

DRAFT
SUBJECT TO SENATE APPROVAL

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

February 27, 1990

Chair Wedeen called the session to order at 7:10 p.m. in Room 1700A of the Graduate School and University Center. Present were Senators Aaronson, Barley, Baumrin, Baxter, Beaton, Beheshti, Berkowitz, Binder, Bishop, Brady, Brenner, Broido, Bronars, Brugnola, Buianouckas, Bushler, Canate, Carro-Kowalczyk, Cohen, Cooper, Cyril, Danziger, Davidson, Davis E., Depas, Donleavy, Donoghue, Feldman, Frisz, Galub, Gerber, Ginsberg, Gordon, Gram, Greenbaum, Grossman, Gura, Hough, Jaffe, Kaplan, Kaufman, Knoop, Koepfer, Lundeen, MacLennan, Magid, Manassah, Matthews, McCullers, Moore, Muehlig, O'Malley, Otta, Parkhurst, Picken, Reidler-Berger, Riley, Rodriguez, Rose, Schuyler, Shaffer, Simor, Sohmer, Speidel, Stern, Stroup, Squitieri, Umolu, Vogt, Washburn, Weiss, Westrem, Yousef, Zades, Zarin, Zinberg and Alternate Senators Caudle, Franco, Meier, Muzio, Svitak, Taylor, and Whealey. Senators Markoe, Plissner, Selvadurai, and Zaneteas were excused. Heads of Faculty Governance Bodies Chabora (Baruch), Frisz (Queens), Galub (Bronx), Ginsberg (BMCC), Gura (Brooklyn), Kirsch (Hunter), Sohmer (City), and Zades (CSI) also attended. Vice Chancellor for Budget and Finance Joseph Vivona attended as well. Acting Executive Director Hoffacker and Administrative Assistant Pasela also attended.

I. Adoption of the Proposed Tentative Agenda: Chair Wedeen asked for a motion to adopt the proposed tentative Agenda. The motion was made, seconded and adopted.

II. Approval of the Minutes of the 179th Plenary Session (January 30, 1990): Professor Frisz (Student Personnel, Queens) noted that her comment on p. 2, para. 4 should have been recorded differently. The transcription of that meeting indicates that minutes correctly reflect the discussion between Professor Frisz and Chair Wedeen.

Professor Brady (Library, Queens) felt the summary of her remarks under New Business (p. 16) was not accurate. She stated that her comments referred to the omission from the CUNY Five-Year Plan of any consideration of libraries and of improving access to the collections through technology. Other comments reported under that heading were made by Senators from the floor.

Additional comments were made by other Senators which did not require text corrections. The minutes, as corrected, were accepted.

III. Communications from the Chair: Chair Wedeen (Education, Brooklyn) reported that the majority of her report was available in writing but she wished to report on three additional items.

The Board of Trustees, meeting on February 26th, passed all agenda items. Details on the specific items are available in the Reports of Faculty Members of Board of Trustees' Committees. Chair Murphy stated that he hoped a new chancellor would be in place by early fall.

Chair Wedeen had just come from a reception for participants in the CUNY Faculty Exchange Program which is co-sponsored by the University Faculty Senate. The reception was "very warm" and well attended by University officials. Faculty participants seemed "content with their experience" and ready to promote the program among their colleagues.

As to the situation at New York City Tech, a document has been prepared by the Nursing Faculty and is available to Senators (statement appended to these Minutes). Since the document has just been received, and the situation remains in flux, the Executive Committee will continue to monitor the situation and come back to the Senate after getting additional information. Professor Donoghue (Social Science, NYCTC) reported that the document represented the views of the entire Nursing Department which has 18 faculty members.

IV. Report of the Chancellor: Chancellor Murphy was unable to attend the meeting and asked that his "Testimony on the 1990-91 CUNY Budget to the Assembly Ways and Means and Senate Finance Committees" be entered in the record (appended to Minutes).

V. Invited Guest Speaker: Vice Chancellor for Budget and Finance Joseph Vivona: We have just come back from Albany. We are at an unusual stage in the budget process at this point. We have an Executive Budget that has been finalized. On one level, that budget for the senior and community colleges is in no way similar to the budget that we faced a year ago at this time. If you would like, I will go over some of the details in that budget. However the latest budget that we have from the Governor, as amended in what they call the 30-day amendment period, is basically a standstill budget -- one that restores cuts at City College for the Center for Worker Education and the Sophie Davis School of Biomedical Education. However, a like amount of \$6.2 million is taken from the overall budget in the form of management savings. Yesterday Senator Lombardi, who is the Chair of the Senate Finance Committee, asked me what it meant -- how would we go about making management savings of \$6.2 million? I told him a couple of things. One is that the University accepted, in the Governor's budget, \$3 million of management productivity savings. We could save \$3 million if we succeed in implementing a number of systems initiatives. However, to think that we can construct another program, even in an \$800 million budget, generating \$6 million in additional productivity savings in the time frame permitted -- which is July 1st to June 30th, 1991 -- is not possible. So this, in effect, would mean service and program reductions. It is a far cry from the \$59 million cut that we faced a year ago at this time. It is a far cry from that. I would characterize it as a standstill budget for the senior colleges, one in which I think the Governor made an earnest effort to preserve the current academic program. If you believe that the current academic program is funded inadequately, it continues to be funded inadequately. If you think that a budget which basically permits us to fill the same number of positions that we have filled over the last couple of years is acceptable, this budget will permit that. This budget will

permit the Retirement Incentive Program. This budget will permit some modest improvements in a select number of categories. It is not by any stretch a rich budget. It is not a budget that takes into consideration the fact that for the senior colleges, over the last 18 months, we have accepted the equivalent of the 6th largest college in the system in the form of new students. We have grown by basically 10,000 full-time equivalent students in the senior colleges. That would be the size of the sixth largest college in the system and there has been no budget recognition of that fact. That, I think, is the central quality issue that we are facing. The increased enrollment is retention. You predict losing 20,000 students a year. We didn't in the senior colleges. The retention programs appear to be working from college to college and it is not a Manhattan-based phenomenon as it has been in the past. It is across the board stronger enrollment than what one would have reasonably predicted for the senior colleges. That is what we have right now. We have grown dramatically. You have the highest enrollment in a decade and it is on the heels of basically a standstill budget which followed a budget that we cut a year ago. That is where we stand with senior colleges.

On the community college side -- two different worlds. In the world leading up to the election we had a budget which was terrible for the community colleges, one that would have required tremendous service reductions. The new Mayor, David Dinkins, has restored most of what the new administration would have had to cut in order to balance the budget. He restored all but \$1 million of a \$9 million cut that the City had planned. However, we still must live with the cuts imposed by the prior administration, roughly \$8 million. So we are back in the ballgame in the community colleges although we are still down in terms of the dollars that we need. The Governor, in his budget, came through with some dollars for the community colleges and I don't believe that the game is over with City. I think that it will not get worse for the community colleges and I think that the new administration will recognize the importance of the community colleges to the City, which is a recognition that did not exist in the prior administration. That basically is the story.

I would be glad to answer any questions at this time, but I should point out that on the State side I could be back here next month. A lot of people will talk about the politics of this budget and I am not going to get into that, but keep this in mind. The State budget is \$46 billion. Thirty billion is supposed to be tax collections within the State. They will only collect \$27 billion. If one assumes that the third year of the State income tax reduction is not carried out, and that is an assumption in the Governor's current budget model, that will only save \$400 million of this \$3 billion problem. The budget is also, in part, balanced on \$700 million of one shots, including the refinancing of the \$800 million of CUNY bonds that would create a one-time savings within that \$700 million of roughly \$100 million for the City and State. It is precariously balanced at this point. It is not balanced at this point. If there is a budget at the end of March, as there is supposed to be, it may be a budget that is very different for the senior and community colleges than the budget that I can talk to you about tonight. That is why it is an unusual period of time. Normally at this time I can tell you that from X it is only going to get better. If we were at this point a year ago, I would say that there is a possibility for program enhancements but, that is not the case now. So keep that in mind and hold on to your hats in all of this.

Professor Sohmer (Mathematics, City) -- "In the document produced for the 30-day amendment period from the Chancellor's office, I presume by you, there is a statement requesting financing of John Jay Phase II which involves spending an enormous amount of money on a certificate of participation out of the operating budget. Could you explain the rationale of doing the same kind of thing in the University that sent the City into bankruptcy some years ago?"/It is not by any stretch that kind of budget gimmickry. It is an earnest attempt to take advantage of a situation that exists around the John Jay complex -- one that was not accepted in the 30-day period -- but which would be one campus only. It would not be anything else but selling off property that exists at North Hall and using the proceeds to finance certificates to complete what is needed at John Jay, which is probably the second fastest growing college in the system. It would put residential property on the tax roll in the next three or four years for the City. It is not a major cost item. I should also point out that in next year's budget, in all likelihood, the cost of John Jay payments from year to year will be moved technically to the capital budget. The dramatic \$14 million increase -- from \$8 million to \$22 million -- was a heavy hit on the operating budget. Professor Sohmer notes, "300 percent."/But it was paid for and it was anticipated. That project, if compared say with the Staten Island project in terms of delay and the like, did nothing but save money and produce results for students and faculty at John Jay. It is not to be construed as some money-waster in that sense. It saved a lot of money and it produced a campus in record time for 8-9,000 people. Professor Sohmer, "My question really is certificates of participation which are off the top of the budget always..."/Who said that it is off the top of the budget? I don't understand that. Professor Sohmer, "All certificates of participation are, aren't they?"/ No this is held in a separate budget. Professor Sohmer, "No, when we buy a very big machine for computing, we buy it through a certificate of participation. We then have an obligation..."/What is the difference between that and buying something on a lease purchase, which was the old locution for certificates of participation. That is the way the University financed equipment purchased for the better part of the decade. When it purchased cars it did not buy them. When it purchased microscopes in large number or micro computers or mainframes it purchased them on lease purchase agreements. Right now what we are attempting is simply to take the least cost way of acquiring a durable good. If it happens to be certificates, we use certificates. Professor Sohmer, "I really want to know the answer to the question. Given a certificate of participation, does it not mean that each year there is an incumbrance on the operating budget of that particular institution..."/Not on that particular institution. Professor Sohmer, "The entire senior college budget?"/Correct. Professor Sohmer, "Therefore at a time when the budget may diminish, the certificate stays constant which means that the diminution is magnified."/As do all capital payments -- they stay constant. You protect the bondholders. So you can't separate the \$14 million increase for John Jay against the current \$200 million debt service that the University pays for all of the other campuses. It is the same issue. It doesn't affect the University's budget more one way or the other. Whether it had been a capital item financed over a period of time or a lease payment financed over a period of time. It happens to be the technical difference between which budget you show that incumbrance against -- either a capital budget, which still comes out of tax-levy money, which still increases from year to year, and which still must be paid; or the operating budget which follows the same conditions. John Jay is probably the lowest cost increase, among campus rehabilitations, in the entire system. I would be glad to tell you what the cost increases are in the

capital budget when you renovate a building at City College, a historic site - it costs \$250 million to do so -- or you build a \$350 million campus at the College of Staten Island. It is the same hit on the State's budget. No difference. You seem to think that because it appears in the operating budget, that in some way, shape or form it affects negatively the positions that we get, the OTPS that we get, the small equipment needs of the University, and that is not the case. In fact, in this budget, the continuation needs we requested outside of the John Jay lease -- for work load, meaning keeping everybody paid and adjusting for inflation -- out of the \$24 million request we got \$22 million. That is better than we have ever done. In addition, we got the full \$14 million increase for the John Jay lease. Professor Sohmer, "But you also lost other items."/We can't be sure of that. Had that obligation not been on the books it is not to say that \$14 million would have found its way into the University's budget. They were two different tracks. What the State did this year for us, for the regular operating budget, was make an earnest attempt to continue the current level of service; to fund 10,795 positions and to bring the budget from the current level of \$827 million to \$862 million. That handled continuation needs. They were not going to entertain major programmatic enhancements. Did we get modest ones in excess of what we had in the prior year? Yes. You cannot make a relationship between the two. If you do then what you must also say is that the other capital projects also took away from the operating needs of the University. Professor Bronars (Education, Queens) -- "I realize that a reduced or even a standstill budget hurts everyone, but from where I stand it seems to me that the students are hurt most immediately and most sorely. I was wondering, does the University Student Senate, and do the student governments of the various campuses, receive the kind of information that we are receiving and do they have an opportunity to mobilize their powerful resources to assist in improving things?"/Two or three weeks ago I briefed the student leadership of the entire University on a Sunday afternoon. At the time, the centerpiece of that description was twofold. One was that, in the context of this continuation budget, City College appeared to be dealt a poor hand with four or five substantial cuts at the campus, which I described to students. I also described how the State is attempting to pay for most of the increase in the budget for the senior colleges by taxing the City \$20 million related to associate degree programs at New York City Tech and John Jay, an item which remains part of the revenue side of the budget. They were angry. The services are not what they should be by any stretch. No one would deny that. The first year of the Five-Year Plan, which is the budget request, attempts in a small way to deal with the question of student services, primarily freshman services -- the time period where faculty and the administration believe students are most vulnerable. The Governor did make modest improvements. He granted us \$4 million to shore up freshman-year programs. He also recognizes, which I think is the major victory which you should pursue in the next several years, the need for more full-time faculty in exchange for adjunct faculty. However, student support service ratios are terrible. Against 180,000 headcount students in the senior and community colleges you would need, in order to make a numerical change of substance in this category, a number of new positions that would not be in this universe. So we decided to target freshman and decided to request 100 counselors per year for 5 years and target them to freshman. Then, in another part of the universe, attach to the student information system a degree audit system which would map out for every student the courses that they would have to take from the 30th credit forward in order to achieve a particular degree and when those courses might be offered. That would take the place of some counseling

services which are needed. Having been in the system for a year, students might be able to deal with that, and bringing the printout to their faculty counselor might accelerate the discussion between the two as to what the recommended course of action for the remaining credits should be. It is a no labor strategy for the sophomores, juniors and seniors and a labor-intensive strategy for first-time freshman, including an attempt to give pre freshman activities to every academically-needy student -- from 7,000 up to 13,000 in the entire system. That is paid for in this budget. So there are some gains but things are not what you find at some other places, to be sure. Professor Gura (Speech, Brooklyn) -- "Could you share with us your prognosis about the early retirement? That is really the beginning of a two-part question."/There appears to be no substantive justification for not doing it. It will be a legislative issue. We are well prepared to deal with what it will take to convince those on the appropriations committees to retain it in the Executive Budget. Professor Gura continued, "I have been hearing, today particularly, on my campus, some disquieting thoughts that maybe you would like to dispel. The first of those disquieting thoughts is that the one for one return is, in fact, fiction dependant on continuing or increasing enrollments at the various institutions."/It will not be because of increasing enrollment at the institutions. That is over. The data indicates that we have hit a level -- the applications data, the admissions data -- that does not indicate increased enrollment for next year. We will park at about 194,000. Whether or not one for one replacement is at stake, the proposal is made for one to one replacement. We would not be involved in it if we did not believe that to be the case. However, who knows what the fiscal condition of the State will be down the line. There is a three-year implementation because, even after a year, you have not hired back all of the faculty and staff that you have lost. It takes time to conduct these searches, up to three years from our last experience. It is a gamble and there is no question about it. Professor Gura added, "It is that three-year implementation that really is of most concern." Professor Stroup (Philosophy, John Jay) -- "I have a question about the "good news" side of the page. Specifically the conversion of adjunct lines to full-time positions, and I have two questions. One is, has there been any tentative allocation of those lines to the individual colleges and, if not, what will the basis be for the allocation? Secondly, is there any formula by which, once colleges get the lines, they will fill them, specifically with regard to rank?"/I know that 25 full-time positions for the entire senior system -- two or three positions a college -- are admittedly not very much. We are trying to get that up to at least 50 in year one and then 100 per year over the next 5 years. Over the 30-day period we received sort of a nod from the State Division of the Budget to go ahead and convert 50 out of the adjunct budget. This six-year plan would take the number of adjuncts down from 2,200 to 1,650 and try to build up faculty from 5,000 to 5,550. Initially, I thought to make the cost equal we would hire lecturers. That doesn't have to be the case. We have some capability to hire at a higher rank than lecturer because when we made the switch the Division of Budget only took away 17 adjuncts and gave us \$400,000 in addition to the 17 adjuncts to create 25 lines. So we have something more than the average salary for lecturers so there can be variability on how we approach it. Also, in a system where we are going to go out and hire seven or eight hundred people next year, who will know? No one will know. It just creates more full-time faculty capability. Professor Baumrin -- (Philosophy, Lehman) "The comment is, it really is strange for the Bureau of the Budget to decide that the rank should be lecturer to begin with."/ You know I try not to make academic judgements -- that would be inappropriate. I think it's inappropriate that the Bureau of

the Budget make academic judgements but I also think that they make them and sometimes we get around that in a variety of ways. For them to come with a freshman-year initiative in their own mind is something you have to work around. We will work around those things as we chip away at getting what we really want, which is more full-time faculty in the classrooms. Professor Baumrin continued -- "There is more to be said about that. This is a three-part question, no part having any relationship to any other part. Is the increase in graduate fellow support of \$500,000 part of the graduate initiative, is it funded out of the tithe in the same way, and is this actual money? Two, on the \$24.6 million which is going to be shifted to the City, is that actually being covered by the City or it is in limbo between the State and the City? And third, is the cut of \$7.28 million for the medical school a disabling cut or just a little froth on the tide?"/In answer to your first question, the increase in graduate student support is part of the Graduate Initiative. It is funded exclusively out of an increase in the tax known as the Research Foundation tithe. The tithe will go up from \$4 million to \$4.5 million and student support will go up from X to X plus \$500,000. In answer to your second question, yes it is limbo. I expect the City will fight tooth and nail through the legislative process. As to the froth question, as I explained earlier, during the 30-day period they reversed most of that cut by restoring the two programs at City College, worker education and Sophie Davis. It is a real cut and it will hurt. In the context of an \$862 million budget, one can judge what \$6 million -- or half-million dollars a college -- will mean. Professor Baumrin continued "I know this requires some clarification. If the City fights it successfully does that mean that the State will, in fact, fund it or does it mean that the State will also fight it and it will turn out to be a \$4 million dollar cut?"/The view of the State Assembly regarding the attempt to move New York City Tech to City support for associate degree programs is that the Division of Budget was ill advised in doing so for two reasons. One is substantive. In 1980, the Governor at that time, I guess it was Cary, made a decision to align New York City Tech with the other A and T Schools of the State University with the knowledge that it wasn't so much the categorization of associate degree students, but the type of academic program offered, that warranted that it be funded solely by the State. That notion was accepted and we have what they call the legislative packet -- the English language explanation of the status of New York City Tech -- to back that up. Second, on a political level, at the same time that New York City Tech was being moved, something of importance to the State Senate was being moved; the College of Staten Island. The Assembly views this as a violation of an agreement reached a decade ago to keep Staten Island and New York City Tech in the State's family, and I think that will be the basis for the debate. I don't believe it is likely that the University will suffer the loss of the revenues related the transfer of associate degree programs./ Professor Speidel (Earth and Environmental Science, Queens) -- "In what is turning out to be Chancellor Murphy's memorial appearance, I hear he was asked about his support for doctoral programs, for support personnel and for things that of that sort. Last month, Vice Chancellor Bloom was asked about the effect of the early retirement system which, parenthetically, is the most pernicious thing that the University has done since the "F" grade fiasco. He responded that while a sizeable proportion of faculty took advantage of it, about one-third of the Gittlesons took advantage of it, and that leads to my point. Quite frankly, we can do with slightly fewer faculty a lot more easily than we can with fewer secretaries and fewer laboratory technicians and fewer specialists. And these are the exact lines that the University, under Chancellor Murphy, has been squeezing. What is going to happen with the secretarial lines? What is going

to happen to the laboratory technician lines and how are we going to have the level of support necessary to continue the Ph.D. programs?"/In the last go round, 289 faculty out of 744 retirees took advantage of the program. The number of Gittlesons and support staff who took it did not exceed let's say 250. The other third was maintenance and custodial. When we replaced the positions, we did not replace exclusively faculty lines. In fact, the only full-time positions that we allow in year one are other than faculty. Ironically enough, in the first year of the program we would use adjuncts to back-fill the lost teaching power, but use full-time lines to restore the support services and maintenance staff. There are really two things to be said: One is I'm not going to come up here and suggest to you that with or without retirement there is sufficient support staff. I believe, I don't know for sure, but I believe that we that we are short in support from CLT's through registration through bursuring. I think the University is really vulnerable in audit areas where we have to ensure that financial aid is calculated properly and given out to students who meet the academic progress requirements from campus to campus. Faculty do not always stick to the regulations, and it falls to support staff to look over and make sure that academic progress is in fact in line with the catalog and faculty policy from campus to campus. But the design is not to retire 650 people from all parts of the University and hire back only faculty. It is assumed, I think, that a like proportion would go back to the areas from whence they came. Within faculty, perhaps a different distribution from department to department, but not to hire back half of the retirees as faculty when only a third of the retirees were faculty. That is not supposed to happen. If you look at the data, it indicates that we do not have many more faculty than we had after the '83 experience, and that if we are short on staff now, we are short because the hiring freeze affected the non-instructional categories to a greater degree than the instructional categories; specifically the faculty categories. Ninety-seven percent of faculty positions are filled; 95% of all positions are filled, so consequently only about 93% of support lines are filled. The attrition that hit from November 10, 1988, through the end of last summer occurred, except for retirements among faculty, mostly in non-instructional categories, and that is the problem. Hiring back those people is the problem, and I suspect colleges want to do that. The student-faculty ratios are not such, nor the class size such, that you would want that many more faculty. Class size is not high. [Many Senators questioned this statement.] Among remedial courses it is high, based on the data. Professor Yousef (Mechanical Tech., Staten Island) -- "I just returned from Albany where your PSC engaged in lobbying with our sister union at SUNY. As to the conversion of adjuncts and full-time positions, and although it is very early in the game as you have stated accurately, this was one item that legislators will not make big issue about. Number one, I feel that it is a good idea because you know we need the faculty. And by the way, in Albany they were discussing mainly faculty. The other issue was the long-term savings the plan would generate, and this they also seemed to be in agreement with. The point about John Jay, there is definitely anger in the Assembly about it, and the City can not fund it. Of course, we emphasized the unique character of John Jay, not because we have anything against the unique character of our New York City Tech, but we felt your argument about old agreements should really be honored, and is really the telling argument, so we did not emphasize that. And the question about Sophie Davis and so forth, I'm glad you mentioned the \$6.2 million because that is a figure we had. They gave assurance that they will get that back."/We got that back but out of our hide. Professor Yousef continued, "No, no we'll get it back in refunding. The statement there was that the Governor sees this as a

legislative initiative so he said management savings, but it is up to the legislature to put it in. Now we have also about \$8.2 million which you would call legislative items. We also fought for that. So as I said it is just very early in the game. We seem to have listening ears in Albany this year." Professor Chabora (Biology, Graduate School) -- "What I would like to do is focus a little bit on graduate student support. It seems that we are playing somewhat of a zero sum game both on the good news and the bad news front. On good news we have already had two comments on graduate fellowship support which is going to come out of the Research Foundation tithe and also this change from adjuncts to full-time lines. I realize there is about a \$425,000 increase in going from the adjunct to full-time positions. However, many of the graduate students are being supported on adjunct lines. All of a sudden this becomes unavailable for graduate student support. We are now looking for the full-time person. On the same hand we are getting an additional \$500,000 in graduate student support which is almost the balance of this. On the other hand, the Research Foundation is now decreasing the amount of money that is going to departments on the tithe. It is going down from about 74% last year down to about 50% this year which means we are talking about less money for the support of graduate students overall. So regardless of how we add up these numbers, we are getting stuck. Am I wrong in this or can you reconcile this in some way?"/ Of the 2,200 or more adjuncts that we have, there are many more than that because they are not all full-time, not all are graduate students. That is the first thing to be said. There are other opportunities. For example, the limitation in the community colleges on overload did not affect graduate students. It affected full-time faculty. Next, if you are assuming that when the colleges receive their cuts in individual cost recoveries, that they will penalize exclusively the graduate students, then you are right. I don't believe that the presidents will target graduate students when they receive their share of the \$500 million cut in indirect cost recoveries. I do think that while it is clearly taxing the University to pay for the graduate initiative, taxing the Research Foundation offset to pay for the initiative, I don't believe one can make the assumption that, through the back door, it will come away from the graduate students. That has not been the case by the way. We have increased the tithe from \$1.5 million to \$4.5 million and graduate funding for a variety of things, including student support, has gone up by over \$9 million. Professor Cooper (History, Staten Island) -- "I have a question regarding an item which is not on any of these lists about the budget. Could you tell us approximately how much of the CUNY budget is used to fund institutes and centers and at what point they go on to the regular budget from the outside funding that may be their seed money? I open the paper on Sundays and I suddenly see in the middle of the budget freeze that a college is recruiting a director of an institute when we are told we can't keep faculty. The whole thing is quite mysterious."/I would have to find out the details for you but the relationship is to be quite the opposite. We are supposed to use tax levy as seed money and then the center or institute, based on Board policy for centers and institutes, is supposed to become self-supporting. That is the track it is supposed to follow. In one success story, we funded a transportation institute and sure enough they generated substantial dollars. In other cases the center or institute was never really designed to be self-supporting and the State decided to call it a center. So it is a mixed bag. I'll have to get you the information on it. Basically it is \$3.2 million for centers and institutes. That is the basic funding that is associated with an item we call organized research. Professor Cooper, "Who legitimizes that? Who says they can exist? To my knowledge, the faculty is never asked on a campus whether or not they want this group. They

appear one day. They get space. They get secretaries and support. Who authorizes those things?"/It comes from a variety of places. At one college the State Legislature has decided to fund three centers. The total value of which is well over a million dollars. [Senators from the floor comment that the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs is responsible for centers and institutes.] For those that fall under the RFP process for getting a center or an institute, they come in in a variety of ways. Professor Picken (Romance Languages, Queens) -- "To go back to the projected or possible shortfall in State revenues, if there is a \$3 billion shortfall in tax collections, the budget we have been discussing is pretty much pie in the sky isn't it? So my three part question is, how large a hit can we expect, when will we know, will it be during the summer, will it be after the election, and are any plans being made?"/Politically we would not make a plan to take a tremendous cut. We would not consider that. We want to leave the State in a position of having to do draconian things to us. I say that very definitely to our Board of Trustees. Second, I don't know when it will happen. The history has been that only after the budget has been put to bed, three or four months later, we get cut and that would indicate that if there is going to be a move, it would happen after the election, after November. I think the events from a year ago will do a lot to temper what the Governor might otherwise have done. Professor Manassah (Engineering, City) -- "Although my question referred to the graduate initiative, I am not going to go through that after you have kindly agreed that we will meet in committee and go over details of that. But there is something that recently happened that I would like some clarification on. When you made the reserve for the University, the money was taken from different budget items in different proportions. For example, coming back to the tithe of the Research Foundation, there was \$4 million dollars if my recollection is correct; \$2.25 million put in the budget, \$1.75 million kept away. Then out of \$2.25 million there was \$600,000 that was put in reserve. Recently I saw an item where the Counsel of Presidents decided to take this money and give it back to the colleges without any restriction that it should be used for the purpose which it was initially approved for. I am wondering whether, if the money goes to reserve and then it goes out from reserve, it should not go back to the same item it was taken out of?"/My real job is what they call budget implementation, which is the blue smoke and mirrors part of the process. In all candor, this year, not really knowing what was going to happen to the University's budget, all bets were off. I knew at the beginning of the year that we were spending at a rate that would have meant overspending the budget. We just didn't slow down enough moving toward the end of last year to meet the cuts that were mandated for the current budget. So I froze 15%, 15% of all accounts with one or two exceptions. One of those exceptions related to the \$1.75 million increase in the tithe that was part of last years budget. I wanted to leave the presidents with the option of collecting it and depositing it or not. So I froze it. From the very beginning my orientation was not to pursue individual programmatic initiatives as much as it was to make sure that salaries and OTPS was covered. I really didn't know if they would be. We took \$59 million in cuts. At one point \$36 million was restored. The Governor vetoed the tuition increase. He asked us to contribute management savings to the tune of \$5 or \$6 million. I really didn't know what was going to happen. I held back a large amount and in late November, early December, I gave it all out to the colleges. In the letters to the colleges, I indicated that roughly \$200,000 of that money would have gone for graduate-related programs for the four or five colleges involved. I did state that in the letter. If they really made a case not to do so, I probably would look the

other way this year. But next year it is business as usual. We are back to straight budget implementation. This year, not knowing what the budget really meant to them, I didn't feel competent from my office to direct them in dealing with what they had to deal with on their campuses. The five presidents that I met with indicated that they would make an earnest effort. It is unclear as to how it will all fall out. I still don't know how it will all fall out because we are now under a hiring freeze, implemented a week and half ago by the State. I don't have an adequate answer to your question. Professor Broido (Chemistry, Graduate School) -- "I want to follow up in a rather blunt and perhaps controversial way on some of the questions that Peter Chabora raised, particularly since I'm not happy with your answer and I question it. As you may recall, the SETM Task Force had several discussions with you, both in oral and written form, with regard to the graduate student initiative and adjuncts. There was discussion from which we understood your office to have instructed that the graduate student initiative money, particularly adjunct lines, be converted to full-time faculty through some type of magic manipulation like the government is doing with social security funds these days. I have to ask you, when you are talking about converting adjunct lines to faculty lines, is this again under the instruction that you take graduate student initiative money and convert that to full-time faculty lines?"/I think you misunderstand what we did. Professor Broido interjected, "As I said, this is controversial. We had several discussions about this and we haven't agreed on what was done." /Let me explain. What I did two years ago was buy, with graduate initiative money, all of the lines that were being consumed by graduate fellows. I wanted to take them off the line count because it was a legitimate way of hiring people. Taking graduate fellows off the regular line count freed up X number of positions; up to 25 a college for the 5 or 6 colleges involved. Those 125 or 130 graduate fellow positions are fully funded in each college's budget./Professor Broido, "They are fully funded as what?"/Graduate fellows. Then in the line count, they are fully funded at the average salary of \$45,000 a line. The college had the ability to do with the 25 lines that were freed up a combination of things ranging from hiring full-time faculty to what most of them did which was hire support staff. Professor Broido, "If I understand what you are saying, you have taken graduate student initiative lines, lines which can be used for graduate students, but don't have to be." /Correct. They don't have to be. Professor Broido, "Graduate student initiative money no longer has to be used for graduate student support?"/All graduate initiative funding was not exclusively for graduate student support. In fact, most of it went toward faculty lines and equipment. In a very rough way it may be \$3 million in student support, \$3 million in lines, and \$2 or \$3 million in equipment. Professor Broido, "Is any of that changing with regard to the new conversion of adjuncts?"/It is not related to what your calling the graduate initiative. It is to be taken out of the \$28 million adjunct budget. We are supposed to take out \$700,000. We are supposed to take an additional \$400,000 from State funding and hire 25 full-time faculty. I am supposed to meet with your committee. I will meet with them as I did two years ago, and I'll do what they ask me to do. I didn't meet with them this year. Professor Frisz (Student Services, Queens) - - "I want to make a comment about something you said earlier, in regard to the student service support money that is now going to the initiative for freshman programs, in terms of trying to beef up the support needs in the University. My first reaction is that I think it is wonderful if we put extra money into freshman programs. However, I am appalled to hear that the way we are going to deal with the rest of our students is to give them a computer printout of their grades or course outlines to play with. I think this University has had

a lack of commitment to student services and the counseling issue over the years and this is just another indication of brushing it under the rug again and saying that our students can cope with this kind of service. I don't think they can. I see it at Queens. I am sure other institutions can verify it. Students want individual attention. They don't want to read pieces of paper. They need clarification and help. A piece of paper without the backup and support of professional staff people in the University is meaningless. I know you don't have any control over this, but I want to have it on record that this kind of issue makes me very very uncomfortable. Professor Berkowitz (Chemistry, Graduate School) -- "The total graduate initiative funds X number of Grad A's or Grad B's or the equivalent that \$500,000 might hire. On the other hand, I understand the State has upped the salary for Grad A's to \$15,000. I think the averages now are \$11,000 - \$12,000. Will that \$500,000 be enough to cover the increases?"/The increases are handled automatically in the salary counts so that will be part of the basic budget.

Chair Wedeen then thanked Vice Chancellor Vivona for his presentation.

VI. Resolution on Changing the Treatment of "F" Grades: Chair Wedeen introduced Professor Greenbaum (History, Queensborough) who presented the resolution for the Executive Committee.

SUBSTITUTE PROPOSED RESOLUTION OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE OF
THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK REGARDING
BOARD OF TRUSTEES ITEM, "F" GRADE

February 27, 1990

Whereas: The ultimate responsibility for all University matters rests with the Board of Trustees, the proximate power for academic policies rests with the faculty at each college; and

Whereas: The University Faculty Senate of the City University New York maintains that grading practices for purposes of retention, graduation and continuation are a prerogative and responsibility of the faculty which teaches the courses and recommends for degrees.
Therefore be it

Resolved: The Board of Trustees should not legislate grading practices.

Professor Frisz moved to amend the resolution by adding the word "policies" to the Resolved. Supporters of the amendment argued that the proposed Board action was a policy and the resolution read "should not," not "cannot." Opponents suggested that, while agreeing with the sense of the phrase, the Board had a legal right to set policy and using that particular word in the resolution might raise a red flag. Professor Greenbaum noted that the resolution recognizes the power of the Board but states that they "should not" involve themselves in grading standards. The amendment carried. Professor Baumrin then moved that "should" in the Resolved be changed to

"must." After a short discussion, the amendment failed. After two editorial changes, the amended resolution was adopted (copy appended to minutes).

VII. Panel on "F" Grade Practices at Selected Colleges: Professor Davidson (Computer Information Services, LaGuardia) opened the panel by noting that at the January Plenary, Professor Speidel had commented that probably few in CUNY knew of the diversity of grading practices that existed on the various campuses. The panel was designed to detail some of that diversity. Panel members were Professor Frisz (Queens), Jaffe (BMCC), Umolu (Medgar Evers), Weiss (Queensborough) and Zades (CSI).

Professor Frisz began by describing the special circumstances at Queens that apply to first semester students. Students who earn an "F" in their first semester have that grade automatically changed to an "NC." This practice has been used for many years and has worked well. For second semester students, the option to withdraw without penalty exists through the last week of class (for all other students, withdrawal without penalty is permissible through the 8th week). Students may take up to 21 credits "P/NC." When a student signs up for this option, the instructor is not informed of the decision.

Professor Jaffe reported that, at BMCC, their policy for first semester students was the same as at Queens. He noted that the "NC" option is available only to students enrolling in college for their first semester. Beginning with the second semester, standard college grading standards apply including an eight-week withdrawal option. Students who stop attending receive an "F" grade. In addition, "WU" is used for excessive absence after a certain week in the semester.

Professor Umolu described the concern of the Medgar Evers faculty for limiting the damage done to students by assigning "F" grades. In composition courses, a grade of "C" or better must be achieved before a student can advance and the grade is counted in the GPA. In remedial courses, the grade of "R" is assigned where a student does not achieve satisfactory performance. The faculty is considering a "NC" grade in special circumstances. For majors and in the Nursing program, only grades of "C" or better are considered grounds for advancement.

Professor Weiss described practices at Queensborough noting that they had been developed in the 1960's, partly in response to students transferring between the technology and liberal arts programs. Students earning the grades of "D+," "D" or "D-" may repeat a course once for credit. A student who takes a course a second time has the first and second grade averaged to determine the basis for computation in the GPA. In addition, Queensborough also utilizes FAB (absence) and FIN (incomplete) grades.

Professor Zades reported on the rich history of grading practices at the College of Staten Island and the two institutions from which it was merged. In the early 1970's Richmond had a system of Honors, Pass or Fail. At the time of the merger, a traditional A - F system was adopted. The faculty later added "+ 's" and "- 's". On February 21, 1990, the Faculty Council passed a motion on repeated courses which allows a student to repeat a course once unless forbidden by a department or program. Both grades will appear on the transcript and the higher of the two will be calculated in the GPA. He noted

the importance of faculty prerogative in grading practices citing an instance of a student that receives a "C" and needs repetition before advancing to the next level of instruction. This student would be penalized by a policy that would allow him/her to repeat only by receiving an "F."

Professor Davidson then commented that the short presentations indicated that grading practices cannot be easily encapsulated across the University. The colleges prize their independence and that faculty view as their prerogative the establishment and implementation of grading standards.

Professor Muzio (Biological Science, Kingsborough) -- "I have been sitting here listening to the two major agenda items in which I am convinced that there was, in all due respect to the speakers, an incredible amount of doublespeak. We hear words like integrity and wisdom and upholding standards. Then I listen to the variety of approaches that have been developed and I am not questioning anyones intention, to doctor or to modify or to correct in one way or another, official records with all sorts of changes. It is clear that there is marked variation, with not only the letters, but the criteria. What are the evaluative criteria that we are making our determinations on? I guess I am expressing some sort of frustration. Obviously, I think it would be outrageous for the Board to do anything. I certainly think that down the road there is need for a committee of this body to look into the issue of grading policies in the University." Professor Zades responded, "I would like to react to that. One of the things that has been a strength within the University is the fact that each of the colleges, each of the faculties, has had the responsibility to develop a grading system; and the important thing is that we do not doctor the record. At the College of Staten Island, the things that I talked about have been on our transcript. The resolution that we passed last Wednesday will spell out in detail exactly what it is that we do, so that a person who takes the trouble to read that transcript will know which grades have been included and which grades are not included in the GPA. I think it is very, very important and that was one of the weaknesses of the document that came out of the Vice Chancellor's office. The thing that I find disturbing is that up to now the University has had no policy regarding grading. The document in 1985 was a menu. What they did was go around and collect the grading practices of all the colleges and write all of the grades and said, 'choose from any one of these.' You may not choose a grade that is not there. That, to me, is merely giving direction and not dictating policy. The thing that troubles me, and I am repeating something that was said earlier, is that the University is trying to strangle, and I use that word advisedly, the independence of the colleges. We are unique as a University because students come to us because they believe in what our philosophy is. They come to us because of our curriculum. They come to us because of the strengths of our faculties. If they don't like what happens at Brooklyn, they go to Queens. If they don't like Queens, they go to Staten Island or maybe they go back to a community college. I am thinking of the exciting program that Kingsborough has regarding students who can't make it the first time around. This is the thing that makes us unique and to have the Board dictate policy to us, I think, is repugnant and we should fight it with all the strength we have.

Chair Wedeen closed the panel by commenting that the extent to which faculty were concerned about grading standards was obvious and she thanked the panel participants.

LX. New Business: Professor Westrem (English, Lehman) rose to inform Senators that some information was now available in the Lehman/Japan program. The handout is appended to these Minutes.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:10.

Respectfully submitted,

Bruce Hoffacker
Acting Executive Director