

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

January 28, 1992

Chair Picken called the session to order at 7:00 p.m. in room 1700A of The Graduate School and University Center. Present were Senators: Allaire, Alsop, Anderson, Baum, Baumrin, Baxter, Bleyman, Bloom, Brenner, Brugnola, Buianouckas, Bushler, Cañate, Caroselli-Dervan, Cyril, Danziger, Davidson, Davis E., Davis R., Donoghue, Fitzgerald, Frisz, Galub, Gerber, Grossman, Gura, Jaffe, Kaufman, Kaplowitz, Knoop, Koepfer, Krashinsky, Lidov, Magid, Martinez, Matthews, McCullers, Meier, Neville, O'Reilly, Otte, Picken, Reid, Riedler-Berger, Rodriguez, Schwarzenbach, Shen, Sherrill, Simor, Sohmer, Speidel, Squitieri, Stevens, Svitak, Tenenbaum, Treitler, Umolu, Vasilov, Weinberg, Weiss, Westrem, Zades, Zarin, Zinberg, and Newly elected Senator Trumbach, and Alternate Senators: Brady, Hounion, Lowy, Picon, Taylor, Whealey, and Newly elected Alternate Kulkarni. Professors Caudle, Cooper, Edwards, Greenbaum, Koshi, Lundeen, MacLennan, Plissner, Reynolds (ex-officio), Rosario, Rose, Selvadurai, Walters, Wedeen, Yousef were excused. Heads of Faculty Governance Bodies: Chabora (Graduate School), DeJongh (City), Frisz (Queens), Gura (Brooklyn), Kaplowitz (John Jay), and Weiss (QCC) attended. Vice Chancellor for Budget, Finance and Computing Richard Rothbard attended. Senate Executive Director Hoffacker, UFS Newsletter Editor O'Malley, and Administrative Assistant Pasela also attended.

I. Adoption of the Tentative Agenda. The agenda was adopted with the following revisions: item II.b., Report of the Chancellor, was deleted since she was unable to attend (see item IV.a.); items III. and IV. were reversed to allow Mr. Rothbard to speak early.

The agenda, as revised, was adopted.

II. Acceptance of the Minutes of the 195th and 196th Plenary Sessions. The minutes of both sessions were accepted with one correction to the 196th plenary: Professor Lundeen (City) should be noted as present.

III. Invited Guest: Mr. Richard Rothbard: Vice Chancellor for Budget, Finance, and Computing: *On behalf of the Senate, Chair Picken congratulated Mr. Rothbard on his appointment as Vice Chancellor and expressed the appreciation of the Senate for his past presentations to the Senate and his candor in presenting bad news.*

I believe that you have received copies of several documents: the final production version of the University's 1992-93 Budget Request; an analysis of the Governor's Executive Budget Recommendations; and the actual portions of the Governor's recommendation regarding higher education -- SUNY, CUNY, the Higher Ed. Services Corporation, and the State Education Department. I could go on literally for hours about those recommendations and other associated items in the budget recommendations from the governor. What I thought I would do instead is, in dot-point fashion, highlight for you what the major elements of those recommendations are for CUNY and higher education in general, place them in the context of

the overall state budget, and then take any questions you may have on the budget or any other matters that I might be able to speak to for you. So let me proceed in that fashion.

The Governor's Executive Budget for 1992-93 was released on January 21st after many weeks of discussion and negotiation during which there was a lot of talk about a possible 15-month budget settlement since the state was trying to grapple with the current year shortfall of about \$900M and was looking at a shortfall for 1992-93 of about \$4.3B. That never jelled for various reasons, political and otherwise, but mostly political. What happened is they reverted to the standard process of the issuance of the Governor's Executive Budget. There was some question as to, if they had reached a 15-month agreement, whether that would have been constitutional. There were many folks, organized groups, waiting in the wings to challenge the constitutionality of the so-called 15-month budget deal, but that is all history at this point. On January 21st, as required by the Constitution, the governor issued budget recommendations for the subsequent fiscal year. There now ensues the standard 30-day amendment period during which the governor can make adjustments to those recommendations depending upon who makes the most noise. After the 30-day period expires at the end of February, the legislature will have the budget. The governor has said a lot of things about the failure of the state in past years to pass a budget by the constitutional date of March 31st. He has tried in advance to cajole the legislature into speeding up the process this year by threatening things, including withholding pay from government officials for every day that the budget is late. Nevertheless, despite all the talk, I don't think there is anybody who realistically expects, given the severe issues in this budget, that this will be done by April 1. So I think we are in for another long haul. Whether or not it is as long as last year, I don't have a crystal ball on that, but I would place money on it going beyond April 1.

The total state operating budget -- let's leave the capital budget aside, let's leave federal funds aside -- is \$30.3B and that is up about 1.4%, a very very modest increase. Most of that increase is in areas where there are mandated costs over which the state has little control. Those are up significantly but are off-set by cuts in other agencies. As I have said before, they are looking at a \$4.3B gap in 1992-93, but they are adding on top of that about half a billion dollars from the current year. They were only able to take actions in 1991-92 to off-set about \$400M of the \$900M shortfall. For the other half-billion, they have to issue debt notes. Those debt notes will have to be repaid next year and so the \$500M is being added to the \$4.3B, so we have a \$4.8B shortfall built into this budget at this point. As we all know from previous years, those numbers change; mostly they go up. They are addressing this shortfall by taking several actions. They are freezing revenues, so they are not considering any kind of tax increases at all to address this. There are various reforms in medicaid/social services programs and there are cuts to agency and local assistance budgets -- those dollars that go to NYC and other localities to support local efforts. They also anticipate cutting about 6,200 state jobs across all agencies.

In terms of the University, the senior college budget includes a reduction in state aid. Now this is not the bottom line, this is a reduction in state support in the University's budget of \$95.5M. We get something in the neighborhood of \$650M in state aid -- all of these figures appear previously in the material you have. There are offsets to the \$95.5M. There are increases in revenue of \$57M, basically from a proposed increase in tuition of \$500 a year for senior college students. The net reduction when you balance all of the cuts in state aid with all of the proposed increases in revenue, as well as offsets in payments from NYC, comes to \$38.5M for

the senior colleges. That is a decrease of 4.5% over last year. The \$95M reduction, besides containing a state aid cut of \$74M, also comprises a city cut of about \$13M and a cut in certain non-tuition revenue items of \$8M -- those are the elements that together comprise the \$95M cut. As I said, the bulk of the revenue increase is from a tuition increase of \$500 and there is small enrollment growth that will contribute about \$2M to that total figure. That is the senior college dollars and percentages.

On the community college side, the Executive Budget has a reduction of \$8.9M that comes largely from a reduction in base aid -- that aid that is given to us on a per capita basis -- that had been \$1,680 from which they are recommending a reduction to \$1,600. That is offset by various increases totaling \$6.1M, mostly as a result of enrollment growth. The community colleges continue to enjoy, if that is the right word, enrollment growth as a result of local economic circumstances, things happening at the senior colleges in terms of enrollment, and things happening in the private sector of higher education as well. We are at a 15-year high in enrollment in the University. The segment of the University largely responsible for that increase is the community colleges.

One of our watershed issues last year continues to haunt us in this budget and that is the issue of funding of associate degree programs at NYC Tech and John Jay. Once again, the state budget calls upon NYC to offset a portion of those costs. For 1991-92 it was in area of \$20M based on the fact that the city is contributing less per student to the community colleges than they used to because of their cuts. The state has recomputed this amount and now says the city owes approximately \$13M to offset associate degree costs at NYCTech and John Jay. So that is still in there. The PSC research award is still half of what it was. It is still at \$1.4M; they did not restore that.

Now in addition to the budget, there are program bills, commonly referred to as Article 7 bills, that accompany the budget. As devastating as the numbers are, they were not unexpected given all the talk that we have been hearing over the last year and especially over the last couple of months when they were trying to negotiate the 15-month deal. What is most frightening, perhaps, in this budget is the fact that they are making changes throughout that make the City University look and behave more like SUNY, which means more like a regular state agency which means greater control ultimately in Albany over University activities. As an example, we have something called the City University Construction Fund which handles University construction projects, design, and so forth, which works in cooperation with the Dormitory Authority. It has been a very effective vehicle for advancing the University's Master Plan. That is an operation with a separate, independent Board of Trustees, and is significantly different from its counterpart in SUNY. One of the Article 7 bills introduced along with the budget calls for a restructuring of the Construction Fund so that it would report directly to the state as a regular state agency. It is not clear yet whether the independent board would be abolished. We are still going through the legislation, which is quite thick, that we just received to try to determine just how this is being done. Another example is that they are encouraging the University to consult with the state Office of Employee Relations on collective bargaining matters in negotiating contracts for the senior colleges, not the community colleges, which would split us in two in terms of faculty and staff policies. They want us to work through the Office of General Services more directly in terms of our purchasing. There are other elements of lesser significance in here, all of which, when taken as a whole, eliminate or infringe upon the special

status that we have had since the 1979 takeover legislation in which we were designated a public benefit corporation.

The other thing that is going on is that they are proposing the elimination of city prefinancing. For those of you who may not be aware of it, before 1979, NYC determined the University's overall budget, paid the bills up front, and whatever state aid was forthcoming came as reimbursement. When the state agreed to take over responsibility for the senior colleges in 1979, part of that agreement compelled the city to prefinance senior college expenses so the city periodically transfers cash to the state that is used to pay for senior college expenses and then, on a quarterly basis, the state does a reconciliation with the city based upon the appropriation and then reimburses the city. Eventually everything works out and the city is not left holding the bag on anything. Well, this creates a problem for the city. It impacts on its cash flow, it loses interest income as a result of having to put \$150M at a time up front. So you may recall a couple of months ago when the governor came up with his various plans for assisting NYC, one of the proposals was eliminating prefinancing. This is something the city would very much like to see happen. The city would improve its cash flow and would make \$6-8M on interest earnings on that \$150M if it were to be in the bank or could be used for other things. The city is very supportive of this, but this again is one of those things that changes the unique status of the University and will make it appear much more like a regular state agency. So we are very concerned not only about the dollar issues in here but about these kinds of structural issues. One can speculate about all sorts of things that might lie down the road in the years ahead if these changes were to go through.

There is distressing news as well on the capital budget side. For the second straight year there are no new projects authorized in the capital budget, although SUNY has managed to receive funding for new capital projects. So we are making that quite an issue with people upstate and will be pushing it during the 30-day period as well as the legislative session that will follow.

Just for comparison purposes, the SUNY budget is about \$1.5B. That is down about \$50.6M or 3.3%. Now if you wonder why they are down 3.3% and we are down 4.5%, most of that is represented by the fact that CUNY only increased tuition \$400 this year when the budget appropriation authorized \$500 and SUNY went the full \$500. The \$100 difference, which is about \$8 or \$9M for us in appropriation authority that we couldn't spend because we didn't raise the revenue, has been taken out in this budget. We have not been disproportionately treated in this budget. SUNY and CUNY are equally mistreated in this budget.

As is the case with CUNY, there is a recommendation for a SUNY tuition increase which averages \$500 per student per year. But there is a wrinkle in the SUNY recommendation, and that is that they are proposing that SUNY be allowed to set differential tuition rates at the university centers, four-year undergraduate liberal arts colleges, and two-year agricultural and technical colleges. The reason for this, as explained to us, is that SUNY feels that their ag and techs are being priced out of the market. So they want to be able to have a higher tuition at the university centers so as not to have to raise tuition at the ag and techs that full \$500 and still be able to generate the same overall amount of revenue. Now, of course, looking ahead again a little bit, one can see a situation where in the future SUNY would hope to use this differential tuition to enrich the funding of the university centers and not necessarily to offset the need for

increases at some of the other campuses, but that is not yet an element of the budget and is not part of the 1992-93 budget. I have to tell you that the initial reaction that we have been able to gauge in Albany is not very favorable to this idea among legislators so it remains to be seen whether or not this is going to go through this way for SUNY.

In terms of financial aid, the safety net is again being cut out from under a lot of students in New York. For the TAP program, the most important program for our students and most other students in the state, there will be two classes of students. Continuing students will continue to receive TAP under the current rules -- meaning the current award schedule, current maximum award, the current family income level, and the same automatic award reductions that are currently enforced for this year. New students, that is students who have never before received a TAP award coming into public or private institutions in this state, will be under a family income schedule and a maximum award schedule that was the schedule before the existing schedule went into effect, before the latest increases to family income, before the latest increases in maximum award. Now the maximum award reduction does not affect our students because our tuition is no where near the maximum award, but several students could be affected by the changes in family income so we are concerned about that. Bundy Aid, aid to private institutions, after having been cut significantly this year, what's left of that is cut in half in this budget. Several scholarship programs which are listed in the material you have are either reduced or eliminated entirely. It looks as if the Liberty Partnerships and Liberty Scholarships may never get off the ground. There are some other small things happening, small in terms of dollars but great in terms of the concern it gives us. Einstein and Schweitzer chairs are eliminated in this budget and we have several of those.

Finally on the city side, we should know on the 30th, which is Thursday, the city's recommendations for the community colleges. The mayor sought and received from the City Council a two-week delay in updating the financial plan for 1992-93 because he wanted to wait and see what the state was going to come out with. We had, in late fall, been down in the city financial plan, I am talking about the community colleges now, for a nearly \$17M cut next year going out after five years to a \$40M cut; more than halving the remaining city contribution. The Chancellor has been very energetic in holding discussions with city representatives, the Office of Management and Budget, the Mayor's Office, and so forth. We managed as a result of those discussions -- convincing them that cuts would be counter productive because we would also lose state aid and tuition because certainly we would have to reduce the numbers of students we took under that scenario -- I think they finally bought our argument and they have made adjustments in the financial plan so that instead of a \$17M cut next year, we could actually have a \$700,000 increase at the community colleges next year. But there is a bit of fantasy in those projections because within that they are assuming that the state will fully assume the costs of Medgar Evers next year as a senior college. Not merely the senior college costs, but the associate degree cost as well. That is not even something that we have proposed, so we know that it is not going to happen. But, in the worst case -- nothing happening with Medgar Evers -- the potential city cut under the published numbers is under \$6M instead of \$17M next year, which is of a whole different magnitude. Now obviously some adjustments are still to be made because we don't know what impact the state's recommendations that came out on the 21st are going to have on the city's planning. We don't know what is happening with the MAC money, we don't know what is going to happen as a result of the bond rating downgrading and so forth on the state and what impact that may have ultimately on the city. But as of now, if I could characterize the

community college recommendations that we know of from the state and the city, relative to the seniors, the communities at the moment are a little better off than the senior colleges are. The state, of course, makes no recommendations with respect to community college tuition because they have no authority over that, that is a local sponsor issue and what happens with that will depend on what the city's ultimate recommendations are for funding the community colleges.

Just two words if I can about the current year's budget. Because leadership in the state failed to arrive at a 15-month agreement which would have included dealing with the current year shortfall, we have been assessed a reduction at the senior colleges of \$13.2M. Even though the governor and the Assembly at one point in the process had agreed to reduce that by \$5M, they nevertheless have slapped us with the whole deficit reduction program of \$13.2M. We are looking at ways of dealing with this that would have the least impact on the classroom, but I have to tell you that it is very difficult at the end of January to try to figure out how we are going to save \$13.2M in a system that started the year having to cut \$25M after a couple of years of cuts. We are wrestling with various scenarios right now on that. On the community college side, what had been a \$5.6M cut mid-year was reduced, by action of the City Council, to \$4.6M and the city is allowing us to do things that they would not allow us to do in the past and take those actions as credit against that \$4.6M. So we think we can handle that with virtually no impact on services for the rest of the year beyond what we have already experienced.

So that is basically where we are at the moment on the budget. The 30-day clock is ticking, we are preparing 30-day amendments, once that is over we are in the legislative arena. Just one more important date to inform you of; February 11th we have testimony before the Assembly and Senate Ways and Means and Finance Committees and the Higher Ed Committees as we do every year. They are fast tracking it this year to keep the governor from complaining as much as possible about the legislature slowing down the process and being irresponsible and so forth. So it comes a little earlier than it might ordinarily, but that is the next important event that occurs. All this material is repeated in what has been distributed to you.

Professor Sohmer (Mathematics, City) -- "Unrelated to this budget is an action of your office in the last several weeks which I would like to understand. On January 6th, you memorialize the various presidents instructing them to institute a fee which had never been approved by the Board. Subsequent to that, the fee appeared at the Board last night, instituted, as far as I can see, to affect the very best students at the colleges by requiring a surcharge for taking credits beyond 18, for which students receive permission from deans for. For some reason there seemed to be a great rush, and the Board in its own inimitable fashion, knowing that it was improper and poorly discussed -- not discussed at all -- voted almost unanimously to support the fee. My question is, why the rush? Why the behavior? What are the financial consequences of this?" /I'm not sure I would agree that these are our very best students, so let's put that aside for the moment. First of all, on the timing issue, it came to our attention, as a result of an audit, that this was a practice that was much more widespread than we had thought. In fact, there are 1,525 students in the University taking an excess of 18 credits, not an excess of 16 -- which would be the average one would take to achieve either an associate or baccalaureate degree in two or four years -- but over 18. In surveying the colleges we found that in all cases students need permission to go beyond 18 credits and that students are able to go up to 18 at all of the campuses without any kind of special dispensation or counseling and so forth. The fact of the

matter is that the University incurs a cost as a result of this. In allowing students to take beyond 18 credits, which in effect makes them more than full-time students, colleges are on their own authority granting tuition waivers. Plain and simple, colleges do not have authority to grant tuition waivers, only the Board of Trustees can grant a tuition waiver. The Board policy is essentially not very explicit on this and in fact we consider this to be a loophole about which students may be advised or not be advised. We also believe, in the instance that we examined, that the institution involved was engaged in the deliberate practice of counseling students to behave in this fashion. The fee was instituted in recognition of the fact that there are certain non-instructional costs that are born by the institution when students take an excessive amount of credits. We granted the opportunity for students to take credits beyond the average that would be required to graduate "on time" -- if two and four years can be considered on time anymore. We also exempted from the fee those circumstances where as a result of remedial contact hours a student was going over 18. So for instance, a student who had trouble with language skills but was otherwise capable of performing at a high academic level would not be, to use your phrase, "penalized," although the purpose of the fee was not to render a penalty. We have not prohibited any student from taking beyond 18 credits. We have merely said that there is a cost involved when students do that. There is a forgone revenue when students do that. Imagine hypothetically, to give an extreme example, two colleges each with 1,000 FTE students, one where the students average 15 credits, another where they average 30 credits. One is bringing in twice the revenue of the other, even though they are serving the same number of FTE's. We haven't addressed the revenue issue from a tuition perspective because everyone was well aware that the Executive Budget was around the corner and there would probably be some dramatic issues involving tuition as part of that and tuition has to be considered long term and in larger context than this. The reason for the rush, if you will, is that when this came to our attention, the spring semester was about to get underway. There are many occasions where the University initiates action pending Board approval and had the Board disapproved this action, we could have always rescinded the instructions to the colleges. We calculate, based upon the fall 1990 figures on which we were going, that this would generate about \$350,000 University-wide if applied equally. The one amendment that was made to this last night at the suggestion of the Vice Chairperson of the Board, Edith Everett, was that this not be applied to students who were in their last semester prior to graduation. So if the student needed an extra course, an extra two credits, an extra three credits, or whatever beyond the 18 and was able to handle it, the fee would not apply in those cases. So that is the reason and that is why the rush.

Chair Picken -- "I will exercise my privilege as Chair and ask the same question I asked at the Board last night and did not get an answer. Why is it necessary to establish a fee when it is only one or possibly two institutions who are causing the abuse? Why not reform those institutions?" The fact of the matter is that it came to our attention because of an audit we were doing at a single institution, but when we took a look at the University, we found other institutions that were in more flagrant violation of what we considered to be a kind of honor system here in terms of the maximum credits. It is widespread. It is not limited to one or two institutions. I am sorry I did not have an opportunity to address your question last night. I would have answered it. This is across the University, certainly to a greater extent in some places than in others, and at a very few nearly nonexistent, but the bulk of the institutions have substantial amounts of students taking an excess of 18 credits a semester. This is not on occasion, this is repeatedly throughout the semesters.

Professor Speidel (Geology, Queens) -- "Substantial amount -- if you have 1,500 over the total number of students, that is well less than 1%. My question, however, is slightly different. If I understood correctly your discussion, what the senior colleges are looking at right now, not the summer, but right now, is a \$13.2M cut. That is between now and June?"/Yes. *"Is there any way at all, just sitting and dreaming and looking at numbers and all the rest, is there any way at all that \$13.2M can be cut out of the senior colleges between now and June without firing massive amounts of administrators or faculty?"*/Yes. We have a couple of million dollars left that we have not yet distributed for things such as instructional equipment. We have some funds that are distributed pursuant to a matching arrangement for library collection development and so forth. We will give the colleges the opportunity to forgo their share of those funds as an option against what might be a larger cut. That is number one. That doesn't take care of the full \$13.2M obviously. We have a freeze on. In most cases it is a self-policed freeze by the colleges, unlike the freeze last year that was handled centrally. As a result of a budget bulletin that came out in the fall from the state, we asked the colleges to implement a procedure on campus for making sure that only the most important positions were filled -- health and safety, the usual -- and to carefully review any OTPS expenditures. We believe that that process will generate several millions of dollars worth of savings. In fact, presidents are telling us that that is indeed the case. But that still won't take care of \$13.2M, we don't think. So the other thing we are looking at is perhaps, in those cases where the colleges opt to handle it in this way, rolling over into 1992-93 the remaining portion of the hit that the college would take on the assumption that in some cases a college, even though they may find themselves in dire consequences next year, having a whole year or knowing at the beginning of the year what the situation is rather than having to deal with something mid-year, would prefer to roll a portion of that into next year. There are various ways of doing it. One of the ways is using a prefinancing mechanism. We are looking at whether or not we can enter into an agreement with the state and city whereby the state would reduce its payment to the city as reimbursement on prefinancing for the last quarter and we would make that payment up to the city out of next year's budget by actually cutting a check from the senior college budget and sending it to the city. All of these are just ideas right now and have not really been fleshed out. The short answer to your question is yes, we believe there is a way to do it without massive layoffs.

Professor Danziger (English, Hunter) -- "Could you comment on the elimination of the Einstein and Schweitzer chairs? Does that mean no new appointments, or does it mean eliminating the appointments of those who already hold such chairs?"/It means eliminating the state supplement for the individuals that hold those positions currently. *"Has the University given any thought to what it is going to do about that?"*/Oh yes. We are going to oppose it, obviously. We are now in the process of formulating our 30-day package. There are lots of things to which we object in this budget. The 30-day amendment period is supposed to be a period in which technical adjustments are made -- in other words, if they made a mistake adding something or they forgot to include something as an oversight. Now it has come to be a policy decision-making period and the governor can really do whatever he wants, whether it is a technical amendment or not, during the 30-day period. So we have to decide which issues make sense to push with the governor, who is the same person who issued this budget in the first place, and which ones to reserve for discussion with the legislature after the 30-day period has expired. So I can't tell you at this point whether or not there will be a discussion of the Einstein and Schweitzer chairs as part of the 30-day amendment period or if it will wait until we have discussions with the legislature. But, it will be part of package that the University presents.

Professor Kaplowitz (English, John Jay) -- "This is about the John Jay/New York City Tech situation. The associate degree programs had been funded \$23M in the past, then the state stopped funding. This past year the city provided \$19M. You have explained that with the reformulation it is \$13M. But what didn't come clear, unless I misunderstood you and the Chancellor yesterday at the Board, is that \$13M has been assigned for the city to provide. Not the state, despite a very strong lobbying effort by CUNY, by your office, and the Chancellor's office, in Albany. Could you comment on this? The University made the point that this was a legal mandate to fund these programs, that the state funds the associate programs at the senior SUNY colleges and continues to do so, and here again there was not only no funding, but the state is telling the city that if it funds it should fund even less money. Is there any hope that the city will fund it. How are you approaching this?" First of all, the fact that it is \$13M this year and it was \$20M last year is a funding issue. In other words, it doesn't affect the college's overall budgets. The state still says John Jay's budget should be \$40M and NYCTech's budget should be \$37M or whatever they are. But it says we should pay only this portion of it and NYC should pay that portion of it. Now it is saying that NYC should pay \$13M out of that whereas it said a year ago \$20M because they are pegging it to the per student amount that the city contributes to the community college system in general. They are kind of following a quasi-CSI model where the offset that the city provides in the state budget for CSI is dependant in any given year on a per student computation of how much they are giving for the community colleges. It is all very convoluted. So that is why it is 13 and not 20. It doesn't mean that John Jay and Tech lost \$7M. Of course, John Jay and Tech will lose their portion of whatever the University is losing as a whole, and we are losing \$40M on the bottom line or if there is no tuition increase as much as \$78M in the budget. This will continue to be our number one priority -- reversing this, in the 30-day amendment period or in the legislative period that follows, since I would assume that we are not going to achieve success in the 30-day period with the same person that recommended this in the first place -- and it will continue to be a top priority in all discussions the Chancellor and all staff have in Albany and with people in the city. On the other hand, we don't want to be left caught in the middle again as we almost were for the current year, so should we arrive at a point where the state budget is adopted and the state budget still says that CUNY has to pay \$13M, we are going to do what we can to make sure NYC pays \$13M and doesn't pay for it by taking it out of the hide of the community colleges, which was also threatened this year.

Professor Beaujour (Russian and Slavic Languages, Hunter) -- "One of the obvious ways for the University to save the money it needs to save between now and June would be on the kinds of costs like electricity, heat, and things of that sort. It seems to be extraordinarily difficult to have a clear and public idea of exactly how much each college, including 80th Street, spends on this kind of thing. Therefore, the incentives to try and cut this down are not very large. Has 80th Street considered making this whole matter a little clearer?" First of all, we know exactly what each facility expends in terms of electricity, gas, fuel oil, and so forth. We have a very widespread energy management program in the University right now. We are engaged with the New York Power Authority in a relamping program throughout the University. The Power Authority is relamping, at their expense, the upfront capital costs of relamping. They will recoup that from the savings in our budget within two years, after which the savings will be ours to the extent that we can hold on to them and someone in Albany doesn't say the University is saving all of this money, thank you very much, it is ours now. That is going to be a process of negotiation. We are about to go to bid for a University-wide contract, which has never been

done before, for boilers and related facilities that should save substantial amounts of money. We have various kinds of energy management programs in effect. Some still on the drawing boards, but at some point they will come off the drawing boards and we will start saving some money. The problem as you correctly point out is the incentive is not always there because you cannot always be sure that the powers that be will let you benefit from any savings that accrue. We try as best we can before entering into a program such as this to pin down with the people in Albany to the greatest extent we can, a commitment on their part to allow, if not the full savings to be used, at least some substantial portion of the savings to be used and we get those savings back to the campuses to reinvest in others kinds of savings programs to use in other ways. It is not millions of dollars yet, but at some point it will be millions and millions of dollars.

*Professor Baumrin (Philosophy, Graduate School) -- "A comment and a question. I really don't think that you should characterize students as abusing the system by taking more than 18 credits. Whether they are our very best students or not would require something of an audit. I don't know that you have one. I certainly don't find the case that you presented very convincing. But the question is, suppose what looks likely is the case that we don't get any relief either in the 30-day period or in the legislature. Is there any reasonable plan that has been given some consideration that you could tell us that would avoid firing faculty? I am not concerned about whether you fire other than faculty."/*First, let me comment on your comment. When students take 30 credits a semester they are abusing the system. *"I would not have gotten through college if I hadn't so I don't think it is an abuse of the system -- accelerated programs. What you said doesn't make any sense, at least not from the point of view of an educator. If I have students who want to take 30 credits and they can do 30 credits, I am delighted that they can do 30 credits. I am not outraged that they can do 30 credits."/*Well, that is just a comment I wanted to make before my answer. The answer to your question is that this question was asked about this same time last year and I will have to give the same answer that I gave last year. We are just out of the gate. When we are just out of the gate and the budget has just been proposed and there is what is certain to be a very long process ahead of us, what we concentrate our energies on is fighting the recommendations and achieving restorations. Once we have a reasonable sense of what our final budget is likely to be, then we will turn our attention to those other issues of what kind of plans can be implemented to avoid one thing or another. *"I appreciate that and maybe I should have asked this a different way. Since January 21st, everybody I have spoken to has said either there are going to be student strikes or there are going to be layoffs or there are going to be both. You may think that we can play this game in the usual way. I would think we will have a closed-down University by April. I don't think you are going to get much faculty support for keeping it open."/*Was that a question?

*Professor Baum (English, York) -- "This is a follow-up question. The budget may just be news out of the gate, but a buzz word that I have heard a great deal is 'downsize.' I am aware that at several senior colleges there have already been movements to discuss downsizing. First, I would like your definition of downsize and second, I would like a particular discrimination, if you can make it, as to whether are we talking programs, consolidation of departments, elimination of departments, elimination of divisions?"/*Well, it depends on who the we is. I don't have a definition of downsizing. The mayor uses the term "rightsizing." I think what you are referring to is, for example, the Chancellor announced last night at the Board meeting that we are implementing a program review process throughout the University. She

intends to appoint a committee of distinguished faculty and a couple of college presidents to start considering issues of program duplication, enrollment, where program invigoration is necessary, the whole gamut. There are also administrative issues involved in downsizing, if you want to use that term. Issues such as, does everybody have to have a mainframe computer? Can we provide some of those services in a more efficient manner? Can we do more University-wide purchasing on behalf of the colleges so they can free themselves of some administrative burdens and use those resources and those staff to do other kinds of things? We are starting to do a little bit of that, to get our feet wet and to see how successful we can be. We are looking at issues, telecommunications, for example. We are in discussions right now with NYC in order to see whether or not it would be worthwhile to piggyback on their long distance service, as an example. Rather than have the 21 colleges out there separately bidding on and evaluating long distance carriers, we can do this as a result of a good contract that the city has already done the research on and has entered into with the carrier. It will save us up to 40% of what we are currently paying for long distance service. That is not a small piece of change. We want to do those kinds of things. Is this downsizing? I don't know. It is redistributing your resources, certainly. It is taking people who might have been doing one thing, especially administratively, and having them do other kinds of things, perhaps more productively, perhaps filling a void that was left by an early retirement, by an inability of a college to hire where there has been attrition or loss of a position. So that in the downsizing, to use that phrase, consideration is being given across the spectrum, administratively and academically. This is not being gone into with the assumption that out of the program review process there is going to be an end result that will be a smaller University or fewer programs and so forth. As I said before, we are at a 15-month high in terms of enrollment. You can not accommodate that enrollment, as we are compelled to do by our legal mandate, by closing down programs that students want to enroll in. Granted, when you look across the spectrum questions emerge about the need for 15 of this or 12 of that when enrollments are very low and have been historically low. Those are the issues that the group is going to consider and it will also consider the good reasons for doing that. If there are a dozen masters programs in the same subject with 15 students each, that raises an immediate issue about whether or not we need the dozen masters programs in the same subject with 15 students each. But, we don't know enough to evaluate that and that is the purpose of the committee. There may be very good reasons why you need those dozen programs with 15 students each but we don't know the answers to that yet and those are the kinds of things we are going to be looking at. Undoubtedly there will be some recommendations emerging from that kind of process that will recommend restructuring for some of those programs, consolidating, pairing up, or whatever, and possible elimination at all levels. I am not going to say that that won't happen at the end.

Professor Chabora (Biology, Graduate School) -- "Perhaps you could provide some perspective on what might be going through Comptroller Regan's mind in terms of faculty benefits?" / You are referring to the non-payment of the TIAA-CREF employer contribution for the Tier II, III, and IV participants. I can't speculate as to what is going through his mind. Let me state what the problem is. The state comptroller, who is responsible for actually cutting the check on whatever periodic basis he does so to pay the employer contribution to TIAA-CREF for those who entered the system after 1973, has announced that he will not make the next payment which is due this week or next week. He won't make the January payment. The reason being that he feels that the law is currently ambiguous as to the basis on which to compute that. The reason he feels that it is ambiguous is there is language in the education law that pegs the employer contribution in the optional retirement system to the employer contribution to the state

retirement system. As we all know, the state has been using the gimmick of re-estimating the interest earnings on the state public retirement systems to reduce its contribution. The state retirement system is a defined benefit system, meaning that whatever you put in, you get a defined amount out of it after so many years. The optional retirement system, TIAA/CREF, is a defined contribution system which means you are required to pay a certain amount in, you the employee and you the employer, and what you get in the end is a function of the plan you chose, the investment decisions that are made over the years, and how successful or unsuccessful those investment decisions are. So you will get a variable amount. A person in the state system will get a fixed amount. What the contribution has to be to the state system is a function of how much they anticipate that system overall will earn in any given year. So as interest earnings go up, or the assumption about interest earnings go up, the amount of the contribution goes down. The state comptroller wants to peg the contribution to the optional retirement system to that number that is currently going down. Now one can foresee a situation where the economy is so good that in the extreme, the contribution to the state system could go to zero for a particular year because it is earning enough on the corpus to make any contribution unnecessary given the actuarial tables that govern these kinds of things which nobody, I am convinced, understands. If that were to happen, and you were to peg the optional retirement contribution to that it would mean that the contribution by the employer to TIAA/CREF would go down to zero in that year. Obviously, that is going to have an impact 20 years hence. A bill had been introduced in last session that would have mandated that the state continue its contribution under the old rules for TIAA/CREF and that over a two-year period a study would be instituted to see what the problems were, how to reconcile the various elements of the law and so forth. The governor vetoed that -- he said it wasn't necessary, the law was clear. Then the attorney general issued an opinion and he said the law was not clear. He issued an opinion contrary to that for governor in his veto decision. The comptroller has said that when you guys get your act together, then I will make a contribution. The more important question is not what is going through his mind, but why he didn't at least make the minimum contribution under any circumstance that would have been necessary and dicker about the difference. I suspect that it is his way of forcing the issue with the legislature to come to terms with this earlier rather than letting it get all bogged down in the session along with the budget and taking until god knows when to resolve that issue. I assume that this is a little pressure tactic on the part of the comptroller to get the legislature to move quickly on this issue. I haven't heard anything this week, by the way, in terms of them moving on anything. When I was up there a week ago they were talking about introducing a new bill again with this two-year provision and then coming to some kind of agreement after this two-year period as to what the eventual rules ought to be governing the contribution. There has been no movement to my knowledge this week.

Professor Trumbach (History, Baruch) -- "I wonder if you would clarify what was said about tuition in the budget that is hopefully going to be passed by April 1st? The New York Times had reported the proposals as saying that there was going to be a SUNY tuition increase but not one at CUNY. You clearly say that the budget proposes an increase at both places. I wonder if you could just talk about that?" / Again, they are proposing a \$500 tuition increase at the CUNY senior colleges generating 50 plus million dollars to take the place of an equal amount of state aid that is being withdrawn. At SUNY they are suggesting an average \$500 tuition increase but offering SUNY the opportunity to set differential tuition levels among various types of institutions within the State University senior college family and that is comprised of university centers -- Stonybrook, Buffalo, Binghamton, Albany -- the four-year

liberal arts colleges, and the six ag and tech colleges. SUNY is the one that requested that this be put in the budget this way. SUNY is concerned that if they raise their ag and techs \$500 they will be pricing themselves out of the market and the students will go elsewhere. So what they want to do is raise the ag and techs less than \$500 and raise the university centers more than \$500 -- the figure that has been thrown around is \$800 -- and by a combination of those actions they will generate, on average, the revenue from a \$500 across the board tuition increase. Their budget has been offset by state aid in an amount equivalent to what they would generate with a \$500 across the board tuition increase. I don't know why the Times didn't report the CUNY piece of that, but it is clearly in the materials that you have from the State Executive Budget that there is a tuition proposal for the City University.

Professor Picken -- "As a final question, I would just like to ask your assessment of the impact on the Research Foundation of this budget and the transfer of functions to IFR's?" We don't see the wholesale manipulation of the IFR accounts as we did last year. If you recall, last year they proposed, and it was ultimately adopted, that we move a lot of operations from the tax-levy budget to what is called the IFR, Income Fund Reimbursable account, which is a self-supporting account with the funds and the revenues being drawn from revenue generating activities. As part of that, they reduced in half, the RF tax that supported the University's operating budget in half, with intention of eliminating the remainder this year. They have, in fact, eliminated the remainder of it this year. So the RF in a way benefits from this because it now has another 2 plus million dollars that it otherwise would have had to contribute to the state in support of the senior college budget to use to return to the colleges in support of research activities, so this is a positive budget from that perspective. What is negative about it is that while we don't quibble with the policy of returning the RF funds to the RF because we never believed that they should be taxed to support the regular operating budget, they didn't replace the dollars they took out of the budget by doing that with state aid. If they replaced it with anything, they have replaced it with tuition but since the budget is going down \$38M plus, it is a net loss to the University's operating budget.

Chair Picken thanked Vice Chancellor Rothbard for his extensive and thoughtful report.

IV. Reports:

a. Chair: There were no written communications distributed. The Chancellor is not with us this evening because she, along with a number of other representatives of the University including myself, were convoked by the State Senate Higher Education Committee today to testify on certain matters which I will report on presently. She felt that, being in Albany, she had to use her time to try to lobby and try to ameliorate the budget situation. So she regrets very much having missed our plenary.

Since I last reported to you in December, there have been two meetings of the Board of Trustees. There was a special meeting on Friday, January 3rd, to brief the Trustees on the tragedy at City College and the events as they were known at that point. Everything that was communicated to the Trustees at that meeting has appeared in the press and it has been superseded by the Mollen report and the Elique report so I won't go into what was discussed at that meeting.

As Vice Chancellor Rothbard indicated, there was a meeting of the Board of Trustees last evening; a very lengthy meeting. It started by acknowledging the important losses which the University has sustained over the past two months: the untimely passing of Brooklyn College President Robert L. Hess; the death of Dr. John Everett, the first Chancellor of City University; and, of course, the deaths of the nine young people at City College on December 28th. The Chancellor's oral report focused on the budget situation and you have had a comprehensive summary of that from Vice Chancellor Rothbard. As he indicated, the Chancellor also announced that she will be creating an ad hoc committee on program planning which, as I understand it, will be composed of four presidents (that is, two senior college presidents and two community college presidents) and five distinguished professors of whom the Chancellor will choose three, the PSC has been asked to nominate one, and I have been asked to nominate one on behalf of the UFS. The formal charge of this committee was not presented to the Trustees, but as the Vice Chancellor said, it will include an analysis of where the University can be streamlined and consideration of the University's academic programs. Further information on this committee will be presented to the Fiscal Affairs Committee of the Board at its meeting next week. We will try to communicate that information to you as soon as it becomes clear.

As reported by Vice Chancellor Rothbard and Professor Sohmer, the University Report Addendum item on the Fee for Accelerated Study provoked considerable discussion. It was something, I believe, of a minor victory in this whole difficult situation -- I won't hide my dismay at what has taken place -- that we did manage to obtain a concession for students who are in their last year before graduation who will not be charged this excess fee for credits over the number of 18. I must say the Student Trustee, Vice Chair Everett, Trustee Carrion, and myself argued very strongly that some concession be made to this category of students.

Two new academic programs were approved upon recommendation from the Academic Policy Committee: a BA in Africana Studies at Queens and a BA in Religious Studies, also at Queens. I took the opportunity of these actions to highlight the fact that the Queens College Academic Senate approved these proposals in 1984 and 1986 and that they had not been substantially revised since those dates. I recommended that efforts be undertaken to expedite and rationalize the approvals process and that a sunset provision be included in all proposals that would require faculty reconsideration after such a delay and that the approval history be a part of all submissions to Board committees. Trustee Bernstein, Chair of the Academic Policy Committee, expressed her dismay that she had been unaware of the six and eight-year delays in the approvals process of these two programs.

A lengthy proposal for amendments to the governance plan of John Jay was withdrawn from the Board Calendar. It will be reconsidered by the Faculty, Staff, and Administration Committee when it meets next week.

The public portion of the Board meeting ended with a report by Trustee Carrion for the Student Affairs Committee that proposed amendments to the University Bylaws, specifically Article 15, concerning student disciplinary procedures which will come to the Board for action at its February meeting. She noted that the student and faculty representatives on the committee had opposed the changes in their present form and that there had been hearings at which participants spoke in one voice in opposition to these proposals. A report on the proposed change can be found in Professor Speidel's report on the January meeting of the Student Affairs

Committee and I believe material prepared by the Graduate Student Association on this issue is available on the table at the back of the room.

At this point the Trustees went into a very lengthy Executive Session. You know if you read The New York Times this morning that the tragedy at City College was discussed at length and personnel actions were considered in connection with that sad event. The matter of Professor Jeffries was also, as mentioned in the The New York Times, discussed. The Board approved a nomination of the Chancellor to appoint as Acting President of Brooklyn Dr. James N. Laughran, S.J., formerly President of Loyola Marymount University in Los Angeles. Father Laughran is a Ph.D. from Fordham where he was formerly a faculty member and dean. He is a philosopher specializing in ethics.

I now turn to today's activities. As I said, the Senate Higher Education Committee has begun an inquiry and evaluation of administrative procedures and academic decisionmaking in higher education in New York State. Today's session was devoted entirely to City University. The issues that the committee wished to pursue were: number one, policies that insure a campus environment conducive to learning and critical thinking; number two, policies governing discipline of students, faculty, and staff when a complaint is raised; number three, criteria for oversight of student groups and outside organizations who sponsor events on campus; fourth, procedures for evaluating the conduct and performance of faculty members; and finally, the administrative and academic role of the department chair, the process for evaluating a department chair's performance, criteria for administrative qualification for the position, and the process by which a department chair can be removed or replaced. These are all serious matters of great concern to us. I think all of us involved took these hearings very seriously indeed. It was the opinion of most observers in Albany today that the hearings were politically motivated. I must confess that I share that opinion. The hearing started with the Chairman of the Board, James Murphy, receiving a brutal grilling from the committee which went on for well over an hour. It centered mainly on City College. He was followed by Chancellor Reynolds who also received some very harsh questioning. By harsh questioning I mean hostile questioning. President Harleston testified and then Professor DeJongh, the Chair of the City College Faculty Senate, and myself testified jointly. In my testimony I tried to explain to the committee the role of the UFS and to briefly address each of the questions that the committee had posed. I particularly, since it hadn't received much attention, talked about the importance the vast majority of faculty feel for the election of departmental chairs within our University. I will append copies of my testimony to this evening's minutes so that you can know what I said on your behalf. At that point it was after 3:00 p.m. and so I had to think about getting back to the city, but scheduled to speak after Professor DeJongh and myself were Presidents Jackson, LeClerc, Meredith, and Kenny; Dr. Polishook, on behalf of the PSC; Jean La Marre, the Chair of the USS; Jeremy Burton, the student body president at Queens; Gregory Meyers, the former Chair of the USS; and Lisette Nieves of Brooklyn whom as you know recently became our second Rhodes Scholar from City University.

Turning to other matters, Vice Chancellor Rothbard discussed with you the crisis situation as concerns the payment of the state's contribution to the optional retirement plan. This is not, of course, a matter that falls within providence of the UFS, but I would urge all of you to make your views on the matter known to your elected representatives and also to work through the PSC on this very important issue.

Several announcements: First of all, as has been previously announced on a number of occasions, the Senate will be sponsoring a conference on graduate studies throughout the University to be held on Friday, March 6th, and it is being planned and coordinated by our Graduate Affairs Committee under the chairmanship of Professor Danziger. President Horowitz of the Graduate Center will be the keynote speaker. Second, the Senate Research Committee, chaired by Professor Westrem of Lehman, is soliciting nominations for the disciplinary panels for the University Committee on Research Awards. An announcement of that is contained with the material at the back of the room. I would urge you to take this very seriously, to inform your colleagues, and try to solicit good candidates. This is a very important service that the faculty should be performing for the University.

As you know, the Office of Urban Affairs, at the direction of the Chancellor, has embarked on a series of campus forums on the College Preparatory Initiative (CPI). Two have been held so far, one at Lehman and one at NYCTech. All other campuses will have their forums during the coming five or six weeks. As I have in the past, I would urge you to participate and also to participate in the planning to see that these go well and that there is true consultation. We will receive in one way or another reports on these forums and discuss their content at our March meeting. That is being coordinated by the Student Affairs Committee, chaired by Professor Zarin of Lehman. What we hope to do is to get a sense of what has gone on and get a sense of faculty feeling on the CPI so that it can be presented to the Board at the time the Board is called upon to debate this proposal for its April meeting.

Finally, I would like to report on an issue that was raised at the last plenary which is the question of the multiple position report forms. I have had several discussions with Vice Chancellor Bloom concerning this. Vice Chancellor Bloom is, I think, prepared to admit that a mistake was made, although I am not certain that he would put it in exactly those terms. The form is being revised. A committee has been constituted to do this. The PSC is represented on that committee. I discussed with Mr. Arnold Cantor, the Executive Director of the PSC, what was said at the plenary last month. He considers this a very serious matter as well. I would urge all of you who wish to participate in the discussion of this issue to do so through the PSC and to contact Mr. Cantor. That concludes my report. I would be happy to answer questions.

Professor Sohmer expressed his dismay over the acting president appointment at Brooklyn, noting the many qualified colleagues within CUNY. Professor Picken reported that similar sentiments were expressed at the meeting. Professor Gura (Speech, Brooklyn) asked for clarification as to the description of faculty to serve on the Chancellor's committee on academic programs. Professor Picken responded that, as he understood it, the faculty participants were to be identified from among those holding the title Distinguished Professor. Professor Gura suggested that Distinguished Professors might not have particular background in the analysis of curriculum and that presidential participants might have interests to protect. Professor Picken noted that the Executive Committee would meet with the Chancellor and express those concerns. Professor Zinberg (Speech, Queensborough) asked about a memo Professor Picken had sent to the Chancellor regarding the CPI in July, but which she had just received. Professor Picken noted that the memo had not been circulated to the full Senate, but had just recently been sent to certain UFS committee members. Professor Zinberg asked if the concerns expressed had been addressed and Professor Picken answered that some had and that the campus forums would permit the others to be raised in that consultative process and he agreed that there are substantial

concerns about CPI on many campuses. Professor Speidel asked if faculty would have to fill out a revised multiple position form and Professor Picken responded that he thought they would. Professor Frisz (Student Personnel, Queens) expressed her concern that the University was increasingly trespassing on the authority of the faculty. She noted the new disciplinary procedures, the acting president appointment, and the composition of the Chancellor's committee on academic programs as particular examples of this willingness to ignore historic, collegial practices.

Professor Baumrin expressed his disbelief at the acting president appointment and moved the following resolution: "The University Faculty Senate condemns the Chancellor for recommending and the Board of Trustees for approving the appointment of an individual from outside the City University to the acting presidency of Brooklyn College." The motion was seconded. Amendments to revise "condemn" were defeated. Senators debated the wisdom of formally recording their dismay over the action versus the fact that the action had already been taken and public condemnation might only serve to damage Brooklyn at a difficult time. Several Senators suggested that the issue should be expressed in positive terms, looking to forestall such actions in the future. The question was called and debate closed. The motion failed on a show of hands. Professor Speidel asked that the issue be referred to the Executive Committee for further consideration.

b. Reports of Faculty Members of Board of Trustees Committees: Professor Picken added to the written report on the January meeting of the Faculty, Staff, and Administration Committee. He reported that he had provided the Committee with data that showed that during the five-year period 1986-91, enrollment in the University increased by approximately 10%, the number of faculty decreased by 9.5%, and the number of senior administrators (defined as Executive Compensation Plan and those receiving REMs) increased by 9.8%. Professor Picken did note that the senior administrative category declined by 8.2% from fall 1990 to fall 1991, but that this decrease did not compensate for the dramatic increases in the late 1980s. Professor Picken estimated that if senior administration had decreased at the same rate as faculty, the savings to the University would be on the scale of \$5-6M; not an inconsequential sum. The full text of Professor Picken's letter will be in the next edition of the UFS Newsletter, due out in early February.

Professor Cyril (Cooperative Education, LaGuardia) asked Professor Speidel to elaborate on his written report on the proposed Board of Trustee Bylaw changes as they relate to student disciplinary procedures. Professor Speidel reiterated his view that all sides were fairly heard in Committee debate and characterized the proposed revisions as stemming from concerns among trustees that students have suffered under current procedures, in part due to the non-professional and idiosyncratic nature of the proceedings. They argue that students can be more effectively protected by using the rules of administrative hearings. Second, timeliness and equity will be promoted through the revised procedures. He stated his view that anytime you increase the administrative nature of such procedures, individual and group rights suffer. He also recommended that, instead of revising procedures, the University insist on responsible implementation of the extant procedures at the colleges. Finally, he decried the use of "circuit judges" which is one of the critical changes proposed.

Senators argued forcefully that existing procedures worked and protected the rights of students. It was noted that most disciplinary cases are cheating or other infractions and not the type of charge that stems from a campus disruption. **Professor Galub** (Social Science, Bronx) described the process that took place on his campus, suggesting that there was a lack of support from the Office of Legal Affairs of the University that hampered implementation of disciplinary procedures. It was also suggested that faculty not stand for election to disciplinary panels if the revised procedures are adopted.

Professor Frisz made the following motion:

- Whereas: the proposed changes to the CUNY disciplinary procedures would infringe on the rights of the individual colleges; and
- Whereas: the current disciplinary procedures when appropriately implemented have more than adequately served the University for almost twenty years; and
- Whereas: students and faculty will be adversely affected by the proposed changes; therefore be it
- Resolved: that the University Faculty Senate is adamantly opposed to the proposed changes in the CUNY student disciplinary procedures.

The motion was seconded. After further discussion, debate was closed and the motion passed without dissent.

V. Old Business: Proposed Charter Amendments: Professor Zarin: Laid over.

VI. New Business: Professor Matthews (Mathematics, Hunter) reiterated the concern that Distinguished Professors should not serve on the Chancellor's Advisory Committee and that the definition of potential faculty participation should be enlarged. She asked that the Executive Committee consider the issue.

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 9:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Bruce Hoffacker
Executive Director