning as part of the total funding of the University.

Beyond the purely fiscal considerations, the so-called "free tuition" policy raises important social and political issues that must be considered. These are matters of public policy, originally instituted through political processes. If they are to be reconsidered, they should again be addressed by the people or their elected representatives. (Tuition is now paid by 36,000 undergraduate non-matriculated students at \$25 per credit (community colleges) or \$30 per credit (senior colleges), 27,000 Master and doctoral students at rates higher than at State University, and 27,000 adult and non-resident matriculated students. All "free tuition" matriculated students pay fees of up to \$110 plus obligatory student fees.)

**Mr. Williams, in addressing the Chairman of the Board, said:**

Let me personally endorse every word in your statement and subscribe to it fully. Now, let me address myself to you personally for a moment.

For two years and three months I, even as you and others, have served on this Board as a public service and have done my best to assist you. There have been many times when we have disagreed but if during such disagreements any of my comments seemed to have been personalized, it was not so intended. I have attempted over these past two years and three months to preserve the City University as I have understood its mission to be, and that understanding, unfortunately, differs from that of a majority of my colleagues.

The actions we have taken tonight, the impact of those actions is going to be felt disproportionately by those people of this City who are least able to resist, to fight back, and who most need academic opportunities. They happen to be the Black, Puerto Rican, and poor residents of New York. I suggest that the next thing that will occur, whether initiated by this Board or elsewhere, will be the imposition of the additional burden of tuition.

Let me express my personal respect to you for the manner in which you have carried your heavy responsibility. This has been a difficult time for you. I have shared in this Board at all times with a commitment to getting the job done. I believe, however, that it is necessary now, in view of the actions that we have taken this evening that I be true to my conscience as well. In expressing my deep respect to all of you, I submit my resignation to you and I shall submit it to the Governor tomorrow.

**Mr. Giardino expressed regret at Mr. William's decision and stated that Mr. Williams had been a tower of strength in helping to meet the problems of the University and in having accepted chairmanship of many important committees.**

**Mr. D'Angelo expressed regret at Mr. Williams' resignation and then read the following statement:**

We have now taken an important step in the process of restructuring the University in the light of the financial crisis affecting our chief funding sources, the State and the City of New York.

The resolutions we have adopted are responsible actions which will permit the retention of open access for all immediate high school graduates and returning veterans in accordance with the Full Opportunity Program provisions of the State Education Law. The consolidations we have voted will unfortunately result in short-term dislocations, but they are required for the long-term health and stability of this University.

## Board of Higher Education

We need take no pleasure in these measures. They do hurt. As time goes on we may find ways to soften this hurt. Any cutbacks performed under pressure must hurt. But surgery had to be performed. But these measures are only a beginning to the solution of our problem.

What we have yet to identify are the financial implications of our actions today not only for the coming year but for several years to come.

Our chairman has circulated an analysis of future funding patterns which would maintain the current policy of free tuition for matriculated undergraduate students. This is a noble objective. I also, believe in free tuition. But I don't believe that this fiscal formulation will be given serious consideration by the State and the City. Without a tuition policy comparable to that in the State University system, there would be required, under the academic program we voted today, more than 76 million dollars of additional State and City appropriations beyond the levels now provided for the coming year in the State budget and in the City's modified financial plan. There are no such funds available and we all know it.

Some of my colleagues believe that to solve this problem and to fill a part of this gap, the elected officials of our State and City should themselves make the decision to impose undergraduate tuition. As I have pointed out on several occasions, the State legislature has already specifically delegated that power to this Board as did the City of New York in 1975, when it reduced its tax-levy appropriations to the University "in lieu of tuition." I believe the failure of this Board to submit to the appropriate State and City officials an alternative financial plan which realistically recognizes the fiscal circumstances will not only cause this Board to lose whatever credibility it now retains as the guardians and trustees of this institution, but will further tragically jeopardize the opportunity for student access and the quality of our programs.

Mr. Chairman, I do not raise the subject of tuition lightly. I have raised the question before, and always with a heavy heart. But in the absence of massive infusions of State and City funds I, as one member of this Board, believe we must present this alternative to the City and to the State. And if we opt for tuition, I certainly would do everything within my power, Mr. Chairman, to see that additional funds are appropriated by the State to the Tuition Assistance Program so that deserving students are not excluded from our institutions for lack of financial resources.

We must, in any event, amend our budget request to the City and the State to reflect the restructuring actions which we have taken today. Not to do so would be irresponsible on our part.

Mr. Chairman, I move that this Board transmit immediately to the appropriate officials of the State and City government two analyses of the financial implications of our restructuring plan -- one which maintains our current tuition policy and one which extends tuition to all students.

I also move, Mr. Chairman, to ask you to appoint an ad hoc committee of this Board and the Chancellor to stand ready to meet this week with City and State officials to negotiate an acceptable funding pattern for the coming year. The time for action is now.

Mr. Jones called attention to the fact that since this was a special meeting, consideration was limited to the items on the agenda. He pointed out that since these items were not on the agenda, the motion was out of order. Ms. Bass, the General Counsel and Vice-Chancellor for Legal Affairs, suggested that the bylaws could be waived. A motion was made and seconded that the bylaws be waived. The motion failed to secure six votes.

Mrs. Quinones asked to go on record as follows:

I would like it to be clearly understood and I would like to go on record as opposing all mergers, all reductions of any college from a senior college to a junior college or community college, and I take strong exception at the way the business tonight was conducted. There are many alternatives, but I will not be specific. I think this plan is not fiscally sound. You have not come up with any plan to meet the gap. I think its impact is unduly harsh on those who can least afford it. I think the Board has done a terrible disservice to the City.

Mrs. Bird presented her views as follows:

Because this Board has elected to specifically eliminate those programs that serve the special needs of the City's minorities and poor, because it has elected to take this action now, knowing that free tuition, the last stronghold of education for the disadvantaged, will be eliminated in the near future, because it has elected to slap the City's Hispanic, Black and poor in the face, I condemn these actions as racist, irrational and irresponsible.

Mr. Jones read a resolution passed at a meeting of the University Student Senate Steering Committee during the dinner recess, which called for a University-wide shutdown in response to the passage of the restructuring resolutions.

Mr. Murphy made the following statement:

I personally have regretted many of the actions that I have supported this evening, and I have done all of these things for one reason. I feel that these actions are necessary to preserve the City University as an institution essential for the present and future needs of this City. When you consider the alternative, I think that the things that we have done tonight are understandable. The alternative is a University out of control because its public trustees have not made every reasonable effort, and perhaps gone above and beyond the call of duty, to keep a difficult situation under control.

This is by no means the last chapter in the saga that has been evolving with respect to the University over the past fifteen months. With a great deal of pain and anxiety we have shown the State and City authorities who are the funding agencies for this University that we have the courage to make the decisions affecting the underlying policies and structure of this University. I would hope that in the days and weeks ahead, the State and City authorities take due notice of what we have done here tonight and that they will see their way to providing the funding necessary to enable this University to get through the next fiscal year and the years beyond that. This has been a very difficult year.

I regret that the Vice-Chairman isn't here now. I hope he will reconsider his resignation and that the Governor will lose that piece of paper (his resignation) for an indefinite period of time. There is still important work to be done.

Upon motions duly made, seconded and carried, the meeting was adjourned at 1:25 a.m.

ETTA G. GRASS  
Acting Secretary of the Board