

MINUTES OF THE TWO HUNDRED AND FIRST PLENARY SESSION OF
THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

May 12, 1992

Robert A. Picken, Chair, called the meeting to order at 7:10 p.m. He began by introducing the members at the head table and reviewing the rules of order for new members. Present were Senators Adewumi, Allaire, Anderson, Barbanel, Baum, Baumrin, Baxter, Baxter-Boehm, Beheshti, Bell, Berkowitz W., Bleyman, Bohigian, Borgese, Brugnola, Buianouckas, Cañate, Caroselli-Dervan, Caudle, Cooper, Cyril, Danziger, Davis R., Davis E., Donnangelo, Donoghue, Eisenberg, Erber, Feinerman, Fitzgerald, Frank, Frisz, Galub, Gerber, Goldberg, Greenbaum, Grossman, Gura, Hounion, Hurtado, Jacobson, Jaffe, Kaplowitz, Karan, Kaufman, Koshi, Krashinsky, Lidov, Lundeen, MacLennan, Magid, Mandel, Martinez, Matthews, Meier, Meyers, Moore, Neville, Norton, Otte, Picken, Plissner, Reitano, Riedler-Berger, Rodriguez, Romer, Rosario, Shaffer, Shen, Sherrill, Simor, Sohmer, Squitieri, Stevens, Svitak, Tenenbaum, Terrell, Tillyer, Trefousse, Trumbach, Umolu, Vasillov, Walters, Weinberg, Whealey, Youkeles, Yousef, Zarin, Zinberg, and Alternate Senators Brady, Cohen, Coleman, Diz, Glass, Roff, Italia, Lagos, Lowy, Mettler, O'Donnell, O'Malley, O'Riordan, Petratos, Seidman, Sirota, Sourian. Professors Alsop, Guttenplan, Plissner, and Speidel were excused. Campus Faculty Governance Leaders Chabora (Graduate School), Frisz (Queens), Gallardo (Hostos), Gura (Brooklyn), Johnson (Medgar Evers), Kaplowitz (John Jay), and Magnus (Hunter) attended. Vice Chancellor for University Relations Jay Hershenson was present. UFS Executive Director Hoffacker and Administrative Assistant Pasela were in attendance.

I. Adoption of the Agenda: The tentative agenda was moved and annotated as follows: Vice Chancellor for University Relations Jay Hershenson would be reporting in place of the Chancellor; Professor Reitano (Social Science, LaGuardia) asked to report to the Senate, under New Business, a situation on her campus; and Professor Sohmer (Mathematics, City) asked that a motion from City College regarding retrenchment be brought before the Senate for consideration under New Business. The Agenda was adopted with the above notations.

II. Acceptance of the Minutes of the 199th Plenary session (March 24, 1992) and 200th Plenary session (April 14, 1992): Minutes of the 199th Plenary session were accepted as distributed. It was noted that the attendance of Campus Faculty Governance Leaders was not included in the Minutes of the April 14 plenary. The following Governance Leaders attended: Professors Bird (Baruch), Chabora (Graduate School), DeJongh (City), Gura (Brooklyn), Johnson (Medgar Evers), Kaplowitz (John Jay), VanFelix (BMCC), and Professor Wiess (QCC). The minutes of the 200th Plenary session were accepted as corrected.

III. Reports:

a. Chair: I should like to begin my oral report by wishing a very warm welcome to all those newly elected Senators and Alternates whose official terms commence with this plenary. I also rejoice in the return of a number of re-elected Senators and Alternates. I shall introduce all those beginning a term this evening, by college. [ed. The list of newly elected and re-elected Senators and Alternates is attached to the Minutes.]

For all of those who are new to the Senate, we wish you a very, very warm welcome indeed, and for those of you who are returning, welcome back. We are happy you are here. The University Faculty

Senate is charged by the Board of Trustees, under the provisions of Article 8.14 of the Board's Bylaws, with "the formulation of policy relating to the academic status, role, rights and freedoms of the faculty, University level educational and instructional matters, and research and scholarly activities of University-wide import." This is an important mandate, one which takes on even greater importance in this time of extreme financial stringency, when it appears that very difficult decisions are being made concerning the structure of the University as a whole, its academic program, and its research commitment. During the term of three years newly elected Senators are beginning tonight, decisions will be taken which will affect the shape of our University well into the next century. We welcome your collaboration. Together, we must work to represent the University's faculty as a whole, to make wise and judicious decisions, and to make the faculty's voice heard, not only by the Board of Trustees and central administration, but by all those who are responsible for public higher education policy in this city and this state.

Vice Chancellor for Faculty and Staff Relations Ira Bloom submitted his resignation on April 21, effective April 30. The Chancellor has named Associate University Dean for Faculty and Staff Relations Judith Bronstein as Acting Vice Chancellor. The search for a permanent Vice Chancellor will begin immediately. The Senate will, of course, be represented on the search committee.

I now turn to the Board of Trustees Meeting of April 26, certainly the most important Board Meeting in terms of the measures passed to have taken place since the fiscal crisis of 1975-76 and the subsequent restructuring of the University. You have read in the press more or less accurate, although incomplete, accounts of the proceedings and, of course, all of the major items on the Board's Calendar for the April meeting were discussed in one way or another at our last plenary on April 14. I made a number of lengthy statements to the board on behalf of the faculty. Because of our full agenda tonight, I shall only summarize them for you and, without objection, will append the full texts to the minutes of this meeting for the record.

The first major item to be considered was the College Preparatory Initiative (CPI). It elicited very little comment, having been discussed thoroughly at the November Board Meeting and at the April 1 meeting of the Long Range Planning Committee. The Chancellor made a brief presentation in which she thanked the numerous committees and other groups which had contributed to the refinement of the Initiative. She called attention to the strong expressions of support received from public schools Chancellor Joseph Fernandez and State Commissioner of Education Thomas Sobol. In my statement, I reviewed the involvement of CUNY faculty in the planning of the initiative from its very first stages. I spoke about the campus forums and the scrutiny the Initiative has received. I reminded the Trustees of the two major areas of concern on the part of the faculty -- that the Initiative may result in a limitation of access to the University and that there may not be sufficient resources available to implement it properly -- and I called on them to spare no effort to insure that the clauses of the enabling resolution which speak to these concerns are honored. Finally I presented to the Trustees the resolution which this body adopted at last month's Plenary. The Trustees passed the CPI unanimously.

The next major item to be considered was the revisions to the retrenchment guidelines of 1983. On this item, I was the only speaker. I sketched out for the Trustees the history of the retrenchment guidelines and reviewed the steps that led to the removal of the AAUP censure of the University. I emphasized the extreme importance the faculty attached to any revisions of the guidelines. I alluded to the negotiations which surrounded the current revisions and expressed satisfaction that the chancellor had, in the end, dropped provisions which were totally unacceptable to the faculty as represented by the UFS, the PSC, and the Council of Campus Faculty Governance Leaders. The revised guidelines were passed unanimously.

The Board then turned to a consideration of the tuition increase. On this matter, virtually every member of the Board had something to say, and you have read reports of the debate in the press. A number of Trustees vowed that they would not vote for any further increases in tuition in the foreseeable

future. Similar statements have been heard in the past, but on the present occasion they were made with considerable vehemence. The student Trustee was not present and submitted a written statement in opposition to the proposed increase. I restated the UFS's historic opposition to tuition, but I called attention to innovative elements of the proposal, particularly the mitigation of the increase with respect to continuing students and the concept of a free last semester for newly enrolled students which will represent a cost savings to those who eventually may outstay their financial aid eligibility and come as a reward for completing the baccalaureate program. The proposal to increase tuition passed the Board by a vote of 10 to 3.

The final measure to be considered by the Board was the declaration of financial exigency for the senior colleges and the central office, the first step in any retrenchment process. By this time, it was getting late and the Trustees were not inclined to further debate. I did manage, however, to be recognized and described the ever worsening conditions faced by the faculty and our students as we endeavor to teach and they attempt to learn. I emphasized that maintaining the quality of the academic program will become well-nigh impossible if the process of defunding continues. As concerns the implementation of the retrenchment guidelines, I reminded the Board that they call for presidents to consult with faculty at every stage in the elaboration of retrenchment plans. I noted that my dictionary defines "consult" as "to seek advice or information of; to exchange views; to confer." Nowhere included in the definition is a provision for convening of a group of faculty, telling them of what you propose to do, and then dismissing them. I appealed to the presidents to follow the consultation provisions scrupulously in the difficult days ahead, both as a practical matter -- in that only the instructional staff collectively, through its elected representatives, has the depth and breath of knowledge of the institution to come up with a workable plan -- and also because of the fact that any other course of action will have a devastating effect on morale. The declaration of financial exigency unanimously passed the Board.

This evening, we are distributing a tentative schedule of the Senate plenary meetings for 1992-93. This is earlier than usual -- we ordinarily distribute the schedule in the summer -- and we are doing it in response to a number of requests from Senators who would like to begin planning their calendars for next year. While some of the schedule will likely change, the fall dates are firm and the major agenda items are fairly certain. The dates of the two Senate conferences, December 4 and March 5, have been agreed on by all involved.

This academic year's final issue of the Newsletter is at the printer's and should be in every faculty member's mailbox by the end of next week. I would be remiss if I did not thank our colleague Professor O'Malley (English, Kingsborough) for all the effort she has devoted as editor to making the Newsletter the invaluable source of information it has become for the faculty of the entire University.

I am pleased to report that the two proposed amendments to Article 4, Section 3 of the Senate's Charter, lengthening the term of office of the Secretary and of the Treasurer to two years and making them coterminous with the terms of the Chair and Vice Chair, amendments approved at the February plenary by the requisite two-thirds vote, have been ratified. They have been approved by the appropriate faculty governance bodies at Baruch, Brooklyn, City, John Jay, Lehman, Medgar Evers, Queens, Staten Island, and York colleges, which represent 55.9% of the instructional staff of the University as represented in the Senate. In the absence of any provision to the contrary, I would rule that amendments to the Charter take effect immediately on ratification. We shall therefore, a little later, be electing colleagues to fill these offices for a two-year term.

b. Vice Chancellor for University Relations Jay Hershenson: Chair Picken -- "Vice Chancellor Hershenson is well known to this body, and especially well known to those of us from Queens, and needs no introduction. It is always a great pleasure to have him here with us and without further ado I will call on Vice Chancellor Hershenson."

Thank you very much, Chair Picken. This is the third time in the last two years that you have been kind enough to invite me to the Senate. I am glad to be here and I am glad to still be welcomed after two other appearances.

Chancellor Reynolds is in Albany this afternoon for a late meeting with the governor. She is communicating three essential elements of the University's needs. First, the continuing demands of strong student enrollment that we are all familiar with, and particularly the impact of the budget -- the very devastating impact of the budget -- on our campuses. Second, the overall underfunding of public higher education, on both an FTE basis and in relation to comparable states -- which we have talked about in great detail. But if we are going to reverse that trend in New York, it is going to take action by the governor and the legislature. Of particular interest is how we rank as to the percentage of tax revenues spent on higher education in relation to comparable states around the country. Third, most specifically, the immediate need for passage of the early retirement incentive and restorations at the senior and community colleges.

The budget was adopted, as everyone knows, on the state side almost on time -- I guess it was about a day late. But what many people in the general public do not realize is that the legislative session is continuing and so consequently we have to continue to work. And, in fact, we have done so. Each college president has been given a list of capital rehabilitation and improvement items to work on with individual legislators.

The legislation on the early retirement incentive program is being introduced formally this week with a lot of help from Assemblyman Sullivan (Chairman, Assembly Higher Education Committee) and Senator LaValle (Chairman, Senate Higher Education Committee). You probably noticed that The New York Times did endorse the incentive program. In fact, the Times, in general, in the past several weeks has been extremely favorable and supportive of the University, as has The Washington Post and The Daily News. Newsday has been extremely supportive. That has not gone unnoticed in terms of the work that takes place in Albany. Some of you may have seen the page one, Sunday, Daily News story. I don't know how many people here read the Sunday Daily News, but you really ought to because the picture on the front page with students from Brooklyn was a tremendous picture, and then there were two full pages inside detailing the impact of budget cuts on the University and the importance, in a very very sympathetic manner, of help for the University -- with charts of our alumni and a lot of information that was very important. Legislation on Medgar Evers is being introduced in the Assembly this week. We are also seeking a variety of funding additions and language changes relating to the welfare reform act, science and technology funding, and, of course, you are all familiar with the pension task force that was appointed which is looking at the whole TIAA-CREF situation. Overall we are circulating a document in Albany asking for an additional \$21.4M that specifically relates to the budget situation at the senior colleges. I guess almost 85% of that push in Albany is for the senior colleges. The reason for that is obvious because of the financial situation that we are currently in. I want to emphasize the tremendous, tremendous importance of taking advantage of the remaining few weeks. The Chancellor's visit with the governor today was an effort to drive home at the top of the state the fact that higher education has been drastically underfunded, and particularly City University. She will be meeting with the speaker next week. In fact, she saw the speaker, Lt. Governor Lundeen, and Senator Marino briefly this afternoon, and that push will continue. It needs to continue. The higher education scene in general in the state is an extremely difficult one, not just for City University, but for State University and the private colleges, which simply puts us in the position of having to make it clear to the legislature that they have not finished their work as far as we are concerned.

On the city side, the budget works back from June 6th, and this relates specifically to the community colleges. Even though the community colleges receive shared funding, as everyone knows, from the state and the city, the city budget itself works back from June 6th. So we really only have a small window of opportunity to see if we can do everything possible to secure some additional funding

from the city. The mayor's budget includes a \$8.1M cut for the community colleges with a contingency cut of \$6M dollars if the mayor's tax program does not get adopted by the legislature. Now a lot of these numbers were put together prior to everything that came out in the last three or four weeks, the talk of surplus, the negotiations involving MAC funding, various turns in the economy, and you'll probably see tomorrow in the newspaper somewhere that now the mayor and Comptroller Holtzman have figured out a way to reinvest some bonds to come up with some additional money. So the finances of the city, in some ways, certainly appear to be taking an upturn, at least in the context of the upcoming city budget negotiations. So for those reasons we have basically adopted the following strategy: One, in order to protect the community colleges, we have to take into account the fact that the legislature, even though it provided the funding for NYCTech/John Jay of \$13.1M, did not come through on a restoration of funding for the community colleges which was, in terms of how much state aid we would have gotten, a little bit under \$4M. We did get in the Executive Budget an additional \$3M for special needs for the community colleges such as ESL programs and student services, so there was some gain made, but the fact of the matter is that we really did not get our due on the community college side. So the mayor's budget, as it is currently presented to the City Council, really only does one thing for us and that is it permits the University to keep the revenue that is gained from the tuition that the University is charging - - in particular for the community colleges, it is an additional \$350 per year which you are all familiar with. But, that does not preclude the University from coming forward to the City Council and the mayor during the city negotiating process. So, as a result, we have come forward with a \$12M programmatic proposal which has been given to the mayor and his people and the speaker and his people. In fact, I am meeting tomorrow morning at 7:45 a.m. with Chairman Berman of the City Council Finance Committee in preparation for the Chancellor coming forward at 12:30 tomorrow with a formal proposal for a \$12M package for the community colleges. The three pieces are basically related to: Student success, with a real emphasis on student services, that is \$3M; \$6M for job training funding for the community colleges -- we could leverage that at the community colleges if we were able to just get \$4M on the city side, we could pull in a tremendous amount of federal money for job training; \$3M for the staffing of new facilities at four of our community colleges. We are talking about LaGuardia, Hostos, Bronx, and Kingsborough, all of which have facilities that need to be staffed. They cannot just sit there without some help. That will be presented tomorrow formally before the City Council Finance Committee and the City Council Education Committee.

In another corner of the universe we have an \$18M proposal over a five-year period for MAC funding. Now the MAC funding is a stand in line. Everyone, and everyone's friends and relatives are on line to see if they can get hold of a piece of the MAC surplus. It is an extremely competitive battle. You have all read about the love affair between the Mayor's Office and the Board of Education in the newspapers and the love affair between organized labor and the BoE on the same issue. We are staying out of that. We have made a proposal and we are now moving into the operating side of the city budget. So we work backwards from June 6th. We have had CLAC teams working with help from faculty in the room, help from students, help from alumni, who go out and visit council people individually, and then we will see the City Council as a whole on May 21st when the University will host the council through its Board of Trustees. So we are doing a full-court press and we will need to continue to do that. Some state legislators are helping us in terms of pushing with the council, such as Assemblyman Sullivan, and some city officials are helping us push on the state side on issues like the retirement incentive, such as Borough President Messinger. So we have to blur the lines between the officials in order to use the next few weeks. It is very important that we continue to do everything we can because if we are successful in any of the areas that I have mentioned, that can partially ameliorate some of the pain that you feel on the campuses. That is why it is important, at least in terms of how we view the situation centrally, to continue our efforts vigorously and not be prepared to go on vacation until August.

On the federal side, the Chancellor has been very active in Washington. She visited with three New York members of Congress on April 30th who are the conferees on the higher education reauthorization legislation -- Nita Lowey, Susan Molinari, and Jose Serrano. In fact, Jose Serrano was

coordinating hearings for the Education Committee at Hostos in mid-June. There is a lot of back and forth between the various sides over the higher education reauthorization. I think we have mentioned before at faculty senate meetings about funding for urban universities that we are, obviously, trying to get into the bill. There is a big battle over how one defines the size of a city. There is a push by some congresspeople to redefine a city as 200,000 or over. Of course, this really opens up every city on the planet. Unfortunately, one of the stumbling blocks is Senator Ted Kennedy's office. There is a staff person there who has a unique interpretation as to what an urban center is and so we have had to go to some congresspeople to see if we could turn that person around and that is what we are working on. You all know that Pell grant funding is the highest priority and, of course, we are supporting raising Pell grants to the maximum, especially given the situation our students face. We are also looking for less than half-time Pell grants which, right now, is in both versions. There is a lot of independent legislation that involves teacher programs to encourage minority students, all kinds of drug education programs, etc., that we are also involved in. We are looking to maintain whatever tax benefits we can that allow employees of universities not to have to declare as taxable income the cost of education allowed to them by their employer without cost, and also the deduction of the interest on student loans. So the federal agenda is very strong and complete.

I have given you a very quick snapshot of about 25 items, when you add up all of the pieces, that have to be monitored and pushed within the remaining weeks of the city budget, the legislative session, and time in Albany. It is time well spent and I would only express gratitude to those members of the faculty who have participated in these activities, who have been involved in everything from letter writing to going to Albany, offering counsel, and being in touch with us, and we hope that that will continue. We just need to be able to do it until the end of June rather than closing up shop now.

Professor Greenbaum (History, Queensborough) -- "A very simple question. One of the most important items in our state package is early retirement. I keep getting different reports. Where are we now?" My political call right now is that we have a one-in-three chance, and I will tell you why. We have a commitment on the Senate side, and that is very very clear. On the Assembly side, I'll make it two in three the moment the bill gets introduced because Assemblyman Sullivan and many key people who work closely with the speaker have been extremely supportive. One thing to keep in mind is that the Chairman of the Board of Trustees was here for the previous retirement incentive effort so I think today there is much more of a sense of the fact that it will work at CUNY and the governor was given some charts which deal with the issues of cost, the position ceiling, and the like. I think it is fair to say that we are getting a sympathetic response. But that is where we are as of today. It is looking up on the governor's side, but there is still a lot of work that has to be done.

Professor Sohmer -- "There are several Central Office initiatives -- one of them is security which I believe has been estimated to be costing this year any place from \$2M to \$5M -- and there is a rumor that there is a sequestration of between \$15M and \$20M someplace down at 80th Street, in some vault. We are all on campuses threatened, with or without early retirement, with some level of disaster or retrenchment or both. Is it possible for 80th Street to spring lose from its vault the monies so that the actual destruction of the campuses does not take place?" I, frankly, have never seen the keys to that vault. You ought to know that the situation in the state is still a very difficult one. The Division of Budget (DoB) is not playing softball. They are continuing to play hardball with all the agencies and they are asking all agencies for what they are calling a 1% hold back; I don't know if that has been reported to you through your campuses yet. That cut has been made for all agencies as a, what they call, safety valve. Whether or not those funds will be released or not, we don't yet have a commitment from the DoB. Obviously, the point today was to indicate that what is needed is relief from the legislature this session above and beyond any hold back that they are talking about. I will tell you that the Chancellor is extremely sensitive to the situation that the campuses are facing. That is why she was in Albany today. That is why she'll be back in Albany next week, and I am sure that every effort will be made to minimize

the impact and I will take this back to her, which I think is really the intent of your point. I will make sure that she is well aware of it.

Professor Trefousse (History, Brooklyn) -- "Is it contemplated that in this retrenchment anyone with tenure will be affected by being fired?" My understanding is that adequate protections have been put into effect. When the University receives all of the plans that will be coming in from the campuses, they all will have to be reviewed to make sure that they are in accord with the guidelines, with the directives that the Chancellor has sent out, and negotiations that have taken place between the University and the PSC. All of those plans are not in, but there is a tremendous sensitivity to making sure that the guidelines are adhered to.

Professor Shaffer (Library, Hunter) -- "May I ask a question about TIAA? What is the status of legislation in Albany? I understand that in June they have to do something and I want to report to my people." I think at the present time that all I can really say is that a commission has been designated which is going to make recommendations to the state. The University is represented on the commission, and labor is represented on the commission. In fact, there was also a late meeting, late today, which I believe was a public session. What we will do is provide the faculty senate with a written report on the deliberations of that commission so that you are kept informed.

Professor Baumrin (Philosophy, Graduate School) -- "You said 'adequate provisions have been made.' Either you are referring to the fact that the retrenchment guidelines already provide adequate retrenchment protection for tenure, in which case it is not gift by this administration, or you are referring to something new? If it is something new, I would like to know what it is." I am not referring to anything new. I am just referring to the previous guidelines. My office doesn't handle actual plans as they come in. I know from participating in various meetings that there are various plans that are still being submitted to the University. You will need a further report back once that occurs. *Professor Baumrin -- "You also mentioned in your remarks that the Chancellor sent a directive to the presidents with respect to this matter, cautioning them or advising them or something or other. Unless it is private, could you tell the Senate what that admonishment or caveat was?"* There was a memorandum that the Chancellor did send to the presidents which really talked in terms of the importance of doing everything possible to minimize the damage of the budget on the classroom process at the University, on its educational programs, and to pay particular attention to the importance of maintaining affirmative action gains. I would be more than willing to share that memo with anyone who is interested.

Chair Picken -- "We have received copies of the memo and will distribute it to the Senate."

Professor Baum (English, York) -- "Could you give us, please, some tentative schedule about the retrenchment plans? When are they due in the office and when will a proper response be made by the Chancellor? Those of us who remember 1976 not only remember what happened, but how it happened and the timing -- the summer, when people were not around and felt very much at a disadvantage. So I would appreciate, as far as possible, specific dates and actions." Of course, my office is very much involved in a number of actions which will hopefully have a positive impact on the very difficult process that is occurring on the campuses. So when you ask that question, I cannot put aside our efforts to secure the retirement incentive program and also to, frankly, see if we can get some additional relief on the state side with respect to both the senior college and community college budgets and, frankly, that was why I emphasized those areas because they are the areas of responsibility I am principally involved with. As I indicated, that needs to take place. My understanding is that plans are currently in formulation. We are talking about a matter of weeks. I don't have the exact date that all of the plans need to be in by. Most of the presidents were talking in terms of the end of the month, but don't hold me to that date because there may be differences between campuses.

Professor Walters (Educational Services, Brooklyn) -- "I would like to know if it is possible for the faculty senate members to get a copy of the retrenchment guidelines?" / Yes.

Professor Magnus (Nursing, Hunter) -- "Do you know the details of the time frame for the ERI? What kind of schedule are we talking about?" / I think what I will do, rather than go into details here since the legislation itself is being introduced later this week, hopefully on Thursday, we will make that available to the Chair with a summary so that everyone can receive a copy of it and be able to have it handy.

The Senate thanked Vice Chancellor Hershenson for his report.

c. Faculty Members of Board of Trustees' Committees: written.

IV. Elections: Chair Picken reviewed election procedures and asked Vice Chair Cooper (History, CSI) to preside over the election for chair.

a. Chair: Professor Kaplowitz (English, John Jay) nominated Professor Picken. Professor Lundeen (Nursing, City) nominated Professor Sohmer, and nominations were closed. Each nominator made a statement. Professor Picken received 67 votes and Professor Sohmer received 33. Professor Picken was declared elected and resumed the chair.

b. Vice Chair: Professor Baum nominated Professor Cooper and made a nominating statement. Nominations were closed. Ballots were cast and Professor Cooper received 91 votes with 1 abstention.

c. Secretary: Professor Lundeen nominated Professor Sohmer and made a nominating statement. Nominations were closed. Professor Sohmer received 91 votes with 7 abstentions.

d. Treasurer: Professor Cooper nominated Professor Greenbaum, Professor Danziger (English, Hunter) nominated Professor Baumrin, Professor Donoghue (Social Science, NYCTech) nominated Professor Speidel (Geology, Queens). Each nominator made a short statement. Professor Greenbaum received 53 votes, Professor Baumrin 26, Professor Speidel 18. Professor Greenbaum was declared elected.

e. Members at Large: Professor Jones-Moore (English, Hostos) nominated Professor Cañate (Mathematics, Hostos); Professor Danziger nominated Professor Baumrin; Professor Gura (Speech, Brooklyn) nominated Professor Donoghue; Professor Karan (Natural Science, Medgar Evers) nominated Professor Umolu (Humanities, Medgar Evers); Professor Zinberg (Speech, Queensborough) nominated Professor Whealey (Science, BMCC); Professor Donoghue nominated Professor Speidel; Professor Matthews (Mathematics, Hunter) nominated Professor Sherrill (Political Science, Hunter); and Professor O'Malley nominated Professor Martinez (English, Kingsborough). Nominations were closed. Each nominee made a short statement. The final tallies were: Professor Donoghue 75, Professor Martinez 70, Professor Speidel 65, Professor Cañate 55, Professor Baumrin 45, Professor Umolu 43, Professor Sherrill 29, Professor Whealey 28. Professors Donoghue, Martinez, Speidel, Cañate, and Baumrin were declared elected.

V. Campus reports on faculty consultation in the budget process:

York College: Professor Baum. In order to expedite matters, I exclude numbers from this brief report except to indicate that when presented with shortfall figures of gross amounts and lines, faculty questioned

how an original administration Plan A would truly solve problems. At York, the budget process became synonymous with retrenchment, and though it should have been clear that downsizing -- political decisions -- should have been kept separate from budget matters, they ran together. A retrenchment committee was formed, but its voice was not heeded. Only a strange last-minute "grace" in the form of found money by the Chancellor, in return for increased admissions -- with no increase in faculty of course -- "saved the day." Faculty questioned the number of administrative positions being retained and the wisdom of instituting a search for an academic vice president at the same time. Although faculty were informed about budget matters, invited to participate by way of open forums, and sent updates, many faculty questioned both policies and procedures. Between the appearance of going by the book and actually accepting faculty recommendations, there was, for many faculty, a serious gap. In short, the process goes by the book, but many feel there are hidden footnotes.

College of Staten Island: Professor Kaufman. I understood the item to refer to the degree of consultation that the president has been conducting with the members of the budget committee rather than the developments resulting from the retrenchment activity. Regarding consultation at CSI, the committee has met perhaps four or five times during this past year. At each of the meetings, a report was presented of some factual data prepared by the business manager, and the president summarized the significance of the items in the report and indicated how certain savings would be implemented and opened the discussion for any clarification. I must in all honesty say that I do not have any sense of consultation in the way in which the Chair has defined this term. At no time, as I can recall during this past year, has the committee been invited to make very specific suggestions about how savings could be implemented in one way or another. For example, the matter of personnel cuts -- where there had to be some discretion displayed as to whether respective hiring in one area or another would be, at least, temporarily frozen if not permanently canceled. There is merely the indication that a certain number of lines may have to remain unfilled without any further idea as to whether those lines would be in the teaching area, or a non-teaching area, or an administrative area, or a custodial area, or anything. So that remains unaddressed. Speaking for myself, I do not have a sense of any true consultation having taken place.

Queensborough Community College: Professor Svitak. From speaking with the Vice President of Academic Affairs at Queensborough and several past and present chairpersons, I learned the following about our budget consultation at Queensborough. A formal subcommittee of the college P & B is elected. One new person is elected each year to meet with the administration to review the budget formation and to make recommendations regarding the distribution of those college funds which have not been preallocated by other mandates. That leaves, from what I understood from our conversation, a lot of money which does not get reviewed by this committee. These recommendations are sent to the president and are reported to the college P & B which consists of all the department chairpersons, several deans, and is chaired by the president. Budgetary requests from the college departments are considered in this process. The perception from the faculty point of view is that the college P & B is told what the budget is and its task is to recommend how it should be divided.

Queens College: Professor Frisz. At Queens, early in October, the president formed a budget advisory committee to spend several months determining what kinds of areas within the college could be looked at in terms of savings. As part of that committee she appointed some members, but asked me as the chair of the senate to ask our Executive Committee to have two members serve. That committee made its report to her in March and it was distributed to our college P & B and to the campus at large and she held open hearings about the committee's recommendations. At our college, the chair of the governance body sits as an ex-officio member of the president's cabinet, of the college P & B, and we also have a meeting once a month with her with the chairman of the union at the campus, the chairman of the college P & B, and the chairman of the governance body. During those times, the issue of how the college would make budget cuts if needed was discussed and she has remained adamant, and still does as of this morning's cabinet meeting, that she is going to try very very hard not to have retrenchment. She has put

a plan into CUNY that we not declare retrenchment or financial exigency at Queens. She is awaiting word from the Chancellor's Office in terms of whether her plan will be accepted.

New York City Technical College: Professor Donoghue. I would like to report on behalf of Morris Hounion. This past week we have had a realignment of the college by the president and there was no consultation. It was just presented to us in a letter yesterday, dated May 7th. Somehow we have come from \$2.8M in arrears to a mere \$650,000 by getting rid of 8 HEO/executive pay plan people. It does not appear that there is going to have to be retrenchment of, this is very nebulous, teaching faculty. I don't know what happens to people in counseling or any of the other HEO's that we have. We have not had a financial plan that has been circulated. However, I understand that today members of the administration met with the budget committee of the college. I don't think there was anything significantly different about that, that is consultation, and we have not had a move to form a retrenchment committee - obviously, we are not going to have retrenchment. However, I must say that only today the president found out about sequestration of the 1% of our budget. That was talked about a week and a half ago. So I don't know what kind of condition our college is in or what direction it is even going in at this particular point. There is a Title III planning committee, and it is doing some sort of planning, but I don't see how that ties in with retrenchment.

Medgar Evers College: Professor Umolu. At Medgar Evers, historically, personnel and budget matters are presented to the college-wide P & B. Selected budget matters are referred, periodically, to the sub-committee on the budget. This committee may make recommendations. The various units of the college submit budget requests to the administration. Individual faculty members, the Faculty Organization, the PSC, the College Council, and other organized groups are not involved in budget preparation or final decisions. Some faculty members have requested that the faculty be more involved with the budget development and allocations. Others have stated that they learn about the budget in the Chancellor's (printed) Report; others have not indicated any concern. Medgar Evers is underfunded. Most of the tax-levy funding received by the college is assigned to personnel services. Funds are limited. Allocations for OTPS are submitted to, considered, and finally decided by the administration.

Lehman College: Professor Zarin. Like the president of Queens, the president of Lehman, Ricardo Fernandez, is attempting to meet the gap in the budget through means other than retrenchment and to minimize the effect, as we heard the Chancellor's memo asks, on classroom teaching and student services. This year, the budget consultation process was revitalized through the strengthening of a faculty committee on budget from the faculty P & B -- a sub-committee of the faculty P & B -- which is the primary means of consultation with faculty on budget matters. This group meets on a regular basis with the provost of the college, has interviewed the deans of the college, the heads of various programs, the heads of student services such as the writing center, and so on in an endeavor to find out what is being done at the college and how the money allocated to those areas is being spent and what the effect on faculty and students is. In addition, the president, during this particular time of crisis, is consulting with the budget committee of the Lehman senate and the Executive Committee of the faculty in an ongoing way and in the last week in May there will be a special meeting of the general faculty of the colleges called by the president and devoted solely to the budget crisis and problems and possible solutions. As of now there is an official committee, and I guess we will have more to say at the next meeting.

LaGuardia Committee College: Professor Frank. At LaGuardia, the long standing quip has been that the college P & B never deals with the B. Some time ago, the Executive Committee of the PSC chapter met with the president and pointed out that, as we read the Bylaws of the University, the budget must pass through the college P & B for its recommendation before it is submitted to the Central Office. The president assured us that he had no objection to this and that he would do this. It appears that the dean did make a presentation on the budget to the college P & B and this is certainly a first step in the right direction. As I understand it, it was a presentation and not actually for consultation. Nevertheless, it is a step in the right direction and we hope that eventually we will be able to push this process so that the

budget eventually becomes transparent and understandable to the faculty, to the P & B, to the point where they can make recommendations. We have also asked that the line-item budget be put on reserve in the library. There was some balking at that request. We are interested to know if we have a legal right to get the line-item budget -- if the Sunshine Laws really require that that be on public record. Dr. Picken -
- "They do indeed."

Kingsborough Community College: Professor Youkeles. Senators or members of the local PSC committee are not aware of any faculty consultation in the budget process at Kingsborough.

John Jay College: Professor Kaplowitz. At John Jay, our president was one of two presidents who did not ask the Chancellor to declare a state of fiscal exigency. Nonetheless, the Board, as you know, declared a state of fiscal exigency for all the senior colleges and for 80th street. We have not had a retrenchment committee formed even though we are supposed to and at our last council meeting I asked the president if we must have a retrenchment committee at John Jay. He said yes. There has been no move to have one. We have been told that there will be no retrenchment; there has been no discussion about it. We have been told that. This is something, of course, that is good hear, but it would be good to discuss. There is a college P & B, of course, of which there is a subcommittee called the budget planning committee which is told what cuts have to be made and helps make the cuts, but it doesn't help formulate the budget and doesn't discuss other possible ways to meet the cuts -- well, it discusses, but it is not well received. When the P & B meets, the president of our college always says that the decisions of the P & B -- to which I am invited as the Chair of the Faculty Senate without a vote -- only makes advisory suggestions, does not vote on anything except to advise the president who can reject that advice. Of course, we don't agree with that interpretation. So that is the state of John Jay.

Hunter College: Professor Meier. At Hunter, the president solicits recommendations on the budget from the Senate Budget Committee and the Master Planning Committee -- both are standing committees of the Senate -- and also from the FDA's Budget Committee which is ad hoc and from the Executive Committees of both the Hunter College Senate and the FDA. The president sometimes attends these meetings. He also meets with committee chairs and presidents of the heads of the Senate and the FDA on occasion to discuss committee proposals for cuts. The chief librarian, the affirmative action officer, and the president's council also meet with the president on a regular basis to advise him on budgetary as well as other matters. Lately the president has formed a Hunter College Planning Committee whose members include the head of the Senate and the FDA. Their charge is to help define short- and long-range planning at Hunter and especially to establish funding priorities. All of these bodies as I mentioned are advisory to the president. The budget is on reserve in the library and the president has said that he does not expect that there will be retrenchment.

Hostos Community College: Professor Gallardo. I am supposed to provide you with information about the budget process at Hostos and the participation of its faculty. One of the problems is that we don't really know what the process is at Hostos. Our discussions with the president have made us believe that from the Board of Trustees or from the Chancellor's Office, requests for budget cuts or requests for budget allocations come from one day to the next and she is supposed to respond in a hurry and she doesn't have the time to get the information or input from the faculty or from the Senate. We reminded her yesterday, as a matter of fact, in a meeting that one of the senate committees had with her that we know every year in October the Chancellor requests the budget for the following year and that we should be planning for that budget now. She told us that there is some kind of plan in progress. However, we don't know that plan yet. We have scheduled a new meeting with the Dean of Administration and the financial committee.

Graduate School and University Center: Professor Chabora. Budgetary processes at the Graduate School have always been the province of the administration. The question has come up numerous times over the past few years, requesting mechanisms for faculty input. Nothing has ever happened. Several times during

this latest crisis, the administration was asked to set up something or at least to devise a committee. The doctoral policy faculty committee has considered this and made the recommendation to the administration that perhaps the Executive Committee of the Council of Executive Officers would be the most appropriate standing body should they be needed. However, the administration -- the president -- as of about five o'clock today, said that there is no question in her mind that the Graduate School will not be going into financial exigency this year.

City College: Professor Sohmer. There are two aspects of this. The ongoing budget process consists of the Vice President of Administration listening to some testimony by faculty which is solicited by the Faculty Senate. Every now and then that gets incorporated into the document, but the actual budget is something vastly different from any of that stuff. Last spring and early fall, the Faculty Senate at City College created an all faculty committee to consider what would be the problems if the budget were to be poorer this year. There was some testimony, data, and recommendations that at least certain broad strokes be undertaken -- largely, the elimination of some administrators and then other things. It was clear that the large dollars could only come from eliminating people who did not have any kind of faculty position because of the retrenchment guidelines. After financial exigency was declared, the president created a committee of 32 which has grown to either something like 34 or 36 depending on which day it is, and a steering committee of some sort which was created by the president which consisted of no faculty whatsoever. At the behest of me and a couple of other folks, one faculty member was adjoined to that planning committee which will then be feeding into the retrenchment committee of 32. Some preliminary steps relative to the budget have been taken. Most of you at most campuses were exposed to a nonreappointment period of April 17th. At City College there were 16 HEO's and 27 others who were not reappointed. This was done entirely without consultation of anyone. They were targets of opportunity. Their reappointments came up and they were not reappointed. One or two probably would not have been reappointed anyhow, but the vast majority were not reappointed because they were there. One department has been negotiated off the campus to NYCTech. For some reason or another, an assumption has been made that the departure of that department to NYCTech would enhance our budget even though at the same time it is one of the larger departments in the school in terms of full-time equivalent students and therefore it seems that our budget will probably be diminished as a result of this. There was no consultation on that either. It is the Bachelor of Technology program which is a continuation of a two-year program at community colleges.

Brooklyn College: Professor Gura. At Brooklyn College, budget consultation normally is accomplished through the Faculty Council's standing Master Planning Committee. To prepare for retrenchment, a college-wide committee was established which included representatives of the Faculty Council, department chairs, and members of the Policy Council. The incumbent chair and chair elect of the Master Planning Committee also served. It is my sense that the retrenchment committee has worked diligently and that all voices have been heard.

Bronx Community College: Professor Galub. At the present time, we don't anticipate retrenchment at the college but, of course, the future is a little bit fuzzy for us. With respect to general questions on the formulation of the budget and the execution of the budget, there is no real consultation in the sense that faculty bodies formally participate in these processes. However, the president does make a presentation on the budget to the college senate, usually at its October meeting, and makes a similar presentation to the college-wide P & B. Once the budget is known, the college P & B does have some role in allocating relatively small sums for OTPS, travel funds, and the like. Besides that, the president informally -- and this is more of an impression that I have, but it is based on some experience -- and the Dean of Academic Affairs, who is the second person in the college hierarchy, do consult with chairs or program heads regarding their needs. Generally speaking, the allocation of resources is really up to the president and the dean, but the absence of formal consultation is mitigated I suppose, a little bit, by this informal political process which goes on. At the present time, our budget situation is not definitely known for next year and probably will not be until the city-wide political process is complete in June. There has been

some vigorous discussion within the college senate regarding an expansion of information about the budget, but there is also some doubt as to whether there even exists anything like a line-item budget for the college or any printout which could be examined by the faculty. There may be, and I suppose when I say this it indicates some of our own uncertainties about the full budget process. There is also some agitation for formation of a long range planning committee, but these discussions are at the very beginning and so I really couldn't say how they will turn out.

Borough of Manhattan Community College: Professor Whealey. I am going to preface my report with a commentary to my colleague from LaGuardia, and maybe some others. We have also a P & B and we don't know what happens to the B. However, I teach science and you would be very surprised to know that we do address problems in English. I do have to inform my students that when we add a syllable to a word that ends in B, we have to change it to a P, like absorb, absorption. I think this is what is going to happen in many of the cases that I am seeing -- that if the problem still exists in the B, there is soon going to be a problem in P.

In the budget process at BMCC, the administrative role is that of informing the faculty rather than one of consultation. The president does this through the college-wide P & B. The committee is chaired by the president and is made up of the chairs. Sometimes emergency meetings are added during budget crises. The president usually informs the general faculty on some budget problems at the faculty day meetings twice a year. Incidentally, our president is also the president of our faculty council. Department budgets are usually settled between the dean of academic affairs and individual department chairs.

Baruch College: Professor Bleyman. Being last, I did notice in the various reports that certainly the senior colleges seem to have to some extent a stronger faculty voice than the community colleges. That has been my general impression. I just want to say that at Baruch, which is one of the newer senior colleges, there has been a lot more consultation recently with our new president in terms of budgetary information and consultation with the faculty than there has been in the past. Possibly on the model of the Chancellor, the president did establish what he called a Presidential Commission which was to make both long-term and short-term recommendations and open forums were held April. This commission did distribute a report on its recommendations throughout the campus. Some of the recommendations were then further discussed and the main result, I would say, is that after many budget discussions, there has been a redistribution of where cuts would be made. One of the major things is that the administrative side took a larger cut than was originally proposed. Nevertheless, the president did declare retrenchment at Baruch. The president's commission consisted of 12 faculty and 2 vice presidents. The retrenchment committee consists of 23 people, 10 of whom are faculty. They have also already held open meetings. Today the president announced that the retrenchment plan is going to be circulated for comment to the entire community this coming Friday. So there has been a lot of communication. Now how much of it is ultimately listened to in terms of the feedback from the faculty, we just don't know at this point, but there has been a significant increase in communication between the faculty and the president during these hard budgetary times.

Professor Picken -- Thank you all very much. That concludes our reports on budget consultation on the campuses. I would like to point out several of the reasons that the Executive Committee arranged this series of reports and also ask you to reflect a little bit on their meaning. First of all, we wanted every member of the Senate to get a sense of what goes on in the various campuses so that they would have a better perspective from which to view their own campus. Secondly, we wanted to hear the current situation, get a sense of just where every campus is in this process -- especially those campuses such as Baruch that appear to have to move to retrenchment. Finally, this is a kind of preparation for the conference which the Senate will be sponsoring in collaboration with the Council of Campus Faculty Governance Leaders next December on strengthening faculty governance throughout the University. One of the things that this conference hopefully will do is come up with acceptable and workable models of consultation of faculty with respect to the three very important areas of budget and strategic planning,

personnel, and curriculum. Each of the campus governance leaders will be asked to designate a certain number of delegates and, of course, members of the UFS also will be welcome to attend.

VI. New Business: Professor Reitano reported that LaGuardia President Raymond Bowen has acted to mandate a new faculty schedule. The key sentence reads, "Beginning in the fall of 1992, all full-time instructional faculty will be expected to teach no less than four-day schedules." The faculty are deeply concerned about the memo and believe that it violates BoT Bylaws section 9.3, which gives chairs the right to assign courses and arrange/check schedules for their departments. The faculty has expressed its concerns at a recent instructional staff meeting and the chairs have collectively opposed it. President Bowen is preparing a response to the faculty updating his position and it will be reported to the UFS.

Professor Sohmer reported that at a recent meeting of the faculty of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences of City College the following resolution was presented and passed unanimously:

Whereas: The business of The City University is the education of students and
 Whereas: in the past five-years alone, while the senior administration of the
 University has increased by 10%, the teaching faculty has decreased by
 the same percentage. There be it
 Resolved: before any faculty retrenchment occurs, the University should reverse
 this trend in the ratio of faculty to administrators.

After discussion, a motion was made and adopted to refer this matter to the Executive Committee for disposition prior to September.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Bruce Hoffacker
 Executive Director