

**MINUTES OF THE THREE HUNDRED AND FIFTY THIRD PLENARY SESSION
OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK**

October 19, 2010

The meeting was called to order by UFS Chair Cooper at 6:00 p.m. in Rooms 9204/05/06 at the Graduate Center. Eighty-five of 116 voting members were present.

Baruch: Present – Bazzoni, Ellis, Hill, Martell, Wine, and Wymbs. Absent – Myers, Remler, and Nematollahy. **BMCC:** Present – Conway, d’Erizans, Friedman, Genis, Martinez-Lopez, Persaud, Soto, and Alternate Vozick. Absent: Samuel. **Bronx CC:** Present – Skinner. Absent – Bandar, Ismail, and Prabhu. **Brooklyn:** Present – Cirasella, Florence, Jacobson, Massood, Viscusi and Alternate Winslow. Absent – Bank-Munoz, Dexter, Magliozzo, Morrill, and Wills. **CCNY:** Present – Brass, Crain, Dalglish, Lascar, and Alternate Kalia. Absent – Jablonsky, Khanbilvardi, Kiely, Raj, Rinard, and Watkins. **CSI:** Present – Batson, Cooper, Klibaner, Talarico, Yousef, and Zimmerman. **CUNY Law School:** Present – None. Absent – Burton and Goldscheid. **Graduate School:** Present – Aguirre-Molina, Albrecht, Baumrin, Burke, Philipp, and Alternate Vora. Absent -- Weinstein. **Hostos CC:** Present – Pimentel, Sharma, and Alternates August and Hubner. Absent – Ovtcharenko. **Hunter:** Present – Baumann, DeMeo, and Kuhn-Osius. Absent – Ancona, Grossman, Guzzetta, Kaye, Spark, and Strayer. **John Jay:** Present – Crossman, Katz, and Alternates Benton and Tovar. Absent: Browne-Marshall, Dunham, Kaplowitz, King-Toler, and Kubic. **Kingsborough CC:** Present – Arliss, Barnhart, Hume, Ruoff, Stubin, Wood, and Alternate Cowan. **LaGuardia CC:** Present – Berke, Kurzyna, McCormick, Mettler, Richmond and Alternate Lerman. Absent: Shean. **Lehman:** Present – Alexanderson, Carey, Maybee, and Alternate Silverman. Absent – Larimer, Jervis, and Marianetti. **Medgar Evers:** Present – Reid. Absent – Stewart and Withers. **NYCCT:** Present – Cermele, Gelman, Hounion, and Richardson. Absent: Woytowich. **Queens:** Present – Brody, Moore, Savage and Zevin. Absent – Gonzalez. **Queensborough CC:** Present – Barbanel, Borrachero, Pecorino, Tai, Volchok, and Alternate Meltzer. **York:** Present – Hughes, Klein, Lewis, and Rosenthal. Absent –Corkery.

Governance Leaders present: Brody (Queens), Burke (GC), Hume (Kingsborough), Jacobson (Brooklyn), Martell (Baruch), Parides (NYCCT), Philipp (Lehman), and Tai (QCC) attended. PSC Liaison: Bowen attended.

Chancellor Goldstein attended. Executive Director Phipps, Administrative Assistant Pasela, and Secretary Blanchard were also present.

Guests: Reuben Blundell (Hunter), Dina Dahbany-Miraglia (QCC), Jason Young (Hunter), Barbara Bowen (PSC), Steven London (PSC) and Dennis Bakewicz (NYCCT) were guests of the plenary.

- I. Approval of the Agenda – The agenda was adopted as proposed.
- II. Approval of the Minutes of September 21, 2010 – The minutes were adopted as proposed.
- III. Reports (Recorded in Reports & Deliberations)
 - A. Chair
- IV. Invited Guest, Chancellor Matthew Goldstein (Recorded in Reports & Deliberations)
- V. Old Business –There was none.
- VI. New Business

A. Presentation of how to access the Chancellor/University Reports Online – Senator Manfred Philipp demonstrated how to log into the CUNY portal to view the personnel and academic actions that campuses send every month or two to the Board of Trustees for formal

approval. Faculty were urged to check the Reports before each Board meeting to ensure that their governance bodies had processed all of the items under their jurisdiction.

B. Resolutions on the CUNY Compact – The resolution was moved by Vice Chair Terrence Martell and seconded. There was a long comment period on the floor that is recorded in the Reports & Deliberations section. Senator Robert Cermele then made a motion to postpone a vote until next month. After further discussion, the motion to postpone was adopted.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

William Phipps
Executive Director

.....

REPORTS AND DELIBERATIONS
OF THE 353rd PLENARY SESSION
OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

October 19, 2010

Chair Cooper – May I have a motion for approval of the agenda? It is approved. May I have a motion for approval of the minutes? They are approved. The Chancellor... please come up.

Chancellor Goldstein – It’s good to see you all. Thank you for changing your schedule to let me speak. I have about half an hour, and I must leave. I want to give you a sense of the terrain of last year, and what I envisage we are going to be facing as a University over the next year or two. Unfortunately, my remarks won’t allow for questions. It’s not that I want to avoid it; in fact, I enjoy that more than my remarks, but I must run to another event where I’ll be speaking.

Last year, I got a call from the Division of the Budget, which is an entity of the State of New York that basically deals with all of the financial resources of the agencies that comprise the State of New York. He wanted to share with me a new platform for supporting SUNY and CUNY, and it had a very lofty title to the effect of The Empowerment and Innovations Program for Public Higher Education. I listened politely and wanted to be appropriately supportive, but I cautioned the head of the Division of the Budget, including the Governor and others who were promoting this, that while I very much supported some of the precepts that developed into this particular program, that I saw some very serious problems with it. So let me very briefly describe what the Governor was proposing. This was very strongly supported by the new Chancellor of SUNY, Nancy Zimpher. It was basically a program of revenue generation by students, and lifting some of the regulatory practices that both SUNY and CUNY have felt burdened by for many years. The revenue component of the program was essentially to devolve authority from the State Legislature to the individual governing boards of both universities. I thought that was a good thing, but I said to him it’s not going to happen. Nobody wants to say no to acquiring authority to do something, especially if you believe in what your position is, but I felt that it was naïve to expect that the State Legislature would relinquish their “skin in the game” with respect to tuition policy. Essentially that was the first component, to give the

authority to SUNY and CUNY to raise their tuition. They were using language I have used for some time basically to give the authority to both these universities to raise tuition in this particular case up to about 10% a year. They were using a very simplistic model of a four year average of the Higher Education Price Index (HEPI) as a basis on which to create a multiplier, and then come up with a maximum tuition increase. When the multiplier was put into effect and you used a four year weighted average you come up to a ceiling of about 10%. There was no particular time frame under which this particular model would sunset. I had a problem with that as well, because I felt that tuition increases of that magnitude and aggressiveness would very quickly undermine our students who relative to SUNY are much more economically challenged. So I expressed deep concern about that as well. What I didn't see in the Empowerment Program was any commitment from the State to maintain our level of mandatory costs, which was very fundamental to the algorithm that I presented actually to this body several years ago, and which served us very well as an investment vehicle.

The one area I was deeply concerned about other than this was that in order for us to have tuition increases, and this is going to be one of the primary parts of our legislative agenda this year, we have to for the first time positively correlate tuition increases with the TAP program. The Tuition Assistance Program needs to be either indexed or positively correlated in some way with tuition increases to ensure that the students who are most vulnerable among us are protected. That was nowhere to be found in this particular program. And lastly, the idea that the State would transfer risk from the State to the students, I thought was wrong and not well thought out. But there were seeds in this program that needed to have a discussion, especially around regulatory relief and a rational policy for creating tuition increases. I have talked about a rational program for tuition increases since the day I walked into this University as Chancellor. We have had a theme that has threaded through this University for too long that basically says when the State has a weak balance sheet, the State looks to both SUNY and CUNY to come forward with a very steep tuition increase. So if you look at the history of tuition increases, it's a spike function or step function whereby tuition could be level for a number of years and as soon as the problem in the State were to manifest itself, there would be a huge tuition increase. It's probably the most regressive way of creating tuition, but it is somewhat ubiquitous around the country, and it really has to stop. I've been pounding away at this problem for a long time.

Let me give you the themes we will be creating, and they are not new but they are going to be reshaped a bit as we go forward with our legislative agenda, and indicate to you that we are coming into some very rough waters. I was just on a call with the Division of the Budget last week, and although we haven't finalized all the dollars here, we are going to get another \$14.25 million cut to our senior colleges on top of the \$85 million cut that we have already endured this year, bringing our overall cut to \$100 million, and it's not going to end. We are in very serious trouble, and it is not we alone in New York State but across the United States. Public higher education is in trouble in terms of creating the necessary financial base for these universities to move forward, so much so that I have invited to New York 25 of the leading heads of the top public universities in the U.S. to a 2 day summit. I did this in 2008, and we're doing it again, at the Journalism School and at the New York Times building. I will be leading a panel about reimagining the financing of public higher education because we cannot continue on the same road. If you want to have a mediocre university, with very little investment, if you don't really believe you need to constantly refresh and expand your base, then I guess we could limp through it, but that is not fair to our students or to the extraordinary faculties that we've been able to recruit to this University for quite some time.

So we are facing serious financial problems, and we could talk about the reasons for this. I told the Council of Presidents as early as 2007, and the Board of Trustees as early as 2007, that there

were serious storm clouds -- I apologize for the vapid metaphor, but that storm clouds were gathering. We started to see this in the financial services world very quickly, and it has hit with a vengeance and we're not out of this yet, although I think New York City is starting to show signs that recovery is well on its way, but way ahead of the rest of New York State. Commercial real estate is starting to percolate here, certainly the financial services industry is starting to hire to invest, but until we see companies in the State making investments in people and in materials, and people are put back to work, we are still going to be limping through a very difficult time. For those that believe there is going to be new stimulus money of significance, get over it. It's not going to happen. Whoever wants to tell you this is not informed. I would say there may be obviously some help by the federal government, but the states collectively have very weak balance sheets, and it's going to take a while for us to get out of the situation we are in.

In about 2004, I started talking about the idea of the CUNY Compact, which to me was a fresh way of imagining how to support public higher education in a way that was different from what we have experienced here in New York before. When Eliot Spitzer was governor, I worked closely with him and people in his administration to tell them that we must have a commission on public higher education. We expanded it to private higher education as well to really talk about the importance of higher education in the State. He took that advice, and we did have a commission. SUNY participated, and they embraced this idea of the Compact, and so did the Commission, and it was unanimously reported out. The investments we have made over the past few years have been directly related to rethinking not only our operating budget but the components that would make the operating budget more robust than it is today.

Let me describe to you what the Compact is. I don't care what moniker you use. To me it's the components of the ideas about financing public higher education that is important. The ACE, when they looked into this a few years ago, said it was innovative, creative, and should become a model for other state universities. Indeed, we are starting to see many of the people who are invited to the November summit to be embracing these principles as well. The idea is simple. When I came in as Chancellor, I think we were raising about \$40 million a year at best in philanthropic largesse to the University. That is appallingly low for a University of this size and complexity and reputation. Very quickly, it occurred to me and others, I'm sure, that we had to start behaving in a way to increase the roads where revenue would travel down in order to give us the ability to make investments in the University. We were basically a two-featured game here at this University. We got money from the State and City, and we charged tuition, and that was it, and we washed our hands of everything else. You can't operate in the complex and competitive world we are in today doing just that. So the idea of the Compact was to start identifying stakeholders that should be involved in helping to create a vibrant University, where we would be able to have the income needed to make the investments that we could create more faculty positions, provide more opportunities for academic support services, work with matching programs to capitalize the construction of new facilities in the University, equip our laboratories with the most modern instrumentation we can get so our faculties and students can work on the leading edge of science – what any university would do to provide academic supports for students both in terms of scholarships and other supports to help them maintain their matriculation and to maximize the likelihood they will succeed when they enter the University and leave with a degree. To me, hearing people saying it's not important that they get a degree is nonsense. A degree matters, and we need to do everything we can so when students come in, they graduate. With those principles in mind, the Compact envisages the following components in order for us to get the kind of investment that we need.

Philanthropy obviously has to be a part, and I've mentioned that already. We now are raising between \$150-200 million a year. That's a pretty good jump from \$40 million. It's much too

low, and we are working very hard. The presidents that I've recruited, and the Board that has approved the recommendations, are men and women who understand that part of their job is to generate revenue to support their campuses. Today yet again I got a call about another \$3 million gift that has come in which is terrific, and I get these calls on a regular basis. The culture of the University is changing, and it should have changed a long time ago as did Michigan and Virginia and some of the campuses of the University of California, Texas, Georgia, Tennessee, Florida, some of the states that have premier public universities. They've been in this business for a long time. We unfortunately were not.

The second component of the Compact is to say that the State has an obligation. The State has an obligation from where I sit in two major areas. Putting aside our capital needs, which are a different mechanism than our operating revenue, the State of New York needs to protect the basic core that the University has. It would be wonderful if the State made investments above the core, but if you start eating into the seed corn you start to get into trouble, and we have seen this in the past. We've had collective bargaining increases that some years were not fully embraced in terms of the economics, and the University had to absorb on the margin. Those days hopefully are over, but we will see. So the idea of maintaining mandatory costs is critically important. That is part of the Compact. We say to the State of New York, fund our mandatory costs.

Tuition. I believe we have to have a rational policy for charging students tuition. To have a flat line that goes on for three or four years, and then a spike where we have seen rather sizeable increases, where as a result of that an outmigration of students because they cannot afford to pay the bill, I think is outrageous. So in our platform for the Compact is to develop a mechanism where the tuition assistance program moves in consort with tuition increases. We have a problem with that because the State is going to push back, but we must force the issue. I have no problem with tuition increases provided the most vulnerable among us are protected. The only way we can protect those students is to ensure that TAP and the Pell Grant Program are held in a robust way to provide the support to the students that need it. We will continue to do that. It's a very fundamental component of what we are going to be lobbying for. The idea is to spread risk, not to have risk situated in one or two stakeholders in the University, but to spread that risk and to do business in ways that we haven't done before.

Our productivity areas have blossomed and have generated multiple millions of dollars each year, where we have had smarter business practices, and reshaped those dollars back into the operating budget. The reason we have been able to hire as many faculty as we have has been, not because we got any investment – a few million dollars one year, and a couple of million the next year – but we have been able to do the hiring above where we started in about 2000 because we have implemented these ideas of business practices in ways that we could reshape the budget to do the things that all of us held very dear. When I started, I think we had about 5400 full-time faculty, and we now have about 7100 or 7200 full-time faculty, and that is in addition to all of the people who have left the University for retirement and been replaced.

We are going to continue down that line. We will do it through this idea of the Compact. It is something that we're starting to see real traction with, and this year I had to be very delicate by not standing up and saying part of what is being suggested, I think the intentions were honorable, but not thought out to the complexity that they needed to be thought through in order to generate the kind of support that we need. We probably will be seeing further cuts, and I believe we will be able to manage these cuts, but we cannot do this without additional revenue.

So let me talk a little bit about that component. We created three working groups three or four years ago in anticipation of the problems that we are experiencing now. We are well ahead of the curve, and in November I'm going to be coming in with spending reduction plans that will preserve jobs and also to operate more efficiently than we have before. I will be coming in with a tuition proposal, and we are discussing what the level of that proposal will be because we have to have it. I am going to stay away, and I used these words very strongly when I was in the Executive Committee, I am unalterably opposed to retrenchment. I think it has been a poorly thought out tool to deal with problems of an extreme fiscal nature. Retrenchment in this University has basically eaten our seed corn, and I'm not going to do it. We have hired fabulous people to this University. Many of them are new to the professoriate, and I'm not going to sacrifice those extraordinary people for the future of this University. This University is going to need these young faculty. Now, we are going to find a way to do this if we can without retrenchment. I will do everything in my power, and I don't think we will need to retrench based on the numbers that we have. But I am not a seer beyond a reasonable period of time. I don't know how fast the economy of the State is going to be turned about. We've had numerous discussions with the leading people who I hope will aspire when the voters are heard in November. I believe they get it. They understand it. We have relationships that go back a long time. So I am saddened that the momentum we have created at this University probably will be slowed down a bit, but I'm not going to be in a position to really dismantle so much of the great things that all of you have helped in creating. For me, that is a non-starter.

So we are going to need your support. We're going to need you to understand that people who tell you there's going to be money coming in from this source and that source, to me it's not going to happen. I always try to be straight, and I don't try to create palliatives and make people feel good and create expectations that I don't believe are going to happen. We have real problems in this University and in the State of New York, and it's going to take serious people to solve these problems, not people who will try to convince that we can manage, we've helped before. We're going to do all of that, but the realities are that this State has had a spending frenzy as so many other states have had, and many of them are very good things and we should try to continue to support as much as we can, but we also have to be smart about how we go forward, and we have to be truthful, and not create expectations that we know have a very small likelihood of succeeding. So with that I have to stop. Thank you for the invitation, and in November we will outline a plan for going forward. The Senate is intimately involved in these working groups now, which is a pledge that I made to help us think through how we create some expenditure reductions, and I look forward working with this group as we go forward. Thank you very much.

Chair Cooper—As you know, the Chancellor is usually perfectly happy to take questions, but he has a major reception at the Library tonight to go to. He agreed to go to that event late to come here at our request. I would like to make a few comments. This is a bit belated, but last spring at the end of Manfred Philipp's term we voted a big thank you to him but until now he hasn't had it framed yet but here it is. Professor Philipp—Thanks again to all of you for your help while I was chair. I ask you to support our new Chair in every way you possibly can. Chair Cooper – The list of activities that I have engaged in on your behalf is in the back. This morning at the bookstore of John Jay College, the University, organized by Jay Hershenson, kicked off the CUNY Votes Campaign, which has gotten a certain amount of press, and I'm told it's on YouTube. The president of Barnes & Noble and of Follett, the other company that provides books for our students, is giving a 25% discount on apparel. We're trying to get them to include books in that. Students will wear their colors to the polls, and also the CUNY Votes initiative pushed the idea of students working as poll workers, for which they get \$300 a day. Don't forget this, and if you see any hungry-looking students, there is a website they can go on. The kids

came from all over the place to this event, and it was really quite exciting. Hopefully at the next plenary on the 16th of November we will have Senator Toby Stavisky, the senator in Albany in charge of the Committee on Higher Education. If the State Senate remains in Democratic hands, she will remain head of Higher Education. So far she has been extremely supportive and forthcoming, and I do hope she can come but at the last minute these people get called to meetings. Make sure you come with questions. This is the first time in years that the Senate has had a Democratic chair of that Committee, and this should make it a little easier for us to go forward. Finally, I have been closely in touch with the Chair of the University Faculty Senate of SUNY. Yesterday we had a meeting in New York to discuss some of the issues. It is absolutely the case this year that we are better off than they are. Exactly how long this will last, of course, nobody knows. We spent some time talking about the drastic situation in Albany at one of their flagship campuses, where after \$40 million dollars in cuts in a couple of years they are closing six departments. The faculty have two years in French, Italian, German, Russian, Theater, and Classics. This is in a doctoral granting institution. There are six other senior colleges that are engaged in various stages of retrenchment plans. It wasn't a very cheerful meeting. I provided him with information about our situation in the past because as a result of the way in which retrenchment was conducted in 75 and 76, CUNY was censured by the AAUP. To lift that censure, we negotiated an arrangement that requires the University and the college presidents to follow certain steps in the event it ever happens. As the Chancellor has just said, he is opposed to it. He also said he could not predict the future. That's pretty much the way we all are, opposed but unable to predict. The SUNY faculty leadership was happy to see our system because they had none. So each time they are faced with these major cuts, there is a scramble to figure out what to do next. I circulated these Guidelines a few weeks ago to your Governance Leaders, not to scare anybody but to prepare and education in the event we face an issue and you don't know what your rights are. The object was not to terrify, or undermine, or say that I know something you don't know. I don't. But I just don't like the idea of having to play catch-up at the last minute. I apologize to anyone who got scared! One last announcement: on the 4th of February the UFS conference will be on the subject of higher education in the prisons. We have a number of faculty who are interested in restoring practices that we once were able to engage in, I think before Governor Pataki cancelled it, providing community college and baccalaureate degrees to prisoners. We were once very active in that area, but it has been pretty much suspended. There are some programs that still exist at Queensborough and John Jay. We have a conference that's being planned that looks very exciting. We are bringing in people who have a lot of knowledge about this. We also have a committee of faculty, and if you are interested you can speak with Manfred, who are working on this whole subject of what we can do. Under the current budget situation, it would clearly be folly to propose a new program, so one of the things we will try to do is enlist support from foundations. This is a matter of preventive medicine. Rather than sending people out from prison with no possibility of performing in the society, the idea is to give them some chance while they are locked up to learn something that might turn their lives around. It might not. We had some good success with this in the past, 15 or 20 years ago, and it was always to me personally a disaster that it was cancelled. Is there any Old Business? For New Business, Manfred is going to offer us a presentation of something that is extremely important for all of us to have, especially those of you who are Governance Leaders. Every so often the UFS office gets frantic phone calls from one or another college, saying our president has put something in the Chancellor's Reports, and we don't know what is going on, or there is a new appointment being made that didn't get approved, and so on. It's very easy if you know how to use the Internet to access the University and Chancellor Reports and all the other University reports online, so you don't have to have the UFS office scrambling to play catch up when it's almost too late. The Chancellor's and University reports contain new hires and the establishment of new curricula. We attempt if we find something suspicious to alert you to it, but we don't always. [Summary instructions will be circulated shortly.]

Chair Cooper – The second item of New Business is a resolution that the Executive Committee has accepted as a recommendation from the Budget Advisory Committee, a committee we appoint who are expert in public financing of the University and who have worked very closely with the Vice Chancellors in charge of finance for many years. The Budget Advisory Committee may well be one of the UFS’ most successful long-range activities. Over the years, I think we have become respected partners with the University central administration, at least in the issue of presenting what faculty consider important for the pursuit of educational objectives. The Budget Advisory Committee has spent long hours agonizing over the numbers and the problems that were presenting by the Chancellor and that you have been listening to for months now, especially last month when we had two officials from 80th Street. To reach the conclusion that they reached and that the Executive Committee accepted, although not unanimously, was not easy. It wasn’t something we enjoyed doing. We were suspicious. We certainly didn’t race the way the SUNY Faculty Senate did last spring to embrace PHEEIA, which they are now retracting and they are more interested in our approach. We did not take a position on this mess that we are dealing with until we finally concluded that the faculty in this University have got to say something, albeit agonizing.

The resolution on the Compact does *not* endorse PHEEIA. I repeat, it is not an endorsement of PHEEIA, and I am convinced the Chancellor does not support it either. I really believe that. This presentation of his today was not his first on this. He stated that very clearly in public in September at the Fiscal Affairs Committee, and he did in fact communicate that to State officials. The resolution asks the Senate to call upon the State Legislature and Executive to fully fund the Compact, not simply produce a tuition increase and keep the money. Nor to produce a tuition increase, and then cut their mandatory obligations. Whether they have done that in the past, perhaps, perhaps not. It varies with the year and the economic circumstances. Sometimes we’ve been looked upon, as someone said to me, as a cash cow, and other times they have not done that. And, the resolution asks for endorsement by the Legislature to permit the Trustees to set tuition. I’m not at all sure that can happen, but it is certainly something that the central administration I think will go forth and ask whether we support it or not. We are aware of the fact that there will be a special meeting in November of the board’s Fiscal Affairs Committee, and Terry Martell, who is sitting next to me, is our voting member on that committee. And the Chancellor plans to present to the Board at that point with a financial project that in his view will get us through the next year or so. By that time the results of the November election will be in. All we have now is indications, hints, polls, and from my point of view a lot of very bad news from all around the country. I’m not even so thrilled about the possibility of the State since the leading candidate for governor has promised a 20% cut in State agencies. Although we are not a State agency, I’m not sure that minor detail will escape his knife. In any case, given what looks like an immensely gloomy future, we have with a certain amount of pain suggested that you take this seriously.

I am aware of the fact that it appears to contradict what the PSC has wanted. I don’t like the fact that we are not standing behind each other on this, although I’m sure that when we get to any public space up in Albany we will fight with each other there. The truth is that this is not something, at least from my point of view, that I enjoyed doing. Escaping to another country seems extremely tempting! I’d like to ask the Vice Chair of the Senate, who is going to be sitting on the Board Fiscal Affairs Committee, to see if he would like to make any comments. Then people who have remarks, line up at the mics. Obviously, this is a public meeting, and anyone who wishes to speak comes to the mic and I have to get permission of the body for that to happen.

Professor Martell – I don't want to repeat what the Chair said, nor do I want to repeat what the Chancellor said. In your packet, distributed electronically, is the resolution we wish you to act upon. The explanation is also included. The reality is the senior colleges have taken \$220 million in cuts since 2009, and the expectation we have for fiscal budgets is a State deficit of \$8.2 billion for FY 2012, \$13.5 billion for FY 2013, and \$15.6 billion for FY 2014. It's clear that the ability to support public higher education is eroded in the current economic climate. Consequently, the Compact, which calls for a balance among cost savings, philanthropy, and consistent but modest tuition increases seems to be the way to go. No faculty that I know is in favor of tuition increases, but the reality is that if we fail to get some tuition increase we are going to have an even bigger fiscal problem to deal with. I know the situation at Baruch. It's grim. Any additional cuts will come out of muscle and bone. The fat is gone. No one wants to have to support something that will include a tuition increase, but without it I fear for the future of the University, and for our ability to deliver a quality program. Unfortunately, I also fear for some of our positions.

Chair Cooper—I'd like to add that when the Chancellor mentioned his three task forces concerned with reviewing the entire CUNY operation to see where cost savings could be achieved, I have successfully persuaded the people running those things to accept faculty appointments on them. You can be sure that the senators who will be on those task forces will do their very best to defend as much as they can. But there are going to be programs that disappear. By programs I don't necessarily mean English majors, or anything like that. But the University is engaged in a great many activities that are not directly and immediately in the classroom. It also has physical property in parts of the City. We may see rather drastic selloffs and cutbacks. First and foremost, they will obviously not be in the core academic mission, but there will be "stuff." I have a vague idea but not enough evidence to talk about anything yet. Things are being kicked around. We have faculty on those task forces – Terry, for example, is on the one concerned with reducing operations expenses. Ned Benton is going to be on the one concerned with physical assets. The third is not really functioning yet, but it's the one I have my eye on, and that's the one in which the Vice Chancellor for Legal Affairs is looking at ways that the bylaws can be changed. We have a couple of tough lawyers on that one, but that may end up being the one that troubles us most. I say these things to try to assure you that none of us are galloping into this thing with arms open embracing it enthusiastically.

Professor Crain—This resolution is very bad for students, for student access, and for the mission of the University. It's a real violation of the mission of the University, which puts student access first and requires an affordable University. To give the Board of Trustees the power to raise tuition without a brake provided by the Legislature is extremely bad as an idea. To say there is no fat – we've just heard that there is administrative fat all over the place. That's just wrong, and it doesn't even mention the fat at CUNY Central, all the people who we don't even know what they are doing who are making high salaries, which keep going up and administration keeps going up. A better resolution would ask for things that are student friendly like part-time TAP. To say as the Chancellor does that TAP ought to correlate with tuition ignores the huge number of students who can't even afford to go the college full-time and need to go part-time. A better resolution would ask for an examination of TAP which provides a lot of service to the private colleges right now for families making up to about \$80,000 a year. So this resolution is not student friendly and endangers our mission, and I urge the body to vote against it.

Professor Barnhart—I respectfully disagree with Bill, and I strongly urge the body to support this. If you maintain the status quo you are actually guaranteed to hurt students a great deal more than if you were actually able to implement the Compact. I do have a question of clarification: I'm rather unsure what CUNY plans to do in regard to this measure in Albany. I know this is

going before the Board of Trustees. I'm not sure what the game plan is beyond that point. Professor Martell—Anticipating that issue, I called the Associate Vice Chancellor Matt Sapienza and asked him what was the plan going forward. He said the plan is to put a Compact-like budget proposal in front of the Board and, assuming it is approved, before the Legislature.

Professor Philipp—I think CUNY's overall mission is an important question here. That historical mission to accept everybody to the community colleges was broken for the first time this year. We did not admit all high school graduates to CUNY's community colleges. There was a simple reason: we didn't have the money. We have an historical mission. We have to admit them all. But the fact is that we didn't even have enough money to hire the adjuncts to do that, let alone full-timers. I know it's true that there has to be a reduction in administrative expenses in this University. But I don't think that would be enough. Going into the future of State budget cuts which will hit the senior colleges – it's true they will not hit the community colleges because they are dependent on the City not the State – but it's the community colleges that have violated our mandate even though the City is more flush than the State. That's unique. Sitting on BAC as I do and as a former Chair of this body, I've had a lot of interaction with the financial officers of this University, particularly Marc Shaw and Matt Sapienza. I have enormous respect for their ability to hold this place together in a period when otherwise everything is falling apart. As you noticed, in spite of the fact that we've absorbed hundreds of millions in cuts, nobody has been fired from the faculty. We are going on as if everything were normal. Frankly I don't see how they manage to do that. It is a brilliant job that they are doing, but nonetheless they are now telling us in BAC quite frankly that their methods have run out. They cannot continue to hold it together with continued cuts. Yes, it's true, the example of what is happening in Albany does not apply to the community colleges, but it does apply to the senior colleges. I think we all ought to hold together. Is the Compact a good thing? Well, it's a thing that the managers who have held us together so far are saying that we have to do. Is it politically risky and dangerous? Yes, it is, because the legislators we are relying to fund this place have not been funding us in a way that allows us to hire full-time faculty. They have simply failed. At the same time, many of them are saying no, don't get money from another revenue source, but we don't seem to be getting the money that we need now. We are in trouble. And the people who have done such an outstanding job holding us together are saying we have to do this now. That's why I'm in favor of it.

Professor Pimentel—I appreciate the good intentions. We all have the same concerns, and I really appreciate your good intentions. We agree that we have to do something, and that it is serious. But I don't favor giving carte blanche to the Chancellor and the administration for this kind of decision. It's quite risky. The way this solution is formulated, we should not support it. Why is their nothing in the resolution about the way CUNY has been treated? We can't send the wrong message to Albany. If we can work out a different resolution with some balance there, I might consider it. But now it is unacceptable. I call on my colleagues here to oppose the resolution the way it is now written.

Professor Vozick—I have 30 plus years experience at CUNY. I've served as an administrator in community programs, as an administrator in continuing education, as a full-timer substitute for two years, and as an adjunct for many years. I've seen these problems from many points of view. I'm a strong student advocate. I also have nearly 50 years of experience in higher education reform. I've spent my whole life in this field. I think we are coming up into a major change in the profession. I don't have control of it. I don't want it. I don't not want it either. I think it's forced on us. It has to do with what sustainability requires, and as they say on the street it's Big Time. If we are far-seeing academics we have to prepare ourselves for it. There is an inching away from support for the students, as Manfred indicated, over the last decade under this

tremendously powerful logic of the Compact. But it's like the frog in the water, you inch away from the students and at some point it breaks. The true strength of this University, the true power that we have to sustain the work we are doing, comes not from the immediate behavior of the Legislature around us, even though we have to respond to that and it's what is conditioning everything today, it comes from our link to the students and the communities that we are serving. Anyone who knows anything about the sociology of what we are doing has written that and said that. Public higher education is either sustained by the people or not sustained by them. In my opinion, this resolution is moving in the wrong direction. In some people's minds, it may be a necessary first step to try to preserve what we have, but in the long range we have to think through a much deeper and wiser understand of our relationship with our base and a way of approaching the Legislature that as risky as it may be really fulfills our mission.

Professor Kalia—I think what is being passed in this resolution is a doctrine of necessity. Manfred basically articulated that idea. I am uncomfortable with anything that passes under the doctrine of necessity. It is always to some extent suspect. But let us for the sake of argument interview what the Chancellor said. He is projecting a deficit of about \$100 million. To what extent the tuition increases will make up that \$100 million, we have no idea and no one has given any figures here. We are being asked to vote on a resolution which is bereft of any numbers. In principle I agree that radical tuition increases that the Chancellor was pointing out are unhealthy for our State, our system, and our students. If there was to be some mechanism developed at some point where there would be incremental increases in tuition, I can understand that. But to impose those tuition increases at a time when the country as a whole is going through difficult economic times and when students themselves are struggling to afford college or books, I think this is the wrong time to do it. I think the union does have a good point, the alternative that they are suggesting. I think our problem has to be looked at in the national context. If you do that, the President has emphasized on several occasions about declining academic standards in this country. He recently concluded a community college conference in the White House. Many other initiatives have been done. If in Detroit major corporations and companies on Wall Street can be salvaged, I'm certainly confident that the President would be more than happy to support a very important area on which the very foundations and the future of the country depends. To undermine this and to cheat the next generation of students would be a travesty, and not only a violation of our historic mission but I think a violation of our own potential future.

Chair Cooper—We need permission for a guest to speak. Any objections? Professor Barbara Bowen—From Queens College and the Graduate Center, and President of the Professional Staff Congress, and I think I'm an ex officio member of this body. I wanted to thank Sandi especially for what she said in the beginning and her recognition of the importance of working together. In fact, I think we have, since Sandi has been Chair and as Manfred was finishing his term, done one very important thing, which was to renegotiate for the PSC-CUNY grants and increase the money there. We have already done some things to be proud of that Manfred had a big hand in. And I appreciate what Sandi said about our standing together whenever we can. Absolutely. We can do that. But I would urge this body at least to hold this over for a longer discussion and more consideration. I don't understand why it is necessary that the UFS pass this resolution, except to give the CUNY administration the ability to say in Albany that the faculty supports this. Otherwise, I don't really see why it's necessary. I also think it's important for us to know that this is something that the union leadership and the union's Delegate Assembly which many of you are part of has given real consideration to. Unfortunately the premises behind the CUNY Compact, for instance, don't hold true historically. If you look at the last 20 years of funding in New York State for public higher education, every single time tuition has been increased at CUNY and SUNY, the State contribution has decreased, and the overall budget has tended to go down in years when tuition has gone up. That's because the State is waiting around for an

excuse to withdraw money from CUNY and SUNY, and they take that excuse when tuition is raised. So the idea that the Compact is a compact and that there is somebody on the other side really needs reexamination. Also the idea of fully funding the Compact is a little bit deceptive, not intentionally so, but the Legislature is legally bound not to guarantee spending from one year to the next. Even if they wanted to put in a kind of maintenance of effort that every year they would meet the tuition increases, they can't do that. So "fully funding" raises some questions. Also, the endorsement of a change in the State Education Law to give the Trustees the power here to set tuition and take that power away from the Legislature, while I totally agree with Sandi that is not the whole of the Public Higher Education Empowerment and Innovation Act, PHEEIA, it is a central, if not the central, plank of that Act. It will be seen, and not because you have said this, but believe me I've heard it already about the SUNY faculty that they are totally supporting PHEEIA. The minute you pass that one plank, we will hear in Albany, as I heard from the Governor's head of higher education, Oh, don't worry, the faculty support it. So I think we may think one thing here, but things get construed differently in Albany. I'll just end with two things. One is that Chancellor Goldstein *does* support PHEEIA. If you look at the testimony he has given in front of the Governor in Albany, you will see him on the record in front of the Legislature, where it matters, supporting PHEEIA. You will see him standing at a press conference with the Governor's higher ed person supporting PHEEIA. Furthermore, he supports different tuition by different majors. He has said publicly that he would like to charge more for an engineering major than, say, for an English major like my humble discipline. We can all see where that would have an effect on students channeling some in some direction, others otherwise. It's totally contrary to the mission of the University. Finally, I would ask you to think about giving trustees the ability to set tuition when this group of trustees is not elected, and they are not accountable. The Legislature, as bad as it is, at least they have to get elected. Our trustees are simply appointed, not elected at all and they have no accountability to anybody but to the Governor and the Mayor. I would have the fear that they would simply intensify scarcity at certain campuses and further defund the campuses we all know are underfunded right now in the senior college system. You can all name them for yourselves. In appreciation of the time you have given and the potential of working together, I really ask the Senate to hold off on this – it at root accepts the condition of underfunding. It accepts the premise that the public funding will never go to CUNY. We believe that can be changed, and has been changed. Not easily, but I would just urge you to reconsider. Thank you very much.

Professor Batson—A few years ago I was doing some research, and I came across an article in the New York Times from 1976 on the introduction of tuition at CUNY. They were profiling a group of women at the College of Staten Island who were talking about the impact of tuition. Right there jumping out from the page was Professor Sandi Cooper, standing with these women and talking about in these families with very little discretionary funds that the first thing that would go is these women's education. The arguments that she made very eloquently then in 1976 still hold true today. She's been putting up the good fight for a very long time and when she speaks about how painful the decision was to come up with this resolution, I would take her at her word, but that argument that she made in 1976 I would say is very much with us today – that question of access. I have been deeply concerned with the increasing privatization of this University. I believe the Compact is another huge step in that direction. I don't trust that the Legislature won't do what they have historically done, which Barbara just mentioned, which is to cut their financial obligation to CUNY every time there is a tuition hike. So we find ourselves here 30 years after that initial tuition hike in 76 going from where tuition was no part of our budget to approaching almost 40% of CUNY's budget in a 30 year period. This Compact is another large step forward in that process of privatization and I think endangers access of our most vulnerable students. The parts of PHEEIA about differential tuition, which I know is not

on the table now, either by campus or by major, is just further discrimination in our education system, and I think really argues against the mission of this public university.

Professor Florence—Professor Florence—As one of the newer faculty members, I was impressed at the passion with which every one of you fought the furloughs and faculty retrenchment. I hope we do the same when it comes to students' interests, who come from places where I come from. Thank you.

Chair Cooper—May I have permission for a guest to speak? Professor London—Steve London, Brooklyn College, Political Science, also First Vice President of the Professional Staff Congress. I must say I'm delighted to be back here. I was a senator for 12 or so years and also served for 10 years on the Budget Advisory Committee, so I speak with whatever authority the Budget Advisory Committee has in expertise. I do appreciate the opportunity to talk. One of the jobs I have in the PSC is I'm legislative director. I spend a lot of time in Albany. Sandi, I think it may be another country! So I talk to legislators quite a bit both in Albany and in New York. So the kinds of positions that the union forms are not in a vacuum. It is out of a real practical understanding of the politics of New York State. We also meet with our colleagues across the country several times a year – the AAUP, AFT, state-wide with the New York State United Teachers and touch base about what our perceptions are about the political realities. So I just wanted to convey to you that the positions we take are not idiosyncratic. They are very informed and mainstream and very much in the context of people who are engaged in trying to fund public higher education both in the State and in the nation. A lot has been said here tonight about how bad things are. That's not an issue, and I could add to it. We all know how bad things are, but that's not what we are here to talk about. We are here to talk about how we can make things better, and how we can deal with the circumstances that we are in. Clearly when we think about that, one of the primary points we have to address is how we can better fund CUNY and SUNY. That is our central issue. You just heard that tuition is 40% now of CUNY's budget. In the last 10 years it has gone between 33% and 40%, up and down over the years. But take the other side of that number. Sixty percent of our money comes from public sources. If we are going to move forward out of this recession we have to be concerned about that 60%. We have to be conscious of policies that will not diminish the vast majority of our funding. That is why we are opposed to the Compact. The Compact sounds great. It says the State will do its part, we will do our part, the students will do their part, everyone will be happy, and we will move forward. But since the Compact has been in place, the leaders in Albany have not adopted it. In other words, since administration, management, of CUNY has proposed this as a funding model, it has not been adopted. And it's not been adopted just by people who are opposed to funding us, it has not been adopted by our friends. Deborah Glick, who is chair of the Assembly Higher Education Committee and a very strong and committed supporter of CUNY, as everyone in this room knows, is opposed to this. Why? She has said publicly and privately if the trustees get the authority to raise tuition and if the Compact goes through, one, CUNY would not see another dime raised in public funding, and whenever the Legislature can see that the board of trustees has the authority to raise tuition they've got a lot of other constituents clamoring for money. What do you think will be the path for them? The path will be to allow the trustees to raise tuition, and the legislators will reduce funding. That's the problem with the Compact. For the five year period between the two recessions, between 2003 and 2008, when the Compact was not in force, we saw a 50% increase in public funding. We had debates throughout that five year period with CUNY management over whether or not we should adopt the Compact, and we said No. New York State United Teachers said No. The AAUP, the SUNY union, said No. And we prevailed. And during that period, the Legislature continued to increase public funding. What would have happened if the legislators thought that they could have money come out of the students, and relieve them of that responsibility? Well, that's speculation. But we know what worked. And

we should not adopt something during a recession that will make us poor in the future. So I would urge you to understand that we're not talking about how bad things are, but how we can make them better, and we should take what has been proven to move us forward in the future. Thank you.

Professor Martell—I would never suggest that our union leaders are doing anything other than acting in our best interests as they see it. These are dedicated people that work very hard for us. I find it difficult to be in a position where I simply disagree with their long-term economic approach. It's predicated upon things that I don't believe are real: additional tax increases, additional federal stimulus money. I don't think that's going to be forthcoming, and therefore I've got a problem with the fundamental approach. I think the model needs to be changed. And while I appreciate their effectiveness, they've lobbied the very people they've just mentioned to be against the Compact they were against, and they succeeded. I would like to see them lobby in a different direction. What are we asking for here? We are asking that the UFS calls upon the Legislature and the Executive to fully fund the CUNY Compact. What does "fully fund" mean? It means cover our mandatory costs. They covered our mandatory costs last year, then they cut it. But if they hadn't covered the mandatory costs and cut that we would have been really up the creek without a paddle. There is a balance here. There is a balance among the various stakeholders, and as faculty we've got an obligation to look not just at today and the recession, but at the future of CUNY. When Bill talks about access I think that's wonderful, but what I want is access to excellence, not just access. I want the children of the State of New York to be able to get the education they need to succeed in this extremely competitive world, and to me that requires a different funding model than what we are currently seeing. So when I ask you to support this resolution, I ask you to think about not just today or tomorrow, as Steve said, but where is the future going to be? Where and how are we going to retain the kind of upward direction that we've seen in the last few years? I don't see any other way. If I did, I would be happy to endorse it.

Professor Cermele—I think everybody here is sincere in looking at it in the best interests of the University from the Chancellor on up, or is it down? The Compact is a brilliant, innovative, and creative idea. Sadly, it doesn't work. It's predicated on three legs: tuition, State aid, and philanthropy, none of which are very reliable. We've had five or six years of experience with the Compact. It's failed every time. I don't know why we think it's going to work in the future. The Chancellor talked about linking TAP and the tuition. When the University imposed tuition 30 years ago, they said don't worry about it, we will have TAP to cover the students who can't afford tuition, and they were selling bridges across the East River at the same time. It didn't happen. TAP keeps slipping. It's unreliable. To rely on tuition is not unlike sub-prime mortgages. If we rely on tuition and there is a sudden shrinkage of students, which could happen if the economy takes off or if tuition gets too high, we're in big trouble. We have a little bubble that's going to collapse on us. We have little bubbles going on at the University right now having to do with tuition support for students. So I don't think this resolution is a good idea, and I think we should not be under an illusion that this is a fiscal resolution. This is a political resolution that has resonance in Albany. I think this needs more thought and debate and so I move to table this until we can have perhaps an expert panel to discuss both sides and hear both sides. I don't think there is any need to rush ahead and do this.

Chair Cooper--You can't make a motion after a speech, but I'd like to permit the other speakers at the mic the opportunity to speak and then if you wish to make a motion, it's OK. I would also like to say something about the historical citation of myself!

Professor Barnhart—I would like to respond to a few of the things that Barbara and Steve said. I think Barbara made a good case for why it matters that we pass this right now, because clearly CUNY wants to move this in front of the Legislature. Clearly it will also make a difference, and I think that's certainly why Barbara and Steve and others are down here speaking to this. It certainly will make a difference in Albany if CUNY can say that the faculty in fact endorse this. I think it will be very powerful and important. If you believe in it, I think it's very important that we vote on it tonight. I don't quite understand the nature of the remarks to the effect that this is a good idea, but. If it's a good idea, it's a good idea. It's being put forward as an idea. To say it's a good idea and it won't work – well, we don't know because it hasn't been tested yet. I also think that some of the evidence that's being put forward for why it doesn't work is rather selective. It's claimed that whenever tuition goes up, in fact funding goes down. But it actually works the other way around: it's when funding goes down that tuition goes up, because somehow you have to keep this University going, especially assuming you don't want to retrench and do other draconian sorts of things. So it's false and misleading to suggest that if we talk about rational tuition increases, somehow we're automatically making it the case that funding will go down. It is entirely the point of the Compact -- now obviously there are limitations, at least the way things are currently mandated in the law that may change and we don't know the nature of a bill that might be put forward – but it is certainly the point of the Compact to lock in a commitment on the part of the State to funding CUNY, so that we're not looking at what I think in the end does indeed hurt students a great deal, which is that Albany decides in the end that although all of these things are painful they have to cut the budget, and they will make up for it with tuition increases. Then we have, as the Chancellor mentioned, tuition increases that occur under these conditions and because these conditions are not every year but at rather lengthy intervals, it means the increases are very hefty and hurt the student badly because they are not able to plan, and TAP is not linked to it either. That's a wonderful suggestion, and I think our support for this is support for the entire package. We're not talking about supporting only tuition increases. We're talking about supporting that along with correlating increases in TAP so that the most vulnerable students are protected. It seems to me that is a reason to call it a wonderful idea, as people are suggesting. So I think if it is in fact a wonderful idea, and if it does matter that faculty get behind it, then I think that we definitely ought to do that tonight.

Professor Baumrin—We are once again facing an imminent budget shortfall. Whether it will be a cut by the Governor or a failure of tax revenue, we are going to as a University face a significant shortfall. The PSC would like numbers. I would be glad, in camera, to give them numbers. I need to use my calculator, but it doesn't take very long. I estimate off the top of my head something like a 10% cut. There is very little left to cut. You can count in your departments what 10% means. We need to make that up by tuition. That's approximately \$125 million, give or take. It will take a tuition increase of roughly \$400, and that would be, if it's covered by TAP, mostly paid by TAP eligibility for those students who have TAP eligibility left. If you think, as some of you may because you belong to a different generation, that this will come out of the administration alone, or buildings and grounds, or the heating budget, let me tell you it comes out of faculty and faculty alone.

Professor Pimentel—We can't be here the whole night. We need some procedural motions to limit the time we have to fiddle with this. We will decide to pass it, or table it, but we can't continue with it. I agree with Michael. He's right. We have different ideas of what should be the message to Albany. The point here is what kind of message we want to send. That is in your hands.

Professor Crain—I understand things looks bad, and I understand the expertise of those who are saying things are inevitably going downhill, but I don't know how we predict how things are

going. The Chancellor mentioned something about the City recovering. I don't know if we are not going to get out of the drains of Afghanistan and Iraq, which are the basic root of all the problems the country is having. We can't predict. It's a bad idea to say things look real bad so we're going to change policy. It would be a bad idea to say we were facing war or something so we're going to change the Constitution because we can't afford to hold onto that. The real bad idea is the policy change of giving authority for tuition to the Board of Trustees. You don't want to make that policy change. If things go really bad, they could raise tuition any amount they saw fit and what would be our recourse? At least the legislators have to be reelected. They have a constituency. We could go to their neighborhoods and offices and rally public support. We would have a recourse on behalf of the students. It's a really bad policy move that I think should be rejected.

Professor Cermele—I retract that motion to table and offer a motion to postpone the vote until the next plenary.

Chair Cooper—I would like a moment to speak [stepping down from the chair]. I am professor of history since 1967 in CUNY, and since 1959 elsewhere. As I said before, this is not my happiest moment. From what I understand our Legislature, and I too have spoken to some of them, is basically paralyzed at the moment. I'm not altogether sure that the paralysis is permanent – nobody knows. As far as the independence or the nastiness or hostility of the appointed trustees, many of you know that I led a campaign at least 20 years ago to recreate the old system for appointing trustees. We couldn't get it though the government in Albany because the Senate was controlled by Republicans who refused to accept it unless they got control of the Regents. That system would have recreated a blue ribbon panel to recommend to the Governor and the Mayor the trustees, the way that judges were picked and trustees were picked when it was called the Board of Higher Education. I still would campaign for that as a matter of principle. I think the current system of trustee selection is a human embarrassment to us. In the 1990s when we had a Board Chair named Paolucci, a mayor named Giuliani, and a governor named Pataki, the trustees did nothing before they made phone calls to the boys in city hall or up there before they voted. In fact some of them were dumb enough with the microphones on and say in public I can't vote until I call Pataki. However, this group, even though some of them are from that era, has not done that kind of thing. They have basically been led by the administration. They have accepted the Schmidt Report, for better or worse, which says this University needs to be managed more like a business – I'm not crazy about this, but this is the fact. We have appointed you, Matthew Goldstein, to run our business. You make a recommendation. I have never seen them reject them, so we're not dealing with a board of trustees of the 1990s. If we were, I wouldn't dream of recommending this project. Stimulus money: for the most part what we got, and it's gone, went to the Research Foundation, and to research projects. It won't save faculty salaries, even if we got it again. I wish we could. You read the newspaper as much as I do, and you can smell the future drift of this country. Even if the Democrats hold on to this Congress they are not going to bail anyone out anymore. They are going around apologizing for having done it. They are reading the tea leaves, and that was an accidental metaphor! These are the things, with my limited understanding of numbers, that have led me to suggest that this might be the right course. As far as the two parts of the resolution, I am much more concerned with the first, personally, than I am with the second part. I know the Chancellor will put through a resolution on tuition whether we support it, oppose it, table it, or stomp on it, it's going to happen. Whether we want to be associated with it or not as a group maybe doesn't matter. What matters is that we end up with a University that's functioning next September. And we are a whole group. Even if the community colleges slide through a little better than the senior colleges, lots of those students transfer and they need to have courses to take that don't have 55 students in a 300 level course, or have a full-time faculty member being

invited to teach overtime on multiple positions in order to avoid hiring the people we should be hiring because the enrollment might be growing. Enrollment growing also helps the budget to an extent – not that much. Finally, about 1976 when I was happily defending the absence of tuition in my own experience with those housewives from Staten Island that Mike Batson found, I was doing it because there was no proposal yet for something like TAP. And then when it came about, it was so limited it wasn't going to help. But when we realized after Ford told New York City to drop dead that CUNY had to have tuition, none of us liked it, especially those of us like Matt Goldstein and I who benefit from a free City College education, along with 15 members of my immediate and extended family. When we realized that was going to happen, the next best thing we could get was some kind of commitment from the State to ensure that the poor could go. They have not stuck by that commitment. They have fiddled with it, and we have fought back. I don't think that tension is ever going to end. But it's there. The other point I think we ought to take into consideration is less iffy, and that is the possibility that Pell money will be cut even further. Textbooks and so forth are being removed from what students can use the money for, or limited, and if the Congress goes the way some of us think it will, there is no hope for that money and the Stafford Loans which is a huge area of support for our students. Do I like anything I'm saying? I don't even like looking in the mirror anymore, so I hardly like this. But I mainly wanted to correct the thing about me in 1975 – that was somebody else.

Professor Cermele—I move to postpone this motion until after when the body can think about it for a month, and then we could have a little debate here among people who claim to be experts in this area.

Chair Cooper – The motion is not to table, but to delay consideration, which has been seconded, and to create a debate in the next month so if we do have Toby Stavisky it's going to be a little problematic. Any comments?

Professor Vozick – We need to turn our attention in the long term in the direction of what do we think about the long range future of our profession. You've heard the word sustainability. It's not just global warming arguments. It's professional arguments. Professor Cermele's motion is a tiny step in the right direction.

Professor McCormick – Are there any political stakes in delaying this vote by a month?

Professor Martell – That's a serious question on several levels. Fundamentally, when is this motion going to really matter? When the budget is presented to the Legislature. I don't know that a month is going to make a difference in that. It will make a difference in terms of there's intermediate votes that the Board will have. It might make a difference there, but I don't think fundamentally it matters.

Professor Baumrin – The Budget Request is in. The reception of the Budget Request in the Governor's office for promulgation on or about the 15th of January will occur probably mid-November through December. The reason I asked Professor Martell to address this is to see whether he said anything different from what I just said, and I didn't hear anything.

Professor Kalia – We have benefitted from the wise minds who have spoken this evening, and Sandi's narrative was very informative. I'm a new kid on the block. But everything, Sandi, that you said, and what strikes me as kind of funny in some sense, seemed to suggest not to act on this at the moment. Your concern about the character and the flavor of the board of trustees in the 1990s is very appropriate, but what keeps a similar kind of flavor coming back in the future when we hand over this power to determine on tuition for students in the future? It would occur

to me at a time historically in this country whenever there has been a recession – and there are questions now about whether the recession itself is turning around – enrollment across the country goes up. We have seen this from generation to generation, largely because these people are going to retrain themselves, and it would occur to me that people who are already down should be kicked in the teeth at a time when they should be given help to walk. We are doing just the opposite of what we are supposed to be doing. You mentioned about profiting from free tuition, and Goldstein too. Now we are talking about punishing our students at a time when they are struggling. I, at City College, have started a fund for tuition and every year out of my own pocket I pay \$500 to \$1000 to help students buy textbooks. I have had a huge difficulty with my administration at City College to actually make it work. We do it on an ad hoc basis. We have not been able to establish something. I have welcomed other friendly faculty to come and join me in that, and some have. There are many ways to skin the cat, and I think this is the time to reflect on it rather than to act precipitously. If we leap now, we may well be wondering where the hell are we floating.

Chair Cooper – The motion is to lay the issue over. People at the microphone are asked to address that rather than the content.

Professor Dalglish – I'm hearing that we don't want to cave in to necessity. Necessity being the mother of invention, we don't want to invent tuition and put that burden on our students. I think we all agree we don't want to do that. At the same time, we're faced with this time, and the question was raised is it a political decision and that we need to have a unified voice. So I'm asking if we can at least come together on a concern that we all share, and not just two sides of it with everything else in limbo, and you said that we could go on for two years on this, and we could. Meanwhile, what is the government going to do up in Albany? They are going to make decisions without us. If we can put forth one condition, or have some united agreement that we together as a body want, and we should put that before them in a timely matter rather than waiting for them to move forward when it's too late.

Professor Friedman – I'm speaking to the motion. I support the motion to put this over to the next meeting at a minimum. I say that for a practical reason. It's very impressive that the room is still filled at this time. Clearly everybody in this room is really engaged in this and is really taking it very seriously no matter what side we are on. I think if we vote tonight, we have to be prepared for the very real possibility that this may pass or this may fail. If we force a vote tonight with such a divided house, we might vote this resolution down, and what will the consequences be? I think what is trying to be offered here is some way that we can leave tonight united and not divided. I support the motion to put this over whatever we have to do, and I really do not see the pressure of meeting a deadline that the Chancellor sets because the board of trustees or a board of trustees committee is meeting in two weeks. We can't behave rationally with that artificial pressure on our heads.

Chair Cooper – Some has called the question. All in favor? There is a clear majority of hands. Now the recommendation is that the issue be laid over for a discussion at the next meeting. We will have to of course, as I said before, see what the agenda looks like. We count 44 hands in favor and 20 opposed. The motion carries.

Professor Pecorino – I would ask the Executive Committee to invite somebody from the Governor's office or the Assembly or the Senate committees on higher education to address the issues that have been brought up referencing the State Legislature. In their view, if authority was moved, what would the consequences be? Would we get to keep the tuition money? That would all have to be rolled into legislative action. What is the likelihood? It's bad enough that we have

to deal with Albany whose record of ineptitude is extreme, but at least we could get some word from them rather than the speculation from people down here as to what those people up there are thinking.

Professor Conway – I'd like to make a suggestion to the Executive Committee that we find a better format for this discussion because I don't see it improving next month if we just have people taking turns back and forth and then some people come up three and four times to give their view. We need a more structured debate with time limits, handouts, and things that make it a more productive discussion for those of us who need to be better informed.