

Draft: Subject to Senate Approval

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

February 26, 1991

Chair Picken called the session to order at 7:05 p.m. in room 1700 of the Graduate School and University Center. Present were Senators Baumrin, Baxter, Berkowitz W., Bishop, Bleyman, Bohigian, Brugnola, Buianouckas, Caudle, Cooper, Cyril, Davidson, Davis E., Depas, Donleavy, Donoghue, Frisz, Galub, Gerber, Gordon, Greenbaum, Grossman, Hill, Jaffe, Kaufman, Koshi, Krashinsky, Lidov, Lundeen, MacLennan, Magid, Matthews, McCoy, McCullers, Meier, O'Malley, Otte, Plissner, Riedler-Berger, Riley, Schuyler, Selvadurai, Shaffer, Simor, Sohmer, Speidel, Squitieri, Stern, Stroup, Svitak, Tenenbaum, Thompson, Trefousse, Umolu, Vogt, Walters, Washburn, Wedeen, Westrem, Zades, Zarin, Zinberg and Alternate Senators Alsop, Blanks, Brady, Immergut, and Reid. Newly-elected Senators Jacobson, Martinez and Newly-elected Alternates, O'Reilly, and Terrell. Senators Brenner, Bronars, Bushler, Danziger, Knoop, Reynolds (ex-officio), Rodriguez, Rose, and Sherrill were excused. Heads of Faculty Governance Bodies Bird (Baruch), Chabora (Graduate School), Frisz (Queens), Galub (Bronx), Sohmer (City), and Zades (CSI) attended. Senate Executive Director Hoffacker and Administrative Assistant Pasela also attended.

I. Adoption of the Agenda: Chair Picken asked for a motion to adopt the revised tentative agenda. The motion was made, seconded, and approved.

II. Acceptance of the Minutes of the 188th (January 29, 1991) Plenary Session: Two corrections were received by the Senate office: Professor Frisz, the Governance Head from Queens, was omitted from the attendance under Heads of Faculty Governance Bodies, and a typographical error was noted.

III. Reports:

a. Chair: I would like to begin my report with an announcement regarding the upcoming plenary schedule. Chancellor Reynolds has asked me to give you advance notice of her intention to hold a reception for the University Faculty Senate at her residence on East 79th Street preceding our April Plenary meeting. Since the reception cannot be held on our previously scheduled date of April 23, the Executive Committee has decided to move the Plenary to Tuesday, April 16. For convenience sake, the Plenary will be held at Board Headquarters, 535 East 80th Street. The principal agenda item for that session will remain a panel discussion of multi-cultural education. You will receive an invitation from the Chancellor in due course.

As usual, the greater portion of my report is being submitted to you in written form and is available at the back of the room. I would, however, like to report verbally on several matters, the principal one being last evening's Board of Trustees' meeting, about which you have read in this morning's Times.

The meeting began with the introduction of three distinguished visitors from the People's Republic of China. They were Cao Zhong-xian, Vice Chancellor of Shanghai University, and his collaborators Hou Yuchen, Vice President of the College of Engineering, and Diao Huiyao, Dean of the International Business College. The delegation was visiting 80th Street and observing the Board meeting in order, it was announced by Board Chair Murphy, to learn from us how to administer a large university. [ed. -- There were many comments from the floor at this point.]

The first item of business was the following resolution, which I shall read:

**HON. SHIRLEY ULLMAN WEDEEN -- APPRECIATION OF SERVICES:**

WHEREAS, The Honorable Shirley Ullman Wedeen served as the faculty exofficio Member of the Board of Trustees from September 1986 to May 1990; and

WHEREAS, During her tenure on the Board, Professor Wedeen served with devotion and distinction on many Board committees, ranging from the Standing Committees on Academic Policy, Program and Research; Committee on Public Affairs, and the Long-Range Planning Committee, to such Ad Hoc or Special Committees as the Search Committee for a Chancellor, a president of New York City Technical College, and for a president of Eugenio Maria de Hostos Community College, and the Robert J. Kibbee Awards Committee, the Ad Hoc Committee on Diversity and Pluralism, the Ad Hoc Committee on Presidential Personnel Policies and the Task Force on Student Life; and

WHEREAS, Professor Wedeen brought to the deliberations of these committees the insights and judgements of a wide academic background, as well as an astute knowledge of college affairs; and

WHEREAS, During her four years on the Board, Professor Wedeen attended all Board Public Hearings and Borough Hearings; and

WHEREAS, Her commitment, energy, vision and comprehensive experience in the University have greatly contributed to the deliberations of the Board; and

WHEREAS, Professor Wedeen responded readily to every call on the Board for participation;

THEREFORE, BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED, That the Board of Trustees expresses its appreciation for her outstanding service.

The resolution was approved unanimously by the Board of Trustees, and Professor Wedeen received a warm round of applause from all present.

The principal item on the agenda was, of course, the Long-Range Planning Committee's policy resolution on the College Preparatory Curriculum Initiative. The Trustees unanimously approved this policy. There was a full discussion of the matter. This morning's Times article, while not precisely inaccurate, conveys a false impression of the nature of that discussion. It is also not entirely clear to me that Mr. Weiss fully understands all aspects of the Initiative. The support for the resolution was overwhelming. The Chancellor presented her reasons for undertaking the Initiative, all of which she has previously discussed with us, and her arguments were reinforced by: Acting President Joyce F. Brown, Baruch College; President Isaura Santiago Santiago, Hostos Community College; and President Robert L. Hess, Brooklyn College.

The reservations expressed by some of the Trustees centered on the willingness and ability of the Board of Education to respond to the University's Initiative. Chancellor Reynolds described the enthusiastic support she has thus far received from Chancellor Fernandez as well as some of their plans for collaboration. Trustee Stanley Fink asked a series of questions dealing with the proposed timetable for the full elaboration and implementation of the Initiative. During the discussion the Chancellor reiterated her pledge that the needs of all non-traditional students would be provided for and that the faculties of the various colleges would play a key role in the implementation of the Initiative on their campuses. Trustee Calvin O. Pressley expressed the hope that the Initiative would not bring about a separation of the community colleges from the senior colleges, thereby creating a two-tier university. He was assured that this would not happen.

I presented a lengthy statement in support of the Initiative. Although it has been my practice to report to the Senate my statements to the Board, considering this one's length, I shall only briefly summarize for you what I said. I will, however, with your permission append the full text to the minutes of tonight's meeting so that it can be a part of our record.

After restating the Senate's unequivocal commitment to the University's twin goals of access and excellence, I reviewed some of the problems posed by the inadequate preparation of a significant number of incoming students. I said that the key element for realization of CUNY's promise of equal access to excellence and equal opportunity for all students to benefit from a college-level education will be the provision for pre-college-entrance preparation by the secondary schools that is designed to fulfill expectations that the University faculty has for students going into their first-year courses. Equal opportunity for all students admitted to the freshman year at one of the community or senior colleges of City University has meaning only if all are equally equipped to do college-level work.

I stated my firm belief that the Board's action in approving the policy resolution under consideration would signal a recommitment on the part of our University to ensuring not only that all high school graduates can find a place in one of our colleges, but that all those students who come to us have a genuine opportunity of successfully completing the studies they undertake.

I remarked that while the challenge of this initiative is formidable and long overdue, the faculty is encouraged by successful examples of similar initiatives toward improving college preparatory curricula in the high schools by other college systems and institutions of higher education across the nation. The development of an appropriate college preparatory curriculum for the over 32,000 students who graduate from the New York City public secondary schools each year will require intensive collaboration and sustained dialogue between high school teachers and CUNY faculty, who together are ultimately responsible for maintaining a continuum between the two sides of the bridge that connects secondary and higher education. The task will demand mutual respect and good will and especially the shared determination to reach a consensus that will clarify for high school students and their parents what CUNY enrollees will have to know and be able to do to succeed in mastering college-level work. As responsible educators, we can do no less than to inform our prospective students what will be expected of them.

Finally, I commended the Chancellor for having accomplished something of a miracle. For the first time that I can recall in nearly 20 years, everyone in the University--students, faculty, administrators--are talking about, discussing, debating an academic issue. I concluded by stating my confidence that we are embarked on a renewal and revitalization of the educational enterprise within our city and that this policy resolution marks the beginning of a auspicious new chapter in the history of City University's service to all New Yorkers.

The Chancellor has offered to brief the Senate fully on the data underpinning the concept of the College Preparatory Initiative and on her projections for its implementation. She has given similar briefings to the Trustees, the Council of Presidents, and the Council of Provosts and Chief Academic Officers. I have heard several of these presentations. They have been most compelling and have gone far beyond what the Chancellor has been able to discuss with us during her monthly report to the Senate. The Executive Committee has accepted the Chancellor's offer, and the briefing will be held on Thursday, March 14.

As you know, the Executive Committee has undertaken, on behalf of the Senate, to report to the Chancellor by April 1 on the levels of knowledge and competencies incoming students need in order to fully participate and succeed in introductory college courses. As you also know, for the past two and a half months, we have had an Advisory Committee, co-chaired by Professors Humberto Cañate and Ethyle Wolfe, working intensively to meet this deadline. When I say intensively, I mean intensively. The Committee, or portions of it, has even met on all of the University one-day holidays since the beginning of the year for all-day working sessions. We are most grateful. It is anticipated that this Committee will soon have completed its work, and that we will be able to mail you its report, which is scheduled for the Senate's

review at the March plenary, in advance of that session. I would caution you that this report is being made to the Chancellor at her request. It is not a regular policy proposal of the Senate nor a public document. We have agreed with the Chancellor that it will be up to her to make the report public.

Senators will recall that the next step in the College Preparatory Curriculum Initiative is for working committees of CUNY faculty and high school teachers to determine jointly the content of specific high school courses in the curriculum and criteria for assessment of students. Chancellor Reynolds has secured the cooperation of Chancellor Fernandez and the Board of Education for this process and expects to receive outside funding. She envisages the committees meeting during the summer, with experts in curriculum design, in settings outside the city conducive to sustained reflection.

In order to provide a starting point for these deliberations, the Senate proposes to hold an all-University conference, sponsored by the Student Affairs Committee, the Remediation Committee, and the Executive Committee on the College Preparatory Curriculum Initiative. As with the Articulation Conference, we shall invite representatives from every department in the University. Needless to say, all Senators will also be asked to participate, as will other interested faculty. Chancellor Reynolds will participate, and Chancellor Fernandez has expressed an interest in doing so. It will depend on his schedule. Judging from our experience with the Articulation Conference and considering the importance of the theme, we can expect wide participation.

Colleagues will be asked to reflect on those topics which they most wish to see addressed in college preparatory courses. Conference participants working in a plenary/workshop format will be invited to discuss, in general terms, the syllabi, skills, texts, and assessment criteria which will best prepare students for college-level work. The conference is scheduled for Friday, May 3rd, from 9:30 to 3:30 p.m., at a Manhattan location. A preliminary announcement is being mailed this week to departments. Please alert your colleagues to this upcoming event.

That concludes my report. I would be glad to answer any questions on the written or oral parts of it. *Professor Donleavy* (Special Services in Education, Lehman) expressed concerns that in the College Preparatory Initiative, content was being highlighted over context. She also called attention to the need for the training of additional teachers and of rewarding University faculty engaged in the training of teachers. She recommended to Senators: Elman, Sandra E. and Sue Smock; Professional Service and Faculty Rewards: Toward an Integrated Structure, American Association of State University and Land Grant Colleges, 1985.

b. Faculty members of Board of Trustees' Committees: Written.

IV. Invited Guest: Acting Vice Chancellor for Budget and Finance, Mr. Richard Rothbard: Professor Picken introduced Acting Vice Chancellor Rothbard and noted that he has briefed the

Senate on a number of occasions and that those who teach at Queens are particularly proud of him.

Thank you for those kind words Professor Picken. I wish I could come here once in a while and give you folks some good news. That doesn't seem to be my lot in life, however. We did provide, and I hope you have with you, copies of two documents that we have prepared since the Governor's Executive Budget was released. One is a preliminary analysis of that document. Another is this yellow sheet which gives you a pretty good overview of what the recommendations are. What I would really prefer tonight, rather than speaking at any great length, is simply to touch on the highlights and then take your questions. There is really nothing more I can add to the information that you have and that you've no doubt already seen reviewed in the press. I will, though, run through quickly what some of the major issues are in the Governor's recommendations.

As we all know from reading the newspapers and listening to the news, the state projects a shortfall in 1991-92 of somewhere in the area of \$6 billion. That is what they are saying publicly at this point. What we all fear, of course, is that it may be substantially more than that and as time goes on and as the revenue picture plays itself out as was the case last year, the problem will begin to grow. If that happens, what the Governor's budget will represent is the best situation we can hope for. You will recall last year that when the legislature got to its deliberations on the budget it had to administer additional cuts to agencies. At that point the University, at the senior-college level, took another \$10 million worth of reductions from what the Governor had already recommended in his Executive Budget. So that is one of my personal fears in terms of how this process will proceed. It is undoubtedly going to be a long, drawn-out legislative session. The situation is further compounded by the ongoing and as yet fruitless negotiations occurring throughout the state between the various unions and state government. We may very well, by the end of this process, be facing something far in excess of a \$6 billion shortfall.

So it is in that context that the Governor has made these various proposals for the City University and the State University and all other aspects of state government. Very simply put, they are disasters. If this budget were to be implemented it could very well be the most dire budget that the University has faced; not since the last fiscal crisis, but faced period. Back in 1976 when the University faced a dollar lost in state aid for every dollar lost in city aid, it was on the heels of a period of growth that the University had enjoyed after the years in which open admissions came into being -- 1969 and so forth. The University did grow by leaps and bounds in terms of facilities as well as budgetary support. It was on a firm base that the University took the reductions that it did experience in the last city fiscal crisis. That is not the case facing this institution now. We have faced years of erosion. Three years of erosion at the senior colleges and more than that at the community colleges -- in some cases chipping and in some cases jack hammering -- as we faced multi-million dollar reductions in state aid and in city support. Of course, in December we faced the need to raise undergraduate tuition by \$200 at the senior colleges on an annual basis. Cuts for next year of a \$100 million or more in the system come on an eroded budget base that goes back several years. So we are in a weakened condition now

and the proposed budget will only exacerbate the situation. We are not facing this proposal from the position of fiscal strength as we did in prior years and that is of great concern to all of us at the University.

Basically, the three major concerns that we have about the Governor's recommendations are obvious to all of us. There is a proposal for a \$500 increase in tuition across the board. The budget does not specify how that ought to be implemented; whether it is higher for graduate students and lower for undergraduates and so forth. It simply makes certain expectations in terms of revenue that an across the board \$500 increase would yield -- that is \$40 million. If the University does not implement a \$500 across the board tuition increase, we either have to come up with \$40 million some other way or cut \$40 million out of the system through service reductions, productivity initiatives, or whatever other kinds of labels you want to give the actions that the University would have to take. That comes, as I just mentioned, on the heels of a \$200 increase that was approved by the Board this past December. The proposal is the largest that has ever been proposed in a single year since the days that tuition was first imposed on undergraduates.

Also in the Governor's proposal are all sorts of destructive reductions in programs of student financial aid; the most notable of which occurs in the Tuition Assistance Program (TAP) which supports full-time students at the University and around the state. That proposal calls for a \$100 reduction in the award for any student receiving the maximum TAP. Some 35,000 of our 50,000 TAP recipients do receive the maximum award. For those students who do not receive the maximum award, a \$400 reduction is proposed. What a student potentially faces between the fall of 1990 and the fall of 1991, if this budget were to be implemented, is the \$200 increase in December; the proposed \$500 increase for the fall; and the \$400 reduction in TAP award -- a \$1,100 change. This is an incredible burden to impose on any of our students. I don't care what their backgrounds are. This is a near doubling of tuition levels for the University.

The third aspect of the Governor's recommendation that causes great concern is the proposal for a base aid reduction in state aid to community colleges. Community colleges throughout New York State are all funded in the same manner by the state. There is a formula, in statute, which provides for a certain level of dollar support per student whether it is a CUNY or SUNY community college. Contributing further to those budgets are the local sponsor share -- for us the local sponsor is the City of New York -- and then tuition. For the first time in the history of community college funding, the Executive Budget is recommending a decrease in state aid per student from \$1,725 to \$1,600. There have been attempts in the past, in mid-session and so forth and in times of interim budget cuts, to adjust that funding formula, but there has never been, to my knowledge, a case where the Governor's Executive Budget actually recommends a decrease in that support. There have been years, most years in fact, where the Governor's budget has not recommended an increase and the legislature has come along and provided for enhanced funding of community colleges through the formula, but there has never been a situation where the Governor has recommended a decrease in aid. That is of concern not just to City University but to the State University as well. We will be working closely with them

when the budget gets to the legislature to see to it that as much information and education as possible can be brought to bear on legislators to advise them of the harm that this will do to that portion of the system.

I want to express a little greater concern on behalf of the community colleges because of the years of constant budgetary erosion at the hands of the City of New York which has taken two, three, four cuts out of the community college budget each year for the past several years. That part of the system is really hurting; especially so now because we see that the bulk of the enrollment growth over the last one to two years in the University has been in the community colleges. Community college enrollment this year is up 6.2% while it is basically flat at the senior colleges. That is probably a result of several factors. We know that retention efforts are starting to pay off so we are becoming victimized by our own success. We know that students are making decisions, when confronted by the absence of choice at senior colleges because of budget considerations, to go to community colleges. The growth is not essentially in first-time freshman. It is in transfers, retention, and so forth. We have just received the numbers for the spring on the flash enrollment reports and again we see that community colleges are up. They are up just under 5% over last spring in terms of overall enrollment. They're up 10% in first-time freshman over a year ago. I, along with you, wonder where we are going to put them. Where are we going to find the money to open up the needed sections and where are we going to find the instructional equipment, computers, and so forth to be able to make the experience meaningful for them? We all know that as the economy continues to worsen in this area, people's desire to return to school is going to increase and we are going to see most of that increase manifesting itself at the community colleges.

A couple of words about what is likely to happen over the next couple of months. The Governor released his budget at the end of January. What happens next is that there is a 30-day amendment period. That is a period during the which the Governor has an opportunity to make adjustments to his own recommendations -- for instance, someone added 2 and 2 and came up with 5; he has an opportunity to correct that. It is supposed to be a period in which only these kinds of technical adjustments are made to correct actual errors of computation rather than changes in policy. Once that period expires, which will be March 1st, the budget then becomes the property of the legislature and then it will begin its deliberations. The University will be testifying, in the person of the Chancellor, on Tuesday in Albany before the joint Senate and Assembly Higher Education and Finance Committees on our reactions to these budget recommendations. We will then, along with coordinated efforts of faculty, staff, alumni, and students and through the CLAC group, be mounting a very ambitious letter-writing campaign, a series of visits by legislators, visits to legislators in Albany, and so forth in order to try to tell the University's story on the three very important issues of tuition and financial aid and state aid to the community colleges. The budget is fraught with other items that cause us concern and I won't list them now, but they are in the material that I distributed to you. Of course, they are overshadowed by these three issues that I mentioned. This system and our students cannot withstand a tuition increase of \$500 as well as serious reductions in the TAP program and other programs. In addition, we have some concern about the part-time aid program which has not been slated for improved funding. One of the requirements the Board of Trustees placed on the



December tuition increase was that certain restrictions in the ATPS program be lifted so that more of the part-time students could become eligible. Indeed, we were successful in having those restrictions lifted and the program is sufficiently funded this year to provide for the additional participation that we anticipate. However, even in the absence of any additional action on tuition for next year, the program will not be sufficiently funded under the Governor's Executive Budget to take care of the increased participation that we anticipate in 1991-92, and so we are very concerned about what is happening there as well.

There have been various other actions in financial aid programs -- Regents scholarships, Nursing scholarships, Empire State scholarships and so forth -- that have either been eliminated or cut. Those are going to affect our students as well as other students throughout the state. We know that we can probably count on the support of the independent sector and the State University on the student aid issues. We know we can count on support on the issue of the aid to community colleges. But as you all know, the tuition issue is a CUNY issue. SUNY has very publicly and strongly expressed its opinion on the tuition issue. They want a substantial increase. They have wanted it for quite a while and they further want to index tuition to some automatic measure so that they no longer have to revisit the issue when it becomes necessary to adjust their budget by filling a hole with revenue -- they want it to be triggered automatically by virtue of some indexing device tied to the CPI or state aid or some other such thing.

That is basically where we are right now. The University did submit a list of 30-day amendments, technical clean up items, to the Governor's office. If past practice is any guide, there may be some adjustments here or there, some reshuffling of funds, but it rarely happens that the 30-day amendment period results in any addition of resources to the University's budget. Last year it resulted in restoration of funding to a couple of programs but that funding was achieved by increasing lump-sum reductions that the University then had to distribute to the colleges. So we are not particularly hopeful of anything occurring during the 30-day period. I must tell you though, there is a rumor afoot in Albany that by the end of the 30-day period, because of recent new information that has become available to the state, we could very well see recommendations for further cuts coming from the Governor's office in agency budgets as opposed to any improvements. Let's hope that that is not the case, but it could very well be. That will be known by the end of this week when the 30-day period expires. Then it is a free-for-all as every legislative session is -- with every agency in there pitching, trying to make its case, and every constituency up in Albany for its day of lobbying. Every organized group launches its letter-writing campaign. We just have to be better at it than others if we are going to attain a larger slice of what is an increasingly shrinking pie in the state. In my conversations with state officials, most notably the Budget Director and his staff and others, I must say that I am starting to become a little more optimistic about the out years. We might be seeing the bottom in 1991-92 and things may begin to turn around. What we are trying to keep the state focused on is that it is very easy to do damage to a University and it is going to be very hard to undue the damage if we are not careful about losing sight of long-term needs as the state struggles to meet short-term requirements of achieving some kind of budget balance. So we need to keep our eye on the ball here and make sure that we keep hammering home our case over and over again.

If you ask me the question, that I am sure you would if I didn't raise it now, what will the University do to save \$74 million at the senior colleges and what will the University do to save \$35 million at the community colleges if these cuts go through?, my response is that the University's planning cannot afford to be directed at answering that question at this point. The University's planning has to be directed at mitigating to the greatest extent possible, what the ultimate results of this budget could be, trying to restore to the greatest extent possible, with all the energy we can muster, as much of the budget as we can. When the budget is passed and put to bed in April, May, June, or whenever this year it turns out to be, that is when the University will grapple with the issues of how it is going to implement whatever budget it has. We are trying to investigate options. The legislature has asked us for options as alternatives to the proposals that are in the Governor's budget, but I have to tell you that over the last couple of years we have pretty much turned over all of the rocks to see what it is we can come up with -- a million here, a million there -- to try to offset the cuts that the city and state have imposed. It is becoming increasingly more difficult to come up with any one-shot gimmicks or any long-term proposals that will not have a serious, long-lasting, and damaging impact on the University. While meetings continue to go on and crazy ideas get thrown about, in terms of any serious ideas emerging that would negate the impact of these budget cuts, I can tell you that none have as of yet. With that as an introduction, I will be glad to entertain any questions that anyone may have or provide any additional information.

*Professor Chabora (Biology, Graduate School) -- "I would like to first ask a question regarding the estimate of \$40 million to be raised by a \$500 increase. Certainly you have taken into account that enrollments will not stay the same and I was wondering if you can comment on the reduction in total enrollment the last time or when we instituted tuition for the first time?"* /Sure. When the University implemented tuition on full-time resident undergraduates in 1976, we went from about 250,000 students to just under 200,000 students. Of course, there were a lot of other things going on at that time both in the city and the University. We had had the two-week closing of the University. There was some serious concern as to whether the University as an independent entity was to going to continue or was in some way going to be subsumed by SUNY. There were concerns about the very future of the city itself and so forth. It was a situation where we went from nothing in terms of tuition to \$775 and \$925. I would argue that the situation is not, perhaps, analogous to the one we face now. In terms of your other question about how the Division of the Budget (DOB) has come up with \$40 million without taking into account what the likely impact on enrollment would be, we put that very question to them when they briefed us privately the day of the release of the budget. Their position was a very straightforward and bureaucratic one. Simply put, they didn't want to make any assumptions about what would happen with enrollment and so they left enrollment stable. They did not predict any loss of enrollment. What we do know is that enrollment University-wide, for the last couple of years, has been on a steady increase -- owing to the success of retention initiatives and the demographic blip in the high school population resulting in more first-time freshman. Transfers have been up and graduate student enrollment has been up. So enrollment, despite the recent increases of \$200 in December and the much larger non-resident increase at the senior colleges two years ago, has been going up. We don't know what would happen if there was a \$500 increase. We could take a pretty good guess -- at least at the senior

colleges... *Professor Chabora* -- "That was my second question." / ...if a student faces the potential, between the tuition increase and the TAP reduction, of a \$1,100 increase, I think a lot of students are going to seriously reevaluate their options, but the DOB didn't want to make any assumptions. *Professor Chabora* -- "But your office probably has, and that is the follow-up question. Considering the fact that you might have a 15 or 20% decrease in enrollment, have you come up with any projected of figures for the following year?" /No we have not. We do enrollment estimates based on trends. The Office of Institutional Research which is responsible for enrollment estimation uses trend analysis. It doesn't introduce new elements such as a tuition increase, a new program opening, and so forth. Other than what I just said today, the only assumption the University is making is that we are going to beat back this recommendation -- students will not be required to pay a \$500 increase in tuition as a result of this budget. I know from my discussions with staff in the Assembly and the Senate that, despite SUNY's big push for a \$500 tuition increase, there isn't a lot of support, even in the Senate, for such a significant one year increase in tuition for SUNY even though SUNY is full square behind it. At least the Chancellor is at this point. *Professor Berkowitz (Chemistry, Graduate School)* -- "What is IFR? Of the RF tithe that is being transferred to IFR, what will become of it and what funds from the Research Foundation are involved?" /Okay. IFR stands for Income Fund Reimbursable which is an off-budget account where revenue supports expenditures dollar for dollar. It is a below the line appropriation in the budget and incorporates such things as performing arts centers. It is not uniform across the University, it depends on the nature and structure of some of these activities -- Adult and Continuing Education, parking lots, a whole host of activities that, several years ago, the state decided ought to be self supporting and that state resources ought not be used in their support. In some cases, the state even levies a tax against these activities on the assumption that they are making use of state-financed facilities to carry on the activities and so something in the neighborhood of 6% of some of these defined activities is taken by the state in support of the regular operating budget. We have been concerned about this for many years because we have seen this as a foot in the door by the state in order to off load what should be legitimately supported state activities onto these IFR's. Last year they took a very big step in that direction. What they did is insist in the budget, and it was adopted, that the University Application Processing Center, which is responsible for collecting all admissions applications to the University and then distributing first-time students to the various colleges, become self-supporting. There is a fee for the application. They wanted the fee to be the source of funding to support that activity and the University had to, through a phase-out process, move the application processing center off the regular state tax-levy budget onto an IFR account. The fee had to be raised from \$25 to \$30 in order to support those activities and that was done. In this budget they are pushing that door open even further by suggesting that a whole host of activities be operated in this fashion including the Office of Admissions Services (OAS) which is the counseling center for many students, especially students who are not coming to us straight from the high schools which is a good percentage of our first time students at the City University. They want that to become self-supporting and they do not suggest how it is to become self-supporting -- whether a fee is to be charged for anyone who comes in requesting counseling or whether some other IFR activity should boost its revenue in order to support an unrelated activity at OAS. They simply suggest that that and many other activities -- including grants officers, anyone involved in alumni activities on college lines, and

a slew of others that are outlined in that preliminary analysis that has been distributed -- be handled that way. So it is the precedent that we are concerned about here as much as the dollars involved because if today it is OAS and it is alumni and grants, tomorrow it may be libraries. That is our major concern. The other question you raised was about the tithe. The RF as you all know, has overhead recovery funds as a result of the grant activities that it coordinates. Some of those funds are used for the expenses of the Foundation itself and administering those grants. The rest is distributed back to the colleges from which the funds are generated. A couple of years ago when the state decided to fund the Graduate and Research Initiative (GRI) in both the SUNY and CUNY budgets, it decided that part of the way to fund this would be to tax both Research Foundations; again on the assumption that state-supported facilities and other things were being used to generate these grants which were bringing these overhead recoveries and so forth, and the state was entitled to receive some of that money back to support GRI. So the RF tithe at CUNY, which up to that point had been at its highest, I think, about \$1 1/2 million, was subsequently over the years raised to \$4.5 million in partial support of GRI. We have always argued that that was wrong. Our argument has been that GRI is a legitimate University enterprise deserving of direct state tax-levy support. What the state is doing in the 1991-92 recommendations is heeding that call but implementing it in a very poor way. They are suggesting a two-year phase out of the need to tax the RF support of the GRI but they are not substituting state tax-levy funding in order to make up for the elimination of the tithe. Rather what they are suggesting we do is, again, create an IFR and either take that very same RF tithe money, put it in an IFR, add other funds from who knows where to support the very same activities that had been supported before through the direct taxation of the Foundation. The alternative being, you do not have to. Then those funds would return to the RF and the University would be left with having to figure out how to either support the ongoing activities of GRI or to phase out those activities. *Professor Berkowitz -- "The key administrative question is, if the funds are transferred to an IFR, who will administer it? Will there be a portion to the colleges based on the funds raised by research? Will they be given to 80th Street to reapportion to the colleges as they see fit?"* Well that is a discussion that it is a little bit down the road. You have to remember that the RF is an independent corporation with its own Board of Directors. It is true that the Chancellor chairs that corporation. There is college representation, but it is my suspicion that the colleges, particularly the colleges that generate the majority of grant activity in the University and the overhead recoveries, would much prefer returning to the distribution that existed before the state started taxing the RF so that those that generate the funds get the funds rather than have that money returned through kind of a back door mechanism into the University's budget. That might not be. It may be that people will decide that they would rather support the ongoing activities of the research initiative. All sorts of things could happen on that. *Professor Donleavy -- "I have some questions on page 8 of the preliminary review. We have the 1990-91 adjusted base and then the 1991-92 request. Who is making the recommendation there?"* That is the Governor's recommendation. *Professor Donleavy -- "It seems really a political matter to me that the programs to be eliminated here are pluralism and diversity, -- what is COP? /Certificate of Participation. It is a financing device used to acquire equipment that colleges finance over a period of time. Professor Donleavy continues -- "...student services, worker education, and finally teacher education."/* Let me explain because there are some technical issues in here. It is not all as it seems. The Governor's Budget

traditionally does three things. First, the Governor's Budget, as a matter of standard operating procedure, eliminates any items that the legislature in the previous year added to the University's budget. So in the case of the student services item, it was a specific line-item appropriation to enhance student services by \$1.3 million. So although that is called student services, in no way is student services support eliminated; most student services money is in the college base budgets. This was an enhancement for the specific purpose of student services put in by the legislature last year and so that is out. The other thing that the Governor's Budget does is cut, obviously, and we've talked about that -- or enhance as happened in years that are now fading into memory. The third thing that the Governor's Budget does is when the budget does not provide funding for a program that the University has determined is important to support, or when it does not provide as much funding as the University thinks is necessary, the University will transfer funds from other places in support of those activities. When the Governor prepares next year's recommendations, the budget staff reverses those transfers. There was never an appropriation in the state budget for teacher education. There was never an appropriation in the state budget for worker education. There was never an appropriation in the state budget for pluralism and diversity. The University created those programs and funded those programs using its budget flexibility. So what you see with those items is the state taking the money and putting back from where we took it to fund those programs at the beginning of the year. That money was not taken away from the budget in that sense, it was simply shifted to other areas. We will again, when the budget is implemented, all other things being equal, refund those programs for the next fiscal year. *Professor Donleavy -- "My other question is on page ten. The changes in full-time position allocation has an interesting pattern too; Hunter, Queens, College of Staten Island, Central Administration -- they all seem to be taking a bigger cut than any of the others. Could you explain that?"* /This is an example I referred to earlier when I talked about technical amendments to the budget. One of the 30-day amendments that the University requested was a realignment of the college position bases as well as the dollar bases because the DOB staff made some very serious errors in computing the college bases. So what is likely to be seen if the 30-day amendment period doesn't correct it, at the beginning of the year, we will have to shift positions and dollars around among and between colleges because they weren't in the right place to start with. They made some very big errors. The most glaring of which is at Hunter where they put in a million dollars too little in the college's base simply because they made a mistake in where they put a number in a column on a computer or on a piece of paper. This is a misalignment of positions and does not represent accurately what ought to be going on in terms of those executive budget adjustments. *Professor Donleavy -- "Who was responsible for that? The University?"* /Oh no. No. Of course not. These are contained in the recommendations in the Executive Budget. The Executive Budget is prepared by the Division of the Budget. There is a unit assigned specifically to CUNY with a staff of about six people and they are the ones that prepare the numbers that you see in these last three columns. *Professor Speidel (Geology, Queens) -- "A couple of things. The student government has come up, finally, with a newspaper and Steve Kladberg has done a very nice job on it. His editorial started me thinking specifically of one of the things that I would like to ask you tonight. In my opinion, in 1976, the Board of Trustees entered into a Faustian bargain and we are really seeing just how much we are going to have to pay. I am speaking specifically about the tuition aspect. I would like to ask you if you could invert your thinking -- I don't expect you to have*

*an answer tonight, but I certainly would appreciate one in the future -- by thinking of tuition not as revenue, but tuition as an expense. Let's assume that we go back to zero tuition for full-time undergraduates. Let's assume that we have the full cooperation of the state agencies and the Governor's budget office to move such funds as might be appropriate from one column to the other. Can you get at exactly what tuition is costing us? There has been a constant rumor for the last 10 years or so that there was a study done soon after tuition was set up that indicated that the actual cost of collecting the tuition and paying out the TAP with all of the additional people that were hired as financial aid people and so on was actually slightly greater than income that we got in tuition. "Do you recall who the author of that study was? I was the one who wrote it. It was my masters thesis and it was based 1978 data. In fact, I thought I had proven, based upon conditions that prevailed at that time, that if you took into account the increased administrative burden placed on the University, various state and other agencies, the expense in financial aid and so forth, that taking all of those pieces together, the expenditure exceeded the net gain. What you can't lose sight of however is that a large portion of that was Pell. To expect the federal government to make a direct payment to CUNY equal to what it otherwise would be paying out in Pell raises a whole host of national issues and of course would be a great deal of pie in the sky to hope for. It was a straightforward economic analysis which didn't take into consideration the fact that you would have to be able to reverse a whole host of policies -- local, state, and federal -- in order to offset the revenue that tuition brings into the system with the payments that are made by various student aid and other agencies. It also examined the whole student loan issue. In fact, I think it pretty convincingly demonstrated the point that you raise. I am a died-in-the-wool free tuition advocate from way back and I always have been, but I think I am also a pragmatist and must be in the job that I now hold. Given the current economic circumstances, I think that were the state to agree to do what you suggested and the city to do what you suggested we would probably still have to come up with something in the neighborhood of \$75 to \$100 million to fill the remaining gap. After all, tuition now contributes about \$250 million of the about \$1 billion University budget; almost 25%. TAP to the University students is something in the area of \$52 million. The other programs on the state level are insignificant by comparison. It leaves a big gap. Professor Speidel -- "I would appreciate a rough figure on this. If we are going to take a hit anyway, we might as well do it from a base which in the future will be a lot more sensible." I think it would be an interesting academic exercise to be a part of. I don't know that it is something that I could with any confidence do in quick time. It is something I'll think about. The last one took me a year. Professor Baumrin (Philosophy, Graduate School) -- "For several years, the Senate pursued the Chancellor and your predecessor for an exact breakdown of the GRI. After four years we got a piece of paper, very brief, which gave us some idea, but not very much about where the money was going. As a member of the RF Board of Directors, which was responsible for providing the money, we never knew where it was going. It just went. After a while it become reasonably clear that some of it was going for faculty hiring. The question that I want to put to you is whether or not those people are on soft money or hard money. Let me clear that up for you for a moment. Once they were put on board under the GRI, is it the case that they now are tax-levy lines that can't be moved over to IFR accounts or could we now move them over to IFR accounts because that is really where their money came from?" I mean if consistent with the Executive Budget recommendations that the tithe be put into an IFR, the people who are*

currently supported by that tithe income also be moved to an IFR. Professor Baumrin -- "Take that as the question. It is a little bit different than my question, but it is close enough." /Well let me answer your question. "Well my question is, some of the people who were appointed under the GRI hold tenured faculty positions at the University. They are not grants officers and things like that. These are people who are hired in faculty positions primarily through the Graduate School. When you are moving other functions like the support of graduate students over to an IFR paid for previously by the GRI with money paid from the Foundation, are you also moving over the faculty members who are appointed by those very same funds so that they are now also to be paid out of an IFR account?" /What you are referring to is a recommendation in the Governor's budget which specifically identifies functions that are suggested to be moved over to the IFR. One of the functions they suggest moving is graduate assistants that support research activities. There is no recommendation in that budget that faculty previously supported by the GRI be moved over. The University has opposed the recommendation in the 30-day amendments and we are waiting a response on that. Professor Baumrin -- "Okay. Let me ask one more question. There are several million dollars of support. I know it is supposed to support grants officers, admissions officers, and it is also supposed to support graduate students. Now you just described those graduate students as graduate students working on research." That is how DOB has described those graduate students that ought to be transferred to an IFR. It is not how I described them. "Okay, who is going to pay the students who are not, who were being paid by the GRI? Some of the students who are being paid on the GRI are graduate students in such fields as theatre where there aren't in any grants. Who is supposed to pick up the bill or are we supposed to let them go now?" /Neither. If they remain in the tax-levy budget it is the responsibility of the college budgets to pay for them. "How did they ever get into the tax-levy budget if they were being paid from the money moved over from the GRI? I just don't understand it." /The senior college budget has basically two sources of funding. The first is direct state aid appropriations which has a source; taxes. The other source is revenue. At the community colleges you have a third which is city support. Revenue is not merely tuition and fees. There are a whole host of revenue items that go into making up the revenue budget. What the state says is your budget includes \$200 million dollars of revenue support. Of that \$200 million, \$170 million comes from tuition and fees, \$20 million comes from payments by the City of New York and \$4.5 million comes from the tithe on the Research Foundation. It is essentially an offset to state support of the senior college budget. It is not a separate bank account, if you will, that the University somehow accesses different and apart from the regular overall budget. We have an overall budget of \$850 million in the senior colleges. It is supported by the tax-levy and revenue elements and to the extent that the University does not fulfill the revenue requirement in any of those pieces that make up the overall revenue budget, our expenditure authority declines by that much. So if we have to collect \$200 million in revenue from the various sources to support a budget of \$850 million and we only collect \$175 million, we can't spend \$850 million. We can only spend \$825 million. That is how that \$4.5 million from the RF comes in. It is all fungible. There is no differentiation in professor x's salary and fringe benefits between what is supported from tax-levy funds, what is supported from GRI, city support or anything else. It is simply in general support of the overall senior college budget. To the extent now that they are suggesting that that be cut in half and some functions that have previously been supported moved over to an IFR account, we are either going to have

to find the wherewithal to say, "no, we are not going to move it to an IFR account, even though you are taking away the away the money." We would have to fund those out of a reduced base because half the RF money that supported the overall budget is being taken away, or we are going to have to do it through IFR using that RF money essentially the same way but through another mechanism and having to supplement. Not only are they cutting the RF tithe in half, but they are also cutting the state tax-levy support of various of those activities that they are recommending be moved over to the IFR. Now on your issue of what the GRI money is used for, I apologize that the material that we provided wasn't sufficient. I would be happy to have the people on my staff who know the nuts and bolts of where every dollar of that money went, sit down with whoever the Faculty Senate would like to go over this in nauseating detail until you are satisfied that you understand what happened to that money, at the time and place of your choosing. *Professor Cooper (History, Staten Island) -- "I have this fantasy which has been secret up till this very moment that in the next millennium CUNY will consist of administrators, adjuncts, video terminals, computers, and compact disks. Full-time faculty, as they retire, seem to be expendable. My colleagues are wondering whether or not another early retirement incentive is in the offing and if there is any possibility that the new one, if there is one, and the current one will ever lead to replacement of colleagues by colleagues rather than computers and video terminals?"* I understand. The state in fact did offer a second program to other state agencies which was just completed. The difference between their program and ours, at least at the beginning, was that the state program called for elimination of each of the positions as they were vacated. The University's program in statute provides for one-for-one replacement for the vacated positions. Let me say this to dispel some myths that have been going around about the retirement program. First of all, I don't envision us doing this again over the next year -- sorry you missed your chance -- for a very simple reason. To do it while you are trying to iron out the implications of the one that you are going through at the moment doesn't make a lot of a managerial sense. Secondly, the reason we were able to do it is that we have not done it since 1984 and we determined that there was sufficient demand among the staff to take advantage of it and to reap the benefits that were the reason for the state accepting the program in the first place and providing us with the one-for-one replacement. It is absolutely true that we have had to delay our replacement schedule for this spring as a result of the budget situation. We have only delayed replacement of non-teaching faculty. Our original schedule only called for adjunct replacement in the spring and we have in fact replaced at 100%, or at least provided the funding for it. I can't speak for what has happened in each individual classroom. We have provided the funding for 100% replacement of retiring faculty currently on travia with adjunct personnel. Next year's schedule, as originally cast, called for 50% replacement of the full-time teaching staff and replacement of administrative staff. The University remains committed to a replacement schedule under RII. We have to be mindful of the budget situation. We cannot develop a replacement schedule until we know what our 1991-92 budget will be. However, there is something in the neighborhood of 1000 staff, who opted for this program; 700 in the seniors and 300 in the community colleges that will be off payroll on August 31st. The University will be left in a terrible situation if we are unable to replace these staff, but we are no doubt going to have to slow down our original schedule. I must say that, because of the retirement incentive, we do not face perhaps some worse alternatives that other agencies face as a result of having the option of keeping some of what are many vacancies on the books while



we work out the details of which lines we are going to replace and where. To the extent that a college lost 20, 30, 40, some up to 100 positions, we are still intent on providing one-for-one replacement; not just in the system but at the campuses at which this occurred. So you won't see what you saw the last time with the massive redistribution among campuses because since that time we have been able to keep the system in balance, which wasn't the case back then when Brooklyn, Queens, and some others lost a lot of positions. We are continuing our guarantee on one-for-one replacement but when that replacement occurs is yet to be determined. No one can say at this point, given the budget situation and given what is likely to happen by the end of the legislative session, what that replacement schedule will be. There is no doubt it is going to have to be slowed down, but I also have no doubt that the University will strive to maintain its commitment over some period of time to replace every one of those people who retired. *Professor Caudel (Psychology, Sociology, and Anthropology, Staten Island) -- "During one of her earlier presentations to us, the Chancellor mentioned that, subject to contractual approval, there would be possibly an increase of one contact hour for a period of time. Do you foresee any pressure or any negotiating efforts to increase teaching load? Can we assume that we are safe from this, at least?"* /All I can say is that in the face of a budget that is \$100 million in the hole there is probably nothing that at one point or another won't be on the table in some discussion somewhere. There are a lot of people in the state DOB who constantly raise the workload issue. This goes back to the workload arbitration agreement when we went back to the state and asked for additional adjunct support in order to make up for the reduced workload that was agreed to as a result of that arbitration. They have been on this issue ever since and have wanted to see implemented policies regarding workload that are stricter than the ones that are in place. In fact, it has been difficult at times when we have tried to go into Albany and make a case for additional adjunct support or additional faculty. Sometimes what we get back from the staff up there is, "well, if the staff currently on board would add to their workload, you would not have to come to us with this request." It has been quite difficult to educate them in terms of what a University is all about and what workload really means and what released time really means and what the need for research and scholarship and community service and institutional service really are all about. They just see the 21 hours and they think people are working 21 hours. *Professor Picken -- "I would like to remind you Professor Caudel that this is a matter for the collective bargaining unit and not for the Senate."* /I can't say that it is under discussion at this point, but I will not rule out anything in terms of the University addressing the budget situation. *Professor O'Malley (English, Kingsborough) -- "Before I ask a proper question, I just want to add something to what Professor Speidel said. It seems to me that you should also take into account all of those people who work in financial aid. If you added all of that together, it would be another incredible lump."* /That was part of the original study. *Professor O'Malley -- "My question is, what about full-time positions cut both in the senior and community colleges -- how many are faculty? How many are administration?"* /The senior college is budgeted not only on the basis of dollars but on the basis of full-time positions. The community college budget is not. The community college budget is budgeted only on the basis of dollars. There may be internal restrictions that are imposed from time to time as a result of city budget cuts or as a result of internal University policies, but in terms of how we get the budget, we only get position controls from the state on the senior colleges. They are recommending a cut of 811 positions, gross. It turns out to be 810 because they balanced the

scales and gave us one position for an energy project coordinator to offset the 811 cut. They don't tell us how to do it. We have something called budget flexibility in the University, something for which we fought very hard several years ago. That basically said to the state, "don't tell us how to add, how to cut, where to do what. Provide us with the budget, provide us with the state policy guidelines, and let the University decide how to administer the budget." Well the problem with that is, like they say, "be careful what you wish for, sometimes you'll get it." We got budget flexibility and as a result whenever we have approached the state with an expressed need for a new program or expanding an existing program or something of that sort, the response from the state more often than not has been, "well, you have budget flexibility. So that if x is important, take the funds, take the positions, from somewhere where it is not so important and use it for that. Also, as a result of that, whenever the state adds resources to the University senior college budget or reduces resources in that budget, they do it in the form of a lump sum most of the time. What they have done this time is indicated various lump-sum reductions of positions adding up to 811. Except in the case of those positions which are part of this IFR transfer we were talking about before which are a hundred some odd I think, they don't tell us how to do the rest. They simply say you have x positions to cut, you have y dollars to cut, you have budget flexibility, go and decide. In that way, they don't have to show program cuts. They don't have to show that they are cutting college budgets. They don't have to show that they are cutting University-wide programs. They simply continue to fund all of those programs at the base level to appear as if no harm has been done and then they impose a lump-sum reduction somewhere else in the budget that naturally has to be distributed among those various programs in order to achieve the savings. What we plan when an Executive Budget comes out is how to better the University's position with the legislature in response to those recommendations and we are not planning how to cut 810 positions. In fact, one of our 30-day recommendations calls for restoration of those positions to the budget.

*Professor Svitak (Mathematics, Queensborough) -- "My question relates to the one-to-one replacement for the faculty. I am thinking specifically of the faculty in my department. Will that one for one be across the campus or will it relate specifically to a department?"* /It is one-to-one replacement for all retirees, not just faculty. One to one refers to the institution. It is up to the institution to determine that distribution.

*Professor Chabora -- "The question I would like to explore is a sort of laundering that is done with funds by 80th Street. What I am referring to is the so called allocation system for the reimbursement for graduate or doctoral work being done by faculty on campuses where approximately 35% of the money allocated in the budget for the Graduate School comes off the top and is distributed to the campuses where faculty have been participating. Eightieth Street has the policy of taking these funds and combining them, at least as I understand it, with the total budget going into the campuses. Therefore, it is not specified that this was in repayment for work done by faculty for doctoral teaching. I was wondering if you could comment on this and if you could perhaps suggest the mechanism by which the departments and the faculty that are doing the work could be rightfully reimbursed for the efforts that they put in?"* \ The mechanism was devised and is implemented by the Graduate School. It is not done by 80th Street. The Graduate School gets its budget and the Graduate School determines an allocation to the individual colleges involved in doctoral work. There has been a great deal of concern over this over the past several years. At the beginning of this year, I met with several of the college presidents to discuss this and I know that the Chancellor has

interested in this since she arrived. What we have been telling the colleges and the Graduate School is that we are interested, over the next year or so, in trying to come to some new understanding about allocations to the colleges. You have to understand a little bit of the history of this. Several years ago, the Graduate School didn't get the money directly. The money for science programs, which are campus based, went directly to the campuses. The problem with this was that it made CUNY's Graduate School look underfunded relative to the SUNY University Centers and caused some embarrassment for people in state government. What was decided at that point was that all doctoral funding would be provided to the Graduate School and that the Graduate School would devise a reallocation system for a portion of the funds to go back to the campuses in recognition of the campus effort on behalf of graduate education. That, as you know, supports faculty and some modest amount of OTPS, although in recent years that OTPS has been dwindling. There has been some concern because the colleges, when cuts come, not only face the cuts that are directly allocated to the campuses, but they face a portion of cuts as a result of cuts to the Graduate School budget. The fact of the matter is, if those funds didn't flow to the colleges through the Graduate School and flow directly, the campus cuts would simply be larger in recognition of their larger bases. I do recognize there have been some very legitimate concerns about how that allocation system has worked. As you know, there is a search for a new president of the Graduate School which is nearing its final phases. I am sure once a president has been named there will be a lot of people at the campuses interested in entering into a dialogue about the allocation system. We at the University, specifically in my area, intend to participate in that and see if we can arrive at a reasonable allocation system. No one is going to be pleased 100% in any of this, it is an impossibility. But at least we can agree on something that is workable, recognizes the times and the conditions that we face now, and adjusts the more serious problems that have been inherited in that allocation system over the years. What I can't guarantee is that in arriving at this there will be some exact measurements that will be available to the campuses to know exactly what is supported as a result of the Graduate School reallocation, what is supported as a result of the direct allocation of the college budget from the central office, but there are people on your campuses, certainly, that know that.

*Professor Chabora -- "This seems to be the first year where this has become sufficiently contentions. Campuses are saying, 'no you can't have my faculty teach at the Graduate School unless they want to teach as an overload.' Too much of whole graduate program has been based on the good will of faculty; faculty teaching graduate courses as an overload, just to maintain the system. There is no way that if you spoke to chairs that you would find that any reimbursement is coming back to the departments. It is going directly to the campuses. It is the province of the provost and you don't see it coming back where it really should. The whole concept of the consortia graduate school is based on the fair allocation of funds and it must be established. There has got to be a mechanism where the departments and the faculty are the ones that are being supported." /It raises very fundamental issues and you are raising also some governance issues. Those all get compounded when you have a tight budget situation and everybody is counting every penny, and it is going to get worse before it gets better. I would welcome any input from this group or anyone else in terms of any alternative mechanisms that they think would be more workable.*

Professor Picken and the Senate thanked Vice Chancellor Rothbard for his clear and comprehensive presentation.

V. Reports of Committees:

Executive Committee: On behalf of the Executive Committee, Professor Picken reminded Senators of the work of the Ad hoc Committee on Senate Elections and the Ad hoc Committee on Committee Structure. He encouraged Senators to forward any recommendations or general comments to committee members.

The membership of the committees as follows:

Committee on Elections:

Prof. Wasser (GS), convener  
Prof. Barbanel (QCC)  
Prof. Cooper (CSI)  
Prof. Hunte (BMCC)  
Prof. MacLennan (Brooklyn)  
Prof. Zarin (Lehman)

Committee on Committee Structure:

Prof. Sohmer (City), convener  
Prof. Buianouckas (Bronx)  
Prof. Chabora (GS)  
Prof. Gerber (Brooklyn)  
Prof. Zades (CSI)

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Bruce Hoffacker  
Executive Director