

**\* \* R E M I N D E R \* \***

**MEETING OF CONCERNED FACULTY**

**FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 1993**

**12:30 P.M.**

**ROOM B100**

**SEE ATTACHED REPORTS**

**PLEASE READ THE MATERIAL BEFORE THE MEETING**

## INTRODUCTION

The relations between faculty and administration have been deteriorating steadily over the last few years reaching critical proportions in Spring 1992. At a time when drastic, State-mandated budget cuts presaged the probability of faculty retrenchment, and there was a need for proceeding with some measure of sensitivity, the Administration adopted a strategy that only made a bad situation worse. The Faculty made clear its position on the issue of retrenchment: while it would not participate in identifying faculty lines to be cut, it would assess the educational implications of any administrative plan. (*Document on Council of Conveners.*) The concern of the Faculty was to avoid adding divisiveness to an already trying circumstance. The Administration's response seems to be that by not helping to initiate the cuts the Faculty is not entitled to comment on plans before they are implemented. In Spring '92, academic support staff and faculty in Health and Physical Education were retrenched, and in December '92, retrenchment notices were given to faculty in Performing Arts. Yet, according to the President, "there is no existing retrenchment plan for SUNY College at Old Westbury." (*President's Memorandum to the Faculty Senate Chair, 1/15/93, circulated to the College Community.*)

### Performing Arts

The case of Performing Arts is particularly troubling on at least four counts:

1. In the SUNY 2000 Report, the interdisciplinary programs are valued as the best examples of curricular innovation, enjoying "regional, national and international recognition" (p.5). Performing Arts is one of the oldest interdisciplinary programs with one of the most innovative curricula. (*See also the Document reviewing SUNY 2000.*)
2. Termination of the program severely diminishes the multicultural college-wide curriculum in which Old Westbury has taken pride and for which it can legitimately claim to be a forerunner in the multicultural movement that is shaking up higher education.
3. Retrenchment reduces by four the relatively small cohort of tenured African-American faculty and is a great setback to the goal of increasing faculty diversity.
4. The process by which retrenchment has been implemented raises questions of fairness and justice. The budget crisis, notwithstanding, the primary, if not the only reason for the program's "curtailment" is precisely its innovative character, with its unabashed emphasis on African-American music and dance.

There is evidence to support this conclusion. Performing Arts was the last remnant of an earlier interdisciplinary program, Communicative and Creative Arts (CCA). Unlike the other two components of CCA (Visual Arts and Modern Languages) its registration as a degree program was held up by the State Education Department in 1982, pending review by an independent consultant. A revised proposal addressing the consultant's questions was being prepared when, on the completion of the new Theatre, the Performing Arts faculty sought to include theatre courses in the proposal. The deadline for submitting the revised proposal passed and, with the College's concurrence, the State Education Department removed the original proposal from its active file in 1985. This action did not preclude subsequent submission of a new proposal. Such a proposal, incorporating music, dance and theatre in an interdisciplinary degree program was ready for submission in 1986. The new President expressed concerns about the non-traditional curriculum and did not approve its submission for registration. There the matter rested, until last year.

In 1992, the Faculty was informed of the deactivation of CCA. At the May '92 Faculty meeting, administration's responses to faculty questions made clear that the aim of deactivation was to avoid legal complications from granting CCA degrees to Performing Arts majors. Performing Arts faculty were expressly encouraged, on that occasion, to devise a new degree proposal. A proposal, broadened to include all American music styles and forms, was submitted to the Curriculum and Academic Planning Committee (CAP) in Fall 1992. CAP reviewed it and recommended some changes in the light of statements made by a staff member of SUNY Central, who was invited by the Academic Vice President to address conveners (but not CAP) on program registration procedures. The revisions had been sent to CAP when the notices of termination were issued. *(See also, the CCA Document detailing the chronology of exchanges with the Administration.)*

## Consultation

The breakdown of communications between the Faculty and the Administration is not a new phenomenon at Old Westbury, nor is the spotty record of administrative consultation. However, the current problem has taken on additional dimensions. For example, the relations between the Office of Academic Affairs and CAP are worse than they have ever been since the committee was established in 1978. The Academic Vice President rarely attends CAP meetings and seems intent on bypassing the committee and circumventing the various responsibilities assigned to it under the Faculty Bylaws. Information that would help the committee conduct its business is often not forthcoming; similar complaints emanate from the Council of Conveners. *(Documents on CAP and the Council of Conveners.)*

Control of information seems to be an obsession of the present administration. Faculty serving on the Budget Committee are invariably frustrated by inadequate data. And, for the first time in the history of the College, faculty can only have access to unpublished information, routinely collected by the Office of Institutional Research, if the President approves. The inescapable conclusion is that the Administration does not trust the Faculty.

In a climate of mistrust there will not be the openness that one would expect at a College dedicated to the principle of human justice. Rumors abound about the arbitrary and unjust nature of hiring and firing practices within the Administration. People are in favor today and are promoted; out of it tomorrow, and dismissed. Many faculty have served on administrative screening committees and spent countless hours reading resumes only to find short lists rejected, searches aborted, and acting appointments made. A mysterious and apparently unqualified registrar is given a temporary appointment and within weeks, just as mysteriously, his resignation is announced. Faculty who have been here long enough can certainly point to instances of arbitrary personnel practices in the past, but nothing that can match the regularity of the present administration's.

Last semester, the Faculty Senate set up a sub-committee to look into administrative hiring practices. The Senate's predecessor, the Faculty Council, had been mandated by a unanimously passed faculty motion to undertake such a review in December 1991, but its investigation was stalled. The Senate sub-committee has been able to complete a preliminary assessment of the high turnover of administrative personnel in the last two years and of the budgetary implications of the inordinate expansion of management confidential positions. (*Document on Budget Priorities.*)

In relations with faculty, some dubious firsts have also been achieved under this Administration. For the first time, faculty and staff on the Middle States Steering Committee were excluded from the Visiting Team's exit interview; faculty did not participate in the recent evaluation of the President--the overwhelming majority only heard of the evaluation after the fact; finally and most reprehensibly, a faculty member's name was removed from a grant proposal as a condition of the President's approval, for no other apparent reason than the President's personal disagreements with the individual in question.

### **Access, Diversity, and Quality**

The themes of access, diversity and quality recur with persistent regularity in Middle States Self-Studies and other public documents in which the College defines its mission and goals.

Maintaining access and the ethnic/cultural diversity of the student body was the motive behind faculty protests against administrative proposals on admissions in the '70s and early '80s. These proposals ranged from introducing pre-admission testing to completely overhauling admissions policy. Past administrations based their suggestions primarily on the budgetary cost of providing academic and support services for underprepared students. The last confrontation between faculty and administration on this matter resulted in a compromise, the admissions policy of 1984, in which both academic and specific non-academic criteria could be used as the basis for recruiting and admitting students.

According to the Middle States Self-Study Report of 1990, the College continues to adhere to the 1984 admissions policy. After the report was prepared, the budget crisis deepened. As noted earlier, academic support services have been cut. The full impact of the cuts will be felt with the termination of staff in the Writing and ESOL Centers in Summer '93. At the same time, Basic Education, as a program geared to the needs of underprepared students, seems to be no longer functioning fully and its future status is unclear. *(Document on Basic Education.)*

There has been no discussion of the effect of these developments on the admission of historically underrepresented students. For instance, one of the fastest growing groups of minority students is made up of non-native speakers of English. Either the ESOL cut will necessitate a change in admissions policy, or ESOL students will be admitted and be inadequately served. The same situation would obtain for English speaking students in need of remedial and developmental work if the Basic Education Program is eradicated. The prospects of maintaining student diversity and quality are hardly promising. Further, Old Westbury's self-proclaimed identity may be in the process of change, without faculty consultation on so fundamental an issue.

In the various documents that follow, a clear pattern emerges of administrative contempt for faculty and for faculty governance. Faculty's rights and responsibilities are comparatively limited under the Board of Trustees Policies, but only by standing firm on the rights and responsibilities we do have will we be able to resolve some of the problems described.

## C.C.A. CHRONOLOGY - MARCH TO DECEMBER 1992

March 11th - The President calls a meeting of C.C.A. faculty and expresses disappointment with the program. Foremost in her list of complaints are a) a lack of quality and no performing ensembles, b) a recent robbery of P.A. equipment was probably an inside job possibly involving faculty, c) vague references to student complaints, d) that the program did not answer State Education Department (S.E.D.) letter. She concludes that deactivation will follow if improvements are not made.

March 30th - The C.C.A. Program submits a five year plan of curricular development as requested by the Administration that includes answers to all S.E.D. questions and Middle States questions. A plan to improve quality through auditions, and an extensive record of accomplishments of C.C.A. graduates and students and career assistance for graduates done by C.C.A. faculty and staff.

April 9th - The C.C.A. Program sends the Administration a memo detailing the long record of student performances and program collaborations and accomplishments.

April 28th - The Administration in a meeting with the program rejects the five year plan and requests a program proposal. The Administration recommends deactivation but in response to a question about retrenchment, the Administration states that this action is not retrenchment nor a prelude to it. The program says it will submit a proposal by September 1st.

August - Tenure is denied to one person and promotion to two others on the basis that the program is not registered.

September 1st - A proposal is sent to the C.A.P. Committee by the C.C.A. Program and the A.V.P. is notified. Revision and discussions about the proposal are carried on through the semester. The A.V.P. is sent a copy of that work and is an ex-officio member of C.A.P.

November - The Program is told by the Administration it may not participate in Open House.

December 21st - The C.C.A. Program is retrenched by the President on curricular grounds. The Administration states that they have not seen the proposal nor has the A.V.P. attended any meetings of the C.A.P. Committee.

## II

### FACT SHEET - COUNCIL OF CONVENERS

The Council of Conveners has found it difficult to carry out its role in faculty governance on a number of occasions due to a lack of consultation exacerbated by a lack of response to requests for information and, in certain cases, receipt of inconsistent information. The following represent some of the more serious instances.

#### I. Conveners' Council Role in Spring 1992 Budget Cuts

- a. Last spring, the full faculty charged Conveners with adopting a position on faculty participation in the state mandated budget cuts and carrying out the responsibilities thus entailed. The Council sent a memo to Dr. Hall, dated March 26, stating that position. In essence, the Council's position was not to initiate any discussion of reorganization, faculty reductions or other related matters but to respond speedily to any plans proposed by Dr. Hall or the Administration by convening a special meeting for this purpose.
- b. At the April 14 meeting of Conveners' Council, Dr. Hall requested that Conveners and Chairs meet on April 21 to discuss some of the details of his proposal for budget cuts.
- c. On Monday, April 20, Dr. Hall canceled the April 21 meeting.
- d. Some Conveners/Chairs requested a special meeting to be called for April 23 to discuss rumors and information about recommended cuts.
- e. At the April 23 meeting, a series of questions were developed about recommended budget cuts. They were to be asked of Dr. Hall at the meeting he scheduled for April 28.
- f. At the April 28 meeting, Dr. Hall provided only the following information (an iteration of information already provided at the April 14 meeting):
  1. cuts in academic area: 6.5 lines = \$261,451  
temp services = \$51,998  
OTPS = \$74,???
  2. total cuts = \$380,000
- g. When asked for further information, Dr. Hall responded that other than a recommendation to deactivate some programs, which he would not identify, he cannot and will not be more specific nor will he share further information since his recommendations have not been acted upon by the President nor has the plan to Albany been finalized.

- h. Dr. Hall stated that he would like to respond to the series of questions developed by Conveners' Council at the April 23 meeting. He stated that after he had time to prepare, he would meet with Conveners' Council to speak to these issues. The semester ended without his doing so. Conveners met on June 30 to address a number of outstanding concerns with respect to the Office of Academic Affairs. A memo was sent on July 7, 1992 bringing these to Dr. Hall's attention. Among them was a repeated request to discuss the list of questions concerning the mandated budget cuts. Conveners asked that this be addressed in September. To date, the Council has not received any further information on these cuts and thus has not been able to carry out its charge. Furthermore, the Administration claims that the faculty position was not to "participate" in this process. The March 26, 1992 memo to Dr. Hall says something quite different:

"The Conveners' Council will not initiate any discussions on reorganization, faculty reductions or other related matters, but will respond speedily to any plans you or the administration propose by convening a special meeting for this purpose. The Conveners' Council is willing to meet with you anytime - on very short notice - when you complete your proposal."

Dr. Hall, I will call a Conveners' Council meeting - at any time - on notice from you."

## II. Lack of Response to Requests for Information

- a. A memo to Dr. Hall dated June 2, 1992 requested information and clarification on a number of issues related to the registration of concentrations. It also expressed concern about "inconsistent information about the current status of these proposals," the lack of consultation with CAP, the status of the Language and Literature interprogram concentration, and the related issue of the deactivation of Performing Arts. The memo said we would meet during June and we "look forward to your response." There was no response for the June 30 Conveners meeting.
- b. At the June 30 Conveners meeting, another memo was drafted and sent to Dr. Hall on July 7, 1992. This memo requested information, yet again, on a number of critical issues. A request for catalog copy was honored by the Office of Academic Affairs. Requests for information on the spring budget cuts, the deactivation of Performing Arts, and the use of the term "probation" in connection with all our academic programs have not been answered to date.



### III

#### FACT SHEET - CURRICULUM AND ACADEMIC PLANNING COMMITTEE

The ability of the Curriculum and Academic Planning Committee to carry out its appropriate and mandated role in faculty governance has been seriously undermined in a number of ways.

##### I. The Process for Registering New Degree Programs

The issue that program "concentrations" had to be registered as degrees or dropped from the College's catalog was never brought to CAP as the body responsible for curriculum planning. CAP learned of the concern of the Office of Academic Affairs only at a general Faculty Meeting. CAP also heard from individual Conveners/Chairs that Programs had been requested to prepare degree proposals by the Office of Academic Affairs. These activities were ongoing during March and April 1992 with no communication from Academic Affairs to CAP during this period. CAP sent a memo to Dr. Hall (April 24, 1992) requesting information about the status of these proposals. In a memo dated May 8, 1992, Dr. Hall stated that when the proposals were completed CAP would receive copies of the same. It was the understanding of several Conveners/Chairs involved in the process that proposals were already being reviewed by SUNY Central but had not yet been forwarded to CAP by Academic Affairs. As a result, CAP had to request these proposals from individual programs in order to begin its own review process as mandated by the ByLaws. CAP received three proposals from the Office of Academic Affairs only after they had been reviewed by SUNY Central and sent to the State Education Department for registration.

Within this context, an even more egregious violation of the curriculum process occurred when the Academic Vice President made his own decision regarding registration of the old Language and Literature concentration despite the fact that CAP had already submitted a recommendation on a literature degree to him. This recommendation was ignored and as of this date, CAP has not been able to obtain a copy of the Language and Literature proposal even though it has already been registered by the State Education Department.

##### II. Lack of Consultation

Major curricular decisions have been made by the Administration without consultation with CAP.

a. Performing Arts: At no time was CAP consulted or informed during the process which led to the deactivation of the Program and the subsequent retrenchment of the faculty. Given that this decision has a major impact on the College's curriculum as a whole and the General Education Program specifically (1/3 of the Creativity and the Arts cluster is made up of Performing Arts courses) some form of consultation was in order. (Such a precedent was set in the early 80's when the Academic Vice President came to CAP on the issue of the Urban Studies Program.) In fact, Performing Arts submitted two degree proposals to CAP this fall. CAP supports the registration of these new degrees and the Academic Vice President, as an ex officio member of CAP, was aware of the committee's work and support.

b. Continuing Education: During the academic year, 1991-92, CAP raised a number of questions about Continuing Education with Dr. Hall. CAP was not part of the process which led to the institution of a Continuing Education program, nor was it consulted about the nature of courses, credits, impact on already existing curricula and programs, etc. despite repeated attempts to discuss these issues.

c. Basic Education: CAP was not consulted about the Basic Education Program nor the decision to change the Invitation to Learning from one to three credits. Major questions about the status and structure of the program remain unanswered despite CAP's repeated attempts to get answers.

d. Curricular impact of budget cuts of spring, 1992: CAP was never consulted about the decision to cut the Health and Physical Education Program, the Writing Center, and the ESOL Program. In fact, the entire skills component of the curriculum has undergone dramatic changes without any consultation with CAP and the faculty.

e. This fall, 1992, a meeting was held with a representative from SUNY Central on the issue of the registration of concentrations. CAP was not invited to attend despite the fact that it has primary responsibility for approving new degrees according to the ByLaws of the College.

f. The Administration did not ask for a CAP representative to the President's Budget and Long Range Planning Committee despite the fact that CAP is charged with the curricula aspect of long range planning. A CAP representative sits on that committee only because Faculty Senate gave up one of its seats to a CAP member.

### III. Lack of Response to Requests

a. On December 9, 1991, CAP sent a memo to Dr. Hall requesting information concerning the Continuing Education Program. CAP received a response dated December 17, 1991, which stated that CAP would receive a copy of a report to be given to the Conveners' Council. CAP never received the report.

b. On May 26, 1992, Dr. Hall held a meeting with the Chair of Faculty Council, Chair of Conveners' Council, and the Chair of CAP. One issue that was raised was the breakdown of communication between the Office of Academic Affairs and the faculty. At this meeting, it was agreed that Dr. Hall would convene a joint meeting with the Faculty Senate, Conveners' Council and CAP to discuss areas of concern. The Chair of CAP discussed this meeting with the CAP Committee. The Chair wrote a memo dated May 29, 1992 proposing a tentative agenda and requesting documents on a number of outstanding issues including the registration of new degree programs and the deactivation of Performing Arts. Some of those documents were forwarded by Academic Affairs. Committee members read and discussed these documents in anticipation of the meeting to be called by Dr. Hall. The meeting was never called.

#### IV

#### COLLEGE BUDGET PRIORITIES: CONCERNS AND QUESTIONS

Since there is no information given to faculty on budget decisions, or participation in making such decisions, questions about budget allocation and campus restructuring priorities are difficult to document. However, the following data are illustrative of concerns about management decisions and priorities.

I. OVERVIEW: In the last two years of no pay increases for faculty and staff, substantial budget cuts decimating the learning environment, now including Program retrenchment, the management confidential area has expanded:

Based on line, title and salary information from October 15, 1990 and December 15, 1992:

1. MANAGEMENT CONFIDENTIAL POSITIONS HAVE INCREASED FROM 25 TO 31 POSITIONS: 6 NEW POSITIONS: APPROXIMATELY 25% INCREASE
2. THE NET INCREASE IN THE MANAGEMENT CONFIDENTIAL PERSONNEL BUDGET HAS BEEN \$206,256 BETWEEN OCTOBER 1990 AND DECEMBER 1992

NOTE: THE TOTAL SAVINGS ON FULL-TIME FACULTY LINES FROM PERFORMING ARTS IS \$282,740

3. THE TOTAL CAMPUS BUDGET WAS REDUCED APPROXIMATELY \$900,000 BETWEEN 1990-91 AND 1992-93; THE RATIO OF BUDGETED INSTRUCTIONAL:NON-INSTRUCTIONAL LINES REMAINS 40:60.

II. TURNOVER: There has been an extraordinary turnover of people in office in the last two years.

1. ONLY 2 PEOPLE REMAIN FROM BEFORE 1986: THE DIRECTOR OF THE LIBRARY AND DIRECTOR OF CAMPUS SECURITY
2. 13/25 OF THE PEOPLE IN POSITIONS IN 1990 HAVE BEEN REPLACED
3. A TOTAL OF 20/31 PEOPLE ARE NEW IN THEIR POSITIONS SINCE 1991; 14 IN 1992 ALONE

III. REDEFINING POSITIONS: There is a pattern of redefining positions from union to non-union (management confidential) titles, then recruiting both externally, and by moving people internally from union (CSEA or UUP) positions. This permits superceding union seniority in CSEA positions in particular, and removes all union protection. Such appointments serve solely at, and salaries are awarded at, the discretion of the President.

1. 9/31 (29%) PEOPLE HAVE LEFT UNION POSITIONS FOR MANAGEMENT CONFIDENTIAL POSITIONS, USUALLY WITH SUBSTANTIAL SALARY INCREASES

2

IV. EDUCATIONAL SUPPORT: LIBRARY ACQUISITIONS AND PERSONNEL

THE COLLEGE ALLOCATION FOR ACQUISITIONS IN 1989-90: \$463,100  
IN 1991-92: \$268,600  
IN 1993-94: \$260,300

Note: These are the allocations in the campus SUNY summaries, in the archives; they do not mean that these dollars were necessarily allocated for that purpose, given "flexibility."

THE LIBRARY'S ACTUAL DATA SHOW:

IN 1989-90: \$337,749 (-\$125.35K)  
IN 1991-92: \$231,668 (-\$40K)  
IN 1992-93: \$172,852

Whether in the official allocation or in actual expenditures, the net loss is obvious over time - at a cost to the learning environment with which we are familiar in attempting to supervise student research papers and senior theses.

There has also been a substantial LOSS OF LIBRARY PERSONNEL IN REALLOCATION DECISIONS over the last two years: for example, the reallocation of Wagih Shenouda to ETC/AV - reporting to Hermine Lewis in Academic Affairs, taking his line with him; and the "borrowing" of Elaine Thornhill in Winter 1992 (formerly clerk in AV), to Academic Affairs: she and her line have now been "reassigned" to that unit.

## SUNY-2000

## I. OVERALL IMPRESSION

The document is unremarkable and in most respects unexceptionable. Interdisciplinary curricula and racial and ethnic diversity are both cited as distinctive features of the College. "Multicultural education" is featured in the title of the College's development campaign, outlined in Appendix K. There is no explicitly announced departure from Old Westbury's traditional admissions practice. Sections on criteria for new program development quote faithfully from CAP documents, and a list of proposed new undergraduate degrees holds no surprises. (The ones mentioned are those emerging from the recent exercise in registering "concentrations.") The two graduate degree programs that are mentioned have both been approved by CAP and the faculty.

Our conclusion is that SUNY-2000, as a planning document, is not asking to be understood as a blueprint for change, nor, with one possible exception, does it hint at significant departures from current principles and practice at the College. (The possible exception is discussed in Section III of this report.)

II. In at least three respects, the SUNY-2000 document seems to by-pass the faculty's appropriate role in academic program development:

- A. SUNY-2000 asserts that a plan calling for "a designated curriculum of studies for entering students with 0 to 31 credits" was "approved by the faculty." No such proposal was ever submitted to CAP and no such proposal was ever voted on by the faculty.
- B. SUNY-2000 notes that the "Retention/Graduation Task Force was unanimous in its endorsement of the development of a...[course similar to Invitation to Learning]...which would carry more credits." The document then goes on to make a startling statement: "The Office of Academic Affairs accepts the Faculty Council recommendation of three credits." Under the old ByLaws, the Faculty Council had no authority to take the final faculty action imputed to it. Credit for "college-wide" courses is recommended by CAP and approved by the faculty. Neither group was ever asked to approve a three-credit Invitation to Learning course.

Nor did the Faculty Council specifically "recommend three credits." On May 15, 1992, the Faculty Council sent Dr. Hall a report on Basic Education (synthesizing recommendations made variously by CAP and two committees appointed by the Administration.) This report contains the statement that "the [Invitation to Learning] course should carry 2 or 3 credits." The Faculty Council's report was submitted "to the Office of Academic Affairs for appropriate action." In fact, "appropriate"

action was never taken; yet in August 1992, the Vice President for Academic Affairs directed that the credits for Invitation to Learning be increased from 1 to 3.

- C. The SUNY-2000 document asserts that "The College will...provide encouragement to regional artists through the Artists in Residence Program." No proposal for an "Artists in Residence Program was ever reviewed or acted on by any faculty department or committee. The performing arts groups currently "in residence" were brought to the College unilaterally by the President.

III. Although SUNY-2000, dated November 1992, is presented as a planning document, it gives no hint that a radical change in the College's academic program is anticipated. Yet one month later, the faculty and staff in the performing arts are retrenched, leaving a gaping hole in the academic fabric of the College. There is, moreover, a striking discrepancy between the deed of the Administration with respect to this retrenchment and the actual words of SUNY-2000; for according to the principles and values expressed in these words, the performing arts program would rank close to the very top of a protected species list.

- A. SUNY-2000 in several places reasserts the College's long-standing commitment to interdisciplinary curricula.

The performing arts curriculum at Old Westbury reflects an interdisciplinary approach to music, dance and theater.

- B. SUNY-2000 claims with pride that the College "has enjoyed regional, national and international recognition for its innovative curriculum" and cites as one goal of the College that it "continue its tradition of offering a high quality innovative undergraduate curriculum...."

Over ten years ago, the performing arts program received a federal grant (from the Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education) in recognition of its "innovative" pedagogy. It has also been the recipient of grants from the National Endowment for the Arts.

- C. SUNY-2000 quotes from the Mission statement the requirement that the College "assure the broadest possible access to higher education to all constituents of our society, including persons from a variety of cultural, racial and ethnic backgrounds, and those who are economically or otherwise disadvantaged."

Unusual among performing art programs, the one at Old Westbury offers an "open-access" course of study. Performance criteria are not applied to determine admission.

- D. SUNY-2000 lists among the goals of the College, maintaining "diversity of faculty," and "preparing a diverse student body to participate in a multicultural work force."

The performing arts program has a tenured faculty that is 100% African-American (four out of four).

- E. SUNY-2000 presents a plan for a major fund-raising campaign, the prospectus for which is entitled "Support Multi-Cultural Education."

The performing arts curriculum at Old Westbury is unique in placing emphasis on African-American musical traditions. No other SUNY campus offers a comparable curriculum.

- F. SUNY-2000 lists the General Education Program among the College's achievements in the area of "Undergraduate Programs."

The performing arts program supports a significant percentage of the courses offered in Cluster II of the General Education Program (Creativity and the Arts).

- G. SUNY-2000 asserts that, towards the goal of improving retention, the College will seek to "provide more opportunities that enable students to take responsibility for their own development" and to "foster feelings of self-worth in students."

The performing arts program supports a number of co-curricular and extra-curricular activities that contribute greatly to the quality of student life on campus. It is difficult to think of another program at Old Westbury that does more in this respect.

- H. SUNY-2000, in describing plans for new undergraduate programs, cites several specific proposals (involving registration of existing concentrations) and goes on to say that "other plans call for the development of programs in the Arts...."

At the time they were retrenched, the performing arts faculty were in the process of completing work with CAP on a proposal for a new registered degree, as anticipated in President Pettigrew's letter to the Chancellor of May 25, 1992 requesting deactivation of the obsolete degree entitled "Communicative and Creative Arts."

## VI

### BASIC EDUCATION

What emerges from a review of the documents is the following:

1. The Vice President for Academic Affairs has never addressed issues of Basic Education in any written communication to CAP, the Conveners' Council, the Faculty Council or the Faculty Senate. There are no memoranda from the Office of Academic Affairs that either identify issues to be addressed, respond to problems identified by the faculty or announce the fate of faculty recommendations. This lack of communication has persisted in spite of repeated written requests for information and responses addressed to the Academic Vice President by CAP, the Conveners' Council and most recently the Faculty Senate. In the absence of direct written communication, it has been extremely difficult to ascertain what's actually been happening with the Basic Education Program.

2. SUNY-2000 lists "a Basic Education Program" as one of the College's achievements in the area of undergraduate education, but does not devote a separate section to it. To find comments with implications for basic education, one must really look to Appendix F - Phase I Retention/Graduation Plan." (Such a plan was referred to earlier in the SUNY-2000 document as having been "approved by the President and the faculty.")

3. Appendix F has a lot to say about things that will be done for incoming freshmen, but it never once uses the phrase "Basic Education Program." In fact, Appendix F leaves the impression that there never was anything called a Basic Education Program. The word "basic" has been shorn of its previous association with the word "program" and appears only as part of the title of two English courses (i.e. Basic English I and Basic English II). The key sentence would seem to be the following:

"Students who place at the Basic English levels will be regarded as all other students in this group, i.e. first-time-to-college students. The only difference for these academically underprepared students will be the conditions of the acceptance and the curriculum of studies in which they will enroll. Those students who do not place at the regular freshman level will be asked to take a summer program."

It would appear from this statement that the College is scheduled to enter a new phase in the history of its relationship to academically underprepared students, without there having been a clear, direct and open discussion either of the issues involved or of the implications of possible policy changes. The Basic Education Program, as a structure requiring distinctive administrative supports, academic services and resource allocation seems simply to have evaporated. A major initiative of the faculty has become invisible without any of the ordinary formal rituals of academic endings and beginnings. But it was not because the faculty didn't care or didn't pay attention. The documentary record of correspondence will show that the faculty has consistently pressed the Administration to clarify the status of the Basic Education Program, to strengthen its supports, in fact, to fully implement it. None of this correspondence has received a formal response.



VII

STATEMENT OF UUP PRESIDENT, TIM REILLY

RE: RETRENCHMENT OF PERFORMING ARTS

A statement from Samuel von Winbush, President, Old Westbury Chapter, UUP, reporting on a meeting with NYS/UUP about the retrenchment of the Performing Arts Program at Old Westbury. Following is a summary statement made to the State by Reilly:

The action of the president at Old Westbury is duplicitous. The action (retrenchment) is in contradiction to the employment security discussed at the table during recent labor negotiations where it was agreed that workers would not be sacrificed for restructuring. The retrenchment of the Performing Arts Program has elements of purging African-American culture from the educational system which New York and the United States can ill-afford to lose. UUP (and Old Westbury Chapter) will do whatever is necessary to change this. This cultural purge must be resisted.

## VIII

### Questions asked at the meeting with the President on January 8, 1993

- Last spring there was a discussion of some 6.5 lines that needed to be cut from the Academic Affairs area. What cuts were actually made?
  - Which lines were they?
  - What criteria were used to determine these cuts?
- Were these changes part of the retrenchment plan that was filed for SUNY/COW in Albany?
  - What were the details of the retrenchment plan that was filed for SUNY/Old Westbury in Albany?
  - When was the plan filed?
  - How many positions or lines did this plan involve?
  - Was there more than one retrenchment plan? If so, could you share with us the details of each one?
  - Are there any further steps to be taken? In other words, is there any further document to be submitted for further retrenchment?
- What was the content of the College's application for deactivation of the CCA degree?
  - What are the steps leading from deactivation to curtailment to retrenchment?
  - Did the College follow these steps?
- On what basis was the Performing Arts Program retrenched?
  - Was there any discussion of the proposed retrenchment plan discussed in the Budget Committee?
  - Was the proposed plan or alternatives to the plan discussed in any other committee?
- What do you see as the impact of these terminations on students in the program?
  - What do you see as the impact of the termination of this program and of the theater on campus life?
  - What is your sense of the impact on the curriculum?

- What will the impact of this decision be on the course offerings in the future in the areas of music, dance and theater?
- Since the theater staff have been terminated, will the theater be closed?
- The terminations will be effective December 1993. What will happen to the resources that will become available at that time?
  - Are these resources going to be lost from the campus or are they going to be reallocated?
  - Is there a restructuring plan for the use of these monies?
- When proposals were made for retrenchment, why weren't the faculty given an opportunity to review and respond before they were filed?
- Did you ever discuss retrenchment with the Performing Arts faculty?
  - Do you have a written record of your meetings with the Performing Arts faculty?
  - Could we have access to them?
- **Written documentation requested:**
  - retrenchment plan
  - restructuring plan
  - memos and materials supporting the request to deactivate the CCA degree
  - written record of the meetings with Performing Arts