

SUBJECT TO SENATE APPROVAL

MINUTES OF THE ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY-NINTH PLENARY SESSION
OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

November 17, 1987

Chair Wedeen called the session to order at 7:05 p.m. in the Third Floor Studio at the Graduate School and University Center. Present were: Senators Aaronson, Alsop, Bank, Barbanel, Baumrin, Baxter, Beheshti, Binder, Bishop, Bleyman, Bohigian, Boylan, Brower, Canate, Constantinides, Cooper, Cravzow, Danziger, Dauben, Davidson, Depas, Donleavy, Donoghue, Galub, Ginsberg, Greenbaum, Grosseman, Gura, Hayon, Henderson, Hernandez-Miyares, Huang, Jaffe, Jiji, Karan, Kirkland, Lea, MacLennan, Magid, Matthews, McCall, McCullers, Meyers, Moyne, Oldham, Otte, Parkhurst, Picken, Riley, Rosen, Shaffer, Simor, Singleton, Sohmer, Speidel, Squitieri, Stern, Taylor, Timoni, Vines, Wasser, White, Wurmfeld, Zades, and Zaneteas; Alternate Senators Glass, Hill, Levitan, Schuyler, Sessions, and Suri. Senators Crump, B. Gerber, R. Gerber, La Rubbio, Loetterle, Lytra, Muller, Plissner, Sheridan, Stroup, Trefousse, and J. Walter were excused. Professors Boylan (Queens), Ginsberg (Borough Manhattan), Gura (Brooklyn), Sohmer (City), and Zades (Staten Island), heads or representatives of local campus faculty governance bodies, also attended. Chancellor Murphy and the UFS Executive Director also attended. Mr. Paul Dickstein, Director of the New York City Bureau of the Budget was the guest speaker.

I. Approval of the Proposed Tentative Agenda: Chair Wedeen announced two additions/changes in the proposed agenda: 1) The name of the speaker was not known at press time; therefore it was omitted from item VI; Item VII was deferred to a later date. She then asked for a motion to approve. The proposed tentative agenda was adopted by motion duly seconded and passed.

II. Approval of the Minutes of the 158th Plenary Session (October 20, 1987): The minutes were approved with the following correction: Senator Danziger was present.

III. Communications from the Chair: Chair Wedeen reminded the Senate that most of her communications, as was her custom, were available in writing on the materials table this evening. She said that she wished to report one or two developments that occurred too late to be printed and that she would discuss now. The issue of the procedures followed to elect the faculty members of the Presidential Search Committee at New York City Technical College, members would recall, had not been in accordance with the Board of Trustees 1980 Guidelines. When that fact came to the UFS leadership's attention discussions to remedy the error had been going on. In the last several days a negotiated settlement had been achieved - a settlement acceptable to the Chairman of the Board, the Trustee chairman of the Search Committee, the Chancellor and his staff, the leadership and faculty of the college and the UFS leadership. The agreement is to add a faculty trustee to the Search Committee and to develop, with UFS Executive Committee participation, a document to be circulated to all CUNY units now and whenever a search is launched, setting forth the procedures for electing the faculty members in accordance with the Bylaw definition of faculty. The Chairman of the Board has now appointed the Faculty Trustee Emeritus, Henry Wasser, to the Committee since a faculty trustee maintained the stipulated balance, under the Guidelines, between trustee and faculty members of the Committee. Senator McCullers (Social Science, New York City Technical), liaison member of the delegation, expressed the delegation's thanks to the Chair and the Executive Committee in this matter. Professor Taylor (Writing and Speech, New York City Technical) asked whether the Faculty Trustee Emeritus was to be in addition to the present three faculty members of the Committee and the Chair replied that it was.

The Chair then invited members who had asked for the opportunity to make brief

announcements or statements to do so at this time. Professor Galub (Social Science, Bronx Community) announced that there was a conference on open admissions sponsored by the CUNY Academy for Arts and Sciences and its Higher Education Seminar on Friday, November 20 at Roosevelt House from 9 a.m. to 4 p.m. and all faculty were invited.

Professor Bishop (Secretarial Science, Borough Manhattan) said that the College Council had passed a motion at its meeting last week to ask the Senate for help in expediting the College's amended governance plan that was languishing at 80th Street. Chair Wedeen said that the plan had been before the Board last April or May but had not been acted on because the Student Trustee was not satisfied with the arrangements for student participation. She would look into the matter, however.

Professor Taylor noted that the UFS Committee on which she serves meets at a time when she can not attend and asked whether there was a provision barring such arrangements. Chair Wedeen said that each committee established its own meeting place and time but that she would ask the Executive Director to bring Professor Taylor's problem to the Committee chairman.

Professor Lea (English, Lehman) said that in reference to the Borough Manhattan amended governance plan it was his understanding that the plan had been referred to the new administration of the College for review. Professor Davidson (Computer Information Systems, La Guardia) confirmed that information.

Professor Jaffe (Science, Borough Manhattan) confirmed that it was his understanding that the Student Trustee had objected to insufficient student input and stated that when the amended plan was initially developed and passed at the college the amendments had been with the framework of the existing plan and did not decrease student participation. Further, the plan was that for the Faculty Council and had been approved by the Borough Manhattan student government at that time. Chair Wedeen said the leadership would follow through on this matter.

Chair Wedeen then resumed her communications. She said she thought it would be of interest to many Senate members to know that other institutions outside the City University have noticed the Senate's discussion and stand on the academic issue of faculty rights and decision-making. If I may, I will ask the Executive Director who didn't expect me to ask her, but I know that she remembers, to share with us some of the other institutions who have been in touch with the Office, Dr. Ellis reported that 1) the State University of New York University Faculty Senate passed a resolution in support of the same principles enunciated in CUNY's. Their resolution was passed without dissent because certain members of the Central Administration of SUNY are assigned by the Chancellor to sit on the Senate and, therefore, they simply did not dissent, neither could they vote in favor and make the vote unanimous. 2) New York University has been in touch with the Office and, as a matter of fact, Chair Wedeen will be going down there before the end of the week to make a presentation to them, answer questions, and so forth, and they have a resolution of support on their agenda. 3) I had a call today from Ohio State University, from the chairman of the Faculty Council there who informed me that he has prepared a resolution, again in support of CUNY's, which will be on the agenda of their next meeting. He will be in touch with me just as soon as that vote is completed. He is expecting that it will be adopted and most probably unanimously. In addition, we had a request from a college in Rhode Island, Salve Regina, asking for information about the resolution and, in addition, an opportunity to review the report of the Task Force. At that point we did inquire of the Deputy Chancellor whether that document was appropriately sent outside the University at this time and he informed us that it is now a public document and that it may be shared with anyone.

Chair Wedeen raised the following question. She said that the covering letter that went to each CUNY President with copies of the report stated that it was the President's responsibility to run off enough copies so that the college governance body, the curriculum-making body, the department or whatever division it is of education, the relevant liberal arts departments and the student governance body each have copies so that each constituency could mail its responses back directly to the Task Force. It does not funnel. That question has been asked here individually by several of our Senators. It does not funnel through the College President's office; each group sends its response directly to the Task Force at 80th Street. Now, the document was sent on Friday, before the first, on the 30th of October and it should be in everyone's hands by now. If anyone here does know of any institutions where they have not been distributed to the appropriate groups, please do be in touch with Chair Everett on it because she has inquired as to whether everyone has received the copy. If anyone here knows, you can give it to Dr. Ellis subsequently. Yes? Dr. Ellis said there was one other thing she wished to say. She spoke with people at each of the colleges, the head of the faculty governance body - in the Senate's definition of such bodies - about the academic decision-making resolution. She asked if they would let the Office know if it had come before the college body and if there had been a vote and a resolution and, if there had, to forward a copy to the Office. She had found a few people this evening who thought the head of the governance body had forwarded the material, who informed me that it had been passed and by a unanimous vote. It would be infinitely helpful to the Chair if we had those in hand. So, if members went back to their colleges and prodded their governance heads about this, it would be appreciated. We have heard from a large majority by now, but there are still a few hangers-on who haven't let us know. Thank you.

Chair Wedeen asked whether there were any questions concerning the status, at this point, of the Task Force Report? She continued and said she assumed that since there were no questions that all of the Senators and their respective governance bodies and departments did have copies to work with at this time. The timetable so far has remained the same - that the Task Force is scheduled to meet on January 11th, she replied to a request from Professor Donleavy (Special Services to Education, Lehman) to know the timetable - that is, on the assumption that all the reports will be in before the Christmas recess so that the staff will have an opportunity to summarize and collate the results for the Task Force in time to read it and discuss it at the January 11th meeting. Now, apparently several people feel that there may be some problems on some of the campuses because it has been brought to my attention that on some campuses the document first has gotten into the hands of faculty this week which makes it two weeks late and that next week is we know, Thanksgiving which makes it a shorter week. Therefore, there are some problems that we are facing on those campuses where this has occurred. If they can proceed on time I'm sure it would make it smoother for everyone. If they cannot, I'm certain they will communicate with the Chair of the Task Force and bring up whatever problems and adjustments in schedules they may have to make. A Senator informed her that the document had not yet been distributed on his campus. Another said that it hasn't been distributed at a lot of places. [Shouts of "Hear, hear!"] Chair Wedeen suggested that Senators name the institutions where it had not been distributed and the Executive Director would list them and the Office would transmit the information. The following were noted as colleges where the document had been partially distributed, or not distributed at all: Lehman, Graduate School, Brooklyn, Hunter (although some arrangements for distribution are being discussed there), Borough Manhattan, Bronx Community, Hostos, Kingsborough, La Guardia, Medgar Evers, New York City Technical, John Jay, Queensborough, Staten Island, and Baruch. Chair Wedeen said that she would share the information with the Chair of the Task Force and thanked the body.

Professor Donleavy asked what the response of the Board of Trustees to the resolution passed at the October Plenary about faculty prerogatives. What would be the next step? Was the Board going to pursue the route it's taken or not? Chair Wedeen said that

that there had been no response received to the particular resolutions. As far as the next steps, one of the members has made a suggestion that will be taken up at the Executive Committee meeting next week - the suggestion was the possibility of having governance heads of the various units perhaps sit down and talk with either the Chairman of the Board or the entire Board. It was a suggestion made by one of our Senators who is also a governance head at one of the colleges. If any Senator has any additional suggestions or wishes to discuss this point, please do so. Any reactions to the suggestion or do you want to wait until we sit down and discuss it and see what we come up with? A member asked which Senate Committee should be responsible for pursuing the resolution and the chair responded that the Executive Committee had given the resolution to the Curriculum Policy Committee, providing copies for each member, and that committee has been working on it and the members did get it on time because the Senate Office received it on October 30th. It was distributed and put in the hands of everyone immediately so that they had it by Monday and they have been working on it since. Their meetings are continuing. As far as I know, they plan on being at the point of being able to have a report for us at either the December or January meeting. Asked whether it did not seem important at this point to find out whether there has been this kind of usurping of faculty prerogatives throughout the University - whether there is a pattern that can be determined or whether it was a single event since on the questioner's own campus, she knew, it was a question. Nonetheless, it seemed to her that the matter was so serious that the Senate should have some strong data to either support what was happening or provide a diagnosis of the actual situation. Professor Grossman (Elementary Education, City) said that she had asked Chancellor Murphy recently whether there was any relationship between the previous Task Force on Education and the current group. He said the report had been passed on. That is true. If anyone has a copy of the previous report which is about 45 pages and compares it with the current report he or she will find that large chunks have been lifted out, slightly edited, some of the better parts left in the original and not in the new one, but it makes for interesting comparative reading. The new group obviously looked at it and used a great deal of it.

IV. Reports of Faculty Members of Board of Trustees' Committees: Chair Wedeen noted that these were available on the materials table this evening.

V. Chancellor's Report: Chancellor Murphy said he was pleased to learn that Budget Director Paul Dickstein was invited to speak and he assumed that the faculty was prepared to raise with him the issues it saw fit. He believed that City officials needed to hear from the faculty about the needs of the community colleges, especially, though about the University generally. I think they understand and certainly we understand, he said, that the community colleges are having a very bad year financially, that this was recognised by the City government that appropriated \$4.2 million for general aid which found itself on something called the "B" list. The "B" list is presumably those dollars to be released for use for all social purposes and public purposes in the City provided that certain income streams remain as originally anticipated and that other costs that were feared at the time did not materialize so that there were some contingencies. It's clear that the \$4.2 million in general aid is necessary. But it doesn't really address the whole issue of the health, vitality mission, role, and future of the community colleges. I think I indicated at an earlier meeting that I thought that it was time for us to have another look at the community colleges, the questions are being raised from coast to coast, different systems have different kinds of community colleges, different kinds of expectations, but overall some of the issues appear to be universal, and probably ought to be addressed, especially by us, since we have innovative, creative and important community colleges given the nature of community college education across the country. And I think it's time for us to do that. What precisely the effects - we did a study recently altogether independent of the stock market of several weeks ago - for some reason someone said it would be a good idea if we took a look to see if there was any relationship between the economic vitality of the City or certain indexes of vitality

in enrollments. We discovered that, what you might have surmised, it's a practically one to one correlation. It's not a bad one, but it's a high correlation between unemployment and enrollment, and as unemployment increases, enrollment increases. And, of course, the deepest depression yields the greatest days for our University. Historically, that's been the case. The Chancellor said that he supposed the principle here was that one increases the numbers of persons interested in getting an education, they they, of course, have time available. One presumably keeps the cost as it was - in the past free or now very low - and then one proceeds to appropriate relatively small numbers of dollars and, therefore, exclude large numbers of people, which is the logic that informs that particular set of arrangements. We didn't have any dramatic, historical changes in mind when we looked at the community college enrollments correlating with other events, but they need looking at and we intend to do that.

This morning, the Chancellor said, there was a ceremony at which the Mayor was - the Mayor has now appeared two days running at two different City University events...one at Queens yesterday commemorating the 50th anniversary at which Senator Speidel appeared as Master of Ceremonies. I thought it was a very effective convocation, well-attended and that the Mayor was reasonably eloquent. Well, this morning I must say he was really very eloquent. He was invited to speak to our graduates in the Literacy program. We have some 6,000 students scattered throughout the University learning how to read. Some of the stories you read about them, it's the stuff of which newspaper stories are made. One, a woman of Hispanic background, is the oldest of 20 children and never learned how to read. She managed. She had to take care of her children and she entered our program at the age of the forties and just learned how to read and suddenly this world opened for her. It's really very moving and this is about the third or fourth of these that I've attended and the Mayor comes back every year. He was there last year and he was there today to tell stories about his own family. It's extraordinarily moving to glimpse at the moment of bravery and courage a middle-aged person has to generate knowledge publicly that he or she's illiterate and then go ahead and put himself in the hands of strangers who are promising to do something about it. It's one of those things that - I guess it's an irony of history - that is being funded by MAC surplus funds.

We had a bad article in The New York Times the other day about student defaults. It makes it appear as though all student defaults in the United States were in The City University of New York. There are all kinds of people in my building who are very eager to talk to the press for some reason, perhaps it is because no one else is paying attention to them. We had prepared for the story, because we do have a high default rate for all the reasons you might imagine, and tried to communicate them to the press but it proved too complicated. I'd indicated to them that there was a concept of collective guilt in punishing future generations of persons who would not be able to borrow money, should they come to CUNY because past generations of students were defaulting at a rate in excess of that judged to be prudent by the United States government. It's strange but reporters can't understand what's wrong with that. The Secretary of Education didn't understand - but the real failure was my inability to explain it and I wish some really competent philosophers could explain to them what was wrong with their reasoning. In any event they paid no attention to that sort of convoluted way of looking at the world. They simply took a story in which they said "City University defaults at 22%, but, boy!, Columbia only defaults at 3". When you say to the reporter that's because kids at Columbia have rich fathers, he says, "yes, we had thought of that." If they hadn't thought of that they couldn't get into any of the colleges of the City University. Most of them don't go here. I met also today with Assemblyman Ed Sullivan at some length. He's chairman of the Higher Education Committee on the Assembly side, who's managed to be very supportive and undoubtedly will continue to be very supportive, as we now embark on our annual budget process at the State level. I have nothing to add to what's been said about teacher education. The document... [Director of the Budget Dickstein entered] Hi! Paul, I've gone first. so that you needn't be concerned. The Teacher Education document is presumably now in the hands of anyone who has an interest

in it, and there are those eagerly waiting for a response. I see people saying that they do not yet have it in hand. Could you tell me the name of the institution so that I'll know which President gets "C-" for not attending...Chair Wedeen intervened - The Executive Director will forward the list which she has. The Chancellor resumed and said "oh, good! Now, I'll let you grade your President..don't get me into that." We're eager to get responses to it and at some moment in time there will be a document presumably incorporating the rational responses to it. Don't ask the question, Stefan [Professor Baumrin], I know what you're going to say. A final document will be transmitted to the Chairman of the Board at which point the Chairman's staff, I'm the Chairman's staff, will examine the document with a view to seeing whether or not and to what degree, policy changes in our present arrangements for teacher education can then be recommended to the Board as a whole.

Finally, the Chancellor said that he just wanted to comment that he has been advocating, and is obviously in the asking budget for those who looked at it, and was pressing on all fronts to see if the University can impress as many people as it can about the importance of worker education. There was an affair, sponsored by the University, in the city last week about the Brooklyn program in worker education which leads to the master's degree, and to remind people that there are well over 100,000 people in municipal unions in this town alone, many of whom are already involved with CUNY either at community college or equivalency degree level, or in a literacy program, or working on Ph.D's. This constituency is especially CUNY's, it's a tax-paying constituency that supports our University, pays the taxes that feed the rest of us. It constitutes political power that supports the University when we need it and we owe it to them to construct programs that fit their particular needs. That concludes my report to the faculty and I would be happy to respond to whatever questions they would like to raise at this time.

1) Professor Sohmer (Mathematics, City) - "Why was it so difficult to communicate to the reporters that the loans go into default once the student drops out and are got that way by the nature of our population which is very high?" / If my explanation was too complicated, wouldn't that appear complicated? Then, why raise the issue of the drop-out rate too. Look, the story was a bad story. It made the University look bad. It didn't deserve it; we got a bad deal. It was our fault because we allowed, we did not take adequate precautions to somehow discourage persons from whatever aspirations they may have had to function as our press officer, no matter what other talents they may have had. 2) Professor Lea - "I too would like to speak to that story in the New York Times. With due respect, Chancellor, the Executive Committee raised the issue with you almost three years ago. I have to say your response was one that suggested you didn't think it was an especially important issue. Besides, you said, it only involves a few colleges. I asked you, could you provide the figures, and you said nobody could. So, it does seem to me - Chancellor Murphy interjected, "Are we talking about student loans?" Professor Lea resumed - Yes, that's what we are talking about, because I related a number of horror stories about CUNY's collection procedures. That's the first thing. The other thing that I think is perhaps even more important is something that's at work at CUNY that is offensive. And it's embodied in the statements of the particular administrator who spoke with the New York Times. I beg to differ with him. The poor pay their debts just like everybody else. And he was feeding into a CUNY stereotype involving both classism and, I think, at the same time, racism. And that's quite unfortunate, because no one more than you is concerned about racism at CUNY and elsewhere. So, I was very disturbed by the whole thing. First of all, it seems to be, to me, most of the blame should be placed on the collection procedures - or, certainly a significant percentage. But to blame the poverty of our students, I think, is simply not proper. / Well, I'm not in a position to defend the individual in question. I've already acknowledged the fact that he's extremely proficient at what he does and there's

no reason to assume that he would be particularly artful at other kinds of things like handling the press. It was a mistake that the issue was referred to him and it's spilt milk now. As to the implication of racism, I'm sure it could not have been conscious, the man himself is a member of a minority race, I suppose, he's Asian. I don't think he intended, I did read those words with very much the same kind of uneasy feeling that you did, but, knowing the man I did not attribute to him something other than what I expect that he at least consciously or specifically intended. Thirdly, I would assume, on the face of it, that the poor, if they managed to put themselves in a position in which they're in debt, which is hard, especially for our students, most of whom never borrow money because they have to walk into a bank where they're not exactly welcomed. It is true that the way in which the thing was written suggests that somehow our students were more culpable or less responsible than others. The fact that there are more of them who are in debt and have not paid off their debts is an indication to my mind of their own economic struggle which is considerable for many of them. The second part of your comment has to do with the responsibility of the University with regard to collection procedures. We have good ones now because we followed government guidelines as to what we're supposed to do. We don't actually pay the people who get on the phone to call people to tell them to pay their debts. We now have, you'll forgive the expression, collection agencies who do this, and they are collection agencies that we get at lowest bid, and, in fact, our collection procedures are now so refined that we just had an audit by the Comptroller of the City whose criticism of us was entirely off base. That's how refined we've got. So I don't know what to say. I think the whole business, frankly, of putting students into debt in order to get a college education is just an atrocity and I think it ought to stop. I think it's very bad. I think we ought to at least determine those students among us who come from families who can afford to, they pay and those who can't, we pay, and that's that. Some of it is just downright ridiculous. We're trying to operate a Medical School with less than a \$50,000 debt, and want them to work in hitherto unserved neighborhoods - in places like Queens which is what the law requires that we produce physicians for, when there is no way in which they're going to be able to do that because they're in serious debt. So, essentially I agree with you, but I think the attribution, at least in terms of motive of the person who's quoted I think I would not agree with. 3) Professor Baumrin (Philosophy, Graduate School) - I wanted this to be a short question. As I understand it, the present timetable for consideration of the Teacher Education Task Force Report would bring the report back to the Board Committee or the Board Committee staff on January 11, and since relevant to that question you asked before about what the degree of distribution is, since the degree of distribution is spotty at best, you'll see the figures from the list, it seems to me given the fact that there's a Christmas vacation, that's going to be rather short. We're effectively talking about only five weeks. If you add the first week in January it's only six weeks. Faculties move like, I don't know, wounded elephants at best. I can't see that you can get more than one General Faculty meeting in at most at any of the campuses - that would be the December meeting - and it might take more than one meeting. I fear that because this has happened before the senior administrators at colleges will say, look, we have time pressure here, we have no time to study this. It's up for discussion today, you say what you have to say, and that's the end of it. So I was wondering whether or not it might not be suggestible that that be moved over to a late February reception date instead of January."/I believe the timetable is a recommendation and, as such, it's a recommendation that goes beyond the charge to the Committee. The Committee was given a charge. When the outcome would go through the process of actual Board action is not part of its charge, although it made recommendations, it can do what it likes, of course. We're taking the recommendation seriously because we would like to see this move along. I have read the document and therefore I know you can read it twice as fast as I can read it. I see some areas in there and I know that you're going to see four times as many. I've raised a couple of questions, one of which you will raise for sure, like will philosophy be included among those subjects which one can major in and be a school teacher. Well, since you've

noticed it and I've noticed it and now everybody else has noticed it, it shouldn't take five weeks to come back and say there's something basically and fundamentally flawed in a proposal that excludes philosophy as a discipline as qualifying a teacher to teach. Madame Chairman, I will not discuss this issue because I take this issue to be beyond discussion. It is an a priori truth and not subject, it seems to me, to further analysis, and he agrees. Chair Wedeen said - "So are some of the other items in that document." 4) Professor Jaffe - "The question was raised earlier, Chancellor Murphy, about the BMCC governance document, and this is about the third time you're hearing it from me. In the April or March meeting of the Board, the student trustee raised an objection to the document which has been hanging around for two years to get through this whole rigamarole. Ms. Negron's objection was about a lack of student participation in the governance process. The faculty at BMCC voted two years ago for about 17 changes in the governance and they voted in accordance with the previous governance document which had previously been approved by the Board of Trustees, including the student representative then and had originally been signed off in the original document by the student government at the college. We currently have a situation where the governance document has now been essentially or de facto returned to the college because of an objection of the student trustee on the Board and the dilemma that the faculty find themselves in is that the faculty has done what they're supposed in accordance with the then governing document and now somebody's changing the rules."/Well, I can't comment on the details because I don't know them. I do know that if there's been an inordinate delay it's been at least partly the result of the transition from one president to another. There were questions about the seriousness with which it was performed by the previous president, there were questions he might have raised then but did not because it appeared moot to him. The new president, I think, is still examining the plan. Professor Jaffe further said - "No, President Kappner had moved the document to the Board, and it went before the Board in either March or April, and the problem now seems to arise with the Student Trustee and it's in the Board minutes. It seems to me that we as a college are being placed under -- somebody's changing the rules - and we're being placed under some more severe restrictions than other colleges are, and I was wondering whether you could look into the matter. The faculty would be kind of grateful."/ I will. 5) Professor Sohmer - "There is a structural problem in the construction industry that operates in the City University and I don't think you can answer it immediately but I think it's a desperately needed problem. As a resident of the last very largest bad building built for CUNY I hope, the structural problem is that the people who do the construction are in no wise responsible to the people who are going to inhabit the buildings. They are responsible to somebody at 80th Street, they are responsible to some Dean who is usually transient, but it is the faculty who are going to have to live in and use the building for as long as they stay at the University. That's a structural deficiency that I don't think you can answer whistling on one foot, but it is one that is very critical for the building program that we're going through. I hope it becomes considered rather than just ignored and we merrily go along building very bad buildings which don't serve the purpose they're supposed to serve."/I can't assure that the undesired outcome will be altered by the process you recommend. The divorce between design, construction and use is not a happy one and it isn't always what it seems to be. We have some very badly designed buildings that have received very careful attention from the future inhabitants so the question is whether there's a correlation between input of persons occupying the building and hoped for outcome. 6) Professor Speidel (Geology, Queens)- "Thank you for your kind words about our program yesterday. It was fun trying to decide how to introduce you. In part, that leads to my question to you tonight. If you recall last year the body was quite unhappy when we felt you were not paying us enough attention. I see you in many ways not just as the Chancellor but as our equivalent of a Dean of Faculty for the entire University and certainly a chief faculty person. Which leads to my question. Last month we resolved that the Board of Trustees uphold its bylaws with respect to the role of the faculty in its actual academic decision-making. How do you feel about that in your position both as a representative, as a member of the University Faculty Senate,

as well as Chancellor?" / There are two issues here. You're referring, obviously, to the teacher education proposal. One issue has to do with the relative merits of the contents of the proposal, and the other has to do with the procedures governing the way in which it comes before us for discussion. The Chancellor said that he had taken the only position he could imagine taking, viz. that the right to come forward with ideas of any kind is a universal one, that anyone ought to have it, and that other constituencies of the University making the effort should be welcomed. He said too that he thought the issue of teacher education a public policy one - not only academic policy. In a number of states, he said, teacher education has been determined or redone by legislators, by outside organizations of one kind or another, by constituencies that are not and do not and have not been charged with either the capacity or the ability to make such changes, but have done so, nevertheless. Because teacher education like other professional education is not a simple question of academic training of a new generation of scholars and teachers but is preparation for a crucial social and cultural role, it seems to me, that a fortiori it is true that the issue of origins doesn't arise and that anyone could raise questions, ought to raise questions, has traditionally raised questions. The Chancellor said that he went to meetings of constituent groups ranging from parents to ethnic caucuses of one kind or another in which the question of teachers came up all the time. Therefore, he resisted the notion that there is a special fount of knowledge and experience with regard to teacher training such that no one else is entitled to have an opinion or no one else is entitled to grapple with the issues that are represented in that debate. The Chancellor said finally that he did not believe nor did he believe the Board believed that it had the right or authority to meddle in matters of curriculum, even in matters of professional curriculum, and he did not think that was what was being done. The report skirted pretty close but it did not do that. The Board does have and there was no question about it and the Senate resolution did not question it, legal authority. Normally the Board exercised its legal authority as a corporate board on the recommendations that came to it from the faculty and the administrators who represented the views of the faculty but that was not universally true. The Board, he said, does take a position with regard to whether or not it's going to offer a degree in a particular area - it does that all the time. There are two or three degree programs currently under dispute, he continued. The Chancellor said that there is a very thin and sometimes difficult to define line between where a board has a right to take certain kinds of positions. Legally there is no question but morally, historically, and where, it does not. If the question directed to me is whether I've been cognizant of my responsibilities as a member of the faculty to protect the faculty against unwarranted intrusions in its historic rights, I believe I have, said the Chancellor. No one's arm has been twisted and nothing has been rammed down anyone's throat, despite the unfortunate locutions by some over-eager members of the Board of Trustees.

VI. Guest Speaker: New York City Director of the Budget Paul Dickstein: Chair Wedeen welcomed Mr. Dickstein and informed the Senate that he received a Bachelor of Science degree from Columbia University and a J.D. from New York University. He had devoted his career to City government except for a brief period in the private sector. Having begun his public career during the Lindsay administration, Mr. Dickstein had served in the various agencies including the Police Department, the Bureau of Housing Preservation and Development and the Department of Corrections as well as the Office of Budget and Management.

Mr. Dickstein said that he was asked to come to the Senate to talk about the implications of the Stock Market crash for New York City. Broadly speaking, he said, he has absolutely no answer to that question. Reinterpreting that question to mean what effect will it have on the City's budget process, its budget, and perhaps City University, he continued, I can predict better than what I can actually for the economy, and these are different disciplines, to some extent. It's certain that the economic boom that this city in particular has experienced over the last five years is coming to an end and, therefore, life for many of us who live in the City will be different in

the future than it has been in the recent past. Mr. Dickstein said that, in his opinion, that was probably a good thing. Both growth is good and so are the benefits of an intelligent retrenchment. The retrenchees, he continued, don't always see it that way but he thought over all there was a benefit to it. A consensus seemed to be forming that was not clear yet but seemed to be forming among forecasters of the national economy that there will be a slowdown in economic growth in general, in the growth of the national product, nationally - perhaps not a recession but a slowdown. The forecaster whom the City pays to provide it with information gave it an update two weeks ago which predicted a decline from what they had previously projected for the next calendar year - about 1.2% in gross national product growth one year to the next. The implications for the City's revenues, he continued, are a little unclear but a reasonable guess is that over the remainder of the current fiscal year and the next fiscal year the City's revenues would decline from the previous projection of \$400 million. The City's budget amounts to a little over \$23 billion; however, on the margin a \$400 million change one way or the other is exceptionally dramatic - if not as a matter of substance in management, as a matter of perception. Therefore, the Director of the Budget said, he was in the process of preparing for the City's January financial plan, a retrenchment program which meant that it was likely, if not certain, to project and present a program that has fewer employees next year than this year. There would likely be an effect on all City agencies including the community colleges. Mr. Dickstein noted that there were a number of different ways of doing these sorts of things, and the City was at the beginning of the process but unless something dramatic and unexpected happened, it would happen and it would affect the City University. There are a number of responses or combination of responses possible on the part of the University. One is that City University and the community colleges which are of particular concern as a matter of budget policy to the City as compared to the senior colleges, is exceptionally important or deserves the highest place in the City's budget priorities and ought not only to be exempted from reductions but ought to be given increases despite the difficulties that the City is facing - at least, in part, that was the response he anticipated. Another response was that the City University recognized that reductions were required, essential, that the City must have a balanced budget, there is a national change in the economy that's undoubtedly going to affect the City and that the City University must participate realistically in it to some extent, and that the University will make an effort to do so, difficult as it is, to minimize the effect of the reductions on the University, that it will once again look at its operations, look at its mission and look at what it does and attempt - to use an outmoded term - improve its productivity, so that while reductions take place, learning, achievement, and what the student receives are not reduced. He said that he expected that to be part of the response in any case.

The community colleges, Mr. Dickstein said, occupy a particularly difficult position in the budget. One of the best things to do in any budget is to get somebody else to pay for your expenses. The University is in the fortunate position of having both the State and the City in the position of attempting each to get the other to pay a larger share of its budget, and there's a third group in the University who pay for expenses, and that is the students, maybe. The State has a program called TAP, Tuition Assistance Payments. Most of the students in the community colleges, the vast preponderance, receive some tuition assistance payments. It's a matter of fact that when the University raises tuition for community colleges, most of the increase is paid by the State, through the tuition assistance program. There is historic resistance on the part of the University to raising tuition at the University and other universities, and some of having to go back to the pre-1975 philosophical position that members of the faculty and administrative of the University have toward tuition. But I would commend to you in this environment, Mr. Dickstein said, that you think about the fact that an increase in tuition is essentially increased support for the University on the part of the State that's in essence

quired.

The City Budget Process goes on. A financial plan which is a legal obligation is released in January, he explained, and that provides a preview of next year's budget, and the four years succeeding that. The Mayor issues his budget at the end of May, beginning of April sic, and then the Legislature, the Council and the Board of Estimate, which may or may not be a legislature, acts on it in June - this process is public, well watched, somewhat acrimonious, and which in fact the University's Chancellor affects. When your Chancellor first became Chancellor he attempted to address the University's budget process in a very substantive and programmatic and direct and analytic way, and that was unsuccessful. After that he approached it in a more political way, and that was very successful. As a man who doesn't repeat his mistakes, Mr. Dickstein said, he suspected the coming year was going to test the Chancellor's skills on both sides - and he has found those skills to be considerable.

Mr. Dickstein agreed to respond to the following questions and comments from the floor. 1) Professor Speidel - "I thought I heard you say that an increase in tuition is tantamount to an increase of support by the State."/ Yes, that is correct. Professor Speidel resumed - "Would you explain that a little bit for me?"/ The State has a program which automatically reimburses tuition up to varying levels depending on the income level of the student. I don't recall the statistics now but I believe well over 70% maybe 80% of the students in the community colleges, which is the budget concern of the City, not the senior colleges, receive such tuition assistance. A large portion of them, 100%, as tuition goes up, the amount of tuition assistance payments they get goes up. So, as a matter of equity and strategy in a sense, there is a consideration here that is on my mind and I think ought to be on your mind. 2) Professor Lea - "Welcome to the City University Faculty Senate, Mr. Dickstein. What you've told us is very sobering indeed, and I don't think any of us is smiling. But I would like to ask a question about something more current, if I may. I understand that Brooklyn Borough President Golden has asked you to account for the \$59 million the Board of Estimate allotted to services including CUNY. Are you going to reply? Have you replied?"/ I have replied. Let me go over that issue for you. My experience, which is extensive is that when a big government puts out a budget, nobody likes it, no matter what the circumstances are, good or bad. It's never enough, or it's too much, depending on whether you view yourself principally as a taxpayer or as a recipient of services. The Mayor's last budget was no exception to that. It was by most standards a good budget from the point of view of people who considered themselves recipients of services and to some extent even those who considered themselves taxpayers. The City Council and the Board of Estimate, in many ways their most important and visible function is to change the Mayor's budget. That's the most important thing they do. They always will criticize the budget and they will always change it. Their changes are always to make the budget bigger, always. This year was no exception. However, their desire was to make it significantly bigger, we believe, and at a level that we thought could not be supported. A compromise was arrived at, which as the legally adopted budget contained an appropriation level that essentially permitted the Board and the Council to add approximately, somewhere around \$90 million in new services for the City, partially offset by some reductions that we imposed on the base budget, including reductions on the City University. The net change on the size of the budget was somewhere between \$50 million and \$60 million. We further agreed that under certain agreed upon circumstances, the remainder of the items that were in their list up until the end, which amounted to an additional \$56 million or so, would be added to the budget. There were really two circumstances under which we agreed such items would be added. One was that the end of the year surplus as predicted by me would be larger than I had predicted and not offset by increased cost imposed by the State legislature on the City which was still in session when the budget was adopted. And that secondly, the Mayor would not seek to modify this budget during the course of the year, to add discretionary services unless all of the so-called "B" list were funded first. The surplus last year was in fact

smaller, by a significant amount, than I had projected, principally because the sale of the Coliseum site, which was to be consummated last fiscal year, was not. Assuming that if it is consummated this year, we ought to attribute it to last year's surplus. It has yet to be consummated. Negotiations are under way that would change the structure of that deal so it is at best uncertain that the amount of money we anticipated receiving from that sale would take place, and as a matter of fact, clearly in fact, it might not take place, which would cost us \$380 million a year out of this year's operating budget, which everybody views as my problem to deal with and still wants to know what's going to happen to the "B" list, which was predicated on certain technical events happening which are not going to happen. The bottom line is, all of that aside, we would be crazy to add \$56 million worth of services now while we're in the very process of preparing to reduce services. So, he probably has received such a letter by now. I don't know when you spoke to him last. 3) Professor Ginsberg (Data Processing, Borough Manhattan) - "you mentioned before that there are various methods of implementing the retrenchment, could you elaborate on that?"/ Sure. You can do it across the board, You can say your last budget was perfect as a matter of theory, and it is perfect on the margin, and that, therefore, marginal reductions ought to affect the differing institutions equally, and that no further work or analysis or consideration is required. I think this is a theory of Milton Friedman's by the way, and that you can just do an arithmetic reduction and balance your budget that way, You can engage in a variety of processes that attempt to elicit both from the agencies affected or that would be affected the different consequences of different levels of reduction on these institutions in an attempt to make a judgment - in effect, that balances off those consequences. That process, by the way, is never straightforward. You can present, certainly in January, what is a financial plan, not a budget, and that has its own strategy behind it aside from presenting a responsible financial document - different ways of reducing services and even description of the circumstances under which you might or might not reduce services and where. You can also increase taxes and decide which taxes you'd like to increase - something that is more difficult to do now than it was a few years ago. There is an analytic and substantive process that I believe that is fruitful to engage in, acknowledging that it's not straightforward. Each year we modify that process a little bit because the process is stale and riddled with cynicism on all sides, and changing it a little has a certain benefit to it. People may look at it a little differently. There's a fair amount of thought has to go into where you think you're going to end up and how you have to deal with the agencies and constituencies they represent in the process. Professor Ginsberg further asked - "Have you requested Retrenchment Guidelines from the community colleges as yet?"/ I don't request them. I issue retrenchment guidelines in a sense. What we will do is to send the Chancellor a letter from the Mayor and we will describe in general and some specifics what we think the City's upcoming financial situation is, which undoubtedly is going to be dire at this point, and requesting his cooperation in a process to best determine how to allocate the resources that we think will be available and then there is some detail behind that in forms and all sorts of things. 4) Professor Cooper (History, Staten Island) - "If I understood you correctly, you were suggesting obliquely that we offset the City reductions by increasing tuition and getting it back through TAP. How do we account for the possibility that the State is going to have at least the same, if not worse, kinds of reductions, and be not too willing to come up with TAP?"/ They have no choice with respect to TAP. It's automatic. They won't change that, I don't believe. 5) Professor Greenbaum (History, Queensborough) - "Given that the community college budgets have been horribly inadequate in times of prosperity, I have a question that has to do with the implementation of those budgets. There are two items on the community college budget that I think are absolutely essential for my own institution. I am Professor Greenbaum of Queensborough. And that is day-care and tutorials, neither of which have ever been implemented in all the years they've been in the budget. I realize a certain amount of discretion is necessary, but how do you get a president to implement items that are absolutely essential to the running of the institution?"/ Well, is your question that day-care has been provided for in the City's budget? Professor Greenbaum - "Theoretically, and so have tutorials."/ If an increase in day-care was an assumption

underlying the budget, a specific assumption, I have no idea why it was never implemented. I don't believe day-care has been implemented at CUNY, whether it's been implemented at Queensborough you would know. Obviously it has not. How those particular day-care funds were allocated amongst the different institutions is not up to me, nor should it be. 6) Professor Bohigian (Mathematics, John Jay) - "This is a difficult question to phrase. The City cannot say to the weather condition that you shall not snow past a certain amount of snow that is not budgeted. The City cannot say to homeless people, there can be no more homeless people to fill our streets. The City cannot say there shall not be more criminals to fill criminal justice correctional institutions, etc. Given those constraints which the City cannot handle, why does it always fall upon those agencies which can be pushed and shoved to a smaller budget? How do you account for that in your formula?"/ I think I understand your question. It's one that I think about a great deal. Is this what you're saying - large portions of the City budget seem to be mandated out of control of the City. The question then follows, it would seem to me, is those portions of the budget that remain discretionary are the only ones that can be reduced if insufficient funds remain to support the totality. That is a fact and, in fact, of the \$23 billion, only about \$11 billion are supported by local tax revenues, the rest are federal and state funds. Of that \$11 or \$12 billion, a very large portion are devoted to things like what you've described, that are essentially out of control of the City, or anybody else. Those are sort of pressing social or even legal requirements that there's nothing that can be done about. What you end up with is that the basic local responsibility is for the most important services - education, crime, cleaning the streets, and putting out fires - that's where the money is. When you have to make reductions, that's where you've got to go. So that the question, it seems to me, is not how can I explain why we do that, but that in fact it's inescapable that we do it. Professor Bohigian resumed - "There are certain premises there. It could be put to the City, for example, in the choices, that would you be willing to have snow not removed as quickly; would you permit it to be piled up to a certain level before it is removed. These are difficult social choices. Could it be that the payments or allocations to the homeless would not be as great? Why is it that the quality of life in the City must always be attacked and yet the "pressing services" which do not really present the quality of life are. I don't expect you to respond. I'm having difficulty with it because I'm at conflict on the issues too. But it does seem that the burden is always borne by the real quality, what makes the City the City, and what happens eventually and ultimately is by affecting the real quality of life in the City, you do affect the tax base, because there are adjustments made by corporations, by people who decide to move out of the City, etc. etc. right down the line and it becomes a cascading effect. You get a smaller tax base eventually because you've addressed issues which aren't so high in the priority list in the minds of individuals that are paying the taxes."/ Just generally. People are elected to make those judgments; they hire people to help them do it. They do the best they can. It ain't easy, believe me, and if you're not satisfied, the appropriate response is to vote for somebody else who you think will do it better. The trade-offs are difficult everywhere. There are few things like putting out a big government budget for the kinds of debate and acrimony it engenders. There are powerful, important, and legitimate constituencies organized around every one of those cost centers but I don't recall ever somebody proposing an expenditure for malevolent purposes. It is always a good purpose and if all the good purposes were funded fully we would have been bankrupt long ago. It's a judgment that's difficult to make, time-consuming, done with a great deal of painstaking care. We've done the best we can. If you think someone else can do it better, vote for somebody else. Professor Bohigian resumed - "I don't think that really addresses the issue. I'd like to think of education and higher education in this City as just as important as if there were a fire burning out of control. There would be no resources spent trying to control that and put that fire out. I think that same attitude has to be portrayed. Essentially what we're doing here is for you to take that message back to the politicians and since you are a very big mover in this budget item we are telling you directly that you have got to look at higher education not as a stepchild but as something as important

as a burning building or a crime in the street and you've got to stop pulling funds from it and denuding that particular operation."/ If I could, one last thing. I would definitely reduce the Fire Department and give it to CUNY, if I could. 7) Professor Baumrin (Philosophy, Graduate School) - "We're all people of good will. I'm not going to raise any question like that. You will recall, I hope, the last time this happened that the City Budget Office struck at the core of the University. It was on short notice, of course, but I don't even want to raise that question, you're better prepared now. "/ Immediately after the fiscal crisis? Professor Baumrin - "During it. Yes. We count it differently, We count it not from when we saw there was a shortfall but when we were laid off. It was deep and it was pervasive and we really haven't recovered from it quite. Maybe we thought we would recover in a year or two, well, that's not in the cards. In the interim the City has seen some incredible growth, but one of the things that has been bruited about rather powerfully is both the need for technical personnel for the kind of industry that has been growing and that's been the job of the University, and a particular job of the community colleges. The last time we lost 100,000 students virtually overnight. They didn't die, they just went elsewhere. That might happen again. What will suffer is not the few hundred people who'll get laid off, but what will suffer is the City. What question was not put to the business community the last time and must be put by the City government to the business community this time is not whether we're going to vote for you again but what will they sacrifice to maintain the City University of New York or that portion they're responsible for. Don't look to us to take it by going away and the students to take it by not being educated. Look to them as to what bill they are willing to pay. They have the benefit of not having paid the stock transfer tax and that I count up to be an enormous amount of money given the volume share on the Stock Exchange alone in the last 13 years. The restoration of that tax alone would amply cover your deficit although I'm not suggesting that they would go along with it."/ Well, first of all there is not going to be another fiscal crisis. Whatever we do will not be anywhere near the dimensions of what was done in 1975 and immediately thereafter. You are suggesting that we raise business tax payments to support the City University. Again, that's not particularly productive or appropriate. There is a general feeling that New York City must compete with its neighbors for jobs and for business and that we are in a vulnerable position because we are the most highly taxed jurisdiction in this country. In order to survive one must consider very seriously even if the times are difficult, reducing not increasing taxes. That again is a judgment that you pay the people who you elect to make. In my own view it would be extremely counter-productive to raise business taxes right now. I would distinguish that from taxes on one- and two-family homes. People in those homes are amongst the lowest tax rates on property in the region, if not the lowest. Well, that gets to the cost of housing and who can afford to live here and other sorts of issues. To respond to the question, I don't believe we will be increasing business taxes.

8) Professor Davidson (Computer Information Services, La Guardia) - "Just a quick follow-up on what you just stated prior to the last comment from my colleagues. You commented on possibilities of increasing taxes for one-and two-family homes. This proposal has been made to the City, was made during the fiscal crisis, has been made over the past 20 years. If you examine taxes on one-andtwo-family homes in the contiguous counties to the five boroughs, you generally find that the tax being paid by homeowners outside the City on the comparable property is five to eight times the amount as in the City. Why doesn't the City do something about it?"/ I think the answer is that the Mayor proposed such an increase two years ago. The City Council refused to do it and the result was an increase in the hotel tax. One could argue that small home owners pay low real estate taxes but high personal taxes, if they own their own businesses the taxes are high, motor vehicle registration fees are high and ultimately the question is the total tax burden. I believe it would be beneficial to raise the property tax but the City Council has refused. It's pure politics there. 9) Professor Parkhurst (Speech, Brooklyn) - "Many of the speakers so far have been skirting, it seems to me, what is the fundamental issue here, and that is that by failing to provide adequate higher education, you're going to continue the massive areas of poverty and urban decay

nich directly account for the fact that those of us who remain to pay taxes are taxed at such a high rate. Only through encouraging education in the poverty areas are we going to be able to bring them into tax-paying status too."/ That's a hard argument to prove, as a matter of fact, especially with respect to higher education. In any case, as I said earlier, there is what the government pays for, through tax dollars, that tends to be very important. The services the government provides. Whether it provides them effectively or not is another matter but they're fundamental to the concerns of everyone and without exception are terribly important in virtually any case. You say that your particular function is especially important and that if it were adequately funded would contribute over some period of time to a reduction in poverty and therefore kind of supply side social service. I personally doubt whether there is a direct relationship at all, but if we were to fund all such claims, once again the taxes would become so high until the time went by until our poverty was reduced substantially that we would be out of business. I'm very skeptical of such beliefs having looked at them. 10) Professor Cooper - "I've noticed your skepticism since you started talking. May I ask how many people in your office or around the Mayor's office are graduates of a city college?"/ I don't know . If you'd like I'll find out. It's a fair number. Professor Cooper - "I would really like to know."/ My father's a graduate. I'll tell Joe [the Chancellor] and he can tell you. Professor Cooper - "Thank you very much."

Chair Wedeen thanked Mr. Dickstein.

VII. New Business: Chair Wedeen asked for new business. Professor Baumrin said that the last time there was a fiscal crisis he seemed to recall that only Hunter College had a crisis committee set up ahead of time. The Senate acted after the fact. It did a lot but it acted after the fact. I suggest that at the very least the Budget Committee be asked to investigate how to respond in the likelihood of future retrenchment both in the community colleges and in the senior colleges and bring back to the Senate at either the December or January meeting, some plan for dealing with the future. The Chair asked whether that was in the form of a motion. Professor Baumrin replied in the affirmative. The motion was seconded and passed.

The meeting was then adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Jean Ellis
Executive Director