

SUBJECT TO SENATE APPROVAL

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

March 15, 1983

Professor Wasser (English, Staten Island) called the session to order at 7:03 p.m. in Room 207 at the Graduate School and University Center. Present were: Senators Barber, Baumrin, Bayer, Baxter, Beck, Beheshti, Beilin, Bohigian, Brogan, Bryant, Buianouckas, Cinquemani, Danziger, Davidson, Donleavy, Ercolano, Finkelstein, Forman, Forstall, Fried, Galub, Gelernt, Gerardi, B. Gerber, Goldzweig, Grossman, Heller, Henderson, Jaffe, Jiji, Julia, Keyser, S. Levine, Loy, McDaniel, Miller, Muehlig, Muller, Parkhurst, Pennington, Picken, Plissner, Rauder, Riley, Rodriguez, Samalonis, Schuyler, Scott, Sohmer, Speidel, Trefousse, Valinsky, Wakatama, Waldinger, Waldman, Walkwitz, Wedeen, Wolfe and Zaneteas; Alternate Senators Ladimer and Otelsberg; Senators Elect Walter and Weightman. Senators Bachman, Borneman, Burton, Cooper, Freedman, Hune, Hunte, Kolliner, Lea, M. Levine, Litke, Petratos, Seguire, Stroup, Timoni and Williams were excused. Professor Nachtsheim (New York State Conference-AAUP), liaison member, also attended. Dr. Jean Ellis, Executive Director, was present also.

I. Approval of the Tentative Agenda: Professor Wasser said that once again there had been a mixup in the Chancellor's schedule and he would be unable to attend because he was hosting a dinner party. Therefore, item 7, Chancellor's Report, would be deleted from the agenda. Perhaps, Professor Wasser added, the Chancellor was wary of visiting the Senate on the Ides of March. The tentative agenda was then approved with the deletion of item 7.

II. Approval of the Minutes of the 118th Plenary Session (February 15, 1983): The minutes were approved with the following emendations: Senator Samalonis was present; Senators Beilin, Ladimer and M. Levine were excused.

III. Communications from the Chairman: Professor Wasser reminded Senators that his report included a portion circulated in writing. He noted also that, as agreed, a periodic update on the Status of Resolutions Adopted by the Senate was to be circulated and such a report was included in the materials for this evening's session. The summary, he suggested, was excellent - a judgment he could make since it was prepared by the Senate Office not by him - and indicated the subject, date, disposition and status of each resolution adopted since September 1981. He said too that he could add to the information about Resolution 170 - Search Procedures for Senior Administrators at the University Level - on the basis of a discussion with the Chancellor which he had earlier in the day. The Chancellor has responded that the proposed procedures are unacceptable since they remove his prerogative to make appointments of members of those committees and eliminate the flexibility he needs in establishing search committees.

Professor Wasser reported also on the status of the Solomon Amendment which establishes a linkage between Federal financial aid eligibility and draft registration. The University has sent a formal comment on the proposed regulations for implementation of the amendment which emphasizes the administrative burden and costs of compliance with the regulations and which proposes that each institution be permitted to establish its own procedures. In addition, the University is maintaining liaison with the American Council on Education with respect to the Council's response to the Proposed Regulations and CUNY is monitoring the course of the Minnesota decision. As you know, Professor Wasser continued, a Federal judge has issued a temporary injunction barring implementation of the act in Minnesota and, according to the press report, did so because it appeared that the law would be found to violate students' rights against self-incrimination. The Senate leadership has suggested that CUNY be in touch with

Columbia University and other New York institutions to seek a similar injunction. The Board Calendar for the Public Meeting on March 21 included a proposed resolution on the amendment but the item has been withdrawn pending review by the Board Committees on Student Affairs and Public Policy before it is submitted to the full Board - presumably, at the April meeting.

Last night, Professor Wasser reported, the Board held a hearing as mandated by law on the calendar for the March 21 meeting. Some 52 students, Professor Riley (member of the Executive Committee of the Senate) and Dean Malone (John Jay) were scheduled to speak on the proposed amendments to the Bylaws on Student Activity Fees. The chief arguments advanced by the students included: their desire for parity of treatment with SUNY where the students have full control of the revenue from student activity fees; desire to control the revenue from auxiliary enterprises since under the proposed amendments there would be two college associations - one with a majority of student members and one without such a majority and the latter would control revenue from auxiliary enterprises except at Brooklyn and Queens Colleges whose student unions are independent corporations; and the desire to be treated as adults. Dean Malone argued for the Council of Deans of Students that they had not been consulted in the development of these amendments and were concerned about their impact on various campuses. He therefore urged the Board to defer action on the proposal until that impact could be assessed. Professor Riley addressed the issue of faculty representation on the College Association and the method of selecting the faculty members. One student argued for direct selection of faculty members and one student argued against the selection of faculty from a panel of faculty elected by the faculty and for the selection of the faculty members by students. Dr. Blanche Bernstein who chaired the hearing emphasized that the proposed amendments were the result of a negotiated settlement in which each constituency got something and had to surrender some of the things it wanted so that no constituency was entirely satisfied with the result.

There was also some confusion about the item on the agenda relating to the Solomon amendment, said Professor Wasser, and several students spoke to that item. Some students attempted to speak to the issue of raising tuition but they were ruled out of order by the chair since there was no item on the calendar on that issue.

Professor Wasser announced that Dean Rothlein had informed the Senate that the Faculty Fellows Program had been funded for 1983-84. The Senate would recall, he continued, that last year the fellows were selected and everything seemed to be in order for the program to go forward when during the summer the decision was made that it would be suspended for 1982-83 because of fiscal problems. The three fellows who were to have served in 1982-83 have been invited to serve in 1983-84 and two of them - Professors Richard Barsam (Film, Staten Island) and Aubrey Bonnet (Sociology, Hunter) have accepted the appointment. The third fellow was unable to do so; therefore, a third fellow will be selected from the pool of last year's runners-up.

Professor Wasser reported next on the Senate's Proposed Retrenchment Guidelines. The document discussed at the February Plenary Session has been revised in accordance with the discussion at that meeting and has been reviewed by the Executive Committee. Dr. Wasser then exercised his prerogative as a Board member to have it placed on the agenda of the March 1 meeting of the Board Committee on Faculty, Staff and Administration for informational purposes and with notice of an intent to place it on the agenda of the April meeting for action. Dr. Wasser shared the document with Dr. Polishook of the Professional Staff Congress and with the Chancellor and is awaiting their comments. In his meeting with Chancellor Murphy this morning, he continued, the Chancellor indicated that his primary concern is a document which will assist in having the AAUP censure lifted and we await his response.

Professor Wasser explained also that he had discussed with both Chancellor

Murphy and Chairman Murphy the Senate's concerns with respect to faculty participation in the planning for the CUNY Law School. He had suggested the addition of a faculty member to the Ad Hoc Committee which is now considering the governance issue and the Chancellor had responded that since the Committee's work is nearing an end no new members would be added now. He had assured the Senate Chairman that faculty would be involved in future curriculum planning and would exercise the appropriate powers of faculty and also he said that the Senate would be kept informed of the progress on the issue of governance which is now being discussed.

Dr. Wasser reminded the Senate also that he had reported earlier in the year on a study being prepared by Robert Harris who was hired as a special consultant to the Chancellor to assess the operation of the central administration and make recommendations on it. The report is now in draft form and the Chancellor has said that when the final report is ready he will make public all of the document with the exception of the individual performance audits. The Chancellor has indicated that the recommendations do not include a major reorganization.

Professor Wasser announced that the Board of Trustees will hold a public hearing on Staten Island on April 20 from 5 to 8 p.m. in College Hall which is located at 130 Stuyvesant Place. He urged all Senators from the College of Staten Island to attend.

Professor Wasser also announced that the Student Senate plans a lobbying day in Albany on March 23 and has invited faculty to accompany them. They will be sending busses to the State Capitol and further information may be obtained from the Student Senate Office, 794-5338. In addition, the Student Senate has asked the Faculty Senate to assist in relaying this information to their home campuses and also to urge their faculty colleagues to look kindly on those students who participate in the lobbying effort and are therefore absent from class that day.

Tomorrow morning, said Professor Wasser, the joint subcommittee of the Executive Committees of the SUNY and CUNY Faculty Senates will meet to discuss major issues of concern related to the current budget crisis and other matters of current attention by the two governance bodies. Professors Wasser, Wedeen and Picken are the CUNY members of the Committee and SUNY is represented by Professors Rogers (Political Science, Cortland) president of the SUNY Senate, Egan (Sociology, Buffalo), vice president and treasurer, and Georgianna Falu (Old Westbury).

Professor Wasser said that the searches for a deputy chancellor and for a vice chancellor for academic affairs are progressing.

Finally, Professor Wasser reported that the University Faculty Senate is facing a major budget crisis because the funding received from the Research Foundation for this year was substantially less than the budget request. At present the Senate can not expend any monies at all and, in fact, recent bills have been covered by personal loans to the account. Negotiations are in progress with the Foundation and the Chancellor for a supplemental grant to enable the Senate to complete the year with some adjustments and plans are also being made to ensure that the same situation does not arise next year. The current problem is the result of an allocation which provided less than \$2000 for OTPS expenditures despite the fact that the Senate pays the University for telephone service and printing costs and purchases all supplies from outside vendors. Members will have noticed, he said, that there were no name tags tonight nor would there be until the May organizational meeting. In addition, members are asked to be especially careful of materials sent them and not to expect duplicates. Publication of the Newsletter has been curtailed and only three rather than the usual four issues are planned for the year. The Office is making additional cutbacks for the rest of the year, i.e. through June 30, and hopes that members will

be understanding and cooperative in this crisis.

IV. Reports of Faculty Members of Board of Trustees' Committees: Professor Wasser reminded members that these reports were available in writing.

V. Guest Speaker: Vice Chancellor for Budget and Finance Jerald Posnan: Professor Wasser said that he had prepared no introductory remarks since Vice Chancellor Posnan needed no introduction but was always a welcome guest of the Senate. Vice Chancellor Posnan responded that he always found attendance at the Senate a good experience and that he had learned a great deal this evening.

Vice Chancellor Posnan then explained that he had read the minutes of the February meeting when Chairman Wasser had filled in for him when he was delayed in Albany and unable to reach the City in time for the session. Nonetheless he had decided to trace the history of the budget process as it has unfolded this year and to begin at the beginning of that process. The University began, he continued, with a Budget Request of \$90 million more than the current budget. That \$90 million included \$36 million for collective bargaining and \$54 million for a number of things which the University needed. The University does not consider the Budget Request a throwaway document but works seriously to develop it beginning in the colleges where faculty are involved, although not as much as they should be in the view of the Vice Chancellor (parenthetically Vice Chancellor Posnan expressed the hope that they would become more involved). The colleges submit their requests and a University Request is formulated. The next step is a dialogue with the State. First the presidents of the senior colleges meet with the Budget Examiner. Until this year that position was held by Mr. Villette who had been at his post for as long as the Vice Chancellor has been at the University. A new Budget Examiner was appointed this year, however, a person who was new at this job and whose experience in other areas of State government had not given him the expertise in higher education which would permit a real understanding of the issues and whose approach was bureaucratic rather than sensitive. The new Examiner took up his work at a time when there were major fiscal problems for the State in the form of an \$8.1 billion shortfall. When Governor Cuomo took office he decided on his approach to that problem. First of all, he included in the Executive Budget a number of nuisance taxes - on movies, on bowling, on barber shops; secondly, there were to be expenditure reductions and finally there were to be roll-overs (putting off expenditures into the next fiscal year and thus establishing a kind of credit line). In the past, continued the Vice Chancellor, the University was usually consulted with respect to its priorities in the Budget Request but this year for a period of time from November to the end of January there was no communication between the Budget Office and the University except for an occasional phone call communicating that "this is the worst[budget you've had]." When the budget finally surfaced the University found out that indeed it was the worst in years. Whether this was purposely done to SUNY and CUNY, since the privates did not suffer and in fact gained a slight increase in Bundy aid, is not known.

The key components of the budget, Vice Chancellor Posnan said, are the University's share of the statewide budget cuts which for CUNY meant \$15.8 million in cuts beyond the base budget. That \$15.8 million was to be made up of layoffs of teaching faculty and non-teaching faculty and staff which meant 554 people with 242 faculty to be fired on August 31 and 312 non-teaching people on April 1 - the percentages here were 43% teaching faculty and 57% non-teaching people which conform to the personnel profile of the University. In addition before that statewide cut was taken the colleges' base budgets were reduced. Each year, the Vice Chancellor said, there is an exercise in what he calls the "position game." The State argues that the University can do with fewer people and that it should not fill vacant lines. Thus, even though last year the Legislature funded 11,300 positions for 1982-83 the Budget Office reduced that number to 11,047 at the beginning of the academic year. Then, a month or two later they reduced it to 10,700 and imposed a vacancy freeze to help the University not to

fill those positions which became vacant. Then for 1983-84 the Budget Office took those numbers and eliminated 300 or so more positions. The third piece in the University's problem was the mandate on attrition. Throughout the University in the course of a month some 50 or 60 positions become vacant due to attrition. The State therefore said that of every three positions vacated in this way only two could be filled. The choice of which positions to fill was left to the University but the mandate was directed towards eliminating 1/3 of the positions vacated by attrition. Out of the 1,000 positions lost in this threefold cut 700 could be translated into people and only 300 were vacant lines.

Considering what the University had gone through in 1976, Vice Chancellor Posman continued, it did not want to repeat that experience. It was therefore decided that under any circumstances those kinds of reductions must be avoided and that became the University's agenda. The strategy was then developed and included a number of things: 1) the Chancellor and the Presidents said that no tenured people were to be fired; 2) even though things are important the University is willing to give up things for people. The University then determined which things might be given up and these included: 1) a building repair fund which has been built up over the past several years and which would yield \$2.4 million; 2) an equipment allocation of \$1 million and a \$1 million allocation for an equipment inventory; 3) capital programs; 4) all but 25% of an emergency repair fund.

The University then determined that to restore personnel \$37 million was needed to keep things at the same level as now - to stand still in other words and to do this although enrollment is growing with Fall 1982 enrollment up 4% and spring 1983 enrollment also up and an 11 to 12% increase in applications for 1983-84 - an occurrence which Chancellor Murphy attributes to Reagan's policy of making more poor people. The University then offered to give up some \$25 million in things in exchange for not laying off people. Part of the reason for this decision was that the Chairman of the Board and the Chancellor met with the Governor when they learned about the layoffs and the Governor indicated that they should tell him where he could find the money not to have layoffs. The Governor indicated that if the University wanted to trade things for people it could. An open question of course, is whether the State meant that this situation is permanent. All of the \$25 million offered in tradeoffs by the University involved things except for an early retirement proposal which would have resulted in an offer of early retirement to 100 people. The early retirement tradeoff, the Vice Chancellor added, was rejected in any case by the State. The remaining \$12 million gap, he continued, the University thought would be filled in other ways.

At this point, said Vice Chancellor Posman, the Board, the Chancellor and various staff people including himself made the annual trip to Albany to meet with legislators and representatives of the executive branch. Mr. Posman said too that in his opinion this year's trip was better than last when the Board had reached Albany very late in the afternoon, held a reception and dinner for legislators which served more as a testimonial dinner to Chancellor Kibbee than a working session, and then returned to New York early the following morning. This year in addition to meeting and talking with legislators at the reception and dinner the Board met with individual legislators the following morning and did not leave Albany until the afternoon. The timing of the trip, however, meant that the University was going up early almost immediately after the budget had been presented but still had to bring a message to the legislature. The reception they hosted for legislators was productive and many legislators indicated that it was good to see the University's representatives and have the opportunity to review the situation with them. The following day there were meetings with a number of people - legislators, key staff people and members of the Governor's staff. Vice Chancellor Posman accompanied groups of trustees who met with Senator LaValle, chairman of the Higher Education Committee, Assemblyman Siegel, chairman of

the Assembly Higher Education Committee, Majority Leader of the Assembly Fink and others. He said that he got the sense that people were receptive to the University's case but all reacted in terms of asking where they were going to get the money the University needed. Assemblyman Fink's plan was rejected by the Governor and there was no response from the Senate on it. Assemblyman Fink stressed that the University should complain to the Governor who seemed favorable to the University in his rhetoric. On the strength of this advice a letter was sent to the Governor indicating that the budget spelled disaster for CUNY. The Governor responded, "Where are we going to get the money?"

The next step was the University's presentation on February 23 to the joint Senate Finance and Assembly Ways and Means Committee chaired by Senator Marchi and Assemblyman Kremer. The Chancellor had a very good reception by the members, people listened diligently and said they would try to do something but they wanted the Governor to act first.

Then the Governor accepted \$12.1 million of the \$25 million the University had suggested it was willing to transfer from things to save people. In exchange for the massive layoffs which would have resulted from the original proposed budget and statewide reduction the number of layoffs was reduced to 42 - the equivalent of a \$1 million cut. There now seemed to be no problem with respect to saving people even if nothing else happened. Then the other day we received another communication from the Governor which stated that SUNY has somewhat solved its problem as has CUNY but others have not. Therefore, CUNY must fire 42 people instead of effecting that reduction through attrition. Our response was based on two arguments: 1) no other agency in 1976 went through what we did and we had offered our deal in order to avoid layoffs and a repetition of 1976. To this the response was, "People are no different - it is a question of equity and CUNY should share the pain." Our other argument was the size of the layoff. But the arguments fell on deaf ears and the response was there have to be 42 firings - 18 teaching faculty by August 31 and 24 non-teaching people by April 7. The only classification of people within the University who can be fired by April 7 are the provisional civil service people, said the Vice Chancellor, because contractual obligations do not permit other layoffs within the present time span. We have discussed this new situation with the colleges today and have told them that if negotiations fail "pink slips" will have to be sent out even though we will try to rehire the people as others leave due to attrition.

Another element in the picture, however, the Vice Chancellor continued, is that between now and April 1 the budget must be passed. The Senate and the Assembly would like to pass it by March 28 since the Passover and Easter holidays fall in that week. Therefore only 10 days remain for the University to press its case. We have heard rumors about what's in the legislature's budget for us and we know that it's not the \$25 million we would like. We are aiming for \$12 to \$15 million for personal service - \$1 million for the remaining layoffs, \$3 million for attrition, \$6 million for the base budget cuts, and \$3 to \$4 million for adjuncts. We should know in a week or so where we are.

The other major issue is that of tuition. The budget for the senior colleges includes an increase of \$32.8 million (and, if you remember that we need \$36 million for collective bargaining that amount is \$4 million less). Out of the \$32.8 million \$28.8 million is to be generated through tuition and fees so that only \$4 million is additional state aid. \$28 million is to be derived from an increase of \$150 in tuition per FTE student generating \$13 million and a \$1400 increase in out-of-state tuition generating \$5 million. The State arrived at the out-of-state figure by using the SUNY model and without an understanding of the CUNY situation. On the basis of a study we have done we know that the University's "out-of-state" students comprise one-third overseas students, one-third people on temporary visas and only one-third

who are "out-of-state" in the sense of being residents of states other than New York. In all we have about 3,300 undergraduate students and 700 graduate students who are "out-of-state". The increase imposed by the Budget Office could wipe out that student population. When we presented this to the State, they responded that we had the option of raising the undergraduate tuition more than the \$150. SUNY which received a \$250 mandated increase has done this by increasing resident tuition beyond that level and including the \$25 tuition fee imposed on both universities' students as a result of the argument we presented concerning the need for funds to acquire computers because of the use to which they are put throughout the curriculum. The State, in other words, provided the funds by imposing what amounts to a tax on students. That fee imposed separately is not TAP reimbursable and considering CUNY's student profile it is an additional burden. SUNY's solution was to increase the tuition to pay the fee. All of this, of course, will get played out in the next few days but the \$18 million increase in tuition on top of the \$37 million in cuts means we need \$55 million.

So far as the community colleges are concerned, Vice Chancellor Posman stated, they are in somewhat better shape. The City process went well. We had a pretty good reception - especially after the experience of some three years ago when I can remember a meeting with the Mayor whose attitude then differed from his attitude towards the University today. At that earlier meeting the Mayor was fresh from a visit to the Fashion Institute and when we argued that CUNY's community colleges prepared students to enter the work force, the Mayor demanded figures, saying that FIT had shown him data to confirm what they said. We learned from that experience never to meet with the Mayor without being armed with supporting data for our arguments. Now he has done a turnaround and the community college picture is healthier than the senior college one but not healthier than SUNY.

At the beginning of the process the Mayor wanted to cut \$12 million from the community college budget. We got that amount down to \$7 or \$8 million and the amount we showed them we could generate through increased revenue from tuition as a result of increased enrollment and which they agreed to let us keep reduced that amount to \$4 million. We expected the State to produce more revenue for the community colleges but instead the State came up with another plan. There is some \$2.5 million in the community college budget for non-credit remedial courses. The State said job training is more important than remediation and therefore that \$2.5 million will be divided into two funds: one for vocational training which will be subject to approval by the State Budget Office and one for the Joint Partnership Training Act - a program for which there are Federal matching funds. \$1.9 million is supposed to be used for the latter program and since that will be matched by Federal funds, the State suggested, there will be an increase. There is no certainty that we would get those matching funds, however, and therefore the \$1.9 million are in jeopardy. So we are now trying to get that action reversed as well as getting additional monies. There will be no layoffs in the community colleges but there may be some losses due to cuts. The enrollment in the community colleges is even healthier than in the senior colleges which are increasing steadily. The next ten days will tell the story on state aid.

Vice Chancellor Posman then responded to the following questions and comments from the floor. 1) Professor Pennington (Nursing, City) - "I am just trying to get this clear. The 18 teaching faculty whom the State is requiring be laid off by August 31, is that a number for the entire University and how does that relate to the April 1 reappointment date?"/ The teaching faculty faces 18 layoffs with the rest of the reduction (their share of the 42 persons) to be accomplished through attrition. The college could decided on non-reappointments so it would not have to do the reduction through attrition throughout the year if it could pinpoint where to do this. Professor Pennington further asked - "Does that assume that in a given unit that can be done with the April 1 reappointments and the December 1 reappointments?"/

No, because the December 1 date speaks to 1984-85. 2) Professor Jaffe (Science, Borough Manhattan) - "Wasn't there a suggestion of adding a sales tax on professional services - on lawyers et al.?"/ Yes. Assemblyman Fink is committed to seeing the University have decent budgets and it was argued that such a tax would benefit the state and indirectly the cities. Senator Anderson, the majority leader in the Senate, opposed it, however. Perhaps there will be a compromise or perhaps nothing. The Senate is currently engaged in what I call the revenue reestimate game. Senator Anderson says there is \$133 million in loose change in the budget. Another proposal that has been put forward is that there be a \$1 a bottle liquor tax - no matter the size of the bottle. But the professional sales tax, I believe, has been dropped. Professor Jaffe further asked - "Do you think it's because there are so many lawyers in the legislature?"/ It was really an alternative to the surcharge which people thought a good way to deal with the problem but which everyone is hesitant to impose since there is already a surcharge which took effect in December. 3) Professor Speidel (Earth and Environmental Science, Queens) - "There probably is no way to protect against or anticipate arbitrary, capricious administrators but how much of our problem do you think is due to the fact that the person in the Budget Office lacks knowledge of higher education? Secondly, if CUNY continues as it is would you send your child here in four or five years?"/ In response to your first question I believe - and this is a personal view - that there is a tendency to wind down the public institutions. If someone can convince the state that Bundy aid is a cheaper means of support through tax levy funds then support for the public will decrease. CUNY, however, is very different from SUNY. I would like to believe that the Governor is friendly towards us but I am very concerned about the financial aid situation. If the crisis leads to a cut in TAP that could destroy the University. In response to your second question a University which produces a Rhodes Scholar, which has programs which in a national survey of graduate programs achieve top ratings, and which has a faculty whose quality is unquestionable is one which I would send a child to. 4) Professor Sohmer (Mathematics, City) - "Two questions. First, rumor has it that the 42 number is a number but that there is also underfunding which leads to a larger number. Is the rumor correct? Second, rumor has it that the \$12.1 million was restored conditionally, that in exchange the Chancellor must produce a grandiose plan for shrinkage. Is this so?"/ In response to the second question - the State has sent a letter accepting the tradeoff if we promise to get back by July 31 with a plan of how to put back things and get rid of people in the future. That doesn't really worry me. It reminds me of the old story about the court jester and the king. The jester has aroused the king's anger and the king orders him executed. The jester pleads for his life saying that if the king spares him, he will do anything the king wants, he will make his dog talk. Give me three years, he says. The king agrees threatening that if at the end of the three years the dog doesn't talk the jester's head will be chopped off. The jester returns home where his wife berates him, saying you are a fool - how are you going to make the dog talk. You know you can't. The jester responds - in three years I could die, the king could die, the dog could die, meanwhile I have my life. Vice Chancellor Posman resumed in a more serious vein to explain that he did not disparage planning but a plan was a plan and nothing more. Chancellor Wharton of SUNY asked the Governor whether the crisis was short term or long term and the response was one can't treat it as long term and if the State recovers we can treat as short term which is what should be done. If we have no additional funding we will have to go through that exercise. The question of whether the 42 number is the tip of the iceberg I would answer as follows. We have 160 people over the number we are supposed to have on June 30. We have imposed a vacancy freeze except for appointments required for reasons of health, safety or emergency. If we don't reach the required level that way we will have to fire additional people. 5) Professor Baumrin (Philosophy, Lehman) - "A point of information: the reluctance to pass the surcharge was due to the other surcharge imposed in December. My question is this - did you say that the 24 people who might be fired would be quickly rehired so that this would be only a temporary discharge?"/ We believe we can achieve the 24 through attrition. The State said we couldn't do it that way but gave us no reason. So at least theoretically we could send notices of discharge for April 7 and rehire the people on April 8. Professor



Baumrin further asked - "You didn't mention the Hunter and City College maintenance people, are they included?"/ What happened there is as close to an analytical travesty as I have observed. The State has said that the positions could not be included in the 10,700 and we have been bargaining all year for them and the Budget Office got as close to acknowledging their error as they ever have but they are now saying that we should be able to get them through attrition or by including them in the 10,700 positions and reducing the balance of positions to 10,600. Then we can staff those new facilities. We're saying the facilities will remain closed until we get the positions. 6) Professor Forstall (Educational Services, Brooklyn) - "With respect to the 42 people I understood that it might be possible to handle them through non-reappointments in April and that the others would be handled through changes in the budget. The problem for me, however, is getting straight non-reappointments for budgetary reasons and non-reappointments for academic reasons."/ On the 18 teaching positions the State wants to see 18 people fired. We are certain that there will be 18 people non-reappointed by August 31 and we can simply say that of those laid off 18 are for budgetary reasons. 7) Professor Ranis (Political Science, York) - "I am not sure of CUNY's policy with respect to the out-of-state tuition. Are we going to follow SUNY's policy and try to equalize the increase or what?"/ There may be an attempt to balance out the tuition by trying to cut down the rate of increase for non-resident students and we think we will look at the increase in full-time tuition to keep the part-time and non-resident tuition down. 8) Professor Bohigian (Mathematics, John Jay) - "I would like to commend you on your presentation. With respect to the strategy you outlined I am not really interested in the strategy. The reason is that I think we should respond in kind and publicize the type of antagonism being exhibited and label the Governor with this tag and make him respond. We should call in the chips since we are the people who elected him. I think something along those lines needs to be done."/ We could respond in three ways: 1) attempt to challenge the Governor directly - but remember they determine the amount we get eventually and to be antagonistic at the beginning can be dangerous because what we get could be paper money; 2) we thought about the layoff strategy. SUNY traded attrition for layoffs and we thought of this but dispensed with it; 3) there is the problem of how can you teach without equipment, staff and with growing enrollment so should we cap enrollment. I have argued against this because I think it falls into the hands of those who want to reduce the size of the University and I think that is a real possibility.

Professor Wasser thanked Vice Chancellor Posman on behalf of the Senate.

VI. Report of the International Education Committee: Professor Loy (Modern Languages, Brooklyn), chairman of the Committee presented the Committee's report and moved the proposed resolution. His motion was seconded. An amendment to delete the fourth clause in the resolution was made, seconded and debated but when put to a vote was defeated. An amendment to substitute the following language for the proposed clause 4 was made and seconded: "4. Office space and staff for administrative and informational purposes shall be provided by the Central Office." When put to a vote the amendment was unanimously adopted. The motion on the resolution was then put to a vote and adopted unanimously.

Professor Loy thanked the members of his committee for their work and Professor Wasser expressed thanks to Professor Loy for his leadership of the Committee.

VII. New Business: Professor Davidson (Data Processing, La Guardia) urged members to write to the Governor and send telegrams to him and to legislators concerning the University's budget problems. He explained that he had just returned from Albany where forces were out in strength to lobby against some of the taxes the Governor has included in the budget such as the bowling tax. It was especially important to communicate with the Governor's office he said and to do so immediately since the next 10 to 12 days are crucial.

10.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jean Ellis