

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE BOARD OF
TRUSTEES OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK**

HELD

JANUARY 30, 1984

AT THE BOARD HEADQUARTERS BUILDING

535 EAST 80TH STREET – BOROUGH OF MANHATTAN

The Chairperson called the meeting to order at 4:40 P.M.

There were present:

James P. Murphy, Chairperson

**Paul P. Baard
Sylvia Bloom
Armand D'Angelo
Harold M. Jacobs
Albert V. Maniscalco**

**Robert L. Polk
Joaquin Rivera
Margaret Titone
Brenda Farrow White**

Henry Wasser, ex officio

Melvin E. Lowe, ex officio

Martin J. Warmbrand, Secretary of the Board

David B. Rigney, General Counsel and Vice Chancellor for Legal Affairs

**Chancellor Joseph S. Murphy
Deputy Chancellor Houston G. Elam
President Milton G. Bassin
President Roscoe C. Brown, Jr.
President Saul B. Cohen
President Flora Mancuso Edwards
President Leon M. Goldstein
President Bernard W. Harleston
President Robert L. Hess
President Leonard Lief
President Gerald W. Lynch
Acting President Denis F. Paul
President Harold M. Proshansky
President Kurt R. Schmeller**

**President Ursula Schwerin
President Joel Segall
President Donna E. Shalala
President Joseph Shenker
President Joshua L. Smith
President Edmond L. Volpe
Senior Vice Chancellor Julius C.C. Edelstein
Vice Chancellor Marguerite Ross Barnett
Vice Chancellor Margaret L.W. Boepple
Acting Vice Chancellor Leo A. Corbie
Vice Chancellor Donal E. Farley
Vice Chancellor Ira H. Fuchs
Vice Chancellor Jerald Posman
Etta G. Grass, Assistant Secretary of the Board**

The absence of Mrs. Everett, Dr. Bernstein, Mr. Cavanagh, Mr. Gribetz, and Dr. Kolodny was excused.

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

A. NEW BOARD MEMBER: The Chairperson introduced and welcomed Mrs. Brenda Farrow White as a new member of the Board of Trustees, appointed and confirmed for a term ending June 30, 1990. He extended best wishes for her activities on the Board and stated that the Board looked forward to working with her.

B. EX OFFICIO MEMBER OF THE BOARD: The Chairperson reported that on January 22 the University Student Senate had unanimously reelected Melvin E. Lowe as its Chairperson. He congratulated Mr. Lowe and welcomed him back as the student ex officio member of the Board.

C. CONDOLENCES: On behalf of the Board, the Chairperson extended condolences to Mr. and Mrs. Maniscalco on the death of Mrs. Maniscalco's brother.

D. DEDICATION OF NEW HUNTER BUILDINGS: The Chairperson reported that the dedication of the new Hunter buildings was a very great success. It was attended by over 3,000 people at the various celebrations and activities. Among those present were Mayor Koch, Assemblyman Mark Alan Siegel, Dr. Polk, the Chancellor and others from the Board and Administration. It was an inspiring event and a wonderful day.

E. GRANTS: The Chairperson reported the receipt of the following grants:

(1) **THE CITY COLLEGE:** Professor Robert Alfano of The City College has received \$158,000 as a renewal of an existing grant from the Air Force Office of Scientific Research for a project entitled: Semiconductors Investigated by Time Resolved Raman, Absorption and Photoluminescence Spectroscopy Using Femtosecond and Picosecond Laser Techniques.

(2) **QUEENS COLLEGE:** Professor John Lidstone of Queens College has received a grant of \$154,000 from the National Endowment for the Humanities for a project entitled: Folklore, Literacy and Critical Thinking: A Humanities Curriculum for Elementary and Middle School Teachers.

(3) **THE CITY UNIVERSITY:** The University has received a grant of \$70,000 from the Ford Foundation to support the development of a system-wide course equivalency guide to promote transfer from community to four-year colleges. The grant will be administered by the Office of Academic Affairs.

F. NEW YORK CITY TECHNICAL COLLEGE -- STUDENT ACHIEVEMENTS: The Chairperson reported that for the seventh consecutive time, 100% of the students in the Department of Radiologic Technology at New York City Technical College passed the examination administered by the American Registry of Radiologic Technologists. Twenty-six took the examination in October, 1983. The Chairperson congratulated President Schwerin on this achievement.

G. WESTINGHOUSE SCIENCE TALENT SEARCH: The Chairperson reported that Steven J. Frucht, a student at Hunter College High School, is one of forty high school seniors who were named national winners in the 43rd annual Westinghouse Science Talent Search. The Chairperson extended congratulations to President Shalala.

H. HONORARY DEGREES FROM STATE UNIVERSITY: Professor Henry Wasser reported that three City University faculty members will be receiving honorary degrees from State University:

Abraham Briloff, Baruch College, from SUNY Binghamton
Henri Peyre, Graduate School (Emeritus), from SUNY Stonybrook
Arthur Schlesinger, Graduate School, from SUNY Albany

Upon motions duly made, seconded and carried, the following resolutions were adopted or action was taken as noted: (Cal. Nos. 1 through 9)

NO. 1. UNIVERSITY REPORT: RESOLVED, That the University Report for January 30, 1984 (including Addendum Items) be approved as revised as follows:

(a) PART D – ADDENDUM: Add the following:

D.4. DESIGNATION OF ACTING VICE-CHANCELLOR FOR FACULTY AND STAFF RELATIONS: RESOLVED, That Ira Bloom be designated Acting Vice-Chancellor for Faculty and Staff Relations, effective January 31, 1984, at the salary level of \$63,191 per annum, subject to financial ability.

D.5. THE CENTRAL OFFICE – ADMINISTRATIVE DESIGNATION:

DEPARTMENT AND TITLE	NAME	EFFECTIVE	ANNUAL SUPPLEMENT
Academic Affairs Acting Dean (Acting Dean for Academic Affairs: Adult and Continuing Education)	Augusta Kappner(11)	2/1/84	\$9,435/A
Academic Affairs Acting Associate Dean (Acting Associate Dean of Academic Affairs: Faculty and Research)	Richard Barsam(11)	2/1/84	7,413/A

(b) ITEM BI 19.7. PROMOTION (MEDGAR EVERS COLLEGE): Delete entries for Dominic Nwasike and Clinton Harrell.

(c) Items listed in PART E – ERRATA, to be withdrawn or changed as indicated.

EXPLANATION: The University Report consists of annual instructional appointments at a salary of \$15,000 and above and other resolutions of a non-policy nature which require approval by the Board of Trustees.

NO. 2. CHANCELLOR'S REPORT: RESOLVED, That the Chancellor's Report for January 30, 1984 (including Addendum Items) be approved as revised as follows:

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

EXPLANATION: The Chancellor's Report consists of standard resolutions and actions of a non-policy nature which require approval by the Board of Trustees.

NO. 2X. ORAL REPORT OF THE CHANCELLOR: The Chancellor presented the following report on matters of Board and University interest:

(a) On behalf of the Presidents and the Administration, the Chancellor added congratulations to Mrs. White on her appointment as the newest member of the Board of Trustees of The City University, and to Melvin Lowe and the University Student Senate Steering Committee on their recent reelection by acclamation.

(b) The Chancellor reported that legislative hearings on the State Budget will take place in mid-February, and the University is preparing for this event. During the course of the past week, the University made a presentation

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

before the City Council Education Committee and was warmly received by the Council.

(c) The Chancellor announced that during the course of the coming month the Board would host a reception for Chancellor Alvarado.

(d) The Chancellor called attention to the designation of Ira Bloom as Acting Vice-Chancellor for Faculty and Staff Relations and offered a resolution of appreciation of the services of Vice-Chancellor Richard M. Catalano.

Upon motions duly made, seconded and carried, the following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, Mr. Richard M. Catalano joined the staff of The City University of New York on July 15, 1976 and served as Secretary of the Board of Trustees until June 30, 1978; and

WHEREAS, From that time, he has served with distinction as Vice-Chancellor for Faculty and Staff Relations; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Catalano has been appointed Vice-President for Labor Relations at the University of California; therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Trustees extends its appreciation to Richard M. Catalano for his devoted service to The City University of New York, and conveys its best wishes for productive and successful years with the University of California System; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Secretary be instructed to transmit a true copy of this resolution to Mr. Catalano.

NO. 2Y. VISIT TO MOUNT SINAI MEDICAL CENTER: The Chancellor announced that on Wednesday, February 8, at 4 P.M., the members of the Board of Trustees are invited to attend a reception and a two-hour presentation at Mount Sinai of the various programs of medicine that are being conducted there.

NO. 2Z. STATEMENT BY THE CHANCELLOR TO THE BOARD: The Chancellor made the following statement for the record:

Now and then we ought to say what we are about as a University: to restate our purposes, especially when our attention is drawn to discussions about the politics of the budget and away from why there is a budget, or even a University in the first instance.

We exist as a University to create and disseminate knowledge and culture. Not much different, in those respects, from a thousand other institutions of higher learning in America.

Our special, additional and distinguishing characteristic is that those to whom we have a particular responsibility, defined in law, history and tradition, are the people of the City of New York.

And largely, though not exclusively, the people of this City who historically have used public institutions in contrast to private ones, have been the poor, the working class, the new or recent immigrants and migrants to this town.

The affluent don't use or need to use subways, buses, public hospitals, public schools, public service agencies or public universities. This City has tried, with varying degrees of success, to keep the gap between the quality of services available to the affluent and that available to the rest from getting out of hand. When the City couldn't manage to do that any longer the State became a major sponsor of our University. All this is well known. What is

less apparent relates to differences in values and perceptions, differences grounded in the historic division between cities and the land around them.

For us, the crucial difference in values deals with tuition. In The City University, tuition is a recent novelty whose imposition came late and painfully and at the cost of substantial erosion of numbers of students and institutional disruption. Many thought then, correctly as it turns out, that once tuition was imposed, it would prove to be an irresistible source of revenue — user fees being apparently more tolerable than broad-based taxes. What is at stake is a national as well as local decision to compensate for the failure of the graduated income tax by privatizing our institutions, making them more dependent upon the ability of their constituents to pay for services rendered.

Though this trend goes beyond decisions made in Albany or New York or Sacramento, it is nevertheless in our State capital where our case has to be made. Obviously, our goal will be to resist any increase such as the one currently proposed, with as much energy and determination as we can muster. Secondly, we must not allow the University to tear itself apart internally through competing interests. It has been suggested that the restoration of eroded faculty resources, tuition increases and potential budget cuts are all related to each other and are explicitly designed to split the University into competing factions. This "Devil's Brew Scenario" is not helpful; nor do I believe it to be true. Student interests and faculty interests are one and the same.

Additional faculty lines have one purpose: the intellectual and academic advancement of our students.

Avoiding tuition increases has one purpose: increasing the number of people of our town who can go to college and remain there for as long as they can profit from it.

Faculty salary increases have one purpose: to provide students with teachers and scholars who will provide the kind of quality education our students struggle and strive for.

Avoiding budget cuts has one purpose: to maintain and enhance the opportunities available for the people of the City of New York.

We must not succumb to the false belief that we can only get what we want if some other constituency of the University gives up what it justly believes it has a claim to.

Withal, fairness requires that we acknowledge that this is an intelligent and complex budget which tries to be responsive to pressures we ourselves have generated.

Virtually all of our capital recommendations have been approved by the State. New resources for the engineering school have been proposed. Aid for part-time students has received support and some support for child-care facilities will be forthcoming. Furthermore, budget flexibility has been recommended, which we are carefully reviewing.

Now the University, after examining the intricacies and complexities of the budget during this 30 day period, must turn its attention to the next phase. Whatever success we may meet will come about only because we have made an intelligent, coherent and persuasive case in an orderly, firm and unified way. And if we need to remind ourselves as to what it's all about, no more compelling image exists than the 137 year history of the hope, sacrifice, courage and determination of our students.

NO. 22A. PROPOSED TUITION INCREASE: Mr. D'Angelo, chairperson of the Committee on Fiscal Affairs, stated that the budget as proposed by the State is unacceptable to the Committee on Fiscal Affairs. There are three or four issues that need clarification. But the main reason is that the members of the Fiscal Affairs

Committee asked the Committee chairperson to express their opinion that the increase in tuition is totally unacceptable under any circumstances and that that Board should do everything possible to fight this kind of situation. Mr. D'Angelo left to the discretion of the Chairperson the decision as to whether or not Board action on this is required and was assured that it was not. The Chairperson stated that the sentiment of the Board is clear, and the point will be conveyed appropriately.

Mr. Baard stated that often at the last moment the Board is asked to vote for a tuition increase or have the University suffer severe financial consequences, and he is prepared to vote NO on a tuition increase. The result of raising tuition is the likely loss of marginal students who, in the face of yet another substantial increase, have their motivation to continue undermined. The University ends up losing a disproportionate amount of the socio-economically disadvantaged, the very group it is commissioned to serve.

Mr. Lowe echoed the feeling of the Trustees who expressed opposition to a tuition increase and stated that the University Student Senate has passed a resolution to this effect and hoped that the Board would do likewise.

Mr. D'Angelo called attention to a misconception of tuition since in addition to the basic tuition charge, a student must pay laboratory and student activity fees, purchase books, pay for transportation, etc. The families of workers cannot afford another tuition increase.

NO. 3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: RESOLVED, That the minutes of the special Board meeting of December 19, 1983 and of the regular Board meeting of December 19, 1983 be approved as circulated.

NO. 4. COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY, PROGRAM, AND RESEARCH: RESOLVED, That the following item be approved:

A. POLICY GUIDELINES FOR RESEARCH INSTITUTES AND CENTERS AT THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK:

RESOLVED, That the following Guidelines for Research Institutes and Centers at The City University of New York be adopted:

I. POLICY GOVERNING PERSONNEL PRACTICES – CENTERS AND INSTITUTES (Continuation of existing policy): Academic tenure at The City University shall be granted in the academic departments, not in centers or institutes. Although neither faculty nor professional staff would be eligible for tenure or its contractual equivalent (CCE) in a center or institute, work in a center or institute should be given appropriate significance in tenure decisions for faculty. Decisions affecting the granting of certificates of continuous employment or other forms of the administrative equivalent of tenure may take into account service rendered to a center or institute but shall not be awarded on the basis of that service alone.

II. RECOMMENDED POLICIES RELATING TO CENTERS:

1. DEFINITION: A center is an organized research unit of a college of The City University of New York. Centers are intended to sponsor, coordinate, and promote the research of faculty and students at a specific campus of the University, thereby fulfilling local campus needs in the area of sponsored research. Ideally, a center should entail the cooperative efforts of faculty from several departments or schools of a college. In the absence of multi-departmental commitments, a center should involve the strong support of at least one academic department. The replication of successful center models at other campuses will be encouraged.

2. APPROVAL PROCESS: Each college shall design its own approval process to be used in the creation of new centers subject to the proviso that such process include the approval of the college's governance body for each center in such colleges as this has been or will become the practice. The Office of Academic Affairs is to

be informed, for informational purposes, of the process chosen by the college and shall be informed of the creation of new centers. That information shall take the form of submission of a proposal that incorporates the elements contained in Item No. 4. below. In addition, the Chancellor will recommend the approval of new centers by placing an appropriate resolution with explanation in the Chancellor's Report. Information on centers that are created or terminated shall be forwarded to the Committee on Academic Policy, Program and Research prior to inclusion in the Chancellor's Report.

3. **FINANCING:** Expenditures for personnel on tax-levy monies assigned by a college to a center in any year may not exceed a dollar amount equivalent to what would be required to support one full-time faculty member at the rank of full professor and one FTE staff support person at the level of CLT or Gittleson 3. OTPS funding of a center in any year shall not be more than 5% of the dollar amount of the FTE lines in the center.

4. **ACCOUNTABILITY:** A yearly report on each center shall be submitted to the Office of the Chancellor. Reports will consist of:

- a) The Director's statement;
- b) A description of the center's staffing pattern and its governance plan;
- c) Present and projected activities;
- d) A budget statement, including an indication of the level of tax-levy support;
- e) Anticipated grant-development activities. It is expected that Centers will pursue developmental activities as consistent with their research objectives and programmatic goals.

If, on the basis of the report submitted, questions arise concerning the viability, governance, or mandate of a specific center, the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs will seek clarification from the President of the College that sponsors the center. The report on the center, together with any supplemental materials submitted by the College, will be submitted to the Chancellor for review and appropriate action.

A listing of centers that are created, continued and terminated shall be forwarded to the Committee on Academic Policy, Program and Research for informational purposes each year, and included in the Chancellor's Report for informational purposes.

III. RECOMMENDED POLICIES RELATING TO INSTITUTES:

1. **DEFINITION:** An institute is a major organized research unit of The City University of New York. As such, an institute represents the substantial investment of the University's prestige, its resources, and its research capacity in activities that are intended to address problems of relevance to the City, State, and nation. These activities will ordinarily include: the conduct of research; the provision of services, including training; the dissemination of research findings; and the sponsorship of conferences. An institute is expected to engage in research efforts that are interdisciplinary in nature, that transcend the traditional boundaries of the academic departments, and that may involve faculty from more than one campus of the University. Because institutes are University entities rather than being campus specific, their duplication will not be encouraged.

2. **APPROVAL PROCESS:** A proposal to create a new institute at the University will require approvals at the campus, system, and Trustee levels. Each college will determine the process by which campus-level approval is conferred, subject to the proviso that such process include the approval of the college's governance body for each institute in such colleges as this has been or will become the practice. At the system and Trustee levels, the process will consist of the following elements:

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

A. The college will provide to the Office of Academic Affairs a proposal that incorporates:

- 1) The governance plan of the proposed institute.
- 2) A funding plan for the institute (see below under No. 3, "Financing," for details of this plan).
- 3) A justification for the creation of an institute, including the local, regional, and national significance of the contributions the institute is intended to make as well as its relationship to existing institutes at The City University and within the City and State of New York.
- 4) A staffing plan for the institute, including an organizational chart, *curricula vitae* of proposed staff members, as well as letters of endorsement for individuals and organizations outside the University.

B. The Office of Academic Affairs will review the proposal and make recommendations to the Chancellor on the approval or disapproval of the proposed institute.

C. Institutes receiving the approval of the Chancellor will be transmitted to the Board Committee on Academic Program, Policy, and Research for review and approval.

D. Institutes receiving the approval of the Board Committee will be submitted to the full Board of Trustees for its review and approval.

3. **FINANCING:** Given the anticipated scale of their operations and the magnitude of institutional commitments that they carry, institutes are seen as an appropriate locus for major investments of tax-levy monies. The University will therefore not place limits on the dollar amounts of tax-levy support allocated to an institute, either in terms of FTE's or OTPS funds. There are, however, clear expectations that tax-levy support will be matched, at specified ratios over fixed periods of time, by non-tax-levy monies. In proposing the creation of a new institute, the college shall include in its documentation a fiscal plan for the institute, indicating its strategies for attaining the budget goals outlined above. Within the first three years of an institute's operation, tax-levy monies, as a percentage of the total budget of the institute, are to decline from 100% in the first year to 50% by the end of year three. By the end of its fifth year of operation, an institute will be expected to be generating indirect cost monies equal to its tax-levy support. If this expectation has not been met by the end of the seventh year of operation, the President, in consultation with the Office of the Chancellor, will conduct a review of the institute to determine its future status at the University.

4. **ACCOUNTABILITY:** At the end of each academic year, the colleges will submit to the Chancellor, for informational purposes, a report on the activities of their institutes. Reports will consist of:

- a) The Director's covering statement, describing the institute's mission and goals and an evaluation of the institute's success in meeting them;
- b) A description of the institute's governance plan and its staffing pattern;
- c) A description of the institute's activities and projects;
- d) A discussion of the institute's budget, including an overall budget statement, individual project budgets, a tax-levy budget showing expenditures of these funds, and a chart indicating the extent to which staff and faculty salaries were met through grant monies.

e) Relevant appendices: *vitae* of personnel attached to the institute; description of physical space allocated to the institute; and proposal abstracts, project budgets, and letters of commitment from funding sources for the institute's projects.

The Office of the Chancellor will prepare a summary of these reports for the Committee on Academic Policy, Program and Research and the Board of Trustees.

Beginning at the end of the third year of an institute's life, campuses will be asked to assess the success of the institute in meeting the goals and objectives outlined in the original plan approved by the Chancellor and the Board. The process by which institutes will be evaluated triennially shall be approved by the college governance body. Such evaluations will include outside evaluator/evaluators. Such triennial reviews will be submitted to the Office of the Chancellor. A summary of the evaluations will be submitted to the Committee on Academic Policy, Program, and Research and to the Board. Recommendations for discontinuation of unsatisfactory institutes will go to the Board Committee on Academic Policy, Program, and Research and finally to the full Board for action.

IV. TRANSITIONAL PERIOD – JANUARY, 1984 - JANUARY, 1985:

The goal of the transitional period proposed here is to provide the University's colleges with the opportunity to select the appropriate organizational models for their on-campus research units. During the period of January, 1984, to January, 1985, the Presidents would prepare for the Chancellor a list of all the centers and institutes on their campuses and will designate which of the two new models they intend to place each in after January 1, 1985. It is recognized that certain entities now labelled centers would be more appropriately called institutes under the policies recommended above, and that some institutes would best be considered centers. These anomalies of nomenclature may be preserved at the wishes of the individual campuses. However, insofar as it is possible, the nomenclature of research entities should conform to the functional and organizational expectations of the University's policy on centers and institutes. There should, however, be no ambiguity concerning college policy in this area or the expectations that will ensue from the designation "center" or "institute" on the Presidents' lists.

V. COUNCIL OF INSTITUTE DIRECTORS:

A Council of Institute Directors shall be established by the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and shall be convened on an *ad hoc* basis to discuss issues pertaining to centers and institutes that are of University-wide relevance.

EXPLANATION: The proposed policy guidelines on research centers and institutes are intended to achieve several goals simultaneously: 1) create functional and budgetary distinctions between research centers and research institutes at the University; 2) provide a distinct approval process for each entity; 3) provide ways and means by which the University holds itself accountable for the expenditure of public funds in its research centers and institutes; 4) assure the academic integrity of its research centers and institutes; 5) encourage faculty research and service at the University.

The policy guidelines emanate from an *ad hoc* presidential task force on centers and institutes and received the endorsements of the Council of Presidents and the Office of the Chancellor, as well as that of the Committee on Academic Policy, Program and Research.

Professor Wasser expressed pleasure at the meaningful interaction of members of the University Faculty Senate and the Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs and the Committee, which effected some language changes, particularly with respect to institutes. He indicated the dissatisfaction of the Senate with respect to some of the language concerning centers. The Senate hopes to work, either through local governance bodies or centrally, for modifications which would include increased faculty participation in the matter of the establishment, omission or evaluation of centers.

NO. 5. COMMITTEE ON FACULTY, STAFF, AND ADMINISTRATION: RESOLVED, That the following item be approved:

A. LEHMAN COLLEGE – ESTABLISHMENT OF THE LYDIA HALL PROFESSORSHIP IN NURSING.

RESOLVED, That the Board of Trustees of The City University of New York approve the establishment of the Lydia Hall Professorship in Nursing at Lehman College, effective January 1, 1984.

EXPLANATION: The Montefiore Medical Center has agreed to fund, for a term of at least five (5) years, the Lydia Hall Professorship in Nursing at Lehman College. The professorship will be awarded to a tenured full Professor of Nursing with outstanding achievements in research, scholarship, and teaching, and a major interest in and a commitment to working actively with health delivery agencies to advance the profession of nursing. The funding, in the amount of at least \$25,000 per year, shall be used to provide support services to the holder of the Lydia Hall Professorship.

NO. 6. COMMITTEE ON FACILITIES PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT AND CONTRACT REVIEW: RESOLVED, That the following items be approved:

A. HOSTOS COMMUNITY COLLEGE – RENOVATION AND ALTERATIONS:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Trustees of The City University of New York accept preliminary plans, outline specifications and preliminary construction cost estimate of \$5,075,000 for renovation and alterations of 475 Grand Concourse, Bronx, for the Hostos Community College (Project No. HS-725-082), as prepared by Montoya-Rodriguez, Architects; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the City University Construction Fund be requested to accept the aforesaid preliminary plans, outline specifications and preliminary construction cost estimate of \$5,075,000, and to authorize the Dormitory Authority to complete final plans, specifications and bid documents for this project.

EXPLANATION: On June 27, 1983, Cal. No. 4.B., the Board of Trustees adopted a resolution that approved the selection of the firm of Montoya-Rodriguez, Architects, for this project. The alteration and renovation includes new mechanical equipment, new plumbing, new windows, refacing of the exterior surface of the building, site work, etc. The preliminary plans, outline specifications and cost estimate have been reviewed by the College, the Office of Facilities Planning and Management and the Dormitory Authority and acceptance by the Board is recommended in order that the Architect may proceed with development of final plans, specifications and cost estimate.

B. LAGUARDIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE – CLEANING SERVICE:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Trustees of The City University of New York approve the contract documents and specifications and authorize F.H. LaGuardia Community College to advertise for, receive and open bids, and award a contract to the lowest responsible bidder for the furnishing of cleaning services for the period July 1, 1983 through June 30, 1984 at an estimated cost of \$563,082 chargeable to Budget Code 2-17801-401 with the option to renew for 2 consecutive one-year periods.

EXPLANATION: Cleaning services are essential for the health and safety of the faculty, students, and staff of the college. This resolution supersedes resolution Cal. No. 4.C. approved by the Board at its March 21, 1983 meeting.

C. HOSTOS COMMUNITY COLLEGE – UNIFORMED GUARD SERVICE:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Trustees of The City University of New York approve contract documents and specifications and authorize Hostos Community College to advertise for, receive, open bids and award a contract

to the lowest responsible bidder for providing uniformed guard service to the College at an estimated cost of \$414,000 chargeable to expense code 348-01-400 for the period July 1, 1984 to June 30, 1985, with three (3) one-year options to renew.

EXPLANATION: This contract is required to provide uniformed guard service to safeguard the faculty, staff, students and property of the college.

D. NEW YORK CITY TECHNICAL COLLEGE – MICROWAVE SECURITY SYSTEM:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Trustees of The City University of New York on behalf of New York City Technical College authorize and approve the contract document and specifications to advertise for, receive and open bids and award contract to the lowest responsible bidder to supply and install a microwave security system encompassing all buildings of the college and an internal security access system for specific areas of Namm Hall located at 300 Jay Street, Brooklyn, New York at an estimated cost of \$327,000 (Project No. NY 930-083).

EXPLANATION: This contract is necessary to update the College's security program.

E. NEW YORK CITY TECHNICAL COLLEGE – ARCHITECTURAL SCREEN:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Trustees of The City University of New York on behalf of New York City Technical College authorize and approve the contract documents and specifications and advertise for, receive and open bids and award a contract to the lowest responsible bidder for the fabrication and installation of an architectural screen on the Adams Street side of the Pearl Street building at an estimated cost of \$100,000 (Project No. NY 725-978).

EXPLANATION: This contract is necessary to screen in the air conditioning equipment boldly visible on Adams Street, a major thoroughfare and thereby improve the esthetics of the College as well as the security of the equipment.

F. LAGUARDIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE – TELEPHONE SYSTEM:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Trustees of The City University of New York approve the specifications and contract documents and authorize F.H. LaGuardia Community College to advertise for, receive and open bids, and award a contract to the lowest responsible bidder for the lease/purchase of a telephone system for all of the buildings occupied by LaGuardia Community College, at an estimated cost of \$200,000 per year, to be paid over a five-year period, chargeable to LaGuardia Community College's budget.

EXPLANATION: The replacement of the New York Telephone Centrex II System with an owned electronic telephone system will enable the College to save an estimated \$750,000 over the five years, based on current telephone costs, and allow for tighter fiscal control and closer monitoring of local and long distance use daily, if necessary. In addition to cost savings, the system provides flexibility in the assignment and use of individual lines and has numerous time-saving features such as call forwarding and queuing. The College will be effectively upgrading its current level of telephone service while saving money. Further, the system will permit the eventual integration of data processing, word processing, and oral communication.

This resolution has the approval of the Vice Chancellor for University Systems.

NO. 7. COMMITTEE ON STUDENT AFFAIRS AND SPECIAL PROGRAMS: RESOLVED, That the following items be approved or action taken as noted:

A. BROOKLYN COLLEGE – AMENDMENT TO GOVERNANCE PLAN ESTABLISHING A COLLEGE ASSOCIATION AND AUXILIARY ENTERPRISE BOARD: *Item withdrawn.*

B. BOROUGH OF MANHATTAN COMMUNITY COLLEGE – STUDENT ACTIVITY FEE INCREASE:

RESOLVED, That the student activity fee paid by Borough of Manhattan Community College full-time students be increased from \$27.50 to \$39.50 and for part-time students from \$7.50 to \$19.50 per semester, effective the Spring, 1984 semester, in accordance with the following schedule:

EARMARKED ALLOCATING BODY	FULL-TIME	PART-TIME
Childcare Center	5.00	2.00
College Association	34.00	17.00
University Student Senate	.50	.50
	-----	-----
TOTAL STUDENT ACTIVITY FEE	39.50	19.50

EXPLANATION: The student activity fee schedule represents a \$12.00 increase in the student activity fee for both full-time and part-time students. A special referendum was held on December 14, 15, and 16, 1983 in accordance with bylaw section 16.12c. The vote was 743 in favor and 214 opposed to the fee increase. The college president supports the fee increase because of the needs resulting from the move to the new campus, including funding of campus child care, athletic programs, media and furnishing of student areas. The fee increase is the first in many years and is necessary to meet inflation.

Within the fee allocated by the college association, the following local earmarkings were established by the referendum: Athletics (\$3.00 full-time, \$2.00 part-time); Media Board (\$2.00 full-time, \$2.00 part-time); and Reserves Fund (10% of unearmarked student activity fees). The Reserves Fund is to be expended for the purpose of furnishing student areas and thereafter for a scholarships and grants fund. Local earmarkings at the college are established and are subject to change at the college in accordance with the referendum process set forth in University bylaw section 16.12 (b & c), provided that there is no change in the total fee or the allocating bodies.

C. HOSTOS COMMUNITY COLLEGE – APPROVAL OF GOVERNING DOCUMENTS OF THE COLLEGE ASSOCIATION AND AUXILIARY ENTERPRISE BOARD:

RESOLVED, That the Board approve the Certificate of Incorporation and Bylaws of the Hostos Community College college association and the Certificate of Incorporation and Bylaws of the Hostos Community College auxiliary enterprise board.

EXPLANATION: In accordance with Board Bylaw sections 16.5 and 16.10, respectively, the governing documents for the college association and auxiliary enterprise board have been approved by the college president and reviewed by the Board's general counsel. The college association is the Eugenio Maria de Hostos Community College Association, Inc. and the proposed name of the auxiliary enterprise board is the Hostos Community College Auxiliary Enterprises Corporation, Inc. The college association will be responsible for student activity fees and its governing board will be composed of seven students, three administrators and three faculty members. The auxiliary enterprise board will be responsible for auxiliary enterprises including food services, the book store and parking and its governing board will be composed of five students, five administrators and a faculty member. The governing documents of the college association and auxiliary enterprise board conform with the requirements of the Board Bylaws.

A complete copy of the governing documents is on file in the Office of the Secretary.

D. LEHMAN COLLEGE – APPROVAL OF GOVERNING DOCUMENTS OF THE COLLEGE ASSOCIATION AND AUXILIARY ENTERPRISE BOARD:

RESOLVED, That the Board approve the Bylaws of the Lehman College college association and the Certificate of Incorporation and Bylaws of the Lehman College auxiliary enterprise board.

EXPLANATION: In accordance with Board Bylaw sections 16.5 and 16.10 respectively, the above governing documents for the college association and auxiliary enterprise board have been approved by the college president and reviewed by the Board's general counsel. The proposed name of the college association is the Herbert H. Lehman College Association For Campus Activities, Inc. and the proposed name of the auxiliary enterprise board is The Herbert H. Lehman College Auxiliary Enterprises Corporation, Incorporated. The college association will be responsible for student activity fees and its governing board will be composed of seven students, three administrators and three faculty members. The auxiliary enterprise board will be responsible for auxiliary enterprises including food services, the book store and parking and its governing board will be composed of seven students, seven administrators and a faculty member. The governing documents of the college association and auxiliary enterprise board conform with the requirements of the Board Bylaws. The certificate of incorporation for the college association will be presented to the Board for approval at a later date.

A complete copy of the governing documents is on file in the Office of the Secretary.

E. BARUCH COLLEGE – APPROVAL OF GOVERNING DOCUMENTS OF THE COLLEGE ASSOCIATION AND AUXILIARY ENTERPRISE BOARD:

RESOLVED, That the Board approve the Certificate of Incorporation and Bylaws of the Baruch College college association and the Bylaws of the Baruch College auxiliary enterprise board.

EXPLANATION: In accordance with Board Bylaw sections 16.5 and 16.10 respectively, the above governing documents for the college association and auxiliary enterprise board have been approved by the college president and reviewed by the Board's general counsel. The name of the college association is the Bernard M. Baruch College Association, Inc. and the proposed name of the auxiliary enterprise board is Bernard M. Baruch College Auxiliary Enterprises Corporation. The college association will be responsible for student activity fees and its governing board will be composed of seven students, three administrators and three faculty members. The auxiliary enterprise board will be responsible for auxiliary enterprises including food services and bookstore operations and its governing board will be composed of five students, three administrators and three faculty members. The governing documents of the college association and auxiliary enterprise board conform with the requirements of the Board Bylaws. The certificate of incorporation for the auxiliary enterprise board will be presented to the Board for approval at a later date.

A complete copy of the governing documents is on file in the Office of the Secretary.

Professor Wasser expressed dissatisfaction with the low number of faculty members included on the boards and stated the intention of the University Faculty Senate to ask for an amendment of the bylaws which would ensure larger faculty representation on these boards.

NO. 8. SPECIAL COMMITTEE FOR LONG-RANGE PLANNING: **RESOLVED,** That the following resolution be approved:

A. STATUS REPORT/MASTER PLAN OF THE UNIVERSITY:

RESOLVED, That the Board of Trustees of The City University of New York adopt "The 1984 Master Plan for The City University of New York" for submission to the Board of Regents as the University's Master Plan for 1984 and for submission to the Governor of the State of New York and the Mayor of the City of New York, the President of the State Senate and the Speaker of the State Assembly as the University's assessment of its future as required by Section 6208(2) of the State Education Law.

EXPLANATION: During the course of the last year, The City University has reviewed those critical issues which it will face in the next several years. In preparing the report the Chancellor has engaged in wide consultation within the University involving the colleges, their faculties and students.

The adoption of the report serves three purposes as follows: First, the report satisfies the mandate of submitting a special status report to the Governor, the Mayor, and the legislative leadership, as required by the University's governance legislation of 1979. Second, the report serves appropriately as the University's 1984 Master Plan submission to the Regents. Finally, the report will furnish guidelines and guideposts for the University's development and progress in the next four years.

The process of planning is a continuing one. The policies and analyses reflected in this report will, undoubtedly, be subject to change in the future as conditions change and as new issues emerge. This report, then, should be considered as part of that continuing process of planning which should be responsive to changing needs and conditions.

A complete copy of the Master Plan is on file in the Office of the Secretary.

Mr. Baard abstained, requesting that the Trustees be involved at an early stage in the preparation of such documents rather than have them submitted in finished form just prior to the required date of submission.

NO. 9. SEMINAR IN WASHINGTON, D.C.: Mr. Maniscalco called attention to the Annual Legislative Seminar of the Association of Community College Trustees, which will be held in Washington, D.C. February 26 through 28. He stressed the importance of participation in these Seminars and urged all Board Members to attend.

Upon motions duly made, seconded and carried, the meeting was adjourned at 5:35 P.M.

**Martin J. Warmbrand
Secretary of the Board**