

4/23/64

THE FACULTY COUNCIL
INTERIM REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON ENROLLMENT POLICY

We should like--for the sake of brevity, clarity, and we hope, force-- to address ourselves at once to our immediate charge: enrollment policy. The challenge has been posed by the recently issued Master Plan, Chapter II, "Student Enrollment Policies" (Sec. 2a,1, p.54):

"Graduates of academic high schools who have academic or commercial diplomas and who are in the top quarter of the entire body of graduates of all high schools, public and private, of every type, are considered, on the basis of our experience over the years to have the ability to achieve a baccalaureate degree."

Corollary to this passage is the statement addressed to the Faculty on February 21, 1964 by President Gallagher that admission scores "probably will be lowered in connection with additional freshman admissions, but it does not follow from this that classroom standards of achievement should also be lowered."

For reasons that it will cite below, this committee feels compelled:

1. To challenge the wisdom and the humanity of lowering admission standards while maintaining ~~standards of achievement~~.
2. To challenge the wisdom and humanity of the transfer procedures currently operable for bringing students from the Community Colleges to the Senior Colleges.
3. To challenge the wisdom and humanity of jamming students into utterly inadequate facilities (see appended "Operation Breakdown") for what will be clearly a typically "indefinite period of time."

To begin with the last and most obvious challenge, we need perhaps note only that there has been no significant increase in classroom space since Army Hall was acquired during World War II. Nor is there any likelihood of additional space until 1968 to meet already overtaxed facilities--more than thirty percent beyond capacity at this point. To argue that learning transcends physical inconvenience betokens a foggy idealism not meeting with the classroom attended by windowsill sitters, or the hallways lined with students awaiting conferences. To avoid the temptation of adjectives, let us merely mention the library, the cafeteria, the bathrooms, Finley Center, and the like. The expanding Graduate Program adds to the pressure. The newly announced formula of one instructor to 19, rather than 15, students mocks the complaints about facilities and classroom size.

Statistical reports of the achievement of transfer students from Community Colleges have been previously presented to support our contention that it does an unprepared student little service to bring him here to suffer intellectual humiliation. The transfer grade of C has been too readily given at the Community Colleges; the task of sustaining a like grade at the Senior College has proved high impossible. A similar objection, of course, may be lodged against bringing into the Day Session from the high schools students who are simply incapable of meeting the standards which have won for the City College its distinction in the front ranks of American colleges. A so-called democratization--in name rather than in fact--by lowering admission averages, can at best add to the overtaxing of educational facilities. It can serve no significantly productive purpose in the preparation of these young people for the tasks we should hope they might one day undertake.

Your committee presents these ~~initial~~ recommendations for meeting the problems of enrollment:

- I. That no lowering of existing standards be allowed until a further study has been made. Professor Villard's study, appended to this report, raises a serious question of the validity of the analysis in the Master Plan of the role of the Senior Colleges.

II. That fuller use be made of the resources of the School of General Studies. This is the established avenue of approach for those who have not met the admission standards of the Senior Colleges. A specific proposal in this field:

A. Admit a special group of pre-matriculated students to be selected from underprivileged areas after close cooperation with high school authorities who will work out with us such problems as:

1. Selection of students having the best motivation to profit from college admission.
2. Exploring means of measuring this motivation, through such criteria as student-teacher relationships throughout the high school years.
3. Strengthening the ten year old Student Personnel Orientation program (SPO), which has worked in small groups and in individual consultation with clinical psychological advisors. Currently, only five or six part time workers serve at the City College. A permanent staff of line personnel is needed to supervise the development of this special pre-matriculated group.

B. Carefully planned advance testing procedures to assign these people effectively. And, as a follow-up, a program of tutorial service for remedial work in mathematics, foreign language, and English. Again, a permanent staff is necessary in these areas.

Such a program could not only succeed in the evening, where special facilities may readily be set apart without interfering with the established pattern of General Studies, but we in the day session can certainly profit, and soon, from these experiences.

III. That the policy for admitting transfer students from the Community Colleges be revised as follows:

- A. Students having an average of B or better be admitted to the Day Session as at present.
- B. Students with average of C be admitted to the School of General Studies as matriculated students.
- C. Transfer of these latter to the Day Session be permitted upon evidence of ability to maintain Day Session standards.

May we, before closing, remind our colleagues and the administrative staff that our efforts have been expended at their joint request and with their endorsement. We recall vividly the president's image of the faculty as an awkward giant. If we are to play out our role as giants, we cannot allow ourselves to be tranquillized. Giants stride; they do not toddle along, led by their masters. A sizable segment of this faculty cares about this college. It is aware and alert, responsive and responsible. It has urgent questions to ask, and it hopes, significant contributions to make. In this preliminary report we have undertaken both. We feel we speak for our colleagues when we urge once more that administrative leadership not isolate us. We are not parochial. We are capable of "university-wide" thinking.

The Committee

Bernard Bellush
John A. Davis

David Lewis
Arthur Waldhorn

Bailey Harvey