

SUBJECT TO SENATE APPROVAL

MINUTES OF THE ONE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY SECOND PLENARY SESSION
OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

March 28, 1989

Chair Wedeen called the session to order at 7:15 p.m. in Room 1700A at the Graduate School and University Center. Present were Senators Aaronson, Bank, Baumrin, Baxter, Beaton, Beheshti, Bleyman, Bohigian, Brady, Broido, Bronars, Brower, Buianouckas, Canate, Cohen, Cooper, Cravzow, Danziger, Davidson, Donleavy, Donoghue, Feldman, Frisz, Galub, Gerber, Ginsburg, Gordon, Greenbaum, Grossman, Gura, Hill, Huang, Levine, Lundeen, Mandel, Matthews, McCall, Muehlig, Otte, Parkhurst, Picken, Plissner, Riley, Rodriguez, Rosen, Shaffer, Sohmer, Stern, Stroup, Taylor, Trefousse, Umolu, Wasser, Wedeen, Weiss, White, Zaneteas and Zarin; Alternate Senators Bastos, Glass, Keane, Ladimer, Markoe, Svitak; Senators Elect Brugnola, E. Davis and Manassah. Senators Bishop, Depas, MacLennan, Segal, Simor, Washburn and Wurmfeld were excused. Also attending were Heads of Campus Faculty Governance bodies Beane (Baruch), Frisz (Queens), Galub (Bronx), Ginsberg (BMCC), Gura (Brooklyn), and Sohmer (City). Chancellor Joseph S. Murphy, Vice-Chancellor for Budget and Finance Joseph Vivona, and University Faculty Senate Executive Director Jean Ellis also attended.

I. Approval of the Proposed Tentative Agenda: Chair Wedeen asked for a motion to approve the proposed tentative agenda. The agenda was approved by motion duly made, seconded and adopted.

II. Approval of the Minutes of the 171st Plenary Session (February 28, 1989): The minutes were unanimously approved by motion made, seconded, and passed.

Dr. Ellis submitted the following which had been omitted from the January 31, 1989 Plenary Session:

VI. Vice Chancellor for Budget and Finance Vivona: Governor Cuomo's Proposed Executive Budget:

16) Professor Simor (Library, Queens College) - "I, too, would like to commend you, Vice Chancellor Vivona, for the openness and for the effectual statement that you made regarding the situation with personal positions at the Library of Queens College. Over the last five years the Library has lost four positions, of which at least one was professional since its move to the new building, that is about three times as large in size and incomparably more complex in operations. It has lost two staff, support staff, not an actual loss, but these are positions that were vacant well before the institution of the freeze and that we are unable to fulfill. These are facts I am personally familiar with." /I'll look into it. I know I gave the positions out. I apologize if I spoke with too much certainty. Professor Simor further added - "I should apologize for taking so much time with a statement that is so very particular, however it may be an indication of situations existing elsewhere, and as such may be useful as an example, and as much you may want to look into it more clearly." / I'm so pleased with the Computer Center now that it's decided to add my

library information system I'll do almost anything for it. Professor Simor further added, - "Computers for the Library, you might be interested in knowing, have not been installed because we also can not afford them." /Maybe that's why you're on my system. "Actually I don't want to look into ridiculousness, but it goes down to non-working elevators and not being able to afford the most trivial of supplies. Thank you." 17) Professor Lundeen (Nursing, City) - "I'd like to make a plea for the nursing programs that are in both the senior and community colleges because cutbacks in all the liberal arts will impact on us as well as cuts in nursing faculty. This is the time of great nursing shortage and I'm wondering if the legislature has considered the impact on professional programs, especially nursing." /The nurses and the health professions carried the day with the city. We indicated to the city that while there is a high demand for nurses and other health professionals, they are generally the more expensive programs to mount, and that in order to avoid a more Draconian situation at a campus, those programs would be most vulnerable. That is something the city did not want to see. So, for the most part the restorations of the city community colleges occurred because of the importance that the city felt with the health and hospital corporation not being able to find nurses. Whether or not we can enhance funding directly from the center to a campus, again, what I always have with the faculties, the fact that there is a president out there that is really responsible for the allocation of resources by campus, but I'd be glad to look into it as a university-wide issue, if you'd like to see what the funding ratios are from campus to campus, and if there is a discrepancy I can raise the question. Professor Lundeen further added - "Well, I really wasn't making a point that nursing needs more money. I think in most campuses nursing is treated pretty fairly. But even cuts in English, any of the social sciences and the natural sciences impacts on us. Cuts in any services impacts on us in the number of students we can attract and maintain in our program, so it's broader than just our needs. We certainly would like more money. Please look into it. I think we have a vested interest in all the colleges, and we're the biggest producer of nurses in the city and our nurses stay here. They don't go away. Thank you." /Thank you. 18) Professor Binder (History, COSI) "As a survivor of 1976 certainly there are some frightening echoes of those days. I hear it tonight. Most disturbing tonight is the ignorance of most of us regarding the executive budget and what's going on. Evidently our Executive Committee has received some information we as members have not received through the mails. As a member of the Senate I hope this would be rectified. But, this is general ignorance, the kinds of questions we're asking. There's a little bit of back biting here regarding salaries, executive salaries, and who's getting what and who is getting what is what disturbs me. It seems to me that in a period of crisis the university administration should call upon the assistance of all constituents in the University and certainly the faculty. I've heard you mention some kind of an emergency budgetary committee of presidents. This could be frightening. But, what I wish to know is to what extent have you drawn upon the Executive

Committee of the Senate -- to what extent have you drawn upon the experts in the fields of economics and finance and higher education among the faculty of our University during this period of crisis?" /As you may know, correct me if I'm wrong, I've always tried to make myself available to the Executive Committee. Professor Binder continued - "I don't mean to answer questions, I mean to call upon them." /I didn't say that exactly, and I think if some of your colleagues form the Executive Committee would come up and talk about what I've tried to do over the last year you might get a satisfactory answer. I've made myself available not to answer questions but to solicit their input, I took their priorities in the last budget go-around to the letter, I added to their priorities by further going down the list as was possible, I thought at the time, and as we go through a budget crisis, I will rely on the input of the faculty. I've learned a great deal in that process. I don't feel that I'm lacking because they haven't provided me with all that they could give me. I see those people in this room right now, and I think the relationship, I don't know what it was before I got here, but I'm always there for them and they're generally available for me. Professor Binder added - "I appreciate that, and by the way I do appreciate the clarity and forthrightness of your presentation and I must remark that it's quite a contrast to the treatment received by the Chancellor who seems to view us as a club audience to be wound up with his humor every month."

III. Communications from the Chair: Chair Wedeen noted that most of her report tonight was available in writing on the table at the rear. However, she said there was the monthly Board Meeting last night, which of course was too late to put into the written part. The meeting was called to order by Vice-Chair Everett who among her announcements reminded us of the Big Apple Job Fair which will take place on April 6 at the World Trade Center. So again, if your colleges do not seem to be apprised of it, please let the students know. There will be over 70 companies and groups there which will be of service in placing our graduates in various jobs. Please make it known on your campus. Also, she introduced Reverend Calvin Pressley, the new member of the Board. All committee items, which again are itemized in the back because of the reports of the various faculty members on the various Board committees were adopted. The Chair of the Student Senate announced that several weeks ago, in fact the day after the Board members visited Albany that Tuesday, the students, a thousand students, went to Albany to lobby against the proposed budget cuts for this next year, and for twenty minutes the students sat blindfolded and gagged to demonstrate the fact that they have not been heard or seen. I'm sure this was a dramatic presentation and a rather important one for the students to handle. Vice-Chair Everett also read a statement into the minutes which was originally suggested by the Board's Long-Range Planning Committee concerning the vital role of CUNY and the effects that the proposed budget would have upon the students and the entire City University.

IV. Reports of Faculty Members of Board of Trustees' Committees: Chair Wedeen said the various reports of Trustee committees would be found on the back table. There was one question from the floor: Professor Grossman (Education, City) - "What happened on the report on the Academic Policy, Program, and Research?"/ Now what had happened is that four presidents had been called into Academic Affairs in order to discuss programs and enrollment rates at their own colleges, and that was part of the discussion. The discussion was what they are doing on their campuses to increase enrollment, what the effects are on the various campuses at this time of the proposed budget cuts, and what will happen if they do occur. No one has moved to the next step at this point.

V. Chancellor's Report: Chair Wedeen greeted Chancellor Murphy who then gave his report. Thank you Madame Chairman. I am going to submit, if I may, a copy of the statement that the Board passed at its last Board meeting which was a sense of the Board which essentially outlines in this statement the Board's assessment of where the University is at this point and it goes into fairly detailed analysis of the budget - most of the numbers you already know - and it indicates what the outcomes will be if the Executive Budget is left in place without major restorations in the legislative budget. There is nothing in there that is new to the people in this room, I don't think, but it may be news to others. In short, I should say this was incidentally not passed by the Board as a policy document [copy attached] but simply issued and read into the record as a statement of the sense of the Board.

The deliberations which I've reported on in the past continue on in Albany. There is no indication that they are reaching closure in their discussions about additional revenues, and there does not now at this point appear to be any agreement on how additional revenues are to be generated. As you know from the last public statements that have been made by the Governor, his view is that there ought not be a delay in income tax cut on the grounds that such a delay would be breaking faith with those businesses and corporations in the state of New York who chose either to come here or remain here on the basis on tax policies announced by implication in the last budget. The position we've taken, informally at any rate, is those tax cuts were predicated on the assumption of certain revenue flows which have not been realized. That being the case, the tax cuts themselves ought to be delayed or at least re-examined as inappropriate in a context in which the assumptions on which they were originally made have not come about. One would think that that is the better part of reason, but that's not been agreed to. Of course there's a lot of in-fighting. No one wants to be responsible for anything that looks like increasing taxes or delaying tax reductions. Every politician is like every general. It seems to devise its strategies to fight the last war. The last campaigns have demonstrated, the two presidential campaigns, that people who are opposed to tax increases are more likely to get elected than people who are not. It's a meager harvest. Two elections - it's a lot I suppose - this not being a scientific enterprise. The result is that the fight continues. Now it's clear that the Assembly's side once again tends to represent those who believe in increasing taxes for maintaining public and social educational services is warranted, and those who are wary of it. Our biggest support, as usual, comes from the Assembly's side and the City Democrats in the Assembly. The least support we get is from the Senate which has other

agenda items and other constituencies to serve. The Governor's role here is unclear to me but must speak, I suppose, to each of you for itself. There were no sessions of the Legislature from last Wednesday night when they adjourned for the long Easter holiday weekend, and they resumed their session today, and there was a long leadership meeting late this afternoon. I don't know what occurred. Some of you will have taken some note of the publicity the University has been able to generate by using the media to call attention to as wide a variety of people, the nature and magnitude of our problem, and those of you who read Albert Shanker who is a more reliable advertiser in The New York Times than anyone I know, wrote an article that was intended to express strong support for the State University and the City University. He linked them together in the course of the article. We thought it was a good article, and the record ought to show that President Irwin Polishook was largely responsible for arranging for the publication of the article, and I have personally expressed my gratitude and appreciation to Albert Shanker for having written it and paid for it. We didn't have anything to do with that part of it - I want to be clear about that. So as far as we can tell some 75,000 letters have been generated on behalf of the University. I'm told by the people in Albany that it is the largest campaign and largest lobbying effort that they've seen on behalf of any legislative effort by any agency or institution within the state of New York. That's largely due to the people, many in this room, and on the campuses who have overcome both the natural institutional apathy in moments of this sort to understand that these letters matter - they do matter. We would like to see you generate another 25,000. For all who have written, another letter wouldn't hurt; Sitting down and writing a letter saying this way at a time when business flourishes in the state of New York and where the unemployment is lower than it's been in several decades to deprive vital public institutions, especially higher education and resources to provide opportunities for all the people in this state is not a good idea, and that you have long memories. An open letter signed by - a well written letter I must say - all our distinguished professors appeared and has been published in the Legislative Gazette in Albany in a full-page ad which I believe represents the first time we've asked and received the assistance of a particular constituency like distinguished professors. People do respect the fact that professors have written and other groups of professors have done as well, many of them distinguished but without stipend. I'm hopeful that we will continue that, and this Body, it seems to me, ought to do what it can in the next ten days to make it clear that there ought not be a budget in the state of New York until the issue of restorations in higher education has been addressed. There was a peculiar, and I suppose if one had a better sense of humor at this stage of the year and the season, might have appreciated the humor involved in an exchange which occurred between the Chancellor of the State University and the Governor. Apparently, the Governor relented in his opposition to a tuition increase and the State University expressed its appreciation to the Governor by admitting that apparently perhaps these charges of mis-management or insufficient management were in order by agreeing to establish a Management Oversight Committee which they've now done or are now doing. We were called the day after and were asked whether we would do the same, and we indicated in principle that we would, but we would want to have a close look at establishing the committee in a way which in no way compromises the Governor's authority to appoint boards by appointing an additional management board. We would not want to see the Governor's authority eroded in that regard. In addition, we offered a press release

which some of you will see, and I'm going to submit, the title of which is "Governor's Management and Productivity Report Praises Three CUNY Programs for Efficiency and Cutting Costs." Three major City University of New York initiatives that, in the words of Governor Mario M. Cuomo, "saved dollars, avoided costs, increased revenues, and increased services for the people of New York," were cited in the 1988 Annual Report of the Governor's Management and Productivity Program. [Copy attached.] I am pleased and proud to present this to the Senate. The Board has not addressed the issue of a management committee. I personally have had my list of candidates for this committee, but I'm not going to tell you my list. I will tell you the recommendations I've received from some members of the Senate: Mr. Lorenzo was proposed, the Chairman of the Board of Lockheed was proposed, Ivan Boesky was proposed. These were proposals the record should be clear about that were made by others. We are taking this seriously, and we are going to establish a management committee. We've given testimony before the City Council and The Board of Estimate on March 22. Copies of the testimony were sent to the Chairperson, and I assume are available to those who wish to see it. The problem we're encountering on the city budget you ought to know, which is a \$22 million problem, is itself predicated on the assumption that the Executive Budget will pass untouched. That is to say if the Executive Budget goes through, the City will suffer a loss of some \$490 million which reflects itself in the amount of money available for the community colleges. Our share of that would be about \$22 million. It also reflects an explicit proposition put forward by the Division of the Budget of \$125 tuition increase. That is to say they simply assume it as part of their financial package. That does not constitute a tuition increase. It constitutes a recommendation by the city that an increase be put in place. Clearly no city budget can be formulated until the amount available on the local aid side is settled in the Executive State Budget - in the state budget which is an executive budget - plus a legislative restoration package. The Reverend Calvin O. Pressley has been appointed to the Board. In my view and in the view of others who know Reverend Pressley this is an excellent appointment. He is well-known and highly regarded by many of us in the University, and we welcome him to the Board. He attended his first meeting, and his magnitude and the depth of his wisdom is best witnessed by the fact that he made no public contribution to that meeting on his first occasion. We have been invited to give testimony before the House Post-Secondary Education Sub Committee. The "we" in this proposition is not a papal royal we, the University is we collectively. Unfortunately, I'm the one who has to read the testimony, but it is the University that has been invited to explain the impact of the proposed fiscal '90 federal budget on student aid. This is a big issue. Some of you have already encountered my apparently imprudent response to the non-amendment which calls for replacing Pell grants with a national service program. You might say, sort of in a rush of misguided Calvinism the theory has come forward that our students should no longer receive student financial aid as an entitlement, but should be obliged to work for it. Middle-class students who are not eligible for student aid, whose parents pay for their education, would presumably not have to work for it. So this proposal effectively plucks out of the lives of our poorest and most dependent students some two years that they might participate in something called voluntary community service programs. I have pointed out that it is not voluntary except in the sense that it was announced in the 18th Century that France was a free country since both the rich and the poor are forbidden from sleeping under the bridges over the Seine. This almost cynical proposal came forward by Senator Nunn.

I'm not sure that he fully appreciated the consequences for institutions such as ours where students already work, and still since it's possible to work at minimum wage and poor officially, in New York City, in fact in all likelihood at minimum wage you're poor, and would in fact be eligible for Pell grants that suddenly these students no longer be eligible for Pell grants as an entitlement, mind you, but would now have to work two years in order to get what Pell would have given to them had they gone to college during that two year period. There are other pieces of legislation that are around. We will obviously criticize the Nunn law, really the amendment to the higher education law. At the moment I'm inclined to support Senator Kennedy's bill, although we don't have it in detail. There will be some other bills. There is a Mikulsky bill in the Senate and there's a Panetta and Dodd bill in the House (Panetta and Dodd in the House and Mikulsky in the Senate) and there will be a Pell bill as well, but we haven't had a chance to examine them and it's too early to anticipate what our reaction to these pieces of legislation will be. Suffice it to say there is tremendous eagerness in both parties and in both Houses that somehow may the support of student financial aid be more contingent on work rather than entitlement. We will oppose those with whatever outcome.

The Chancellor then responded to the following questions and comments from the floor: 1) Professor Frisz (Student Personnel, Queens) - "In terms of the Governor's relenting on the tuition issue for SUNY that happened to happen on the day that a busload of us from Queens went up to speak to legislators, what is the situation?" /Well, the pressure is considerable. What happened was the following: The Governor had repeatedly said that he was not in favor of the tuition increase, and he thought the two universities could manage with his executive budget, which in our case is \$45 million short of what we needed without programatic increases to simply stay even. He said that we could accomplish these cuts by management initiatives, but we can't figure out how to do that, and we don't know what to manage these cuts by management initiatives is supposed to be or what it's supposed to mean. He felt, I think, a considerable amount of pressure from the State University that had a different agenda. The State University is very eager and said very early in the game that it intended to solve the problems with the tuition increase. In fact, the confrontation essentially between the Governor and the Chancellor of the State University was the Chancellor saying we manage very well, but we need a tuition increase if these cuts you are proposing remain in place. His response saying no tuition increase, manage yourselves better so that you neither need an increase in revenues nor need to do dramatic Draconian things to yourself in order to accommodate to a reduced budget. In effect, our issue with the Governor was entirely different. We argued that we can't manage with this and we agree with him entirely with regard to his position concerning the tuition increases. Historically, we've been opposed to tuition and to tuition increases. He then enters into a conversation with the Chancellor. Clearly both of them, under some pressure to reduce the decibel level of their public argument which didn't do anybody any good, and he reluctantly said for your sake, I will withdraw my categorical refusal to sanction a tuition increase, and in return I want from you some expression of your determination to manage yourselves better, and one such expression would be the formulation of a management committee that would be purely advisory, of private businesses and corporation representatives, presumably of successful businesses and

corporations, and that they will advise the institution on how to manage itself better. There was nothing that was said as far as I could tell by the Chancellor, although a member of his Board, Mrs. Moyers, pointed out that representatives from private corporations and their interest in management often related to the profits of the corporation, and were therefore structurally unlike a university which could not under normal circumstances be said to be an institution that existed for the purpose of generating profits. This conversation then goes on and then is resolved. Everyone goes away presumably happy. Well, we're not a part of this, but then we get a telephone call and the telephone call says 'would you also like to have?' Well, yes, and what do we get in return, since we know what the State University got. Well, I guess what we get is that we won't become the object of anybody's empathy. I don't know what else. So we were asked would we have any objection in principle to having a management committee and the answer is of course not, I mean how can anyone say that, although I didn't say that initially, I consulted with the Board. I wasn't able to get all members of the Board, but I made the effort at some point and that there was no way you could stand up and say we're against better management, so we're not against better management. On the other hand, we really haven't gotten anything. None of this addresses our issue. In fact if anything, it makes our problem more difficult because the Governor withdrew his opposition. Nevertheless, we are now faced with the fact that none of the leaders are opposed to a tuition increase. The Governor has now withdrawn his opposition essentially for the State University. Now, maybe that is not intended to apply to us. He's silent on that issue and we haven't obviously raised it. Secondly, the Speaker of the Assembly has not made any secret of the fact that he is for a tuition increase. He does not believe that the poorest of the poor will pay it which is true in some sense; It is not true of part-time students. There are only, so far as I know, two persons outspokenly opposed to a tuition increase of any kind. One is the Chairman of the Higher Education Committee of the Assembly who has not yet proposed how to substitute or to restore dollars that do not appear in our budget, and one member of the Senate who is a Democrat - a member of the minority - and will have no role to play, and the leadership divies up whatever dollars will get divied up. So we're in a way pushed against the wall knowing that our position with regard to tuition is the right one to take, morally speaking, and it is the right one to take, I think at this stage of the game, in absolutely necessary solidarity with the students. Our own students who have to, in many cases, have to sacrifice even more than they already do, particularly part-time students, to go to school. So, we have not backed away from a no-tuition solution. Now if you ask me how is this thing going to break out at the end, I just don't know. I can't say. I think we're doing the right thing by taking the position that we're taking. At some point a budget will pass, and in that budget for the City University of New York there will be a number, and that will be the numbers of dollars we expect to raise in revenue. They won't say tuition increase. No one is going to force this on us. But, if the dollars that we are expected to collect in revenues are high enough then they are going to imply some kind of a tuition increase in all likelihood, and then we will have to deal with it. It's crazy anyway you cut it. You have to deal with it - either do you increase tuition and put a greater burden on your students, many of whom already now are stretched to the limit, especially the part-timers, or do you resist the imposition of tuition increase, and then you take Draconian measures to cut back on sections, instructors, advisement, hourlys. To say what is the case the people who are going to lose their work are going to be the least protected, the most recently hired, the most likely

to be women, members of minorities and so forth. That's the choice that is going to face us as a university, unless we get substantial restorations in this budget -- which is why in a curious way, just as eight years Regan presented us with some very clear and kind of disarmingly honest position. His beliefs about the world were simple and clear enough so that we were astonished when it appeared that he actually believed them. In a way this presents us with a similarly unambiguous situation. We're either going to hurt one constituency or hurt another constituency. There is no way in the world any of us are going to be able to say we ought to do one rather than the other with anything short of great pain and torment because someone is going to get hurt here. The hardest thing to explain is to somebody who got their education at the City University of New York, not having paid any tuition, and will say to you, you realize I could not have gotten my Bachelor's Degree if it weren't for the fact that city colleges were free, and yet explain to me how prudence and necessity, and I suppose the iron laws of history, require that we now increase tuition. Now, what that attests to, perhaps more eloquently than anything else, is the failure of our philosophy departments. That woke up Baumrin, said the Chancellor. 2) Professor Picken (Romance Languages, Queens College) - "What is the status of the University's hiring freeze, and will it continue in effect indefinitely?"/ We're still under a freeze. We have a mechanism in place which examines very closely. If you looked at the Chancellor's report on the University Report at yesterday's Board Meeting, there was a real scarcity of items and it was as thin as a report as you've seen, so that the freeze now has finally effected the flow of appointments. The process we've used at 80th Street is to put in place a series of guidelines and then to examine exceptions. The only appointments made yesterday were exceptions that were agreed to because demonstrated need on the part of the campus that the well being of the institution, that security or safety or the ability to be able to offer vital courses was inhibited or diminished in some fashion by the freeze, and then we made the exceptions. I'm hoping as soon as we have a budget we lift the freeze. You have to remember this budget is going to tell us two things: It will tell us how much money we've got for next year, but it will tell us what our base for this year actually is - remembering that our base was cut in the Executive Budget, as you know. 3) Professor Greenbaum (History, Queensborough) - "This isn't really a question. I just wanted to follow up on something you said about letter writing. There's a bit of advise -- If you live outside of New York City and you are writing letters to your local assemblyman or senator, make sure that you write letters; that you write letters for SUNY or CUNY community colleges because it has more of an impact."/ Good advice. 4) Professor Levine (Education & Community Programs, Queens College) - "We're really out here today. My question may seem frivolous. I know that this is a critical time and I was on the faculty bus that went to Albany. My question really is what are we doing, and what is your office doing, pro-actively. We respond to all these crises and we have consistently. But, the larger picture really is that there has been a steady erosion of our image, the quality of our University, the people we contract. Are we addressing that issue as the longer term issue rather than this what I see as grubbing? Each year we have to go in and grub for just staying alive or just keeping our place at best, but we've lost a lot since '75, and I would ask what the philosophy or what the intent is?"/ Well, you sound more pessimistic than I feel. I mean it is true that every year is clearly one set of feelings against another. I can find lots of reasons for being pessimistic about it. There are

two or three, it seems to me, crucial things that one ought to keep in mind about where our University is now. In '75-'76 we suffered a terrible set-back. We were obliged to do two things. Actually, cut the size of the University by a very substantial margin and put tuition into place for the first time in 140 years. That partly is generated, remember we're a University that has always been a working class University. I know the word working class is not to be used in America because we've persuaded all workers that they are middle-class, but the fact is a little squeeze and they quickly wake up to the fact that they're working class by any sociological standard that I know, partly because a sign of middle-class membership in America (at least after second generation Americans at any rate) is going away and living in a dormitory someplace. We have been a quintessential municipal institution. Even other historically municipal institutions like Wayne State when it became a state university, University of Cincinnati when it became a state university, built dormitories and became genuinely state institutions. We're not that. What we are is an institution for the people of the City of New York overwhelmingly. Now at it happens, our great good fortune is the people who are always coming to our town from everywhere -- the American south, or the Caribbean, or anywhere in the world now. I mean the variety of peoples from different corners of the world is as rich a mix as ever before they become our students. If you look at the student body at a place like Queens which would have 5,000 students in it in the early 1960's and grew to in my days to 27,000 - 28,000 students. Now, somewhere in between that number it is as rich a variety of different faces, backgrounds, languages, as anyone could imagine, and the City College counted, I think, 86 different national groupings and languages among their students on the campus. So, we have to be doing the right thing because the people who are coming to us are the people who are looking to education for the first time. In most cases 90% of our students come from families in which neither parent has gone to college. We should be enormously proud of the fact that we get a shot at all that talent before anybody else, and often when nobody else wants it. Our eleven Nobel Prize winners can all testify to the fact that nobody wanted them. We've got them. We had them and we've got them now. We ought to be enormously pleased about that. Our enrollments are higher today than they've been since '76. Remember, they went down precipitously and they have been coming back each year -- more and more students. Come September we're going to be over 190,000 students. When I came to the University seven years ago we were in the 160's. That has to mean something. We're graduating a larger percentage of those who become matriculated students than we have in the past -- to be sure six and seven years after they come into the institution because large numbers of them are part-timers. But, if you want to look at it in the larger context, this University is doing what no university has ever really done. Certainly not in this magnitude which is to take very large numbers of newly arrived people, whether they've newly arrived in the city or whether they've newly arrived to coming to higher education, especially since open admissions, and creating a whole new middle class. Middle-class Blacks and Hispanics and others in this town are our students. We've graduated them; We've educated them; We've trained them. They're still young. We've only started this thing twenty years ago, and we do it under conditions you correctly describe as 'grubby.' I don't know how they got grubby so fast. We've spent a billion and a half dollars on construction every place but Staten Island. We're exercising restraint there. Professor Levine continued - "We have an antenna on the roof and nothing inside. There's no set in the house. We have a

gorgeous library and we don't have services."/ Well, I realize that the services are a problem, but do you know how long it took to get that library built? Professor Levine further stated - "I'm with you, I'm not an adversary."/ These are not small improvements, but you're asking a larger question and I can't answer it because we've got a tendency here and generally when we talk about education to believe we're talking about some institution in isolation. We've just gone through eight years in which we've deliberately put in place a process for impoverishing our public life. Now why in God's name wouldn't public institutions suffer from that. That's what we did and you're seeing the results of that and that's not because we didn't do something in New York. It's because we didn't do something in America. Professor Levine also added - "I would like to say one thing. I'm not finding fault, and I'm not here as an adversary. Do we have a larger vision?"/ Do we need another vision? Do we need one besides the one we've got? It's not enough? It's not enough to say that our job is the same job that it was in 1847 to educate the working people of our town? Getting the resources to do that is our problem and what we're having this conversation about. 5) Professor (Unidentified)

"This relates to the budget and the other relates to the fact that the legislation will have to wait until after the budget is adopted, but it happens to be an editorial in New York Newsday: 'CUNY Catch 22-Financial Part Aid for Part-Timers' - and I've noticed you've said part-timers more than once today. Would you say some more about that, and what we need to do to also push this through."/ Good point. I appreciate you raised it. We obviously intended for this to appear. This is our creation. We're hoping everybody reads it. Five or six years ago we took the initiative and got the Governor to put a part-time tuition assistance program into the tuition assistance bill. It's the first part-time tuition assistance program. The assumption has always been that a full-time student who is going to school full time does not have time to work, therefore has no income, therefore we have to entitle them. Whereas a part-time student presumably has money because that part-time student has been working. The economics of it don't work out. The fact is that a part-time student is often working at minimum wage and \$100 in tuition which is - I don't know how much a course costs these days - it's over \$100, at least \$120, isn't it - which is, I think \$40 -something a point. That looks like very little if your income is \$50,000 or \$60,000, but if you are working at McDonald's at \$4.00 per hour you have to work all day -- take out your taxes and your transportation, and you have a \$20 bill. That's a week's work to get \$100 to pay for less than a course at one of our colleges. So our whole effort has been to try to get more money into the part-time tuition assistance. I had hoped that we would get part-time tuition assistance as an entitlement, that is to say simply drop the present twelve semester hours as a requirement for getting tuition assistance down to nine, down to six. And then, suddenly, only those students who are poor enough to get tuition assistance would get it but they could at least get it for part-time schooling. This is not any different than the way the Pell grant works. If it's good enough for the federal entitlement programs, it would have been good enough for ours as well. That got a lot of resistance. I quoted for you and I don't think I want to do it again, but the cynicism that was met with was perceived as strictly as a university bill. The bill actually passed, but then it was hemmed in by a whole series of restrictions including things like you had to sign up for six semester hours, so it wasn't available for freshmen. That is to say you could not apply until you've already gotten six semester hours, then you have to pass the course. If you didn't pass the course the

college had to pay the money back to the state. Some of our colleges didn't want to participate in this. So what is the tendency? The tendency then is to give the part-time tuition assistance to a student who is likely to pass the course. That is to say the one who needs it the least. Take the one who is genuinely economically and educationally disadvantaged for whom we'd want the program - They're not going to get into it because why give it to them - you'll have to pay the tuition back if the student doesn't complete the course with a passing grade. We said this really isn't nice. So what we've been trying to do this year is get a bill through which takes away these restrictions on the way in which the part-time tuition assistance works, and I'm hoping that the Governor's bill - he has a bill now, and it has a number on it, but I don't know the number - gets passed. 6) Professor Gura (Speech, Brooklyn) - "Mr. Chancellor, could you share with us what progress, if any, has been made on your offices implementing the Senate's resolution to regularize the protocol for the combination or dis-establishment of departments across the City University?"/ I have asked as a result of your having raised it that Academic Affairs put it on its agenda and I haven't gotten a report from them, but I will at the next meeting. Professor Gura added - "Thank you." 7) Professor Wasser (Humanities, COSI) - "I have two small questions. I wonder where and how is the justification for exceptions to the freeze made. I read the Chancellor's and University Reports, and a number of things may be perfectly valid, but nevertheless one raised the question: We see the addition of a special assistant to a president. We see the appointment of an Acting Associate Dean of Academic Affairs at CUNY Law School. We see early tenure for assistant professors, and so forth. Now all these may be perfectly justified, but in the Chancellor's and University Reports there was no indication of justification. You asserted that they have been justified by the colleges requesting them, but what I'm not certain of is the process or the publicity of such whereby that justification takes place. The second small question has to do with the fact that why is SUNY getting the big stories in The Times? In a sense they come out for tuition increase, but it's a kind of long story they receive which is, it seems to me, of some value to them, and we have not apparently gotten those in The Times."/ The answer to your first question is best answered by whoever the University Faculty Senate representative is in the Faculty and Staff Relations Committee since that person would know whatever the explanations were and I don't sit on the Committee and I don't know it, so you're more likely to generate an explanation. Secondly, the long stories, to be sure, that have appeared describing the political dynamics that the State University and the Governor have been involved with is a little bit like how come we're not on the Obituary Page. I have to tell you, Henry, I am grateful and thankful that we have not been publicly identified with an argument with the Governor of the State as to whether or not we are well managed. I don't think being involved in a discussion about being well managed is useful for our purposes or interests. 8) Professor Matthews (Math Sciences, Hunter) - "I was especially interested in what you were saying about the dormitories in the residential college experience which is more the middle-class. Is there anyway the legislature or the Governor can increase fees for dormitories and things instead of for tuition? That's something that is more appropriate with SUNY than with CUNY and it would seem to me that it would affect the body that could pay more."/ Well, I am not sure how to answer that. Normally rates set for dormitories and so forth are rates that are intended to cover the real costs of dormitories and food services and so forth. The question that you raise is whether or not they ought not make a profit. You might raise the question a little differently. You might say if the City University is opposed to tuition

and the State University is not, let them double their increase and we'll take half. That's really your proposal. As a matter of fact, on the table the only revenue enhancement over the Executive Budget that exists right now is the SUNY tuition increase. That's the only proposal that anyone has made to increase revenues above those presently anticipated in the Executive Budget. The State University has a completely different attitude toward tuition. The Chancellor has indicated publicly that he even believes it ought to be indexed to costs. That is not our position and has not been our position. The Governor has, on occasion, made a statement we fully agree with as a matter of policy, and has indicated that he would love to see in some ideal world free tuition in the public institutions, and so would we. We believe that policies ought to be designed in a way that bring about in some fashion the ideal world and that is what we have been pursuing. 9) Professor Manassah (Engineering, City College) - "As a preface to my remarks I would like to point out to some of my colleagues that may not have noticed it that in the present budget, close to \$4 million are allocated for the graduate initiative. My understanding, and correct me Sir if I'm wrong, is that a good portion of this money is coming from Research Foundation overhead recovery money that in the past has been returned to the colleges. This in the past has had some equity in the sense that strong research groups had strong graduate programs, so that when the money went back to the Research Program it immediately went to the Graduate Program that is very active. The situation is changing. Is my assumption correct that this budget will be centrally managed from now on by the Graduate School, and if yes, what would be the criteria for its programmatic allocation? I'm posing this question because historically, and I'm not trying to put any blames, but the Ph.D. programs with the center of gravity such as ours, which is engineering, are not located in the Graduate School receive proportionately less lines, less OTPS, less library funds, etc., from the graduate budget. Now, given that this issue is university-wide and not concerning a particular college, I would urge the Chancellor, and I would urge the President of the Senate, this issue should be brought up to become a university-wide summit. We're going here in a little bit of a vicious circle. Yes indeed, everybody is represented on the graduate council, but the representation is proportional to what now the allocations are basically in terms of lines, etc. These formulas have changed. They have changed dramatically and we would like as being a unit of the University that is very productive in research that has a big graduate Ph.D. program. We have more than about 150 students that are there. They would like to see that there are some criteria that would be public, be known, can be checked against with respect to this issue. Thank you."/ You ought to know that President Harleston and I have had a conversation in which he indicated that he thought that several things have to be done to offset the effect that the State budget has. But the President asked that three things be put in place. First, a more coherent principle of distribution, more in accordance with the way in which the dollars are generated which is the point of your observations. Secondly, as every president in the system always does, he raises questions about whether the Foundation is too expensive to operate, and which I remembered 15 years ago raising the same question passionately (when I had passion to generate), and, thirdly he made the argument that the monies that have been taken out of overhead recoveries that have been put into the effort the Foundation has been making to build capital be delayed for a year. All of those are under consideration, and I think that you will find that we will make whatever effort we can to put the money back in some way that represents the way in which it was generated, as well as cut the costs as best one can with the Research Foundation -- although they will always be seen as excessive since the Research Foundation

has no substance justification for existing other than the services it provides. What all this comes to is that we are damaged by the State's mechanism of taking soft dollars which gives us flexibility and which has gone back to you and your departments in schools to spend in ways you want. By their practices, this in turn captures money that gives us tax levy dollars back, and the tax levy dollars have to be distributed in accordance with the rules that govern tax levy monies. It hampers us; We lose flexibility. What we're going to try to do is fight it on the State side. Each year we've made the argument that this is not an efficient way of dealing with overhead recovery monies and it is a dis-incentive to those who secure the kinds of grants that generate this overhead. And, at the same time, to see if we can make the overhead use more efficient in the administration of these grants. If you've got ideas about a more equitable, predictable public formula for allocating dollars, since I'm Chairman of the Research Foundation I have an obligation to look at whatever you generate -- and I will. Professor Manassah further said - "I would like basically, Chancellor, to have you know that the position President Harleston taking on this issue received the widest support in the City College Engineering faculty. I think it should go on record that this is the case, and yes, I would be very happy to share with you some ideas I may have on that, having myself been a director of a foundation before I came back to the University." /Thank you.

Chair Wedeen thanked Chancellor Murphy for a very lengthy and detailed discourse. She then added that before Vice-Chancellor Vivona be asked to join the meeting, Professor Sandi Cooper had asked for a point of personal privilege because she had to leave early in the evening and wanted to share something with us. Chair Wedeen asked to move the agenda differently. A motion to do so was made, seconded, and passed. Professor Cooper (History, COSI) thanked the Chair and said that what she wanted to do was read the essential text of a letter that she just mailed to Vice-ChancellorCarolynn Reid-Wallace. "It has come to my attention that the budget crisis which has imposed a freeze on all of us does not apply across the board uniformly to all institutions. Specifically I am told that at least one distinguished professorship is in process of recruitment at present at the Graduate Center. This distinguished position is to be filled moreover in an area where the campuses of the University already contain significant personnel capable of teaching the area, or at least something close to it. Given the fact that we have all cancelled courses, that we have already cut cleaning services to the bone, that security is a sometime affair at many campuses, that departments function without secretaries, and that many of us are providing paper for copying for classes. I want to protest this unfair allocation of resources." "Thank you," said Professor Cooper, "I just wanted that to be put in the minutes. Professor Davidson (Computer Information Services, LaGuardia) asked whether this is a new position beyond the number of positions that were allocated, and the reply was in the negative. The question of whether or not anybody should morally be hiring anybody from out-of-state at the moment is, I think, the issue. This is a follow-up to what Henry was asking. Apparently there is some consideration at the moment to creating distinguished professors out of some faculty already on campuses, which is as far as I'm concerned is questionable enough at this point. But to go out and bring in somebody from outside, in fact now after I drafted this I was told that it might be happening in two departments, not just one, to go and find somebody from outside the university.

at about \$90,000 per year for a few graduate students, just struck me as kind of unfair. 1) Professor Trefousse (History, Brooklyn) - "As far as I know, nobody is being hired pending the hiring freeze. There has been discussion only of hiring people after the freeze has been lifted. I happen to be on the Executive Committee of one of the history programs of the Graduate School." 2) Professor Baumrin (Philosophy, Graduate School) - "Programs differ. My department is authorized to fill a line." / Chair Wedeen stated that they will continue with the regular agenda.

VI. Vice-Chancellor for Budget and Finance Joseph Vivona: Chair Wedeen introduced Vice-Chancellor Vivona. Vice-Chancellor Vivona stated, "There is a hand-out around. Actually, Joe went into such detail about both the senior college situation and the community college situation, I won't bore you with any kind of presentation. You can take the senior college fact sheet which is going around. When the Mayor completes his budget presentation, we'll certainly be doing a similar kind of impact statement for public use. This, incidentally, is sort of the larger version of a palm card that was used in Albany to give legislators and the like, and it actually worked out pretty well. I tried to summarize some of the effects of the \$45 million budget cut. Essentially this one-pager talks about a \$45 million cut in the University Senior College Budget. We would probably lose about 8,000 head count students. We would lay off 750 full-time faculty and staff; We would eliminate 300 adjunct staff. As Joe mentioned, most of the progress we've made on affirmative action would be reversed. Nearly 1500 class sections affecting 25,000 students would be eliminated. 41% of our part-time hourlies would be eliminated. Our partnership with the Board of Education would be cut even more than the proposed cut in the Governor's budget. Our physical plant and equipment would be cut by about \$4 million based on our guess as how we would allocate these cuts. The library would be cut back fairly dramatically as well, and then there are certain member items we've received on an annual basis from the Legislature. Eliminating those would cause further reductions in staff. Since the last time I met with this group when the question was raised about whether or not the colleges had a say in exactly what would go on, the answer is they've had their say. They came up with a layoff figure of about 735 against my 750. However, I probably have underestimated the effect on part-time staff and part-timers would tend to go -- to be separated from the payroll at a rate greater than what I predicted. The class section number is a college base number. I think colleges are going to treat the separation of staff differently depending on their condition, their distribution of staff, so we'll run the gamut of a layoff to a retrenchment. I suspect, given the community college condition, that we will be having a similar discussion when the Mayor comes out with his budget. Are there any questions?" 1) Professor Sohmer (Mathematics, City) - "Roughly a decade ago somebody in the chancellory, may still even be there, promised (that promise was carried out for several years) that the rentals of City University would continuously go down and zero out ultimately. My impression is that in the recent years they have been going up at a time when we've not been putting books on our library shelves. Do you have any idea about what both kinds of rentals (the kinds that come off the top and the kinds that come off the bottom) have been doing? I mean certificates of participation as well as other kinds of rentals." / Certificates of participation are not rentals. It is the way you acquire property as in the John Jay program, or the way you acquire equipment and it's probably the most cost beneficial

way of acquiring equipment at this point since it provides a lower interest rate than capitalizing a large piece of equipment./ Professor Sohmer further asked - "On the other hand it comes out of the operating budget and the other stuff doesn't because it can be bonded, right?"/ Major construction can be bonded. To pay for John Jay we would make that deal in a second and it would save us \$100 million to do John Jay with a lease purchase agreement in a turnkey operation. You compare that to any other -- any other -- construction program, to start a program and to complete it within two years, I would trade that with any kind of program and I'm sure they would do that on Staten Island if they had the opportunity. I'm sure they would have done it at Queens if they had the opportunity. I'd make that trade in a second for a \$4 million pay increase in terms of the lease purchase payment for this year, and we would gladly pay for the early delivery. The longer we wait on the regular capital program, the cost escalators go through the roof and we're constantly back for larger appropriations to pay for the capital budget. In answer to your second question, while in nominal dollar terms the dollar amount associated with rentals may appear to be increasing, and in certain cases we are expanding rented space. Overwhelmingly, property is owned by the dormitory authority. Overwhelmingly, the plan (especially when you take Baruch off line over the next decade) the ratio of rented space to owned space (except for the Graduate Center, which I think is a large consumer of rental space, and of course Baruch is as well) is going off line and we will own most of the property, so I think maybe Senior Vice-Chancellor Donal Farley would be best to answer the question about what the ratio is at this point, but it is dramatically different than it was a decade ago because we have more owned property relative to rental./ Professor Sohmer added - "What I'm really worried about is what the rental costs are relative to our operating budget."/ I think it's a \$22 million rental budget. Our operating budget as it now stands is \$786 million. Professor Sohmer asked - "Before or after the cuts?"/ After the cuts. 2) Professor Wasser (Humanities, COSI) - "In your impact statement you speak of cutting 300 adjuncts. Are there any directions from Central Office for the colleges to decide themselves if they are faced with cutting adjuncts? What procedure do they follow? Do they follow seniority or, as many of the adjuncts are doctoral students, and in a sense I've heard that seniority doesn't work there -- that is in a sense you see if a graduate student entered after '82 they would hope to support him. If he's been a graduate student since '81 or '80 he might be cut off. In other words, I've heard variations of this and I just wonder are there directions from Central or is it up to the colleges how that cut would be made?"/ It would be inappropriate for the colleges at this time to describe in detail what they would do. There is a policy that would have to be called for beginning with the Presidents, reviewed by the Chancellor, and then brought before the Board. We requested the colleges to be very careful of the wording since one has to be careful about the difference between doing a plan for reducing staff and doing a simulation of what would happen if given a certain budget. We've done the latter. We know what it will mean -- whether they are senior people, whether we follow the retrenchment guidelines, whether we go heavily with non-reappointments of staff at the appropriate times during the fiscal year, or other means of separating people from the payroll. So, I really have to be careful about it, and I don't want anyone to think that we got anything more from colleges other than a very carefully designed one page summary -- which some of you may have seen because colleges handled it in different ways. But without triggering this infamous retrenchment guidelines,

we had to do these simulations and that's what I have. I know what the retrenchment guidelines would cause and how we would have to go about doing it, but I can't speak to that. 3) Professor Manassah (Electrical Engineering, City College) - "In your impact statement I do not see that you have basically considered a very important question which is that many programs that are coming for accreditation next year, and what will be the impact of these cuts on the accreditation, and I think this is a very important issue that should be addressed. It's something that has to be addressed and is something that in your public relations campaign should be mentioned. The second issue is that in your mentioning here a \$1 million reduction in library acquisition, I submit that you are being very optimistic. I know only out of the journals at City College more than a quarter of a million dollars is going begging."/ Well, you have to keep in mind that in order to make nearly \$14 million of savings this year, virtually all of our options for next year have been taken away, so you see very little in the way of what we call things. The strategy has always been to save people and to give up things: equipment, library books and the like, at least in the short term. In the current year we took \$14 million in cuts - before we talk about this \$45 million reduction - so I'm well aware of the fact that virtually every college has stripped down every bit of OTPS, every bit of temp service, in order to live with the current budget. Next year you will see, if this budget comes to pass as is, you will see a much heavier reliance on staffing because the dollars are not available in the library any longer. Those cuts would have to be sustained into next year just to balance the budget if we had the same amount of dollars next year as we have this year. In fact, we have less. So now we're past things and on to people. 4) Professor Cooper (History, COSI) - "At what point in the semester do you imagine the declaration of financial exigency should take place, if at all?"/ For the senior colleges we will know twenty-four hours after the budget is passed what our condition is. If we don't break the \$25 million barrier, we're in serious trouble, and that's not to say we don't need lay-offs, but one might avoid retrenchment at that level. That depends on how we finish out the year. We currently have 10,700 workers at the senior colleges. If that level doesn't drop substantially between now and the end of the year, we're backing into sort of a retrenchment mode. But I think halfway through the deficit we may have an option other than retrenchment, but it would still require a layoff of large numbers of people. Professor Cooper further asked - "What part of the spring does this vote occur?"/ We're supposed to have a budget on April Fool's Day, but I don't see them passing a budget until perhaps the end of April. Professor Cooper added - "The end of April? Thank you."/ The only reason to pass a budget, given the way they do business in this state, as you know which is fairly sorry, is if the banks decide to lower the bond rating - then they will move. Other than that, they'll pass continuing resolutions. The first big bolt is the Medicaid payment which is due in about two weeks. That will require a supplemental appropriation. 5) Professor Baumrin (Philosophy, Graduate School) - "This thing is sort of never clear to me. Does layoff of the full-time faculty become effective in January? It's too late for it to be effective in September."/ It depends on the status of the faculty member. A layoff can be a non-reappointment for a non-tenured member. A layoff could be a person that is non-tenured, but has been reappointed - that would take six months. The layoff of a tenured individual would take twelve months. Any combination of those things could occur. Professor Baumrin further asked - "Let's take the first one. The first one is sad. The second one doesn't do

anything for your \$45 or \$52 million." / What doesn't? Professor Baumrin responded with - "Laying off of tenured faculty members because it takes 12 months." / That's true, but the college may decide that the condition is as much that it has to balance that way so that in the following year - Professor Baumrin asked - "Right, to drop a department or some old thing like that?" / Right. Professor Baumrin further added - "But if you were trying to play ball inside the year, you'd have to give notice." / We need about 120 days before you actually put them into place. I mean, there are a whole set of procedures that has to be undertaken from consultation to development of a plan to measuring up against Affirmative Action Guidelines, to organizing the campus in a way that is reasonable. But, our layoff number is predicated on the fact, Stefan, that we will not generate full year savings by laying off people. We understand that. We will only save \$37,000 a layoff and the average salary is substantially higher than that, as you know. 6) Professor Picken (Romance Languages, Queens College) - "I just wanted to follow up on Stefan's question: the deadline for notifying non-tenured people is April 1st, which is only four days away. Are those people in danger at this point?" / We have suggested to the Presidents of the Colleges that institutional considerations weigh very heavily in their decisions this go-around. As you may know, two colleges considered institutional reasons on March 1st and it led to sort of a disproportionate number of people being separated from the payroll. I suspect that that number will go up above what we will normally get on an April 1 reappointment. There are 500 people up. Our plans would indicate that at least 150 should be non-reappointed if we're going to stay with any chance of not backing into a retrenchment mode down the line. You keep the people now, you have them later. To separate them later requires a different legal action, so I think you've raised probably the thing that's weighed most heavily on my mind this last week or so. Not that that's important. 7) Professor Sohmer - "Am I right in saying that people on the Executive Pay Plan need no time notice?" / Correct. There being no further questions, Chair Wedeen thanked Vice-Chancellor Vivona.

VII. Senate Committees: Switching away from budget at this point, as many of you recall in the Spring we start asking Senators for their choice of Senate committees. The Executive Committee felt that we would like a few minutes of your time to share with you and get from you your reactions to the functions of the various committees. As you know we have standing committees. We have found some of them working more efficiently than others. We would like to have you put in your time in the most efficient way. We would like the work you put in there to count, otherwise we all know that we are all busy and are not looking in anyway to make use of your time in a manner other than which can be considered most productive. So we are asking you, what do you think you would like to see before we draw up the charges and the committees for the following year. Are there any committees that you feel perhaps could be disbanded at this time? Are there any charges that should be moderated or changed? What about holding committee meetings -- what times, what places, how can we make the most use of the talent we have in working with committees? It's really open at this point, and should you come up with any ideas that you have not had this evening, please send them into Jean. We will be going over them subsequently again at an Executive Meeting before coming up with our final list of committees. So, I'm throwing this really open to you now to come up with some of your reactions and thoughts on our committee structure.

1) Professor Bleyman (Natural Science, Baruch College) "I was Chair and am still Chair of the Undergraduate Affairs Committee for this year as well as last year, and I should say first of all that I've enjoyed being Chair, but I

find that there are a lot of things that could be fixed. One of the things I've bothered my Committee with this year, and have communicated to the Executive Committee, was I think the charge was not really thought out as well as all that, and I understand that we are all very busy, but we are willing to do the work. Perhaps future charges might be made in consultation with the members of the Committee of the previous year. I think what would have helped us this year is that if the committee charge this year had been done after the committee -- or at least myself -- might have been consulted. I think that would be helpful in general for other committees, particularly for those of us who have continuing charges. The other thing I don't know what the solution is. I think we all have this problem about time and place of committee meetings. I hesitate to convene my meeting other times besides before the Plenary, and when I do so I find that that one, there is no room available, and two, our liaison to the committee from your Executive Committee also has a meeting because you also hold your meeting before. I don't know what the solution is, but I just want to say for the record that I found this to be a real problem." /We have asked in the past and perhaps we should reiterate this, that we've always asked the Chair of the Committee at the end of the academic year what are your reactions, what are your statements concerning the charge, but perhaps we ought to do it in a more formal way. Is that what you're looking for? Or should we meet with the Chairs and if the Chairs would please get back to us if they'd like to meet with the Executive Committee. Do you think it would be most useful on that basis, because first to meet with each particular committee you have a liaison for that, so it would be either for us to meet with the Chairs or have some other means of communication. Concerning the meetings, we all know we've been facing that and we tried, if you remember, two years ago we took one of the meetings that we felt we could cut in half and had meetings here for the second half. Some people like it. Some objected because we did have some who were non-Senate members coming down. This has been a problem. We've used this room partially, we've used the Commons. If you have any other suggestions as to how we could get together without having other trips on other days it would be helpful too. 2) Professor Grossman (Elementary Education, City College) "I think it would be a value if we could ask the Executive Committee to meet earlier in the day on Tuesday. I know Executive Committee members are given some release time or given a charge that if you're going to run for the Executive Committee you had better give your life and soul and all Tuesday to the Senate. People on the Executive Committee do work above and beyond, but it would be helpful if we could schedule things and advise new and existing senators, continuing senators, that if we are serving the senators in this Body that we try to reserve our Tuesdays -- at least an hour or two -- let's say from 5 p.m. on, on the day of the Senate so that we could have committee meetings at that time and the Executive Committee Meeting earlier so that liaisons are available. That seems to be the most convenient time for most people. It doesn't work for everyone, but since we all have to be here on that day that might work out. And, if that is the case then possible the Senate could arrange for some little alcoves and places in the building that warrants where we could meet. Secondly, about the charges, I think that if the entire Senate body were given the list of current charges, perhaps some sample past charges for each of the committees, we could react because I'm sure that all of us have views on different kinds of problems that might exist, and this might feed a little bit more into the Executive Committee in terms of ideas." /That would be an easier one to do. 3) Professor Manassah (Engineering, City College) "In reviewing the committees, I did not see that any of the committees are charged with the

Doctoral Program. I understand that some people may feel that the Graduate School is already the Doctoral Committee and the government body of the Graduate School would act as faculty representative. However, this is not really so. As I mentioned earlier in my remarks to the Chancellor, there are many programs that basically do not have a voice in the government body of the Graduate School, or if they do, it's in a very minor fashion. I do suggest to the Executive Committee to address the question of creating a committee on Doctoral Programs -- the same way you have Undergraduate Affairs, Graduate Affairs, Doctoral Affairs Committees. Thank you." There were no other comments nor suggestions. Chair Wedeen stated that a list of the committees and charges as the Senate had them this year be forwarded, and hoped that Committees will respond to the Executive Committee. She further stated that when in responding people give us their name, the committees they've served on and those committees they've been Chair of because that gives the Executive Committee a better feel of the framework in which they're getting these answers.

VIII. New Business: Chair Wedeen then recognized Professor Umolu who had a statement to make. 1) Professor Umolu (Humanities, Medgar Evers) "Good evening everyone. At one of the meetings of the Executive Committee we came up with an idea of some members of the different campuses coming on WNYE and making a presentation on behalf of the Senate, and of course the different faculties. We were able to get some of the public officials to make a statement on our behalf as they discussed the budget of the state, and they referred particularly to the needs of CUNY and to SUNY. I still propose to have the program with members of our Senate on the program, and I'll be getting in touch with those representatives during the course of this week between tomorrow (Wednesday of this week) and Wednesday of next week, because as you know many campuses are on vacation. The program had great impact; it was a call-in program and many people responded, many people who did not know how City University operates asked questions. This shows there is a need for us to educated the public about City University. Professor Wedeen thanked Professor Umolu and asked for other items of new business, and if there were not any she said then would entertain a motion to adjourn.

There being no new business Chair Wedeen declared the meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Jean Ellis
Executive Director