

SUBJECT TO SENATE APPROVAL

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

April 19, 1988

Chair Wedeen (Education, Brooklyn) called the session to order at 7:10 p.m. in Room 1700 at the Graduate School and University Center. Present were: Senators Baker, Bank, Barbanel, Baumrin, Baxter, Bishop, Bleyman, Bohigian, Boylan, Brady, Brower, Buianouckas, Canate, Carro-Kowalczyk, B. Cohen, Cravzow, Dannenberg, Danziger, Davidson, Depas, Donleavy, Donoghue, Feldman, Galub, Geach, B. Gerber, Greenbaum, Grossman, Gura, Henderson, Huang, Jiji, Karan, La Rubbio, Loetterle, MacLennan, Matthews, McCullers, Oldham, Otte, Parkhurst, Picken, Plissner, Riley, Rodriguez, Rodway, Rosen, Segal, Shaffer, Simor, Sohmer, Stern, Taylor, Trefousse, Umolu, Wasser, Wedeen, White, Wurmfeld, Zades, and Zaneteas; Alternate Senators Anderson, Hill, Levitan, and Thompson; Senator Elect Geach and Alternate Senators Elect Beaton and Keane. Senators Aaronson, Cooper, Hayon, Lytra and Sheridan were excused. Also attending were heads of local faculty governance units Boylan (Queens), Gura (Brooklyn), and Sohmer (City). Chancellor Joseph S. Murphy and University Faculty Senate Executive Director Dr. Ellis also attended.

I. Approval of the Proposed Tentative Agenda: The proposed tentative agenda was approved by motion, duly seconded and passed.

II. Approval of the Minutes of the 163rd Plenary Session (March 22, 1988): The minutes were approved by motion, duly seconded and passed.

III. Chancellor's Report: Thank you Dr. Wedeen, and good to welcome you, Dr. Ellis. The Primary today may allow State officials to redirect their attention to the budget. This is as long a period without a State budget as I can recall, and if the intention was to delay the implementation of a State budget in order to keep the Governor occupied in Albany through the course of this entire Primary, it clearly has worked. We hope now to get a budget. Obviously we've been in touch with Albany, and we have at least those parts of the budget that we believe to apply to us in hand, and Vice Chancellor Vivona has been discussing with the leadership of the Faculty Senate the contents of the budget, and is available tonight to respond to whatever issues people want to raise. I want to just do two things and then respond to any questions from the floor - first, to talk a little about the community colleges. Joe will talk at greater length about the community colleges. They're not in good shape, as you know, even if the increases which we expect at two or three of the colleges will be forthcoming as suggested by the outline of the State budget that we've seen. We're still running a substantial distance behind where we need to be in order to feel reasonably comfortable in our community college accounts. We have put now a number of different strategies in place. The Senate, I presume, will play its appropriate role as well. We've been meeting around the clock, almost, on mobilizing as much political support from our various constituencies, vis à vis the City, on behalf of the community colleges. We met today at some length with representatives from the various colleges, including the presidents, on the importance of a letter-writing campaign directly to the Mayor, keeping in mind that the City budget will appear by the ninth of May, and that between now and then the Mayor is active in the preparation of the Executive Budget. There was an article in today's Times indicating that revenues are running a little bit better. The depression that we all expected to be plunged into a couple of months ago hasn't occurred yet, and consequently people are continuing to spend money as though the party isn't over, and the result is that revenues are sufficient now, probably, to put some money back into the budget. Where he's going to put the money isn't clear. We want to emphasize to him the importance of the community colleges, and suggest that whatever revenues do become available, they be put in

the community college account, so we're hopeful that you will contribute to the letter-writing campaign to the Mayor. Right after that, we've got about a month in which we try to persuade both the Board of Estimate and the City Council to replace what the Mayor hasn't. So this is all part of our spring ritual, and so we're proceeding on it, however with a greater degree of concern than we have in the past. We're paying particular attention to both business and labor this year. We've got some 24 different labor unions that are going to be writing to the Mayor on our behalf, and we're meeting with our business advisory groups, which consist of a series of different businesses and corporations that have been linked to our various college technical programs, who have had a direct experience with the community colleges and therefore are in a position to speak on their behalf. We've already met with various members of the Board of Estimate and the City Council and continue to do that throughout the remaining six weeks during which this budget will be formed. We're doing this annually now, having a kind of Board of Trustees' reception for the City Council in early May. We're going all out on this, but I have to say we are meeting a certain kind of cynical resistance. It's not new to us. We've now become accustomed to it from City Hall. There is, I believe, a fairly clear-cut notion that the community colleges serve those constituencies for which the Mayor has no great regard. Consequently, this does not appear to be a high agenda item. In fact, I can say, "remove the word appear." It is clearly not a high agenda item for the Mayor in the City budget. He has to be persuaded that his interests will be served by considering the University a more important place than he has so far.

I want to, in another connection, extend congratulations, though he's not here, and to express to the Senate my feelings about Joe Shenker's departure as President of LaGuardia Community College. We're going to miss him. He's been a personal friend of mine for 20 years. He's been with the University for 24 years. It's hard to imagine that, because he only looks about 34. But he's been President of LaGuardia I believe now, for about 17 years, which is about as long a period of tenure as anyone. I think he was the first President of the College, and more or less grew up with it. He's done a terrific job at the college. I personally am going to miss him. I know many of you will as well.

Finally, I would like to mention an issue that I have raised in here earlier. I feel increasingly concerned about it, and I don't know whether to laugh or cry. There was an article in The Nation recently which discussed at some length the Library Awareness Program of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. As you may recall, we had this conversation in here in which I called attention to the fact, and I see I've been quoted around the country, here and there, including the Chronicle, as having taken a position, and I thought it was a little awful to contemplate the fact that FBI agents were going into our libraries asking librarians, in fact directing librarians to serve their country by informing the librarians as to what kinds of suspicious behavior, mind you, our patrons of the library were exhibiting that might lead the librarians to believe, and consequently the FBI to investigate, that these patrons, or users of the library, were agents of a foreign country. I guess in a way it's funny. I mean I have some quotes here from the FBI which I suppose really reveal the extent to which it's funny. According to one spokesman from the FBI, "Foreign agents are stealing information from libraries. The New York office has a large number of documented cases." We do know of one case where apparently at Queens College, in fact you all know of this case, it was in the Times. A Soviet agent apparently tried to seduce a Queens College student into spying for the Soviet government. But I guess since we know about it, it failed, since I guess if he was successful we wouldn't know about it. But the general feeling is, I guess it's best expressed by an FBI agent who approached Director Selma Algez of the Broward County Library in Fort Lauderdale, who said, "We know for a fact that there are

agitators in this area who are using the library for information." There was another event that occurred at the University of Wisconsin. This is reported by Professor Alexander Rolich, a Soviet and East European bibliographer at the University of Wisconsin, Madison. He reported the following: Two agents watched a Soviet scholar whose specialty was the Chinese economy while he took a break to read Pravda. Then, "there were two more people by the library elevator and they were wearing raincoats and boots and it wasn't raining." A couple of days later the FBI called to say this Soviet scholar had been identified by a defector as having been present at a meeting with the KGB. They wanted to know if the newspaper he was reading looked funny or like it had been marked up. This is Pravda. There is concern, apparently, that there is much to be learned in libraries. I suppose it would be funny except for the fact that there have been a number of instances in which librarians have been intimidated by people informing the librarian that they are members of the FBI and that they have some sort of authority to question people working in libraries as to the behavior of the users of the library. Now, I believe the Senate really ought to take a position on this, and I would like to recommend that they do. There is a bill in the State of New York Senate. Senator Volker. And I believe it's now an amendment to the Civil Practices' Law and Rules and it does have to do with the confidential nature of library records and does suggest that these are confidential. Users of libraries and the things they do use are their private business, presumably, between them and their - whatever intimate connection they have with their own librarian - but not available to any casual or even official sounding-like or appearing-like person who wishes to know what kinds of things anybody is reading. So I would like to encourage, and I do herewith encourage the Senate to examine both the pending legislation and act hopefully in support of it, but certainly to support our librarians in their effort to function as professional librarians and not as part-time or amateur sleuths for an otherwise incompetent, largely incompetent one would assume, if these were the lengths to which they are driven, investigatory agencies. That concludes my presentation, and I will respond to any questions that you want to raise.

Chancellor Murphy then responded to the following questions and comments from the floor. 1) Professor Umolu (Humanities, Medgar Evers) - "My question is one that you can anticipate, regarding the four-year status of Medgar Evers College and the special budgetary consideration that the Governor of the State of New York claimed that he had made, and the present situation regarding the legislators and their decision and the \$100,000 that's given to us for some type of study. There are so many questions surrounding that, and a lot of unhappiness because we feel that we are more than prepared to move back to where we were before and to continue the journey down the trail towards academic excellence." / I appreciate the question and the way in which it was asked, and I'll try to answer it as completely as I can. As you know, three years ago the Board of Trustees passed a resolution directing me and the University's administration to pursue return to four-year status and State funding for Medgar Evers College. We have done that. The first year we got nowhere. The second year we got the Governor to put in the State budget a line, that was the Governor's response to our request, which indicated that four-year status would resume to the College the following fiscal year. That was dropped by the Republican Senate on the grounds that it would presume to direct a future Legislature as to how monies should be appropriated. This past year we got as far as we'd gotten with it by getting the Executive Budget to include a \$13 million item for Medgar Evers. \$5 million of it was funny money, \$8 million was real added-on money for the purpose of allowing Medgar Evers to resume full-funding by the State. We were happy to have that in the Executive Budget. When it got to the Assembly and Senate, the following occurred. First, the Senate informed us that they thought, from their analysis of the budget, that the monies that the Governor had allocated in the budget for

Medgar Evers was not added money, but had been taken out of the University's base. Secondly, in our efforts to inform ourselves as to who in the Assembly would be cooperative and pressing forward with the use of these dollars as allocated by the Governor, it became apparent that there was a lot of soft support for this. When we went then to the various caucuses - and including the Borough caucuses where one would have imagined we had the strongest support - we discovered that Medgar Evers was not highest on the agenda for these political entities. The rest you now know. The Senate and Assembly, in adopting a budget, reallocated the \$8 million real money, \$13 million in total, that would have gone for supporting Medgar Evers as a four-year institution in the general base of the budget, and in return - I can't say who negotiated this but it was negotiated - in return member items totaling some \$2.2 million were put in the budget for Medgar Evers. In short, we were put in the position in which the Legislature took money out of the Executive Budget, I'm not saying which house or which group approved this. You know, I can surmise and guess, but I never know. They're sitting up there in Albany winking at each other and make their accommodations. They took the \$8 million of real money that the Governor had put in the budget for the conversion of Medgar Evers College and put it into the base of the entire University saying that there were insufficient dollars at this time and insufficient will to give Medgar Evers full State funding. What is there to be said about this? It seems to me that we have gotten further this year than we have gotten in the past. The idea to put \$100,000 in to study the feasibility of, and I don't have the exact language, but we can get it. When I was first approached with this in conjunction with Acting President Corbie, I said - "We've got a choice here: We can take this and assume that they gave us \$100,000 to study the implementation of something that can happen next year, or", it was my inclination to say, "This has now been studied, re-studied, over-studied, we already have a Middle States Association study, we already have a State Education Department study, we don't need another study. Keep your \$100,000. This is a waste of taxpayers' money. Why waste money to do another study to test the efficaciousness of a plan or the likelihood of its being successful when in reality we've done all the studies we can." I was personally prevailed upon by others who said we can't trace whose idea this \$100,000 was. If it was a question of simply saying to the Republicans in the Senate, keep your money, and embarrassing them publicly, that's good for a day and we can feel good. On the other hand, we might be able to use this to make as powerful a case for next year as we can, in order to be able to go back to the proposal again. It's a judgment call. I frankly think, if you ask me who betrayed our enterprise here, I think everybody. I think the Governor put it in probably with the expectation that others would take it out. And others took it out always pointing at each other. I can tell you that among those who have the most investment in this because of their political position or their personal position or their publicly stated moral position, they did not see this as highest on their agenda. And when I spoke to them, people who said - and I am not going to mention names - they said housing was higher, homeless, jobs, other things were higher on their agenda, and they were not going to make this the highest item on their agenda. And they didn't. And so it failed. What is the University to do? I think we made, and this has been incremental, and maybe you've got to be an incredible optimist to believe it, but each year we've made a little more progress. The first year we got nowhere, the second year we got a date, the third year we got money in the budget. We'll try again next year. But that's the University's policy, passed by the Board, and we're going to continue to do it. I have done, I say this I think with a pretty clear conscience, everything I personally have been able to do to advance this. I don't know what else I might be able to do to advance it. If anybody's got suggestions, I'd be happy to hear it. But my gut feeling at this point is that we just simply persevere. And we'll get it. Professor Umolu further stated - "But sir, we had money in the budget last year."/ No you didn't. You didn't have money in the budget for four-year status. What you had, and this is what's been happening. What's been happening is the members sit

down and they lock the door and they divide up the pie. Now the pie this year got divided up among three institutions, very heavily. Members' bills - over two million bucks an institution or thereabouts - Joe has the exact numbers - Kingsborough, Medgar Evers, LaGuardia Community College. Those were the three institutions that walked away with as much in the way of members' items for various enterprises as the amount allocated - in fact more, much more, than the total dollar amount allocated to all the community colleges on the State formula. Now you might ask yourself just exactly who's doing the budgeting for the City University of New York if the State Legislature is going to play this kind of a role. Well, the answer is that members' items have been getting larger and larger, reflecting increasingly the relative power and imbalance in the distribution of power throughout the City and the boroughs. Bronx got virtually nothing in members' items, and they've got two important and large community colleges. So, what is the job of the University? How do we justify having an 80th Street? God knows, plenty of people would like to see it disappear. What we try to do is to create some kind of just distribution of resources after the imbalances are created by the Legislature, And that's what we do. We can't do a thorough job of it, and after all there will be instances in which one particular institution, because it has specialized programs, or a particularly creative or imaginative set of plans for some kind of activity that's been widely supported, will in fact get more money for that kind of activity. And that's as it should be. LaGuardia's a good example of a college that came forward with a proposal for a Middle College High School and it does get more money because it funds those Middle College High Schools. It isn't as though these were presents. These are dollars that are earned for support of particular programs people think are worthwhile and useful. At your institution is a Caribbean Research Center. There is a Center for the Study of Law and Social Justice. There is a Jackie Robinson Sports Center - all of which are supported with members' items. Now you can always ask yourself the question as to whether or not that's the best disposition for the dollars that are available to us. Some of us might like to see more library books instead of a sports center, but different institutions have different values. They get bargained out and negotiated, and that happens to be what the institution pursues - at least one year, and then another year, a different set of values. There are other programs around the University that frankly I don't think to be nearly as important as other things that we might have done had we had the money. I'd like to see more library books, etc. but it depends on what a given institution pursues. And I think what we do is we take what's given to us for the activities that the money was intended, we carry on with that activity, and we go back and ask for more for the other things next year. Professor Umolu further stated - "Thank you very much for the response, but I honestly feel that some of these Centers are siphoning off funds that could be used for other purposes because, as you know, we, in terms of the guidelines, we really have no control over those Centers, they're independent bodies. So I thank you very much for your answer. I appreciate the fact that we have been sacrificed and we'll continue the fight with dignity."/ Thank you.2)Professor Karan (Natural Science, Medgar Evers) - "We have received \$100,000, as you said, we have had already Middle States Evaluation, State Evaluation, you mention maybe we can use this fund to strengthen something. What were you really thinking of when you say about making strong cases with this money?"/ I don't know that I really want to talk about it now, but I guess maybe I ought to. I've talked about the fact that I think we really need to take a good look at community colleges. I don't mean just us. I think community colleges are a major issue around the country. They're being looked at. I talked to Boyer last night, Ernest Boyer, who's head of the Carnegie enterprise that's been studying community colleges around the country. It's been over 40 years now since large numbers of community colleges were established in the States around the country, and there are literally hundreds and hundreds of them. California now has over 104 community colleges I believe, 70 different community college districts. We, of course, have 37 in the State, or something like that, maybe 40. Some states went into the

community college concept in a big way. A lot of things have changed, and these community colleges have not been reexamined. Some, like Medgar Evers, don't fit any kind of recognizable model. It had its baccalaureate programs and it had its A.A. programs, and I don't know if the college has had a chance to figure out just exactly how it wants to distribute its various programs so that it has coherent academic and educational programs. I think some of that might go on as a result of having gotten money to free up some people to take a look at it in a systematic way. My own personal view is that it's time for us to examine the concept of community colleges. We've spent a couple years here going through articulation agreements which, however painstaking, and however slowly, and however arduously, and some of you are witness to it much more than I, have begun to show results. It's not a perfect universe and it's not a windless world and there's lots of back and forth. I think some progress has been made. At least the people who know have been able to tell me, and I've talked to people who seem to believe that some progress has been made. When I compare us to other universities I'm amazed at how much progress has been made, because when you look at Florida or California, Illinois, and other places with community college set-ups you realize how completely alien they are from the main stream of their universities' - their state universities' - life. Nevertheless, what's been happening is that increasingly, there are vocational enterprises in which it is impossible to train somebody in two years. It's even impossible if you don't do anything else. Now, the world has changed, but unfortunately the flexibility of our bureaucratic arrangements don't accommodate, don't change with it. I'd like to see us re-examine some of these programs. I am not, in principle, adverse. I mean some people think it's like breaking the tenth commandment to suggest that a community college be authorized to give a bachelor's degree. Not me. California is a good example in which the State University, not the University of California, but the State college system, are adamantly opposed to community colleges giving bachelor's degrees - with the same passion that the University of California is opposed to Cal State University campuses giving Ph.D.'s. I mean, they've got their class status and no one's giving it up, but of course the community colleges are at the bottom of this hierarchy. Well, I don't think we've got that kind of a system, and I think we could probably begin to increase the amount of flexibility in our University if we had a strong, coherent, logical, reasonable basis for doing that. And maybe some of this \$100,000 can buy that. Maybe what it buys is concentrated effort and time of people who take an interest in it, and over the next year or two would have a chance to re-examine the role and mission of our community colleges and perhaps come back with some new and innovative ways of looking at them. I can foresee, and this sounds terrifically heretical, I suppose, but it's too late for me to begin to get discreet, and especially with Dr. Ellis back, there's no hope at all. I can foresee a time when some of the senior colleges now would begin to offer degrees in certain fields, and some of the community colleges would offer B.A.'s, until we begin to obliterate the distinction. I know, it sounds terribly miscegenous, but then there you are. 3) Professor Greenbaum (History, Queensborough) - "To talk about something that's perfectly mundane - money. The community colleges were once funded by an Ingler formula that was 15:1. It has in stages gone to an Ingler formula that is 22:1. Since it has gone to a formula of 22:1, even in so-called rich years we've been poor. Now is there any chance of our ever being restored to a funding formula that enables us to run community colleges in some fashion that's reasonable?"/ The answer is that if we proceed with the kind of re-examination of our community colleges, that ought to be an important issue. That would be an important issue.

IV. Communications from the Chair: Chair Wedeen said that she did not want to say hello to Jean before because she knew some people were still coming in, with the difficulties with transportation, but that she knew, and would like to say to her for all of the members - we're delighted to see you back here where you belong,

and we hope you stay here, because we need you in every way. (Applause) Dr. Ellis responded: I just want to say how good it is to be back tonight, and also to say a word of thanks to many of you who wrote to me and called the office and inquired about me. I know you've been discouraged from calling me personally because of my sundry problems, but it's good to be here again. One other word. I think one good effect of my being away has been the opportunity for all of you to meet Joanne Bronstein, without whom the Senate could not have survived this period of time. Joanne has been with us, as you all know, for a long period, from 1978 until '83, when she had to leave New York for a while, and then returned to us last year to our great good fortune, but Joanne is really a very stalwart associate in the office and support of the Senate. So I think we all owe a very great vote of thanks to her. Professor Wedeen continued, amen from all of us who work at the office. I will proceed to the agenda item on the community college budget crisis, and ask Vice Chancellor Vivona to speak to us on that now.

V. Budgetary Matters: A. Community College Budget Crisis: Vice Chancellor Vivona greeted the Senate and stated that he would just do two things, and then try to take some questions. First, he said, I'll review the nature of the problem as I see it, and then read a letter from the Mayor to all agency heads regarding the City's budget which affects the community colleges. First, one of the consequences of failing to gain senior college status for Medgar Evers is fiscal relief that potentially would become available for the remaining six community colleges is not an option. That would have been upwards of \$5-6 million of fiscal relief. Second, the way I define the problem is that I add several numbers together, like most budget types. The City has imposed a \$7.7 million cut, that's known as a PEG reduction, Program to Eliminate the Gap. It's a holdover from the City's fiscal crisis 12 years ago. Second, enrollments at the community colleges overall have declined over the last couple of years. That's created two types of funding problems. One - State aid declines, and it has declined in this budget by about \$1.5 million, and also we lose tuition revenue, at \$1225 a full-time student. About \$900,000 is lost there, and we've also lost about \$.5 million in equipment funding. All told, that's a \$10.5 million problem. What we now know with the State budget, although it's not finalized, is that at best we can throw \$3.7 million against that \$10.5 million problem, leaving us with a problem in the \$6-7-8 million range, depending on how the City cuts up the increase in State aid through the various formulas. Usually the City takes half of the increase in State aid to the community colleges. If they do that, the problem is of course a million or two greater than it might be if they allow us to keep the full value of the State aid increase. I don't want to throw too many numbers at you, but overall it's a \$10.5 million problem and at best what we've got to throw against it is \$3.7 million. At worst, I would say \$2.5 million to throw against it at this point. From Ed Koch to the agency heads - for this purpose we are a City agency: "On February 1 the City issued its financial plan for 1988 through 1993 which anticipated a slowdown in economic growth as well as a delay in reduction in sale of the Coliseum site. These and other changes resulted in a projected gap (PEG) of \$758 million, and a retrenchment - that's not to be taken the wrong way, he means general service reductions, not necessarily the way we define retrenchment - which included \$221 million in service reductions and \$150 million in tax increases." Then he complains about the changes that the Legislature made - you may have heard about pension supplementation - well, he blames the Legislature for causing the City to pay an additional \$81 million for pension supplementation for various union agreements. "The Office of Management and Budget is in the final stages of updating their expenditure and revenue forecast for the City. It is clear, however, that the City's basic budget outlook remains unchanged. Needless to say, that's poor. Nonetheless I am committed to implementing the goals I set out in the State of the City message and work is proceeding on implementation of expanding the recycling program in the Department of Sanitation,

and improved bridge maintenance. These programs must be accommodated even if it means raising revenues or reducing programs elsewhere." Bear with me, there's not much more of this, but it's sort of telling. "The preliminary forecast. Most economic forecasters have modified their assumptions about the rate of growth in the Gross National Product." He calls it Project, I guess it is a project. "The forecaster the City uses, Wharton" - I guess from Pennsylvania, they know more about New York than we do - "which had revised its projected rate of growth in GNP down from 3.5% to 2.2%, has increased its expected growth in Gross National Product to 2.5%. This will generate additional revenues." That's what Murphy was talking about earlier. He then goes on to say, however, that "the State's budget process is drawing to a close and while a number of key issues remain unresolved it is virtually certain that the City will not receive \$200 million in State gap-closing aid." That's an assumption that he claims they made in the budget. I believe that claim is correct. "And that gap-closing aid will likely be between \$110 million and \$150 million." That's probably correct as well. He talks a little about public assistance case loads decreasing, but then always having a way to spend money, talks about the explosion in Medicaid. I assume that's related to AIDS. "I believe conservative fiscal practices are the best. I also believe restoring services in the executive budget, only to reduce them again, is the least desirable course of action. Recognizing the economic uncertainties we currently face, I have directed OMB to prepare for my review a list of contingency service restorations that would be presented with the Executive Budget if more resources become available. Let me sum it up for you. There are many people who believe that notwithstanding our econometric model and the national forecasters, we nevertheless will do far better than we had projected in January, and those people do not take into consideration other aspects of our budget, meaning other cuts. If we are off by only 1% in our revenue estimates, we will have overspent our budget by a quarter of a billion dollars. It's a \$25 billion budget." When I read this memo and tried to relate one per cent at being a quarter of a billion dollars, which is the size of the whole community college operation, I checked the math, and the math is correct. One per cent of \$25 billion is \$250 million. So one appreciates why a half a point change in an econometric model might spell serious problems for the City. The Chancellor outlined the fact that we'll be going full force towards trying to get some restorations for the community colleges. What I can report to you is that the community colleges know what their budgets will be if the budget conditions remain as they are now, and it ain't pretty. It's roughly \$1 million a college. The average size of a college budget is about \$30 million. Myself, having gone through pretty severe cuts in the early years of the Reagan administration in human services, while those cuts were more important than the cuts that we'll have to implement, this is the toughest five per cent cut I've ever had to deal with, because it's on the heels of really restrictive community college budgets. These are real cuts. When I say \$10.5 million, I control for collective bargaining, I control for marginal improvements in OTPS. Taking that, what we need to do is the same thing we are currently doing. We will have \$10 million less, or something slightly less than that, unless there's a major budget turnaround. Using the best-case scenario, and suggesting that the overall cut will be \$5 million, at \$8-900,000 a college, or \$7-800,000 a college, that's a rough cut. And I have all the reports, I know what the colleges plan on doing. What my fear is, is that it will in a real sense influence enrollment. We will try to take the students in. The presidents have agreed not to raise questions of access. So, as we say in our budget request, is the open door really a revolving door? I'm not sure about that any more. There's no way, given the effort we've put behind reducing student-faculty ratios at least in the remedial courses, where we've really funded 15 to 1, knowing colleges can't even fund at 19 to 1 because they steal from remediation to fund upper-division, upper-level community college courses. What will happen to those students when it goes from 19 to 22, and they really just determine class size as a function of the size of the room, if this

room were available, we'd have a remedial class of 100. I don't know what will happen. My guess is that we will start losing students. And if you lose students, as the budget group that I'm involved in with the Faculty Senate understands better than I, because they live with it in the colleges every day, the budget hits this downward cycle. You lose enrollment, you lose tuition revenue. You lose enrollment, you lose State aid. Every time we lose a student we lose \$1225 in tuition. Every time we lose a student, in year one State aid is reduced by half the value of the State aid per student, roughly \$700 or \$800 per student. Every time we lose a student we lose \$2000. Every time we lose a thousand students, we lose \$2 million. That math I know is correct. We've lost a few thousand students. So, it's a budget crisis, and that's what I can leave you with. Any questions? There were no questions, and Chair Wedeen said that Vice Chancellor Vivona has been that specific and clear that there are no questions now. The members were overwhelmed, but as was proven to many of them in the meeting with him this morning, he is very accessible and if members do have any specific questions they can give them to the Office and we will give them to Joe, and I am sure he will give us back the answers. Thank you very much.

IV. Communications from the Chair (bis): In order to expedite the evening for our visitors, I went out of order here. So we'll go back to our agenda. Most of the communications are on the back table. However, there are a few items I would like to mention to you now. There will be a meeting this Thursday of the Faculty Governance Heads, as we have had several times before, in order to see to what extent and to try to every extent, to keep the faculties in this University informed, so that no one is out there hanging alone with any problem or any issue. We do not start these meetings with a set agenda other than the agenda items that the members bring in themselves. So that if at any time you feel that something is of vital import to your college and would probably be of interest and importance to other colleges, let the head of your governance unit know, because these members, myself, and any other members of the Executive Committee who wish to come in at that time, are available to go over items and problems of mutual concern. In that vein, we met this morning. When I say we, there was a member from every one of the 19 units met this morning with Vice Chancellor Vivona on issues of budget. About a month ago three members of the Executive Committee met with the Vice Chancellor to sit down and outline the role of the faculty in the budget process. We all know in our own institutions and our own campuses that we've complained and been unhappy for many years, even when we have budget committees on campuses - and those are the campuses where the faculties seem to be more active - that in most cases our role is one where we receive information. On some campuses, the interpretation of consultation is even after the fact, because if you look it up in Webster's Dictionary, consultation can be pre- or post-. And some of us have lived through that. And so the feeling was if the person who is most involved in dealing with the budget really had direct contact with some of the faculty members, perhaps there could be some influence. We in no way feel or believe or want to be in the position where we are giving directives as to what we want included in the budget or to how the priorities should work. However, we feel it would be of import to all of us if we could give advice, if our feelings and our thoughts were known. And it was in that frame of mind that some members of the Executive Committee sat down with Vice Chancellor Vivona and went over possible plans. We therefore decided to hold a meeting this morning. A member from every college was there from the Senate and the Executive Committee was there. We met this morning for close to two hours, during which time Vice Chancellor Vivona gave us an overall rundown as to the budget process, explaining the input he gets from Board members on the Board of Trustees, from Presidents, and assured us that we would become and continue to be one of the groups with which he consults. Consultation only and prior to his drawing up the tentative budget. And therefore we could express ourselves as representative

faculty members of the Senate. Now if those members in this committee wish to discuss budget problems to a greater extent on their own campuses, well that's for the individual member of this committee to bring back to his or her own campus, to bring it up in their governance structure, if there is or is not a budget group there, and for this person to speak with whatever budget committee exists on campus. We are planning our next meeting at the time Vice Chancellor Vivona will start getting the pieces together for the next round of budgets. It will probably be in June. He will try to tighten it up if he at all can, to have it at a time before faculty start disappearing, so that we can all be represented. So that I think this is a very positive first step for us. I think we can play a vital role here. The particulars of this meeting, and where we're going, will be taken up by Professor Picken later on in the agenda. Professor Picken graciously came to me earlier and said please put Vice Chancellor Vivona on before me, though on the agenda he is listed after me, because both people, Chancellor Murphy and Vice Chancellor Vivona have been putting in very long days, and we were anxious to have them, yet give them the courtesy of getting out at a reasonable hour.

The other item I'd like to bring before you now is information concerning the memorial service for Gordon Lea. It will be held this Saturday, April 23, at 2:00 p.m. in the Recital Hall of the Music Building at Lehman College. For your information, and for anyone else's information who you wish to share this with. We are in the process of preparing a memorial fund for Professor Lea. It is not as yet thoroughly organized and therefore I am not giving you all the particulars. However, I will have a letter sent, not only to each of you but to anyone who's been a member of the Senate for the last 12 years. We are planning on having a scholarship. The particulars have not been worked out yet, sponsored through the English Department at Lehman in honor of Professor Lea. However, as soon as we have the particulars as to where to send your checks and how it will be handled, we will be in touch with you. This information will come at a future time.

VI. Reports of Faculty Members of Board of Trustees' Committees: Chair Wedeen noted that these were available in writing on the table at the rear of the room.

V. Budgetary Matters: (bis) B. Report of the Budget Advisory Group: Chair Wedeen asked Professor Picken, who was one of the three people who met with Vice Chancellor Vivona initially to help plan this morning's Budget Advisory Group meeting, and was certainly present this morning, to give the report to the Senate. Professor Picken (Romance Languages, Queens) said that as Professor Wedeen had indicated, for a very long time, ten years at least, possibly 15 years, the Executive Committee has felt that for the faculty to have any meaningful input into the budgetary process, it had to be consulted, it had to make its views known during the planning stages of the budget, not after the budget has been prepared, although it has in the past always seen the budget before it was submitted to the Board. Now the planning stages of the budget begin immediately after the Legislature adopts the budget for the coming year. As you know, the Legislature is about to adopt the '88-'89 budget and so the planning for the '89-'90 budget is beginning right now. As a result of extended negotiations with Vice Chancellor Vivona, the Executive Committee arrived at an agreement whereby the Executive Committee augmented by representatives from each of the colleges which is not represented on the Executive Committee, would meet with him during this planning period to represent the faculty's view on the budget for the coming budget cycle. This morning's meeting was mainly devoted to Vice Chancellor Vivona reviewing precisely what goes into the planning of the budget during this planning stage. He starts with the adopted budget for the coming year, his office then reviews the various fiscal constraints that will be evident in the subsequent year's budget, they review the key statistics, they consult Board members, they consult presidents, and now under the new arrangement, they will listen to

representatives of the University Senate as well. The budget is conceptualized, really, in two parts: University-wide categories of expense, that is money that goes to the Central Office either for disbursement by the Central Office or for allocation to the faculty, and college-specific items. College-specific items are, for instance, things having to do with construction programs on the various campuses, academic programs which are unique to a certain campus, initiatives which take place on one campus or on a few limited campuses. It was the feeling of the Executive Committee, and I believe of Vice Chancellor Vivona, that this Advisory Group would concentrate only on University-wide categories, since we are representatives of the University Senate, which represents the University faculty as a whole, and we would advise our colleagues on the various campuses to work through their governance organizations for the campus-specific items. We had a very frank, far-ranging discussion on a number of items which the faculty feels very strongly about - student/faculty ratio, workload, the fear which has been discussed this evening, the fear of falling enrollment, and our dismay at the fact that the fear of falling enrollment seems to condition all budget decisions in the University. We discussed the equipment budget, and the presidential rejection last year of the possibility of capitalizing a portion of the equipment budget. We discussed temporary services. We discussed the possibility of lump-sum budgeting for released time. We discussed at some length the concept of the FTE and I think emphasized to Vice Chancellor Vivona our very real concern that we have in the classroom, that students are not FTE's, but people, and you may have three people to deal with, but in the end it's only counted as one FTE, and there's something wrong there. As Professor Wedeen indicated, the session went on for some two hours. We plan another session in about a month when the planning sessions actually get underway. I view this as an extremely hopeful sign. I think that in my long experience in the Senate, this is the first time that we have been consulted at the stage of the budgetary process where it really matters. There are undoubtedly any number of procedural matters to be ironed out, but at least we've made a start. Are there any questions? Thank you very much.

VII. New Business: Chair Wedeen said that under "New Business" we have two items that she knew of. One is a brief one from Professor Danziger. Professor Danziger (English, Hunter) said she would just like to remind the Senate of the existence of the CUNY Academy of Humanities and Sciences, which, in fact, is alive and well and is presenting very interesting lectures and symposia and seminars all through the year. This coming Monday, the 25th of April, there's going to be a fascinating lecture by Adolf Grunbaum called "The Scientific Foundations of Psychoanalysis." He is a philosopher who is also interested in psychoanalysis and in physics, and he is the author of The Foundations of Psychoanalysis: A Philosophical Critique, which has been described as monumental and epoch-making. So - 5 o'clock on the 25th of April in the Auditorium of the Graduate School. Professor Baumrin (Philosophy, Graduate School) interjected - May I add something? He's also an absolutely terrific speaker, and you'll not be bored. Professor Danziger resumed and said that in addition, on May 1, the Academy has its semi-annual social in Roosevelt House, which is always absolutely delicious, as well as being great fun socially. This is for members of the Academy and their guests, so if you are a member, do come and bring a guest. If you would like to be a friend of a member, see me, and we'd be delighted if members of the Senate would come. Chair Wedeen said that Professor Gerber asked to speak, too. Professor Gerber (Comparative Literature, Brooklyn) said she was bringing an issue on behalf of the Department of Comparative Literature from Brooklyn College, but an issue she thought had wider ramifications for the entire Senate and for the individual units of CUNY - the prospective dissolution of Brooklyn's Department of Comparative Literature. There have been dissolutions of departments in the past, usually for compelling reasons, and among the compelling reasons have been budgetary reasons. In this

instance, no compelling reasons have been offered, and in fact the budgetary reasons have not even been cited. Presumably the proposed dissolution is to be made as a favor to the Department, and that is to give it greater visibility by having a merger. The Faculty Council of Brooklyn College, she said, has recommended the continuation of the Department as an autonomous unit, and that the Department not be merged with any other. The Department in consultation with the Steering Committee has decided to put before the UFS Executive Committee a proposed resolution for the next meeting of the Faculty Senate, to support a recommendation that the Department not be merged if no compelling reasons are offered. It would be very useful to Brooklyn to have the UFS's endorsement of such a position. Brooklyn's faculty feel that a department ought not to be dissolved casually. There are issues of seniority, and if a department is to be dissolved, even if this is the prerogative of the President, the President still ought to be accountable, and further, the concern ought to be not just of the situation of the department in its own unit, but how this dissolution could also affect the program of Comparative Literature at the Graduate Center. On the basis of the opinions of experts in the field who have been consulted, the recommendation, without exception, is the continued autonomy of the Department. In addition, it is interesting to note that at the very time that the Comparative Literature unit within the Modern Language Association is given a separate status, the President of Brooklyn has chosen to dissolve Comparative Literature as an independent unit. By at least raising some of the issues here, you will at least have been apprised of some of the concerns. Chair Wedeen asked if there were any other items. Professor Baumrin said to move the agenda, and to approve the minutes. Chair Wedeen said that was done earlier when Professor Baumrin was otherwise occupied. Professor Bohigian (Mathematics, John Jay) asked if he might ask 1) if Professor Gerber's concern has been referred to the PSC on campus, and 2) whether the provisions have been put in to maintain seniority? Professor Gerber responded that the Department spoke to Arnold Cantor, Executive Director of the PSC, and his response was that it could only be faculty pressure at this point, because Brooklyn College is unique in having a procedure as a result of its governance plan, where the President can unilaterally, upon consultation, have any kind of structure he chooses. As far as seniority, he said the merged department's faculty would lose their seniority if they were merged in a department where the department title were changed, and the other members of that department would lose their seniority too. Professor Bohigian further said the faculty faced this problem at John Jay, and though he did not know about the uniqueness at Brooklyn, the John Jay Faculty was very careful about recording in the minutes any action taken, the maintenance of seniority within the departments of any transfer. So that option is available...it's not available at Brooklyn? Professor Sohmer (Mathematics, City) said that the State Education Law was ambiguous. Professor Bohigian replied he would still look into it. Professor Plissner (Student Services, Kingsborough) asked what unconvincing reasons the President offered for the merger. Professor Gerber responded that at the time Brooklyn's five-year plan was drawn up, at the time that the core curriculum went into place, many of the liberal arts majors in general, suffered a diminution in enrollment. Comparative Literature has since had a reversal. There is also a problem in that the President does not wish to consider the core course as an introductory course to the discipline. The vote on Brooklyn's Faculty Council was 39 to 17 in support of continued autonomy, because Master Planning did not find the reasons compelling. Professor Plissner further said he felt confident that the Department would have the support of the Senate. But, he added, it might help because of the shortness of time if some sort of statement went out to the membership so that it could be brought back to the campus. Professor Sohmer said that unfortunately, several years ago because of mergers, several Senators had to check through the State Education Law, and the law is clear. One cannot, by resolution of the Board, preserve seniority, the resolution of anybody. It changes, at the

City University or any place covered by the State Education Law. Professor Wedeen said she thought this question should be referred to the UFS Legal Affairs Committee. Professor Baumrin noted that the way the State Education Act reads is that one holds tenure and seniority in his/her unit. The Board of Higher Education and now the Board of Trustees interprets that to mean the department. It can be interpreted as meaning one's institution, and where it's interpreted as being in the institution, seniority and tenure would be in terms of the whole college. The Legal Affairs Committee has looked into this, this is what it found, this is what it decided, if one is very careful, one winds up having institutional tenure and seniority. If not - and most CUNY institutions are not very careful because they've left things up to their administration and to the legal department of the Board of Trustees, one winds up having tenure in your department. Professor Galub (Social Science, Bronx) said that as the chair of the UFS Legal Affairs Committee he thought there was some ambiguity. The Committee had not looked at this problem since retrenchment times. If the Executive Committee wished, it will re-examine the issue and come back with some kind of answer. Chair Wedeen asked if there were any other items under New Business? Professor Davidson (Computer Information Services, LaGuardia) said he had a point of personal privilege. He would like to thank all of those who called him and sent him get-well cards during his recent hospital incarceration and subsequent getting better at home, and again, wished to thank all personally.

The meeting was then adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Jean Ellis
Executive Director